ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive review of the literature on Online Hedonic Consumers' Privacy Paradox and Privacy Awareness. Furthermore, the authors attempt to identify a gap that can be addressed in the future by developing a comprehensive and integrated model on Online Hedonic Consumer Behaviour that focuses on their Privacy Awareness. The authors conducted a systematic literature review of the extant literature. The discussion on “Privacy”, “Privacy Paradox” and “Privacy Awareness” elucidated the differences among them, thereby helping to remove any confusions held by the researchers and readers. This review offered insight into the current status of research in this field and recognized the factor “Privacy Awareness” as a gap in the existing model on Online Hedonic Consumer Behaviour that could properly be explored in further scholarly empirical research. Managers and E-Commerce vendors could utilize the findings of this review to address their Hedonic Consumer Privacy Awareness for the growth of their online businesses. This paper lays a groundwork to explore Online Hedonic Consumer Privacy Awareness in detail. A new integrated model is suggested, which will lead to the development of a theoretical framework for researchers to further examine the mediation effect of Privacy Awareness.
INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of the 21st century, several studies (S. A. Brown & Venkatesh, 2005; Hsu & Lu, 2007) found that instead of the business sector, the most robust growth in the computing industry happened in home and personal computing sectors. Starting in 1996, the rise in video game software sales figures in the U.S.A has been more than three times that of Utilitarian software (Entertainment Software Association, 2007), and in 2018, this industry had a record-breaking sales exceeding US$43.4 billion (Entertainment Software Association, 2019). The worldwide video game market was predicted to reach US$128.5 billion in 2020 (Newzoo B.V., 2017, April 20), and thus far, it has surpassed it- amid the global COVID-19 pandemic to nearly US$180 billion (MarketWatch, 2020). The growth of “Mobile Computing”, “Social Computing” and “Gaming”- prime examples of “Hedonic-Motivation Systems” or “HMS”, indicates that an economic and social revolution in technology usage is eminent. HMS usage and adoption happens predominantly for sensual gratification as opposed to necessity. HMSs are now growing to be more of the essence to the world economy. It is now more important than ever to have a close observation of this phenomenon from the academician’s perspective.

Privacy was originally defined by legal scholars (Warren & Brandeis, 1890) simply as- “the right to be left alone”. This elegant and timeless nature of the definition was proclaimed by Stewart (2017) in his recent commentaries. However, Privacy needs to be redefined more specifically in the context of the modern era of Information Technology and from the consumer’s point of view. Hence, Martin and Murphy (2017) further clarifies that “consumers tend to define Privacy according to whether they maintain control over their personal information”. The importance of Privacy protection and various publicized incidents of severe Data Privacy breaches have caught the attention of the mainstream media. One of the largest Consumer Data Privacy violations of recent times involved Facebook (FB) and the data analysis firm Cambridge Analytica, which affected more than 87 million FB users (Frenkel, Rosenberg, & Confessore, 2018). The repercussions have been quite significant to say the least. FB lost north of US$43 billion, stemming from its largest ever stock price drop (Palmatier & Martin, 2019) and in further fallout, several high profile companies and their CEOs deleted their FB pages (Jenkins, 2018). Additionally, many other leading businesses also reported that the Privacy of millions of their customers’ accounts was compromised (Paul, 2018). Scholars (Martin, Borah, & Palmatier, 2018) estimate an average of US$8 million in stock price drops for publicly traded companies in the US per data breach incident. Business leaders losing their jobs in the wake of their company’s data breaches have been illustrated in detail by Palmatier and Martin (2019). Studies led by Hsieh, Noyes, Liu, and Fiondella (2015) and Sen and Borle (2015) have also examined data security breaches and their effects on a firm in a comprehensive manner.

