

**THE ETHICS OF GLOBAL MARKETING:
AN EVOLUTIONARY APPROACH**

Oswald Mascarenhas
Saint Aloysius College
Mangalore-575022
India

Ram Kesavan
University of Detroit Mercy
4001 W McNichols Rd
Detroit MI 48221
USA

Michael Bernacchi
University of Detroit Mercy
4001 W McNichols Rd
Detroit MI 48221
USA

Corresponding Author: Ram.Kesavan@UDMercy.edu

ABSTRACT

With all the recent changes in the global marketing arena, global management ethical responsibilities in general and global marketing ethical responsibilities in particular, increase. Global distributive justice in marketing calls for extensive global cooperation, including a commitment from multinational corporations to help “distribute” prosperity to the less fortunate among us. Our central thesis is that since global marketing is the generalization of all domestic to non-domestic marketing strategies and institutions, the former should include the ethical imperatives of all the latter institutions. Specifically, we invoke the normative theory of distributive justice to spell out the micro ethical imperatives of global marketing. We trace the evolution of global marketing from its predecessor domestic to non-domestic marketing strategies and institutions and derive ethical imperatives for global marketers.

INTRODUCTION

During the last four to five decades, domestic marketing strategies have evolved and expanded into many non-domestic marketing areas such as export marketing, foreign

marketing, international marketing, multinational marketing, and global marketing. These strategies have also penetrated via several intermediaries such as multi-cultural marketing, multi-domestic marketing, pan-regional marketing, transnational and Internet marketing. Recently, there has been significant interest on issue concerning business ethics among multinationals firm (Budden and Budden 2011; Chan, Fung and Yau 2009; Chitakornkijsil 2011; Choi, Kim and Kim 2010; McKinney and Moore 2008; Pies 2010). In this article, we review the historical transitioning of domestic to global marketing strategies and evaluate its evolution from the viewpoint of the ethical normative theory of distributive justice. An analysis of the evolutionary process can unravel institutional and well-accepted ethical and moral imperatives. The historical evolution of domestic to global marketing provides a rational justification for its ethical imperatives.

The emergence and sustained management of global resources, human skills, production, distribution and marketing imply many new or augmented corporate responsibilities. Global corporations have progressively become aware of this and have, therefore, sought a united front to reflect and formulate some commonly agreed responsibilities. Their first outcome was the *Caux Round Table Principles for Socially Responsible Business Practices* formulated in Caux, Switzerland by executives from representative global corporations. The goal of the principles was to set a world standard against which business behavior could be assessed, a yardstick that individual multinational or global companies could use to write their own business codes. The grounding principles are rooted in two basic ethical ideals: *human dignity* (sacredness and value of each person as an end, and not simply as a means to the goals of others), and *koysei* (a Japanese term for living and working together for the common good that enables cooperation and mutual prosperity with healthy and fair competition).

The Caux Principles offer a basic ethical background against which concrete global corporate ethics behavior must be assessed. The Principles, however, need much more specificity and teeth. The Caux Principles are macro-ethical principles that require detailed micro ethical and moral imperatives. This paper provides such detail. Our approach is new in several ways: a) We are blueprinting micro the ethics of global marketing as opposed to global corporate ethics that the Caux Principles represent; b) We derive the evolution of global marketing ethical principles by tracing the growth of domestic marketing to global marketing via several intermediary strategies and institutions that postures the principles as being a posteriori rather than a priori as does the Caux Principles; c) We invoke the normative theory of distributive justice, both individual and social justice principles to global marketing ethics in a comprehensive manner..

This paper, accordingly, has three parts: 1) Historical development of domestic to global marketing strategies and institutions; 2) Discussion and presentation of the theory of Distributive Justice, and 3) Derivation of micro ethical and moral imperatives from the evolution of domestic to global marketing. In sum, we discuss practical managerial and marketing implications of these ethical imperatives.

A HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC TO

GLOBAL MARKETING STRATEGIES

We trace the historical evolution of various marketing strategies and institutions from domestic to global marketing as they developed in the history of corporate strategy. This evolution is best characterized into three distinct stages: strategies and institutions that primarily focused: a) on marketing of goods and services; b) on production and marketing of goods and services; and c) on the entire process of management from product design to market launch.

Marketing Strategies that Focus Primarily on Marketing:

Domestic Marketing: Historically marketing starts as the selling of domestically produced products and services. Companies are designated as domestic if their foreign content (as measured by percentage of sales, operating profits, employees, and assets) is less than, say, 10 to 15 percent (Quian 1998). In the initial stage, the innovating company produces and markets the product at home to its growing market (Wells 1968), and marketing, therefore, targets its domestic market (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998: 4). Thus, historically the first marketing strategy is always domestic marketing that is adapted to meet the needs and wants of its domestic consumers.

Multicultural Marketing: Is a more recent development of domestic marketing. It is marketing to diverse nationality-ethnicity-specific target groups that are large and steadily growing within a country. If the set target markets also have high-buying power (e.g., White Caucasian, Afro-American, Hispanic-Mexican, or Pacific-Asian in the USA), then these are multicultural markets that marketers must tailor their products and services to such that their cultural and sub-cultural sensitivities are safeguarded – this is *multicultural domestic marketing* strategy. This strategy is capturing executive attention in recent years (e.g., Deresky 2003; Harris and Moran 2000; Lee 1996; Linowes 1993).

