

Bruno Škrinjarić, Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh

The Perceived Impact of Government Regulation in Reducing Online Privacy Concern

Lipanj • June 2018

Radni materijali EIZ-a • EIZ Working Papers



HR EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH



Br . No EIZ-WP-1803

Radni materijali EIZ-a
EIZ Working Papers
EIZ-WP-1803

The Perceived Impact of Government Regulation
in Reducing Online Privacy Concern

Bruno Škrinjaric

The Institute of Economics, Zagreb
Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia
T. +385 1 2362 259
F. +385 1 2335 165
E. bskrinjaric@eizg.hr

Jelena Budak

Corresponding author
The Institute of Economics, Zagreb
Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia
T. +385 1 2362 228
F. +385 1 2335 165
E. jbudak@eizg.hr

Edo Rajh

The Institute of Economics, Zagreb
Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia
T. +385 1 2362 298
F. +385 1 2335 165
E. erajh@eizg.hr

www.eizg.hr

Zagreb, June 2018

IZDAVAČ / PUBLISHER:

Ekonomski institut, Zagreb / The Institute of Economics, Zagreb
Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7
10 000 Zagreb
Hrvatska / Croatia
T. +385 1 2362 200
F. +385 1 2335 165
E. eizagreb@eizg.hr
www.eizg.hr

ZA IZDAVAČA / FOR THE PUBLISHER:

Maruška Vizek, ravnateljica / director

GLAVNI UREDNIK / EDITOR:

Ivan-Damir Anić

UREDNIŠTVO / EDITORIAL BOARD:

Katarina Bačić
Tajana Barbić
Sunčana Slijepčević
Paul Stubbs
Marina Tkalec
Iva Tomić
Maruška Vizek

IZVRŠNA UREDNICA / EXECUTIVE EDITOR:

Ivana Kovačević

TEHNIČKI UREDNIK / TECHNICAL EDITOR:

Vladimir Sukser

e-ISSN 1847-7844

Stavovi izraženi u radovima u ovoj seriji publikacija stavovi su autora i nužno ne odražavaju stavove Ekonomskog instituta, Zagreb. Radovi se objavljuju s ciljem poticanja rasprave i kritičkih komentara kojima će se unaprijediti buduće verzije rada. Autor(i) u potpunosti zadržavaju autorska prava nad člancima objavljenim u ovoj seriji publikacija.

Views expressed in this Series are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the Institute of Economics, Zagreb. Working Papers describe research in progress by the author(s) and are published in order to induce discussion and critical comments. Copyrights retained by the author(s).

Sadržaj

	Abstract	5
1	Introduction	7
2	Regulative Framework regarding Privacy	8
3	Conceptual Model and Methodology	12
4	Data Description	15
5	Results and Discussion	17
6	Conclusion	23
7	Appendix	25
	References	26

The Perceived Impact of Government Regulation in Reducing Online Privacy Concern

Abstract:

This paper examines the impact of regulation as an antecedent of online privacy concern. The aim is to investigate if and how perceived effectiveness of government regulation affects internet users' concern for their privacy in the online environment. Existing research shows that perceived effectiveness and enforcement of regulatory policies reduce online privacy concern; however, it does not explain what factors influence this relationship. This research fills the gap by analyzing different perceptions of the existing country legislation and government effort to protect online privacy in the context of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, computer anxiety, individual desire to maintain control of personal information, as well as intensity and diversity of online activities. The empirical analysis is conducted on a large sample of internet users in Croatia. The dependent variable in the regression model is online privacy concern and the model is tested with OLS and ordered probit estimation. The results confirm that perceived effectiveness of government regulation reduces online privacy concern whereas computer anxiety has a major positive impact on online privacy concern. These findings might be useful for national policy-makers and for business strategies in the context of the GDPR regulation coming in force in 2018.

Keywords: regulation, data protection, online privacy concern, Croatia

JEL classification: D1, K2

Percepcije utjecaja regulative na smanjenje zabrinutosti za privatnost u *online* okruženju

Sažetak:

U radu se ispituje utjecaj regulative na zabrinutost korisnika interneta za privatnost u *online* okruženju. Dosadašnja su istraživanja pokazala da percipirana provedba i djelotvornost regulatornih politika smanjuju razinu zabrinutosti za *online* privatnost. Međutim, ta istraživanja ne preispituju temeljem čega se formiraju percepcije korisnika interneta. Cilj rada je istražiti kako percipirana djelotvornost regulative utječe na zabrinutost korisnika interneta za njihovu privatnost u *online* okruženju uzimajući u obzir njihova sociodemografska obilježja, želju pojedinca da zadrži kontrolu nad osobnim podacima, individualni strah od računala, te učestalost i raznolikost aktivnosti koje pojedinac obavlja *online*. Empirijska je analiza provedena na velikom uzorku internetskih korisnika u Hrvatskoj. Zavisna varijabla u regresijskom modelu je zabrinutost za privatnost u *online* okruženju, a model se testira običnom metodom najmanjih kvadrata i procjenom ordinalnog probit modela. Rezultati potvrđuju da percipirana djelotvornost regulative smanjuje, a strah od računala znatno povećava zabrinutost za privatnost u *online* okruženju. Ove spoznaje mogu biti korisne nositeljima politike i kreatorima poslovnih strategija, posebno u svjetlu nadolazeće primjene europske Opće uredbe o zaštiti osobnih podataka (GDPR).

Gljučne riječi: regulativa, zaštita podataka, zabrinutost za *online* privatnost, Hrvatska

JEL klasifikacija: D1, K2

1 Introduction

Government regulation affects all domains of everyday life. Both formal institutions, in terms of laws, regulations and rules, and informal institutions, such as culture, tradition or inherited social norms, affect economic activity (North, 1990) and shape the behavior of citizens, consumers, businesses and organizations. The role of regulators has changed in the digital era (Henderson, 2015), where enforcement of privacy legislation has become a major issue (Reay et al., 2011). Living in the digitalized world has increased concern about online privacy (Malhotra et al., 2004; Dinev & Hart, 2006; Ginosar & Ariel, 2017). These two simultaneous processes raise questions on if and how government regulations impact the level of privacy concern in the online environment.

Past research has examined the impacts of regulation, legal and regulatory policies on online privacy concern (Lwin, Wirtz & Williams, 2007), indicating that internet users often have limited knowledge and resources to protect their data and thus they might rely on institutional laws and regulations. Rust, Kannan & Peng (2002) show that regulation is considered to be important in protecting online privacy, while the study of Lwin, Wirtz & Williams (2007) demonstrates that perceived effectiveness of regulatory policies and their enforcement reduces consumer online privacy concern.

The findings, however, do not explain what factors lie behind the perceived effectiveness of government regulations in terms of demographic characteristics, diversity of online activities, computer anxiety and individual desire to take control over personal data when online. This research fills the gap and provides insight into a large sample of internet users in the post-transition country of Croatia. The aim of the research is to contribute to the scholarly debate on whether the perceived quality and effectiveness of the regulatory framework determine online privacy concern of internet users, i.e., consumers and/or citizens. If so, what business opportunities in improving relations with clients arise, in particular in the context of the upcoming GDPR? Policy-makers and regulators will get feedback on the impact of regulatory control as perceived by internet users in Croatia and might improve the regulatory framework or public communication strategies accordingly.