The danger is always there. The truth is, that in a modern data-rich environment, the consumer’s data can only be so protected and private regardless of the consumer’s cybersecurity savviness and self-policing (Palmatier & Martin, 2019). People now-a-days are very much in fear regarding cybersecurity issues (Rosenbush, 2018). Brough and Martin (2021) explored the heightened sense of vulnerability felt by consumers during the recent COVID-19 pandemic regarding their sensitive, personal data. Fortunately, not everything is dark and gloom in the protection of Data Privacy as Palmer (2019) illustrated that several regulators both at the state and local government levels- worldwide, are taking necessary steps to enact and revise relevant policies.
Regarding Privacy, there are numerous and quite interesting topics that have been explored in academia. Privacy, Privacy Paradox, Privacy Awareness, etc. are to name the prominent few. They appear to be quite close and slightly confusing at times, as new researchers often use these terms interchangeably without knowing the subtle differences among them- resulting in miscommunication.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

This research paper aims to review what is already known about Online Consumers’ Privacy, Privacy Paradox, Privacy Awareness in the specific context of Hedonic Consumptions, to identify existing research gaps and to propose probable directions for future research.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

More specifically, this paper attempts to address these following research questions by carrying out a systematic literature review: (1) “For Privacy issues, which research contexts i.e., types of markets and types of consumers have been studied?” (2) “Do the issue of Privacy, Privacy Paradox, Privacy Awareness have any direct or indirect impact on Hedonic Consumers’ Consumption Behaviour?”

**RESEARCH GAP**

Due to its uniqueness, a specific look and focus was given at Hedonic Products and Services. This literature review will subsequently lead to the establishment of a new model of Consumer Behaviour in the future- which might be discovered during this study. A model, that might help us explain- how and why, the Socially Networked Hedonic Consumers behave in the way they behave during their Online Purchases-while they are aware of their Privacy. Starting in Asia and later followed by extensive research conducted in other parts of the world, this research might even expand the generalizability of this proposed model and establish it further.

This idea could hopefully open up new avenues for further research- looking into the impact of Privacy Awareness on many other areas of consumer behaviour, plus inclusion of any new variable(s) should the need arise.

**METHODOLOGY**

For the purpose of providing a conspectus of the existing research on “Privacy”, “Privacy Awareness” and “Privacy Paradox” in the context of Online Hedonic Consumers, a systematic literature review was carried out. A systematic literature review is stated to provide “research synthesis of existing studies on an issue, identifying opportunities for future research” (Bhimani, Mention, & Barlatier, 2019). A systematic literature review is considered to be “rigorous” and “transparent” (Mallett, Hagen-Zanker, Slater, & Duvendack, 2012). To reduce bias and allow replications later on, systematic reviews practice clear and prespecified procedures to “select, scan, and analyse all the available evidence” (Gopalakrishnan & Ganeshkumar, 2013).

**Eligibility Criteria**

To recognize the present and pertinent literature on the “Privacy”, “Privacy Awareness” and “Privacy Paradox” of Hedonic consumers, certain selection criteria were agreed upon. The peer-reviewed academic journal articles that were included in this review were (a) published in English; (b) based on online context; and (c) focused on the “Privacy”, “Privacy Awareness” and “Privacy Paradox” of Hedonic Consumers. Logically, the excluded articles were: (a) non-academic by nature; (b) based on offline context only; (c) focused on aspects other than “Privacy”, “Privacy Awareness” and “Privacy Paradox” of Hedonic Consumers.