Export and Import Marketing: Despite strong domestic and multicultural marketing, however, rival brands and products from competing domestic companies begin to challenge the domestic innovating company, and eventually, with the saturation of domestic markets, export marketing emerges. The international product cycle (IPC) theory of Vernon (1966) as applied by Wells (1968) maintains that as domestic production increases above the home market demands, the firm turns to exports and develops markets in other developed countries. When these new markets get saturated with both foreign exporters and local producers, the firms shift their trade to the Third World markets. *Export Marketing* is marketing to foreign consumers outside one's domestic base of operation and mostly consists of shipping products from home (domestic) country to host countries. Conversely, when quality products and services are more cheaply available abroad than in domestic markets, or are not just produced domestically, then *import marketing* arises.

Foreign and Regional Marketing: When export marketing transits from sporadic ad hoc transactions or discrete exchanges of one-time orders at list prices to long-term exporter-importer relationships of continuous ordering at bargained prices and negotiated currency

choices, then we move into the domain of foreign marketing. *Foreign marketing* is “marketing *in* foreign countries” (Johansson 2000: 9). Foreign marketing implies developing export channels such as export branches, sales-districts, local warehousing, local brokers, local distribution centers, and local advertising and promotion programs - all these activities are primarily geared to fight local (host) competition. This is the stage of intensive international trade, and the classical theories of country-specific *absolute advantage* and country-specific *comparative advantage* come into play. Both comparative and absolute advantages get exploited in the process of bilateral or multilateral trade between exporting (domestic) companies and importing (host) companies. Given the diseconomies of scale still associated with foreign marketing strategies tailored to each market country, however, multinational companies begin to emphasize marketing strategies for larger trade areas that embrace several preference-based markets and countries – this is *Regional Marketing* that covers several countries within a trade area (e.g., EU, NAFTA, Pacific Rim, ASEAN, and MERCOSUR). Regional marketing corresponds to Perlmutter’s (1969) concept of *regiocentric* management: each region is considered as a unique market opportunity.

Pan-regional Marketing: These multicountry trade regions began to be progressively integrated via common trade customs protocol (Customs Union), low and equivalent trade-barriers (Common Market), international transfer of labor and assets (Economic Unions), common currency (Monetary Union), and common economic and defense policy (Political Union) – a phenomenon that was called Pan-regional Marketing. Thus, some contend that the Latin American market is pan-regional market and that a marketing strategy aimed at the overall Latin American region will be more effective than a strategy targeted to each of the Latin American countries (e.g., Johansson 1997). A similar argument is made for the Pan-European or the EU markets (Halliburton and Jones 1993). Pan-regional marketing obtains and services demand abroad with product-mix and marketing mix strategies coordinated to target large regions of countries.

Internet Marketing: A still more recent phenomenon that involves aspects of domestic, foreign, transnational and global marketing is *Internet Marketing*. The Internet is a gigantic global mall that shelters all websites or “online retail outlets” of the world. The Web is a vast collection of interconnected documents stored on computers (called “hosts”) all around the world that is linked to the Internet (Hoffman and Novak 1996). Any company that uses the Internet automatically has a global supply presence. A typical homepage describes the main purpose and features of the website that provides an interactive table of contents that is a navigation scheme for the website. These doors lead to other doors that lead to other doors connecting to documents all over the world, and so on. It is a maze, and hence its name the www. But it is a retail maze, a virtual global market mall.

Marketing Strategies that Focus both on Production and Marketing:

Production Abroad for Domestic Markets: The domestic firm gets more and more internationalized at this stage and begins to produce abroad. During the two decades after World War II, while the rest of war-torn world was reconstructing its nations, multinational

companies began to make massive U. S. foreign direct investments [USFDI] abroad to form wholly owned subsidiaries, branches and affiliates. During its earlier stages, the primary purpose of USFDI was to produce products and services for U. S. domestic markets – a phenomenon we call as *Production Abroad for Domestic Markets*. During later stages, products and services of USFDI were also marketed abroad, and this phenomenon is called International Marketing.

International Marketing: This stage is an extension and combination of *foreign marketing* and *production abroad for domestic markets*. It follows the third stage of the international product cycle (IPC). The Third World countries or the newly industrialized countries (NICs) develop their own manufacturing capability, helped by the technology transfers from and alliances with the home country. As low-cost but high-quality production gets developed in these countries, the home country imports the products that it had originally innovated back home, thus completing the IPC (Wells 1968). As many other countries other than U.S.A. begin to invent and produce new products and processes, home (e.g., U. S. A.) countries begin to strike joint ventures with them with majority to minority local participation. The IPC theory gets revised to include this phenomenon (see Vernon 1979). The home country that started production of a given innovative product, however, may still continue as the foremost manufacturing site (Vernon 1979). This is particularly true in the case of computers and other high-tech products (Porter 1990).

Multinational marketing further expands *international marketing*. The focus of multinational marketing came as a result of the development of the multinational corporation (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998:5). Multinational companies are those that have significant (say, over 30%) shares of foreign sales, operating profits, number of employees abroad, foreign assets, or combinations of any of these variables (Shaked 1986; Quian 1998). Multinational marketing companies expand their participation in foreign markets and integrate their marketing efforts in various host countries (Yip 1995). During this stage foreign multinationals begin to invest heavily in the United States. Massive USFDI abroad invites enormous reverse foreign direct investments [RFDI] in the U. S., thus increasing interdependence between countries and economies (Kujawa 1986).