The paper is structured as follows. First we provide a brief description of the regulatory framework regarding privacy and personal data protection and a literature review in this field. Next we explain the survey data and methodology applied in this empirical research and the variables in our model. The results of regression analyses are presented and discussed in section four. Policy implications are offered in the last section, together with concluding remarks and suggested lines of future research.

2 Regulative Framework regarding Privacy

In order to understand the relationship between regulation and online privacy concern, one needs to get an overview on how privacy and personal data are dealt with in the legislative and regulatory framework.

Privacy regulation and legislation have a rather long tradition, since the first rules on integrity of home and business premises were introduced in Britain in the eighteenth century (Henderson, 2015). The privacy protection regulation has evolved somewhat differently in the United States when compared to Europe (and other parts of the world). The development of automatic data processing and data transmission worldwide and across national borders raised the issue of privacy protection in relation to personal data. From 1980 onwards, privacy protection laws have been introduced in many countries to prevent unlawful storage of personal data, abuse or unauthorized disclosure of data and similar privacy breaches. At the same time, the most developed countries in the world recognized that such restrictions implemented in national legislations could be too restrictive for the free flow of information and digital transfer of data required for further development of financial services, the ICT sector and trade. Thus, in 1980, the OECD developed guidelines which would help to harmonize national privacy legislation and, while upholding human rights, would at the same time prevent interruptions in international flows of data (OECD, 1980).

In order to put this research in the legislative framework context, here the focus is on European regulation. Within most European countries, the right to a private life as protected by Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)¹ and the data protection laws that eventually developed is ensured both at national and international level. At the EU level, one of the first documents addressing the protection of individual data being automatically processed dates back to 1981². The more detailed EU data protection framework was developed a decade later. That framework includes, among other things, the 1995 Data Protection Directive³, the 2001 EC Data Protection Regulation governing processing activities by the EU institutions⁴, and the 2002 Directive 2002/58 on Privacy and Electronic Communications known as the ePrivacy Directive. The latter aimed to regulate “online privacy including browsing on the internet, using a mobile phone, wearables or other internet-connected devices”⁵. The ePrivacy Directive, however, failed to provide efficient safeguards:

¹ Available at https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf.

² Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of Individuals with Regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data, adopted on January 28, 1981, available at <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/108.htm>.

³ Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A31995L0046>.

⁴ Available at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001R0045&from=EN>.

⁵ More information available at https://epic.org/international/eu_privacy_and_electronic_comm.html.

“The failure to meet the objectives of the directive is on the one hand due to fragmented implementation across EU member states. On the other hand, the rules have been poorly enforced and lawmakers could not keep up with the pace of development in technology. The law has left users vulnerable to consequences of the extensive usage of smartphone (app)s, online profiling, social media, and the explosion of the internet in general.”⁶

The form and scope of the right to data protection vary considerably in national jurisdictions (Koops et al., 2016). In some EU countries, privacy is a constitutional category, but objects of protection in constitutional rights to privacy vary, and personal data is one of them. Personal data protection in Croatia is a constitutional category as well:

*Article 37*⁷

The safety and secrecy of personal data shall be guaranteed for everyone. Without consent from the person concerned, personal data may be collected, processed, and used only under the conditions specified by law.

Protection of data and oversight of the operations of information systems in the state shall be regulated by law.

The use of personal data contrary to the express purpose of their collection shall be prohibited.

In Croatia, the Personal Data Protection Act (Official Gazette 103/03, 118/06, 41/08, 130/11, 106/12) and by-laws are in accordance with EU regulations, namely with:

- Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and
- Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data of January 28, 1981 and its Additional Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data, regarding supervisory authorities and transborder data flows.

The persistent challenge for EU legislators is to align regulations to the real life situations driven by new ICT usage. Therefore, the Council of Europe is updating its Personal Data Protection Convention – “Convention 108” – with an aim to address challenges for privacy

⁶ More information available at https://epic.org/international/eu_privacy_and_electronic_comm.html.

⁷ Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, available at <http://www.sabor.hr/Default.aspx?art=2405>.

resulting from the use of new information and communication technologies⁸, and the Croatian Data Protection Agency is following the EU directions⁹.

In light of this research, it is important to note the recent developments in the regulatory framework for the EU and Croatia, and other countries trading and exchanging data with EU members. The issue of personal information protection is additionally raised in the European Union by introducing the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for EU member states and non-EU based companies operating within the EU. In 2016, when the European Parliament approved the General Data Protection Regulation, it was evaluated as a historic privacy ruling that would impact everyone in this digital world¹⁰. The aim of the GDPR is to protect all EU citizens from privacy and data breaches. The new regulation on processing and movement of personal data¹¹ is considered an essential step to strengthen citizens' fundamental rights in the digital age and facilitate business by simplifying rules for companies in the digital single market. According to the new GDPR rules in force from May 2018, businesses will have to comply with various provisions, including "the right to be forgotten"; "clear and affirmative consent" to private data processing; the right to know when data has been hacked; and the right to transfer data to another service provider.¹² In practice, this means that citizens will have expanded rights to access data, e.g., to obtain from companies confirmation as to whether or not personal data concerning them is being processed, where and for what purpose. The principle of data portability has been introduced as well to guarantee the right for people to receive the personal data concerning them, free of charge, in an electronic format. This change is a dramatic shift to data transparency and empowerment of citizens. Data subjects, in our case internet users, should give clear consent to collect, process, and use their data, and can withdraw the consent. Consequently, they might require erasing their personal data, cease further dissemination of the data, and potentially have third parties halt processing of the data. Finally, GDPR legalizes a concept of privacy by design (which calls for the inclusion of data protection from the onset of the designing of systems) and data minimization. The latter imposes holding and processing only the data absolutely necessary for the completion of duties, as well as limiting the access to personal data to those needing to act out the processing.

GDPR applies to all companies processing the personal data of data subjects residing in the EU, regardless of the company's location. Non-EU businesses processing the data of EU citizens will also have to appoint a representative in the EU since GDPR applies to the

⁸ More information available at <http://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/28-january-data-protection-day-factsheet?desktop=true>.

⁹ More information on Croatian Data Protection Agency available at www.azop.hr.

¹⁰ More information available at <http://www.cbronline.com/news/cybersecurity/data/european-parliament-approves-general-data-protection-regulation-in-historic-privacy-ruling-4864721>.

¹¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2016.119.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2016:119:TOC.

¹² More information available at <https://www.eugdpr.org/key-changes.html>.

processing of personal data by controllers and processors in the EU¹³. One of the most serious infringements is not having sufficient customer consent to process data or violating the core of privacy by design concepts. Nonetheless, national governments may exclude public institutions from money sanctions in the case of GDPR rules infringements. Currently there is a public debate in Croatia on the Government proposal to exclude public institutions from paying fines if breaching the GDPR rules. This proposal discriminates private vs. public data holders and might raise negative public opinion on the effectiveness of government regulations in protecting privacy.

