

EXPLORING ONLINE CONSUMER ETHICS: DO CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS OF E-ETHICS CHANGE ACCORDING TO CAD PERSONALITIES?

Oylum Korkut ALTUNA*
F. Müge ARSLAN**
Özge SİĞİRCİ***
A.Ercan GEGEZ****

Abstract

In the new era, one of the major factors influencing the buying decisions and patterns of consumers is the Internet and all concepts are being adapted to non-traditional channels. This study addresses the big gap on academic research regarding online consumer ethics. The aim of this study is to explore the dimensions that makeup online consumer ethics and to assess whether consumers' online ethics perceptions show variations among the three CAD (compliant, aggressive, detached) personality types. Data were collected from 725 respondents through face-to-face surveys. Online consumer ethics dimensions were determined by factor analysis. Then, respondents were classified into groups according to CAD personality types. Finally, the personality types which perceive questionable behaviors in online behavior as more unethical are determined.

Keywords: E-Consumer Ethics, Online Consumer Ethics, Consumer Ethics, CAD Personality Types

Özet

Günümüzde tüketici satın alma kararlarını ve davranışlarını etkileyen en önemli faktörlerden biri İnternet'tir ve bu nedenle tüm uygulamalar geleneksel olmayan kanallar için de adapte edilmektedir. Bu çalışma online tüketici etiği konusunda akademik araştırmalardaki büyük bir boşluğu doldurmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, online tüketici etiğini oluşturan boyutları ortaya çıkartmak ve tüketicilerin online etik algısının CAD kişilik tiplerine (Uyumlu, Agresif, Başına Buyruk) göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini incelemektir.

Veriler 725 cevaplayıcıdan yüz yüze anket yöntemiyle toplanmıştır. Online tüketici etiği boyutlarını belirleyebilmek için faktör analizi kullanılmış ve sonrasında cevaplayıcılar CAD kişilik tiplerine göre gruplara ayrılmıştır. Son olarak, hangi kişilik tipinin hangi online davranışları daha etik dışı bulunduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: E-Tüketici Etiği, Online Tüketici Etiği, Tüketici Etiği, CAD Kişilik Tipleri

* Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi, oaltuna@istanbul.edu.tr

** Prof. Dr., Marmara Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi, mugearslan@marmara.edu.tr

*** Research Assistant, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, sigirci@marmara.edu.tr

**** Prof. Dr., Marmara Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi, egegez@marmara.edu.tr

Introduction

Ethics has become one of the major concerns in business environments. This has led to a growing interest on the subject by academicians and professionals. Ethics has found a place in business and marketing literature from various perspectives. Looking over the ethics literature concerning marketing issues, it can be seen that this noteworthy subject has received priority consideration in terms of the business rather than the consumers' perspective. Although consumer ethics has been an understudied area in marketing ethics, the subject seems to get more popular day after day as the ethical manner in consumption is becoming more important in the new business era.

The Internet has become such an important marketing medium that it is almost impossible for a company to communicate with its customers without contacting them on the Internet. Besides, this rapidly developing medium has led to changes in socialization processes and types of behavior between individuals. Although the Internet has become an indispensable medium both for individual users and companies, the number of studies focusing on the online ethical issues is still limited.

The aim of this study is to explore the dimensions of online consumer ethics and to determine the respondents' judgments about which dimension of online consumer ethics is perceived as being more unethical from the consumers' perspective. In addition, the second aim of this paper is to assess whether consumers' ethics perceptions regarding online behavior patterns show any variation among the CAD (compliant, aggressive, detached) personality types based on Horney's (1945) tripartite interpersonal model (Cohen, 1967).

Literature Review

During the 1960s the focus of marketing ethics research was on corporate ethical decision making, whereas during the 1970s, as a result of a shift in focus, it was on marketing education, product management and social marketing (Schlegelmilch and Öberseder, 2010). Although there are a few remarkable studies on consumer ethics written prior to the 1990s (e.g., DePaulo, 1987; Moschis and Powell, 1986) the majority of literature on consumer ethics has been published after the 1990s. As all aspects of consumer behavior have an integral ethical component, ignoring consumer ethics in research may result in development of ineffective marketing strategies (Swaidan et al., 2004, p. 752).

Consumer Ethics

Consumer ethics is defined as, "the moral principles and standards that guide behavior of individuals or groups as they obtain, use and dispose of goods and services" (Muncy and Vitell, 1992, p. 298). There are different categories of studies in consumer ethics research. One of the most commonly investigated areas of research regarding consumer ethics is 'shoplifting' (e.g., Kallis et al., 1986; Moschis and Powell, 1986; Tonglet, 2002).

A second stream of research has focused on the ‘*double standard*’ that exists between what consumers perceive as acceptable behavior from the perspective of both consumer behavior and business practices (e.g., Davis, 1979; DePaulo, 1987; Vermeir and Kenhove, 2008; De Bock and Kenhove, 2010a). In her preliminary study, Davis (1979) has found that most respondents are likely to insist on their own rights as consumers as compared to their willingness to accept their responsibilities that correspond to these rights. In a similar study, DePaulo (1987) found that, consumers were more critical of sellers than they were of buyers when both engaged in the same unethical behaviors. In their study, Vermeir and Kenhove (2008) undertook the subject in terms of gender differences and found that gender differences concerning double standards in perceptions of unethical issues depended on the type of unethical behavior and that females were less likely to use double standards when it was their own unethical behavior in question as compared to the unethical actions of the corporate.

A third set of studies focus on providing normative guidelines for businesses and consumers on ethical related issues. Stampfl’s (1979) study in which the author outlines a code of ethics for consumers, and Schubert’s (1979) study in which the author proposes a set of strategies for combating consumer abuse are two important studies of this stream.

As stated by Vitell and Muncy (1992) there are a number of studies that focus on the ethical decision-making process of consumers (e.g., Grove et al., 1989; Burnett, 1994; Tan, 2002; Shaw et al., 2005). In their study, which is one of the most cited papers in consumer ethics research, Grove et al. (1989) develop a model based on the neutralization techniques developed by Sykes and Matza (1957) in sociology. Through this model, the authors explain that consumers may justify their non-normative behavior through the denial of responsibility, injury, victim, condemning the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties (Vitell and Muncy, 1992, p. 586).

Studies on consumer attitudes related to a variety of potentially unethical consumer practices form another stream in consumer ethics research (Vitell et al., 1991). Besides the vast amount of qualitative research on this area, a remarkable number of consumer ethics research provides empirically tested results on various samples (e.g., Vitell and Muncy, 1992; Rawwas et al., 1995; Rawwas, 1996; Erffmeyer et al., 1999; Vitell et al., 2001; Swaidan et al., 2003; Swaidan et al., 2006; Kavak et al., 2009; Vitell, 2009).

An additional set of studies may be grouped as the cross-cultural research on consumer ethics issues (e.g., Rawwas et al., 1995; Al-Khatib et al., 1997; Polonsky et al., 2001; Rawwas, 2001; Babakus, 2004; Belk et al., 2005; Kavak et al., 2009).

A final set of studies on consumer ethics may be clustered as the cyber ethics or online consumer ethics studies, which are highly limited in number (e.g., Thong and Yap, 1998; Chatzidakis and Mitussis, 2007). With its characteristic of examining consumer ethics issues from the perspective of online consumer behavior, this study appears to take place in this final set.

Vitell (2003, p. 34) claims that, among the major comprehensive theoretical models of the decision-making process in situations involving ethical issues in marketing and business, the “Hunt-Vitell Model is the only one that can be readily applied to individual consumer behavior.” The Hunt-Vitell Model proposes two major ethical evaluations which are deontological and/or teleological that take place in situations where an individual decision maker perceives an ethical problem and possible alternatives that might be used to resolve this problem (Hunt and Vitell, 1986; Vitell et al., 2001; Vitell, 2003, p. 34). Deontology refers to ethics concerning the specific actions and behaviors of the consumer; while teleology refers to ethics concerning the consequences of these behaviors (Vitell et al., 2001, p. 155).