Multidomestic Marketing: The term multidomestic was first proposed by Hout, Porter and Rudden (1982) in the context of industries and not strategies (Yip 1995). Multidomestic markets are defined as product markets in which local consumers have preferences and functional requirements widely different from those of other markets or countries (Johansson 2000). It is running different businesses in a number of countries, and hence the term “multi-domestic,” each subsidiary represents a separate business that must be run profitably (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998: 288). Multidomestic Marketing strategies compete with many strategies, each one tailored to a particular local market (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998; Keegan 1999). Hence, Yip suggests the term “multilocal” rather than multidomestic to describe these strategies (Yip 1995: 24). Perlmutter (1969) would describe this strategy as “polycentric,” that is, each country is a unique market center.

Marketing Strategies that integrate all major Business Functions

Transnational Marketing is an extension of multinational marketing, and as such, follows transnational firms. Transnational firms are stateless corporations that are global in operations. Bartlett and Goshal (1989) first proposed the term “transnational organizations” for emphasizing their cross-country management-production-marketing network. No country has a majority control in equity, top management, corporate mission and policy (Wendt 1993). Some of the top 50 Fortune Global Companies may be truly transnational in this sense (e.g., GM, Ford, Toyota, IBM, GE, Unilever, and Exxon).

Global Marketing: Currently pan-regional marketing and transnational marketing are evolving into Global Marketing. *Global Marketing* is targeting homogenous markets in several countries [e.g., the triad of North America, Western Europe and Japan] with standardized products and globalized marketing programs (Buzzell 1968; Levitt 1983). Global Marketing philosophy is “thinking globally but acting locally” (Ohmae 1985). Global Marketing involves many activities: global supplies, global financing, global human resources, global advertising and promotions, global technological alliances, global production, global sourcing, global standardization of the product mix, globalization of the marketing mix, global transactions via global currencies, global markets and global Internet marketing. The domestic company may develop a core product mix and marketing mix strategy, but it soon globalizes by integrating it across almost all countries of the world (Yip 1995).

Table 1 sketches this evolution. Historically the first eight strategies, domestic, multicultural, export/import, foreign/regional, pan-regional and Internet marketing have focused primarily on the marketing function. The next four, production abroad for domestic markets, international, multinational and multi-domestic marketing strategies and institutions have primarily focused on both production and marketing. The final two, transnational and global marketing strategies, are currently focusing on global integrated the management of purchasing, process, production and marketing functions. As is evident from this evolutionary analysis (see also *Table 1*), global marketing, by definition includes all strategies and institutions from domestic to global marketing, and hence, may be considered as the generalization of all other marketing strategies and institutions (Bartels 1968; Mascarenhas 1978). Ethics of global marketing, accordingly, is comprehensive and must include all the ethical imperatives of domestic to global marketing strategies and institutions.

**TABLE 1: CLASSIFICATION OF DOMESTIC AND NON-DOMESTIC
MARKETING STRATEGIES**

Marketing Strategy & Institution	Foreign Content¹ (FC) Domestic Control (DC)	Basic Strategy
Primary Focus: Marketing		
Domestic Marketing	FC: Low DC: High	Home produced products and services for home use. Marketing for a single market.
Multicultural Marketing	FC: Low DC: High	Home produced products and services adapted to domestic mlticultures. Promotions are dovetailed to cultural market sensitivities.
Export/Import Marketing	FC: Growing DC: Growing	Given saturated domestic markets, market penetration abroad is necessary (export mktg); Import finished products for domestic markets and components and parts for better scale economies.
Foreign/Regional Marketing	FC: Medium DC: Medium	Marketing in foreign countries via local branches, brokers, channels and media (foreign mktg). Marketing by regions and for regions (regional mktg)
Pan-Regional Marketing	FC: Medium DC: Medium	Marketing in multicountry trade regions that are integrated as common markets, economic unions, monetary unions or political unions.
Internet Marketing	FC: Medium DC: Medium	Online marketing of products and sources that is 24/7 and global.
Primary Focus: Production and Marketing		
Production abroad for Domestic Marketing	FC: Medium DC: Medium	Manufacturing abroad for domestic markets. Creation of wholly owned subsidiaries, affiliates, branches and other joint ventures.
International Marketing	FC: Medium DC: Medium	Production abroad for domestic and foreign markets.
Multinational Marketing	FC: Majority DC: Minority	Marketing by multinational companies that have significant equity and control from many countries.
Multidomestic Home Marketing	FC: Majority DC: Minority	Multiple businesses targeting multiple country markets by the home country or host country multinational corporations.
Primary Focus: Global Management, Production and Marketing		
Transnational Marketing	FC: Majority DC: Minority	Giant stateless corporations with equal equity and control spread across nations optimizing management, production and marketing functions.
Global Marketing	FC: Majority DC: Minority	Targeting homogenous markets in several countries via global supply, skills, finance, logistics, distribution and promotions management.

1 *Foreign Content* may be measured as percentage of Company's sales revenue, operating profits, assets, and employees coming from non-domestic operations (Quian 1998). *Domestic*

(foreign) *control* may be assessed by home (host) country control of any or all of the money, supply, skills, logistics, production, trade and promotions operations.

Also, our analysis of domestic to global marketing strategies and institutions, unravels several interesting phenomena: a) foreign content of companies (measured by the percentage revenues, assets, manpower, equity, skills, technology that comes from non-domestic operations) keeps increasing and proportionately, domestic content decreases; b) consequently, the domain of non-domestic or foreign control keeps increasing while domestic control decreases (see *Table 1*); c) flowing from (a) and (b) are other concomitant phenomena such as: c) stakeholders increase by number, types and ubiquity from domestic to global strategies as the domains of operations increase; d) especially, as global marketing spreads to third world countries, the number of vulnerable stakeholder communities keeps increasing, and e) consequently, global income and opportunity inequalities between home and host countries begin to widen. All these phenomena have distributive justice ethical implications that we investigate in the next section.