In the business environment, profit-making business models rely upon collecting personal information and profiling clients who pay for online services by disclosing personal information (Rauhofer, 2013). However, people tend to maintain control of their personal data and this might be the complementary variable determining their level of online privacy concern. On one side, internet users might call for more effective government regulations to protect them, and on the other, individuals employ other risk-mitigating actions. Individuals who feel fearful about computers, being afraid of losing their data for example (Parasuraman & Igarria, 1990; Thatcher & Perrew, 2002; Korzaan & Boswell, 2008), behave less comfortably when working with computers and show higher privacy concern (Stewart & Segars, 2002).


As previously stated, the quality of regulation is expected to reduce concerns about privacy intrusions (Lwin, Wirtz & Williams, 2007; Rust, Kannan & Peng, 2002). The role of data protection agencies as national regulators in the EU is crucial; however, their capacities to comprehend new technologies are questionable and this could pose a huge problem given the GDPR requirements (Raab & Szekely, 2017). A comparative survey study on privacy shows that “citizens (especially in Hungary) do not consider themselves knowledgeable about laws protecting information in government departments”, and a small share of knowledgeable people consider legislation effective (The Surveillance Project, 2008:10). In the online context, the situation looks equally puzzling. More recent studies also recognize state privacy policies and regulations as an important domain for online privacy research (Ginosar & Ariel, 2017), in particular having in mind that internet users have limited knowledge and resources to assess data security and they rely on laws to protect them (Acquisti et al., 2015). Opposite to this view, advocates of the self-regulation principle suggest that companies and e-business have strong incentives to introduce privacy protection rules to keep their online clients satisfied (Ginosar & Ariel, 2017).

¹³ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2016.119.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2016:119:TOC.

This kind of empirical evidence is lacking for Croatia and the region. Peštek et al. (2011) show that consumers in Bosnia and Herzegovina consider a company's privacy policy an important factor for participating in e-transactions. They suggest e-merchants develop an online trust model that among other factors would include privacy protection. However, there is scarce empirical research on perceptions how state regulations protect consumers' personal data and how they affect internet users' privacy concern.

3 Conceptual Model and Methodology

The conceptual model we empirically test is presented in Figure 1. It indicates the proposed positive or negative relationship of each independent variable to online privacy concern (or possibly the significant impact in either direction, as there have been opposite findings in the existing literature). An explanation of all these variables is presented in the remainder of this chapter and in Table 1. Unless stated otherwise, all tables and figures in this research are our own.



The dependent variable in the model is online privacy concern (*opc*). The intensity or range of online privacy concern is subjective and difficult to measure, so we have taken the measurement scales for privacy concern developed in the literature and adapted them for the internet environment. One of the first scales of concern for information privacy (CFIP) was developed by Smith, Milberg & Burke (1996) to measure collection, errors, secondary use and unauthorized access to information as dimensions of an individual's concern for privacy. Our *opc* scales are based on Malhotra, Kim & Agarwal's (2004) construct of internet users' information privacy concerns (IUIPC). It better reflects concerns in the online environment because it comprises attitudes towards the collection of personal

information, control over personal information and awareness of privacy practices of companies gathering personal information (Anić et al., 2018).

The determinants of online privacy concern have been taken from the existing literature on antecedents of privacy concern and adapted for the online environment.¹⁴

The perceived degree of regulatory control (*reg*) and its efficiency is measured by three items. Respondents were asked to declare if the existing country legislation and government effort are sufficient to protect online privacy (Lwin, Wirtz & Williams, 2007) or should more strict regulation be put in place to protect personal privacy online (Wirtz, Lwin & Williams, 2007).

Based on past studies (Malhotra, Kim & Agarwal, 2004; Smith, Milberg & Burke, 1996), we include desire for information control (*ctrl*) into the model. It is measured with four items related to the individual's desire or inclination towards the control of the collection, usage, and sharing of their personal data on the internet. Intuitively, fear of computers and technology, a phenomenon known in the literature as computer anxiety (*ca*), might increase the level of online privacy concern (Stewart & Segars, 2002).

The intensity of internet usage in terms of time spent online (*time*) and the type of online service or activity performed (*web*) could significantly determine the level of online privacy concern. Heavy-users and advanced users of the internet might be more aware of privacy risks when online and therefore more concerned. However, it might be the opposite as well, if these internet users are so internet-addicted that they just do not feel any concern for their online privacy.

The privacy concern of internet users might be more or less evident depending on the socio-demographic characteristics of individual respondents (e.g. Zhang et al., 2002; Hoy & Milne, 2010). First we included basic demographic characteristics of the internet users into the model: gender (*gender*), age (*age*), level of education attained (*educ*), occupation (*ocu*), size of the household (*hh*) and monthly household income (*income*). Here the past research has reached no consensus about the significance and direction of relationship, so it would be interesting to shed more light on the individual socio-demographics and online privacy concern nexus. Further, we wanted to examine if there were any regional differences across the five regions in Croatia (*region*) and among respondents living in larger or smaller places of residence (*size*). The difference in the place of residence size is a proxy for capturing differences between the urban and rural environment in Croatia. People living in rural environments might be less concerned about privacy when online because they openly interact more with each other and privacy is harder to keep in everyday life in smaller places.

¹⁴ The questionnaire is available from the authors upon request.

The conceptual model presented in Figure 1 is tested using the following model:

$$OPC_i = \alpha + \beta_1 REG_i + \beta_2 CTRL_i + \beta_3 CA_i + \beta_4 TIME_i + \beta_5 WEB_i + \gamma' X_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where online privacy concern, *opc*, is a dependent variable, *reg* is perceived degree of government regulatory control, *ctrl* is need for control of personal information online, *ca* is computer anxiety, *time* is number of hours spent online during a day, *web* is diversity of internet activities and *X* is a matrix of other socio-demographic characteristics of respondents used in the model. All of the latent variables used in the model above (*opc*, *reg*, *ctrl* and *ca*) enter the equation in their standardized form, i.e., with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1; hence, they are interpreted in terms of standard deviations. Items used to calculate these variables (presented in Table 1) were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

Variable	Description
<i>Online privacy concern (opc)</i>	Index computed from these six items*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am concerned about my online privacy. • All things considered, the internet could cause serious privacy problems. • Compared to others, I am more sensitive about the way my personal information is handled online. • I am concerned about extensive collection of my personal information over the internet. • I am concerned about my privacy violation when using the internet. • Compared with other subjects on my mind, personal privacy online is very important. (Cronbach alpha 0.86, inter-item correlation 0.79)
<i>Degree of regulatory control (reg)</i>	Index computed from these three items*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing laws in my country are sufficient to protect people's online privacy. • The government is doing enough to ensure that citizens are protected against online privacy violations. • There should be tougher regulations by the government to protect personal privacy online. (Cronbach alpha 0.68, inter-item correlation 0.40)
<i>Individual's desire for information control (ctrl)</i>	Index computed from these four items*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My online privacy is really a matter of my right to exercise control and autonomy over decisions about how my information is collected, used, and shared. • My control of personal information lies at the heart of my privacy. • Personal information should not be used for any purpose unless it has been authorized by that person. • When people give personal information for some reason, it should never be used for any other reason. (Cronbach alpha 0.81, inter-item correlation 0.27)
<i>Computer anxiety (ca)</i>	Index computed from these three items*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers are a real threat to privacy in this country. • I am anxious and concerned about the pace of automation in the world. • I am easily frustrated by increased computerization in my life. (Cronbach alpha 0.72, inter-item correlation 0.82)
<i>Time (time)</i>	Number of hours in a typical day the respondent spends on the internet
<i>Diversity of online activities (web)</i>	Number of different activities the respondent uses the internet for. In total there were 15 of them: receiving and sending e-mails, using chat/instant message services (e.g. WhatsApp), downloading music and/or movies, playing online games, paying bills/e-banking, attending online courses, online shopping, live video or audio streaming, watching videos over the internet (e.g. YouTube), making phone calls over the internet (e.g. Skype), using social networks (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram), following daily news, looking for general information (e.g. Google, Wikipedia), using online forums, using public services available online (e.g. tender applications, online forms, filing taxes online, etc.)