In most of the empirical studies on consumer ethics conducted after the 1990s, the *consumer ethics scale (CES)* developed by Muncy and Vitell (1992) has been used. The mentioned scale was developed to examine the extent to which consumers believe that certain questionable behaviors are ethical or unethical (Muncy and Vitell, 1992; Vitell and Muncy, 1992, Vitell, 2003). The original research was conducted on 569 households in the U.S. The scale is composed of 27 statements that are believed to cover the breadth of potential unethical situations (Vitell and Muncy, 1992, p. 588). The respondents were required to rate these statements on a five-point interval scale with anchor points being ‘strongly believe that it is wrong’ and ‘strongly believe that it is not wrong’. The results of the study revealed that the 27 statements on ethically questionable situations may be grouped into four main dimensions: ‘actively benefiting from an illegal activity’; ‘passively benefiting at the expense of others’; ‘actively benefiting from a questionable action but not necessarily illegal’ and ‘no harm / no foul’. The results of the original study show that, “consumers are more likely to accept passive unethical behavior which comprises of questionable behaviors such as ‘getting too much change and not saying anything’ or ‘observing someone shoplifting and ignoring it’ than active unethical behavior which comprises of questionable behaviors such as ‘changing price tags on merchandise in a retail store’, or ‘drinking a can of soda in a supermarket without paying for it’ although both are considered to be wrong (Vitell and Muncy, 1992, p. 596).

The four dimension structure of the scale was supported in many studies in which CES was used to measure consumer attitudes towards questionable behaviors (Vitell, 2003). Among the independent variables that the consumers’ ethical attitudes and ethical decision making were associated with, personal values made up a large percentage. In studies where personal values were used, ethical ideology has also received considerable attention. In most of these studies, Forsyth’s (1980) “Ethics Position Questionnaire” is used through which the respondents are divided into four groups of ethical types on two scales, idealism and relativism. Forsyth (1980, p. 175) conceptualizes relativistic individuals as those that “reject the possibility of formulating or relying on universal moral rules when drawing conclusions about moral questions” whereas conceptualizes the idealistic individuals as those “assume that desirable consequences can, with the right action, always be obtained” (1980, p. 176). As seen from these two concepts, relativistic individuals are associated with teleological perspective whereas idealistic individuals are associated with deontological perspective (Al-Khatib et al., 1997, p. 754). These two scales generate the ethical types of situationists, absolutists, subjectivists and exceptionists (Rawwas, 1996,

p. 1010; Al-Khatib et al., 1997, p. 754). Among these types, situationists are expected to draw upon deception in order to achieve the best output whereas absolutists believe that deception is always wrong (Al-Khatib et al., 1997, p. 754; Rawwas, 1996, p. 1010). Subjectivists tend to be teleologists who reject moral rules and believe that deception is a personal matter whereas exceptionists are those who believe deception is allowable as it cannot be avoided as long as safeguards are used (Rawwas, 1996, p. 1010; Al-Khatib et al., 1997, p. 754). This two dimensional personal moral philosophy is accepted as being parallel with the deontological / teleological paradigm (Al-Khatib et al., 1997, p. 754). In most of the studies on consumer ethics, results show that those respondents who achieve high scores on the idealism scale and lower scores on the relativism scale are more likely to reject questionable actions (e.g., Swaidan et al., 2004; Lu and Lu, 2010).

Another important concept of personal values that received considerable attention as being associated with consumer ethics is Machiavellianism. This construct was developed by Christie and Geis in 1970 to represent the actions of those in power in an organizational setting (Rawwas et al., 2005, p. 186). "Machiavellians possess a kind of cool detachment that makes them less emotionally involved with others or with saving face in potentially embarrassing situations" (Vitell et al., 1991, p. 367). In other words, Machiavellians believe that in order to stay in power, some behaviors, although not accepted by society in general, may be considered as being acceptable. Thus, it is expected that the higher the level of Machiavellianism of an individual, the less ethical he/she will perceive questionable behaviors.

Demographic factors of individuals are among the factors that are believed to influence consumers' attitudes towards ethics. Hence, demographic characteristics of individuals have received considerable attention in ethics literature and research. Age, gender, nationality, marital status, religion, educational level and participation in ethics courses are some of the common demographic factors that have been associated with consumer ethics in past studies. Age was found to be the most significant demographic variable among these factors that influenced the perception of unethical behaviors (Vitell, 2003). In a study conducted by Vitell et al. (1991), elderly consumers are found to be more ethical than young consumers while being diverse in their ethical beliefs. Another study conducted on African Americans shows parallel results: older, more educated and married consumers find questionable activities more unacceptable than younger consumers (Swaidan et al., 2003). In another study, which was conducted on Japanese consumers, the results support these findings: younger consumers are less ethical than elder ones (Erffmeyer et al., 1999). The findings of the mentioned study also reveal that Japanese males are significantly more acceptant of actively benefiting from both illegal and questionable actions (Erffmeyer et al., 1999, p. 47). Another study, conducted on Indonesian consumers, shows consistent results: female Indonesians tend to be more ethical than males (Lu and Lu, 2010). In their study on Malaysian consumers, Teck-Chai and Kum-Lung (2009) found that females are more ethical in two of the four CES dimensions.

Besides age and gender, another important demographic characteristic that is examined in consumer ethics studies is religiosity (e.g., Vitell and Paolillo, 2003; Vitell et al., 2005).

Vitell and Paolillo (2003) found that, religiosity was a significant determinate of idealism and relativism and an indirect determinate of consumer ethical beliefs. In their study where they investigated the relationship between religiosity and ethical judgments, Vitell et al. (2005) revealed that those individuals who have strong intrinsic religious beliefs more likely tend to perceive that questionable activities are unethical. Among the four dimensions of the CES, only the 'no harm / no foul' dimension was not found to be significant for intrinsic religious individuals whereas for extrinsic religious individuals none of the four factors were significant. In other words, the intrinsic religious individuals believed that three dimensions of the CES were unethical and one dimension was ethical, whereas extrinsic religious individuals believed that all four dimensions were ethical.

In addition to personal values, demographic characteristic, Machiavellianism and religiosity, a number of other concepts were also linked with consumer ethics such as materialism (Lu and Lu, 2010); acculturation – the desire to keep one's original culture and/or the desire to adopt the host culture (Swaidan et al., 2006); self-regulatory focus (De Bock and Kenhove, 2010b); Hofstede's cultural taxonomy (Rawwas, 2001); self-concept (Kavak et al., 2009) and self-monitoring (Kavak et al., 2009).

As mentioned above, there is a stream of studies regarding consumer ethics that are conducted on a cross-cultural platform. Rawwas et al. (1995) conducted a study comparing Northern Ireland and Hong Kong consumers' ethical attitudes using the CES of Muncy and Vitell (1992) and examined the influence of colonialism on consumer morality. The results of their study show that, there is a relationship between moral reasoning development and lack of laws. In addition, Northern Irish consumers have expressed less sensitivity to moral issues than Hong Kong consumers. In another study conducted on samples from Austria, Brunei, France, Hong Kong, UK and USA, Babakus et al. (2004) examined the individual tolerance for unethical consumer behavior in the mentioned societies using 11 unethical consumer behavior scenarios. The results showed that, those who were affiliated with Islam and Eastern religions indicated less tolerance to unethical consumer behaviors as compared to the religions of the other (Western) regions (Babakus et al., 2004, p. 260). Rawwas et al. (2005) compared the ethical beliefs of American and Turkish consumers using consumer ethics scale of Muncy and Vitell (1992), the Machiavellianism scale and Forsyth's (1980) ethical positioning scale. The results showed that, Turkish consumers scored higher on idealism and lower on Machiavellianism. American and Turkish groups differed among three dimensions of CES (actively benefiting from questionable actions, actively benefiting from illegal actions and no harm/no foul) (Rawwas et al., 2005). Moreover, Turkish consumers were somewhat more sensitive to benefiting from questionable actions than the American consumers. Among the other cross-cultural studies, comparisons were made between: China, Turkey, USA, India, Sweden, Australia, Germany and Spain (using qualitative methods) (Belk et al., 2005); Egypt (a less developed country) and the USA (a developed country) (Al-Khatib et al., 1997); Northern European Union countries (Scotland, Denmark, Germany and Netherlands) and Southern European Union countries (Italy, Portugal, Greece and Spain) (Polonsky et al., 2001); and the USA, Ireland, Austria, Egypt, Lebanon, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Australia (Rawwas, 2001). Overall, as stated by Vitell (2003), "the findings of these studies

support the relatively consistent factor structure of Muncy – Vitell scale for consumer ethics” (Kavak, 2009, p. 117).

