



Short Communication

Safe harbor: Personality and the acceptance of online piracy


Daniel M. Rempala^{a,*}, Bradley M. Okdie^b
^a The University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA

^b The Ohio State University at Newark, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 3 May 2017

Received in revised form 28 June 2017

Accepted 30 July 2017

Available online xxxx

Keywords:

Online piracy

Policy

Personality

ABSTRACT

Online piracy causes significant monetary losses to many industries. Perceptions of victimization (who is hurt) and physicality (is the product physical or digital) drive attitudes regarding the moral superiority of online versus offline piracy. We investigate whether personality predicts the adoption of those perceptions. Participants completed two personality scales, disclosed whether they believed offline and online piracy were morally different, and justified their belief. Reduced empathy, perspective-taking, and preference for order predicted viewing online piracy as morally superior. Moreover, high empathy participants who perceived online piracy as morally superior to offline piracy made justifications denying victimization. Results suggest increasing empathy and clarifying victimization may reduce online piracy.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Illegally downloading content from the internet costs the U.S. music and movie industries billions of dollars per year (Gibbs, 2014). Although the exact numbers are disputed (e.g. Raustiala & Sprigman, 2012), online piracy's costs to the entertainment industry undoubtedly have been substantial. This study examines personality factors that predict the acceptance of online piracy.

1.1. Perceptions of online piracy vs. shoplifting

In a study of Finnish 9th graders, online piracy positively correlated with other delinquent behaviors and, like other delinquent behaviors, negatively correlated with measures of self-control and social control (e.g. parental supervision; Aaltonen & Salmi, 2013). Additionally, studies using Polish samples examined differences between traditional theft and online piracy, rather than similarities (Krawczyk, Tyrowicz, Kukla-Gryz, & Hardy, 2014). The authors examined student and non-student participants' attitudes toward a character in a vignette who steals a season of a TV show, either by physically stealing DVDs or by illegally downloading digital files. Versions of the vignettes varied on key dimensions that reflected proposed factors.

Krawczyk et al. (2014) identified five contextual factors predicting participants' perceptions of the theft. The most powerful factor was "Physicality." That means participants approved less when the theft involved tangible items. The second most powerful factor was "Direct

Loss." Thus, participants approved less when they perceived a clear victim of the behavior. The third most powerful factor was "Breach of Protection." That is, overcoming some protective obstacle decreased approval. Fourth most powerful was "Peer Status." Stealing from someone whom the thief knew personally produced less approval than when the victim was remote. The final significant factor was "Sharing," indicating that distributing the stolen material decreased approval versus stealing for personal use. Interestingly, "Availability of Alternatives" (i.e., whether cheap, legal alternatives existed) failed to predict participant attitudes. Finally, by using both student and non-student samples, this study established that these views extended beyond poor college students.

1.2. Reducing online piracy

Increasing the "physicality" of downloaded material appears impossible, as does legislating to increase self-control. However, Phau and Liang (2012) suggest reforms that would influence other factors mentioned above. First, they suggest making the piracy of the material more difficult. This strategy, on its face, makes sense: if you want to reduce theft, buy a better lock. The strategy also works on a psychological level: in terms of "breaching protection," making the violation more explicit (rather than casual) makes the act less acceptable. However, strategies intended to affect "breaching protection" would ideally apply to all who engage in piracy of the item—not just the first person—as digital locks are less effective after the initial breach. Another suggestion involves increasing the consequences for violation by penalizing the parents of child pirates, thereby motivating social control (Phau & Liang, 2012).

* Corresponding author at: Department of Psychology, The University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2500 Campus Rd, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA.

E-mail address: rempala@hawaii.edu (D.M. Rempala).

To address victimization-related factors (e.g. “Direct Loss” and “Peer Status”), one could clarify the link between the piracy and its harmful consequences (e.g. “Piracy is not a victimless crime” campaigns). However, this strategy produces mixed results in actual practice (Cox & Collins, 2014; Levin, Conway Dato-on, & Manolis, 2007). Finally, efforts have been made to sanction companies that facilitate sharing of pirated content (e.g., Kazaa) but found questionable success (Bhattacharjee, Gopal, Lertwachara, & Marsden, 2006). Identifying the types of individuals who are accepting of online piracy may help in determining what strategies to utilize in reducing online piracy.

1.3. The current study

Krawczyk et al. (2014) showed that physicality and victimization drive perceptions that downloading illegal content categorically differs from shoplifting. The current study examines whether personality characteristics predict adoption of those perceptions. Specifically, we predicted that participants with low empathy and perspective-taking would be (relatively) more accepting of online piracy and more likely to minimize its harm, compared to shoplifting. Also, we predicted that participants high in constructs related to Need for Closure would be (relatively) less accepting of online piracy because of desires to maintain the status quo and clear behavior definitions (e.g. stealing is stealing, regardless of an object's physicality).