<i>Gender (gender)</i>	1 = male, 0 = female
<i>Age (age)</i>	Age of respondent
<i>Education (educ)</i>	Highest achieved level of education: 1 = primary school or less; 2 = secondary education; 3 = tertiary education/college, university; 4 = master's degree/doctoral title
<i>Occupation (ocu)</i>	Occupation of respondent: 1 = owner of the company/craft (own-account worker); 2 = manager/official; 3 = professional (highly educated, e.g., medical doctor, lawyer, bookkeeper, etc.); 4 = technician/clerk; 5 = worker; 6 = retired; 7 = student; 8 = unemployed
<i>Household (hh)</i>	Number of people living in respondent's household
<i>Income (income)</i>	Total monthly income of respondent's household (in HRK ¹⁵): 1 = 2,500 or less; 2 = 2,501–5,000; 3 = 5,001–7,500; 4 = 7,501–10,000; 5 = 10,001–12,500; 6 = 12,501–15,000; 7 = more than 15,000
<i>Region (region)</i>	Five Croatian regions ¹⁶ (based on 21 Croatian counties): 1 = Zagreb; 2 = Western Croatia; 3 = Eastern Croatia; 4 = Central Croatia; 5 = Southern Croatia
<i>Size of place of residence (size)</i>	Number of inhabitants in respondent's place of residence: 1 = 10,000 or less; 2 = 10,001–50,000; 3 = 50,001–100,000; 4 = more than 100,000

*Notes: * The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). All indexes were calculated as a simple average of their items.*

4 Data Description

In the research we use survey data collected from November 2015 to March 2016 on a sample of internet users in Croatia. The survey was conducted by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) method. An online phone book was used as a sampling frame and secondary data (Stilus Media) were used to assess the number of internet users in Croatia. The sample was created based on a one-way stratification by 21 counties, where the sample allocated to each stratum was proportional to the assessed number of internet users in each stratum. Within each stratum a combination of random and systematic sampling was applied. Pages from the phone book were selected using simple random sampling procedure. Sample units within each page were selected applying systematic sampling procedure. Altogether, more than 19,000 calls to participate in the survey were made. With a response rate of 10.8 percent, the final sample consisted of 2,060 internet users aged 18 or older. The sample size was determined with the goal of decreasing the margin of error, especially for subsample comparisons. The descriptive statistics of variables in Model 1 are presented in Table 2.

¹⁵ 1 EUR = 7.529 HRK (2016 average).


¹⁶ Defined in Table A1 in the Appendix.

Variable	n	Mean	St. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Online privacy concern	2,060	3.56	0.96	1	5
Degree of regulatory control	2,060	3.06	0.6	1	5
Control of personal information online	2,060	4.56	0.57	1	5
Computer anxiety	2,060	2.94	1.06	1	5
Time spent online	2,060	3.22	2.87	0.5	24
Diversity of online activities	2,060	9.05	2.68	1	15
Gender					
Male	1,030	0.5	0.5	0	1
Female	1,030	0.5	0.5	0	1
Age	2,060	39.83	12.91	18	84
Education*					
Primary or less	17	0.01	0.09	0	1
Secondary	1,035	0.5	0.5	0	1
Tertiary	945	0.46	0.5	0	1
PhD or postgraduate	63	0.03	0.17	0	1
Occupation*					
Self-employed	42	0.02	0.14	0	1
Manager	44	0.02	0.14	0	1
Professional	616	0.3	0.46	0	1
Technician/clerk	373	0.18	0.39	0	1
Worker	508	0.25	0.43	0	1
Retired	180	0.09	0.28	0	1
Student	180	0.09	0.28	0	1
Unemployed	103	0.05	0.22	0	1
Other	14	0.01	0.08	0	1
Number of people in household	2,060	3.52	1.26	1	12
Household income*					
2,500 or less	51	0.02	0.16	0	1
2,501–5,000	305	0.15	0.36	0	1
5,001–7,500	451	0.22	0.41	0	1
7,501–10,000	601	0.29	0.45	0	1
10,001–12,500	274	0.13	0.34	0	1
12,501–15,000	197	0.1	0.29	0	1
More than 15,000	181	0.09	0.28	0	1
Region*					
Zagreb	544	0.26	0.44	0	1
Western Croatia	262	0.13	0.33	0	1
Eastern Croatia	387	0.19	0.39	0	1
Central Croatia	461	0.22	0.42	0	1
Southern Croatia	406	0.2	0.4	0	1
Size of place of residence*					
10,000 or less	279	0.14	0.34	0	1
10,001–50,000	731	0.35	0.48	0	1
50,001–100,000	311	0.15	0.36	0	1
More than 100,000	739	0.36	0.48	0	1

Note: * These variables were transformed into dummy variables for each possible outcome, so the means in this case actually represent the percentage of respondents with a given outcome for every variable.

5 Results and Discussion

Prior to estimation, latent constructs in Model 1 were validated using confirmatory factor analysis, as presented in Figure 2. Figure 2 presents standardized estimates, and root mean square error of approximation of 0.062 confirms the usage of the aforementioned items to measure the latent constructs.



Model 1 was then estimated using the OLS method in Stata 13 software. The model was estimated three times by subsequently adding more covariates – version 1 is a simple case where *opc* is regressed on other latent variables in the model; version 2 further includes two indicators on internet usage; and version 3 also includes all the personal characteristics of the respondents. The results of these estimations are presented in Table 3.

All three social-psychological factors (perceived degree of regulatory control, computer anxiety and control of personal information online) showed to be of statistical significance, in all three versions of Model 1 at a 1-percent significance level. A unit standard deviation increase in perceived degree of regulatory control is translated to a decrease of 0.049 to 0.051 standard deviations in online privacy concern.

