



Magnitude of Benefits in Privacy: Data Protection

Sunhee Yun*

Department of Law, Hanyang University, Sungdong Gu, Seoul, Korea

Abstract

In an information society the self is expressed, defined, and affected through and by information and information technology. The boundaries between private and public become blurred. Privacy has therefore become more a class of multifaceted interests than a single, unambiguous concept. However, the same technology that makes it easy to share our personal information is also a danger: once our information has been shared it is difficult or even impossible to maintain control over it.

Keywords: Psychological; Solitude; Theories; Freedom; Phenomena; Consumers

Introduction

The effect information technology has had on personal privacy factors, the amount of data that can be collected; the speed at which it can be exchanged, the length of time that the data can be retained; and the kind of information that can be acquired. Privacy is a multi-disciplinary issue and therefore has a variety of definitions. Concepts such as secrecy, solitude, security, confidentiality, anonymity, liberty, and autonomy, amongst others, are often viewed as part of privacy [1]. Some argue that it can be distinguished and is distinctly separate from these concepts, while others argue that it is integral with them. The matter of its definition is also closely related to the issue of whether privacy should be seen as a right or merely in terms of one or more interests an individual may have. Westin defines privacy as the claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves when, how and to what extent information about them is communicated to others. He went on to elaborate that in terms of social interaction, privacy is the voluntary and temporary withdrawal of a person from the general society through physical or psychological means. According to him, people need privacy in order to adjust emotionally to interpersonal interactions, and it is a dynamic process and a non-monotonic function. Westin proposes four states of privacy: solitude, intimacy, anonymity, and reserve. He also proposes four purposes of privacy: personal autonomy, emotional release, self-evaluation, and limited and protected communication. Four views of privacy. Accessibility privacy, also called physical privacy, is freedom from intrusion into one's physical space. Decisional privacy is freedom from interference with one's choices [2]. Psychological privacy, also known as mental privacy, is the freedom of intrusion upon and interference with one's thoughts and personal identity. Finally, informational privacy is having control over and being able to limit access to one's personal information. It is this view that is most relevant in the context of this article and we continue by examining theories relevant to our discussion. Informational Privacy Theories discusses two informational privacy theories: the reductionist interpretation and ownership based interpretation. According to the reductionist interpretation, informational privacy is valuable because it guards against undesirable consequences that may be caused by a breach of privacy. The ownership-based interpretation has the view that each person owns his or her information [3]. The theories are not incompatible, but emphasize different aspects of informational privacy. However, Though these two theories may be appropriate for privacy in general, they may not be for informational privacy. He suggests that most analyses of issues that affect informational privacy use variations of the restricted access and control theories. According to the restricted access theory, people have informational privacy when they are able to limit or restrict others from access to information about them. To

do so, of privacy need to be established. In control theory, personal choice is important and having privacy is directly linked to having control over information about oneself. Despite their widespread use, neither the restricted access theory nor the control theory provides a satisfactory explanation of informational privacy, though each notes something important about it [4]. A framework that attempts to merge the important elements into a single theory is Restricted Access/Limited Control theory. The RALC theory stresses that privacy and control are separate concepts. Privacy is fundamentally about protection from intrusion and information gathering by others. Individual control of personal information, on the other hand, is part of the justification of privacy and plays a role in the management of privacy.

Discussion

In the framework, a person has privacy in a particular situation if he or she is protected from intrusion, interference and information access by others [5]. Like the restricted access theory, it emphasizes the importance of setting up zones that allow individuals to limit the access others have to their information, and like the control theory, it also recognizes the importance of individual control. However, it does not build the concept of control into the definition of privacy, nor does it require that individuals have full or absolute control over their personal information in order to have privacy; instead, only limited controls are needed to manage one's privacy. More specifically, the individual has control over choice, consent and correction: the individual needs to be able to choose situations that offer others the desired level of access, for example, to choose to waive the right to restrict others from accessing certain kinds of information about him or her and the individual needs to be able to access his or her information and correct it if necessary [6]. There are numerous ethical issues around information, its existence and use. Mason sums these up as privacy, accuracy, property, and accessibility. Individuals face numerous complexities when considering these questions while making decisions about privacy and whether or not to share personal information. Numerous issues can arise from the improper use or inadequate protection of consumers' privacy and the concern about these issues can further affect their decisions

*Corresponding author: Sunhee Yun, Department of Law, Hanyang University, Sungdong Gu, Seoul, Korea, Tel: +0222220114, E-mail: hyun@hanyang.ac.kr

Received: 25-Jul-2022, Manuscript No. JCLS-22-73455; Editor assigned: 27-Jul-2022, PreQC No. JCLS-22-73455(PQ); Reviewed: 10-Aug-2022, QC No. JCLS-22-73455; Revised: 15-Aug-2022, Manuscript No. JCLS-22-73455(R); Published: 22-Aug-2022, DOI: 10.4172/2169-0170.1000344

Citation: Yun S (2022) Magnitude of Benefits in Privacy: Data Protection. J Civil Legal Sci 11: 344.