THE THEORY OF DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE AND ITS RELEVANCE TO GLOBAL MARKETING

Ethical scholars distinguish at least three primary positions when evaluating moral rectitude of decisions, actions, and institutions (Beauchamp and Bowie 1993; Frankena 1973). Applied to assess the ethics of domestic to global marketing systems, the three ethical theories are:

TELEOLOGY: this position maintains that the moral correctness of all marketing actions is primarily determined by their consequences. For example, to the question what makes a domestic or global marketing strategy or institution teleologically just, a teleologist would argue that this strategy should bring more advantages over disadvantages to the greatest number of stakeholders.

DEONTOLOGY: this position holds that the moral appropriateness of all strategies and institutions primarily determined by certain principles, rules, rights and duties of the subjects involved. To the question what renders a domestic to global marketing strategy or institution deontologically just, deontologists would argue that it should uphold the moral rights and duties of all stakeholders involved.

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE: this position affirms that the morality of some actions is dependent upon how the costs and benefits, rights and duties of these actions are distributed among its many stakeholders. To the question what assures a domestic to global marketing strategy or institution distributively just, the advocates of distributive justice would argue that the said strategy or institution should ensure that the rights and duties, costs and benefits involved should be equitably spread across all stakeholders affected by that strategy or institution.

Marketing ethics literature has regularly invoked *teleology* (as utilitarianism or consequentialism) and *deontology* (as right/duty or norms based reasoning), in analyzing ethical decision-making process in marketing (e.g., Ferrell and Gresham 1985; Hunt and Vitell 1986; Laczniak 1983; Reidenbach and Robin 1990). More recently, a third moral system, justice in general, or *distributive justice* in particular, has also been included (e.g., Ferrell, Gresham, and Fraedrich 1989; Laczniak and Murphy 1993; Mascarenhas 1990, 1991, 1995; Reidenbach, Robin, and Dawson 1991; Robin and Reidenbach 1993). This paper argues for a more explicit and comprehensive inclusion of distributive justice considerations in the ethical assessment of domestic to global marketing strategies and institutions.

Justice is commonly defined as giving unto others what rightfully belongs to them (Rawls 1971). Justice, therefore, has both deontological and teleological aspects. The theory of distributive justice is particularly relevant when different people put forth conflicting claims on society's rights and duties, benefits and burdens and when all claims cannot be equitably satisfied. In such cases, the standards of justice are generally taken more seriously than utilitarian considerations (Hare 1978; Rawls 1958). The moral right to be treated as free and equal persons is the basic foundation of distributive justice (Vlastos 1962). For instance, target marketing to vulnerable minorities, charging exorbitant premium prices on new drug introductions, and by using coercive channel power against competing products in retail stores are marketing strategies that may be productive and profitable (and hence justifiable on utilitarian grounds). Additionally, they may not explicitly violate consumer rights or duties (and hence justifiable on deontological grounds). But in as much as these marketing strategies distribute costs and burdens, rights and duties, unevenly across various global stakeholders such as customers, clients, consumers, competitors, and channel members, they violate global distributive justice.

The theory of justice distinguishes three classic forms of justice or fairness, depending upon the specific moral rule or standard used: a) *distributive justice* deals with an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens, and states that equals should be treated equally and unequals, unequally; b) *retributive justice* maintains that one should adequately reward a person for right done and punish (blame) for wrong perpetrated; c) *compensatory justice* affirms that one should compensate the wronged person for the wrong done by restoring the person to his or her original position. Compensatory and retributive justices are subsets of distributive justice since there are basically concerned with correcting wrongs using the distributive justice rule (Boatright 2005). All three forms are subsets of a largest system: corrective justice. Global marketing ethics involves the whole world of resources, skills, markets and opportunities and thus challenges all three forms of corrective justice: distributive, retributive and compensatory.

Distributive justice looks at two important factors (Ryan 1942): *what is distributed*, and *how it is distributed*. What is distributed (e.g., product information, healthcare) "must itself be generated by production, whether one produces agricultural products, manufactured goods and commodities, or services" (Ryan 1942:181). One's share of what is distributed may

depend upon various modes or canons of distributive justice: a) canon of equality based on egalitarian justice; b) canon of need (socialist justice); c) canon of merit (naturalist justice); d) canon of effort (retributive justice); e) canon of productivity (capitalist justice); f) canon of common good (social libertarianism), and g) canon of supply demand (individual libertarianism). *Egalitarianism* emphasizes equal access to the goods of life that every rational person desires based on need and equality. *Libertarianism* focuses on equal access to social and economic liberty and invokes fair procedures and free-market systems rather than substantive outcomes. *Naturalist Justice* rewards one's innate merit or ability. Since global marketing relates to the distribution of global purchasing and production, global products, brands and services, what and how it is distributed becomes the scope of global marketing ethics.

Distributive justice relates both to individuals (individual justice) or groups or societies (social justice). Each aspect of distributive justice involves several theories, rules or principles formulated by different philosophers of distributive justice.

