

**INVESTIGATING ETHICAL DECISION MAKING IN
MARKETING RESEARCH**

An Exploratory Study Towards the Interaction of Different
Moral Agents in Marketing Research

Iva BIMPLI

Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

VOLUME II

School of Management
University of Bradford

2015

Table of Contents

References	326
Appendices	383
Appendix 1: The interview scenarios	384
Appendix 2: Mock interview template	388
Appendix 3: The interview themes and the generic questions	390
Appendix 4: The updated generic interview guide.....	392
Appendix 5: Interview questions – Sample 1 (MR researchers).....	393
Appendix 6: Interview questions – Sample 2 (MR respondents).....	395
Appendix 7: Information sheet and consent form	397
Appendix 8: Interview transcripts sample (MR researchers)	400
Appendix 9: Interview transcripts sample (MR respondents)	421
Appendix 10: Original research proposal for Ethics Approval	441
Appendix 11: MR researchers’ identified factors with example quotes from the interview transcripts	446
Appendix 12: MR respondents’ identified factors with example quotes from the interview transcripts	447
Appendix 13: Sample of interview transcript coding (MR respondents).....	448

References

- '*Neuromarketing: beyond branding*' (2004), *The Lancet, Neurology*, Vol. 3, retrieved 20 February, 2009 from <http://download.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/laneur/PIIS1474442203006434.pdf?id=afe8b6b6e1926035:-5155eac4:12209d5d8f8:1ba61245709318221>
- Abbasi, S. M. & Hollman, K.W. (1987), 'An Exploratory Study of the Personal Value Systems of City Managers', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.6, No.1, pp. 45–53.
- Abelson, R. P. (1963), '*Computer simulation of hot cognition*', In S. S. Tomkins & S. Messick (Eds.), *Computer simulation of personality* (pp. 277.298). New York: Wiley.
- Abelson, R. P., Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., & Fiske, S. T. (1982), '*Affective and Advertising Association*', retrieved 24 April, 2013 from <http://www.adassoc.org.uk/Advertising-Statistics>.
- Abraham, C., & Sheeran, P. (2003). 'Acting on intentions: The role of anticipated regret'. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 42, pp. 495-511.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990) '*Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*', London: Springer Verlag.
- Aggarwal, P., Vaidyanathan, R. & Castleberry, S. (2012). 'Managerial and Public Attitudes Toward Ethics in Marketing Research', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 109, No 4, pp. 463-481.
- Ajzen, I. & Driver, B.E. (in press), 'Application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Leisure Choice', *Journal of Leisure Research*.

- Ajzen, I. & Madden, T.J. (1986), 'Prediction of Goal-Directed Behaviour: Attitudes, Intentions and Perceived Behavioural Control', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 453-47.
- Ajzen, I. (1985), 'From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior', In Julius Kuhl and Jürgen Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behavior*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Ajzen, I. (1988), 'Attitudes, personality and behaviour', Dorsey Press: Chicago.
- Ajzen, I. (1991), 'The theory of planned behavior', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (2002), 'Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and the Theory of Planned Behavior', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 32, pp. 665-683.
- Ajzen, I. (2006), 'Constructing a Theory of Planned Behaviour Questionnaire', TPB Questionnaire Construction, retrieved 20th January, 2012 from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf>
- Ajzen, I. (2012), 'Constructing a theory of planned behavior questionnaire', retrieved 13th August, 2012 from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf>
- Ajzen, I. (2012), 'The Theory of Planned Behaviour: Frequently Asked Questions', retrieved 20th January, 2012 from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/faq.html>
- Ajzen, I. (2013), 'Theory of Planned Behaviour Questionnaire', Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science, retrieved 13th August, 2012 from www.midss.ie

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). '*Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*'. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ajzen, I., & Timko, C. (1986), '*Correspondence between health attitudes and behavior*'.
- Akaah, I.P & Riordan, E.A. (1989) 'Judgements of Marketing professional about Ethical Issues in Marketing Research: A replication and extension', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 26, pp. 112-120.
- Akaah, I.P (1989) 'Differences in Research Ethics Judgements between Male and Female Marketing Professionals', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol.8, pp. 375-381.
- Akaah, I.P (1990) 'Attitudes of Marketing Professionals towards Ethics in Marketing Research: a cross-national comparison', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, pp. 45-53.
- Akaah, I.P. & Riordan, E.A. (1990) 'The Incidence of Unethical Practices in Marketing Research: An empirical investigation', *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 143-152.
- Akaah, I.P. (1990) 'The influences of non-anonymity deriving from feedback of research results on marketing professionals' research ethical judgements', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, pp. 949-959.
- Akaah, I.P. (1992) 'Social inclusion as marketing ethics correlate', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 11, pp. 599-608.
- Akaah, I.P. (1993) 'Organizational Culture and Ethical Research Behaviour', *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 59-63.

- Akaah, I.P. (1996) 'The Influence of Organizational Rank and Role on Marketing Professionals' Ethical Judgments', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 13, pp. 605-613.
- Akaah, I.P. (1997), 'Influence of Deontological and Teleological Factors on Research Ethics Evaluation', *Journal of Business Research*, Elsevier Science Inc., Vol. 39, pp. 71-80.
- Alam, I., (2005), 'Fieldwork and data collection in qualitative marketing research', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 8, No.1, pp. 97-112.
- Allison, J.,& Gediman,D.(2007), '*This I believe: The personal philosophies of remarkable men and women*'. New York: Holt.
- Alpert, S. (2008), 'Neuroethics and Nanoethics: Do we risk ethical myopia?', *Neuroethics*, Vol. 1, pp. 55-68.
- Al-Rodhan, N.R.F. (2008), 'Emotional aethical egoism: A Neurophilosophical Theory of Human Nature and its Universal Security Implications', *LIT*.
- Al-Rodhan, N.R.F., (2009), 'Sustainable History and the Dignity of Man: A Philosophy of History and Civilisational Triumph', Berlin, *LIT*.
- Alsmadi, S. (2008), 'Marketing Research Ethics: Researchers obligations towards human subjects', *Journal of Academic Ethics, Springer Science and Business Media*, Vol. 6, pp. 153-160.
- Anderson, L. (2006a), 'Analytic autoethnography', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol.35, pp. 373-395.
- Anderson, L. (2006b), 'On apples, oranges, and autopsies: A response to commentators', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol.35, pp. 450-465.

- Anderson, T. (2005), '*Analysis of Evidence*', 2d edition, Cambridge University Press.
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2000), 'Social cognition models and health behaviour: A structured review', *Psychology and Health*, Vol.15, pp. 173–189.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T., Akert R. & Fehr. B. (2002), '*Social Psychology*'. 3rd Canadian Edition.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., & Akert, A.M. (2005). '*Social Psychology*' (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Atwell, John (1986), '*Ends and principles in Kant's moral thought*', Springer.
- Axinn, S. & Kneller, J. (1998), '*Autonomy and Community: Readings in Contemporary Kantian Social Philosophy*', SUNY Press.
- Babin, B. J. & Babin, L. A. (1996), 'Effect of Ethical Cognitions and Consumer Emotions on Shoplifting Intentions', *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 13, No. 8, pp. 785-802.
- Babin, B. J. & Griffin, M. (1995), 'A Closer Look at the Influence of Age on Consumer Ethics', *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 22, pp. 668-673.
- Baker, M.J. (2003), '*The Marketing Book*', 5th Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Bandura, A. (1963), '*Social learning and personality development*', New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1971), '*Social Learning Theory*', General Learning Corporation.
- Bandura, A. (1977), 'Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 84, pp. 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1977), '*Social Learning Theory*'. Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.

- Bandura, A. (1982), 'Self- efficacy mechanism in human agency', *American Psychologists*, Vol. 37, pp. 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (2002), 'Selective Ethical Disengagement in the Exercise of Ethical Agency', *Journal of Ethical Education*, Vol. 31, No. 2.
- Bandura, A. (1972), '*Recent trends in social learning theory*', New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A., Claudio B., Gian V. C. & Concetta, P. (1996). 'Mechanisms of Ethical Disengagement in the Exercise of Ethical Agency', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 71, No.2, pp. 364-74.
- Barabba, V. P. (1983), '*Making use of methodologies developed in academia: Lessons from one practitioner's experience*'. In R. H. Kilman et al. (Ed.), *Producing useful knowledge for organizations*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Baron, J. (1998), '*Judgment misguided: Intuition and error in public decision making*', New York: Oxford.
- Baron, J. (2000), '*Thinking and deciding*', 3rd Edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Barry R. Schlenker (1978), 'Attitudes As Actions: Social Identity Theory and Consumer Research', *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 5, pp. 352-359.
- Bartels, R. (1967) 'A Model for Ethics in Marketing', *The Journal of Marketing American Marketing Association*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 20-26.
- Bartlett, D. (2003), 'Management and business ethics: a critique and integration of EDM models', *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 14, pp. 223-35.

- Bastick, T. (1982), *'Intuition: How we think and act'*, Chichester, UK: John Wiley.
- Bateson, G. (2002), *'Mind and nature: A necessary unity'*, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press (Original work published 1979).
- Batson, C.D., Sager, K., Garst, E., Kang, K., Rubchinsky, K. & Dawson, K. (1997). 'Is empathy-induced helping due to self-other merging?', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.73, No.3, pp. 495–509.
- Beale, D.A. & Manstead, A.S.R. (1991), 'Predicting mothers' intention to limit frequency of infants' sugar intake: Testing the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 21, pp. 409-431.
- Beattie, V., McInnes, B. & Fearnley, S., (2004), 'A Methodology for Analysing and Evaluating Narratives in Annual Reports: A Comprehensive Descriptive Profile and Metrics for Disclosure Quality Attributes', *Accounting Forum*, Vol. 28, pp. 205-236.
- Beatty, S. E., Homer, P. M., Kahle, L. K., (1988) 'Problems with VALS in International Marketing Research: An Example from an Application of The Empirical Mirror Technique', *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 pp. 375-380.
- Beauchamp, T.L.& Bowie, N.E. (2004), *'Ethical Theory and Business'*, Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Beaumont, M. (2010), *'A Concise Companion to Realism'*, Wiley-Blackwell, UK.
- Beck, L. & Ajzen, I. (1991), 'Predicting Dishonest Action Using the Theory of Planned Behaviour', *Journal of research in Personality*, Vol. 25, pp. 285-301.

- Beckert, J. (1999), 'Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practice in organizations', *Organization Studies*, Vol. 20, pp. 777–799.
- Beekun, I.R., Westerman, J. & Barghouti, J. (2005), 'Utility of Ethical Frameworks in Determining Behavioral Intention: A Comparison of the U.S. and Russia', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.2005, No.61, pp. 235–247.
- Belk, R. W.: 1975, 'Situational Variables and Consumer Behavior', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.2, No.3, pp. 157–164.
- Bentham, J. (1907), *An introduction to the principles of ethics and legislation*, Dover Publications, Inc. US.
- Bentler, P. M., & Speckart, G. (1979), 'Models of attitude-behavior relations', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 86, pp. 452-464.
- Bernd S. (2004), *Identity in Modern Society*, Blackwell Publishing.
- Berniker, E. & McNabb, D. E. (2006), 'Dialectical Inquiry: A Structured Qualitative Research Method', *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 11, No.4, pp. 642-664.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2000), 'Acceptance of E-Commerce Services: The Case of Electronic Brokerages', *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 411-419.
- Blakeslee, S. (2004), 'If your brain has a 'Buy Button', what pushes it?', *The New York Times*, retrieved 20 February, 2011 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/19/science/19neuro.html>

- Boekaerts, M. & Corno, L. (2005). 'Self-regulation in the classroom: A perspective on assessment and intervention', *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 54, No.2.
- Bommer, M., Gratto, C., Gravander, J. & Tuttle, M. (1987), 'A Behavioural Model of Ethical and Unethical decision making', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.6, pp. 265-280.
- Branden, N. (1969), '*The Psychology of Self-Esteem*', Nash Publishing Corp.
- Brass, D.J., Butterfield, K.D., & Skaggs, B.C. (1998). 'Relationships and unethical behavior: A social network perspective', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 14-31.
- Braun, H.I., Jackson, D.N. & Wiley, D.E. (2002). '*The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurements*', Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960), '*The process of education. Cambridge*', MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1986), '*Actual minds, possible worlds*', Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2001), '*Social research methods*', New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman. A., (2008), '*Social research methods*', Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buchan, H. F. (2005), 'EDM in the public accounting profession: An extension of Ajzen's theory of planned behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.61, pp. 165–181.

- Bunt, H. & Black, W. (2000). '*Abduction, Belief and Context in Dialogue: Studies in Computational Pragmatics*', John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Burnkrant, R. & Cousineau, A. (1975). 'Informational and Normative Social Influence in Buyer Behavior', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 206-215. Published by: The University of Chicago Press Stable
- Burns, A.G. & Bush, R.F. (2000), '*Marketing Research*', 3rd. ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979), '*Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis - Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*', Heinemann: London.
- Camerer C., Loewenstein G. & Prelec D. (2005), 'Neuroeconomics: How Neuroscience Can Inform Economics', *Journal of Economic Literature XLII*, pp. 9-64.
- Camerer, C., Loewenstein, G. & Prelec, D. (2004), 'Neuroeconomics: Why Economics Need Brains', *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 106, No.3, pp. 555-579.
- Carpenter, T. C., & Reimers, J. L. (2005), 'Unethical and fraudulent financial reporting: Applying the theory of planned behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 60, pp.115–129.
- Carrigan, M. & Kirkup, M. (2001), 'The ethical responsibilities of marketers in retail observational research: protecting stakeholders through the ethical research covenant', *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, Vol.11, No. 4, pp. 415-435.

- Celuch, K. & Dill, A. (2011), 'An Extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action in Ethical Decision Contexts: The Role of Normative Influence and Ethical Judgement', *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 86, pp. 201-207.
- Chang, H. (2008), *'Autoethnography as method'*, Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Chang, M.K. (1998), 'Predicting Unethical Behaviour: A Comparison of the Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behaviour', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 17, pp. 1825-1834.
- Cherry, J. (2006), 'The impact of normative influence and locus of control on ethical judgments and intentions: A cross-cultural comparison', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 68, pp.113–132.
- Churchill, A.G. (1999), *'Marketing Research'*, 7th ed., Dryden Press, Chicago, IL, p. 386.
- Churchill, G. A., Jr., & Iacobucci, D. (2002). *'Marketing research: Methodological foundations'*, 8th ed., Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). 'Social influence: Compliance and conformity'. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 55, pp. 591–621.
- Cialdini, R.B. (2001), 'Harnessing the science of persuasion', *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 79, No.9, pp. 72–79.
- Ciamelli, E., Muccioli, M., Ladavas, E., & di Pellegrino, G. (2007), 'Selective deficit in personal moral judgment following damage to ventromedial prefrontal cortex', *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, Vol. 2, No.2, pp. 84-94.

- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000), '*Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*', San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cloninger, C.R., Svrakic, D.M. & Przybeck, T.R. (1993), 'A psychobiological model of temperament and character', *Archives of General Psychiatry*, Vol. 50, No.12, pp. 975–90.
- Coan, J.A. & Allen, J.J.B. (2007), '*Handbook of Emotion Elicitation and Assessment*', Series in Affective Science, OUP USA.
- Cobb-Walgren, C.J., C.A. Ruble & Donthu, N. (1995), 'Brand equity, brand preference, and purchase intent', *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 24, No.3, pp. 25-40.
- Cohen, J., L. Pant and D. Sharp (1993), 'A Validation and Extension of a Multidimensional Ethics Scale', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.12, No.1, pp. 13–26.
- Collis, J. and Hussey, R., (2003), '*Business Research: a practical guide to undergraduate and postgraduate students*', 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Commission of the European Communities, (2003), '*Commission recommendation of 06/05/2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises*' Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, 1-12. Retrieved 20 April, 2013 from: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/sme_definition/decision_sme_en.pdf
- Committee of Research Integrity in Washington University (n.d). '*The role of the Complainant in research integrity proceedings*' retrieved 18th August, 2014 from

http://research.wustl.edu/ComplianceAreas/ResearchIntegrity/Documents/Compliant_RRR.pdf

Congress of Qualitative Inquiry (2007), '*Position statement on qualitative research on IRBs*'.

Cook, K. S., & Whitmeyer, J. M. (1992), 'Two approaches to social structure: Exchange Theory and Network Analysis', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 109-127.

Cook, K.S. & Rice, E. (2002). '*Social Exchange Theory: The Handbook of Social Psychology*', Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.

Corno, L. (May 2001), '*Volitional aspects of self-regulated learning*', In Zimmerman, Bary J.; Schunk, Dale H. *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd edition ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Taylor & Francis.

Corno, L., Cronbach, L.J., Kupermintz, H.K., Lohman, D.F., Mandinach, E.B., Porteus, A.W. & Talbert, J.E. (2001). In Cronbach, L.J., ed. '*Remaking the concept of aptitude: Extending the legacy of Richard E. Snow*', Mahwah, New Jersey: Routledge.

Cosier, R. (1981), 'Dialectical Inquiry in Strategic Planning: A Case of Premature Acceptance', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 6, No. 6, pp. 643-648.

Craft, J.L. (2012), 'A Review of the Empirical EDM Literature: 2004–2011', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Springer.

- Crawford, C.M. (1970). 'Attitudes of Marketing Executives towards ethics in marketing', *The Journal of Marketing*, American Marketing Association, Vol. 34, pp. 46-52.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994), '*Research design: Qualitative & Quantitative approaches*', Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003), '*Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*', Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009), '*Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Approaches*', Third Edition, Sage Publications, United Kingdom.
- Crosier, R. A., & Schwenk, C. R. (1990), 'Agreement and thinking alike: Ingredients for poor decisions', *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 4, pp. 69-74.
- Cushman, F., Young, L., & Hauser, M. (2006), 'The role of conscious reasoning and intuition in moral judgment: Testing three principles of harm', *Psychological Science*, Vol. 17, No. 12, pp. 1082-1089.
- Damasio, A. R. (2000), '*The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*', Mariner Books.
- D'Amato, M. R. (1969). Melvin H. Marx, ed. '*Learning Processes: Instrumental Conditioning*', Toronto: The Macmillan Company.
- De Wit, B. & Meyer (2010), '*Strategy-process, content, context: An International Perspective*', 4th Edition, South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Dembe, A.E. & Boden, L. I. (2000), 'Ethical Hazard: A Question of Ethicality?', *New Solutions*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 257-279.

- Dequech, D. (2001), 'Bounded rationality, institutions, and uncertainty', *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 35, No.4, pp. 911–929.
- Derrida, J. (2005), '*Writing and difference*', London: Routledge.
- Deutsch, M. & Gerard, H.B. (1955), 'A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment', *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, No 3, pp. 629-636.
- Dijksterhuis, A., & Bargh, J.A. (2001). 'The perception-behavior expressway: automatic effects of social perception on social behavior', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol.33,pp. 1-40.
- Doll, J. & Ajzen, I. (1990), 'The effects of direct experience on the attitude-behaviour relation: Stability versus accessibility', *Psychologisches Institut I, Universitat Hamburg, Hamburg, West Germany*.
- Donaldson, T. and T. W. Dunfee: 1994, 'Toward a Unified Conception of Business Ethics: Integrative Social Contracts Theory', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.19, No.2, pp. 252–284.
- Drumwright, M.E. & Murphy, P.E. (2004), 'Moral Muteness, Moral Myopia and Moral Imagination', *Journal of Advertising*, American Academy of Advertising, Vol. 33, No.2, pp. 7-24.
- Dubinsky, A. J., & Loken, B. (1989), 'Analyzing EDM in marketing', *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.19, pp. 83–107.
- Ducot, C. and H.J. Lubben (1980), 'A Typology for Scenarios', *Futures*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp. 15-57.
- Duncan, N.E. and P. Wack (1994), 'Scenarios Designed to Improve Decision Making', *Planning Review*, Vol. 22, No.4, pp. 18-25.

- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. and Lowe, A., (2002), '*Management research: an introduction*', 2nd ed.London: Sage.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). 'Agency theory: An assessment and review', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14, No.1, pp. 57–74.
- Eiser, J.R. & Plight, J. (1988), '*Attitudes and Decisions*', New Essential Psychology, London: Routledge.
- Ellis, C. (1995), 'Emotional and ethical quagmires in returning to the field', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol.24, pp. 711-713.
- Ellis, C. (2007), 'Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others', *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol.13, pp. 3-29.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2006). 'Analyzing analytic autoethnography: An autopsy', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol.35, pp. 429-449.
- Elm, D.R. & Radin, T.J. (2012). 'Ethical Decision Making: Special or No Different?', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 107, pp. 313–329.
- Elman, J.L., Bates, E.A., Johnson, M.H., Karmiloff-Smith, A., Parisi, D. & Plunkett, K. (1996), '*Rethinking Immateness: A connectionist perspective on development*', Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Emerson, R M (1976), 'Social Exchange Theory', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 2, No. 335.
- Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V. & Heier, H. (1996), 'Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and analytical-rational thinking styles', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.71, pp. 390-405.

- Eser, Z., Isin, F.B., Tolon, M. (2011), 'Perceptions of marketing academics, neurologists, and marketing professionals about neuromarketing', *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27, Nos 7-8, pp. 854-868.
- ESOMAR, (2011), '36 Questions to Help the Commission Neuroscience Research', retrieved 2nd February, 2012 from http://www.esomar.org/uploads/public/knowledge-and-standards/codes-and-guidelines/ESOMAR_36-Questions-to-help-commission-neuroscience-research.pdf
- Evans, J. (2003), 'In two minds: dual-process accounts of reasoning', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 10.
- Farah, M.J. (2005). 'Neuroethics: the practical and the philosophical', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 34-40.
- Ferrell, O. C. & Gresham, L (1985), 'A Contingency Framework for Understanding EDM in Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, pp. 87–96.
- Ferrell, O.C., Fraedrich, J., & Ferrell, L. (2002), '*Business Ethics: Ethical decision making and Cases*', New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ferrell, O.C., Gresham, L.G & Fraedrich, J. (1989), 'A Synthesis of Ethical Decision Models for Marketing', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Sage Collections, pp. 55-64.
- Ferrell, O. C., Crittenden, V.L., Ferrell, L. & Crittenden, W.F. (2013), 'Theoretical development in ethical marketing decision making', *AMS Review*, Vol. 3, No 2, pp. 51-60.
- Festinger, L. (1957), '*A theory of cognitive dissonance*', Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

- Finn, D. W., L. B. Chonko & Hunt, S.D. (1988), 'Ethical Problems in Public Accounting', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.7, No.8, pp. 605–615.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975), '*Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*', Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2009), '*Predicting and changing behaviour: The Reasoned Action Approach*', NY, Psychology Press.
- Flew, A. (1979), '*A Dictionary of Philosophy*', London: Pan Books, The MacMillan Press.
- Forsyth, D. R. & Pope, W. R. (1984), 'Ethical Ideology and Judgements of Social Psychological Research: Multidimensional Analysis', *Journal of Personality*.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1992), 'Judging the morality of business practices: The influence of personal moral philosophies', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.11, pp. 461–470.
- Forsyth, D.R. & Nye, J.L. (1990), 'Personal ethical philosophies and ethical choices', *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 24, pp. 398-414.
- Forsyth, D.R. & O'Boyle, E.H. (2010), 'Rules, standards, and ethics: Relativism predicts cross-national differences in the codification of ethical standards', *International Business Review*, pp. 1-9.
- Forsyth, D.R. (1980), 'A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 175-184.
- Forsyth, D.R. (1992), 'Judging the ethicality of business practices: The influence of personal ethical philosophies', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 11, pp. 461-470.
- Foucault, M. (2009), '*Madness and civilisation*', London: Routledge Classics.