Copyright: © 2022 Yun S. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

[7]. Four areas of consumer privacy concerns that are very similar to improper access to personal information, unauthorized secondary use of personal information, errors in personal information, and collection of personal information. The problem with databases is not that information collectors fail to compensate people for the proper value of personal information. The problem is people's lack of control, their lack of knowledge about how data will be used in the future, and their lack of participation in the process. Ensuring privacy is a complex decision-making process and may differ from one individual or instance to another. A variety of issues influence decisions regarding privacy and can lead to inconsistencies and contradictions. Given the multifaceted nature of privacy, maintains that its value may be discussed only once its context has been specified. Context is defined as "stimuli and phenomena that surround and thus exist in the environment external to the individual, most often at a different level of analysis. Four of the most frequently cited contexts for privacy and privacy-related beliefs. The first is the type of information collected from individuals. Some information is considered more sensitive than others, and so, for instance, consumers are generally more willing to provide demographic information than financial information. Second is the use of information by a particular industry sector [8]. The third is the political context whether or not privacy is viewed as a right, the legislation governing privacy, the enforcement of these laws, and so on. Finally, the fourth context is that of technological applications, which can be used to either infringe upon privacy or enhance it. People are often treated as highly rational agents, particularly in economic studies. But accordingly, it is unreasonable to expect individuals to be rational when making decisions about their own privacy. Even individuals who genuinely want to protect their privacy may not do so because of the many complexities hidden inside concepts that are difficult to understand, as well as other factors that may affect both naïve and sophisticated users. Specifically, they will face three problems: incomplete information, bounded rationality, and psychological distortions. Economic transactions are often characterized by incomplete or asymmetric information, where the different parties involved in the transaction do not have the same information and may be uncertain about certain facets of it. Parties can be differently affected by risk and externalities, particularly the secondary use of personal information that is, information passed on by the original collector, an event over which the subject has no control [9]. Privacy intrusion and protection are often bundled with other goods and services. Costs can be monetary but also immaterial (such as switching costs); benefits can be priced or intangible. Privacy calculus where the individual weighs up the perceived likelihood and magnitude of risks and benefits can be extremely difficult to perform because of all of these issues. Bounded rationality refers to the inability to calculate and

compare the magnitudes of payoffs associated with various strategies the individual may choose in privacy-sensitive situations [10]. It also refers to the inability to process all the random information related to risks and the probabilities of events that lead to privacy benefits and costs. The rational man used in economics is assumed to always be rational and has the ability to process all information; in reality, people do not work this way. Often payoffs may only be determined through actual experience.

Conclusion

In addition, many probability values may be almost entirely subjective. Even if an individual has access to complete information and could process all of it, he or she may still find it difficult to follow a rational strategy because of psychological distortions that influence his or her thinking.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Vido SD (2020) A Quest for an Eco-centric Approach to International Law: the COVID-19 Pandemic as Game Changer. *Jus Cogens US* 3: 105-117.
2. Maseiro S, Bailur S (2020) Digital identity for development: The quest for justice and a research agenda. *Inf Technol Dev US*: 1-12.
3. Zaremba A, Kizys R, Tzouvanas P, Aharone DY, et al. (2021) The quest for multidimensional financial immunity to the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from international stock markets. *71*: 1-61.
4. Delone WH, McLean ER (1992). Information systems success: The quest for the dependent variable. *Inf Syst Res USA* 3: 1-95.
5. Lee CS, Jang A (2021) Questing for Justice on Twitter: Topic Modeling of Stop Asian Hate Discourses in the Wake of Atlanta Shooting. *Crime Delinq CA*: 1-21.
6. Lake DA and Rothchild D (1996) Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict. *International Security MA* 21: 41-75.
7. Hopkins N, Vered KH (2010) Minority group members' theories of intergroup contact: A case study of British Muslims' conceptualizations of Islamophobia and social change. *Br J Soc Psychol UK* 45: 245-264.
8. Bussea M, Hefeker C (2007) Political risk, institutions and foreign direct investment. *Eur J Polit Econ EU* 23: 397-415.
9. Sue S, Zane N (1987) The role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy: A critique and reformulation. *APA Psycnet US* 42: 37-45.
10. Mengisteab K (2014) New approaches to state building in Africa: the case of Ethiopia's ethnic-based federalism. *CUP UK* 40: 111-132.