TABLE 2: A TAXONOMY OF DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE PRINCIPLES

Generic Justice	First Basic Division	Second Basic Division: Sub theories of Justice	Basic Underlying Principle	Global Marketing Ethical Imperative
Distributive Justice	Individual Justice	Retributive or punitive justice	Quid pro quo: principle of retaliation	Institute just punitive damages for offending global marketing practices
		Compensatory justice	Restore the harmed person to one's original status	Compensate damages for stakeholders adversely affected by global products and brands
		Commutative Justice	Distribute to each one by one's deserves	Organize global equitable distribution of quality products, brands, services at equitable prices
		Rights/Duty or deontological Justice	Distribute to each one by one's rights and fulfilled duties	Global marketing should uphold rights/duties of global citizens and customers
		Entitlement Justice	Nozick's Principle: distribute to each one by one's entitlement	Minimally, global marketing should distribute costs and benefits by customer merits, efforts and contribution

		Cost-benefit or Utilitarian Justice	Distribute such that benefits exceed costs for each one	Global marketing strategies should act such that net benefits accrue to the greatest number of global stakeholders.
	Social Justice	Liability Justice	Distribute such that all harm is avoided	Global marketing should not harm anyone in the world
		Protective Justice	Distribution should protect all people from current harm	Global marketing should protect every stakeholder in the world
		Preemptive Justice	Distribution should prevent all people from future harm	Global marketing should prevent harm to all its global stakeholders.
		Procedural Justice	Distribution set up procedures to avoid all harm	If harmed, global marketing should establish due process for stakeholder redress.
		Egalitarian Justice	Distribution should be equal for all	Global marketing should eventually bring about global equality in opportunity and prosperity
		Aristotle's Minimum Justice	Distribute equally among equals but unequally among unequals	Global marketing should at least maintain equality among equals and justifiable inequality among unequals.
		Rawls First Principle of Egalitarian Justice	Distribution should not merit undeserved advantages of people	Global marketing distribution should not favor undeserved advantages of color, lineage, ethnicity or religion,
		Rawls Second Principle of Egalitarian Justice	Distribution should nullify undeserved disadvantages of people	Global marketing should progressively nullify disadvantages of color, creed, gender or nationality
		Beneficent Justice	Distribution should promote good of all people	Global marketing should promote the good of all its stakeholders.

Table 2 categorizes some of them that have relevance to global marketing. For the sake of brevity, we only state these principles, illustrating them by examples but without discussing them in detail. [Such details may be found, for example, in Bowie 1971, Deutsch 1985, Frankena 1973, Rawls 1971, Rescher 1966, and Ryan 1942].

ETHICAL IMPERATIVES OF GLOBAL MARKETING STRATEGIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Marketing strategies and institutions, from domestic to global, involve markets of individuals and groups, countries and regions. Marketing impacts people, good or bad, rightly or wrongly, justly or unjustly. Thus, an overarching normative ethical theory that can best deal with domestic to global marketing strategies and institutions is the theory of justice, in general, and the theory of distributive justice, in particular. Normative ethical theory is the *reasoning process* that one uses to justify the moral goodness or ethics of judgments, actions or institutions. We apply the theory of distributive justice in order to identify and understand ethical responsibilities of domestic to global marketing institutions...

Global Marketing Ethics of Strategies that Focus on Marketing

Since global marketing is a generalization of the domestic (see Bartels 1968; Mascarenhas 1978), that is, since the various strategies and institutions from domestic to non-domestic marketing are contained in global marketing, our ethical discussion of global marketing must include all strategies and institutions of domestic to global marketing. Our first normative proposition is:

P₁: Global marketing as a generalized version of domestic marketing must be guided by domestic marketing ethical principles.

All the ethical theories, principles and imperative of individual and social distributive justice listed in *Table 2* apply to each strategy and institution of domestic marketing. For instance, offending manufacturers and marketers are liable for *retributive justice* while wronged customers are entitled for *compensatory justice* through proper consumer redress (Andreasen 1988). Artificial shortages, domestic or international, in distribution violate distributive *utilitarian justice* and can particularly affect the poor (Alwitt 1995; Caplovitz 1963), the ghettos (Sturdivant 1969) or the disadvantaged ethnic groups (Andreasen 1975, 1982). Machiavellianism (Hunt and Chonko 1984) violates one's *entitlement justice*. All forms of market greed and avarice that infect some domestic marketing practices such as predatory pricing (Gundlach 1995; Sheffet 1994), seductive marketing (Deighton and Grayson 1995) and easy credit granting (Faber and O'Guinn 1988; Feinberg 1986) could easily slip into Machiavellianism. Persuasive advertising that leads to compulsive eating, smoking, gambling and other addictions are violations of individual and social distributive justice especially when such promotions target vulnerable consumer groups such as children, teenagers and the elderly (see Andrews *et al.* 2004; Beauchamp 1983; Faber and O'Guinn 1988; Faber *et al.* 1995).

The market does not treat all consumers fairly. The classic theory of price discrimination that tries to maximize revenues by charging each customer the highest price one is willing to pay may safeguard Nozick's theory of entitlement justice but violate Rawls theory of egalitarian justice (see Kamen 1992; Maynes 1990). Pricing strategies such as price fixing, predatory pricing, and bait-pricing are basically violations of commutative and procedural distributive justice (Sheffet 1994). Prices based on value-in-use have been criticized as unfair and violates protective and preemptive distributive justice (e.g., drug AZT). Over-pricing ghetto

or inner city poor consumers compared to urban and higher income classes has been regularly documented (e.g., Alwitt 1995; Andreasen 1975; Caplovitz 1963; Goodman 1968; Hudson 1993; *New York Department of Consumer Affairs* (NYDCA) 1992; Sturdivant 1969). Redlining (a process by which goods or services are made unavailable, or made available on less than favorable terms, to people because of race, color, creed, or nationality) violates deontological distributive justice (Purviance 1993; Trout 1993).