	Version 1		Version 2		Version 3	
Degree of regulatory control	-0.051 ^{***}	(0.019)	-0.051 ^{***}	(0.019)	-0.049 ^{***}	(0.019)
Computer anxiety	0.427 ^{***}	(0.019)	0.423 ^{***}	(0.019)	0.423 ^{***}	(0.019)
Control of personal information online	0.298 ^{***}	(0.019)	0.297 ^{***}	(0.019)	0.312 ^{***}	(0.020)
Time spent online			0.009	(0.007)	0.007	(0.007)
Diversity of online activities			-0.018 ^{**}	(0.008)	-0.022 ^{***}	(0.008)
Male					0.021	(0.038)
Age					-0.005 ^{**}	(0.002)
Household					0.011	(0.016)
Education level (primary benchmark)						
Secondary					-0.392 [*]	(0.208)
Tertiary					-0.379 [*]	(0.212)
Postgraduate					-0.177	(0.239)
Occupation (self-employed benchmark)						
Manager					-0.204	(0.182)
Professional					-0.253 [*]	(0.139)
Technician/clerk					-0.126	(0.139)
Worker					-0.109	(0.139)
Retired					-0.083	(0.152)
Student					-0.309 ^{**}	(0.150)
Unemployed					-0.264 [*]	(0.158)
Other					-0.153	(0.260)
Place of residence (10,000 or less benchmark)						
10,001–50,000					0.009	(0.060)
50,001–100,000					-0.022	(0.071)
More than 100,000					0.066	(0.066)
Income (2,500 or less benchmark)						
2,501–5,000					0.006	(0.129)
5,001–7,500					-0.012	(0.127)
7,501–10,000					-0.024	(0.127)
10,001–12,500					-0.009	(0.134)
12,501–15,000					0.045	(0.138)
More than 15,000					0.067	(0.140)
Region (Zagreb region benchmark)						
Western Croatia					0.085	(0.065)
Eastern Croatia					-0.002	(0.062)
Central Croatia					0.026	(0.066)
Southern Croatia					-0.010	(0.059)
Constant	0.000	(0.018)	0.130 ^{**}	(0.066)	0.837 ^{***}	(0.307)
<i>N</i>	2,060		2,060		2,060	
Adj. <i>R</i> ²	0.2988		0.3001		0.3023	

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Benchmark levels of certain socio-demographic variables were chosen based on our intuition.

One standard deviation increase in computer anxiety will lead to an increase of 0.423 to 0.427 standard deviations in online privacy concern. Similarly, a unit standard deviation increase in an individual's desire for information control when online will lead to an increase between 0.297 and 0.312 standard deviations in online privacy concern. Internet users are concerned about their privacy primarily if they experience fear of computers and of technology in general. Concerns are increased for those users who feel a strong desire to maintain control and somewhat alleviated for users who believe regulations are protecting their privacy. Turning now to version 2 of Model 1, the measured intensity of internet usage in terms of time and range of activities performed online is less important for online privacy concern. Namely, out of two analyzed experience factors (time spent online and diversity of online activities), only diversity of online activities showed to be of statistical significance. A unit increase in diversity of online activities will lead to a decrease between 0.018 and 0.022 standard deviations in online privacy concern.

Finally, in the third version of Model 1, out of eight analyzed demographic factors, only age, education level and occupation showed to be of statistical significance. Somewhat unexpectedly, older people express less concern, since a one-year increase in a person's age will lead to a decrease of 0.005 standard deviations in online privacy concern. Online privacy concern drops with higher level of education attained. Compared to someone who has completed only primary level of education, secondary and tertiary education degrees make a person less sensitive to online privacy concern by 0.392 and 0.379 standard deviations, respectively. Any further education degree has no significance for perceived online privacy concern. Certain occupation groups also showed to be statistically significant when explaining variation in online privacy concern levels. Namely, compared to people who are self-employed, professional workers are less concerned for their online privacy by 0.253 standard deviations; students are also less concerned by 0.309 standard deviations and those unemployed by 0.264 standard deviations. Gender, household size, place of residence size, income group or region did not bear any significance in explaining online privacy concern variation. The most consistent result of this analysis is also the one of our key interest in this research – perceived degree of regulatory control. As we added more and more controls in our original version (version 1) of Model 1, the estimated coefficient for this variable proved to be very robust with very little variation, which only adds validity to these results.

Although the analysis using standard deviations as the unit of measure in the dependent variable is mathematically sound, it lacks a practical application in the real world. Most people are not used to thinking in terms of standard deviations, so another approach predicting the probability of each outcome of the online privacy concern might be more intuitive to explain. Keeping this in mind, and also as a robustness check, the full specification (version 3) of Model 1 was estimated using the ordered probit estimation procedure.

In the ordered probit method, we assume the underlying relationship as

$$opc_i^* = X_i'\beta + \varepsilon_i, \quad (2)$$

where X is a matrix of all covariates used in Model 1 and dependent variable opc^* is exact but unobserved – instead, we can only observe different categories $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ of this variable, and we define thresholds α such that

$$opc_i = j \text{ if } \alpha_{j-1} < opc_i^* \leq \alpha_j. \quad (3)$$

Then, the probability that the observation i will choose alternative j is given by

$$p_{ij} = p(opc_i = j) = p(\alpha_{j-1} < opc_i^* \leq \alpha_j) = F(\alpha_j - X_i'\beta) - F(\alpha_{j-1} - X_i'\beta), \quad (4)$$

where F is standard normal cumulative distribution function. The model is estimated using the maximum likelihood estimation procedure.

In our case, the online privacy concern (opc) dependent variable can take five different categories (outcomes) on the Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5 (1 – “Not concerned at all”, 2 – “Unconcerned”, 3 – “Neither concerned nor unconcerned”, 4 – “Concerned”, 5 – “Very concerned”). These discrete outcomes of opc were obtained by rounding the value of opc to the nearest integer for each respondent. Other latent covariates (reg , $ctrl$ and ca) still enter the equation in their standardized form and are hence interpreted in terms of standard deviations, but the dependent variable opc now enters as a discrete variable. Table 4 shows the results of ordered probit estimations.

	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5
Degree of regulatory control	0.001** (0.000)	0.011*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.005)	-0.010*** (0.003)	-0.018*** (0.006)
Computer anxiety	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.081*** (0.006)	-0.113*** (0.008)	0.071*** (0.007)	0.129*** (0.007)
Control of personal information online	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.064*** (0.005)	-0.089*** (0.007)	0.056*** (0.006)	0.101*** (0.007)
Time spent online	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.002)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)
Diversity of online activities	0.000** (0.000)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	-0.005*** (0.002)	-0.008*** (0.003)
Male	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.011)	0.003 (0.007)	0.006 (0.012)
Age	0.000** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.001)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.001)
Household	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.003)	0.001 (0.005)	-0.000 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.005)