**Literature search and selection**

A significant number of academic journal articles were collected after appropriate keyword searches in diverse databases i.e., Web of Science, Google Scholar, Scopus etc.
These were then screened based on the aforementioned selection and exclusion criteria. Since the emphasis of this review is the privacy issues of Hedonic consumers in an online context, a multidisciplinary topic, the key multidisciplinary and widely used databases were utilized for the literature search. These databases were selected as they have a rather high volume of scholarly articles related to Information Systems, Marketing, Hedonic Consumers and Privacy and the fact that articles found in these databases come from high impact, highly ranked peer reviewed journals. Additionally, several leading academic journals (e.g., “Journal of Marketing”, “Computers in Human Behaviour”, “MIS Quarterly” etc.) where quantitative, relevant studies are often featured were researched. Published articles from 1960 to 2020 were systematically reviewed to determine whether they included our topics and their antecedents and consequences as measured variables. Conference proceedings, dissertation databases, i.e., ProQuest dissertations & theses full text, review papers and references from the retrieved papers, were also researched. The emphasis was placed mostly on scholarly journal articles as Rosenthal (1995) clearly notes: “Since journals are more likely to publish statistically significant results than nonsignificant results, articles therein are more likely to report the results of studies with effect sizes larger than studies that are not published”. The keywords were selected based on the concepts, ideas and theories related to Privacy and Hedonic Consumers. To identify possible pertinent research related to Privacy and Hedonic consumers, the terms “Privacy”, “Privacy Paradox”, “Privacy Awareness”, “Online Shopping”, “Hedonic-Motivation System” and “Hedonic Consumers” were used as keywords. To include the maximum number of scholarly papers in this study, the full text (i.e., all fields except for the reference section) of the journal articles was reviewed. The search concluded on 16 April 2022, yielding a total of 358 journal articles. After removing a few copies, 315 articles remained. The scrutinization of titles, abstracts, and keywords excluded 104 irrelevant journal articles. Most of the excluded papers focused neither on Privacy nor on Hedonic Consumers. Afterwards, the authors of this review evaluated the full-text of the outstanding 211 journal articles independently to recognize pertinent papers on the basis of the research questions and the eligibility criteria. Differences of opinions that were raised were resolved through discussions among the authors of this paper. Finally, among these 211 journal articles, 103 journal articles along with few additional book chapters (13) and conference papers (8) and recent web resources (10) were utilized for this systematic literature review. Outstanding 77 journal articles were not included for numerous reasons. The authors found that many studies that were carried out in the context of online shopping were referring to Utilitarian Consumers rather than Hedonic Consumers. Few papers have focused on the Privacy Concern of Utilitarian Consumers rather than on the Privacy Concern of Hedonic Consumers. Finally, some other studies focused on the privacy concern of hedonic consumers, but they were not conducted in an online context.

**RESULTS**

This review analysed the selected articles from three perspectives: (1) the research theme; (2) the research context; and (3) key findings related to the “Privacy”, “Privacy Awareness” and “Privacy Paradox” of Hedonic Consumers. The key findings are presented below in the literature review section and in Table 1.

**Hedonic Consumers**

“Hedonic” products and services are defined as “sensational and experiential”, whereas “Utilitarian” products and services are defined as “practical, instrumental, and functional” (Lu, Liu, & Fang, 2016). Scholars (Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2000; Voss, Spangenberg, & Grohmann, 2003) further refine the attributes of Hedonic and Utilitarian products, specifically by describing “Utilitarian” products and services as “effective,
helpful, functional, necessary, practical”, and “Hedonic” products and services as “fun, exciting, delightful, thrilling, and enjoyable”. As earlier research (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998) was able to put it simply- “Hedonic products provide more experiential consumption that results in fun, pleasure, and excitement (i.e., designer clothes, sports cars, luxury watches, etc.), whereas Utilitarian products are focused primarily being instrumental and functional (i.e., microwaves, minivans, personal computers, etc.). The Hedonistic consumption of items is termed “the multisensory, fantasy and emotional aspects of consumers’ interactions with products” (Bamossy & Solomon, 2016). The element attracting the consumer most is the “Imagined Pleasure” aspect of this consumption, so the element of fantasy is vital to this theory. However, Migone (2007) viewed it as a “highly wasteful and discriminatory pattern of consumption that predominates in current capitalist models”. Whereas the use of Utilitarian items is noticeably linked to necessities and use of Hedonic items is significantly connected to luxuries (Kivetz & Simonson, 2002a, 2002b), consumers benefit from the consumption of both Utilitarian and Hedonic items. The Utilitarian–Hedonic distinction therefore- is not limited to the product level. This concept can be applied to attributes of both products and services. Researchers (Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2000; Voss et al., 2003) thus argue that certain products and services have both Utilitarian and Hedonic characteristics.