Online Consumer Ethics

Internet has become a very important part of the daily lives of almost everyone, especially in developing and developed countries. In a recent study, it is stated that Internet usage rate in Turkey has increased by almost 40% over the last three years, in spite of the high prices of Internet service providers (Urhan and Kızılcıca, 2011; www.tepav.org.tr, September, 27, 2011). Together with technological developments such as smart phones, 3G and 4G technologies and tablets, with the increase in the number of social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and the rise of click and click companies, individuals have become more active on the Internet. Internet is not only a medium for commercial transactions but also a very important medium for socializing. As the number of activities that can be engaged in the Internet by individuals increase each day, the ethical concerns regarding these activities will also keep rising. Although there is a tremendous increase in Internet usage throughout the world, appropriate policies and laws in this area are still highly lacking worldwide. It is expected that this study will shed a light on this issue as well.

Horney’s CAD Interpersonal Personality Model

Personality traits are known to be enduring signs determining how individuals respond and interpret the environment (Noerager, 1979). Therefore, personality is stated to be an important determinant of consumer behavior (Kassarjian, 1971). Thus, the secondary objective of this study is to investigate whether there are any differences in consumers’ ethical perceptions regarding the online activities based on their personality types.

Horney’s (1945) tripartite interpersonal theory mentions that a child can move ‘toward’ people (*Compliant type*), ‘against’ people (*Aggressive type*), and ‘away’ from people (*Detached type*) to cope with environmental influences which in turn leads to lasting character trends (Coolidge et al., 2001). Cohen (1967) has developed a 35-item scale based on Horney’s CAD interpersonal theory to measure the interpersonal orientation of consumers. In this study, the CAD scale developed by Cohen (1967) is used for measuring the personality types of the respondents.

According to Horney (1945), *compliant type people* tend to attach themselves to people or groups they perceive as powerful and wish to be protected, helped and guided by them. They want to be loved, appreciated and needed by others. Since compliant people try to avoid conflict, they subordinate themselves to the wishes of others and their main aim is to find a place in society. That is why they generally show the accepted forms of behavior in society (Horney, 1945; Cohen, 1967). So, it is expected that; *compliant type people will be the most ethical group among the three personality types and will perceive the wrong online behaviors as being unethical the most.* Therefore,

H1: The compliant type personalities are inclined to be more ethical in the internet than the detached and aggressive type personalities.

Aggressive type people see other people as competitors and want to achieve success, prestige and admiration. They have the power to control their emotions superiorly. They value people as long as they are useful in achieving their goals. In general, they can do everything and rebel to be noticed and admired (Horney, 1945; Cohen, 1967). So, it is expected that; *aggressive type people will be the least ethical group among the three personality types and will perceive the wrong online behaviors as being unethical the least.* Thus,

H2: The aggressive type personalities are inclined to be less e-ethical than the compliant and detached type personalities.

Detached type people generally put emotional distance between themselves and others and avoid emotional involvement. They value freedom from obligations and worship independence, and self-sufficiency. Detached type people consider themselves to be unique and believe that they should be recognized without any effort (Horney, 1945; Cohen, 1967). So, it is expected that; *detached type people will be more ethical than aggressives but less ethical than compliants and will perceive online behaviors as being unethical more than the aggressive types but less than the compliant types.* Therefore,

H3: The detached type personalities are inclined to be more e-ethical than the aggressive type personality but less e-ethical than the compliant type personality.

Methodology

The Consumer Ethics Scale (CES) developed by Vitell and Muncy (1992) was used as a basis while generating the items used in this study. Additional items were generated as a result of a pre-test. The pre-test was composed of an open-ended question ('According to you which online behaviors may be considered as unethical?') that was conducted on business students of three different universities in Istanbul, Turkey. As a result of the literature review and pre-tests a total of 40 items were generated. The items generated during the pre-test were debated in class discussions in order to verify whether they were appropriate to be included in the survey. In order to determine the personality type of the respondents, Horney's CAD personality scale developed by Cohen (1967) was used. In this study, the 35 items of the original Cohen CAD scale were transformed into judgments (the original scale is a 6-point interval scale – 'extremely desirable' to 'extremely undesirable') so that a 5-point scale (1=strongly believe that it is wrong; 5=strongly believe that it is not wrong) could be used. The items were translated into Turkish and back translated into English by linguistic experts. Finally, a pre-test was conducted on 35 students in order to test the scales in terms of wording and context. The items that were not clear were reworded, and the final scale was achieved.

Surveys were self-administered because of the sensible nature of the subject. The re-

spondents were directed a screening question in order to eliminate non-users of the Internet. Convenience sampling was used and a total of 725 questionnaires were collected. At the end of the editing process incomplete and incorrectly filled questionnaires were eliminated and a total of 681 usable questionnaires remained for analysis.

Demographic Profile of Sample

In Table 1, the demographic profile of the sample is given. From Table 1, it can easily be seen that the sample consists mainly of males (51.8%), mostly aged between 22-30 years (54.7%), mostly university graduates (34.2%), with a household income of 1000-2500 TL (43.5%). The demographic characteristics of the respondents regarding the three different personality types can also be seen from Table 1. It is interesting to see that the percentage of females (55.7%) is higher than the males for the compliant personality whereas the percentage of males (aggressive=68.9%; detached=63.6%) is higher than the females for the aggressive and detached personalities. For the three personality types, the age and educational levels are similar to that of the total sample, but for income, although the general profile for the compliant and detached personalities are similar to the total sample (1000-5000 TL), for the aggressive personality type, the income level is lower (less than 1000-2500TL).

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Sample

	Total		Compliant		Aggressive		Detached	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender								
Female	322	47.6	226	55.7	14	31.1	78	35.9
Male	351	51.8	177	43.6	31	68.9	138	63.6
TOTAL	677	99.4	406	99.3	45	100	217	99.5
Age								
≤ 21	124	18.2	77	19.0	14	31.8	31	14.2
22-30	371	54.7	223	54.9	20	45.5	126	57.5
31-40	117	17.3	63	15.4	6	13.6	44	20.1
41-50	48	7.1	31	7.6	3	6.8	13	5.9
≥51	18	2.7	12	3.0	1	2.3	5	2.3
TOTAL	678	100	406	100	44	100	219	100
Educational level								
High School Student or a lower educational degree	73	10.7	41	10.1	3	6.7	27	12.6
High School Degree	115	16.9	59	14.5	10	22.2	43	20.1
Undergraduate Student	202	29.7	131	32.3	16	35.6	54	25.2
Undergraduate Degree	233	34.2	145	35.7	14	31.1	71	33.2
Graduate St. & Graduate Deg.	51	7.5	30	7.4	2	4.4	19	8.9
TOTAL	674	99.0	406	100	45	100	214	100
Monthly family income level (TL)								
Less than 1.000 TL.	98	15.4	58	15.1	10	23.3	29	14.3
1.000-2.500 TL.	277	43.5	160	41.7	21	48.8	92	45.3
2.501-5.000 TL.	194	30.5	127	33.1	9	20.9	57	28.1
5.001- 10.000 TL.	53	8.3	34	8.9	3	7.0	15	7.4
More than 10.000 TL.	14	2.2	5	1.3	-	-	9	4.4
TOTAL	637	100	384	100	43	100	203	100

Reliability and Validity

Prior to the analyses, the scales were tested for reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha score of the scale measuring the consumer attitudes towards unethical behaviors on the Internet was, $\alpha=0.938$ for the 40 items, which is much higher than the acceptable threshold of 0.60, indicating that the internal consistency of the group of items used for measuring consumer e-ethics is very high (Nunnally and Berkstein, 1994).