- Fraedrich, J. & Ferrell, O.C. (1992), 'Cognitive Consistency of Marketing Managers in Ethical Situations', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.20, No.3, pp. 245–252.
- Fraedrich, J. P. (1993), 'The Ethical Behavior of Retail Managers', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 12, No.3, pp. 207– 218.
- Frances-Gomez, P., Sacconi, L. & Faillo, M. (2012), 'Behavioural business ethics as a method for normative business ethics', *Basic and Applied Research and Development*.
- Frazier, M. (2007), 'Hidden persuasion or junk science?', *Advertising Age*, retrieved 20 February, 2011 from http://adage.com/article?article_id=120335
- Frederick, R.E. (1999), '*A Companion to Business Ethics*', Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.
- Fredricks, A. J., & Dosseit, D. L. (1983), 'Attitude-behavior relations: A comparison of the Fishbein- Ajzen and the Bentler.Speckart models', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 20.
- Fruggeri, L. (2012), 'Different levels of psychotherapeutic competence', *Journal of Family Therapy*, Vol. 34, pp. 91–105.
- Fuchs, T. (2006), 'Ethical issues in neuroscience', *Curr. Opin. Psychiatry*, Vol. 16, pp. 600-607.
- Fugate, D. L. (2007), 'Neuromarketing: a layman's look at neuroscience and its potential application to marketing practice', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 24, No. 7, pp. 385-394.

- Fugate, D. L. (2008), 'Marketing services more effectively with Neuromarketing research: a look into the future', *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 170-173.
- Fukukawa, K. (2003) 'A Theoretical Review of Business and Consumer Ethics Research: Normative and Descriptive approaches', *The Marketing Review*, Westburn Publisher Ltd, Vol. 3, pp. 381-401.
- Funke, J. (1991), '*Solving Complex Problems: Exploration and Control of Complex Systems*', University of Bonnt, Frangfurt.
- Galliers, R. J. (1991), 'Choosing Appropriate Information Systems Research Approaches: A Revised Taxonomy', *Information Systems Research: Contemporary Approaches & Emergent Traditions*.
- Gambelli, D., Vairo, D. & Zanolli, R. (2012), 'Exploiting qualitative information for decision support in scenario analysis', *Journal of Decision Systems*, Vol. 19, pp. 407-422.
- Garcia, J. R. & Saad, G. (2008), 'Evolutionary Neuromarketing: Darwinizing the neuroimaging paradigm for consumer behavior', *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 7, pp. 397-414.
- Garner, R.T. & Rosen, B. (1967), '*Moral Philosophy: A Systematic Introduction to Normative Ethics and Meta-ethics*', New York: Macmillan
- Gauthier, D. (1986), '*Morals by Agreement*', Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Giacobbe, R.W. & Segal, M.N. (2000) 'A comparative analysis of ethical perceptions in marketing research: USA VS Canada', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 27, pp. 229-245.

- Gibson, A. M., & Frakes, A. H. (1997), 'Truth of consequences: A study of critical issues and decision making in accounting', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.16, pp. 161–171.
- Gigerenzer, G. & Gaissmaier, W. (2011), 'Heuristic Decision Making', *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 62, pp. 451-482.
- Gigerenzer, G. (1991), 'How to Make Cognitive Illusions Disappear: Beyond Heuristics and Biases', *European Review of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, pp. 83–115.
- Gill, J. and Johnson, P., (2002), '*Research methods for managers*', 3rd ed. London: Sage.
- Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.) (2002), '*Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*', New York: Cambridge University Press
- Glanz, K., Rimer, B.K. & Lewis, F.M. (Eds) (2002), '*Health Behaviour and Health Education*', 3rd Ed, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goddard, W. & Melville, S. (2004), '*Research Methodology: An Introduction*', 2nd edition, Blackwell Publishing.
- Godet, M. and F. Roubelat (1996), 'Creating the Future: The Use and Misuse of Scenarios', *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 29, No.2, pp. 164-171.
- Goles, T., White, G.B., Beebe, N. & Hewitt, B. (2006), 'Moral Intensity and EDM: A Contextual Extension', *The Data Base for Advances in Information Systems*, Vol. 37, Nos 2 & 3, pp. 86-95.

- Goolsby, J. R. and S. D. Hunt: 1992, 'Cognitive Moral Development and Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 55–68.
- Gorsuch, R.L. & Ostberg, J. (1983), 'Moral Obligation and Attitudes: Their Relation to Behavioural Intentions', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 44, pp. 1025-1028.
- Gough, J.W. (1963), *The Social Contract*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011), 'Mapping the moral domain', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 101, pp. 366-385.
- Greene, J. D. (2011), *The moral brain and how to use it*, New York: Penguin.
- Greene, J. D., Morelli, S. A., Lowenberg, K., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2008), 'Cognitive load selectively interferes with utilitarian moral judgment', *Cognition*, Vol. 107, No.3, pp. 1144–1154.
- Greene, J. D., Nystrom, L. E., Engell, A. D., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2004), 'The neural bases of cognitive conflict and control in moral judgment', *Neuron*, Vol. 44, No.2, pp. 389–400.
- Greene, J. D., Sommerville, R. B., Nystrom, L. E., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2001), 'An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment', *Science*, Vol. 293, No.5537, pp. 2105–2108.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y. (1994), *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y. (2005), *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences*. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Guba, E.G. (1990), '*The alternative paradigm dialog*'. In E.G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-30). Newbury Park, CA, Sage.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A. & Johnson, L., (2006), 'How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability', *Field Methods*, Vol. 18, No.1, pp. 59-82.
- Guidice, R. M., Alder, G. S., & Phelan, S. E. (2008), 'Competitive bluffing: An examination of a common practice and its relationship with performance', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 87, pp. 535–553.
- Habermas, J. (1984), '*The theory of communicative action*', Boston: Beacon.
- Hackley, C. (2007), 'Auto-ethnographic consumer research and creative non-fiction: Exploring connections and contrasts from a literary perspective', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 10, No.1, pp. 98 – 108.
- Haesun Park (2005), 'The Role of Idealism and Relativism as Dispositional Characteristics in the Socially Responsible Decision-Making Process', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.56, pp. 81–98.
- Haggard, P. (2011), 'Decision Time for Free Will', *Neuron*, Vol. 69, No. 3.
- Haidt, J. (2000). The positive emotion of elevation. *Prevention & Treatment*, 3(3), 1-5.
- Haidt, J. (2001), 'The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 108, pp. 814–834.
- Haidt, J. (2007a), 'The new synthesis in moral psychology', *Science*, Vol. 316, pp. 998-1002.

Haidt, J. (2007b), '*Moral psychology and the misunderstanding of religion*', Retrieved on July 20, 2014, from http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/haidt07/haidt07_index.html

Haidt, J. (2008), 'Morality', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 65-72.

Haidt, J. (2012), '*The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*', New York: Pantheon.

Haidt, J., & Algoe, S. (2004). Moral amplification and the emotions that attach us to saints and demons. In J. Greenberg, L. Sander, & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.), *Handbook of experimental existential psychology* (pp. 322-335). New York, New York: Guilford Press.

Haidt, J., & Bjorklund, F. (2008), 'Social intuitionists answer six questions about moral psychology'. In W. Sinnott-Armstrong (Ed.), *Moral Psychology, Volume 2: The Cognitive Science of Morality: Intuition and Diversity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (pp. 181-217).

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007), 'When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize', *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 20, pp. 98-116.

Haidt, J., & Hersh, M. A. (2001), 'Sexual morality: The cultures and reasons of liberals and conservatives', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 31, pp. 191-221.

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004), 'Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues', *Daedalus*, Vol. 133, pp. 55-66.

- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2007), 'The moral mind: How 5 sets of innate intuitions guide the development of many culture-specific virtues, and perhaps even modules'. In P. Carruthers, S. Laurence & S. Stich (Eds.), *The Innate Mind*, Vol. 3 (pp. 367-391). New York: Oxford.
- Haidt, J., Graham, J. (2009), 'Planet of the Durkheimians, where community, authority, and sacredness are foundations of morality', *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification*, Oxford University Press.
- Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009), 'Above and below left-right: ideological narratives and moral foundations', *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 20, pp. 110-119.
- Haidt, J., Koller, S., & Dias, M. (1993), 'Affect, culture, and morality, or is it wrong to eat your dog?', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 65, 613-628.
- Hannah, S.A., Avolio, B.J. & May, D.R. (2011), 'Moral maturation and moral conation: A capacity approach to explaining moral thought and action', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36, No 4, pp. 663-685.
- Hansen, R. S.: 1992, 'A Multidimensional Scale for Measuring Business Ethics: A Purification and Refinement', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.11, No.7, pp. 523-534.
- Harenski, C.L., Antonenko, O., Shane, M.S. & Kiehl, K.A. (2010), 'A functional imaging investigation of ethical deliberation and ethical intuition', *Neuroimage*, Vol. 49, pp. 2707-2716.
- Harp, L. M. & Caudill, J.L. (2009), 'Moral Judgments in the Third Dimension: Effect of Elicitation of Disgust and Elevation on Moral Judgments', Hanover

College, retrieved 20th, December 2014 from
<http://psych.hanover.edu/research/Thesis09/Cadill%20HarpFinal%20Advanced%20Research%20Paper.pdf>.

Harris, J.R. & Sutton, C.D. (1995), 'Unravelling the EDM Process: Clues from an Empirical Study Comparing Fortune 1000 Executives and MBA Students', *Journal of Business Ethics*, No.14, pp. 805-817.

Harrison, M.R. (2005), *An Introduction to Business and Management Ethics*, Palgrave Macmillan Publications, New York.

Hatchuel A., LeMasson P., & Weil B. (2002), 'From Knowledge Management to Design-Oriented Organisations', *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 171, pp. 25-37.

Hatchuel, A. (2001a), 'Towards design theory and expandable rationality: The unfinished program of Herbert Simon', *Journal of Management and Governance*, Vol. 5, pp. 260-273.

Hatchuel, A. (2001b), 'The Two Pillars of New Management Research', *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 12 (Special Issue), pp. 33-39.

Hauser, M. (2006), *Moral minds: How nature designed our universal sense of right and wrong*, New York: Ecco/HarperCollins.

Hegarty, W. H., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1978), 'Some determinants of unethical decision behavior: An experiment', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.63, pp. 451-457.

Hegarty, W. H., & Sims, H. P., Jr. 1979, 'Organizational philosophy, policies and objectives related to unethical decision behavior: A laboratory experiment', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.64, pp. 331-338.

- Henn, M., Weinstein, M. & Foard, N. (2006), 'A short introduction to Social Research', London, Sage Publications.
- Henthorne, T.L, Robin, D.P. & Reidenbach, R.E. (1992), 'Identifying the Gaps in Ethical Perceptions between Managers and Salespersons: A Multidimensional Approach', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 11, No.11, pp. 849–856.
- Heugens, P.M.A.R. & Oosterhout, J. Van (2001), 'To Boldly Where No Man Has Gone Before: Integrating Cognitive and Physical Features in Scenario Studies', *Futures*, Vol. 33, No. 10, pp. 861-872.
- Higgs-Kleyn & Kapelianis, D. (1999), 'The Role of Professional Codes in Regulating Ethical Conduct', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 19, pp. 363–374.
- Hogg, M. A., Turner, J. C., & Davidson, B. (1990), 'Polarized norms and social frames of reference: A test of the self-categorization theory of group polarization', *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 11, pp. 77-100.
- Holmstrom, B. (1979), 'Ethical hazard and observability', *Bell Journal of Economics*, pp. 74-91.
- Holton, R. (2009), 'Response to 'Free Will as Advanced Action Control for Human Social Life and Culture'. In Roy F. Baumeister, A. William Crescioni and Jessica L. Alquist. *Neuroethics*, Vol.4, No.1.
- Hommel, B., Müsseler, J., Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (2001), 'The theory of event coding (TEC): A framework for perception and action planning', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 24, pp. 849-878.

- Hudson, James M. & Bruckman, Amy S. (2004). 'The Bystander Effect: A Lens for Understanding Patterns of Participation', *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 165–195.
- Huff, L.C. & Alden, D.L. (2000), 'A Model of Managerial Response to Sales Promotions: A Four-Country Analysis', *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 7-28.
- Huges, J. & Sharrock, W. (1997), *The Philosophy of Social Research*, Third Edition (Longman, London and New York)
- Hugman, C. (2005), *New approaches in ethics for the caring professions*, Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hunt, S. D. & Chonko, L. B. (1984), 'Marketing and Machiavellianism', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 30–42.
- Hunt, S. D. & Vasquez-Parraga, A. Z. (1993), 'Organizational Consequences, Marketing Ethics, and Salesforce Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 21, pp. 78–90.
- Hunt, S. D. (2003), 'Understanding EDM: Why do people's ethical judgments differ?' Business Ethics Symposium, Denver, Colorado.
- Hunt, S. D., V. R. Wood & Chonko, L. B. (1989), 'Corporate Ethical Values and Organizational Commitment in Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.53, No. 3, pp. 79–90.
- Hunt, S.D. & Vitell, S.J. (1986) 'A General Theory of Marketing Ethics', *Journal Macromarketing*, Vol. 6, pp. 5-15.

- Hunt, S.D. & Vitell, S.J. (2006), 'The General Theory of Marketing Ethics: A Revision and three questions', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Sage Publications, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 1-11.
- Hunt, S.D. & Vitell, S.M. (1993), '*The General Theory of Marketing Ethics: A retrospective and Revision*', *Ethics in marketing*, edited by Smith, N. C. & Quelch, J. A., pp. 77-84.
- Hunt, S.D. (2013). 'The inductive realist model of theory generation: Explaining the development of a theory of marketing ethics', *AMS Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 61–73.
- Hunter, J. D. (1991), '*Culture wars: The struggle to define America*', New York: Basic Books.
- Hussey, J. and Hussey, R., (1997), '*Business research: a practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*', Basingstoke: Macmillan Business.
- Huttunen, R. & Heikkinen, H. (1998), '*Between facts and norms: action research in the light of Jurgen Habermas's theory of communicative action and discourse theory of justice*', *Curriculum Studies*.
- Ibrahim, N., Angelidis, J., & Tomic, I. M. (2009). 'Managers attitudes toward codes of ethics: Are there gender differences?' *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 90, pp. 343–353.
- Illes, J. & Bird, S.J. (2006), 'Neuroethics: a modern context for ethics in neuroscience', *Trends in Neurosciences*, Elsevier, Vol. 29, No. 9, pp. 511-517.
- Illes, J., De Vries, R., Cho, M.K. & Schaedley-Desmond, P. (2006), 'ELSI Priorities for Brain Imaging', *American Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 1-12.

- Izquierdo, S. S. & Izquierdo, L. R. (2007), 'The impact of quality uncertainty without asymmetric information on market efficiency', *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 60, No 8 pp. 858–867.
- Jackson, P.L., & Decety, J. (2004), 'Motor cognition: A new paradigm to investigate social interactions', *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, Vol.14, pp. 1-5.
- Jankowicz, A.D., (2005), '*Business research projects*', 4th ed. London: Thomson.
- Jeffrey, S. & Sharon B. (2002), '*The mind and the brain: Neuroplasticity and the power of mental force*', New York: Regan Books.
- Johnson, M. (1993), '*Moral Imagination*', Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, T. M. (1991), 'EDM By Individuals in Organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 366-395.
- Josephson Institute (2011), '*Ethics and Intentions*', retrieved 21st April, 2014 from <http://josephsoninstitute.org/business/blog/2011/02/ethics-and-intentions/>
- Josephson, J. R. & Josephson, S.G. (1994), '*Abductive Inference: Computation, Philosophy, Technology*', Cambridge University Press, New York & Cambridge.
- Jullisson, E.A., Karlsson, N. & Garling, T. (2005). 'Weighing the past and the future in decision making', *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, Vol. 17, No.4, pp. 561-575.
- Juma'h, A.H. (2006), 'Empirical and realistic approaches of research', *Inter Metro Business Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Kahane, G. (2015), 'Sidetracked by trolleys: Why sacrificial moral dilemmas tell us little (or nothing) about utilitarian judgment', *Social Neuroscience*, DOI: 10.1080/17470919.2015.1023400.

- Kahle, L.R. (1983), '*Social Values and Social Change: Adaptation to Life in America*', New York: Praeger.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A. & Slovic, P. (1982), '*Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics & Biases*', Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Karande, K., Rao, C.P. & Singhapakdi, A. (2002), '*Ethical philosophies of marketing managers: A comparison of American, Australian, and Malaysian cultures*', *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36, pp. 768–792.
- Keat, R., & Urry, J. (1980), '*Social Theory as Science*', London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kelley, P.C. & Elm, D.R. (2003), 'The effect of context on moral intensity of ethical issues: revising Jones's issue-contingent model', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 139-54.
- Kelley, S. W., Ferrell, O.C. & Skinner, S.J. (1990), 'Ethical Behavior among Marketing Researchers: An Assessment of Selected Demographic Characteristics', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9, pp. 681–688.
- Keltner, D., Van Kleef, G.A., Chen, S. & Kraus, M.W. (2008), 'A Reciprocal Influence of Social Power: Emerging Principles and Lines of Enquiry', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40
- Kendall & Kendall (2005), '*Systems Analysis and Design*', Sixth Edition, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Kidwell, B. & Jewell, R. (2008). 'The Influence of Past Behaviour on Behavioral Intent -An Information-Processing Explanation', *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 25, No. 12, pp. 1151-1166.

- Kimmel, A.J. (1996), *'Ethical Issues in Behavioural Research: A Survey'*, Blackwell, USA.
- King, N., (1998), *'Template analysis'*. In: Symon, G. and Cassell, C., eds. *Qualitative methods and analysis of organizational research*. London: Sage, pp. 34-118.
- Kinsella, E. (2005), *'Constructions of self: Ethical overtones in surprising locations'*, *Medical Humanities*, Vol. 31, pp. 67–71
- Klignite, V. (2008), *'The influence of emotions and emotional regulation strategies on ethical decision making'*, Ann Arbor, MI: Proquest.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). *'Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization'*. In *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, edited by D.A. Goslin, Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 347-380.
- Kohlberg, L., & Candee, D. (1984), *'The relationship of moral judgment to moral action'*. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development*: pp. 52-73. New York: Wiley.
- Koocher, G. & Spiegel, K. S. (2010), *'Peers Nip Misconduct in the Bud'*, *Nature*, No.466, pp. 438-440.
- Krantz, S.F. (2002), *'Refuting Peter Singer's ethical theory: the importance of human dignity'*, Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Krasnovsky, T. & Lane, R. C. (1998), *'Shoplifting: A Review of the Literature'*, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 219-235.
- Kruger, J., & Gilovich, T. (2004). *'Actions, intentions, and self assessment: The road to self-enhancement is paved with good intentions'*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 30, pp. 328–339.

- Kurland, N. B. (1995), 'Ethical Intentions and the Theories of Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 25, No.4, pp. 297-313.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009), *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*, Second Edition, Sage Publications.
- Kvale, S., (1983), 'The qualitative research interview: a phenomenological and hermeneutical mode of understanding', *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, Vol.14, pp. 171-96.
- Laczniak, G.R. & Murphy, P.E. (2006), 'Normative Perspectives for Ethical and Socially Responsible Marketing', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Sage Publications, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 154-177.
- Laczniak, G.R. (1983), 'Framework for Analysing Marketing Ethics', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Sage Collections, pp. 7-18.
- Laczniak, Gene R. & Patrick E. Murphy (1993), *Ethical Marketing Decisions*, The Higher Road, Allyn & Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.
- Landa, Janet T. (2005), 'Bounded rationality of Homo Classificus: the law and bioeconomics of social norms as classification', *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, Vol. 80, pp. 1167-1180.
- Larner, G. (2008), 'Exploring Levinas: The ethical self in family therapy', *Journal of Family Therapy*, Vol. 30, pp. 351-361.
- Latané, B. & Darley, J. M. (1968), 'Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 10, pp. 215-221.

- Lawler, E.J. (2001), 'An Affect Theory of Social Exchange', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 107, No 2.
- Lawler, E.J., & Thye, S. R. (1999), 'Bringing Emotions into Social Exchange Theory', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 25, No. 217.
- Leben, D. (2010), 'Cognitive Neuroscience and Moral Decision-making: Guide or Set Aside?', *Neuroethics*, Vol.4, No. 2, Publisher: Springer Netherlands, pp.163-174.
- Lee, N., Broderick, A. J. & Chamberlain, L. (2006), 'What is 'neuromarketing'? A discussion agenda for future research', *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 199-204.
- Levin, D. M. (1988), *The opening of vision: Nihilism and the postmodern situation*, London: Routledge.
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D. & Reicher, S (1968), 'Identity and Emergency Intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behaviours', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 31, pp. 443–453.
- Lewis, D. & Bridger, D. (2005), 'Market research make increasing use of brain imaging', *ACNR*, Vol.5, No. 3, pp. 36-37.
- Lewis, D. (2007), 'Everything you wanted to know about neuromarketing but didn't know who to ask!', retrieved 14th November, 2011, from <http://www.neuroco.com/NeurocoPDF.pdf>
- Libet, B. (1985), 'Unconscious cerebral initiative and the role of conscious will in voluntary action', *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 8, pp. 529–566.

