

## ONLINE HEDONIC CONSUMERS' PRIVACY AWARENESS AND PRIVACY PARADOX: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

FG. M. Shafayet Ullah

Sameer Kumar

Fumitaka Furuoka

Asia-Europe Institute

University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

\*Corresponding author's email:  
fumitaka@um.edu.my

Received: 7 December 2021

Revised: 20 March 2022

Accepted: 31 March 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

DOI://doi.org/10.51200/mjbe.v9i2.4359

**Keywords:** Literature Review, Hedonic-Motivation System (HMS), Hedonic Consumers, Privacy, Privacy Paradox, Privacy Awareness

### 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 address any potential research gap that 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; Parboteeah, 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 (Katawetawaraks & 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". "The Online Information 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

(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.

### **Disclosure statement**

The authors of this review paper report no potential conflicts of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Acquisti, A., & Gross, R. (2006). *Imagined communities: Awareness, information sharing, and privacy on the Facebook*. Paper presented at the International workshop on privacy enhancing technologies.
- Acquisti, A., & Grossklags, J. (2005). Privacy and rationality in individual decision making. *IEEE security & privacy*, 3(1), 26-33.
- Awad, N. F., & Krishnan, M. S. (2006). The personalization privacy paradox: an empirical evaluation of information transparency and the willingness to be profiled online for personalization. *MIS quarterly*, 13-28.
- Aydođan, R., Øzturk, P., & Razeghi, Y. (2017). *Negotiation for incentive driven privacy-preserving information sharing*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Principles and Practice of Multi-Agent Systems.
- Baek, Y. M. (2014). Solving the privacy paradox: A counter-argument experimental approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 38, 33-42.
- Bamosy, G. J., & Solomon, M. R. (2016). *Consumer behaviour: A European perspective*: Pearson Education.
- Barnes, S. B. (2006). A privacy paradox: Social networking in the United States. *First Monday*, 11(9).
- Barth, S., & De Jong, M. D. (2017). The privacy paradox—Investigating discrepancies between expressed privacy concerns and actual online behavior—A systematic literature review. *Telematics and informatics*, 34(7), 1038-1058.
- Baruh, L., Secinti, E., & Cemalcilar, Z. (2017). Online privacy concerns and privacy management: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Communication*, 67(1), 26-53.
- Bélangier, F., & Crossler, R. E. (2011). Privacy in the Digital Age: A Review of Information Privacy Research in Information Systems. *MIS quarterly*, 35(4), 1017-1041. doi:10.2307/41409971
- Beldad, A., de Jong, M., & Steehouder, M. (2011). A Comprehensive Theoretical Framework for Personal Information-Related Behaviors on the Internet. *The Information Society*, 27(4), 220-232. doi:10.1080/01972243.2011.583802
- Beltramini, R. F. (1983). Student surrogates in consumer research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 11(4), 438-443.
- Benndorf, V., & Normann, H.-T. (2018). The Willingness to Sell Personal Data. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 120(4), 1260-1278. doi:10.1111/sjoe.12247
- Bhimani, H., Mention, A.-L., & Barlatier, P.-J. (2019). Social media and innovation: A systematic literature review and future research directions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 144, 251-269.
- Bidler, M., Zimmerman, J., Schumann, J. H., & Widjaja, T. (2020). Previewing a Meaningfully Gamified Data Disclosure Process to Increase Consumers' Willingness to Engage in Data Disclosure Processes. *Journal of retailing*, 94(4), 507-532.
- Boyd, D. (2008). Facebook's privacy trainwreck: Exposure, invasion, and social convergence. *Convergence*, 14(1), 13-20.
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of computer-mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Brough, A. R., & Martin, K. D. (2021). Consumer privacy during (and after) the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 40(1), 108-110.
- Brown, B. (2001). Studying the Internet experience. *HP LABORATORIES TECHNICAL REPORT HPL*, 49.
- Brown, S. A., & Venkatesh, V. (2005). Model of adoption of technology in households: A baseline model test and extension incorporating household life cycle. *MIS quarterly*, 29(3).
- Brunk, B. (2002). Understanding the privacy space. *First Monday*, 7(10).
- Buchanan, T., Paine, C., Joinson, A. N., & Reips, U.-D. (2007). Development of measures of online privacy concern and protection for use on the Internet. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58(2), 157-165. doi:10.1002/asi.20459
- Campbell, J. E., & Carlson, M. (2002). Panopticon.com: Online Surveillance and the Commodification of Privacy. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(4), 586-606. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4604\_6
- Carrascal, J. P., Riederer, C., Erramilli, V., Cherubini, M., & Oliveira, R. d. (2013). *Your browsing behavior for a big mac: economics of personal information online*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Chellappa, R. K., & Sin, R. G. (2005). Personalization versus privacy: An empirical examination of the online consumer's dilemma. *Information technology and management*, 6(2-3), 181-202.