The CAD personality scale was also tested for reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha score for the CAD personality scale was 0.558 for the 35 items which is actually not a high but an acceptable value for internal consistency of the CAD personality. Although not clearly stated, Cohen (1967) implies in his study that the reliability of the scale was satisfactory. Similarly, Noerager (1979) has calculated the reliability of the CAD scale according to the different personalities and found that the compliant personality yields the highest Cronbach' alpha score (0.604) followed by detached (0.426) and aggressive (0.362) personalities. This study has yielded similar scores for reliability, compliant $\alpha=0.591$, detached $\alpha=0.384$, aggressive $\alpha=0.346$. The face validity of the group of items used to measure misbehaviors on the Internet was achieved by expert opinion.

As mentioned above, in order to determine the personality types of the respondents, Horney's CAD scale developed by Cohen (1967) was used. In order to provide evidence of validity of the CAD scale, 10 items based on the definitions of the three personality types (3 items for compliant personality; 3 items for aggressive personality and 4 items for detached personality) were developed by the authors to test for convergent validity. Thus a correlation analysis was conducted between the three personality types of the original CAD scale and the 10 items developed from the definitions. The results of the three correlation analyses were statistically significant indicating that there is correlation between the original scale and the items developed from the definitions. However, the Pearson R scores were not very high ($R=0.382$ for compliant personality; $R=0.178$ for aggressive personality and $R=0.288$ for detached personality). Noerager's (1979) test for convergent validity was also low (the highest $R=-0.247$), although a different instrument was used for convergent validity (16 PF personality inventory).

Descriptive Statistics

In Table 2, the descriptive statistics are given. The item perceived to be the most unethical among the 40 items is '*watching child porn on the internet*' (mean=1.11; s.d.=0.49) whereas the item perceived to be the least unethical is '*watching online movie / serials without paying for its copyright*' (mean=3.09; s.d.=1.35). Taking into consideration each personality type, the mean scores do not show any differences with the total sample regarding the item perceived to be the most ethical. However, there are slight differences with the item that is perceived to be most unethical (for compliants, '*downloading and watching child porn on the Internet*' (mean=1.09; s.d.=0.43 – 0.41) is perceived to be the most unethical, for detacheds, "*watching child porn on the internet*" (mean=1.17; s.d.=0.63); and for aggressives, "*sharing child porn on the internet*" (mean=1.09; s.d.=0.35) are perceived to be the most unethical online behavior.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Group of Items Used to Measure Consumer E-Ethics

Items*	Overall		Compliant		Aggressive		Detached	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
E1	1.21	.640	1.16	.534	1.29	.757	1.30	.773
E2	1.20	.732	1.17	.737	1.27	.618	1.24	.755
E3	2.48	1.203	2.32	1.136	2.91	1.328	2.69	1.244
E4	2.52	1.216	2.39	1.158	2.73	1.370	2.69	1.263
E5	2.84	1.294	2.71	1.248	3.31	1.427	2.97	1.324
E6	2.88	1.323	2.75	1.279	3.23	1.412	3.03	1.351
E7	3.09	1.353	3.00	1.333	3.24	1.401	3.22	1.366
E8	2.33	1.272	2.16	1.205	2.58	1.406	2.57	1.325
E9	1.13	.538	1.09	.430	1.18	.614	1.20	.689
E10	1.11	.499	1.09	.417	1.13	.457	1.17	.637
E11	1.14	.531	1.10	.427	1.09	.358	1.22	.709
E12	1.92	1.104	1.82	1.015	2.29	1.375	2.04	1.194
E13	2.15	1.180	2.05	1.091	2.49	1.440	2.26	1.279
E14	1.93	1.098	1.81	1.005	2.16	1.348	2.10	1.195
E15	1.55	.889	1.47	.835	1.58	.892	1.69	.965
E16	1.42	.732	1.35	.622	1.49	.815	1.54	.884
E17	1.52	.832	1.46	.764	1.47	.757	1.65	.958
E18	2.15	1.068	2.07	1.020	2.44	1.235	2.28	1.110
E19	2.01	.955	1.88	.823	2.31	1.203	2.18	1.079
E20	1.75	1.015	1.64	.891	2.29	1.308	1.82	1.100
E21	2.61	1.271	2.62	1.243	2.64	1.313	2.60	1.311
E22	1.55	.909	1.49	.872	1.58	.839	1.66	.993
E23	2.46	1.243	2.40	1.208	2.87	1.424	2.49	1.268
E24	2.14	1.118	2.06	1.061	2.38	1.284	2.22	1.151
E25	2.32	1.120	2.26	1.074	2.50	1.171	2.40	1.189
E26	2.06	.995	2.01	.957	2.41	1.127	2.08	1.035
E27	2.12	1.062	2.09	1.017	2.40	1.250	2.11	1.100
E28	1.46	.857	1.38	.736	1.76	1.190	1.56	.969
E29	2.19	1.221	2.12	1.219	2.42	1.270	2.32	1.215
E30	1.45	.758	1.36	.691	1.69	.925	1.56	.808
E31	1.28	.627	1.25	.595	1.34	.713	1.34	.662
E32	1.90	1.118	1.80	1.053	2.24	1.282	2.02	1.185
E33	1.39	.739	1.33	.680	1.49	.920	1.50	.800
E34	1.73	1.049	1.62	.925	2.11	1.385	1.86	1.166
E35	1.61	.872	1.56	.831	1.60	.837	1.70	.954
E36	1.44	.754	1.38	.668	1.44	.825	1.56	.874
E37	2.50	1.249	2.43	1.201	2.75	1.449	2.53	1.281
E38	2.09	1.104	2.03	1.049	2.27	1.355	2.17	1.151
E39	2.27	1.156	2.16	1.090	2.73	1.421	2.35	1.185
E40	1.65	.808	1.59	.741	1.73	.915	1.74	.893
TOTAL	1.89	.539	1.81	.489	2.07	.705	1.98	.573

* The complete scale is given in Appendix.

**5-point scale is used (1=strongly believe that it is wrong; 5=strongly believe that it is not wrong).

The overall mean score for the 40 items concerning the whole sample (N=681) was calculated and found to be 1.89. Considering the anchor points of '1=strongly believe that it is wrong' and '5=strongly believe that it is not wrong' and the mid (neutral) point being 3; the overall mean score shows that in all the items were mostly perceived as being unethical by the respondents. Regarding each personality type separately, the overall mean scores for the 40 items are as follows: compliant=1.81 (N=408); aggressive=2.07 (N=45); detached=1.98 (N=219), meaning that the compliants perceive the items as being more unethical than the other two personalities and the aggressives perceive the items as being less unethical than the other two personalities. To test whether any significant differences in perception of the whole items regarding the unethical behaviors on the internet existed between the three personality types, One-Way Anova was conducted and the results showed that significant differences existed (F=6.397; Sig.=0.000). Post-hoc Scheffe test revealed that the significant difference stemmed from the difference among all three personality types. These results indicate that **Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 are supported**. Thus, it could be said that the compliants perceive the given online behaviors as being more unethical than the other two personality types; the aggressives perceive the given behaviors as being the least unethical and the detacheds perceive the given behaviors as being more unethical than the aggressives but less unethical than the compliants.

Results of Analyses

In order to be able to determine the dimensions of online consumer ethics, a Factor Analysis was conducted on the 40 items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test results (Table 3) show that the sample is adequate for conducting a factor analysis (KMO=0.905) and the resulting model is significant (sig.=0.000).