- Locke, E.A., Fredrick, E., Bokbo, P. & Lee, C. (1984), 'Effect of self-efficacy, goals and task strategies on task performances', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 69, pp. 241-251.
- Loe, T. W., L. Ferrell and P. Mansfield: 2000, 'A Review of Empirical Studies Assessing EDM in Business', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.25, No.3, pp. 185–204.
- Lomas, H., & Vivian-Byrne, K. (2007), 'Approaching care together—A compass to guide us', *International Journal of Art Therapy: Inscape*, Vol. 12, pp. 69–78.
- Lonergan, B., (2000), '*Insight: A study of human understanding*', Canada: University of Toronto Press
- Lund, D. B. (2001), 'Deontological and teleological influences on marketing research ethics', *Journal of Applied Research*, Vol. 17, No 2, pp. 65–82.
- Lyons, D. (1965), '*Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism*', Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Madden, T.J., Ellen, P.S. & Ajzen, I. (in press), '*A comparison of the theory of planned behaviour to the theory of reasoned action*', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Magnani, L. (2001), '*Abduction, Reason, and Science: Processes of Discovery and Explanation*', Kluwer Academic Plenum Publishers, New York.
- Malhotra, N.K. & Birks, D.F. (2007), '*Marketing Research: An Applied Approach*', 3rd European Edition, Prentice Hall, FT, Pearson Education, Essex: England.
- Malhotra, N.K. & Miller, G.L. (1998), 'An Integrated Model for Ethical Decisions in Marketing Research', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 17, pp. 263-280.
- Malhotra, N.K. (1996), '*Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*', 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

- March, J. G. (1988), '*Decisions and Organizations*', Oxford: Blackwell
- March, J. G. (1994), '*A Primer on Decision Making*', New York: The Free Press.
- Marczyk, J. & Marks, M. (2014), 'Does it matter who pulls the switch? Perceptions of intentions in the trolley dilemma', *Evolution and Human Behavior*, Vol. 35, pp. 272–278.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999), '*Designing qualitative research*'. 2nd ed. UK: Sage.
- Marta, J. M., Singhapakdi, A. & Higgs-Kleyn, N. (2001), 'Corporate ethical values in South Africa', *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol.43, pp. 755–772.
- Marty, M. E., & Appleby, R. S. (1993), '*Fundamentalism and the State*', Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mason, M. (2010), 'Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol.11, No. 3.
- Masters, T. (2014), '*Ethical Considerations of Marketing Research*', retrieved 5th September, 2014 from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/ethical-considerations-marketing-research-43621.html>
- Mayo, M.A. & Marks, L.J. (1990), 'An Empirical Investigation of a General Theory of Marketing Ethics', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 18, pp. 163-171.
- McClure, S.M., Li, J., Tomlin, D., Cypert, K.S., Montague L.M. & Montague P.R. (2004), 'Neural correlates of behavioural preferences for culturally familiar drinks', *Neuron*, Vol.44, pp. 379-387 .

- McDonnell, J., Strom-Gottfried, K. J., Burton, D. L. & Yaffe, J. (2006), '*Behaviorism, social learning, and exchange theory*'. In Robbins, S. P.; Chatterjee, P.; Canda, E. R. 'Contemporary Human Behavior Theory: a critical perspective for social work'. Pearson. pp. 349–85.
- McKinney, J. A., Emerson, T. L., & Neubert, M. J. (2010), 'The effects of ethical codes on ethical perceptions of actions toward stakeholders', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 97, pp. 505–516.
- McMahon, J.M. & Harvey, R.J. (2007), 'The Effect of Moral Intensity on Ethical Judgment', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.72, pp. 335–357.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001), '*Research in education: A conceptual introduction*', 5th ed., New York: Longman
- McRorie, M., Sneddon, I., Sevin, E., Bevacqua, E. & Pelachaud, C. (2009), 'A model of personality and emotional traits', *LNAI*, pp. 27-33, Springer-Verlag Brelin Heidelberg.
- Meiksins, W. E. (1972), '*Mind and Politics: An Approach to the Meaning of Liberal and Socialist Individualism*', University of California Press.
- Mendez, M., Anderson, E., & Shapira, J. (2005), 'An investigation of moral judgement in frontotemporal dementia', *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 193–197.
- Merriam, S.B. (1988), '*Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*', Jossey-Bass Publications, San Francisco, CA.
- Michaelides, P. & Gibbs, P. (2006), 'Technical skills and the ethics of marketing research', *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 44-52.

- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994), '*Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded Sourcebook*', Second Edition, Sage Publications, United Kingdom.
- Miltenberger, R. G. (2008), '*Behavioral Modification: Principles and Procedures*', Thomson, Wadsworth.
- Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. & Wood, D.J. (1997), 'Towards a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What really counts', *The Academy of Management Review*, Academy of Management, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 853-886.
- Monin, B, Pirazzo, D.A. & Beer, J.S. (2007), '*Reason and Emotion in Ethical Judgment: Different Prototypes Lead to Different Theories*'. In K.D. Vohs, R. F. Baumeister, & G. Loewenstein (in press). Do emotions help or hurt decision making?: A hedgefoxian perspective. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Moore, C., Zaltaman, G. & Deshpande, R. (1992), 'Relationships between providers and users of market research: The dynamics of trust within and between organisations', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 14, pp. 314-28.
- Morris, J., Marzano, M., Dandy, N. & O'Brien, L. (2012), 'Forestry, sustainable behaviours and behaviour change: Theories', *The Research Agency of the Forestry Commission*.
- Morse, J. (2002), 'Writing my own experience', *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 12, No.9, pp. 1159-1160.
- Morse, J.M., (1995), 'The significance of saturation', *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 5, pp, 147-149.

- Morse, J.M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K. & Spiers, J., (2002), 'Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 1, No.2, pp. 1-19.
- Mumford, M.D., Connelly, S., Murphy, S.T., Devenport, L.D., Antes A.L., Brown, R.P., Hill, J.H. & Waples, E.P. (2009), 'Field and Experience Influences on EDM in the Sciences', *Ethics Behaviour*, Vol. 19, No.4, pp. 263–289.
- Muncy, J. A. & S. J. Vitell (1992), 'Consumer Ethics: An Investigation of the Ethical Beliefs of the Final Consumer', *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 24, pp. 297–311.
- Murphy, E. R., Illes, J. & Reiner, P. B. (2008), 'Neuroethics of Neuromarketing', *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 7, pp. 293-302.
- Murphy, P. E. and G. R. Laczniak (1981), '*Marketing Ethics: A Review with Implications for Managers, Educators and Researchers*'. In B. Enis and K. Roering (eds.), *Review of Marketing* (American Marketing Association, Chicago), pp. 251-266.
- Nakamura, K. (2013), 'A closer look at moral dilemmas: Latent dimensions of morality and the difference between trolley and footbridge dilemmas', *Thinking & Reasoning*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 178–204.
- Nantel, J. & Weeks, W.A. (1996) 'Marketing Ethics: is there more to it than the utilitarian approach?', *European Journal of Marketing*, MCB University Press, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 9-19.
- Nature Neuroscience (2004), 'Brain Scam?', *Nature Publishing Group*, Vol. 7, No. 7, p. 683.

- Netemeyer, R.G., Andrews, J.C. & Durvasala, S. (1990), '*A comparison of three behavioural intention models using within and across subjects designs*', Marketing Dept, Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge.
- Neuman, W.L. (2003), '*Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*', Allyn and Bacon.
- Nguyen, N.T. & Biderman, M.D. (2008), 'Studying Ethical Judgements and Behavioural Intentions Using Structural Equations: Evidence from Multidimensional Ethics Scale', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 83, pp. 627-640.
- Niedenthal, P.M., Winkielman, P., Mondillon, L. & Vermeulen, N. (2009), 'Embodiment of Emotion Concepts', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Vol. 96, No. 6, pp. 1120–1136.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Ross, L. (1980). '*Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*', Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Brien, F.A. (2003), 'Scenario planning—lessons for practice from teaching and learning', *European Journal of Operational Research*, Elsevier.
- O'Fallon, M.J. & Butterfield, K.D. (2005), 'A Review of The Empirical EDM Literature: 1996–2003', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.59, pp. 375–413.
- Oliver, R.L. & Bearden, W.O. (1985), 'Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 324-340.
- Orlikowski, W.J. & Baroudi, J.J. (2002), '*Studying Information Technology in Organizations: Research Approaches and Assumptions*'. In M. D. Myers and D.

- Avison (eds.), *Qualitative Research in Information Systems: A Reader*, Sage Publications, London.
- Otis, J., Godin, G. & Lambert, J. (n.d), 'AIDS prevention: Intentions of high school students to use condoms', *Advances in Health Education*.
- Packard, V. (1957), *The Hidden Persuaders*, 8th printed edition, New York: McKay.
- Page, J. (2008), *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*, Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Palazzo, G., Krings, F., & Hoffrage, U. (2008), *A person-situation interactionist framework to account for ethical blindness*, National Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Palys, T. (2008), *Purposive Sampling*. In Lisa M. Given (Ed.) (2008), 'The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods', Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, Vol.2, pp. 697-698.
- Parker, D., Manstead, A.S.R., Strading, S.G., Reason, F.T. & Baxter, J.S. (1990), *Intention to commit driving violations: An application of the theory of planned behaviour*, Dept of Psychology, University of Manchester, Manchester, England.
- Parsons, T. (1975), *Social Systems and The Evolution of Action Theory*, New York: The Free Press.
- Patton, M.Q., (1990), *Qualitative evaluation and research method*, London: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q., (1990), *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*, London: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q., (2002), *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, London: Sage.

- Paxton, J.M. & Greene, J.D. (2010), 'Moral Reasoning: Hints and Allegations', *Topics in Cognitive Science*, Cognitive Science Society, pp. 1-17.
- Penn, D. (2008), 'Beyond neuroscience – whatever happened to Neuromarketing?', *World Advertising Research Centre*, pp. 27-29.
- Phillips, A. (2010), 'Researchers, snoopers and spies—The legal and ethical challenges facing observational research', *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 52, No 2, pp. 275–278.
- Pickler, R.H., (2007), 'Evaluating qualitative research studies', *Journal of Paediatric HealthCare*, Vol. 21, No. 3), pp. 195-197.
- Pinker, S. & Jacques, M. (1988), '*Connections and Symbols*', Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Pirouz, D. (2004), 'The Neuroscience of Consumer decision-making', *MPRA*, No. 2181.
- Potter, J., (1997), '*Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk*'. In: Silverman, D., ed. *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage, pp. 144-160.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004), 'Co-Creation Experiences: The Next Practice In Value Creation', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 18, No. 3.
- Prestholdt, P.H., Lane, I.M. & Mathews, R.C. (1987), 'Nurse Turnover as Reasoned Action: Development of a Process Model', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 221-227.
- Prinz, W. (1984), '*Modes of linkage between perception and action*'. In W. Prinz & A.-F. Sanders (Eds.), *Cognition and motor processes*, Berlin: Springer.

- Prinz, W. (1997), 'Perception and action planning', *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, Vol. 9, pp. 129-154.
- Proctor, T. (2005), *Essentials of Marketing Research*, FT Prentice Hall, England
- Pronin, E. (2009), 'The Introspection Illusion'. In Mark P. Zanna. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 41, pp. 52–53.
- Pronin, E., Gilovich, T. Ross, L. (2004), 'Objectivity in the Eye of the Beholder: Divergent Perceptions of Bias in Self Versus Others', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 111, No. 3, pp. 781-799.
- Pronin, E., & Kugler, M. B. (2010), 'People believe they have more free will than others', *PNAS: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Vol. 107, pp. 22469–22474
- Pronin, E., & Kugler, M. B. (2007), 'Valuing thoughts, ignoring behavior: The introspection illusion as a source of the bias blind spot', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, pp. 565–578.
- Pylyshyn, Z.W. (1999), 'Is vision continuous with cognition? The case for cognitive impenetrability of visual perception', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 341-423.
- Racine, E. & Illes, J. (2005), 'Neuroethics: Dialogue on a Continuum from Tradition to Innovation', *The American Journal of Bioethics*, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- Rae, S.B. (1995), *Ethical Choices: An Introduction to Ethics*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Raikka, J. (2010), 'Brain Imaging and Privacy', *Neuroethics*, Vol.3, pp. 5-12.

- Ramaswamy, V. & Guillard, F. (2010), *'The Power of Co-Creation: Build It with Them To Boost Growth, Productivity, and Profits'*. Free Press.
- Rambo, C. (2007), 'Handing IRB an unloaded gun', *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 13, pp. 353-367.
- Rand, A. (1964), *'The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism'*, New York: The New American Library, Inc.
- Reidenbach, R. E. & Robin, D. P. (1990), 'Toward the Development of a Multidimensional Scale for Improving Evaluations of Business Ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.9, No.8, pp. 639-653.
- Reidenbach, R. E., D. P. Robin & Dawson, L. (1991), 'An Application and Extension of a Multidimensional Ethics Scale to Selected Marketing Practices and Marketing Groups', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 83-92.
- Reidenbach, R.E. & Robin, D.P. (1988), 'Some Initial Steps towards the measurement of ethical evaluations of marketing activities', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol.7, pp. 871-879.
- Reidenbach, R.E. & Robin, D.P. (1991), 'A conceptual model of corporate moral development', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 273-284.
- Rest, J. R. (1986), *'Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory'*, Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. & Thomas, S. (1999), 'A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach: The DIT and Schema Theory', *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 11, No. 4.

- Rest, J.R. (1984), '*The Major Components of Morality*'. In W. Kurtiniss & J. Gerwitz (Eds.), *Morality, Moral Behavior, and Moral Development*. New York: Wiley.
- Ribeaud, D. & Eisner, M. (2010), 'Are Ethical Disengagement, Neutralization Techniques, and Self-Serving Cognitive Distortions the Same? Developing a Unified Scale of Ethical Neutralization of Aggression', *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, pp. 298–315.
- Ridgely, D.A. (2008), 'Selfishness, Egoism and Altruistic Libertarianism', retrieved 20th December, 2013 from <http://www.positiveliberty.com/2008/08/selfishness-egoism-and-altruistic-libertarianism.html>
- Rokeach, M. (1973), '*The Nature of Human Values*', The Free Press, New York.
- Ross, H. (2003), '*Locke, Hobbs, and Confusion's Masterpiece*', Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, W.T. & Robertson, D.C. (2003), 'A Typology of Situational Factors: Impact on Salesperson Decision Making about Ethical Issues', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 46, pp. 213–234, Kluwer Academic Publishers: Netherlands.
- Rust, R.T. and Cooil, B., (1994), 'Reliability measures for qualitative data: theory and implications', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31, No.1, pp. 1-14.
- Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983), 'Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 44, No.3, pp. 545-552.
- Sadler-Smith, E. (2015), 'Before Virtue: Biology, Brain, Behaviour and the Moral Sense'. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol.22, No.2, pp. 351-376.

- Sagi, A., & Friedland, N. (2007), 'The cost of richness: The effect of the size and diversity of decision sets on post-decision regret', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 93, No. 4, pp. 515-524.
- Sanders, S. M. (1988), '*Is egoism ethically defensible?*' *Philosophia*. Springer Netherlands. Vo. 18, Nos. 2–3.
- Sappington, D. E. M. (1991), 'Incentives in Principal–Agent Relationships', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 45–66.
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, L. & Thornhill, A., (2003), '*Research methods for business Students*', 3rd ed. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, L. and Thornhill, A., (2007), '*Research methods for business Students*', 4th ed. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice.
- Scanlon, T.M. (2008), '*Moral dimensions: Permissibility, Meaning, Blame*', United States: President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Schabner, D, (n.d), '*Playing with your mind: Is neuromarketing research giving advertisers the key to your decision-making?*', Commercial Alert, retrieved 20th February, 2011 from <http://www.commercialalert.org/issues/culture/neuromarketing/playing-with-your-mind-is-neuromarketing-research-giving-advertisers-the-keys-to-your-decision-making>
- Schaacter, D. (2011), '*Psychology*', Worth Publishers.
- Schaefer, M., Heinze, H.J., Rotte, M. & Denke, C. (2013), 'Communicative versus strategic rationality: Habermas Theory of Communicative Action and the social brain', *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 8, No. 5.

- Schifter, D. B. & Ajzen, I. (1985), 'Intention, perceived behavioural control and weight loss: An application of the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 49, pp. 843-851.
- Schlegel, D.B., d'Averna, J. R., Zanna, M.P, DeCourville, N.H & Manske, S.R. (1990), '*Problem drinking: A problem for the theory of reasoned action*', Dept of Heath Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada.
- Schlegelmilch, B.O. & Oberseder, M. (2010), 'Half a Century of Marketing Ethics: Shifting Perspectives and Emerging Trends', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 93. Pp. 1-19.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Forsyth, D.R. (1977), 'On the ethics of psychological research', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 13, pp. 369-396.
- Schmidt, M.J. & Hollensen, S. (2006), '*Marketing Research: An International Approach*', FT Prentice Hall, England.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2001), '*The dictionary of qualitative inquiry*', Second Edition, The Sage, UK.
- Schwartz, S. H. & W. Bilsky (1987), 'Toward a Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 53, No.3, pp. 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992), 'Universals in the Content and Structure of Values', *Theoretical Advances Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 113-128.
- Shanteau, J. (1988), '*Psychological characteristics and strategies of expert decision makers*', Expertise and Decision Support.

- Shaw, D., S., E. & Clarke, I. (2000), 'The Contribution of Ethical Obligation of Self-identity to the Theory of Planned Behaviour: An Exploration of Ethical Consumers', *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 879-894.
- Shaw, D.S. & Clarke, I. (1999), 'Belief formation in ethical consumer groups: an exploratory study', *Market Intelligence and Planning*, Vol.17, No.2/3, pp.109-119.
- Shaw, E. (2011), 'Relational ethics and moral imagination in contemporary systemic practice.', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, Vol. 32, pp. 1-14.
- Sheperd, G.J & O'Keefe, D.J. (1984), 'Separability of Attitudinal and Normative Influences on Behavioural Intentions in the Fishbein-Ajzen Model', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 122, pp. 287-288.
- Sheppard, B., Hartwick, J., & Warshaw, P. (1988), 'The theory of reasoned action: A meta analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research' *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 325-343.
- Shimp, T.A. & Kavas, A. (1984), 'The Theory of Reasoned Action: A Meta-Analysis of the Past Research with Recommendations for Modifications and Future Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 325-343.
- Shome, A. & Rao, H. (2009), 'Machiavellianism in public accountants: some additional Canadian evidence', *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 364-371.
- Siegal, L. J. (2005), '*Criminology: The Core*', Second Edition. Thompson.
- Siegal, L.J. (2015), '*Criminology: The Core*', Fifth Edition. Thompson.

- Simon, H. A. (1967), 'Motivational and emotional controls of cognition', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 74, pp. 29-39.
- Simon, H. A. (1992), 'What is an "explanation" of behavior?', *Psychological Science*, Vol. 3, pp. 150-161.
- Singer, T. & Fehr, E. (2005), 'The Neuroeconomics of Mind Reading and Empathy', *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, pp. 340-345.
- Singhapakdi, A. & S. J. Vitell (1991), 'Research Note: Selected Factors Influencing Marketers' Deontological Norms', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 19, No.1, pp. 37-42.
- Singhapakdi, A. & Vitell, S.J. (1990), 'Marketing Ethics: Factors Influencing Perceptions of Ethical Problems and Alternatives', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Sage Collections, pp. 4-18.
- Singhapakdi, A., Rallapalli, K.C., Rao, C.P. & Vitell, S.J. (1995), 'Personal and professional values underlying ethical decisions: a comparison of American and Thai marketers', *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 65 – 76.
- Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S.J. & Franke, G.R. (1999), 'Antecedents, consequences, and mediating effects of perceived moral intensity and personal moral philosophies', *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27, pp. 19-36.
- Skulmowski, A., Bunge, A., Kaspar, K. & Pipa, G. (2014), 'Forced-choice decision-making in modified trolley dilemma situations: a virtual reality and eye tracking study', *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, Vol. 8, No. 426, pp 1-16.
- Sober, E. (2012), '*Core Questions in Philosophy*', 5th edition.

- Sobh, R. & Perry, C. (2005), 'Research design and data analysis in realism research', *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40, No. 11/12, pp. 1194-1209, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Soon, C.S., Brass, M., Heinze, H.J. & Haynes, J.D. (2008), 'Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain', *Nature Neuroscience*, Vol. 11, No.5.
- Sorrel, T. & Hendry, J. (1994), *Business Ethics*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Sparks, J.R. & Hunt, S.D. (1998), 'Marketing Researcher Ethical Sensitivity: Conceptualization, measurement, and exploratory investigation', *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62, pp. 92-109.
- Sperry, R.W. (1952), 'Neurology and the mind-body problem', *American Scientist*, Vol. 40, pp. 291-312.
- Stack, F. & Deutsch, R. (2004), 'Reflective and Impulsive Determinants of Social Behavior', *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 220-247.
- Stanovich, K.E., & West, R.F. (2008), 'On the relative independence of thinking biases and cognitive ability', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 94, No.4, pp. 672-695.
- Steenhaut, S. & van Kenhove, P. (2006), 'An Empirical Investigation of the Relationships among a Consumer's Personal Values, Ethical Ideology and Ethical Beliefs', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.64, pp. 137-155.

- Stephen, F. (2004), *'The Power of Reinforcement'*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Stockman, N. (1983), *'Antipositivist Theories of the Sciences'*. Netherlands: D. Reidel.
- Strack, F & Deutsch, R. (2004), 'Reflective and Impulsive Determinants of Social Behaviour', *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol.8, No. 3, pp. 220-247.
- Sutherland, M. (2007), *'Neuromarketing: What is all about?'*, retrieved 20th February, 2011 from http://www.sutherlandsurvey.com/Column_pages/Neuromarketing_whats_it_all_about.htm
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979), *'An integrative theory of intergroup conflict'*. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Tenbrunel, A.E. & Smith-Crowe, K. (2008), 'Ethical decision making: where we've been and where we are going', *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 545-607.
- The Market Research Society (2013), *'UK research market worth over £3bn, says first comprehensive sector review'*, retrieved 5th April, 2013 from <http://www.mrs.org.uk/article/item/556>
- Thibaut, J. W. & Strickland, L.H. (1956), 'Psychological Set and Social Conformity', *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 25, pp. 115-129.