**Hedonic-Motivation System (HMS)**

The “Hedonic-Motivation System” or HMS use is not to be confused with the “Utilitarian-Motivation Systems (UMS)” use as they are fundamentally different from one another. Scholars (Jegers, 2007; Sherry, 2004) note common examples of HMS i.e., “Video Games”, “Social Networking Sites” and “Virtual Worlds” and observe that they “can create a level of deep immersion and devotion which is seldom seen with UMS”. Furthermore, users dedicate time to using HMS for “intrinsic rewards”. The users of HMS commonly have the slightest concern for the acquisition of any “potential external reward(s)” that they might obtain (Sweetser & Wyeth, 2005); instead, the users are typically perturbed about the “process or experience of use” itself. In contrast, UMSs must offer “External Benefits” to their users to motivate them for the use and acceptance of the system (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003), and the users of UMSs are focused on “Specific Outcomes” of system use rather than the “Process Involved in Use”. Several scholars on acceptance research (S. A. Brown & Venkatesh, 2005; Parbotech, Valacich, & Wells, 2009; Van der Heijden, 2004) noticed these significant variances in motivations for using systems that lead to the differences in acceptance and use between HMS and UMS. The research carried out by Lowry, Cao, and Everard (2011) explained the motivation for putting attention to and accepting systems with respect to “Intrinsic Motivation” and “Extrinsic Motivation”. Researchers (Csikszentmihalyi, 1991; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) have outlined how “Intrinsic Motivations” can influence the behaviour of humans more strongly than “Extrinsic Motivations”. Furthermore, “joy” (i.e., “perceived enjoyment”), a type of “intrinsic motivation”, was included in the “technology acceptance model (TAM)” by Venkatesh (2000), and “intrinsic motivation” since then has attracted attention in IS acceptance research in various contemporary scholarly works (Qiu & Benbasat, 2009; Saadé, Nebebe, & Mak, 2009). System acceptance studies continue their meaningful contributions by highlighting different theoretical viewpoints and offering evidence for vital theoretical borders (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008; Venkatesh, Davis, & Morris, 2007).

**Hedonic Motivation System Acceptance Model (HMSAM)**

To utilize these prospects, scholars (Lowry, Gaskin, Twyman, Hammer, & Roberts, 2012) built and tested a brand-new acceptance model titled the “Hedonic Motivation System
Acceptance Model” or “HMSAM”. Rather than an inconsequential, all-purpose extension of TAM, HMSAM is an “HMS-Specific System Acceptance Model” that is very much focused. The theory the scholars (Lowry et al., 2012) developed and tested focused precisely on the “underlying motivations driving HMS acceptance in a process-oriented context”. Here, “Intrinsic Motivation” is further protuberant compared to the outcome-oriented “Extrinsic Motivation” that is commonly accentuated in traditional TAM studies. Van der Heijden (2004) proposed an acceptance model of “Hedonic Information Systems” in an effort to emphasize HMS use by employing the construct “Joy” as the surrogate for “Intrinsic Motivation” instead of taking advantage of the more comprehensive CA construct. This new model “HMSAM” builds on Van der Heijden’s (2004) proposed acceptance model, accompanied by two key extensions intended to catch the significant part of “Intrinsic Motivation” in use of HMS. This works side by side with the literature on consumer behaviour that differentiates between “Utilitarian Products” and “Hedonic Products” (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982).

**Privacy**

Privacy indicates the control over our personal information—referring to the degree we choose to disclose them to our selected audiences with our consent. Privacy means “the right that someone has to keep their personal life or personal information secret or known only to a small group of people” (C. B. E. Dictionary, 2019; Thesaurus, 2019). Privacy also means “the state of being alone, or the right to keep one’s personal matters and relationships secret” (C. A. C. Dictionary, 2019). Several definitions from past and present (Martin & Murphy, 2017; Stewart, 2017; Warren & Brandeis, 1890) portray a very clear idea of Privacy. However, how much of our personal information we want to disclose to anyone else willingly with our trust— with the belief that this disclosed information will not be disclosed to any of our unintended audiences that might cause us physical, psychological harm along with possible social embarrassment? The question is far easier being asked than answered. As this issue covers many different aspects of consumer behaviour—there is no easy and straightforward answer. Even though Privacy laws have been in practice since the 1970s in developed countries, emerging markets have only recently seriously handled the issue of Privacy (Polatin-Reuben & Wright, 2014). Furthermore, various scholars (Katawetawark & Wang, 2011; Liu, He, Gao, & Xie, 2008) noted that “Security/Privacy, among other factors, is strongly predictive of Online Shopping Satisfaction”. Many experts argue as to whether data privacy is an issue falling in the domain of Marketing or Information Technology (IT). Data security and privacy were considered to be the top “Conundrum” for marketers as of late (Manion, 2016). Palmatier and Martin (2019) leaned towards Marketing but they also acknowledged several explanations that supported IT. They also pointed out that Data Privacy is one of those rare topics that most people agree. Consumers feel vulnerable whenever marketers collect their information—regardless of the collection purpose. Such vulnerable consumers are more prone to switching to any competitor should there be any feelings of violation or loss of trust in the business (Martin, Borah, & Palmatier, 2017). Furthermore, issues regarding privacy could hinder new technology adaptation and engagement by retailers (PWC, 2018). The need for significant research into data privacy especially in parts of the world where it is less researched has been brought forward by several studies (Martin et al., 2020; Okazaki, Eisend, Plangger, de Ruyter, & Grewal, 2020).