Our second normative proposition is:

P₂: Global marketing includes and affects cultures of the world and, therefore, must be guided by ethical principles of global multicultural marketing.

Global marketing incorporates multicultural marketing. When there are several distinct cultures within and between domestic markets, then new products may have to be streamlined to respond to cultural and semi-cultural sensitivities (Terpstra and David 1991). Multicultural marketing has social distributive justice implications. To be multi-culturally responsive to ethnic, religious and national sensitivities is a distributive social justice mandate of multicultural marketing. Conversely, effectively managing cultural differences (Harris and Moran 2000) can be a virtue. Multicultural marketing should not disparage nor denigrate ethnic cultures (this violates liability justice), but, instead, it must protect them (protective justice) and prevent them from wasteful erosions (preemptive justice). At the same time, multicultural marketing should not foster cultural hegemony and superiority (as in ethnocentric marketing) for this would violate egalitarian justice, specifically expressed in Rawls (1971) Principle of Egalitarian Justice (see *Table 1*).

A just society is not necessarily one in which all are equal, but one in which inequalities are justifiable. Rawls (1971) proposed two principles of distributive justice to defend equality and inequality: 1) *The Equality Principle* (Libertarian Fair Opportunism): where each person engaged in an institution or affected by it has an equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with a like liberty for all; equality is the impartial and equitable administration and application of rules which define a practice; 2) *The Difference Principle* (Libertarian Egalitarianism): where inequalities as defined by the institutional structure or fostered by it are arbitrary unless they work out to everyone's advantage and provided that the positions and offices are open to all. The first principle requires basic equal liberty for all. The second principle admits existing inequalities and differences, if a) they work to the advantage of all, and b) if the social system offers equal opportunity for all to combat or compensate for these differences. Peoples of different cultures (based on nationality, ethnicity and religiosity) have an equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with like liberty all. Multicultural marketing must safeguard Rawls (1971) Equality Principle.

Our third normative proposition is:

P₃: Global marketing includes export, import, foreign and regional, pan-regional, Internet and global Internet marketing and must be guided by the marketing ethical principles of the latter institutions.

Global marketing subsumes import and export marketing. Ethics of import and export marketing specifically relates to distributive justice in relation to individual suppliers or groups of distributors. Using one's centralized purchasing power to renege extant contracts (e.g., see GM's case in Webster 1995), not to honor agreed on demand quotas (e.g., see the case of Ford in Narayandas and Rangan 2004) or to engage in sweatshops (Hartman, Arnold and Wokutch 2003), are some of the import marketing practices that violate individual and social distributive justice.

In a seller's market, the exporter enjoys a quasi-monopolistic position and can engage in competitive negotiating behavior to optimize trade margins (Dabholkar, Johnston and Cathey 1994). On the contrary, in a buyer's market, the importer can assume an aggressive bargaining position and influence contract terms. In such situations, the exporting firm has weak price-bargaining and negotiating control (Perdue and Summers 1991) and may transit to foreign marketing to obtain better control. Ethical principles of protective, preemptive and procedural distributive justice mandate equitable distribution of control among the export marketing partners such that monopolies and monopsonies are discouraged.

Also, when export marketing transits to foreign marketing, the firm is increasingly export-dependent, gathers much information on export countries through market intelligence, and formulates long-term exporting strategies with several long exporter-importer negotiations. There is more customer orientation at this stage and more cooperative behavior (Dabholkar, Johnston, and Cathey 1994), more coordinative problem-solving behavior, a negotiation posture aimed at maximizing joint benefits and rooted in extensive information sharing (Ganesan 1993). There is greater interdependency between the exporting and the importing firms (Frazier and Summers 1984). Export, foreign and/or global marketing encourage and support utilitarian and deontological distributive justice responsibilities that develop long-term supplier-buyer relationships, respect interdependencies and administering all exchanges with fairness and equity.

Regional Marketing includes export marketing and foreign marketing that penetrates an entire trade region (e.g., NAFTA, LAFTA, MERCOSUR, and ASEAN) or trade regions (e.g., EU, Pacific Rim Countries, and WTO). Regional marketing extends the ethical imperatives of export, import and foreign marketing, since stakeholders increase by types, numbers and ubiquity. Hence, utilitarian distributive justice principles apply.

Currently, several tariff and non-tariff trade barriers are falling, larger continental trade regions have emerged, markets have globalized, and even consumer needs and wants have converged globally (Levitt 1983; Ohmae 1990). Global market share, beyond domestic market share, is becoming a determinant in the areas of product design and development, core and end product manufacturing, brand and trademark development, competence and licenses

pooling and formats and standards development (Ohmae 1979; Prahalad 1995). The more that world trade is liberalized, the higher are the commutative, deontological and utilitarian distributive justice responsibilities of global marketing.

Export, foreign and regional marketing strategies and institutions, moreover, have specific ethical imperatives of distributive justice. All these forms of marketing imply some form of mutually agreed upon contracts, written or unwritten, formal or informal. A contract between two or more parties is valid if all the parties have full knowledge of the terms of the contract that is properly represented to them, if they are free to become parties to it, and if the contract is not for an unethical or immoral act. Human freedom is expanded by the recognition of contractual rights and duties (Rawls 1971). A person has a duty to honor one's contracts, and thus treat the other contracting parties as an *end*, and not as *means* to an end; failing to honor one's contract is a practice that cannot be universalized (Kant 1964). Most contracts bind under industry laws. Contractualism is a subset of deontological distributive justice. *Contractualism* is a theory of social contract which maintains that the ultimate determinant of the structure and performance of any strategy or institution is a set of reciprocal, institutionalized duties and obligations which are broadly accepted by its citizens. More recently, Donaldson and Dunfee (1994) have synthesized both normative and empirical ethical decision and assessment approaches under contract-based norms and principles. Corporations are socially responsible because of their social contract with justice behavior and society; that is, they should constrain self-enhancement to allow society to act and grow collectively (Dunfee 1999; Walster, Walster, and Berscheid 1978). These are the minimal demands of contractarian justice which is a form of distributive justice.