According to the results of the analysis, a total of eight factors emerged using varimax rotations. The items that received factor scores below 0.500 were removed (a total of 8 items were deleted). Factor Analysis was conducted on the remaining 32 items and this time a total of seven factors emerged. The results are given in Table 3.

The factors achieved were labeled as F1: Copyright and Licensing Issues; F2: Giving Deceptive Information and Providing Fake Profile; F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information; F4: Child Pornography Issues; F5: Violence; F6: Using Third Party Information Without Permission; F7: Misusage of Credit Card. The total variance of the model is 66.981 which means that the seven factors account for about 67% of the variance of the model. The variances and reliabilities of each factor are given in Table 3. For each factor the variances are between 29.7% and 3.3%, whereas the reliabilities are in acceptable ranges (between $\alpha=0.938$ and $\alpha=0.750$).

Table 3: Factor Analysis Results for Group of Items Used to Measure Consumer e-Ethics*

Factors	Factor Loadings
Factor 1: Copyright and Licensing Issues (No/Indirect Harm) ($\alpha=0.926$, $R^2=29.670$)	
E6	0.923
E5	0.918
E4	0.852
E7	0.851
E3	0.806
E8	0.633
E37	0.554
Factor 2: Giving Deceptive Information and Providing Fake Profile (Passively Benefiting) ($\alpha=0.829$, $R^2=11.570$)	
E26	0.732
E24	0.714
E25	0.709
E38	0.620
E23	0.613
E27	0.600
Factor 3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information (Actively Benefiting) ($\alpha=0.835$, $R^2=7.682$)	
E35	0.761
E36	0.744
E22	0.669
E33	0.618
E28	0.570
E40	0.540
E31	0.526
Factor 4: Child Pornography Issues (Illegal Practice) ($\alpha=0.925$, $R^2=6.041$)	
E10	0.930
E9	0.921
E11	0.874
Factor 5: Violence ($\alpha=0.929$, $R^2=4.940$)	
E13	0.897
E14	0.861
E12	0.859
Factor 6: Using Third Party Information Without Permission (Deceptive Practice) ($\alpha=0.750$, $R^2=3.769$)	
E16	0.681
E20	0.648
E17	0.629
E19	0.595
Factor 7: Misusage of Credit Card (Deceptive and Illegal Practice) ($\alpha=0.778$, $R^2=3.309$)	
E2	0.886
E1	0.823
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	
	0.905
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Square	1.215E4
df	496
Sig.	0.000

*The items of the scale are given in Appendix.

As seen in Table 4, for all three personality types, the factor that is considered the most unethical is child pornography. However, it can be seen that the compliant personalities consider this issue to be more unethical than the other two personalities; the aggressive personality respondents on the other hand consider it to be less unethical as compared to the other two personality types. From Table 4, it can also be seen that copyright and licensing issues are considered to be the least unethical consumer online behavior for all three types of personalities. Again, the compliant personality respondents find this behavior more unethical than the other two personalities; the aggressive personality respondents find it to be the least unethical behavior as compared to the compliant and detached personality types. Even though the levels of ethical perceptions vary according to the three different personality types, all personalities perceive the order of ethicality of the seven factors the same. Child Pornography Issues factor (F4) is found to be the most unethical behavior, followed by Credit Card Misusage factor (F7), Deceptive Transactional Information factor (F3), Using Third Party Information Without Permission factor (F6), Violence factor (F5), Providing Deceptive Information and Using A Fake Profile factor (F2), and Copyright and Licensing Issues (not paying any fee) factor (F1) by all three personality types.

Table 4: Mean Scores of Consumer e-Ethics Factors for the CAD Personality Types

	Compliant Personality		Aggressive Personality		Detached Personality		Total	
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
F1: Copyright and Licensing Issues	2.5327	1.0216	2.9728	1.2298	2.8184	1.0813	2.6603*	1.0648
F2: Deceptive Info and Fake Profile	2.1512	0.7930	2.4651	0.9530	2.2302	0.8132	2.1982	0.8121
F3: Deceptive Transactional Info	1.4140	0.5013	1.5408	0.7122	1.5761	0.6190	1.4730*	0.5611
F4: Child Porno.	1.0889	0.3764	1.1333	0.4573	1.1883	0.6370	1.1225	0.4799
F5: Violence	1.8856	0.9641	2.3111	1.3246	2.1250	1.1477	1.9926*	1.0559
F6: Info without Permission	1.5811	0.5892	1.8889	0.7679	1.7961	0.7620	1.6719*	0.6717
F7: Credit Card Misusage	1.1622	0.5566	1.2778	0.6619	1.2615	0.7058	1.2032	0.6156

*Statistically significant differences exist in means ($p \leq 0,000$) between the three personalities.

Upon comparison of the means of the factors, it can be seen that for the three personality types, for all factors the compliant personality has received the lowest means, indicating that they perceived the factors as being more unethical as compared to the other two personalities. The detacheds received the second lowest means, followed by the aggressives for all factors except for F4: Child Pornography and F3: Deceptive Transactional Information.

In order to see whether any differences existed in perceptions of the ethical levels concerning the seven factors between the three different personality types, means comparison tests were conducted. Taking into consideration the Levene test, ANOVA was conducted for F1 and F2; Welch – Forsythe tests were conducted for F3 – F7. Statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0,05$) in perceptions in the ethical levels were spotted for four factors, F1: Copyright and Licensing Issues, F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information; F5: Violence and F6: Using Third Party Information Without Permission. For all four factors the compliants scored the lowest means (most unethical), and the aggressives scored the highest means (least unethical) except for F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information where the detacheds scored higher than the aggressives.

Literature review on consumer ethics shows that gender and age demographic characteristics of individuals have an impact on the perception of questionable behavior concerning ethics. For this reason in this study, independent samples t-tests were conducted for gender on overall online ethics scores to assess whether there were any differences in the total scores of the 40 items. The results of the two-tailed t-tests show that there is a statistically significant difference ($sig.=0.000$) in total scores of the 40 items between males and females where in general, where females (mean=1.736, s.d.=0.448) perceive the questionable online behaviors as being more unethical as compared to males (mean=2.038, s.d.=0.581), which is in parallel with past studies on consumer ethics (Erffmeyer et al., 1999; Lu and Lu, 2010; Teck-Chai and Kum-Lung, 2009).

As for age, an ANOVA was conducted and the results show that statistically significant differences ($sig.=0.000$, $F=10.537$) exist between different age groups for the total scores of the 40 items. Post-hoc Sheffe tests show that the main differences in the total scores exist between the age group of ‘21 years of age and younger’ (mean=1.9427) and ‘41-50 years of age’ (mean=1.5114); between ‘22-30 years of age’ (mean=1.9735) and ‘41-50 years of age’ (mean=1.5114) and ‘31-40 years of age’ (mean=1.7646); between ‘31-40 years of age’ (mean=1.7646) and ‘22-30 years of age’ (mean=1.9735). In summary, the main difference in perceptions of the questionable actions exists between the age groups of 41-50 (the most ethical) and 22-30 (the least ethical). Surprisingly, the age group of 51 and over perceive in general the questionable online behaviors as being less unethical than the 41-50 age group but more unethical than the remaining age groups; and the age group below the age of 21 perceive the questionable online behaviors in general as being more unethical than the 22-30 age group but less unethical than the remaining age groups. The rest of the results of ANOVA concerning age are similar to the findings of prior studies on consumer ethics where it is indicated that as the age of the individuals increase, they perceive the questionable behaviors as being more unethical (Vitell et al., 1991; Swaidan et al., 2003; Erffmeyer et al., 1999). The findings of the present study show an exception for the 51 and over age group and 21 and under age group which are not in parallel with findings of prior studies.

ANOVA was conducted for education levels and income levels as well but no statistically significant differences were spotted in perceptions of the total scores of the 40 items for varying education levels and income levels. In other words, respondents of different

education levels and income levels perceived in general the questionable online behaviors almost the same in ethical levels. This finding is contrary to the findings of Swaidan et al., (2003), where their study on African Americans showed that more educated consumers found questionable activities more unacceptable than younger consumers.