**Privacy Paradox**

The yearning to protect private information is an expected human attribute. There has been a plethora of research work highlighting online consumers’ concerns and anxieties regarding their information privacy due to several relevant factors (Duhigg, 2012; Valentino-Devries & Singer-Vine, 2012). Hitherto, the exposure of personal data (real
or fictitious) is also something consumers are sometimes willing to give up to gain free access to certain benefits i.e., several online products & services, promotional deals etc. (Papacharissi, 2010; Sayre & Horne, 2000). This issue of apparent dichotomy—attitudes toward privacy behaviour being the opposite from the behaviour itself—has been addressed by scholars (Dinev, 2014). Researchers (Barnes, 2006; B. Brown, 2001) called this phenomenon—“The Privacy Paradox” or “Information Privacy Paradox” or simply “Privacy Paradox” —refers to “the contradiction between one's reported general privacy concerns and actual privacy behaviours”. The consumer privacy paradox is very well examined in academia (Barth & De Jong, 2017; Baruh, Secinti, & Cemalcilar, 2017). Barnes (2006) used the term “privacy paradox” while referring to “the privacy behaviour of young people in social networking sites (SNSs)”. A systematic review of “Privacy Paradox” literature discloses that some scholars have attempted to explain this phenomenon past rational and social based decision making (Kokolakis, 2017). Several studies regarding the quandary of the “Privacy Paradox” have been carried out from the viewpoint of “Psychological/Cognitive Predispositions” and “Heuristics” (Baek, 2014; Kehr, Kowatsch, Wentzel, & Fleisch, 2015). Furthermore, scholars (Mothersbaugh, Foxx, Beatty, & Wang, 2012) propose that the “privacy paradox” is the consequence of information sensitivity being unaccounted for. Social norms (Utz & Krämer, 2009) and social rewards (Lutz & Strathoff, 2014) have often been found to engulf consumers to undermine their privacy. This phenomenon was validated through the results of several empirical studies examining concerns relating to personal privacy. Table 1 illustrates a detailed summary of the further reviewed literature pertinent to the abovementioned ideas. However, interestingly, several studies progressively repudiate the “Privacy Paradox”, as researchers (Dienlin & Trepte, 2015) found substantial associations between “informational, social, as well as psychological privacy attitudes” and “the respective privacy behaviour”. Brunk (2002) suggested that for their privacy, countless online consumers are unwilling to pay. Several scholars (Kim, Barasz, & John, 2019; Palmatier & Martin, 2019; Walker, 2016) highlighted people’s vulnerabilities in protecting their data by citing relevant assertions (Olmstead & Smith, 2017) and called out companies not to use the privacy paradox as an excuse for their actions and responsibilities (or lack thereof). There are still adequate avenues yet to be uncovered regarding privacy paradoxes as new technologies emerge (Martin & Murphy, 2017; Martin & Palmatier, 2020).

Among the 35 prominent articles mentioned in Table 1, 27 articles used quantitative methods i.e., surveys, laboratory experiments and experimental studies to gather observable and numerical data to analyse the relations between Privacy and several related factors in different contexts. The remaining 8 articles used qualitative methods. Furthermore, among these 35 articles, 5 used student samples, 23 used nonstudent samples and the remaining 7 articles were literature reviews. The participants were mostly selected using the convenience sampling method. In this review, numerous articles discussed the pertinent issues relevant to Privacy in a detailed manner, namely issues e.g., “Online consumer’s concerns and anxieties” (3 articles), “Consumers often willing to give up personal data (real or fictitious) to gain free access to certain benefits” (14 articles), “Attitudes toward privacy behaviour being the opposite from the behaviour itself” (10 articles), “Privacy Paradox” (4 articles) and the validation of “Privacy Paradox” (4 articles).