Education level (primary benchmark)					
Secondary	0.003***	0.068***	0.142**	-0.020	-0.193*
	(0.001)	(0.019)	(0.062)	(0.026)	(0.104)
Tertiary	0.003***	0.062***	0.135**	-0.016	-0.185*
	(0.001)	(0.020)	(0.063)	(0.025)	(0.106)
Postgraduate	0.002	0.038	0.095	0.003	-0.137
	(0.001)	(0.026)	(0.071)	(0.026)	(0.114)
Occupation (self-employed benchmark)					
Manager	0.002	0.033	0.058	-0.021	-0.071
	(0.002)	(0.032)	(0.055)	(0.023)	(0.068)
Professional	0.003**	0.048**	0.078*	-0.035***	-0.093*
	(0.001)	(0.021)	(0.043)	(0.011)	(0.056)
Technician/clerk	0.002*	0.034	0.060	-0.022**	-0.073
	(0.001)	(0.021)	(0.043)	(0.010)	(0.056)
Worker	0.001	0.021	0.040	-0.012	-0.051
	(0.001)	(0.021)	(0.043)	(0.009)	(0.057)
Retired	0.001	0.019	0.037	-0.011	-0.046
	(0.001)	(0.023)	(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.061)
Student	0.005**	0.074***	0.106**	-0.060***	-0.125**
	(0.002)	(0.027)	(0.045)	(0.020)	(0.058)
Unemployed	0.004*	0.056**	0.087*	-0.043**	-0.104*
	(0.002)	(0.028)	(0.047)	(0.021)	(0.060)
Other	0.000	0.002	0.005	-0.001	-0.006
	(0.002)	(0.037)	(0.080)	(0.015)	(0.104)
Place of residence (10,000 or less benchmark)					
10,001–50,000	-0.000	-0.002	-0.002	0.001	0.002
	(0.001)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.011)	(0.019)
50,001–100,000	0.001	0.013	0.016	-0.012	-0.018
	(0.001)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.022)
More than 100,000	-0.001	-0.010	-0.014	0.008	0.016
	(0.001)	(0.013)	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.021)
Income (2,500 or less benchmark)					
2,501–5,000	-0.000	-0.007	-0.009	0.006	0.010
	(0.002)	(0.028)	(0.036)	(0.025)	(0.041)
5,001–7,500	-0.000	-0.006	-0.008	0.005	0.009
	(0.002)	(0.028)	(0.036)	(0.025)	(0.040)
7,501–10,000	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.002
	(0.002)	(0.028)	(0.035)	(0.025)	(0.040)
10,001–12,500	0.000	0.003	0.004	-0.003	-0.004
	(0.002)	(0.029)	(0.037)	(0.027)	(0.042)
12,501–15,000	-0.002	-0.024	-0.036	0.020	0.042
	(0.002)	(0.029)	(0.039)	(0.026)	(0.045)
More than 15,000	-0.001	-0.020	-0.028	0.017	0.033
	(0.002)	(0.029)	(0.040)	(0.026)	(0.045)
Region (Zagreb region benchmark)					
Western Croatia	-0.001	-0.010	-0.014	0.009	0.016
	(0.001)	(0.013)	(0.019)	(0.011)	(0.022)
Eastern Croatia	0.000	0.003	0.004	-0.003	-0.005
	(0.001)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.020)
Central Croatia	-0.001	-0.011	-0.015	0.009	0.017
	(0.001)	(0.013)	(0.019)	(0.011)	(0.022)
Southern Croatia	0.000	0.000	0.001	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.011)	(0.019)
<i>N</i>	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The ordered probit estimation results generally confirm the OLS findings. An increase of one standard deviation from the mean is estimated to lead to a 0.1 to 1.6 percent increase in probability to be unconcerned or neither concerned nor unconcerned for online privacy. For the last two outcomes of the *opc* variable, the signs are negative, meaning that an increase in one standard deviation in the perceived regulatory effectiveness is estimated to raise the probability to be concerned or very concerned for online privacy by 1 and 1.8 percent, respectively. This finding is in line with the previous OLS result confirming that internet users who perceive regulation to be effective are likely to be less concerned about online privacy.

The next result indicates that a unit standard deviation increase from the mean in computer anxiety leads to a decrease in probability of being unconcerned or neither concerned nor unconcerned for online privacy (from 0.6 and 8.1 to 11.3 percent) and to an increase in probability to be concerned or very concerned for online privacy by 7.1 and 12.9 percent, respectively. This result is also consistent with previous OLS results according to which people who have fears and feel anxious working with computers are more concerned about online privacy.

With regard to control of personal information, the results are as expected. A unit standard deviation increase in this variable is estimated to lead to a 0.4, 6.4 and 8.9 percent increase in probability to be unconcerned or neither concerned nor unconcerned for online privacy. For the last two outcomes, one standard deviation increase in control of personal information increases the probability to be concerned or very concerned for online privacy by 5.6 and 10.1 percent, respectively. The assumption that stronger desire to maintain control leads to higher online privacy concern is confirmed.

Time spent online again was not significant, contrary to diversity of online activities. The ordered probit estimates show that one unit increase in diversity of online activities leads to an increase in probability to be neither concerned nor unconcerned for online privacy by 0.5 and 0.7 percent, and a decrease in probability to be concerned or very concerned for online privacy by 0.5 and 0.8 percent, respectively.

Age is shown to be of statistical significance, albeit with a very weak impact. Increase in a person's age by one year leads to an increase in probability to be not concerned or neither concerned nor unconcerned for online privacy by 0.1 and 0.2 percent, respectively, and at the same time to a decrease in probability to be concerned or very concerned for online privacy by the same percentage (0.1 and 0.2 percent, respectively). Basically, the older you get, the less concerned you are about your online privacy. This result is contrary to the previous findings that older internet users tend to be more concerned about privacy (Zukowski & Brown, 2007; Zhang, Chen & Lee, 2013). One of the possible explanations is that older people may not be acquainted with online privacy issues, thus the lack of

privacy awareness is related to the lower levels of privacy concern (Dommeyer & Gross, 2003). This remains to be further explored. The results for educational attainment suggest that the probability of being less concerned rises if the respondent belongs to the more educated group of internet users.

The findings about the respondents' level of education are in line with the findings on occupation. Students and professionals are more educated internet users. Therefore, compared to the self-employed, it is not surprising that students are more prone to be not concerned at all (0.5 percent) or unconcerned (7.4 percent), and less likely to be concerned (-6 percent) or very concerned (-12.5 percent). The same stands for professionals who, compared to the self-employed, are more likely not to be concerned at all (0.3 percent) or to be unconcerned (4.8 percent), and unlikely to be concerned (-3.5 percent) or very concerned about online privacy (-9.3 percent). For both students and professionals, the highest probability is observed to be neither unconcerned nor concerned (10.6 for students and 7.8 for professionals). These segments of our sample are certainly more exposed to the internet in their everyday student or professional lives and perhaps they do not even think about privacy when online.

Other variables in the model were not found to be significant.

6 Conclusion

The findings of this research shed light on the privacy protection regulations and online privacy concern nexus. As expected, the perceived quality and effectiveness of government regulations alleviate online privacy concern of internet users. However, this effect is more complex because computer anxiety and desire to maintain control over personal information online showed to be significant variables in our model as well. Computer anxiety has the strongest (positive) impact on online privacy concern. This result, combined with the observed significance of the variable denoting diversity of online activities, leads us to conclude that more skilled internet users feel less concern about online privacy.

The model was tested with OLS and ordered probit estimation methods and the results confirm the findings in both analyses. The contribution of this study is two-fold. Besides contributing to developing an extended model of online privacy concern, with an even larger set of variables in the model, our findings might be useful for national policy-makers as well as for developing business strategies, in particular in the context of the GDPR regulation coming in force in 2018. If the perceived effectiveness of the regulatory framework is one of the major determinants of online privacy concern of internet users, i.e., consumers, businesses should take this opportunity and turn it into their competitive

advantage. Companies and managers should clearly communicate their compliance with the privacy regulations to ensure customers that their personal data are well-protected and safeguarded.