- Timko, C. (1987), 'Seeking Medical care for Breast Cancer Symptoms: Determinants of Intentions to Engage in Prompt or Delay Behaviour', *Health Psychology*, Vol.6, pp. 305-328.
- Tolich, M. (2004), 'Internal confidentiality: When confidentiality assurances fail relational informants', *Qualitative Sociology Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 113–128.
- Tolich, M. (2010), 'A Critique of Current Practice: Ten Foundational Guidelines for Autoethnographers', *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 20, No. 12, pp. 1599-1610.
- Tongco, M.D.C. (2007), 'Purposive Sampling as a Tool for Informant Selection', *Ethnobotany Research & Applications*, Vol.5, pp. 147-158.
- Topp, L., Barker, B. & Degenhardt, L. (2003), 'The external validity of results derived from ecstasy users recruited using purposive sampling strategies', *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, Vol. 73, pp. 33–40.
- Tovino, S.A. (2005), 'Currents in Contemporary Ethics-The Confidentiality and Privacy Implications of Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging', *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, Health Care Rights/Pain Management*.
- Trevino, L. K. & Weaver, G.R. (1994), 'Business Ethics: One Field or Two?', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 113–128.
- Trevino, L. K. (1986), 'EDM in Organizations: A Person-Situation Interactionist Model', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 601-617.
- Tsalikis, J. & Fritzsche, D.J. (1989), 'Business Ethics: A literature Review with focus on Marketing Ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 8, pp. 695-743.

- Tsoukas, H. (1989), 'The validity of idiographic research explanations', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 551-61.
- Tull, D. S. & Hawkins, D.I. (1993), '*Marketing Research: Measurement and Method*', New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Ulaga, W., (2003), 'Capturing value creation in Business relationships: a customer perspective', *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 32, No. 8, pp. 677-93.
- Valentine, S. R., & Bateman, C. R. (2011), 'The impact of ethical ideologies, moral intensity, and social context on sales-based ethical reasoning', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 102, pp. 155-168.
- Vallerand, R.J., Deshaies, P., Cuerrier, J., Pelletier, L.G. & Mongeau, C. (1992), 'Ajzen and Fishbein's Theory of Reasoned Action as Applied to Moral Behaviour: A Confirmatory Analysis', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 62, pp. 98-109.
- Van Ryn, M. & Vinokur, A.D. (1990), '*The role of experimentally manipulated self-efficacy in determining job-search behaviour among the unemployed*', Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.
- Vasquez-Parraga. A.Z. (1990) '*Organizational Consequences and Marketing Ethics: A study of marketing managers' propensity to reward and discipline salespeople's ethical and unethical behaviour*', A Doctoral Thesis.
- Verbeke, W., Ouwerkerk, C & Peelen, E. (1996) 'Exploring the Contextual and Individual Factors on EDM of Salespeople', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 15, pp. 1175-1187.
- Vincent, N.A. (2009), 'Neuroimaging and Responsibility Assessments', *Neuroethics*.

- Vitell, S. & Hunt, S.D. (1990), 'The General Theory of Marketing Ethics: A Partial Test of the Model', *Research in Marketing*, JAI Press, Vol. 10, pp. 237-265.
- Vitell, S. J. & Davis, D. L. (1990b), 'The Relationship Between Ethics and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9, No.6, pp. 489-494.
- Vitell, S. J. & Davis, D.L. (1990a), 'Ethical Beliefs of MIS Professionals: The Frequency and Opportunity for Unethical Behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.9, No.1, pp. 63-70.
- Vitell, S. J. & Singhapakdi A. (1991), 'Factors Influencing the Perceived Importance of Stakeholder Groups', *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, Vol. 10, No.3, pp. 53-72.
- Vitell, S. J. (2003), 'Consumer ethics research: Review, synthesis and suggestions for the future', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 43, pp. 3-47.
- Vitell, S. J., K. Rallapalli & Singhapakdi, A. (1993), 'Marketing Norms: The Influence of Personal Moral Philosophies and Organizational Ethical Climate', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.21, pp. 331-337.
- Vitell, S.J. & Ho, F.N. (1997), 'EDM in Marketing: A synthesis and evaluation of scales measuring the various components of decision making in ethical situations', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 16, pp. 699-717.
- Vitell, S.J., Bakir, A., Paolillo, J.G.P., Hidalgo, E.R., Al-Khatib, J. & Rawwas, M.Y.A. (2003) 'Ethical Judgements and Intentions: A multinational study of marketing professionals', *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 152-171.

- Vitell, S.J., King, R.A. & Singh, J.J. (2013) 'A special emphasis and look at the emotional side of ethical decision-making', *AMS Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 74-85.
- Vivian-Byrne, K. & Hunt, J. (2014), 'Ethical Decision Making: Social Metaphors towards ethical action', *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2014, pp. 1–15.
- Voorhoeve, A. (2009), *Conversations on ethics*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, E. (2010), 'Facing the Ethical Challenges of Neuroscience: An Imperative for Science and Public Welfare', *AJOB Neuroscience*, Vol. 1, No. 4, p.20.
- Walton,C.C. (1980), 'Business Ethics: The Present and the Future', *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 16-20.
- Ward, S. and Wasserman, T. (2010), 'Towards and open ethics: implications of new media platforms for global ethics discourse', *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 25, pp. 275–292.
- Watters, A.E. (1989), *Reasoned/Intuitive action: An individual difference moderator of the attitude-behaviour relationship in the 1988 U.S. presidential election*, Dept of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Weaver, G. & Trevino, L.K. (1994), 'Normative and Empirical Business Ethics: Separation, Marriage of Convenience, or Marriage of Necessity?', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 129–143.
- Webley,S. (1997), *The Business Organisation: A Locus for Meaning Moral Guidance*. In Daves (ed)(1997), Routledge, London.
- Weick, K.E. (1995), *Sensemaking in organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Weiner, B. (1986), *'An attributional theory of motivation and emotion'*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- West, R.F., Toplak, M.E., & Stanovich, K.E. (2008), 'Heuristics and biases as measures of critical thinking: Associations with cognitive ability and thinking dispositions', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 100, No.4, pp. 930-941.
- White, P. A. (1988), 'Knowing more about what we can tell: 'Introspective access' and causal report accuracy 10 years later', *British Journal of Psychology*, British Psychological Society, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 13–45.
- Whittier, N.C., Williams, S. & Dewett, T.C. (2006), 'Evaluating EDM models: a review and application', *Society and Business Review*, Vol.1 No. 3, pp. 235-24
- Wierenga, B. (2008), *'Handbook of Marketing Decision Models'*, New York: Springer.
- Wiersma, W. (2000), *'Research Methods in Education: An Introduction'*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- Wikström, S. (1996), 'Value Creation by Company-Consumer Interaction', *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 359–374.
- Wilson, R.M., Gaines, J. & Hill, R.P. (2008), 'Neuromarketing and Consumer Free Will', *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 389-410.
- Winter, S.J., Stylianou, A.C. & Giacalone, R.A. (2004), 'Individual Differences in the Acceptability of Unethical Information Technology Practices: The Case of Machiavellianism and Ethical Ideology', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 54, pp. 279-301.

- Wong, C. & Mullan, B. (2009), 'Predicting breakfast consumption: An application of the theory of planned behaviour and the investigation of past behaviour and executive function', *British Journal of Health Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 489-504.
- Wood, E.M. (1972), '*Mind and Politics: An Approach to the Meaning of Liberal and Socialist Individualism*', University of California Press.
- Zafirovski, M. (2005), 'Social Exchange Theory Under Scrutiny: A Positive Critique of its Economic-Behaviorist Formulations', *Electronic Journal of Sociology*.
- Zey-Ferrell, M., Weaver, K. M. & Ferrell, O. C. (1979), 'Predicting Unethical Behavior Among Marketing Practitioners', *Human Relations*, Vol. 32, No. 7, pp. 557-569.
- Zgonnikov, A. & Lubashevsky, I. (2013), '*Unstable Dynamics of Adaptation in Unknown Environment: a Dual-System Model*', University of Aizu, Tsuruga, Ikkimachi, Aizu-Wakamatsu, Fukushima, Japan.

Appendices

Appendix 1: The interview scenarios

Sample 1: MR Researchers - Scenarios (Part 1)

Scenario 1

A magazine company is using brain scans, for non-medical purposes, on respondents to identify which cover page can increase their sales. The project aims to identify the preferences of the respondents as indicated through their brain activity. Bob, an experienced marketing researcher has recently joined the Marketing Department team of the company. Bob has an experience in brain scanning for marketing research purposes. Anna, another experienced marketing researcher, has also joined the Marketing Department team of the company, but compared to Bob she has not any experience in brain scanning for marketing purposes. Being both experienced marketing researchers though, they are asked to participate in the new project undertaken by the Marketing Department. The consequences of participating or not are still unknown, but they have to decide within two weeks.

Scenario 2

A magazine is seeking to identify male consumers' brand-relationship on behalf of a specific mobile company. In order to do so the Marketing Director has given to all members of the Marketing Department team a mobile phone of the specific brand and asked them to use the phones for a month. While using the phones they have to record every single experience related to the phone's brand. The project aims to identify the brand relations and in return, the magazine company will get a sponsorship from the particular mobile company. George and John, two experienced marketing researchers, work for the Marketing Department of the company as part of the research team. George has an experience in such a marketing research method, while John does not. Both George and John are asked by the Marketing Director to be responsible for the project outcome. They have to decide within one week.

Sample 1: MR Researchers - Scenarios (Part 2: Ethical Dilemmas)

Scenario 3

Bob and Anna, two experienced marketing researchers, are participating in a project that involves brain scans on a magazine's consumers, for marketing purposes. During the study, they are confronted by some dilemmas. One of the respondents has been very enthusiastic about participating in the study; however once he was placed in the brain scanner he started experiencing high levels of stress. Even though he had not expressed verbally his stress or any intention to withdraw from the process, it was obvious that he was under stress. If Bob and Anna asked him to withdraw, they would lose one research participant, and recruiting another participant will delay the process. If they continue the study, how they would know that the data given have not been affected by the respondent's stress. During the same study, another participant was diagnosed, by the neurologist employed in the study, to have a mental disorder, for which she had not informed any of the team members. Bob and Anna, together with the rest team, are in the dilemma of informing her or not. If they inform their respondent about it, they may jeopardize their selves and the company's reputation. If they withhold this information and the person remains unaware of her disorder, her condition may get worse.

Scenario 4

George and John, two experienced marketing researchers, are leading the project undertaken by their company about identifying brand-relationship of a specific mobile brand on behalf of a specific mobile company. The mobile company will offer a sponsorship in return. As part of the project, they have to use the particular mobile phone for one month and record any experience they have related to the brand of the phone. After a week of recording their experiences in written and oral format, John started feeling uncomfortable. He was experiencing high levels of stress and insecurity about sharing his inner thoughts and his everyday life with his colleagues. If he expressed everything he was experiencing he would offer good quality data for the project, however he may risk of being overexposed to his colleagues. If he withheld some of his thoughts, he would jeopardize the quality of the project outcome, as well as, the potential sponsorship offered by the mobile company. However, he may be less exposed to his team.

Sample 2: MR Respondents - Scenarios (Part 1)

Scenario 1

A magazine company is using brain scans, for non-medical purposes, on respondents to identify which cover page can increase their sales. The project aims to identify the preferences of the respondents as indicated through their brain activity. Bob and Anna have participated as respondents in other projects undertaken by the particular magazine in the past. Therefore, the researchers in the Marketing Department of the magazine company approached them in order to participate in their study. Bob has been a research respondent in studies using brain scanning undertaken by other companies, but Anna does not have such an experience. This is the first time that she has been asked to participate in a study of this kind. Both Bob and Anna have been asked to participate and they have to decide within three days.

Scenario 2

A magazine is seeking to identify consumers' brand-relationship on behalf of a specific mobile company. In order to do so the Marketing Director has asked the members of the Marketing Department team to approach relevant respondents. The respondents will have to use a mobile phone of the specific brand for a month. While using the phones they have to record every single experience related to the phone's brand. The project aims to identify the brand relations and in return, the magazine company will get a sponsorship from the particular mobile company. George and John, potential research respondents, have been approached by members of the Marketing Department of the company. George has an experience in such a marketing research method, while John does not. Both George and John have been asked to participate and they have to decide within three days.

Sample 2: MR Respondents - Scenarios (Part 2 – Ethical Dilemmas)

Scenario 3

Bob and Anna had been asked to participate as research respondents in the project that involves brain scans on a magazine's consumers, for marketing purposes. Bob has decided not to participate, while Anna wanted to give it a go. During the study, she was confronted by a dilemma. Even though she has been very enthusiastic about participating in the study, when she was placed in the brain scanner she started experiencing high levels of stress. However, she did not express verbally her stress or any intention to withdraw from the process. If Anna asked to withdraw, she would feel embarrassed. If she continued in the study, she would not know whether she would bare at knowing that other people are 'looking into' her brain

Scenario Four

George and John decided to participate in the project undertaken by a males' magazine company about identifying brand-relationship of a specific mobile brand, on behalf of a specific mobile company. The mobile company will offer a sponsorship in return. As part of the project, they have to use the particular mobile phone for one month and record any experience they have related to the brand of the phone. After a week of recording their experiences in written and oral format, John started feeling uncomfortable. She was experiencing high levels of stress and insecurity about sharing her inner thoughts and her everyday life with other people. If she expressed everything she was experiencing she would be overexposed to a group of strangers. If she withheld some of her thoughts, she would not be honest, but she would feel more secure.

Appendix 2: Mock interview template

Introduction
General Questions
<p>1) The meaning of ethics—What is ethics to you as an individual and as a person who has actively been evolved in research for marketing?</p> <p>2) Ethics in M.R. – Based on your experience what is the role of ethics in M.R.?</p> <p>3) Importance of ethics in M.R.- How important is ethics in M.R.? Why?</p> <p>4) Application of ethics in M.R.- Based on your experience how ethics are being applied in M.R.?</p>
Determinants of intentions and behaviour
<p>5) Determinants of intention- Before expressing an intention to participate in a marketing research project, what are those elements that determine you to be positive about it?</p> <p>6) Determinants of behaviour- Before participating in a marketing research project, what do you think would make you agree on doing so?</p> <p>7) Volitional control- Do you think that your choice of participation is entirely based on you or are there other influencers that will affect your choice? If so, which are these and what role do they play in your choice?</p> <p>8) The importance of stakeholders - How important is the role of the respondents in conducting M.R?</p> <p>9) The most important determinant of behaviour - So, based on the best of your knowledge and your experience, which is/are the most important factors and constraints that will determine your final decision in participating or not on particular marketing research project?</p>
Scenarios- Part 1: Conceptual Framework
<p>10) Experience- Have you participated in any of the two methods described in the scenarios? If, yes, which on, how was your experience?</p> <p>11) Attitudes/Consequences- Can you think of any positive consequences/outcomes related to the techniques described in the scenarios? Can you think of any negative consequences/outcomes related to the techniques described in the scenarios?</p> <p>12) Level of volitional control - How easy is for you to participate in any of these methods? Why?</p> <p>13) Behaviour before ethical dilemmas- So if you were asked to participate, what would you do?</p> <p>14) Identification of ethical issues- Now, regarding ethics, can you identify any ethical issues related to the first, and then, to the second technique?</p> <p>15) Ethical judgement – Regarding ethics, how would you consider these techniques? What made you say that?</p>
Scenarios- Part2 : Dialectics
<p>16) Awareness - So based on the dilemmas described, what do you think would be the ethical implications? Can you identify any additional or any future ethical issues?</p>

17) **Feelings**- How would you feel if you were in their position?

18) **Behaviour after ethical dilemmas** - What would you do if you were in there position, why?

19) **Propositions** - If you were asked to address the dilemmas presented in the scenarios, what would you propose? What would you propose regarding the respondents?

Closing Remarks

Additional comments- Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Next steps – After analysing the information collected, I will submit a report to you in case you are interested. I will be happy to send you a copy to review in case you would like to do so.

Thank you for your time.

Appendix 3: The interview themes and the generic questions

Themes	Generic Interview Questions ¹
1) Attitudes	What do you think about what is described in the scenarios?
2) Ethical evaluation and evaluation of consequences	How would you evaluate the techniques described? What do you see as the advantages of your participation in the studies described in the scenarios? What do you see as the disadvantages of your participation in the studies described in the scenarios? What else comes to mind when you think about participating in the studies described in the scenarios?
3) Past experience ²	Do you have any experience similar to the situations described in the scenarios? Can you describe the type of experience that you had? Have you found yourself in a situation that you felt uncomfortable during a research study? How did you react?
4) Social influences and importance of marketing research stakeholders	Who are the most important people for you in conducting research for marketing? How and in what way do they influence your participation in a research study? What would other people like you do in situations described in the scenarios? If you were to participate, how would you interact with the rest individuals involved in the study?
5) Perceived behavioural controls	How easy is for you to participate in research for marketing? Do you think is it entirely up to you to participate in a study for marketing purposes?
6) Awareness	Can you identify any worries/issues/concerns, relevant to you, related to the techniques described in the scenarios? Can you identify any conflicts between the groups of people presented in the scenarios?
7) Moral intensity ³	In what degree would the worries/issues described above make you feel uncomfortable? In what way would they influence your participation in the studies described in the scenarios?
8) Affection ⁴	How do you think the people in the scenarios feel about what is happening in the second pair of scenarios? How do you think this will affect their behaviours?
9) Behavioural intentions	What would you intent to do if you were in the position of the people described in the scenarios and what would you eventually do? What would you intent to do in situations when you have contradictory values with other people involved in a research study?
10) Ethical judgements	How do you judge, regarding good research practice, the techniques described in the scenarios?

¹These are the generic questions asked based on the themes emerged from the literature regardless of the group of the participants (i.e. researchers and respondents). In the actual interviews these questions are customised based on the profile of the interviewee, while all these questions are followed by prompts, and elicitations and 'why' questions.

² This is a subtheme embedded in the main interview themes

³ This is a subtheme embedded in the main interview themes

⁴ This is a subtheme embedded in the main interview themes

Themes	Interview Questions
The importance and the role of ethics in MR	Can you define good practice in MR? What is the importance of good marketing research practice to you and/or your company?
Ethical Judgements (generalised)	What would you consider as acceptable and unacceptable in MR?
Propositions	If you were asked to address the dilemmas in the scenarios, what would you propose? What would you suggest to be done for promoting good marketing research practice? What ethical standards should be in place? Describe in detail, from an ethical standpoint, how the relationship between a researcher and a respondent should be in order to conduct good research?
Ethics defined	How would you define your (or your work) ethics?

Appendix 4: The updated generic interview guide

A) Introduction
B) Part 1: Themes emerged from the literature
a) Scenarios describing the marketing research methods under investigation (i.e. neuromarketing and autoethnography)
B) Interviewing on the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ethical judgements, ethical considerations including evaluations of consequences in e• Attitudes• Social Norms• Behavioural Controls• Behavioural Intentions• Past experience• Moral intensity• Importance of stakeholders• Affection
B) Part 2: Dialectics
a) Scenarios including the ethical issues raised by the marketing research methods under investigation
b) Interviewing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the participants' ethical judgements and ethical evaluations regarding the ethical issues presented in the scenarios,• the propositions made to address them• the behavioural intentions and the affection after the ethical issues are presented
c) Interviewing on the key assumptions underpinning the propositions made
C) Additional comments and concluding remarks.

Appendix 5: Interview questions – Sample 1 (MR researchers)

Intro	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Intro of myself and research 2) Respondent's background
Pre-issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What do you think about the methods described in the scenarios? 2) Are you familiar with any of the two? Have you acted as a respondent in any of the two? 3) What would be the advantages and the disadvantages for you in participating in these two techniques? 4) How keen would you be in participating in studies using these methods and why? 5) From a respondent's point of view how would you evaluate the two techniques, and why? 6) What could be the consequences of using these techniques, for research respondents and for the overall society, why? 7) How important are these consequences to you? Did you have any experience over those consequences? Can you tell me in detail about your experience? 8) From a practical point of view, how easy would be for you to act as a respondent in studies using these techniques, why? 9) What could be the practical implications for research respondents in applying the two methods described in the scenarios? 10) From a respondent's point of view, could you compare and contrast the two techniques? 11) Can you identify any worries related to the two techniques, relevant to the respondents participating or willing to participate? 12) From a respondent's point of view, what would you consider as good and what as bad research practice for marketing? Any examples? 13) How would you consider the two techniques in respect of good and bad research practice, why? 14) Can you describe in detail a situation in which you felt uncomfortable when you were asked or participated in a research study for marketing purposes? 15) From a respondent's point of view, what makes you participate in a research study? And what stops you from doing so? Why? 16) Would you consider this type of decisions as to be made entirely by you? Why 17) What do you think are those factors that make research respondents think positively or negatively towards a particular marketing research study? 18) Who would you consider the most important stakeholders in conducting research for marketing? Why? 19) How important is their role in research for marketing? Examples? 20) How and in what way do they influence your participation in a research study? 21) What would you intend to do if you were in the position of the people described in the scenarios?