- Christofides, E., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2012). Hey mom, what's on your Facebook? Comparing Facebook disclosure and privacy in adolescents and adults. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(1), 48-54.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. In: New York: HarperPerennial (Vol. 41).
- Culnan, M. J., & Armstrong, P. K. (1999). Information privacy concerns, procedural fairness, and impersonal trust: An empirical investigation. *Organization science*, 10(1), 104-115.
- Cunningham, W. H., Anderson, W. T., & Murphy, J. H. (1974). Are students real people? *The Journal of Business*, 47(3), 399-409.
- Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A.-K., & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and online privacy: Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 15(1), 83-108.
- Dhar, R., & Wertenbroch, K. (2000). Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(1), 60-71.
- Dictionary, C. B. E. (2019). Definition of Privacy. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/privacy>
- Dienlin, T., & Trepte, S. (2015). Is the privacy paradox a relic of the past? An in-depth analysis of privacy attitudes and privacy behaviors. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(3), 285-297. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2049
- Dinev, T. (2014). Why would we care about privacy? In: Springer.
- Duhigg, C. (2012). How companies learn your secrets. *The New York Times*, 16, 2012.
- Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefit of Facebook 'friends': Exploring the relationship between college students' use of online social networks and social capital. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4).
- Ellison, N. B., Vitak, J., Steinfield, C., Gray, R., & Lampe, C. (2011). Negotiating Privacy Concerns and Social Capital Needs in a Social Media Environment. In S. Trepte & L. Reinecke (Eds.), *Privacy Online: Perspectives on Privacy and Self-Disclosure in the Social Web* (pp. 19-32). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Entertainment Software Association. (2007). Top 10 industry facts. Retrieved from <http://www.theesa.com/facts/index.asp>
- Entertainment Software Association. (2019). 2019 Essential facts about the computer and video game industry. Retrieved from <https://www.theesa.com/esa-research/2019-essential-facts-about-the-computer-and-video-game-industry/>
- Frenkel, S., Rosenberg, M., & Confessore, N. (2018). Facebook data collected by quiz app included private messages. *The New York Times*, 10.
- Gopalakrishnan, S., & Ganeshkumar, P. (2013). Systematic reviews and meta-analysis: understanding the best evidence in primary healthcare. *Journal of family medicine and primary care*, 2(1), 9.
- Gross, R., & Acquisti, A. (2005). *Information revelation and privacy in online social networks*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2005 ACM workshop on Privacy in the electronic society.
- Hann, I.-H., Hui, K.-L., Lee, S.-Y. T., & Png, I. P. (2007). Overcoming online information privacy concerns: An information-processing theory approach. *Journal of management information systems*, 24(2), 13-42.
- Heirman, W., Walrave, M., & Ponnet, K. (2013). Predicting adolescents' disclosure of personal information in exchange for commercial incentives: An application of an extended theory of planned behavior. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(2), 81-87.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(3), 92-101. doi:10.1177/002224298204600314
- Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P., & Peralta, M. (1999). Building consumer trust online. *Communications of the ACM*, 42(4), 80-85.
- Hsieh, T.-S., Noyes, D., Liu, H., & Fiondella, L. (2015). *Quantifying the impact of data loss incidents on publicly-traded organizations*. Paper presented at the 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Technologies for Homeland Security (HST).
- Hsu, C.-L., & Lu, H.-P. (2007). Consumer behavior in online game communities: A motivational factor perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(3), 1642-1659.
- Hui, K.-L., Teo, H. H., & Lee, S.-Y. T. (2007). The Value of Privacy Assurance: An Exploratory Field Experiment. *MIS quarterly*, 31(1), 19-33. doi:10.2307/25148779
- Jagatic, T. N., Johnson, N. A., Jakobsson, M., & Menczer, F. (2007). Social phishing. *Communications of the ACM*, 50(10), 94-100.
- Jegers, K. (2007). Pervasive game flow: understanding player enjoyment in pervasive gaming. *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*, 5(1), 9.