1.4. Hypotheses

- Participants who are accepting of online piracy (compared to shoplifting) will show less empathy and perspective-taking (as measured by the Interpersonal Reactivity Index) and will minimize victimization of the behavior.
- Participants who are accepting of online piracy (compared to shoplifting) will score lower on the Need for Closure Scale and its subscales because they will have a more flexible concept of what constitutes shoplifting (i.e., if it isn't physical, it isn't shoplifting).

2. Method

2.1. Participants

We recruited 253 participants using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (Mturk) and paid them 75 cents for participating. Eleven participants were dropped from the analysis, for either completing the study too fast (in the top 2.5%) or too slow (in the bottom 2.5%). 242 participants remained (107 males; 132 females; 2 transgender individuals; 1 undisclosed) with a mean age of 34.73 years ($SD = 10.12$). Self-reported ethnicities included: 200 “White,” 19 “Black or African American,” 13 “Asian,” 1 “American Indian or Alaskan,” 2 “multiple ethnicities,” 6 “other,” and 1 undisclosed.

2.2. Procedure

Participants completed the measures online. The central question to which they responded was “Do you think there is a moral difference between shoplifting and downloading illegal content?” (“Yes,” “No,” “Unsure”). We refer to this as the “Moral Difference” question. After indicating whether they perceived a moral difference, participants were asked to explain their answers. We refer to this as the “Moral Difference Justification.”

Participants also responded to two questions, “To what extent do you agree with the statement, ‘It is morally wrong to shoplift?’” and “To what extent do you agree with the statement, ‘It is morally wrong to illegally download movies, TV shows, games, or applications from the Internet?’” using a six-point, Likert-like scale (1 = “Completely Disagree,” 6 = “Completely Agree”). Because we sought to examine why

people perceive online piracy as an exception to theft, we subtracted the former score from the latter score, such that lower values indicated perceptions of moral superiority of downloading over shoplifting.¹ We refer to this value as “Moral Disparity Scores.” Participants also completed the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980) and the Need for Closure Scale (NFCS; Webster & Kruglanski, 1994).

2.2.1. Coding of Moral Difference Justifications

Two research assistants coded the Moral Difference Justifications for two themes: Differential Victimization (e.g. “Shoplifting from a store directly affects the people working in the store. Downloading on the Internet is a more gray area...”) and Differential Physicality (e.g. “One is taking a physical item, the other is downloading content.”). Interrater agreement was sufficient (Cohen's $d = 0.61$ for Victimization and 0.72 for Physicality). A third coder resolved any disagreements among the first two coders.

2.2.2. Interpersonal Reactivity Index

The IRI (Davis, 1980) consists of 28 statements (e.g. “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.”) that participants rate using a five-point, Likert-like scale (1 = “Does not describe me well,” 5 = “Describes me very well”). The scale is reliable (internal reliability 0.71 to 0.77; test-retest 0.62 to 0.71) and features Perspective-taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress subscales.

Some researchers argue for using the four IRI subscales separately (Davis, 1980), while others advocate using it as a unidimensional construct (Cliffordson, 2002). We intended to first use the full scale, and if significant, analyze the subscales. In particular, we expected Empathy and Perspective-taking to predict disapproval of online piracy, because individuals possessing these characteristics can more easily identify victimization. Inter-item reliability was high for the full scale ($\alpha = 0.90$) and sufficient for the subscales, ranging from 0.74 (Fantasy) to 0.89 (Empathy).

2.2.3. Need for Closure Scale

The NFCS contains 41 statements (e.g. “I don't like situations that are uncertain”) that participants rate using a six-point, Likert-like scale (1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 6 = “Strongly Agree”; Webster & Kruglanski, 1994). It contains five subscales: Preference for Predictability, Preference for Order, Decisiveness, Discomfort with Ambiguity, and Close-Mindedness.

We used the Roets and Van Hiel (2007) version of the NFCS, which measures Decisiveness as a motivation, rather than a behavior; this is consistent with how the other facets are conceptualized. This version also shows increased internal consistency for the unidimensional NFC construct (ranging from 0.82 to 0.87; Roets & Van Hiel, 2007). As with the IRI, we first used the complete NFCS, and with significance established, examined the subscales. We expected all subscales to predict disapproval of online piracy (because a clear, consistent definition of theft would appeal to high NFC individuals). Reliability for the current study was high when using the complete scale ($\alpha = 0.93$) and sufficient for the subscales (0.72, Closemindedness; 0.84, Order and Predictability).

3. Results

We first examined Moral Difference responses. Specifically, we compared (1) individuals who perceived no difference between shoplifting and illegally downloading content and (2) individuals who were accepting of online piracy. Therefore, we discarded respondents who indicated that they were unsure (36 respondents) and individuals who

¹ The questions comprising participants' Moral Disparity Score varied in specificity (i.e., only the piracy question specified types of items taken). We perceived piracy as an exception to the general category of shoplifting, but it is possible that a parallel wording of the questions could alter the results.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5035704>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5035704>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)