	<p>22) What would other people like you do in situations described in the scenarios?</p> <p>23) What do you think the people in the scenarios eventually did and why?</p> <p>24) What would you do and why?</p>
After issues	<p>1) As a respondent , what would you comment after reading these scenarios?</p> <p>2) What is your opinion about what is described?</p> <p>3) Do you have a similar experience of any of the two scenarios? If yes, what did you do? If, no, what would you do?</p> <p>4) From a respondent’s point of view, what do you think are the ethical concerns here? Can you identify any additional?</p> <p>5) What do you think people like you would do in the situations described in the scenarios? Why?</p> <p>6) What would you do in case you have contradictory values with other people involved in a research study?</p> <p>7) What would you consider the major ethical issues in research for marketing nowadays, from a respondent’s perspective? Why?</p> <p>8) In what degree would those issues make you feel uncomfortable? Why?</p> <p>9) As a research respondent I want you to tell me, in a hierarchical order, what are the most important constraints that can stop you ,or people like you, from participating in a research study?</p> <p>And what are the factors, in order of importance, that can make you or people like you participate in a research study ?</p> <p>10) In what degree the dilemmas described in the scenarios would influence your participation in similar studies? Why?</p> <p>11) How do you think the respondents in the scenarios felt about what is going on? Why?</p> <p>12) What do you think they eventually did and why?</p> <p>13) Could you describe your ethics?</p>
Propositions	<p>1) From a respondent point of view, if you were asked to address the dilemmas in the two scenarios, what would you propose and why?</p> <p>2) What do you think respondents should do in order to protect themselves from situations like these in the scenarios?</p> <p>3) Describe from an ethics point of view the ideal relationship between the researcher and the respondent. Why?</p> <p>4) From a respondent’s point of view, could you define good research practice to me?</p> <p>5) For the respondents in marketing research, what do you think is the importance of good research practice? Why?</p> <p>6) From a respondent’s point of view, what would you consider as acceptable and as unacceptable research practice and why?</p> <p>7) What is ethical and what is unethical for you in regards to research for marketing?</p>
Conclusion	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Further comments.</p>

Appendix 6: Interview questions – Sample 2 (MR respondents)

Intro	<p>3) Intro of myself and research</p> <p>4) Respondent's background</p>
Pre-issues	<p>25) What do you think about the methods described in the scenarios?</p> <p>26) Are you familiar with any of the two? Have you acted as a respondent in any of the two?</p> <p>27) What would be the advantages and the disadvantages for you in participating in these two techniques?</p> <p>28) How keen would you be in participating in studies using these methods and why?</p> <p>29) From a respondent's point of view how would you evaluate the two techniques, and why?</p> <p>30) What could be the consequences of using these techniques, for research respondents and for the overall society, why?</p> <p>31) How important are these consequences to you? Did you have any experience over those consequences? Can you tell me in detail about your experience?</p> <p>32) From a practical point of view, how easy would be for you to act as a respondent in studies using these techniques, why?</p> <p>33) What could be the practical implications for research respondents in applying the two methods described in the scenarios?</p> <p>34) From a respondent's point of view, could you compare and contrast the two techniques?</p> <p>35) Can you identify any worries related to the two techniques, relevant to the respondents participating or willing to participate?</p> <p>36) From a respondent's point of view, what would you consider as good and what as bad research practice for marketing? Any examples?</p> <p>37) How would you consider the two techniques in respect of good and bad research practice, why?</p> <p>38) Can you describe in detail a situation in which you felt uncomfortable when you were asked or participated in a research study for marketing purposes?</p> <p>39) From a respondent's point of view, what makes you participate in a research study? And what stops you from doing so? Why?</p> <p>40) Would you consider this type of decisions as to be made entirely by you? Why?</p> <p>41) What do you think are those factors that make research respondents think positively or negatively towards a particular marketing research study?</p> <p>42) Who would you consider the most important stakeholders in conducting research for marketing? Why?</p> <p>43) How important is their role in research for marketing? Examples?</p> <p>44) How and in what way do they influence your participation in a research study?</p> <p>45) What would you intent to do if you were in the position of the people described in the scenarios?</p> <p>46) What would other people like you do in situations described in the scenarios?</p>

	<p>47) What do you think the people in the scenarios eventually did and why?</p> <p>48) What would you do and why?</p>
After issues	<p>14) As a respondent , what would you comment after reading these scenarios?</p> <p>15) What is your opinion about what is described?</p> <p>16) Do you have a similar experience of any of the two scenarios? If yes, what did you do? If, no, what would you do?</p> <p>17) From a respondent's point of view, what do you think are the ethical concerns here? Can you identify any additional?</p> <p>18) What do you think people like you would do in the situations described in the scenarios? Why?</p> <p>19) What would you do in case you have contradictory values with other people involved in a research study?</p> <p>20) What would you consider the major ethical issues in research for marketing nowadays, from a respondent's perspective? Why?</p> <p>21) In what degree would those issues make you feel uncomfortable? Why?</p> <p>22) As a research respondent I want you to tell me, in a hierarchical order, what are the most important constraints that can stop you ,or people like you, from participating in a research study?</p> <p>And what are the factors, in order of importance, that can make you or people like you participate in a research study ?</p> <p>23) In what degree the dilemmas described in the scenarios would influence your participation in similar studies? Why?</p> <p>24) How do you think the respondents in the scenarios felt about what is going on? Why?</p> <p>25) What do you think they eventually did and why?</p> <p>26) Could you describe your ethics?</p>
Propositions	<p>8) From a respondent point of view, if you were asked to address the dilemmas in the two scenarios, what would you propose and why?</p> <p>9) What do you think respondents should do in order to protect themselves from situations like these in the scenarios?</p> <p>10) Describe from an ethics point of view the ideal relationship between the researcher and the respondent. Why?</p> <p>11) From a respondent's point of view, could you define good research practice to me?</p> <p>12) For the respondents in marketing research, what do you think is the importance of good research practice? Why?</p> <p>13) From a respondent's point of view, what would you consider as acceptable and as unacceptable research practice and why?</p> <p>14) What is ethical and what is unethical for you in regards to research for marketing?</p>
Conclusion	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Further comments.</p>

Appendix 7: Information sheet and consent form

Date.....

Researcher's Name: **Iva Bimpli**

Supervisors: **Prof. Nina Reynolds, Dr Kyoko Fukukawa**

Title of Project: **Conceptualising ethical decision-making in marketing research from multiple-stakeholder perspectives – A holistic approach**

INFORMATION SHEET

You are being invited to take part in a doctoral research. Before you decide, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take your time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

The purpose of the research, which is part of my doctoral thesis, is to conceptualize ethical decision-making in marketing research by incorporating different stakeholders' perspectives (researchers' and respondents'). This attempt is being done to offer a better understanding of a particular decision-making process, in order to offer insights of the challenges faced in current marketing research practice and overcome future ones in the field.

You have been chosen because you are either currently a marketing researcher or have been actively involved in contemporary and/or traditional research for marketing, or because you have been acted as a research respondent in various studies for marketing purposes. It is up to you to decide whether or not to participate in a face-to-face interview. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and you will be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving any reason. In the unlikely event of distress being caused, you can may require short break or terminate the interview if you wish to do so.

The interview is likely to last up to one hour and a half and this interview will be recorded. The main question guiding this interview is; **“How do the different stakeholders involved in marketing research make their decisions in an evolving marketing research environment, when ethical issues appear?”**.

All the information that is collected from you during this research will be kept secure and any identifying material, such as names and addresses will be removed in order to ensure your personal and professional anonymity. It is anticipated that the research will be written up into a report which may be published at a later date. However, your anonymity will be ensured, including the anonymity of your quotes and the organisation in which you work for. All the information I have collected about you will continue to be kept secure for a duration of 5-7 years.

Please note that if you decide to withdraw your data from the study after participation you can do this within one week as after this period the researcher will have already written up the report. If you require any further information about the research please contact me by email: i.bimpli@student.bradford.ac.uk .Thank you for reading this information sheet and taking part in this research.

A hard copy of this document will be provided to you on the day of the interview, printed on headed paper.

CONSENT FORM

Name of Researcher: **Iva Bimpli**

Title of Project: **Conceptualising ethical decision-making in marketing research from multiple-stakeholder perspectives – A holistic approach**

Thank you for considering being interviewed as part of the research. I would be grateful if you would read through the following questions and indicate your response to each of them. The purpose of this is to ensure that you are fully aware of the purpose of the research and that you are willing to take part.

1. I have been informed about the purpose of the study and have had the opportunity to ask questions about it if I wished
YES/NO
2. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any stage, without giving a reason and that my data will not be included in the research
YES/NO
3. I understand that I am free to choose not to answer a question without giving a reason why
YES/NO
4. I have been informed that the interview will be tape-recorded and I give my consent for this recording to be made.
YES/NO
5. I understand that extracts from the recording might be used in a publication at a later date.
YES/NO
6. I confirm that I have not been involved in a similar study in the past 6 months.
YES/NO
7. I understand that if extracts from the recording are used any identifying information about myself and my organisation will be removed and anonymity will be ensured.
YES/NO

I give my consent to take part in the research.

Participant

Signed

NAME IN BLOCK LETTERS

Date

Researcher

Signed

NAME IN BLOCK LETTERS

Appendix 8: Interview transcripts sample (MR researchers)

RCH1

Interviewer: So basically I will tell you a couple of things about my research. You already know a couple of things. I'm trying to understand specific decision making processes within the research for marketing, and basically when there are cases or there are some ethical issues or ethically (dubious) cases. So the research is basically involved in researchers for marketing, don't know how to behave or how they make their decisions by the end of that.

So I'm trying to understand this type of decision making process and basically especially now that research for marketing has evolved a lot, so there are other disciplines introduced and involved within the research for marketing. So I'm trying to see whether these decision making processes have changed or remained the same, this is basically the whole idea.

Now I would like you to tell me a couple of things about your job role and your company so what do you do there?

Participant: I'm a senior research executive and the company I work for is a small service market research agency. So basically we offer the full service from the whole process really from the brief, when we receive the client's brief, and through to managing the fieldwork and then analysing the results and reporting the results back to the client. This is all done in-house as well so we basically keep control of, for example, the address files from customers, all the respondents that we're going to survey, and also the reporting side as well. Everything is kept in-house.

As a senior research executive my role is like a project management role and client liaison role, so I'm basically there day-to-day managing a project. This is really through the full cycle: at the beginning basically being in touch with the client and understanding what are their research needs and what is it that they're trying to achieve, through to developing the questionnaire and then liaising with internal departments like our scripting teams and then set up the survey. It could be online, it could be on telephone, a telephone survey, or it could be even in-depth interviews as well. So we do mixed message surveys as well, so both quantitative as well as qualitative surveys.

Then through to managing the feedback. So whenever there are queries from respondents they come back directly to us as well. So there could be queries

about what is this survey about and what will you be doing with my data and things like that, so managing that. Then at the end basically reporting back the results to clients and just being available for any queries that they might have regarding the results.

Interviewer: So basically from my understanding you are involved in the whole project from the beginning until the very end, so you're definitely one of the people that I'm looking for. You would definitely help. So you basically told me that you are both engaged in quantitative and qualitative research so you have an experience of all of them which is very good for now.

Basically what I will do because the way we are going to do the interview it is going to be based on two sets of scenarios that I would give you. They're not too long, they're very short. So I would just send through a Word format now from Skype the first set of the scenarios. I want you to spend one or two minutes to read them. Based on that basically we will do our discussions.

Participant: I've just read the first scenario.

Interviewer: Okay, good. You can go on with the second one as well.

Participant: Okay.

Interviewer: So before I move on with my discussion is there something that you don't understand, that is not clear from the scenarios?

Participant: No, I think I get the gist of it. They're both quite different projects as well. I don't know if in this scenario now you would like me to take the role of one of the researchers?

Interviewer: Yes. I will tell you about that but first I want you to tell me how would you judge it? So once you've read those two scenarios what's your opinion and your judgment on what you have read of these two techniques? The first technique is on the first scenario and the second technique is on the second scenario.

Participant: Okay, just reading through it and the second scenario is not -- well, I would say it's a difficult research project because, first of all, if I've understood it correctly it seems the researchers become the respondents as well.

Interviewer: Exactly, yes.

Participant: So this is the first thing and actually the purpose seems to be like some commercial interest as well as the market research agency. So there is a little bit of conflict of interest as well. So that project I think would need to -- is a bit sensitive in that respect so it needs to be really clear what's really the purpose of it. Is it to obtain the sponsorship or is it actually to really find out

about what the brand's attributes are and what may consumers think about the mobile brand? These were my initial thoughts on the second scenario.

On the first scenario, I haven't got any experience with measuring brain activity. I know actually that there are techniques where you can see on websites, for example, where the eye looks most, and then you can see such type of (inaudible), and this give you an indication: what is that attracts actually a person looking for something on a website? In this case it would be a page of a magazine. I suppose what is sensitive about this project is what other information may you be obtaining that is obviously very private information of the respondent. You have to be really careful and sensitive about what you can really use about this project and really have a full understanding about that technique, so that you can really properly tell the respondent what is it actually that we're going to find out and do you really give consent to participate in that survey.

So these are my initial thoughts on both projects.

Interviewer: Okay, good, thank you.

Is there anything particular judgment that you would make for those? So if, for example, they ask you to take part or to take up one of these two projects which part would you choose and which one not and why?

Participant: I guess my initial reaction is almost the second one, I would not choose the second one just because of this conflict of interest there. So that you are not actually an independent researcher but actually your roles are mixed up. On the other hand it's less sensitive that obviously being the respondent and the researcher at the same time you have ability I guess to -- It's difficult.

Interviewer: Just take your time to think about it.

Participant: That's because I'm thinking, okay, if the task is trying to find out the brand relationship and the method of basically recording every single experience related to the phone's brand. I mean that could be anything and everything. So being the researcher and the respondent at the same time you have control to say, okay, which experience am I recording or not. So in that sense it is a biased project.

The magazine company is trying to obtain a sponsorship from a particular mobile company but it doesn't say if this is the client. Yes, it's a more complicated project I find. The first one in a way I find more straightforward, it's clearer. I mean it's obviously sensitive in applying the technique of measuring brain activity for various reasons but it's more straightforward. So as long as you have really a clear understanding of what it is that you're measuring and what is the information you can obtain, and as long as the

respondent really gives consent to participate in such kind of research as this, it is pretty straightforward.

The purpose is to find out which of the pages is the most interesting and more attractive one for respondents, and based on their conscious and unconscious perceptions. Yes, so ultimately the reporting would be a kind of recommendation from the research department based on the findings but there wouldn't be any need to disclose any personal or detailed information from any particular respondent. It would obviously be a study which requires many respondents in terms of multiple segments depending on who the target audience is of that magazine.

So my feeling is I would tend to choose the first project over the second one.

Interviewer: Okay, good, thank you very much.

Now by reading these two scenarios can you think of any potential consequences that may come up for the researchers or for everybody basically once they took up this project? Can you think of any consequences from a project using the first technique and any consequences for the project using the second technique?

Participant: So for the first project obviously one of the main ones is you don't really know what you're finding out I suppose. You may be obtaining some information about medical deficiencies of the respondent perhaps which is obviously not part of the research, part of the call, but it's very sensitive information. So what do you do with this information? If I said I don't really have much experience with that type of technique so there may not be -- it perhaps is not that in-depth that you can really find out about everything.

But I think really the main would be really understanding very well all the information that you will be obtaining using that technique, and that you are really open and transparent with the respondent so that they fully understand that this is all the information that we are able to obtain. Yes, this is the main thing, that the respondent is clear about that and gives his consent for that.

I guess on the second one because of the mixed role I think it needs to be really specified what is meant by using the phone and recording every single experience. Is it recording every single conversation? Is it recording every time that the phone is used to send text messages or to browse on the internet? It's very, very vast so obviously if it's a phone which is used for private use there is obviously a lot of private information that is being recorded. So it needs to be understood by the researchers and needs to be made clear in what way is this information being used because obviously the content of the information is not very relevant as such. If it's not relevant in what way is it

used and what's the experience that the user has with the mobile phone? I guess this is what is the purpose of the research.

But what is meant with recording every single experience there? I guess it's possibly writing down how often did I use the phone, what did I use it for, and was it very useable and what was the usability? Was it fun to use or did I have any issues using it, and things like that. So perhaps it's more like a type of diary that's been written. There you've got obviously -- Well, I suppose if it is the researchers themselves doing it if I understood that right. I'm just reading it again. So it is basically the researchers who are asked to become -- to do the experiment themselves?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: So write a diary of every single experience, yes. I guess it could work but obviously it is quite limited as well in terms of the findings I would say.

Interviewer: Now how easy do you think it would be for a researcher like you or for a research team like the one that you are working in to use one of these techniques?

Participant: Sorry, what was the question again?

Interviewer: How easy would it be for you as a researcher and for your research team to use one of these techniques?

Participant: What do you mean by how easy?

Interviewer: Would there be any practical issues so, for example, limit to the budget that you have to spend or limited time or a specific purpose, would there be any difficulties basically?

Participant: Well, I guess for the first one definitely it would be a resource question because you would need to have the software or the programmes. You require some resources to be able to measure brain scanning. In my current role we haven't done that before so it would definitely be an additional investment in terms of acquiring the type of software that can measure that.

The second one, it's actually doesn't require a lot of resources at all because it is actually the researchers doing it themselves. The research that is required is obviously the time and the question is now are the researchers still working or are they taking a week off for this project? If they're still working then it's obviously -- Yes, it could be a bit of a mixed result I would say. But the second technique is certainly something that would be fairly easy to implement, it's just a matter of really just agreeing on certain things, how it's going to work and depending on what the purpose is.

Interviewer: Now if you were in the first scenario in the case of Anna. So if you were Anna what would you do?

Participant: Anna was the lady, she is experienced?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: She has to decide whether or not to take part in this project?

Interviewer: Anna is basically the inexperienced one and Bob is the experienced one.

Participant: Right, okay, so Anna is the inexperienced one. So I guess if I'm the inexperienced one I would like to team up with someone who has experience in that project. I wouldn't want to take full responsibility of that project without having had any experience at all.

Interviewer: Now if you were in Bob's case, so you have an experience on the technique, would you go for the project?

Participant: Yes, I think if I was Bob and had the experience and using that I think I could certainly see myself taking on that project.

Interviewer: Now what about for the second scenario for (John's and George's cases)?

Participant: I think because it's asking both to record their experience it doesn't really matter whether they're experienced researchers or not because everybody knows how to use a mobile phone and everybody can write a diary about using a mobile phone, and everybody has an opinion about a mobile phone brand or what their experience is with using a mobile phone. I think in my view it doesn't really matter whether or not they're experienced researchers or not, the question would be would they agree to do it or not. Would I personally? Yes, depending how it's really set out I don't see any issues in doing that.

Interviewer: So you would do it then?

Participant: Yes, I guess so. I mean obviously I'm not a man so it would be the female brand relationship with the mobile company. I mean from my initial reaction obviously I said that this is more of a biased project because the aim is not so much to really find out about consumers' views about the brand. But actually the ultimate goal that the company or the client in that sense has is to actually get the sponsorship from a mobile company. So I suppose they are trying to sell information in a way and obtain a benefit out of it.

So that's a bit of an unusual project, to be honest, and the question is really how successful can that be. If they're happy to pay for a couple of researchers

to write a diary about their mobile phone usage, why not? But I think the problem is a researcher would have the responsibility to advise them in the way that really how useful is the information that they're going to obtain. It's not guaranteed that there will be a sponsorship. Their objective may not be obtained in that way.

Interviewer: Now maybe just away from the two scenarios, so can you describe in detail a situation where you part of a research team for marketing, and for some reason you felt uncomfortable in participating?

Participant: Not as such. I mean a couple of instances like I've had one to do an interview over the phone, an in-depth interview, and actually the person agreed to take part in the interview but midway through they somehow changed their mind and became quite rude as well. It was a quite uncomfortable situation because I had their consent at the beginning of the interview. I also told them how long the interview was going to last. Actually I could not turn around the situation and the respondent just hung up the phone on me. So that was a bit of an uncomfortable situation. I'm not sure if that's the direction that you're trying to get at.

Interviewer: So it was basically -- I mean feeling uncomfortable but this was caused basically from your interaction with the respondent.

Participant: Yes. So this was uncomfortable.

Interviewer: So how did you manage to handle that?

Participant: Well, obviously this was over the phone which makes it more difficult really to build a rapport with the respondent but I basically went back to explain what the purpose of the research is and what we're trying to do and what is really transparent. So they knew who our clients were, on whose behalf we are doing this questionnaire and this survey. I just went back to that and tried to explain that but it did not convince the person. Not that it did not convince, something happened that they realised actually they'd changed their mind, they didn't want to take part. I think that's fine because obviously at the beginning I also said that at any point they can decide not to participate, not to answer a question if they don't want to.

So this is obviously part of the research process, you cannot force anyone to take part in the project.

Interviewer: That is true.

Now any experience that you felt uncomfortable for the purpose of the research in which you were engaged in?

Participant: You mean the purpose of the research?

Interviewer: Yes, either the topic or what you were looking to find or the way that you were looking to find something.

Participant: No, actually I haven't had any experience with that. The projects that we have at the moment are pretty traditional market research projects and very straightforward. So it's just about customer satisfaction, it is about employee loyalty, employee satisfaction or stakeholder satisfaction and engagement studies. So it is very traditional market research projects.

Interviewer: What would happen if they are asking you to participate in a research project that is not that traditional?

Participant: I mean I guess like sensitive things would be if you work with children and young adults. This is when it would become sensitive where you would need to think about where are the limits of that. There is obviously a code of conduct for market research and the rules are specified, and it would need to be really looked at in detail. So this would be one area, the other area is obviously sensitive topics and sensitive topics could be things like really very personal information about respondents. If it's trying to find out really personal things, it could be religious belief, it could be political orientation, sexual orientation, so things like that.

That's obviously sensitive topics and the purpose of such a research could be sensitive as well but I haven't had any experience with that. So I would be just pretty much guessing and wouldn't be able to give you a very detailed example, I'm afraid.

Interviewer: What are those things that determine you basically to participate in a specific project? It can be anything, either personal or coming from the company.

Participant: To be honest it is very much driven by how the project comes into the business and this varies a lot, and sometimes how a project is allocated within the team depends on the resources of the team, how busy is someone and who has basically free time to take on this project. So these are how they are determined. I worked, for example, on a big (inaudible) study and the client relationship was quite important. I've been working for some time now on that because I've built up the client relationship so that's why I've kept working on that project for a number of years now.

Obviously I have also the opportunity to say, oh, I would like to work on that kind of project and then the management obviously looks at these things as well, so it is possible. I haven't come across the situation where I had to say, oh, actually I would not want to work on that project, if you see what I mean. That hasn't happened, neither for me nor for any of my colleagues as far as I'm aware. So it is really a case of who has time to take on the project and who

wants to do the project, and this is how projects then are allocated within the research team.

Interviewer: Basically what are those things that either your or any of your colleagues make you feel negatively about taking up a specific project? What would be those things that will make you think twice about taking on a specific project, regardless of the outcome or whether you've taken it or not?

Participant: I suppose, and this is also a bit more theoretical, perhaps if the project involves having to make interviews at 10 o'clock at night but I mean that's very uncommon. But, let's say, like travel, having to travel a lot, some people don't like that because it would mean quite a disruptive way of work/life balance I would say. But I mean that's very common in the industry as well, for some projects it requires actually that you're flexible to travel and basically either have focus groups or to go basically where you're respondent is. I mean you seem willing to come all the way down to London just to meet so I thought, well, you really want this interview.

But I think in general it's not, and I can speak only for myself, really -- there hasn't been anything that I felt negative about, any project to take on. There obviously are some topics that are more interesting than others and you would have -- personally you would be more engaged and more enthusiastic about a topic over another but I think that is it.

Interviewer: Basically whenever you take part in a project, the decision of taking up this project or participating in this project, do you think it's entirely up to you or not and why?

Participant: No, it's not. Well because, just as I mentioned, it is to do with resources as well. Obviously the management at the end decides how a project can be allocated and they obviously wouldn't decline a project to a client only because as a researcher you don't want to do it. So that would be a bit of a conflict of interest. I think you would have to have really very strong reasons to reject a project as a researcher.