- Jenkins, A. (2018, MARCH 28, 2018). These Companies Have Cut Their Ties With Facebook Amid the Cambridge Analytica Data Scandal. Retrieved from <https://time.com/5216291/facebook-cambridge-analytica-companies-advertising/>
- Katawetawaraks, C., & Wang, C. (2011). Online shopper behavior: Influences of online shopping decision. *Asian Journal of Business Research, 1*(2).
- Kehr, F., Kowatsch, T., Wentzel, D., & Fleisch, E. (2015). Blissfully ignorant: the effects of general privacy concerns, general institutional trust, and affect in the privacy calculus. *Information Systems Journal, 25*(6), 607-635.
- Kim, T., Barasz, K., & John, L. K. (2019). Why am I seeing this ad? The effect of ad transparency on ad effectiveness. *Journal of consumer research, 45*(5), 906-932.
- Kivetz, R., & Simonson, I. (2002a). Earning the right to indulge: Effort as a determinant of customer preferences toward frequency program rewards. *Journal of Marketing Research, 39*(2), 155-170.
- Kivetz, R., & Simonson, I. (2002b). Self-control for the righteous: Toward a theory of precommitment to indulgence. *Journal of consumer research, 29*(2), 199-217.
- Kokolakis, S. (2017). Privacy attitudes and privacy behaviour: A review of current research on the privacy paradox phenomenon. *Computers & security, 64*, 122-134.
- Krishnamurthy, B., Naryshkin, K., & Wills, C. (2011). *Privacy leakage vs. protection measures: the growing disconnect*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Web.
- Lampe, C. A., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2007). *A familiar face (book): profile elements as signals in an online social network*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems.
- Lanier Jr, C. D., & Saini, A. (2008). Understanding consumer privacy: A review and future directions. *Academy of Marketing Science Review, 2008*, 1.
- Lee, H., Park, H., & Kim, J. (2013). Why do people share their context information on Social Network Services? A qualitative study and an experimental study on users' behavior of balancing perceived benefit and risk. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 71*(9), 862-877.
- Lewis, K., Kaufman, J., & Christakis, N. (2008). The Taste for Privacy: An Analysis of College Student Privacy Settings in an Online Social Network. *Journal of computer-mediated communication, 14*(1), 79-100. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2008.01432.x
- Li, H., Sarathy, R., & Xu, H. (2010). Understanding situational online information disclosure as a privacy calculus. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 51*(1), 62-71.
- Li, H., Sarathy, R., & Xu, H. (2011). The role of affect and cognition on online consumers' decision to disclose personal information to unfamiliar online vendors. *Decision support systems, 51*(3), 434-445.
- Li, Y. (2011). Empirical studies on online information privacy concerns: Literature review and an integrative framework. *CAIS, 28*, 28.
- Liu, X., He, M., Gao, F., & Xie, P. (2008). An empirical study of online shopping customer satisfaction in China: a holistic perspective. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 36*(11), 919-940.
- Lowry, P. B., Cao, J., & Everard, A. (2011). Privacy concerns versus desire for interpersonal awareness in driving the use of self-disclosure technologies: The case of instant messaging in two cultures. *Journal of management information systems, 27*(4), 163-200.
- Lowry, P. B., Gaskin, J., Twyman, N., Hammer, B., & Roberts, T. (2012). Taking 'fun and games' seriously: Proposing the hedonic-motivation system adoption model (HMSAM). *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 14*(11), 617-671.
- Lu, J., Liu, Z., & Fang, Z. (2016). Hedonic products for you, utilitarian products for me. *Judgment & Decision Making, 11*(4).
- Lutz, C., & Strathoff, P. (2014). Privacy concerns and online behavior—Not so paradoxical after all? Viewing the privacy paradox through different theoretical lenses. *Viewing the Privacy Paradox Through Different Theoretical Lenses (April 15, 2014)*.
- Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., & Agarwal, J. (2004). Internet users' information privacy concerns (IUIPC): The construct, the scale, and a causal model. *Information systems research, 15*(4), 336-355.
- Mallett, R., Hagen-Zanker, J., Slater, R., & Duvendack, M. (2012). The benefits and challenges of using systematic reviews in international development research. *Journal of development effectiveness, 4*(3), 445-455.
- Manion, J. (2016). Data Security And Privacy: Marketing's Top Conundrum In 2016. Retrieved from <https://martech.org/data-security-privacy-marketings-top-conundrum-2016/>