Privacy Awareness

Thanks to information technology, the abilities of online advertisers and third-party aggregators to collect, store and process an exceptional amount of personal information about online consumers have been steadily growing. At the same time, awareness about users’ privacy also rises gradually
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Krishnamurthy, Naryshkin, & Wills (2011). Trevinal and Stenger (2014) tried to discover the “content of consumers’ experience” during online shopping while focusing on the “conceptualization of the online shopping experience (OSE)” in unison. Interestingly, out of their main contributions, the establishment of a true and genuine “Social Dimension” in the OSE that took a certain form in the context of online cyberspace: due to “Online Consumer Reviews” and due to “Socio-Digital Networks” (e.g., “Facebook”)- stood out. However, most significantly, this study identified specific values, namely the “Privacy Issue”, that composed the ideological dimension of the OSE. Several studies have been conducted on “social networking”, specifically focusing on “privacy awareness” and “privacy settings” (D. M. Boyd & Ellison, 2007; N. Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Tufekci, 2008). And as a refresher, SNSs are one of the prime examples of HMS.

A versatile relationship exists between an individual’s Privacy and his or her Social Network. As scholars (Gross & Acquisti, 2005) put it quite articulately- “In certain occasions we want information about ourselves to be known only by a small circle of close friends, and not by strangers. In other instances, we are willing to reveal personal information to anonymous strangers, but not to those who know us better”. Studies (Acquisti & Gross, 2006; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2007) illustrated that “Facebook” users disclose much of their private information while being unaware of privacy options or the viewers of their profile. Findings from several studies (D. Boyd, 2008; N. Ellison et al., 2007; Chris Soghoian, 2008; C Soghoian, 2008) illustrate that “Facebook” and other SNSs pose serious hazards to the privacy of their users. Simultaneously, these SNSs are immensely popular and appear to offer a peak level of gratification to users. For example, “Facebook” users provide a reasonable amount of thorough private information to “a loosely defined group”, which repeats apprehensions highlighted by scholars i.e., Acquisti and Gross (2006), Jagatic, Johnson, Jakobsson, and Menczer (2007) etc. concerning “Data Mining” and “Phishing”.

A study by Christofides, Muise, and Desmarais (2012) proposed that “The Awareness of Consequences” ensuing from “Privacy Violations” effectively projected information revelation (i.e., use of privacy settings). This was reinforced by Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, and Hughes (2009) who mentioned a substantial positive association between “The Understanding of Privacy Settings” and “The Limitation of Profile Visibility”. Hoffman, Novak, and Peralta (1999) identified the implication of “control over secondary use of information” anxieties by the users and consumers who were engaged in online transactions. The inadequacy of studies on people’s alertness to privacy policies and practices, and the linkage between such alertness and people’s behaviour as well as perceptions- are mentioned in scholarly articles (Smith, Dinev, & Xu, 2011).

DISCUSSION

Despite existing research investigating the issues of “Privacy”, “Privacy Paradox” and “Privacy Awareness” from diverse perspectives, some gaps in previous studies yet remain. First, as an answer to the first research question: utilitarian consumers have been the focus of scholarly academic studies thus far; as a result, further evidence is required to offer a better understanding of these issues from the perspective of Hedonic Consumers. There have been few explorations on hedonic responses by consumers with regard to data privacy (Martin et al., 2020) and information disclosure processes (Bidler, Zimmerman, Schumann, & Widjaja, 2020), but the issue of actual hedonic consumption has been overlooked thus far. As privacy concerns differ by retail channel (Okazaki et al., 2020), investigations into multichannel (namely web, mobile and social) investigations and analysis into data privacy were directed (Martin & Palmatier, 2020). Most importantly, Data Privacy in the context of Hedonic Consumption remains a very interesting avenue yet to be explored in academia. In earlier sections of this paper, the different kinds of products or services, namely
Utilitarian and Hedonic- were discussed; and the fact that their respective consumers certainly will intend to behave differently than their counterparts has been quite evident in the following literature review sections. Several studies have focused on consumers of Utilitarian products or services but the consumers of Hedonic products or services have traditionally been overlooked. As recent data from the worldwide consumption pattern and growth in certain business sectors suggest-businesses of Hedonic products or services are booming in the last decade, especially during the recent COVID-19 pandemic. These developments demand a critical view of Hedonic products or services and their consumers from academicians. Therefore, future empirical research is suggested to explore the issues of Privacy, Privacy Paradox and Privacy Awareness from the perspective of Hedonic Consumers, and extend the existing research into this previously unexplored area in academia.