But this is something that I haven't experienced or happens in our company but I've heard from another market research agency where their project was about financial institutions. Basically they decided to not give it to one of their researchers because he was of Muslim faith and they felt that he would be quite biased with his questioning, because of his disapproving of interest payment and these types of things. So they made the decision actually that this is a project we wouldn't to give to him and just because we feel he would not be independent or unbiased in the process. He perhaps would from his side said I don't want, I don't want to do that project as well and this would be, I guess, an acceptable reason.

But other than that, yes, it requires discussion with management.

Interviewer: How difficult is it basically to say no or reject the project?

Participant: I guess it really depends on your reasons. If you have a strong -- you feel very strongly about it and you say I really don't want to work on this project for that and that reason. I guess at the end of the day it may go down to the company culture: would management accept that and if they don't accept it what are the consequences that you take? I mean you can either do it against your wishes or you can decide, well, then that's not the type of company that I want to work at.

So it is a difficult -- I think it is difficult to reject the project especially nowadays with the economic climate research budgets are very much squeezed. So research agencies are really in a situation of every project that you get is obviously additional revenue and with tight budgets -- You probably know, marketing budgets are one of the first budgets that get tougher along with the human resources budgets. These are the first budgets in a company when the economic situation is not very good that are being cut, and this has obviously grave consequences for market research agencies. The competition is very -- and very hard to get new projects.

Having the luxury to reject a project that's --

Interviewer: So for you as a researcher basically I would like you to tell me -- to basically put in a list, starting with the most important up to the least important. I would like you to tell me the most important basically stakeholders involved and affected by research in marketing.

Participant: That's very easy for me to tell you because the most important stakeholder is the respondent for various reasons. First of all, it's our responsibility as a researcher to protect the respondent, to protect his identity if he wishes to remain anonymous but also protect any information that we obtain from him. So he's the very first stakeholder and the most important one in my view. Also if you think about if people no longer agree to take part in surveys in the future there will no longer be market research. There is this big hype in marketing, direct marketing, where people are being phoned up at home and people get confused. They think that this is market research as well, they're being asked some bogus questions that's nothing to do with market research. They're trying to obtain either their contact addresses or contact details just to send them some marketing leaflets or any other direct marketing activity.

So this is really one area where it's already difficult enough to obtain the willingness of people to participate in research projects. So I think it's really crucial to treat the respondents really with respect and that they are protected, that's really the most important thing that you need to ensure as a researcher,

and build trust as well. This is what you need if you really want to obtain what people think and really want to understand what they think and feel. You can only achieve that if the respondent trusts you and trusts that you're going to use this information in a responsible manner. So that's the first stakeholder.

The second stakeholder is obviously the client because he is the one who pays for the research so he is the one who has the vested interest in the research. He sets the purpose so he is the one who sets what the objectives are of the research and you're trying with that project. You don't do a project just for the sake of it, you do it for a purpose. You do it to obtain that objective and be able to provide information to the client that will help him in his decision making. So that's maybe the second most important stakeholder.

Then I guess further down the line you've got obviously your colleagues that you work along within the project and obviously management as well. You need to fulfil also the expectations from management but then I guess it's more the internal view within the company.

Interviewer: Okay, great, thank you very much for that.

Now going back to the two scenarios basically that I gave you at the very beginning, how important do you think in this case is the role of the respondent?

Participant: What do you mean?

Interviewer: In the case of the first scenario how important and what exactly would you think is the role of the respondent in this case?

Participant: What's the role of the respondent?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: Well, I mean they are the main research subject so I'm not sure I understand the question.

Interviewer: So basically if you can think of those respondents in the first scenario, how do you think this respondent in the first scenario would feel about the whole idea?

Participant: Well, I mean definitely this could be difficult to get to people to take part in that project because measuring brain activity that sounds very --

Participant: So, yes, I could imagine that you may have some people really hesitant to take part in that just because they are not really sure actually what will happen to them or what kind of information will be obtained, and whether they're really prepared to disclose that kind of information. But it really all depends on exactly what kind of technique is being applied and it may be

completely harmless. It may be really just a measuring of the eye movement, let's say, so that could be really harmless. But if it's doing some brain scans where you potentially could see any anomalies and find any medical condition that would be obviously a very different type of project.

So I guess it really all depends on the technique that is being applied but in terms of purpose and projects I think it's fine. So it's about finding out -- It's like product testing in a way it's testing which page on a magazine is the most attractive one. You probably will need some incentives for people to participate so that's the dirty secret of the research industry but not everything because people are happy to just participate. It's very likely that you will need some incentives like some vouchers. It can't be incentives to get the magazine, there are some regulations about that as well. I think it's recently that it's been really coded as part of the research practices that you're not allowed to use products of your client as an incentive for that project. So that's something to consider about as well when offering incentives to respondents.

But other than that I think it's pretty straightforward.

Interviewer: What about in the second case where they're both respondents and researchers?

Participant: You mean what would be the role, whether the researcher/respondent maybe uncomfortable about it?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: Well, yes, I can easily imagine that because obviously they are disclosing as well in a way their private information for colleagues as well, so they may not want to do that. So it certainly could be difficult to take part. The other thing, what I mentioned earlier, how is it exactly going to work, is it part of their work? Will it be their private conversations? I mean I guess it would be because that's the purpose of finding out brand images and brand relationship. It would be very limited if you just look at mobile phones, let's say. So perhaps some people would not want to do that in that context.

Interviewer: They may feel uncomfortable as you said.

Participant: Yes.

Interviewer: Now I have a second set basically of scenarios. They are based on the first set that I gave you. The discussion, the conversation for those is not that long like the ones that we've had so far. They're basically extend the first set of scenario, an extended version of them. If you can please have a look and then we can continue our discussion.

Participant: Okay, yes.

Interviewer: So what do you think now? After reading the second set of these scenarios how would you judge them now? What is your opinion?

Participant: I mean the first set, now they've started the project and obviously something very common can happen that the respondent who originally agreed to take part in the process then decides perhaps not defect but obviously demonstrates that he's not comfortable in taking part any longer. So that's a very easy -- I mean it's not easy because obviously of the circumstances but I think the right thing for both researchers to do would be to thank him very much for his participation so far. Obviously being understanding and showing that he's under stress and that they don't want to cause him further distress and just really finish the interviews.

Yes, it is losing one respondent, it may mean delaying the project but I think that really is where the ethics part of your project comes in. This is the responsibility of the researchers and if your management does not understand that or if your client doesn't have understanding for that then I think there is no longer research in that sense, then it becomes something else. So that would be very -- It shouldn't be difficult for a researcher to stop in such a situation because that's obviously not good for the respondent and ultimately it won't be good for the company either. So that's quite easy.

The other situation, I would say that they were not experienced enough if they did not anticipate that this may happen. If it became clear or it was understood that this brain scanning may disclose such type of information they should have known from the beginning. So it's not good that they come to that point where it's actually revealed afterwards.

So this is my impression but the other thing obviously now is the dilemma is what to do or not. That's a very difficult question because obviously if you did not prepare yourself well to know what kind of information you're obtaining you could not inform the respondent either about what type of information you may be obtaining. So the respondent would not expect you to have access to that kind of information.

I don't think I would jeopardise the company's reputation. Well, in a way they are but this is like going back to the beginning as well, they did apply a technique that they did not fully understand. So in a way they are jeopardising their reputation with regards to the company's reputation.

That's a really difficult one. I think my feeling is the right thing to do would be informing the respondent and obviously it's very sensitive how you handle that. But my feeling is not saying anything would be the wrong thing to do but it's just a matter of how you actually manage this process. I suppose transparency and being honest I think is one of the key things that they are very crucial in market research. These are like really entrenched principles. So if

you conduct a research project and you're actually not disclosing the real intentions then you're misleading your respondents and this would go against the principle of actually informing the respondents and allowing them to really make their conscious consent, whether or not they want to participate in this study.

Yes, it's a very sensitive situation but my feeling is that the aim should be really to find a good way to make the respondent aware, and then perhaps even offer some sort of, not support but obviously have whatever the next steps perhaps should be taken. But a very, very difficult one.

In the first scenario I think -- Yes, so this is exactly the situation, why it is a bit of a bias project because the researcher becomes the research subject at the same time, and may feel uncomfortable exactly because of what we said before of not wanting to disclose so much information in front of their colleagues. So I think if it was me I would not disclose it because in that sense I'd become -- I think I have the right not to disclose it. So obviously it's a bit like you're having two roles, you're being two roles at the same time. I would feel that it's not worth it to disclose it.

Interviewer: So basically how would you handle the first situation? So you said that it's a very sensitive and difficult case and if something like this happens then it's very difficult to manage it. So if you were about to manage this situation what would be your steps?

Participant: In the case of the first respondent you mean?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: I would stop the study and I would just ask the respondent to just really be frank and say that we feel that this process is causing him stress, and that we don't want him to be put under any stress. We really don't want him to feel obliged to continue the study so we're happy just to finish the study. If he was offered any incentive I think I still would -- it may not be the decision of the researcher. Well, my feeling would be still give the incentive to that respondent for his inconvenience and even more so if he had stress during the process, that may be something that cannot be decided depending the amount of the incentive. But definitely thank him for his participation and finish that interview.

The information obtained I think would not be really available for those reasons mentioned already there. The respondent was under stress so you don't know to what extent did that really affect his responses. So I don't think that this is -- it's not a completed interview and obviously a very affected interview, so I don't think that this is data that could be used for the project. So it could mean finding a new participant.

Then the next step would obviously be informing the client about that so that there may be a potential delay just because this situation arose and we need to find a new participant. Then the client may decide actually it doesn't matter just carry on with the respondents that you have or they may agree and say, okay, yes, we can extend the fieldwork for another week and if you can find a new participant that would be good. So it can have those two outcomes I think.

Now in the case of the second lady, yes, I mean this is still where I'm really, really unsure about how to handle it because it is obviously very delicate. I would as well stop the research straightaway. I think I would stop it and I would consult with management as well and obtain their recommendations and help. But it's a very sensitive and delicate situation that needs to be handled but again it would mean-- In terms of the outcome it would in my view be very similar to the one above. It would mean actually that the interview needs to be stopped and a new participant needs to be found.

But actually what needs to happen at that point is to really review again the technique that is being used and really be quite clear with the respondents at the beginning, so that we're not claiming their consent to participate. That this is perhaps information that may be obtained but --

Interviewer: If basically they have this kind of information, the consent form, so they said, okay, this kind of information may be obtained throughout the study, how do you think the respondents would feel about that?

Participant: You may find people that don't mind, you may find people who mind and then just don't participate. So some people might be scared off and some other people they don't think, they just think, okay, it's just a formality. So it can go both ways but I think it would be wrong to withhold that information.

Interviewer: Now any other worries that you may feel after reading those two scenarios? Is there anything else that worries you related to these two techniques apart from the things that I have on the scenarios, those dilemmas?

Participant: I can't think of anything just off the top of my head. I think those dilemmas have pretty much already -- are the main dilemmas that you face as a researcher. This is when you asked me earlier about the stakeholders, in a way you're actually balancing out the interests of the respondents against the interests of your client. I would always say the interests of the respondent come first and only after come the interests of the clients but I think those are pretty much the dilemmas that you're in as a researcher. So you have to balance out wanting to finish an interview but obviously you don't want to distress your respondents but you have deadlines to meet. You want to finish off a project because you need to deliver the results to the client. I guess, yes, they are the main dilemmas.

Sorry, I can't think of any.

Interviewer: No, it's fine, don't worry. I don't want to stress you or push you or whatever. It's whatever you think, whatever comes to mind.

Now basically another thing that I would like to ask is regarding ethics, how would you consider these two techniques that I have in the scenarios?

Participant: Well, definitely the first one is like unacceptable almost because --

Interviewer: Why?

Participant: Because it's not for a researcher to do brain scans where you could find a condition, that's for doctors to do. So I don't think that's an appropriate technique to use and surely there are other ways of finding out information. Yes, that's my feeling about the first technique.

The second technique is a very developed technique, basically writing a diary. Now the dilemma here is obviously having mixed roles so it's a conflict of interest, so you may actually want to rethink. The technique is fine to use but you may want to rethink: really should it be the researchers doing it, should it not actually be really respondents that are being recruited for that project? Obviously it will involve taking account of a different type of project that will become more expensive as well.

In terms of the technique that's fine, it's like writing a diary because it is up to the respondent how much information they want to disclose. They have control over that so that's fine.

Interviewer: Now basically I'm sure you already know that both the first technique and the second technique are already used. So basically the question is from your experience so far, because you have such massive experience, what should be those things that you and we should put in place in order to protect the good practice in market research from now on?

Participant: I think really understanding all aspects of any technique that has been used, that's quite crucial in this scenario. In the first scenario it became very obvious that despite having one experienced researcher he was not experienced enough to pre-empt that such a situation could arise. So he obviously was not prepared for such a situation and that's one of the worse situations actually. If you're not prepared for any outcome then you are in a really bad situation.

Is there's something in particular that you think of?

Interviewer: No, basically it's just your opinion there.

Participant: I think as long as researchers are really -- they remind themselves that the most important stakeholder is the respondent and for very obvious reasons.

Yes, of course, if there are no longer clients we won't have any projects to work on because nobody will pay us, give us any work. But at the same time if there are no respondents we won't have any projects to work on and report any results.

Interviewer: Any data.

Participant: Yes, exactly, so there won't be any access to data. So I would always go back to really that hierarchy, the respondent is the most important and really the stakeholder that needs to be protected. There is very strong legislation about it and about personal data and personal data not even going to that level, the very personal. But really just your name, your address, your contact details, your date of birth, this is already very, very personal data and there is strong legislation already in place that gives people the right to say I don't want this data to be disclosed, and as a market researcher you have to accept that.

So even if your client asks you, oh, who wrote that comment, can you just let us know, it would be really good to get in touch with the person. If you did not obtain consent from the respondent beforehand there's no way that you're allowed to give out that information. If you do you need to be very clear that you're actually -- you're not only doing something against the code of market research but you're actually something against the law and the company may really get into trouble for doing that. So this is something I think is really good practice and sets apart market research for any direct marketing activities.

Interviewer: But basically based on those companies that are already using the first technique, where do you think they found the gap between ethics, codes of conduct and legal and law so they're practising these techniques?

Participant: I imagine that they probably must have a very long document that they get the respondent to sign beforehand because otherwise they may open up themselves to some litigation or perhaps any other problems with respondents. I think the key is really transparency, so as long as respondents fully understand and fully aware. I mean you can think of other examples like the treatment of new medicines, for example, where people agree to take part in an experiment. Everything is very, very sensitive and they need to sign papers and papers basically to agree that they are aware. They give consent to take on that risk. I think that's probably the only way that you can do it and that's the only way that would be still acceptable to do.

But disclosing the information would definitely be wrong and be bad practice.

Interviewer: What about the second case?

Participant: Well, the second case, again you can't force anyone to disclose any information that they don't want to disclose no matter if he's the researcher himself and having this conflict of interest of wanting the project to go ahead

and have good results. But still if there is hesitation to give that information you can't force anyone. So even in the second case I think it should be clear that for those who decide to participate they have the right to withhold information that they don't want to share.

There may be pressure. I'm sure very well that there could be pressure. There could be pressure from their colleagues. Well, if you agreed in the first instance and now you want to withdraw information there could be that social pressure. There could be pressure from the management saying that we counted on you and now you're withdrawing so it means we may lose the project or we may lose that client. So that pressure could be there as well. You're being pressurised, okay, but actually you may not be very happy in your job any longer. But I think that's the worst case scenario if a respondent is pressurised, that's already a flaw in the research itself.

Interviewer: Yes, it can be, it's true.

Now if I ask you basically to define good marketing research practice what would be those things for you?

Participant: Do you mean in terms of like project management or in terms of when serving respondents?

Interviewer: In every aspect. So overall good marketing research practice, what does it mean for you?

Participant: I think good market research is like if you think about the project and you think about -- you understand the objectives of the client and you can combine the project with the most adequate methodology and using the best technique which is conducive for that objective. Conducting the research in accordance with the code of conduct and delivering actually a good result helps to make decisions. So I think that's good market research.

Interviewer: Thank you very much and basically another thing is about how important is the role of ethics in good marketing research?

Participant: I think it is very important and those two scenarios and cases that you came up with I think they can be quite close to reality in some instances as well. So where it is really about the dilemma that market researchers have, the dilemma between the interests of the respondents and balancing that out versus the interests of your clients and the projects and your management that you're trying to achieve. Yes, definitely ethics I think is important and every market researcher should know the code of conduct of the MRS. In good companies you're trained about it as well. It's nothing that is hidden it's available and whether we know it but just apply it.

Interviewer: So basically from an ethical standpoint how do you manage and achieve basically this balance between the researcher and the respondent?

Participant: I mean thankfully I haven't been in such a situation where it's been such a big dilemma that I have had to handle. These are smaller things like if clients ask you to disclose their information that's very easy to say. I mean I haven't come across any client that would not have understood. So whenever I've explained this is like an anonymous survey and I'm afraid we're not allowed to disclose the respondents' information because they haven't given any consent. I haven't come across any client who has not accepted that.

On the contrary I think that actually it's a good way to really show the client as well that you're a proper market research agency and it's not, okay, whatever the client says you just jump and you just do it. No, there are principles and there are rules as well. So I haven't come across a situation where clients have not accepted that.

I guess a bit of another area that we haven't touched upon is more when clients want specific results to come out. So this is another sensitive area because for whatever reason, internal politics or any objectives that they may have with those results, I've come across clients wanting us to slightly change the results and the reporting. Believe it or not that happens.

Interviewer: Yes, I believe it. The thing is how you handle those situations.

Participant: It's a very difficult one and I think in situations like that it actually requires the management to be involved, I've not given any consent to do that. So in situations that have arisen like this I would have gone to senior management and asked them what they want to do.

Interviewer: So basically from my understanding, when there are cases that there are contradictory values between the different parties in the research then the management should take place and try to manage the situation.

Participant: Definitely management needs to be involved in that and needs to make a decision. The other thing is you need to protect yourself as well only because the client tells you something over the phone and you cannot just do it. So whatever happens there needs to be traceability of communication and that's quite crucial as well to have that written communication.

Interviewer: Yes, that is true.

Now basically overall the very last thing that I have is if somebody's asking you to define or to describe your work ethics, so in the context of market research, what would you say in this case?

Participant: Describe the work ethics?

Interviewer: Yes, just for yourself, from a personal perspective.

Participant: Well, I personally definitely try in any project that I do really to behave according to the code of conduct and not to hide or betray or do anything that would go against that. So I think it's a very important issue, that's why I thought it's really a very interesting research topic that you chose, and especially nowadays with so much marketing activity that is happening that is not market research. So really to distinguish and set yourself apart from those activities I think that's the only way forward and that's the only way that market research in the future will still be relevant.

Then the (why) of the contracts, I think this is the only way as well how market research can protect itself from any more stronger regulation because obviously for lawmakers and governments, for them as well the distinctions become blurred. If it becomes blurred they just treat everything as the same and their regulations become stricter and tighter. I can give you an example for Germany where market research regulation actually has already gone to that length that you're not even allowed to ask the respondent whether they're willing to give their personal information.

So every research project is an anonymous project which can make it very, very difficult because for some projects our clients would require or would want to, especially if it's a satisfaction project and they're trying to find out from stakeholders to actually try to improve the satisfaction. They're obviously are finding something out in the research process and to find out more deeper they would need to or would often have the wish to be able to contact that person. That's something that is no longer possible in Germany and that's because of stronger and more stricter regulation.

I think that also goes back to what's the ethics and what are the principles of market research. So I really think that market research is something great. So I think it's important to have those principles which would be a shame if in the future market research is no longer possible just because people don't trust it any longer, and respondents will no longer be willing to take part.

Interviewer: Yes, that is true.

Thank you very much, very, very interesting things. You did help a lot and now that you basically have mentioned Germany because it's really interesting especially for those first scenarios, for the neuroscience thing. There are a lot of things going on in Germany.

Participant: With an example did you take something that happened in Germany?

Interviewer: No, it's because it's a general trend and it's also becoming very famous in the UK. The thing is that there are a lot of ethical implications there. Basically what is happening is, as you just identified, it's putting up the stake

basically over the whole market research industry. I just picked some extreme cases, so I chose this one because it's very ethical sensitive and also the other one which is about the diaries, the (auto) (inaudible), which is rather sensitive and, as you said, there is a lot of conflict of interest there.

So basically, yes, I've just chosen these two extreme cases.

Participant: Well, I'm originally from Germany so I know this.

Interviewer: That was very interesting. I mean it was a very interesting discussion and thank you very much for that.

Participant: Yes, I can imagine that but nevertheless it's still a very relevant and interesting subject. I really wish you a lot of luck.

Interviewer: Thank you so much and your help was very, very important for me now. I really thank you from the bottom of my heart for investing this time with me.

Participant: You're very welcome.

Appendix 9: Interview transcripts sample (MR respondents)

RNT 8

Interviewer: Just a quick introduction about what am I doing. So I'm trying to conceptualise and understand the ethical decision making in marketing research, and I'm approaching it from the different stakeholders' perspective. So I would like your help actually since you told me that you have some experience as a research respondent. So first of all I would like to ask you a little bit about your background and what type of experience do you have as a respondent for marketing research.

Participant: I'm a first year PhD student in the University of Sheffield and my research area is in marketing itself and I'm looking into the (family decision making) and from children influencing it, especially with respect to environmental behaviour in (inaudible) (consumption). As a marketing research respondent I have participated in two researches, one for (inaudible - background noise) product research which was conducted by a company known as (Name of beverage company). They were coming up with a new kind of drink which was mango flavoured and they had a certain different kind what they called the fizziness and the thickness, and different samples of the drink. They were asking people to come and taste it and things like that. So that was one major one.

Another is general research which usually people ask on the roads to fill up --

Interviewer: Like a survey.

Participant: Survey, yes, on different things.

Interviewer: I don't know whether you want to ask me anything before we start the actual questions or anything?

Participant: I don't have any.

Interviewer: So if you can spend some time on reading the first two scenarios and then we can start our discussion from there.

So, first of all, any particular questions that you have based on the scenarios?

Participant: Any general ones?

Interviewer: Yes. Is there anything that you don't understand from what is described there?

Participant: In this one George and Jenna, are they employees of the company?

Interviewer: No, they are general.

Participant: And the same here as well.

Interviewer: So they are actually --

Participant: General participants.