Pan-Regional Marketing: Is a cost-effectiveness-based adjustment of multidomestic strategies. The participating multinationals coming from the same major trade region or serving the same trade region began to formulate production and marketing strategies that would serve the entire trade region rather than each country within it. This is macro multicultural marketing. The full value-chain could occur anywhere in the region where there are better opportunities for cost containment, quality enhancement, and regional participation. If the product sold transcends regional cultures, then pan-regional distribution, promotions, advertising and retailing is in order (as in the case of Burger King in Latin America; see Rosenberg (1993), and IBM in Latin America (Barks 1994)). Global marketing utilitarian and deontological justice imperatives must enable local actors to share in the creation and sharing of the full-value chain that pan-regional marketing implies.

Internet Marketing and Global Internet Marketing: are the production and marketing of various electronic products and services, and the marketing of all other products and services to all the countries and markets of the world through the global network of computers, laptops, servers, data warehouses, and other backbone network infrastructure (Kleindl 2003; Turban et al. 2000). Internet marketing involves specific mandates of safeguarding consumer privacy (Mascarenhas, Kesavan and Bernacchi 2003), eliminating consumer piracy, consumer cyberfraud, merchant cyberfraud, cyber hacking, and infringement of intellectual property rights. Minimally, these are the imperatives of liability, protective and preemptive justice.

Global Marketing Ethics of Strategies that Focus on Production and Marketing

A marketing strategy that includes production strategy chooses foreign markets that are good sources of minerals and materials, skills and manpower, land and capital, stable hard currency, high buying power and stable markets, low competition, and attractive political incentives (Terpstra and Russow 2000). We distinguish five major production-marketing strategies: a) Production abroad for domestic markets; b) International marketing; c) Multinational marketing; d) Multidomestic marketing and e) and Panregional marketing. Our fourth normative proposition in this regard is:

P₄: Global marketing includes production abroad for domestic marketing, international, multinational and multidomestic and, therefore, must be guided by the marketing ethical principles of these respective strategies and institutions.

Production abroad for domestic marketing – this was pioneered by U. S. firms that invested heavily abroad (via FDI: foreign direct investments) primarily for producing products that would be sold in the U. S. markets. In turn, foreign countries (e.g., Japan, U.K., Netherlands) have also invested heavily in the U. S. (via RFDI: reverse foreign direct investments) but with the primary purpose of entering and capturing the US market. Ethical responsibilities include those of domestic marketing as applicable abroad where production is organized. Specific ethical responsibilities minimally include: a) protecting human rights of labor abroad and refrain from hiring underage children (the International Labor Organization (ILO) estimates that in developing nations 250 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 are working, almost half working full time; close to a billion children ages 14-18 are working (see Hartman, Arnold and Wokutch 2003: xix; b) avoiding sweatshops that involve 90-hour weeks in subhuman working conditions (Hartman, Arnold and Wokutch 2003); c) honoring labor contracts of one's employees with contractarian justice, and d) protecting the environment where production takes place (Ruland 2002). For instance, Levi Strauss & Co. withdrew production of denims from China in 1993 despite its strong market for over a billion denims just because worker rights were seriously violated there (Davids 1999).

International Marketing: goes beyond export and foreign marketing, and streamlines ideation, product designs, prototyping, fabricating, manufacturing, testing, pre-marketing, and the marketing of products and services both at home and in host countries taking into full account local markets, local cultures and environments, local laws and governments and local tariffs and customs (Cateora 1993). Major ethical responsibilities include: host country production (i.e., domestic production is now extended to several host countries for scale economies, local development opportunity, and local stakeholder participation), international purchasing of materials, international employment of skills, international investor participation and host country advertising agencies and promotional tools. An important ethical challenge for the international marketing manager is to understand and respect the political, cultural, and economic environments of the host countries while dovetail international production and

marketing to environmental responsibilities (Cateora 1993). All the theories, principles and imperatives of social distributive justice (see *Table 1*) apply here.

Multinational marketing: Multinational marketing is marketing by multinational companies in several foreign countries with the entire value chain of products, production, advertisements, promotions, distribution networks and financing adapted to local stakeholder needs and wants, cultures and political climate (Keegan 1999). The primary focus is cost containment, creating value, sustained competitive advantage (SCA) and re-exporting to maximize domestic and foreign market shares. All domestic and foreign marketing ethical responsibilities apply here.

Multidomestic Marketing: Is a sequel to multinational marketing. In general, a very large percentage of sales and profits of these multidomestic firms are generated overseas. In their early stages of development, multinational companies operate in a number of countries or markets as if they were local companies with strong local preferences (Kogut and Zander 1993), a phenomenon that eventually was called *multidomestic marketing*. The distinction between home and host begins to fade as all participating nations are “home” or “domestic” and several domestic strategies each one tailored to one’s local market are created (Jeannet and Hennessey 2000). “While some key strategic decisions with respect to product and technology are made at the central or head office, the initiative of implementing marketing strategies is left largely to local-country subsidiaries” (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998: 287). Local operating managers, presumably much more attuned to local market needs, are given the freedom and ethical responsibility to develop marketing strategies tailored to local needs. Technology transfers occur at this stage and care should be taken that these transfers contribute to the development of host countries.