Second, as an answer to the next research question: the paucity of scholarly academic studies into the issue of whether various privacy related topics have any direct or indirect impact on Hedonic Consumer Behaviour leads to the assumption that there is a strong need for an updated behaviour model regarding Hedonic Consumers. The literature review thus far revealed a gap in research in several key areas of Hedonic Consumer Behaviour concerning a few crucial Privacy issues (e.g., “Privacy Paradox” and “Privacy Awareness”). This study revealed that although a versatile relationship exists between Privacy Awareness and HMS (e.g., SNS), Privacy Awareness was not included in the HMSAM. An updated and comprehensive model can provide profound insights into Hedonic Consumer Behaviour in an organized manner and offer improved direction for pertinent research. While looking closely into an existing “Hedonic-Motivation System Adoption Model (HMSAM)”, especially in observing SNS effects on the consumer purchase decision making- it was revealed that there are scopes for adding new dimensions.

The issue of Privacy is of utmost concern to SNS users, more so to them compared to other systems i.e., “Online Shopping”, “Online Dating”, “Online Gaming”, “Virtual Worlds”, “Digital Music Repositories”, “Learning/Education” and “Gamified Systems”; therefore, it is quite reasonable to assume that the user’s concerns regarding Privacy issues will not be similar in the case of SNS usage compared to all these systems. As SNSs are used for a multitude of purposes, the generalized assumption of Privacy and its impact in this regard would not be the best course of action. For all we know, the impact of Privacy in terms of some SNS usage could be quite the reverse compared to its impact in some other above-described systems. Interestingly, some of those effects might be similar to some other HMS systems i.e., “Pornography”, “Online Gaming”, “Online Gambling” etc., where the users require their anonymity to be preserved. Moreover, Lowry et al. (2012) noted that Group and Community-oriented HMSs, i.e., Multiplayer Games, Social Networks, Online Gambling, Blogging etc., were not focused. Thus, the decision to address this issue by including these HMSs by adding mediator variables, i.e., “Privacy Awareness”, seems logical.

CONCLUSION

This review contributes to the research on hedonic consumer behaviour in quite a few ways. First, this review offers an overview of the existing research, offering the scholars and readers an update on the current status of research related to hedonic consumer behaviour. Additionally, the discussion on “Privacy”, “Privacy Paradox” and “Privacy Awareness” elucidates the differences among them, thereby helping to remove any confusions held by the researchers and readers. Moreover, while carrying out the systematic review of pertinent literature, quite a few knowledge gaps were identified. Subsequently, clear directions and suggestions for future research were provided for academicians pursuing this field of study. The ensuing objective of this study is to develop a predictive model for gaining
insights into Online Hedonic Consumers’ Privacy Awareness and to test it empirically. Therefore, after reviewing the extensive literature on relevant topics and identifying a gap, this study proposes a modified version of “hedonic-motivation system adoption model (HMSAM)” by adding a new dimension—“privacy awareness”, especially when consumers are online during their purchase decision making. This review provides a convincing takeaway of Privacy Awareness literature by incorporating numerous viewpoints and arguments from the extant literature. This study proposes to skip the intricate process of full creation and validation of an instrument, only partially by possibly involving few established scales during formation of the construct, but still employing numerous succeeding pilot tests, ensuing evaluation for nomological validity, etc. as suggested by scholars (D. B. Straub & Boudreau; D. W. Straub, 1989). Suggestions can be made in favour of measuring “Privacy Awareness” using established scales and including it as a mediator in the HMSAM model, thereby proposing a new modified model followed by empirical studies to and test this new model. There are ample opportunities to carry on studies in this new, exciting and unexplored research area. This can be done by expanding the breadth of the research by testing the newly proposed model on consumers of different HMSs such as “online dating”; “online gaming”; “virtual worlds”; “digital music repositories”; “learning/education” and “gamified systems” etc., thereby increasing the validity of the newly proposed model.