Interviewer: Participants, yes. In the first case they have acted previously as participants in other methods but they are asked again to participate in the particular study.

Participant: And the second one is general, isn't it, and potentially (inaudible). So George has got experience and John has (inaudible).

Interviewer: He has done it before as a respondent so he has an experience on that.

Now I want you first to tell me about your opinion, what do you think for the two scenarios? Reading and going through the scenarios what are your initial thoughts as a potential respondent?

Participant: If I were a potential respondent?

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant: In the first one both of them involved, it's not a one-off kind of like when you go and do some general feedback giving or survey filling sort of participation. The first one is more medical related and it's a brain scanning which includes the respondent going into the deeper neurography or any other particular process which has got higher risk involved. The similar thing in the second one is mostly more consumption related. You are getting a phone to use and then you have to give it back so the risk level here is lower, and the perception is more marketing orientated here but the direct medical (inaudible) in this one.

Interviewer: So you mentioned risk, what kind of risk?

Participant: The first one -- Well, usually when we think about the brain scanning or understanding scanning we don't basically think any harm on that one. But in general when we ask people to taste anything or when we ask people to go through these sort of process which involves their physical contact with certain rays or anything, which is basically a medical process, we cannot avoid or cannot just ignore the chances of anything going wrong which can harm them on a wider basis. Like in a general way where you fill up surveys --

Interviewer: So what you were saying.

Participant: Yes, in general in questionnaires as well the questions are very neutral. Then obviously it doesn't require the respondent to think or to go ahead of -- or to come out of their comfort zone. But if the questions require some answers

which are kind of coming out of the comfort zone or maybe they want some emotional reactions or they involve some psychological impact, then obviously that's kind of asking the respondents to fight against or struggle against some internal answers and thought process. In that way when we take so much kind of like a process is much more rigorous and tedious in that way to ask for -- the ethical side of it and the approval of the respondent and so on.

In this one it could directly involve a physical contact with certain rays by the medical surrounding. Then obviously the risk of having a physical harm is much more and also the psychological reaction to what will happen if something goes wrong. We know that nothing will go wrong, in 90% of chances nothing will go wrong but then also there's a psychological impact with that one.

In that way that might also threaten the respondent because it was a brain scanning. So if the person is conscious and if the person is very, very -- conscious is again the right word then obviously the brain scanning might not go in the right way what you are looking for. Then when you know that you are being observed for this particular thing then the mind works in two different ways. So in that way it might affect the answer side of it as well and the observation side of it as well.

Interviewer: So the second one is much safer and less risky from that aspect?

Participant: Yes, and also it's much more -- the chances of getting a neutral reply and a much more useful reply are higher in this one than in that one. I don't know, it's my opinion that because among Bob and Anna Bob has already been participating in this sort of brain scanning and he is much more neutral about it. The scanning of his brain waves might come more neutral and more to the point rather than Anna. It might be completely different as well, it's possible that Anna might be much more comfortable in the surrounding and she knows what she's doing. But the (ability) in Anna is higher than Bob, that's what I think.

Interviewer: Now are you familiar with any of these two techniques?

Participant: No, I've never done it.

Interviewer: No, never done it. Now from a respondent's perspective what do you think might be the advantages and the disadvantages for a respondent in participating in these two techniques?

Participant: The first one, again I would say the medical surrounding, the medical setting, so I don't think any direct disadvantage is involved, it's just the conscious side of the mind working, okay, I'm going to do this. The second point might be being a little more uncomfortable when people are observing what's going into your brain in that way. So the feeling of being observed and

being more cautious because you know you are being observed might disrupt the brainwave or something. It's not about the (inaudible) that's coming out and being more cautious that way. So that's it and Anna may become more uncomfortable.

The second one from the respondent's point of view is more comfortable and happy because you're getting a phone at no cost to use and taking your view for (inaudible). It's a good thing because if you have to purchase it you know what exactly you are looking for and you can form your opinion on (inaudible) of that one. In that way you can decide whether you want it or not. So I don't see any problem in that second one.

Interviewer: What about any advantages?

Participant: The second one obviously you're getting a free phone to use and then to play around and to know what kind of company it is and what brand it is. Then as a consumer when you go to buy any phone you will be more informed about the product and the brand as well as the similar kind of phone. You know what you are looking for and how you want to compare rather than reading reviews on some website.

The first one advantages for the respondent, I don't know, maybe just going in and have your own brain scan because it's a (inaudible). It depends what kind of respondent you are, if you are just a neutral one and you are going in just because you kind of liked it and you want to test it, that can be one perception. Then obviously the whole environment will give you an exciting opportunity to participate in such kind of thing.

The second one if you were a little more observant and you want to know how your brain works and what kind of pictures and what kind of colours and strike on which corner, then it might be a different perspective to look at it.

Interviewer: Now the next question I would like to ask you is how keen would you be in participating in these two techniques if you were asked?

Participant: Very much in both of them because both of them are very different and I've never participated in any of these ones. I participated in the (Name of beverage company) product testing and didn't like the way it was designed and the way questions were there. As a consumer I felt empowered at that time because I was giving opinions on some product and I know what kind of tastes are available, and I know what kind of choice I have to make now.

Similarly in this one, for the second one obviously, as I said, it's interesting to keep a phone for a deal and to give a feedback which the company values. I get to know what kind of product and features and other things they're offering. The first one is just very interesting to know what's going on in my brain.

Interviewer: Because of curiosity?

Participant: Yes. It's just very interesting to see what kind of things are going on in my mind. Obviously being a marketing student I will be interested to see the other side of it as well, to see how they decode it and use it to create a very popular magazine cover, and also to see what's the impact of that magazine cover on the wider public, how much useful this technique was.

Interviewer: Now the other thing that I would like to ask you is that from a respondent point of view how would you evaluate them as techniques?

Participant: Both of them are interesting, more involving in the sense the consumer is actually quite involved, as a respondent I'm quite involved in both of them. The second one is more involving in the sense of how it has been taken, my viewpoint is basically affecting a company's perception and the changes and things. Interesting techniques, very interesting.

Interviewer: Now the other thing is about any potential consequences that you may think of coming from those two techniques. So can you think of any potential consequences for a consumer and maybe the general public in using these two techniques?

Participant: To be honest I can't think of anything. I don't know what their sample size is and what their sample of diversity is. With the first one they are going to come up with a cover page and they want respondents' viewpoints on that cover page. It depends, if two people like one cover page or if that's attractive to them it doesn't mean it would be attractive to everyone else, and to see what kind of sampling it is and what age group it is and so on, and what kind of thing they are -- It really doesn't say anything about what kind of cover page it is or what's the topic, what's the area of the cover page. So it might give you a very deep impression in your mind as well.

So that might be something because if I see wording or anything on a cover or in a news that actually makes me uncomfortable and I cannot sleep for a day and night. So that might be an effect in someone else's mind as well.

The second one is obviously the magazine is trying to get a sponsorship so it's basically using the consumer to get a sponsorship rather than asking the consumer to give a feedback for the company. So on a wider perspective I think actually might manipulate the results as well, nobody knows.

Interviewer: How important do you think are those consequences? So, for example, what you said for the first one that it may have an impact on the psychology of the respondents afterwards. So how important do you think is the consequence for you as a respondent to know that it might be there?

Participant: It's important. When as a respondent if I agree to participate or even if I think about participating I would definitely like to know and I guess it's my right to know what can be the consequences of any sort of research. Even if I go and give feedback on certain things I need to know what I'm talking about and if it makes me uncomfortable. Similarly these two techniques which involves the respondent on a very different dimension, it's not only one like you're thinking and doing something. It involves you on a different level and it asks your involvement for certain different time period, for a longer time period as well, then definitely you need to know what the consequences are on a very, very open basis.

Interviewer: From a practical point of view for yourself how easy do you think it would be to participate in either of these two techniques?

Participant: For me it's easy because my interests are different. I'm curious and it sounds very interesting to me, and I guess I keep less responsibility on anything kind of. I'm okay to take this, I'm all right but I guess it won't be that easy for many other different people who are in a family or maybe who are --

Interviewer: Why do you think so for other people?

Participant: Possibly people don't want to go for brain scanning.

Interviewer: Why?

Participant: Just a medical thing, that's it.

Interviewer: Now what do you think would be the practical implications for research respondents in applying these two techniques, these two methods?

Participant: Can you explain the question more?

Interviewer: So, for example, are any of the two techniques going to add something to your life in the future and in what way?

Participant: The second one gives me an idea about the phone and basically makes me more comfortable in using a certain kind of phone and things. Obviously I'll be more informed and equipped as a consumer.

Interviewer: It saves some time in doing marketing research maybe as a consumer?

Participant: Yes, possibly. The first one, I don't know to be honest.

Interviewer: Now regarding the two different types of techniques here, can you compare and contrast and can you think of any similarities or differences between those two techniques?

Participant: Both of them ask for wider involvement, more deeper involvement from the respondent, it's not just one-off, it needs some psychological

preparation. The respondents of both case studies or techniques, one of them is someone who has already participated in the research and the other one is someone who's completely new. So obviously the responses and the comfort level will be completely different and that might affect the response as well.

The first one is actually more direct because the magazine company is doing the research for themselves so there is no other motive involved. So whatever results they are looking for they're looking for very straightforward results so that they can utilise it. The second one a mediator is involved indirectly, the company is not doing it for themselves and the company is doing it to get a sponsorship from a company, another mobile brand. So there's higher chances of doing manipulation in the results coming out of it which might be useful for the company. But might not be as useful for the consumers in that way because obviously they're not going to say they're tired (inaudible) in that way. Yes, that's it.

Interviewer: Any particular worry that you have regarding those two techniques?

Participant: In both of them it doesn't say anything about how much information they have given to their respondents before asking for their participation. I'm not sure if that's a part of the case study or not, it might be a part of the case study as well or not. But that's one for me, it doesn't say anything how much they have disclosed because one person who has --

Interviewer: So for you as a respondent what would you like to see before you know something about the techniques? What would you like to know beforehand?

Participant: I would like to know almost everything, with the first one obviously they want my brain and to measure it.

Interviewer: So what are those things, for example, from both case studies that are missing that you would like to know before you decide what to do?

Participant: The first one obviously the usage of a medical picture for non-medical purposes, I need to know what kind of (inaudible) it's going to be and what kind of equipment is going to be used, what are the consequences. Even there is 1% consequence which can harm in certain types of people or certain kind of things that should be very, very clear. How they're going to use the pictures and the result, if I need to make sure whether they are going to use it just for this purpose and no other thing. No further building up on certain results and stuff because obviously they can utilise it for many other purposes.

I definitely do want to see the picture because that's where the catch of the whole technique is but I would like to have it in writing that this is not going to be used and certain other things. I need to speak to someone who has already participated in that sort -- just refer to a group of people in that way.

The second one --

Interviewer: Would you like to be a person of the general public or would you like to be one of the people involved in the research, so the researchers? Would you prefer to talk to somebody who's a respondent like you and has experienced it before or would you like to talk to the people who are responsible for the research or both of them?

Participant: I guess if I get the chance both of them but the respondent's point of view because I'm on the same so that way. It's possible that I won't understand the researchers. So that kind of something. The second one again, I need to make sure that what I'm using is something which they are going to use later on but in a positive way, they're not going to manipulate it or something. They need to tell me what the purpose of research and everything is. If they don't disclose that they are looking for a sponsorship or what that company is looking for, what that mobile company is going to do with this brand because it doesn't say what they are going to do with it. It's just the brand perception of consumers the company is collecting and that's it. So what they are basically going to do with that and things.

I need to make sure that if something happens to the phone that the blame doesn't come on me.

Interviewer: Yes, that's another thing, a practical thing.

Participant: Because I'm using the phone and (inaudible) test the strength of the body of the phone but if something happened, a software flaw or anything, something happens they are going to blame me.

Interviewer: I would like to tell me from a respondent's point of view what would you consider as good?

Interviewer: In general from a respondent's point of view what would you consider as bad practice in marketing research and what do you consider as good practice in marketing research?

Participant: In this particular case, is it?

Interviewer: In general. If you think of an example then you can have an example of a good one and an example of a bad one.

Participant: From a respondent point of view, any practice which gives me a good idea about what the research is going to be, what are things involved in it, everything will be good because obviously a respondent won't like surprises. If I go for research, to participate in research and then I get to know that whatever it is, it's not made very clear and with all they're expecting to be involved in it.

That would completely disappoint a respondent and also that might affect the replies.

A good practice would be obviously to inform the respondent about each and every aspect of the research and giving a full opportunity to the respondent to decide whether they want to participate or not. Sometimes it doesn't happen because usually everyone struggles for respondents so sometimes they don't do that which shouldn't happen and shouldn't be the case. I was telling you about product research which I participated for (Name of beverage company). I was on the way in Nottingham and they were these old ladies, the company actually used old ladies, not very, very old, I would say mid-50s and so. They were asking respondents to stop and then if they would like to participate. The first thing they said was this is research and you will get £5 for your time. Most of the people were actually getting interested because of the £5.

Interviewer: For a financial incentive, right.

Participant: Yes, because when I went for that research I saw a lot of people who usually you see on the roads who are kind of homeless, you see them on the roads and things. So they were there for those £5 basically. I'm not sure how much good response they got from them because a few of them were actually drinking so how much taste difference they can find out." But, yes, this happens.

So it's not their problem basically, it's a problem of the whole research team. It's not their problem, it's not their fault. It's not the fault of the ladies because they were doing what they were asked to do, it's the whole research design, whoever has designed that research basically should be the one who should be responsible.

Interviewer: Regarding the two techniques from the scenarios, can you see any aspects that reflect bad research and any aspects that reflect good research to those cases?

Participant: Reading the scenarios it doesn't look like that there is some really bad practice in it but obviously it doesn't say much about how much information they have given to the respondents. In both the scenarios the two respondents belong to a completely different outlook, one person has already participated in a similar kind of research and the other person has not participated. So obviously the demand for information and the level of curiosity among both the participants will be different. Both the scenarios do not say anything about how much information has been disseminated or has been given before asking them to participate. It just says that they have been asked and approached. Even though they have been given the time of three days which is a good practice but they haven't been asked like will you take this mobile and go and use it, etc.

Giving them time to think about it and an indication that they have been told about the motives of the research and the process of the research and that's how they have been given time to think about whether they want to participate which sounds a good practice. Otherwise I don't think the magazine has told the participants that they are going to get sponsorship. But I don't know how much a participant should know and there's always a kind of a balance or imbalance between how much a participant should know and how much information you can give to them.

Interviewer: Now regarding yourself, is there any case where you participated in a research that was for marketing purposes that you felt uncomfortable about something, something that you didn't like? You said previously for the (Name of beverage company) case that there were those people that were maybe drunk. How did you feel about being in the same position with them?

Participant: No, I didn't like the whole way it was because the way those ladies were inviting which was okay. They had this small, little questionnaire on a clipboard with them and they were asking, okay, this company is coming out with new drinks and they want to know from a consumer's point of view on the taste and things but nothing more. The place which they hired was not very good. It was on the main street but it was like a (inaudible) church and inside of it was a little dark and things. The arrangement was pretty okay, there were tables and there was one person assigned to each respondent, and they were filling out questionnaires.

I found that the lady who was actually sitting with me filling up questionnaires she was a little less informed about the whole questions herself. There were some questions because when I asked her she couldn't reply back and things like that. Then there was another lady who looked like a boss, maybe she was the one who was actually handing over the envelopes of money, and she had a bad attitude towards that lady, the other one who was actually taking my answers.

Obviously the drinks and everything were okay, I got to drink a lot of different tastes and a few of them were really, really bad. Then they were actually asking anyone and everyone to come in which according to me was not appropriate in the form of research response. So there were not many people as I told you because it took quite a long time. I stayed with them for around half an hour.

I now remember why the boss lady was not very fair with the other lady. It was because that other lady was taking a little longer to fill in the questionnaire for me. I didn't have any problem because the lady was a little old and she was trying and I figured out that she was doing for the first time. But the problem was they were asking everyone and anyone and the place and everything, the environment was not very comfortable.

Interviewer: Now from a respondent's point of view what do you think are those motives or those reasons that would make a respondent participate in a research? So obviously, as you mentioned, it may be those £5, a financial incentive.

Participant: Financial benefit I guess is one of the most important and most attractive thing. The other thing is anyone who is -- likes free samples, free, edible samples or anything like that or sometimes people just do it for fun's sake. So if it's something which invites fun or something interesting or something different people might do it that way, or else maybe a small group of people like me or anyone who is interested in those things that are different maybe.

Interviewer: Now do you consider the fact that you decided to take part in this particular research was made entirely up to you or was there something else apart from your personal motives?

Participant: No, definitely those ladies were really, really pushy. Obviously it's not their fault, I guess their wages were how many people they actually bring in or something like that. They were asking people quite -- They were putting a lot of thought into asking people and stopping them and asking them in that way because the lady who asked me -- Actually I had a little time, my classes were supposed to start at 11.00 and I was there at 10.00 so I thought why not, let's go there and let's see how it works. But the other people were a little too (inaudible) in that way.

Interviewer: The other thing that I would like to ask you is who would you consider the most important stakeholders in practising good marketing research?

Participant: I guess it's the respondent and the researcher both because -- The respondent definitely because if the respondent is participating in the research then a participant is much more open to different outside effects rather than a researcher because a researcher has designed it. As I said last time as well, the participant is the most vulnerable person in the whole design. But from the researcher point of view as well I would say that practising a good research and doing good practice is really important for a long-term perspective. You can manipulate results or you can manipulate the design but it will affect the model of the research.

So obviously getting the proper result, if your whole idea is getting an honest result and contributing some (inaudible) towards the research then obviously you need an honest design and an honest analysis, and more ethical analysis. But if you want a more articulated and good result or maybe designed result obviously you might go ahead with something (inaudible)

Interviewer: Yes, generally approved in a way.

Participant: Yes.

Interviewer: The other thing that I want to ask is what would you intend to do if you were in the position of those researchers in the scenarios, going back to the scenarios? So looking at the first one we have two respondents here. What would you do if you were in the case of the first one and what would you do if you were -- So if you were in the case of Bob would you participate in the research?

Participant: Yes. As I said earlier as well, I'm curious about this whole research design and how it works and what it comes out and things like that. So for me personally it is interesting and I would participate.

Interviewer: Would that be the case if you were Anna?

Participant: Yes.

Interviewer: So it doesn't matter whether you had experience before or not?

Participant: No, it doesn't matter at all because both the designs are very, very interesting to me and I'm curious to see how it's been designed and how it influences some things, that is why I want to participate.

Interviewer: No, it's fine because there are people like that anyway.

Participant: So it's pretty good to say, okay, that looks interesting.

Interviewer: Now the other thing is what do you think eventually those people in the scenarios did?

Participant: There are possibilities of Anna saying no and Bob has already done that and he has been approached again. On the first instance he didn't show any negative feedback, on the first time when he participated. So the possibilities are higher in Anna of saying no than Bob. The possibilities are there in Bob as well. Both of them can say no but the possibilities of saying yes is higher in Bob.

Definitely in the second scenario George is not going to say no most probably because there is no feel of harm or anything in holding to it. I guess if they consider writing each and every single experience it will be a tedious job because it is tedious. You have to be very, very careful and truthful and things like that. So if they considered that particular aspect to be a little tedious then the possibilities are that John can see there.

Interviewer: I don't know whether you'd like to add anything else, if not then we can move to the second set of the scenarios.

Participant: We can move to the second scenarios.

Interviewer: In the second set it's actually the same methods but it's actually including some ethical concerns in here. So if you can spend some time then we can move on with the discussion.

Okay, so reading how the scenarios actually change what is your opinion about the two methods? What is going on the scenarios this time?

Participant: The first one is quite close to what I expected that people can get a little stressed and fearful when they come in front of the scanner, and also other people can see what's going on in their brain even though they cannot decode all the (inaudible). But then also it's both the scenarios (inaudible) for the individuals in front of other people which is, I guess, a common factor in any of the research and the respondents feel the same thing. I was saying last time as well that when the questions are -- even in the questionnaire survey if the questions are something which is related to a very sensitive topic then obviously sometimes the respondents don't feel comfortable in doing that.

Interviewer: But compared to traditional questionnaires or even if you would consider those two methods more intrusive or more trying to get more insight and therefore they're getting into more sensitive paths in a way.

Participant: Yes, definitely because even if the questionnaire is there respondents have the ability and have the way of just choosing from the available statements so that's kind of like restricting and very, very structured. In these scenarios and in the questionnaire the respondent when they decide to leave it in between it's not something which they feel so stress about. Both the scenarios because the whole body and the whole lifestyle and the daily routine is involved then obviously it is more into yourself. It gives them a feeling of opening up everything in front of people that way.

Interviewer: So how does this feel for you as a potential respondent? So is it something that may scare you or may make you think twice or do you don't have a problem at all?

Participant: I don't have a problem with the first one definitely. Again I would say, yes, there is a problem with other people reading what's going on in my mind but then also I'm too curious to know what's happening and how they use it and how they decode it. It's just the brainwaves off -- It's just a brain scan of my brain -- the scan of my brain on that particular part when I am actually looking at that picture and that makes any movement in my mind. So it doesn't expose any more aspects of my life into that, in that I'm pretty okay.

Interviewer: Now I don't know whether you have experienced something similar from what is described in the scenarios. Have you?

Participant: Never.

Interviewer: Now from a respondent's point of view, what do you think can be the ethical concerns from what is described now in the scenarios? Is there anything above what is already there that you can think of as a medical concern?

Participant: A longer-term effect, I guess.

Interviewer: Such as what long-term effect?

Participant: Because in both the scenarios both the respondents are actually more stressed about the idea of getting exposed in front of strangers, so the security issue. The second one is setting a real security issue and if I have been asked to report each and every activity of my day, and that particular journal is going to someone else. Even though they say that they're not going to use it or anonymity is going to be maintained but there are higher chances of breach of security in that sense. So, yes, that looks like a big problem for that one.

Obviously sharing your thoughts and sharing your brainwaves can be okay for some areas but sharing your daily life might not be a comfortable scenario for me.

Interviewer: Now what do you think people like you or people who may be potential respondents would do if they were in these two scenarios?

Participant: I would again go for it, the first one definitely. The second one obviously I would like to ask (inaudible) to leave it whenever I can if I don't feel comfortable. I'm not sure if in this case it is because the response back doesn't make it clear that if they had been given the chance or they had been given (inaudible) to leave it. If that's not been given I wouldn't participate in that way.

