The prevention of id theft against women while shopping

The prevention of ID Theft against women while shopping Affiliation

Characteristics Total Identity Theft Existing Account New Account (%)

Personal Information (%)

Multiple Types (%)

Female

15

13

4

3

5

Male

14

12

4

3

6

Age: 16-24 years old

55

41

16

16

22

25-34 years old

29

25

8

7

13

35-49 years old

19

15

6

3

8

50-64 years old

19

16

5

3

6

65 years old and Above

20

16

5

3

7

Source: Langton & Michael Planty, (2010)

From the data presented above, it is clearly depicted that female in shopping malls suffer more from identity theft cases than men do. Further from the same statistics, most of the affected individuals fall in the age of between 16 and 24 year. In fact, 55% of the affected people are within this age group, with women being the majority. This age group is then followed closely by

people of the age of 25-34 years of age, who account for 29 per cent. It seems that due to increase in one's age, the ability to fall victim of identity theft decrease. People aged between 35 and 49 years and 50-64 account for only 19 per cent each. The implication here could be that these people are mature enough to determine possible threats and they can therefore avoid cases of identity theft. The aged people fall victim even more frequently due to their inability to take care of themselves. Like women, they would prefer seeking assistance regarding the tasks that could lead to identity theft.

This data is further analysed using SPSS as follows:

One-Sample Statistics

N

Mean

Std. Deviation

Std. Error Mean

Total Identity Theft

7

24. 4286

14. 32780

5. 41540

Existing Account

7

19. 7143

10. 29100

3. 88963

New Account

7

6. 8571

4. 25944

1. 60992

Personal Information

7

5. 4286

4. 89412

1. 84980

Multiple Types

7

9. 5714

6. 07885

2. 29759

From the SPSS output on one-sample statistics, the mean value for all victims of identity theft irrespective of the specific characteristic is 24. 429 with a standard deviation of 14. 327.

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 0

t

df

Sig. (2-tailed)

Mean Difference

95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

Lower

Upper

Total Identity Theft

4. 511

6

. 004

24. 42857

11. 1776

37. 6796

Existing Account

5. 068

6

. 002

19. 71429

10. 1967

29. 2319

New Account

4. 259

6

. 005

6. 85714

2. 9178

10. 7965

Personal Information

2. 935

6

. 026

5. 42857

. 9023

9. 9549

Multiple Types

4. 166

6

. 006

9. 57143

3. 9494

15. 1934

The table above is an SPSS output of the data depicting the test of significant using one-tailed t test. From the analysis, all variables are significant in explaining the model. Besides, from the ANOVA statistics are variables are also found to be significant in explaining the model. The ANOVA statistics is as shown below:

ANOVA

Sum of Squares

df

Mean Square

F

Sig.

ExistingAccount

Between Groups

634. 929

5

126. 986

253. 971

. 048

Within Groups

. 500

1

. 500

Total

635. 429

6

NewAccount

Between Groups

108. 357

5

21. 671

43. 343

. 115

Within Groups

. 500

1

. 500

Total

108. 857

6

PersonalInformation

Between Groups

143. 714

5

28. 743

.

.

Within Groups

. 000

1

. 000

Total

143. 714

6

MultipleTypes

Between Groups

219. 714

5

43. 943

21. 971

. 161

Within Groups

2. 000

1

2. 000

Total

221. 714

6

References

Langton, L., & Michael Planty. (2010,). National Crime Victimization Survey

Supplement: Victims of Identity Theft, 2008. Bureau of Justice Statistics:

Special Report, NCJ 231680, 1-20.