- MarketWatch, I. (2020). "Videogames are a bigger industry than movies and North American sports combined, thanks to the pandemic". Retrieved from <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/videogames-are-a-bigger-industry-than-sports-and-movies-combined-thanks-to-the-pandemic-11608654990>
- Martin, K. D., Borah, A., & Palmatier, R. W. (2017). Data privacy: Effects on customer and firm performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 81(1), 36-58.
- Martin, K. D., Borah, A., & Palmatier, R. W. (2018). A strong privacy policy can save your company millions. *Harvard business review*.
- Martin, K. D., Kim, J. J., Palmatier, R. W., Steinhoff, L., Stewart, D. W., Walker, B. A., . . . Weaven, S. K. (2020). Data privacy in retail. *Journal of retailing*, 96(4), 474-489.
- Martin, K. D., & Murphy, P. E. (2017). The role of data privacy in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(2), 135-155.
- Martin, K. D., & Palmatier, R. W. (2020). Data privacy in retail: Navigating tensions and directing future research. In (Vol. 96, pp. 449-457): Elsevier.
- Migone, A. (2007). Hedonistic consumerism: patterns of consumption in contemporary capitalism. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 39(2), 173-200.
- Milne, G. R., & Gordon, M. E. (1993). Direct mail privacy-efficiency trade-offs within an implied social contract framework. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 12(2), 206-215.
- Miyazaki, A. D., & Fernandez, A. (2001). Consumer perceptions of privacy and security risks for online shopping. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 27-44.
- Mothersbaugh, D. L., Foxx, W. K., Beatty, S. E., & Wang, S. (2012). Disclosure Antecedents in an Online Service Context: The Role of Sensitivity of Information. *Journal of service research*, 15(1), 76-98. doi:10.1177/1094670511424924
- Newzoo B.V. (2017, April 20). The global games market will reach \$108.9 billion in 2017 with mobile taking 42%. Retrieved from <https://newzoo.com/insights/articles/the-global-games-market-will-reach-108-9-billion-in-2017-with-mobile-taking-42/>
- Norberg, P. A., Horne, D. R., & Horne, D. A. (2007). The privacy paradox: Personal information disclosure intentions versus behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 41(1), 100-126.
- Novak, T. P., Hoffman, D. L., & Yung, Y.-F. (2000). Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A structural modeling approach. *Marketing science*, 19(1), 22-42.
- Oakes, W. (1972). External validity and the use of real people as subjects. *American Psychologist*, 27(10), 959.
- Okazaki, S., Eisend, M., Plangger, K., de Ruyter, K., & Grewal, D. (2020). Understanding the strategic consequences of customer privacy concerns: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of retailing*, 96(4), 458-473.
- Olmstead, K., & Smith, A. (2017). What the public knows about cybersecurity. *Pew Research Center*, 22.
- Palmatier, R. W., & Martin, K. D. (2019). Customer Data Privacy: Why Every Marketer Should Care. In *The Intelligent Marketer's Guide to Data Privacy* (pp. 3-20): Springer.
- Palmer, D. (2019). What is GDPR? Everything you need to know about the new general data protection regulations. *ZDNet*. ZDNet, ZDNet.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*: Polity.
- Parboteeah, D. V., Valacich, J. S., & Wells, J. D. (2009). The influence of website characteristics on a consumer's urge to buy impulsively. *Information systems research*, 20(1), 60-78.
- Paul, K. (2018). Everything you wanted to know about data breaches, privacy violations and hacks. Retrieved from <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/at-what-point-should-you-be-concerned-about-a-data-breach-2018-04-03>
- Pavlou, P. A. (2011). State of the Information Privacy Literature: Where are We Now And Where Should We Go? *MIS quarterly*, 35(4), 977-988. doi:10.2307/41409969
- Polatin-Reuben, D., & Wright, J. (2014). *An Internet with {BRICS} Characteristics: Data Sovereignty and the Balkanisation of the Internet*. Paper presented at the 4th {USENIX} Workshop on Free and Open Communications on the Internet ({FOCI} 14).
- PWC, C. I. S. (2018). Prepare for the Voice Revolution. *White Paper*.
- Qiu, L., & Benbasat, I. (2009). Evaluating anthropomorphic product recommendation agents: A social relationship perspective to designing information systems. *Journal of management information systems*, 25(4), 145-182.
- Rosenbush, S. (2018). The Morning Download: Companies Should Beware Public's Rising Anxiety Over Data. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Rosenthal, R. (1995). Writing meta-analytic reviews. *Psychological bulletin*, 118(2), 183.
- Saadé, R. G., Nebebe, F., & Mak, T. (2009). The role of intrinsic motivation in system adoption: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Information, Information Technology, and Organizations*, 4, 107-127.