Discussion and Conclusion

Internet usage is increasing throughout the world each day. In the beginning the Internet was being used mostly for business problems and communication, but with the development of social media applications, the Internet has become indispensable for the majority of the world population. People have started to become online almost 24 hours a day. The rapid increase in Internet usage however, has not yet resulted in the development of policies and laws concerning online issues and behaviors at the same pace. In fact, it could be said that hardly any laws exist throughout the world concerning online behavior of both businesses and consumers. A starting point for law enforcers may be initially to try and understand which questionable issues and online behaviors are considered the most unethical by populations.

Upon reviewing existing literature, it was found that limited studies existed on business ethics, less on consumer ethics and very limited on online consumer ethics. This study tried to fill this gap.

As a result of the pre-tests, the literature review and the class discussions, based on the consumer ethics scale of Vitell and Muncy (1992), 40 items were developed. The questionnaire, which also included Cohen's (1992) CAD personality scale and the demographic profile questions, was applied to a non-student sample and a total of 681 usable surveys were collected.

As the 40 items covered the questionable issues on a continuum, with slightly unethical online issues and behaviors on one extreme to highly unethical issues and behaviors on the other extreme, it was expected that copyright and licensing issues would be perceived as being the least unethical, and child pornography issues the most unethical. The results completely confirmed the expectations. Besides, the overall mean score for the 40 items concerning the whole sample (N=681) was found to be 1.89 showing that most of the items were perceived as being unethical by the respondents in the sample.

In order to see the dimensional structure, factor analysis was conducted. As a result of the factor analysis, where the total variance of the achieved model was 67%, seven factors emerged: *Copyright and Licensing Issues; Giving Deceptive Information and Providing Fake Profile; Giving Deceptive Transactional Information; Child Pornography Issues; Violence; Using Third Party Information Without Permission; Misusage of Credit Card.* The factor analysis show very similar results with the Vitell and Muncy (1992) scale of consumer ethics. The original Vitell and Muncy (1992) scale comprised of four dimensions (D1: Actively Benefiting; D2: Passively Benefiting, D3: Deceptive Practice, D4: No Harm / Indirect Harm). In this study seven factors were achieved, which were

named differently than the Vitell and Muncy (1992) study. Nevertheless, it can be seen that most of the dimensions of online consumer ethics correspond with the dimensions of consumer ethics scale of Vitell and Muncy (1992). Stated in more detail, F1: Copyright and Licensing Issues may be considered as '*No or Indirect Harm*'; F2: Giving Deceptive Information and Providing Fake Profile as '*Passively Benefiting*'; F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information as '*Actively Benefiting*'; F4: Child Pornography Issues as '*Illegal Practice*'; F5: Violence; F6: Using Third Party Information Without Permission as '*Deceptive Practice*'; and F7: Misusage of Credit Card as '*Deceptive and Illegal Practice*'. Thus, the results of the factor analysis also show that, although in this study consumer ethics is assessed in a different medium and online behavior is unique, individuals' ethical tendencies, perceptions and behaviors are quite similar in both media: offline (brick) and online (click).

The second objective of the study was to assess the questionable online behaviors according to the three personality types based on Horney's tripartite interpersonal CAD Model (compliant, aggressive and detached personalities). The expectation was that the compliants would perceive the questionable online issues and behaviors as being the most unethical, the aggressives as being the least unethical and the detacheds in between. The overall mean score of the 40 items regarding the online questionable activities according to the three personalities scored as follows: the compliants (N=408) scored 1.81, the aggressives (N=45) scored 2.07, and the detacheds (N=219) scored 1.98. In particular, compliants scored lower than the total mean score of the whole sample (1.89), whereas the aggressives and the detacheds scored higher. Hence, **H1**: The compliant type personalities are inclined to be more e-ethical than the detached and aggressive type personalities; **H2**: The aggressive type personalities are inclined to be less e-ethical than the compliant and detached type personalities; and **H3**: The detached type personalities are inclined to be more e-ethical than the aggressive type personality but less e-ethical than the compliant type personality; **were all supported**. In other words, the compliants perceived the questionable online behaviors as being the most unethical, whereas the aggressives perceived them as being the least unethical as compared to the other two personality types. The detacheds perceived them as being more unethical than the aggressives but less unethical than the compliants.

For consumer e-ethics, even if the questionable issues and behaviors are perceived in varying degrees of being ethical according to the different personality types of the sample, it should be noted that the same issues are regarded as being the most unethical, and the least unethical by the whole sample, regardless of the different personality types. Thus, for the whole sample altogether and for the three personality types individually, the factors found to be the most unethical, given in order from the most unethical to the least unethical, are: (1) Child Pornography, (2) Credit Card Misusage, (3) Deceptive Transactional Information, (4) Using Third Party Information Without Permission, (5) Violence, (6) Giving Deceptive Information and Using a Fake Profile, and (7) Copyright and Licensing Issues (not paying any fee). Moreover for all factors, the means of the compliant personality sample are the lowest among the three personality types (meaning that the factors were perceived as being more unethical as compared to the other two personality

types' perceptions). Interestingly, for factors F4: Child Pornography and F3: Deceptive Transactional Information, the detacheds scored higher than the aggressives, showing that the detacheds perceived these online behaviors as being less unethical than the aggressives. These results show that although the same questionable issues are found to be the most unethical in the same order for all three personality types, in general, the compliants scored the lowest (perceived the issues as being more unethical), the aggressives scored the highest (perceived the issues as being less unethical) and the detacheds scored in the middle (perceived the issues as being less unethical than the compliants but more unethical than the aggressives).

The results of ANOVA indicate that the perceptions of the seven factors show statistically significant differences according to the three personality types on four factors (F1: Copyright and Licensing Issues, F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information; F5: Violence and F6: Using Third Party Information Without Permission) out of seven. This finding reveals that not all questionable online behaviors are perceived at the same level of ethics according to the three personality types (compliant, aggressive and detached). The compliant regard all four factors to be more unethical as compared to the perceptions of the aggressives and the detacheds. In the study, the compliant constitute the majority of the whole sample (N=408) which is believed to be quite reflective of the percentage of compliant in the whole population. This means that when highly needed new policies are developed for online conduct by the authorities, the perceptions of the compliant may be taken as basis. Among the four factors, for one factor (F3: Giving Deceptive Transactional Information) the detacheds (mean=1.5761) scored higher than the aggressives (mean=1.5408), contrary to expectations.

The differences in perceptions according to the varying demographic characteristics of the sample are also highly in parallel with the results of prior studies on consumer ethics except for some minor differences. As expected and in parallel with the results of consumer ethics studies (Erffmeyer et al., 1999; Lu and Lu, 2010; Teck-Chai and Kum-Lung, 2009), females perceived questionable online behaviors as being more unethical than males. Also, as the age of the sample increased, the questionable online behaviors were perceived to be more unethical (except for the 51 and over age group who found the issues as being more ethical than the 41-50 age group; and the 21 and under age group who found the issues as being more unethical than the 21-30 age group). These results are highly similar to results of consumer ethics studies where it was found that as the age of the consumers increase, they perceive questionable issues and behavior as being more unethical (Vitell et al., 1991; Swaidan et al., 2003; Erffmeyer et al., 1999).

Contrary to expectations, no statistically significant differences were found for the perceptions of the questionable online behaviors in terms of ethics according to the different educational levels and income levels of the sample although such evidence was found in a study conducted on consumer ethics (Swaidan et al., 2003).