On the other hand, breaches in privacy protection of data which are collected and used by government agencies could permanently ruin the public trust in the national regulatory framework. GDPR is expected to have strong impacts on business but it is too early to tell whether it could also change the attitudes of citizens, consumers and internet users. In this context, the relationship between regulations and online privacy concern calls for further exploring in future research.

This study is not without limitations. A potential source of bias in our model is the response rate to the survey, calculated as the share of fully completed questionnaires in the total number of respondents contacted. It should be emphasized that the denominator of this ratio also includes those who were not qualified to complete our survey (younger than 18 or those who do not use the internet). This raises the issue of whether the people who did not agree to answer questions from the survey were fundamentally equal to those who answered the questions. Although the answer is “probably not”, numerous recent studies point to the fact that the response rate in telephone surveys is not a good indicator of data quality, i.e., the results do not differ significantly with respect to the response rate (e.g. Holbrook, Krosnick & Pfent, 2008). Also, even if bias exists due to a weak response, it is expected to work downward. Namely, assuming that people who do not want to respond to surveys are fundamentally different from those who agree to respond, those non-respondents are expected to be more concerned about their privacy. Consequently, the existence of this bias means that our estimates refer to the lower limit, or to people who are less concerned about their privacy and thus more willing to respond to the survey. Finally, this analysis could be expanded to other countries by applying the same survey methodology and could provide comparable cross-country insights. Replicating this research in other countries would test if our findings could be considered generally valid in a global digitized world.

Acknowledgments: This work has been fully supported by Croatian Science Foundation under the project 7913-Extended Model of Online PRIVacy CONCern.

7 Appendix

Table A1 Definition of Five Croatian Regions	
Region	County
Zagreb	Zagreb
	City of Zagreb
Western Croatia	Primorje-Gorski Kotar
	Lika-Senj
	Istria
Eastern Croatia	Virovitica-Podravina
	Požega-Slavonia
	Brod-Posavina
	Osijek-Baranja
	Vukovar-Srijem
Central Croatia	Krapina-Zagorje
	Sisak-Moslavina
	Karlovac
	Varaždin
	Koprivnica-Križevci
	Bjelovar-Bilogora
	Međimurje
Southern Croatia	Zadar
	Šibenik-Knin
	Split-Dalmatia
	Dubrovnik-Neretva

References

- Acquisti, A., Brandimarte, L., & Loewenstein, G. (2015). Privacy and human behaviour in the age of information. *Science*, *347*(6221), 509-514.
- Anić, I. D., Budak, J., Rajh, E., Recher, V., Škare, V., Škrinjarić, B., & Žokalj, M. (2018). *The Extended Model of Online Privacy Concern*. Zagreb: Ekonomski institut, Zagreb.
- Dinev, T., & Hart, P. (2006). An extended privacy calculus model for e-commerce transactions. *Information Systems Research*, *17*(1), 61-80.
- Dommeier, C., & Gross, B. (2003). What consumers know and what they do: an investigation of consumer knowledge, awareness, and use of privacy protection strategies. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *17*(2), 34-51.
- Ginosar, A., & Ariel, Y. (2017). An analytical framework for online privacy research: What is missing?. *Information & Management*, *54*(7), 948-957.
- Henderson, H. (2015). *Online Privacy and Government*. San Diego: Reference Point Press.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. (2008). The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J.M. Brick, E. D. de Leeuw, L. Japac, P. J. Lavrakas, M.W. Link, & R.L. Sangster (Eds.), *Advances in telephone survey methodology* (pp. 499-528). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hoy, G. M., & Milne, G. (2010). Gender differences in privacy-related measures for young adult facebook users. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *10*(2), 28-45.
- Koops, B.-J., Newell, B. C., Timan, T., Škorvánek, I., Chokrevski, T., & Galič, M. (2017). A Typology of Privacy. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, *38*(2), 483-575.
- Korzaan, M. L., & Boswell, K. T. (2008). The influence of personality traits and information privacy concerns on behavioural intentions. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *48*(4), 15-24.
- Lwin, M., Wirtz, J., & Williams, J. D. (2007). Consumer Online Privacy Concerns and Responses: A Power-Responsibility Equilibrium Perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *35*(4), 572-585.
- Malhotra, N., Kim, S., & Agarwal, J. (2004). Internet users' information privacy concerns (IUIPC): the construct, the scale and a causal model. *Information System Research*, *15*(4), 336-355.
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OECD (1980). Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data of 23 September 1980, available at http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,en_2649_34255_1815186_1_1_1_1,00.html

Smith, H. J., Milberg, S. J., & Burke, S. J. (1996). Information Privacy: Measuring Individuals' Concerns about Organisational Practices. *MIS Quarterly*, 20(2), 167-196.

Parasuraman, S., & Igarria, M. (1990). An examination of gender differences in the determinants of computer anxiety and attitudes toward microcomputers among managers. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 32(3), 327-340.

Peštek, A., Resić E., & Nožica, M. (2011). Model of Trust in E-Transactions, *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 24(3), 131-146.

Raab, C., & Szekely, I. (2017). Data protection authorities and information technology. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 33(4), 421-433.

Rauhofer, J. (2013). One Step Forward, Two Steps Back?: Critical Observations on the Proposed Reform of the EU Data Protection Framework. *Journal of Law and Economic Regulation*, 6(1), 57-84.

Reay, I., Beatty, P., Dick, S., & Miller, J. (2011). Do you know where your data is? A study of the effect of enforcement strategies on privacy policies. In H. R. Nemati (Ed.), *Security and Privacy Assurance in Advanced Technologies* (pp. 374-400). Hershey: Information Science Reference.

Rust, R., Kannan, P. K., & Peng, N. (2002). The customer economics of internet privacy. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 30(4), 455-464.

Stewart, K. A., & Segars, A. H. (2002). An empirical examination of the concern for information privacy instrument. *Information Systems Research*, 13(1), 36-49.

Thatcher, J. B., & Perrewe, P. L. (2002). An empirical examination of individual traits as antecedents to computer anxiety and computer self-efficacy. *MIS quarterly*, 26(4), 381-396.

The Surveillance Project. (2008). The Globalization of Personal Data Project: An International Survey on Privacy and Surveillance Summary of Findings. Kingston: Queen's University.

Zhang, Y., Chen, J., & Wen, K. (2002). Characteristics of internet users and their privacy concerns - a comparative study between China and the United States. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 1(2), 1-16.

Zhang, R., Chen, J. Q., & Lee, C. J. (2013). Mobile commerce and consumer privacy concerns. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 53(4), 31-38.

Zukowski, T., & Brown, I. (2007). Examining the Influence of Demographic Factors on Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns. In SAICSIT (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2007 annual research conference of the South African institute of computer scientists and information technologists on IT research in developing countries* (pp. 197-204). ACM New York, NY, USA.