- Sayre, S., & Horne, D. (2000). Trading secrets for savings: how concerned are consumers about club cards as a privacy threat? *ACR North American Advances*.
- Sen, R., & Borle, S. (2015). Estimating the contextual risk of data breach: An empirical approach. *Journal of management information systems*, 32(2), 314-341.
- Sherry, J. L. (2004). Flow and media enjoyment. *Communication theory*, 14(4), 328-347.
- Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information privacy research: an interdisciplinary review. *MIS quarterly*, 35(4), 989-1016.
- Soghoian, C. (2008). Exclusive: The next Facebook privacy scandal. *CNet News. Com*.
- Soghoian, C. (2008). Flaws emerge in Facebook's new privacy controls. *CNet News. Com*.
- Spiekermann, S., Grossklags, J., & Berendt, B. (2001). *E-privacy in 2nd generation E-commerce: privacy preferences versus actual behavior*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Electronic Commerce.
- Stewart, D. W. (2017). A comment on privacy. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(2), 156-159.
- Stone, E. F., Gueutal, H. G., Gardner, D. G., & McClure, S. (1983). A field experiment comparing information-privacy values, beliefs, and attitudes across several types of organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 459.
- Strahilevitz, M., & Myers, J. G. (1998). Donations to charity as purchase incentives: How well they work may depend on what you are trying to sell. *Journal of consumer research*, 24(4), 434-446.
- Straub, D. B., & Boudreau, M.-C. MC, & Gefen, D. (2004). "Validation Guidelines for IS Positivist Research". *Communications of the Association for information systems*, 13(24), 380-427.
- Straub, D. W. (1989). Validating instruments in MIS research. *MIS quarterly*, 147-169.
- Stutzman, F. (2006). An evaluation of identity-sharing behavior in social network communities. *Journal of the International Digital Media and Arts Association*, 3(1), 10-18.
- Sweetser, P., & Wyeth, P. (2005). GameFlow: a model for evaluating player enjoyment in games. *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*, 3(3), 3-3.
- Taddicken, M. (2014). The 'privacy paradox' in the social web: The impact of privacy concerns, individual characteristics, and the perceived social relevance on different forms of self-disclosure. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 19(2), 248-273.
- Thesaurus, C. A. L. s. D. (2019). Definition of Privacy. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/privacy>
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of management review*, 15(4), 666-681.
- Trevinal, A. M., & Stenger, T. (2014). Toward a conceptualization of the online shopping experience. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(3), 314-326.
- Tufekci, Z. (2008). Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 28(1), 20-36.
- Utz, S., & Krämer, N. C. (2009). The privacy paradox on social network sites revisited: The role of individual characteristics and group norms. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 3(2).
- Valentino-Devries, J., & Singer-Vine, J. (2012). They know what you're shopping for. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Van der Heijden, H. (2004). User acceptance of hedonic information systems. *MIS quarterly*, 695-704.
- Venkatesh, V. (2000). Determinants of perceived ease of use: Integrating control, intrinsic motivation, and emotion into the technology acceptance model. *Information systems research*, 11(4), 342-365.
- Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision sciences*, 39(2), 273-315.
- Venkatesh, V., Davis, F., & Morris, M. G. (2007). Dead or alive? The development, trajectory and future of technology adoption research. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 8(4), 1.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly*, 425-478.
- Voss, K. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Grohmann, B. (2003). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of consumer attitude. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(3), 310-320.
- Walker, K. L. (2016). Surrendering information through the looking glass: Transparency, trust, and protection. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 35(1), 144-158.
- Warren, S. D., & Brandeis, L. D. (1890). The Right to Privacy. *Harvard Law Review*, 4(5), 193-220.