These results show that because the aggressives perceive the questionable online issues and behaviors as being less unethical than the compliant and detacheds, they could be

inclined to committing online offenses more than the detacheds and compliants. This indicates that if authorities desire to decrease online offenses, they should find ways to identify and reach aggressives and convey messages to them in order to distain them from committing online offenses. For example, social cause advertisements and banners may appear in websites of firms which target aggressives. Similarly, billboard advertisements and posters may be posted near locations where the aggressives socialize, giving messages that questionable online issues and behaviors are, in fact unethical, and are regarded as online offenses. In addition, as the results of this study show that young consumers have more tolerance towards questionable actions and perceive them as being less unethical than elder individuals and taking into consideration that children interact with the Internet at a very early age, courses encouraging ethical behavior and solidifying e-ethical perceptions may be included in elementary education programs in primary schools.

Another step used for preventing unethical behavior on the Internet may be to try to optimize the prices of copyrighted items such as software and music. Specifically, more acceptable prices may lead to more e-ethical behavior.

In summary, the results of the study showed that, most of the 40 items used to measure online questionable behaviors ethically were perceived as being unethical by the sample. Both the results and the dimensional structure showed similarities with previous studies. Additionally, the questionable online behaviors were assessed according to the three personality types based on Horney's tripartite interpersonal CAD Model (compliant, aggressive and detached personalities) in order to see whether there were any differences. The results showed that compliants perceived the questionable online behaviors as being the most unethical, whereas the aggressives perceived them as being the least unethical as compared to the other two personality types. The detacheds perceived them as being more unethical than the aggressives but less unethical than the compliants. Among the demographic variables, only age and gender revealed significant differences in perceptions. Specifically, females perceived questionable online behaviors as being more unethical as compared to males. In addition, as the age of the respondents increased, they perceived questionable online behaviors as being more unethical.

Limitations

As with all studies, there are certain limitations to this study as well. In order to increase external validity a consumer sample was used. However, due to time and monetary constraints, convenience sampling was used indicating that the findings apply only to the sample in concern and are not representative of the whole population. Another major limitation of the sample concerns the number of respondents pertaining to the personality types. The number of respondents of the three different personality types are not similar (compliant=408 respondents, aggressive=45 respondents, detached=219 respondents. 19 respondents scored high on two personality types so were not included for means and Anova analyses), due to the fact that the personalities were not tested beforehand but were measured after all of the questionnaires were collected. Therefore, the differences in perceptions concerning the three different personality types may be misleading. The

final limitation concerns the CAD personality scale. Although Horney's CAD personality scale is a simple, inexpensive and reliable way to measure consumers' personality types there are some mixed results for its validity (Tyagi, 1983; Slama, Tashchian and College, 1988). The shadows on the CAD scale's validity can be noted as a limitation for the generalizability of the findings concerning the personality part of the study. The problems in validity may lead efforts to develop a new scale to measure the CAD personality types. Additionally, in the future other instruments testing personalities may be used to examine the relationship between varying personality types and e-ethics.

Appendix

ITEMS USED TO MEASURE E-ETHICS PERCEPTIONS
1. Using someone's credit card on the Internet without his/her consent.
2. Using a stolen credit card on the Internet.
3. Downloading a software/program without paying the license fee.
4. Downloading a book without paying for the copyright fee.
5. Downloading music without paying for the copyright fee.
6. Downloading a movie/television serial without paying for the copyright fee.
7. Watching online (without downloading) movie/television serial without paying for the copyright fee.
8. Using a fake profile to sign up for a trial version of a software for the second time after the first trial has expired.
9. Downloading child pornography on the Internet.
10. Watching child pornography on the Internet.
11. Sharing child pornography on the Internet.
12. Downloading videos that contain violence on the Internet
13. Watching videos that contain violence on the Internet.
14. Sharing videos that contain violence on the Internet.
15. Sharing messages (written, visual, audio) which degrade different groups/minorities (ethnic, religious, handicapped, age, sexual preference etc.) on the Internet.
16. Disclosing someone's personal information and/or messages on the Internet without his/her consent.
17. Sharing someone's personal information/visuals on the Internet (on social networks, websites etc.) without his/her consent.
18. Using social Networks on the Internet for commercial purposes without any permission.
19. Sharing any information on the Internet without being sure of its accuracy.
20. Using someone else's account for personal reasons, even if the password is obtained with his/her consent.
21. Starting negative word of mouth about a company on the Internet, instead of filing a direct complaint.
22. Shopping on the Internet and making payment by using a credit card, but declaring that such an action was not undertaken.
23. Creating and using fake profiles on Internet.
24. Motivating friends/relatives to bid at high price levels at an auction site in order to be able to sell second hand goods at higher prices.
25. Starting negative word of mouth about disliked brands and/or sites on the Internet on purpose.

26. Speculating on the Internet by making exaggerated positive comments about brands/companies for personal benefits.
27. Buying very cheap products on the Internet although suspecting that they can be stolen or fake goods.
28. Intentionally sending viruses to others on the Internet.
29. Ordering products on the Internet which are illegal to import to a country.
30. Motivating people to undertake self-damaging activities over the Internet (such as alcohol abuse, drug abuse, gambling, committing suicide, prostitution, etc.)
31. Abusing beings in need of protection such as children, animals, and handicapped over the Internet.
32. Acting as a hacker.
33. Using someone else's electronic signature without his/her consent.
34. Reaching locked Web-sites by using someone else's password.
35. Returning a product ordered on the Internet by claiming that it was received damaged although the damage was one's own fault.
36. Claiming that the Internet ordered product did not arrive although it has already been received.
37. Uploading works of others (book, music, movie, dissertation, etc.) on to the Internet without obtaining any copyright.
38. Intentionally providing false personal information (such as false address) when shopping on the Internet.
39. Intentionally showing one's age bigger, in order to enter websites with age restriction.
40. Declaring false information about second-hand products when selling them on the Internet.

REFERENCES

- Al-Khatib, J.A.; Vitell, S.J. and Rawwas, M.Y.A.: 1997, 'Consumer Ethics: A Cross-cultural Investigation', **European Journal of Marketing**, 31 (11/12), 750-767.
- Babakus, E.; Cornwell, T.B.; Mitchell, V. and Schlegelmilch, B.: 2004, 'Reactions to Unethical Consumer Behavior Across Six Countries', **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 21 (4), 254-263.
- Belk, R.W.; Devinney, T. and Eckhardt, G.: 2005, 'Consumer Ethics Across Cultures', **Consumption, Markets and Culture**, 8(3) (September), 275-289.
- Burnett, M.S.: 1994, 'Conceptualizing Guilt in the Consumer Decision-Making Process', **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 11(3), 33-43.
- Chatzidakis, A. and Mitussis, D.: 2007, 'Computer Ethics and Consumer Ethics: The Impact of the Internet on Consumers' Ethical Decision-making Process', **Journal of Consumer Behaviour**, 6, 305-320.
- Christie, R. and F.L. Geis: 1970, **Studies in Machiavellianism**, (Academic Press, New York).
- Cohen, J. B.: 1967, 'An Interpersonal Orientation to the Study of Consumer Behavior', **Journal of Marketing Research**, IV, (August), 270-278.