Popis objavljenih Radnih materijala EIZ-a / Previous issues in this series

2018

- EIZ-WP-1802 Stjepan Srhoj, Bruno Škrinjarić and Sonja Radas: *Bidding against the odds? The impact evaluation of grants for young micro and small firms during the recession*
- EIZ-WP-1801 Dubravka Jurlina Alibegović: *Porezna autonomija gradova u Hrvatskoj u razdoblju 2002.–2016.*

2017

- EIZ-WP-1706 Katarina Bačić, Ivana Rašić Bakarić and Sunčana Slijepčević: *Sources of productivity differentials in manufacturing in post-transition urban South-East Europe*
- EIZ-WP-1705 Martin Larsson: *EU Emissions Trading: Policy-Induced Innovation, or Business as Usual? Findings from Company Case Studies in the Republic of Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1704 Marina Tkalec and Ivan Žilić: *Does Proximity to Conflict Affect Tourism: Evidence from NATO Bombing*
- EIZ-WP-1703 Nebojša Stojčić and Zoran Aralica: *Choosing Right from Wrong: Industrial Policy and (De)industrialization in Central and Eastern Europe*
- EIZ-WP-1702 Bruno Škrinjarić, Jelena Budak and Mateo Žokalj: *The Effect of Personality Traits on Online Privacy Concern*
- EIZ-WP-1701 Alexander Ahammer and Ivan Zilic: *Do Financial Incentives Alter Physician Prescription Behavior? Evidence from Random Patient-GP Allocations*

2016

- EIZ-WP-1609 Edo Rajh, Jelena Budak, Jovo Ateljević, Ljupčo Davčev, Tamara Jovanov and Kosovka Ognjenović: *Entrepreneurial Intentions in Selected Southeast European Countries*
- EIZ-WP-1608 Ivan Žilić: *General versus Vocational Education: Lessons from a Quasi-Experiment in Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1607 Valerija Botrić: *Public vs. private sector wage skill premia in recession: Croatian experience*
- EIZ-WP-1606 Edo Rajh, Jelena Budak and Mateo Žokalj: *Personal Values of Internet Users: A Cluster Analytic Approach*
- EIZ-WP-1605 Simon Stickelmann: *The Influence of the European Union Consumer Protection Policy on Croatian Consumers*
- EIZ-WP-1604 Bojan Basrak, Petra Posedel, Marina Tkalec and Maruška Vizek: *Searching high and low: Extremal dependence of international sovereign bond markets*
- EIZ-WP-1603 Valerija Botrić and Iva Tomić: *Self-employment of the young and the old: exploring effects of the crisis in Croatia*

- EIZ-WP-1602 Vedran Recher: *Tougher Than the Rest? Relationship between Unemployment and Crime in Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1601 Iva Tomić: *What drives youth unemployment in Europe?*

2015

- EIZ-WP-1505 Petra Palić, Petra Posedel Šimović and Maruška Vizek: *The Determinants of Country's Risk Premium Volatility: Evidence from Panel VAR Model*
- EIZ-WP-1504 Sunčana Slijepčević, Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh: *Challenging Competition at Public Procurement Markets: Are SMEs Too Big to Fail? The Case of BiH and Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1503 Ivan Žilić: *Effect of forced displacement on health*
- EIZ-WP-1502 Vedran Recher, Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh: *Eye in the Sky: Contextualizing Development with Online Privacy Concern in Western Balkan Countries*
- EIZ-WP-1501 Petra Posedel Šimović, Marina Tkalec and Maruška Vizek: *Time-varying integration in European post-transition sovereign bond market*

2014

- EIZ-WP-1403 Jelena Nikolic, Ivica Rubil and Iva Tomić: *Changes in Public and Private Sector Pay Structures in Two Emerging Market Economies during the Crisis*
- EIZ-WP-1402 Jelena Budak, Edo Rajh and Ivan-Damir Anić: *Privacy Concern in Western Balkan Countries: Developing a Typology of Citizens*
- EIZ-WP-1401 Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh: *The Public Procurement System: A Business Sector Perspective*

2013

- EIZ-WP-1302 Valerija Botrić: *Identifying Key Sectors in Croatian Economy Based on Input-Output Tables*
- EIZ-WP-1301 Ivica Rubil: *Accounting for Regional Poverty Differences in Croatia: Exploring the Role of Disparities in Average Income and Inequality*

2012

- EIZ-WP-1205 Hrvoje Mirošević: *Analiza razvojnih dokumenata Republike Hrvatske*
- EIZ-WP-1204 Iva Tomić: *The Efficiency of the Matching Process: Exploring the Impact of Regional Employment Offices in Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1203 Jelena Budak, Ivan-Damir Anić and Edo Rajh: *Public Attitudes towards Surveillance and Privacy in Western Balkans: The Case of Serbia*

- EIZ-WP-1202 Valerija Botrić: *Intra-industry Trade between the European Union and Western Balkans: A Close-up*
- EIZ-WP-1201 Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh: *Corruption Survey in Croatia: Survey Confidentiality and Trust in Institutions*

2011

- EIZ-WP-1104 Jelena Budak and Edo Rajh: *Corruption as an Obstacle for Doing Business in the Western Balkans: A Business Sector Perspective*
- EIZ-WP-1103 Alfio Cerami and Paul Stubbs: *Post-communist Welfare Capitalisms: Bringing Institutions and Political Agency Back In*
- EIZ-WP-1102 Marina Tkalec: *The Dynamics of Deposit Euroization in European Post-transition Countries: Evidence from Threshold VAR*
- EIZ-WP-1101 Jelena Budak, Ivan-Damir Anić and Edo Rajh: *Public Attitudes Towards Surveillance and Privacy in Croatia*

2010

- EIZ-WP-1003 Marin Božić: *Pricing Options on Commodity Futures: The Role of Weather and Storage*
- EIZ-WP-1002 Dubravka Jurlina Alibegović and Sunčana Slijepčević: *Performance Measurement at the Sub-national Government Level in Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-1001 Petra Posedel and Maruška Vizek: *The Nonlinear House Price Adjustment Process in Developed and Transition Countries*

2009

- EIZ-WP-0902 Marin Božić and Brian W. Gould: *Has Price Responsiveness of U.S. Milk Supply Decreased?*
- EIZ-WP-0901 Sandra Švaljek, Maruška Vizek and Andrea Mervar: *Ciklički prilagođeni proračunski saldo: primjer Hrvatske*

2008

- EIZ-WP-0802 Janez Prašnikar, Tanja Rajković and Maja Vehovec: *Competencies Driving Innovative Performance of Slovenian and Croatian Manufacturing Firms*
- EIZ-WP-0801 Tanja Broz: *The Introduction of the Euro in Central and Eastern European Countries – Is It Economically Justifiable?*

2007

- EIZ-WP-0705 Arjan Lejour, Andrea Mervar and Gerard Verweij: *The Economic Effects of Croatia's Accession to the EU*
- EIZ-WP-0704 Danijel Nestić: *Differing Characteristics or Differing Rewards: What is Behind the Gender Wage Gap in Croatia?*
- EIZ-WP-0703 Maruška Vizek and Tanja Broz: *Modelling Inflation in Croatia*
- EIZ-WP-0702 Sonja Radas and Mario Teisl: *An Open Mind Wants More: Opinion Strength and the Desire for Genetically Modified Food Labeling Policy*
- EIZ-WP-0701 Andrea Mervar and James E. Payne: *An Analysis of Foreign Tourism Demand for Croatian Destinations: Long-Run Elasticity Estimates*



e-ISSN 1847-7844

9 771847 784002