Xu, H., Luo, X. R., Carroll, J. M., & Rosson, M. B. (2011). The personalization privacy paradox: An exploratory study of decision making process for location-aware marketing. *Decision support systems*, 51(1), 42-52.

Xu, H., Teo, H.-H., Tan, B. C., & Agarwal, R. (2009). The role of push-pull technology in privacy calculus: the case of location-based services. *Journal of management information systems*, 26(3), 135-174.

**Table 1** Summary of the Reviewed Articles

Research Context	Research Methodology	Authors	Data Collection Method	Sample
<b>Online consumer's concerns and anxieties</b>	Quantitative	Culnan and Armstrong (1999)	Telephone Survey	1,000 U.S. Adults Aged 18 and Older
		Novak, Hoffman, and Yung (2000)	Web-Based Consumer Survey	1,654 Respondents
		Miyazaki and Fernandez (2001)	Pencil and Paper Survey	160 Respondents
<b>Consumers often willing to give up personal data (real or fictitious) to gain free access to certain benefits</b>	Quantitative	Milne and Gordon (1993)	Pencil and Paper Survey	175 Respondents
	Quantitative	Spiekermann, Grossklags, and Berendt (2001)	Survey	206 Respondents
	Qualitative	Campbell and Carlson (2002)	Literature Review	N/A
	Quantitative	Chellappa and Sin (2005)	Survey	243 Respondents
	Qualitative	Lanier Jr and Saini (2008)	Literature Review	N/A
	Quantitative	Xu, Teo, Tan, and Agarwal (2009)	Survey	528 Respondents
	Quantitative	Xu, Luo, Carroll, and Rosson (2011)	Experimental Study	545 Undergraduate and Graduate Students
	Quantitative	N. B. Ellison, Vitak, Steinfeld, Gray, and Lampe (2011)	Survey & Interviews	299 Undergraduates & 18 in-depth Interviews
	Qualitative	Beldad, de Jong, and Steehouder (2011)	Literature Review	N/A
	Quantitative	Carrascal, Riederer, Erramilli, Cherubini, and Oliveira (2013)	Survey	243 Participants
	Qualitative	Lee, Park, and Kim (2013)	Qualitative Study + Experiment	36 Participants
	Quantitative	Heirman, Walrave, and Ponnet (2013)	Survey	1042 Respondents
	Qualitative	Aydođan, Özturk, and Razeghi (2017)	Literature Review	N/A
Quantitative	Benndorf and Normann (2018)	Laboratory Experiments	236 Participants	
<b>Attitudes toward privacy behaviour being the opposite from the behaviour itself</b>	Quantitative	Acquisti and Grossklags (2005)	Survey	119 Participants
	Qualitative	Gross and Acquisti (2005)	Investigation of Field Data	4000 University Students
	Quantitative	Stutzman (2006)	Survey	38 Participants
	Quantitative	Acquisti and Gross (2006)	Survey	294 Respondents
	Quantitative	Buchanan, Paine, Joinson, and Reips (2007)	Survey	1706 Respondents
	Quantitative	Hann, Hui, Lee, and Png (2007)	Experimental Study	268 Participants
	Quantitative	Norberg, Horne, and Horne (2007)	Survey	78 Respondents
	Quantitative	H. Li, Sarathy, and Xu (2010)	Survey	182 Respondents
	Quantitative	Taddicken (2014)	Online Survey	2739 Participants
Quantitative	Dienlin and Trepte (2015)	Online Survey	595 Respondents	

<b>Coining the term "Privacy Paradox"</b>	Quantitative	Stone, Gueutal, Gardner, and McClure (1983)	Survey	193 Respondents
	Qualitative	Pavlou (2011)	Literature Review	N/A
	Qualitative	Smith et al. (2011)	Interdisciplinary Literature Review	320 Privacy Articles and 128 Book Sections
	Qualitative	Kokolakis (2017)	Literature Review	N/A
<b>Validation of "Privacy Paradox"</b>	Quantitative	Malhotra, Kim, and Agarwal (2004)	Survey	742 Respondents
	Quantitative	Awad and Krishnan (2006)	Survey	400 Online Consumers
	Qualitative	Hui, Teo, and Lee (2007)	Exploratory Field Experiment	109 University Students
	Quantitative	H. Li, Sarathy, and Xu (2011)	Experimental Study	175 Undergraduate and Graduate Students