- Coolidge, F. L., Moor, C. J., Yamazaki, T. G., Stewart, S. E., & Segal, D. L.: 2001, 'On the Relationship between Karen Horney's Tripartite Neurotic Type Theory and Personality Disorder Features', **Personality and Individual Differences**, 30(8), 1387-1400.
- Davis, R.M.: 1979, 'Comparison of Consumer Acceptance of Rights and Responsibilities', in N.M. Ackerman (eds.), **Proceedings of 25th Annual Conference of the American Council on Consumer Interests**, (San Antonio), pp. 68-70.
- De Bock, T.D. and Kenhove, P.V.: 2010a, "Double Standards: The Role of Techniques of Neutralization", **Journal of Business Ethics**, 99(2), 283-296.
- De Bock, T. and Kenhove, P.V.: 2010b, "Consumer Ethics: The Role of Self-Regulatory Focus", **Journal of Business Ethics**, 97, 241-255.
- DePaulo, P.J.: 1987, 'Ethical Perceptions of Deceptive Bargaining Tactics Used by Salespersons and Consumers: A Double Standard', in J.G. Saegert (eds.), **Proceedings of The Division of Consumer Psychology**, (American Psychological Association), pp.201-203.
- Erffmeyer, R.C.; Keillor, B.D. and LeClair, D.T.: 1999, 'An Empirical Investigation of Japanese Consumer Ethics', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 18, 35-50.
- Forsyth, D.R.: 1980, 'A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies', **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 46, 1365 – 1375.
- Grove, S.J.; Vitell, S.J. and Strutton, D.: 1989, 'Non-normative Consumer Behavior and The Techniques of Neutralization', in R. Bagozzi and J.P. Peter (eds.), **Proceedings of the 1989 AMA Winter Educators Conference**, (American Marketing Association, Chicago), pp. 131-135.
- Horney, K.: 1945, **Our Inner Conflicts**, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.).
- Hunt, S.D. and Vitell, S.: 1986, 'A General Theory of Marketing Ethics', **Journal of Macromarketing**, 8 (Spring), 5-16.
- Kallis, M.J.; Krentier, K.A.; D.J. Vanier: 1986, 'The Value of User Image in Quelling Aberrant Consumer Behavior', **Journal of Academy of Marketing Science**, 14 (Spring), 29-35.
- Kassarian, H. H.: 1971, 'Personality and Consumer Behavior: A Review', **Journal of Marketing Research**, 8 (November), 409-418.
- Kavak, B.; Gürel, E.; Eryiğit, C. and Tektaş, Ö.Ö.: 2009, 'Examining The Effects of Moral Development Level, Self-Concept and Self-Monitoring on Consumers' Ethical Attitudes', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 88, 115-135.
- Lu, L.C. and Lu, C.J.: 2010, 'Moral Philosophy, Materialism and Consumer Ethics: An Exploratory Study in Indonesia', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 94, 193 – 210.
- Moschis, G.P. and Powell, J.: 1986, 'The Juvenile Shoplifter', **The Marketing Mix**, 10 (Winter-Spring), 1-14.
- Muncy, J.A. and S.J. Vitell: 1992, 'Consumer Ethics: An Investigation of The Ethical Beliefs of The Final Consumer', **Journal of Business Research**, 24(4), 297-311.

- Noerager, J. P.: 1979, 'An Assessment of CAD: A Personality Instrument Developed Specifically for Marketing Research', **Journal of Marketing Research**, 16(1), 53-59.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. 'Psychometric Theory', New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- Polonsky, M.J.; Brito, P.Q.; Pinto, J. and Higgs-Kleyn, N.: 2001, 'Consumer Ethics in The European Union: Comparison of Northern and Southern Views', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 31, 117-130.
- Rawwas, M.Y.A.: 1996, 'Consumer Ethics: An Empirical Investigation of the Ethical Beliefs of Austrian Consumers', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 15, 1009 – 1019.
- Rawwas, M.Y.A.: 2001, 'Culture, Personality and Morality: A Typology of International Consumers' Ethical Beliefs', **International Marketing Review**, 18(2), 188-209.
- Rawwas, M.Y.A.; Patzer, G.L. and Klassen, M.L.: 1995, 'Consumer Ethics in Cross-Cultural Settings: Entrepreneurial Implications', **European Journal of Marketing**, 29 (7), 62-78.
- Rawwas, M.Y.A.; Swaidan, Z. and Oyman, M.: 2005, 'Consumer Ethics: A Cross-cultural Study of the Ethical Beliefs of Turkish and American Consumers', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 57, 183-195.
- Schlegelmilch, B.B. and Öberseder, M.: 2010, 'Half A Century of Marketing Ethics: Shifting Perspectives and Emerging Trends', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 93, 1-19.
- Schubert, J.T.: 1979, 'Consumer Abuse: Some Recommendations for Change', Proceedings, **25th Annual Conference of the American Council on Consumer Interests, (San Antonio)**, pp.146-149.
- Shaw, D.; Grehan, E.; Shiu, E.; Hassan, L. and Thomson, J.: 2005, 'An Exploration of Values in Ethical Consumer Decision Making', **Journal of Consumer Behavior**, 4(3), 185-200.
- Slama, M. E., Tashchian, A., & College, K.: 1988, 'Compliant , Aggressive and Detached Types Differ in Generalized Purchasing Involvement', **Advances in Consumer Research**, 15(2), 158-163.
- Stampfl, R.W.: 1979, 'Multi-Disciplinary Foundations for a Consumer Code of Ethics', **Proceedings, 25th Annual Conference of the American Council on Consumer Interests, (San Antonio)**, pp.12-20.
- Swaidan, Z. Rawwas, M.Y.A. and J.A. Al-Khatib: 2004, 'Consumer Ethics: Moral Ideologies and Ethical Beliefs of A Micro-culture in the US', **International Business Review**, 13, 749-761.
- Swaidan, Z.; Vitell, S.J. and Rawwas, M.Y.A.: 2003, 'Consumer Ethics: Determinants of Ethical Beliefs of African Americans', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 46,175-186.
- Swaidan, Z.; Vitell, S.J.; Rose, G.M. and Gilbert, F.W.: 2006, 'Consumer Ethics: The Role of Acculturation in U.S. Immigrant Populations', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 64, 1-16.

- Sykes, G.M. and Matza, D.: 1957, 'Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency', **American Sociological Review**, 22 (December), 664-670.
- Tan, B.: 2002, 'Understanding Consumer Ethical Decision Making With Respect To Purchase of Pirated Software', **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 19(2), 96-111.
- Teck-Chai, L. and Kum-Lung, C.: 2009, 'Consumers' Acceptance of Unethical Consumption Activities: Implications for the Youth Market', **International Journal of Marketing Studies**, 1(2), 56-61.
- Thong, J.Y.L. and Yap, C.S.: 1998, 'Testing An Ethical Decision Making Theory: The Case of Softlifting', **Journal of Management Information Systems**, 15(1), 213-237.
- Tonglet, M.: 2002, 'Consumer Misbehavior: An Exploratory Study of Shoplifting', **Journal of Consumer Behavior**, 1(4), 336-354.
- Tyagi, Pradeep K.: 1983, 'Validation of the CAD Instrument: A Replication', in Richard P. Bagozzi and Alice M. Tybout (eds.), **Advances in Consumer Research**: Volume 10, eds., Richard P. Bagozzi and Alice M. Tybout, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 112-114.
- Urhan, B. Ü; İ. Kızılcıca: 2011, 'Türkiye'de Kişilerin İnternet Kullanımları Ne Şekilde Değişiyor? İnternet Kullanıcıları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme', Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı, <http://www.tepav.org.tr/>, September, 27, 2011, 1-8.
- Vermeir, I. and Kenhove, P.V.: 2008, 'Gender Differences in Double Standards', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 81(2), 281 -295.
- Vitell S.J.; J.G.P. Paolillo and J.J. Singh: 2005, 'Religiosity and Consumer Ethics', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 57,175-181.
- Vitell, S.J. and Muncy, J.: 1992, 'Consumer Ethics: An Empirical Investigation of Factors Influencing Ethical Judgments of The Final Consumer', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 11, 585-597.
- Vitell, S.J. and Paolillo, J.G.P.: 2003, 'Consumer Ethics: The Role of Religiosity', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 46, 151 – 162.
- Vitell, S.J.: 2003, 'Consumer Ethics Research: Review, Synthesis and Suggestions for the Future', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 43, 33-47.
- Vitell, S.J.: 2009, 'The Role of Religiosity in Business and Consumer Ethics: A Review of The Literature', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 90, 155-167.
- Vitell, S.J.; Lumpkin, J.R. and Rawwas, M.Y.A.: 1991, 'Consumer Ethics: An Investigation of the Ethical Beliefs of Elderly Consumers', **Journal of Business Ethics**, 10, 365-375.
- Vitell, S.J.; Singhapakdi, A. and Thomas, J.: 2001, 'Consumer Ethics: An Application and Empirical Testing of the Hunt-Vitell Theory of Ethics', **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 18(2), 153 – 178.