Furthermore, additional longitudinal studies are required in the ongoing research on hedonic consumer behaviour in the contexts of “Privacy”, “Privacy Paradox” and “Privacy Awareness”. Additionally, in almost the entire domain of research, process models of Privacy-related Online Behaviour of HMS consumers remain largely unexplored. Only a few studies (Bélanger & Crossler, 2011; Y. Li, 2011; Smith et al., 2011) exist that explore this idea despite not providing a specific theoretical framework to Online Privacy in the context of HMSs.

Finally, to ensure validity, any proposed future empirical studies should include diversified, representative samples-containing participants from different contexts (i.e., age groups, occupations, working environments, income groups, countries etc.). Most of the reviewed articles that contained empirical results, utilized student samples. The use of convenience student samples in academic research is widely debated. Quite a few authors (Beltramini, 1983; Oakes, 1972) specified the perils of having student samples in academic studies. Scholars frequently cited warnings of “external validity” as their key apprehension, disagreeing that such samples are “atypical of the general population”; consequently, the results originated from such samples not being “generalizable to other populations” (Cunningham, Anderson, & Murphy, 1974). However, researchers argue by stating “students are often forerunners in the adoption of new communication technologies” (Lewis, Kaufman, & Christakis, 2008).

No research endeavour is free from limitations, and this review was no exception. Articles written in non-English language were not included in this review. Expanding the article selection criteria for future literature reviews is always encouraged. Many different kinds of Hedonic products or services exist; for the sake of scale and scope, one of the most prominent Hedonic products or services i.e., SNSs was chosen as a focus of this paper with the options of choosing other Hedonic products or services in future subsequent studies.
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### Table 1 Summary of the Reviewed Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Context</th>
<th>Research Methodology</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online consumer’s concerns and anxieties</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Culnan and Armstrong (1999)</td>
<td>Telephone Survey</td>
<td>1,000 U.S. Adults Aged 18 and Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers often willing to give up personal data (real or fictitious) to gain free access to certain benefits</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Milne and Gordon (1993)</td>
<td>Pencil and Paper Survey</td>
<td>175 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Spiekermann, Grossklags, and Berendt (2001)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>206 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Campbell and Carlson (2002)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Chellappa and Sin (2005)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>243 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Lanier Jr and Saini (2008)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Xu, Teo, Tan, and Agarwal (2009)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>528 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Xu, Luo, Carroll, and Rosson (2011)</td>
<td>Experimental Study</td>
<td>545 Undergraduate and Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Beldad, de Jong, and Steehouder (2011)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Carrascal, Riederer, Erramilli, Cherubini, and Oliveira (2013)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>243 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Lee, Park, and Kim (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative Study + Experiment</td>
<td>36 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Heirman, Walrave, and Ponnet (2013)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>1042 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Aydoğan, Öztürk, and Razeghi (2017)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Benndorf and Normann (2018)</td>
<td>Laboratory Experiments</td>
<td>236 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward privacy behaviour being the opposite from the behaviour itself</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Acquisti and Grossklags (2005)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>119 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Gross and Acquisti (2005)</td>
<td>Investigation of Field Data</td>
<td>4000 University Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Stutzman (2006)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>38 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Acquisti and Gross (2006)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>294 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Buchanan, Paine, Joinson, and Reips (2007)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>1706 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Hann, Hui, Lee, and Png (2007)</td>
<td>Experimental Study</td>
<td>268 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>H. Li, Sarathy, and Xu (2010)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>182 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Taddicken (2014)</td>
<td>Online Survey</td>
<td>2739 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Dienlin and Trepte (2015)</td>
<td>Online Survey</td>
<td>595 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coining the term “Privacy Paradox”</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Stone, Gueutal, Gardner, and McClure (1983)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>193 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Pavlou (2011)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Smith et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Literature Review</td>
<td>320 Privacy Articles and 128 Book Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Kokolakis (2017)</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation of “Privacy Paradox”</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Malhotra, Kim, and Agarwal (2004)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>742 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Awad and Krishnan (2006)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>400 Online Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Hui, Teo, and Lee (2007)</td>
<td>Exploratory Field Experiment</td>
<td>109 University Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>H. Li, Sarathy, and Xu (2011)</td>
<td>Experimental Study</td>
<td>175 Undergraduate and Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>