Interviewer: Now moving away from the scenarios and in general which will you consider the major ethical issues in research for marketing because obviously these are techniques that are being used, specifically the first one is really evolving? So new things are coming up and obviously new issues may come up as well. So what can you think as major ethical issues for now and for the future?

Participant: I do not see anything for the future because the more the techniques get evolved obviously the new issues and the new dimensions will come in front. But looking at who is your respondent because obviously I'm an adult and I can take responsibility for myself and I can decide on it. But there are children, there are old age people, there are people in different other conditions who are much volatile in front of -- in participating in these sort of scenarios. So to take responsibility of those people and to make sure that their replies are being protected and secured and their anonymity has been made sure. The research in my mind is not stressful and they have been given a full idea of what's being

asked and why it's being asked, and a comfortable environment has been created.

So obviously all these things which are very general but are very, very important and it's important to actually think about. It's also important to consider and be very, very practical and be very, very strict on these rules.

Interviewer: But do you think these new techniques that are coming up from new disciplines we should be even more careful on conducting marketing research, even stricter maybe?

Participant: Yes, because obviously the thing is in marketing research the impact of the research and the result of the research is wider. It's not only the respondent it's the whole wider community because the whole research is not going to be just (inaudible) to one particular segment. So that way it has to be a little strict and since the nature of the marketing research is something where you need to speak to the actual people, the actual respondents who are going to use the product or who are going to be a participant or a stakeholder in some point, then you cannot ignore the point that the people are going to be a part of it. There has to be some stricter rules into that.

Interviewer: Yes, research that is approached from a holistic point of view so considering everybody.

Participant: Yes, just like in medical research. They put a lot more strict rules and to get approval for any medical -- and that's important as well for the better good of the humankind. It's important to give these and it's important to ask those people to participate in that but then also to ensure the rights and the values of those people is important, similarly in marketing research as well. Since now the scenario is something that it's getting bigger and bigger and newer and newer techniques are coming in obviously it has to be much stricter.

Interviewer: I would like to ask you actually if you could tell me in an hierarchical order, starting from the most important constraints for you as a potential respondent in participating in a specific study for marketing purposes. So what would be the most important things that would stop you, prevent you from participating in order? What would be the most important one and going to the least important one? It doesn't have to be 10, for example, I mean the ones that come.

Participant: Getting information would be the most important one.

Interviewer: Lack of information then the first thing that would stop you from --

Participant: Yes, lack of information and lack of open information and honest information. It shouldn't be like being told something or a part of it and then when I go and participate I get to know about the whole scenario. It shouldn't

be like that so information and lack of information definitely. The second thing will be liberty to leave. If I don't have that, if there is a contract or anything I definitely don't want to participate in that one.

The third one, if the research design and the place where I have to participate is not very comfortable, comfortable in the sense I don't want to be a lavish thing but the whole idea of it should be very comfortable and should be clear what can be the after effects of that one.

Interviewer: So going back to the (Name of beverage company) case when you told me that the place wasn't that nice and it was quite dark and you felt a little bit weird there, would you do it again?

Participant: No, I wouldn't. I stayed there till the end because I was curious and I wanted to see how they are doing it and what are the things in the questionnaire and stuff. Again, given a chance I won't because I have found what I wanted. As a general respondent, no.

Interviewer: If everything was okay, so the environment was nice, would you do it again?

Participant: Yes.

Interviewer: So it's about good practice so that you can retain your (inaudible).

Participant: Definitely.

Interviewer: I don't know whether you have any other constraints to add?

Participant: If you can give me some hints can I tell you.

Interviewer: It can be anything. If I come now with a question as to what would be those things that would make you say no?

Participant: I can't think of anything else. There might be something but I can't think of it.

Interviewer: Again the same thing, I want you in order to give me the most important things that would make you participate in a specific study. So starting from the most important one and then --

Participant: Again the same thing actually.

Interviewer: So about curiosity.

Participant: The information and curiosity and the research design. Again if the research design is good and interesting I will definitely participate. Obviously the information they are conveying is good then obviously I would and sometimes I just do it because I feel sympathy for the researcher. If someone is

standing somewhere and looking for people to reply and then I really feel sympathy.

Interviewer: I can understand that.

Participant: Yes, that's one of the things as well.

Interviewer: Now going back to the scenarios, to what degree do you think those dilemmas would stop you from taking part if you were in those respondents' positions?

Participant: The first one I wouldn't, I would be a little uncomfortable. I might be, I might not be as well because I know what's going to be there and just my own perceptions about the whole research. In the second one I might because you never know. You don't know how much you are opening up yourself at the start and how much it is demanding. It can be said that, okay, you have to write it every day and then when you start doing it then you can actually (inaudible) how much you are actually expected to do in that way, definitely.

The second one is much more uncomfortable for me.

Interviewer: So what do you the people in the scenarios eventually did? For example, why do you think Bob decided not to go for it and then you have Anna who is actually going but she doesn't know what -- she is in an uncomfortable position as well.

Participant: Maybe it's the same thing with regard to what's happening with Bob and he participated for the first time and he might have experienced the same thing. He didn't want to go through the whole thing again and that's how he decided not to go for it. There are possibilities again then if Anna will keep feeling the same stress and stress of not leaving because of the embarrassment and so on. Then it's possible that once she would get a chance of not participating she won't. So possibly next time she won't start.

Interviewer: What about the second scenario?

Participant: I guess John will leave, it looks like because he was feeling very, very uncomfortable. He's feeling very uncomfortable and he has in her mind a struggle between how honest he can be and how open he can be. If a person who is thinking, okay, I'm not going to say this then it's a completely different thing because that person is much more straight and decided what to do. Now they just (inaudible) obviously it might lead to something else.

Interviewer: I have a couple of questions which are more like propositions. So from a respondent's point of view if you were asked to address those dilemmas described and the ethical issues raised actually in the two scenarios what would you propose?

Participant: To contrast these two issues?

Interviewer: Yes, contrast those issues.

Participant: In this one it can be -- well, they would have arranged a meeting between Bob and Anna or maybe someone who has successfully finished and again coming up, so that Anna was fully informed about what can be the mental state to do that. Both scenarios, like Bob who's is not ready participate: why is he not ready to participate and the other one who is again ready to participate, so what's going on? Again, if Anna is not feeling comfortable and she asks that she don't want anyone else to be present, she don't want anyone else to be observing her in that way, so it can be arranged.

So a scenario where she has actually seen other people looking directly inside her brain in her presence would have maybe prevented in that way. Because her (inaudible) idea basically to open up her mind to someone else and specifically not the mind just the brainwaves. She is just assuming that people decode it because I don't think anyone can decode the brainwaves, that's what you are thinking in that way. So all this information if it is clear.

Second thing, she would have been given a very fair and clear indication that she can leave any time and there is nothing in it because she's feeling embarrassed to leave it. Then obviously she should have given a proper environment which she says that you can leave and there's nothing wrong in it. So that might dilute her (inaudible) and dilute her anxiousness as well.

Similarly in the second one, if John would have met George before she would have made his decision in a much more informed way. Then he would have known what is expected and what is not and in that detail George would have explained what are the things you can actually go through, and then it would have been a more informed decision rather than just going into other than curiosity. Again, the liberty of leaving at midway and denying of (somebody) anything would be there. It's like even if I can go ahead with the whole research but I'm not happy and I'm not comfortable in submitting the whole journal. I can submit you this chunk and this chunk and this chunk. So this (inaudible) if that was there then she would have been more comfortable.

Interviewer: Now from a respondent's point of view, I mean what you said was mainly what the researchers to do to prevent those. From a respondent's point of view what do you think are those things that you would propose actually for the respondents to protect themselves, in order not to be in positions like that?

Participant: Ask questions. If you think that there is some doubt don't just rely on the person that he or she is giving you every information, ask questions. Ask those because you are the one who is going to be inside that first scenario not anyone else. So rather than feeling embarrassed it's your right to leave it. You

have to be aware of that thing, that there is nothing wrong in leaving in between.

Interviewer: From a respondent's point of view, what do you think is the importance of good marketing research? Why is it important to have good practice in marketing research for the respondent?

Participant: Because the respondent is actually the most volatile person inside the whole scenario. That person is actually opening himself or herself to give researchers some ideas about something which is a proposed issue, so it's important. It's very, very important to ensure the confidence of the respondent and also to make the respondent comfortable, and also to get proper answers because if the respondent is a little stressed or the respondent is not feeling that comfortable and open obviously the answers are not going to come right. So if you really want to know it's really important for the respondent to feel comfortable.

Interviewer: Now the other thing that I would like to ask, it's one of the last things actually, is what do you consider is acceptable in research for marketing and what would you consider as unacceptable?

Participant: Pressure definitely unacceptable, pressure of any kind. Openness, liberty, definitely acceptable. Information, as much as one should give and as much as one deserves, acceptable. Free gifts acceptable. Sharing of results acceptable because then if a respondent is curious about what's happening next that person should have access to know what's happening next that way. Any kind of uncomfortable (moment) or (unconferred) is not acceptable at all.

Interviewer: What is ethical and what is unethical for you in marketing research?

Participant: I think any kind of scenario or any kind of environment which makes me feel pressurised is completely unethical. Lack of information is unethical, hiding of information is unethical because if they give me all the information on one (inaudible) but you are clever enough to hide something, or maybe articulate some things in such a way that I cannot acknowledge at that point but I'd realise it later on. So those sort of things are unacceptable, completely unethical because that makes me feel cheated later on or maybe under stress and uncomfortable later on so that shouldn't be the case, completely unethical.

Interviewer: This is the last question that I have for you. If I ask you actually overall what is ethics for marketing research what would you tell me in a couple of sentences or in one sentence?

Participant: It's really difficult actual because --

Interviewer: It is, it's a very broad question.

Participant: Yes, ethics in itself is a very undefined and you cannot define it. For me it's doing the right thing but the right is different for different people that's why it's differing and difficult. But, as I said, for marketing research because the impact of that research is very right, very deep, so it's very, very important to do the right thing.

Interviewer: But for you I mean ethical marketing research is about doing the right thing?

Participant: Yes, it's always the right thing and if it is right then the means and the ends both will be right, and if it is something fishy in it and there's something obviously then it's not going to be right.

Interviewer: Okay, thank you very much. I mean this was everything. I don't know whether you would like to add anything or ask me anything?

Participant: I'm okay, yes.

[End of file]

Appendix 10: Original research proposal for Ethics Approval

Project Proposal

Researcher: Iva Bimpli

Project Title: Conceptualising ethical decision-making in marketing research from multiple-stakeholder perspectives – A holistic approach

Background and Rationale for the Research

Within the marketing discipline, marketing research remains an under-researched field (Malhotra & Miller, 1998) regarding decision-making when ethical issues arise. Nowadays a need for research in ethical decision-making in marketing research becomes even more evident since marketing research is becoming even more ethically sensitive due to influences from other disciplines, while it is a fact that the ethically sensitive nature of marketing is tightly linked to the ethical issues in marketing research that are associated with the stakeholders involved in or affected by marketing practices (Lund, 2001).

In the scholarly literature, ethical decision-making in marketing is heavily based on findings of empirical studies that examined marketing practitioners, while groups such as marketing researchers and especially research respondents are the most under-researched groups. Moreover, the ethical decision-making models developed in the marketing context take a business perspective only (Malhotra & Miller, 1998, Malhotra, 2011). While this is applicable within the business environment, it does not capture how the business and all its functions (e.g. marketing) interact with its external environment. Therefore, ethical decision-making in marketing research

should be considered as a multiple-stakeholders-centric, rather than a business-centric (Malhotra & Birks, 2007).

The current study focuses on understanding and explaining decisions made by different stakeholders in marketing research when ethical issues become apparent. Therefore, the current study aims to holistically conceptualise ethical decision-making in marketing research from multiple-stakeholder perspectives. To clarify that the term '*ethical decision-making*' refers, in the current study, to the decisions made when ethical issues arise, not to making moral decisions. For this purpose the factors that influence marketing researchers and research participants to decide about marketing research methods that generate ethical issues are explored. Moreover, the current study is not concerned with the prediction of behaviours (likewise descriptive ethical decision-making models and models of behaviour). Rather than that, this study aims to explain the influences on decisions regarding contemporary marketing research methods in an attempt to develop a model of ethical decision-making in marketing research. In order to do so this study attempts to provide an answer to the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How does a MR researcher make a decision on whether to adopt, or not, a particular technique that raises ethical dilemmas/issues?

Research Question 2: How is the MR researcher's EDM process conceptualised when influenced by other moral agents, such as the MR respondents?

Research Question 3: What other factors influence, and in what way, the MR researcher's behavioural intention whether to adopt a particular techniques that raises ethical dilemmas/issues?

Linked to the above questions are the following research objectives of this study. These are:

Objective 1: To develop a theoretical understanding of MR researchers' decision-making process in an ethical context.

Objective 2: To investigate the social implications (i.e. as reflected by the considerations of the MR respondents) of MR researchers' decisions in ethical situations.

Objective 3: To investigate individual, situational and contextual factors that influence the formulation of decisions made in ethical matters in marketing research.

Methodology

This project will involve qualitative interviews with two groups of salient stakeholders involved in marketing research; these are marketing researchers and marketing research respondents. Therefore, both the "active" and the "passive" primary stakeholders in marketing research are included in the conceptualization of ethical decision-making in marketing research. For each group 10-15 interviews will be conducted, of a total of 20-30 interviews. The actual number will be finalised based on the quality of the data gathered during the interviews, for this reason the two populations will be sampled to saturation.

Moreover, the current study deals with a sensitive topic (i.e. ethics), therefore projective techniques (indirect questioning) will be used to minimise 'socially desirable responding'. The usage of indirect questioning will also help the respondents of the current study to feel less distressed or emotionally challenged by the research process.

Furthermore, the interviews will be based on scenarios developed by the researcher and provided to the participants. For each group of participants, slightly different scenarios are developed. In the case of the marketing researchers, two scenarios

describing contemporary, but ethically contentious marketing research techniques (neuromarketing and autoethnography) are given prior to the interview questions. These scenarios will include two ethical issues that exist in marketing research and two ethical issues that appeared due to the interdisciplinary nature of these techniques. In the case of the marketing respondents, another pair of scenarios is developed. This second pair of scenarios describes the same marketing research techniques and the same ethical issues, but the language used is simpler, thus less sophisticated professional terminology is used. Therefore, the respondents can get a better understanding of the situation, and hence confusion and misinterpretation will be avoided.

Recruitment

The participants will be recruited using purposive sampling. The researcher will recruit two types of participants: 1) active marketing researchers from a variety of companies, from different sectors, in the UK who are engaged in research for marketing, 2) individuals who have acted as respondents in research for marketing (this includes filling out questionnaires and participating in interviews/focus groups or other market research methods). Both groups will be recruited from a list of contacts of the researcher. Moreover, the researcher will check with them their initial willingness to help with the research and then those who will express such interest will be informed by the researcher of the interview details.

Guidance for the In-Depth Interview Questions

As this is a qualitative study, the data collected will be very rich. The interviews will aim to gain an insight and an in-depth understanding of different marketing research stakeholders' decision-making when ethical issues appear. Therefore, the diversity and the subjectivity of the participants will be offered for a rich analysis. Moreover, the interviews are semi-structured and divided into two parts. The first part is themed

based on the conceptual framework that resulted from the gaps and the findings in the literature. The second part utilises dialectic inquiry, therefore in the second part of the interview the first group of interviewees (marketing respondents) will be asked to develop a plan (proposal) to make the examined contemporary marketing research techniques ethically friendly to the stakeholders involved or affected by. This will be followed by a short list of key assumptions underlying this plan. Similarly, the counter-proposal group (marketing researchers) will develop their own plans based on their key assumptions. The examination of different stakeholders with competing interests or motivations through dialectic inquiry techniques will lead to a final framework that reflects the synthesis of these competing/conflicting viewpoints (Cosier, 1981). This will promote ethical strategic decision-making in marketing research. Furthermore, all the information provided will be handled as highly confidential, in strict anonymity. Finally, the interviews will be analysed using thematic analysis.

Confidentiality of responses

As previously mentioned all information provided by the participants of this study will be considered as highly confidential and handled in strict anonymity. This will protect both the participants and the companies in which they work for or the companies in which they act as respondents.

Dissemination

The findings will be used in a PhD thesis and may be also in further publication but anonymity will be preserved.

Appendix 11: MR researchers' identified factors with example quotes from the interview transcripts

Themes	Subject	Example
Marketing researcher's moral identity - Their research ideology	#10	<i>"I am traditionalist when it comes to methods" and "not so keen on new ones" when could not "see the benefit straight off"</i>
The perceptions towards unknown consequences and their moral imagination	#6	<i>"When things are new and the consequences unknown there is heat and possible conflicts"</i>
	#5	<i>"As soon as we heard enough of that we felt more comfortable that actually that's a good thing to do or an appropriate thing to do".</i>
Risk perceptions and tolerance	#8	<i>"It's just not an issue at all...the neurophysiologists do this stuff dozens of times every single day... but if you're not used to doing it, it could be quite uncomfortable"</i>
Informational social influences – The Passive and the Active Salient Referent Groups	#7	<i>"I would ring the MRS to check with them if this is okay"</i>
	#6	<i>"A good marketing research practice is one which adheres to the objectives of its client sponsors....which does the right thing by its respondents and treats them with respect and gives them absolute clarity about what they're engaged in.....rather than in any way misleading them or abusing their trust".</i>
	#4	<i>"I would follow the codes of conduct of the MRS, because they know better".</i>
	#5	<i>"I'd also want to speak to other organisations that had used this method to see if they actually got anything out of it before I committed to being associated with it"</i>
Commercial considerations – Industry type and competitiveness	#8	<i>"If you are a brand leader part of your competitive advantage can be derived from utilising techniques ahead of your opponents if they give you a better understanding and insight", and new techniques "are used by companies as a competitive advantage"</i>
Methodological considerations – Methods characteristics and resources	#9	<i>"If a method is not fully evidenced of getting to the real truth, then this is an issue especially for those who utilise and apply the findings"</i>
	#2	<i>"Diary method has been for a long time around, and this (autoethnography) is a form of a diary method, so it is more straightforward to me, it generates less ethical issues than the other one (neuromarketing)"</i>
	#1	<i>"Scenario two (autoethnography)has been for longer time around, so in that respect I might feel less uncomfortable with it"</i>

Appendix 12: MR respondents' identified factors with example quotes from the interview transcripts

Themes	Subject	Example
Marketing respondents' character individualism preference utilitarianism	#1	<i>"I do have a strong sense of ethicality..., but you sometimes need to defend your piece, if you like, in terms of defending your ability to live your life as you feel"</i>
	#4	<i>"I don't see any direct benefit to me in engaging in this research"</i>
Uncertainty and risks	#4	<i>"So the first one the health worries a bit because I'm not certain unless I've really been informed about what the consequences of this brain scan is."</i>
	#6	<i>"The brain scan, it kind of makes you worry about the future: will I have some chip implanted in my brain or somewhere and scanning things. It's kind of a sci-fi scenario"</i>
Self perceptions – The social and the private self	#10	<i>"I won't want to be seen as the weird one by the researchers conducting the research, so I would keep quiet".</i>
	#2	<i>"Our civilisation is built under a few principles that we all must respect, and being ethical for me is anything that falls within those principles, I consider myself very sensitive on this"</i>
Past experience – Prototype and personal past experiences	#8	<i>"After participating in this R. [beverage company] experiment I wouldn't do it again, I felt bored and manipulated"</i>
	#1	<i>"I've experienced once in my life when I was about 16, 17, a situation where I felt unable to withdraw from something because it had gone on. After that experience I think I vowed never to put myself in that situation again and I'll tell you what it was. I did, I felt abused, I really did feel like -- I felt quite kind of sordid afterwards and I thought that is never happening to me ever again."</i>
	#6	<i>"Since my adolescence I have been scared of small places, so getting through the brain scan, I wouldn't do it...this is getting too far... I am claustrophobic"!</i>
Hindering factors – Research Timeframe, setting and commitment required	#5	<i>"If it's taking much of my time without the appropriate incentive, then no thanks, the research might not be appropriate for me".</i>
	#3	<i>"When I'm asked to consent to research that is going to increase the profits of a company then I'm not interested at all...you have to be informed of the purpose of the research".</i>

Appendix 13: Sample of interview transcript coding (MR respondents)

Question	Response	Coding
<p>3. What do you think for the two scenarios? Reading and going through the scenarios what are your initial thoughts as a potential respondent? – <u>General Beliefs</u></p>	<p>In the first one both of them involved, it's not a one-off kind of like when you go and do some general feedback giving or survey filling sort of participation. The first one is more medical related and it's a brain scanning which includes the respondent going into the deepertnosography or any other particular process which has got higher risk involved. The similar thing in the second one is mostly more consumption related. You are getting a phone to use and then you have to give it back so the risk level here is lower, and the perception is more marketing orientated here but the direct medical (inaudible) in this one.</p> <p>The first one – Well, usually when we think about the brain scanning or understanding scanning we don't basically think any harm on that one. But in general when we ask people to taste anything or when we ask people to go through these sort of process which involves their physical contact with certain rays or anything, which is basically a medical process, we cannot avoid or cannot just ignore the chances of anything going wrong which can harm them on a wider basis. Like in a general way where you fill up surveys –</p> <p>Yes, in general in questionnaires as well the questions are very neutral. Then obviously it doesn't require the respondent to think or to go ahead of-- or to come out of their comfort zone. But if the questions require some answers which are kind of coming out of the comfort zone or maybe they want some emotional reactions or they involve some psychological impact, then obviously that's kind of asking the respondents to fight against or struggle against some internal answers and thought process. In that way when we take so much kind of like a process is much more rigorous and tedious in that way to ask for – the ethical side of it and the approval of the respondent and so on.</p> <p>In this one it could directly involve a physical contact with certain rays by the medical surrounding. Then obviously the risk of having a physical harm is much more and also the psychological reaction to what will happen if something goes wrong. We know that a thing will go wrong in 99% of chances because will go wrong but that also there's a psychological impact with that one.</p> <p>In that way that might also threaten the respondent because it was a brain scanning. So if the person is conscious and if the person is very, very – conscious is again the right word then obviously the brain scanning might not go in the right way what you are looking for. Then when you know that you are being observed for this particular thing then the mind works in two different ways. So in that way it might affect the answer side of it as well and the observation side of it as well.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk perceptions <li>Harm considerations <li>Hindering factors <li>Ethical sensitivity <li>Harm considerations & perceived risks <li>Behavioural constraints <li>Moral Imagination