Typical products of multidomestic or multilocal marketing strategies reflect specific religious, cultural and social values such as apparel that includes shoe-wear and jewelry, food and beverages, insurance and financial services, and movies and entertainment (Johansson 1997). The focus is on market segmentation strategies that satisfy different markets either within a country or across countries. When this strategy functions within a country, the phenomenon is best designated as *multicultural*, and when this strategy is targeted across countries, it is *multidomestic*. Global marketing ethical imperatives should respect and reflect local religious, cultural and social values rather than disparage them.

Global Marketing Ethics for Strategies that Focus on Management, Production and Marketing:

When management competencies, core competencies, core products, production and content of products and services, and corresponding marketing skills begin to migrate to countries, continents and the globe, there emerge different genera of non-domestic marketing. Currently, we can distinguish two: transnational marketing and global marketing. Our fifth normative proposition in this regard is:

P₅: Global marketing as including transnational and global marketing should be guided by the marketing ethical principles of these institutions.

Transnational Marketing follows the emergence of transnational corporations whose ownership, equity control, core competencies and products, production and marketing bases are so spread across various countries that no nation can claim the corporation as its own. Neither single home nor host country controls major product and marketing mix strategies (Bannister, Braga and Petry 1994), and as a consequence, corporate headquarters and core management are volatile moving from country to country (Miller 1992). No particular national status is important; most operations are metanational (Doz and Asakawa 1997). The center of expertise, ownership, power, control and operations may reside anywhere they best reside (Bluemenstein 1997); there are no German nor American companies, only “successful ones”(White 1998). When no country can officially control nor legally bind transnational companies, some countries can ensure that the codes of conduct and environmental laws that apply in developed countries are applied when functioning in the developing nations (Aaronson 2005; Davids 1999; Logsdon and Wood 2005). Global marketing ethical imperatives should respect and develop transnational values and environments rather than be ethnocentric or foster home country value hegemony. All the theories, principles and imperatives of social distributive justice (see Table 1) particularly apply here.

Global Marketing: is a sequel to transnational marketing; the sphere and center of all activities is global (Jeannet and Hennessey 2000; Keegan 1998; Keegan and Green 2003); it is a geocentric organization (Perlmutter 1969). For instance, the *Caux Principles* suggest the following concrete global responsibilities for the corporate executives of global corporations: 1) The Responsibilities of Businesses: Beyond shareholders toward stakeholders. 2) The Economic and Social Impact of Businesses: Innovation, justice and world community. 3) Business Behavior: Beyond the letter of law toward a spirit of trust. 4) Respect for rules that promote free trade, competition and fair treatment of all. 5) Support and liberalize multinational trade systems (e.g., GATT, WTO). 6) Respect for environment: protect, improve and develop environment and 7) Avoidance of Illicit operations: avoid and eliminate bribery, money laundering and other corrupt (e.g., terrorism, drug-traffic) business practices.

Specifically, global marketing whose domain is the entire resource base of the world, should bring about equality of opportunity to basic human rights in general such as freedom (Nielsen 1985), justice (Nielsen 1979) and to specific needs such as healthcare (e.g., Calmen 1994; Outka 1987), lifesaving drugs (Mascarenhas, Kesavan and Bernacchi 2005c), donor organs (Purviance 1993), and the like. The basic ethical imperative of global production and marketing should be the progressive reduction of global inequalities of income and opportunity (Mascarenhas, Kesavan and Bernacchi 2005 b) and working towards global prosperity. In this regard, even the poor can be profitable for global corporations (Pralhad 2004). By domain and definition, global marketing ethics should also include the demarketing of drugs and tobacco (e.g., Andrews et al. 2004), pornography, gambling and the like products.

With an effective combination of regional, pan-regional and Internet marketing strategies and global marketing results the phenomenon of *Global Internet Marketing*. For instance, over the last eight years (i.e. 1994-2002), the Internet has evolved from a mere communications medium to a global *epicenter of technological transformation* in business models and processes. Businesses are adapting new IT technologies to improve their management, purchasing, production, and marketing strategies. New technologies include the Internet, WWW, Extranets, Intranets, databases, enterprise resource management (e-ERM), supply chain management (e-SCM), customer relationship management (e-CRM), and mass customization software (Kleindl 2003). Currently, all over the world, over 900 million computers are connected to the Internet, with over a billion users, and the WWW has over 60 million websites (Kleindl 2003). The monthly Internet user rates are still growing in double digits; the user numbers are projected to reach a billion by the end of 2003 (Bidgoli 2002). Current global Internet marketing institutions include eBay, Amazon.com, Yahoo.com, Google.com and Dell.com. The ethical imperatives of traditional brick-and-mortar global marketing institutions should also apply to global Internet marketing institutions.

CONCLUSIONS

Justice commonly defined as giving to others what rightfully belongs to them (Rawls 1971), plays a major role in all areas of human exchange and interaction and particularly in marketing exchanges (Reidenbach, Robin, and Dawson 1991; Robin and Reidenbach 1993). Justice becomes an issue whenever a distribution or exchange is made, regardless of what is being distributed (e.g., goods, services, resources, benefits or costs, rights or duties, rewards or punishment). Since most marketing activities involve distributions and exchanges, justice pervades virtually all domains of marketing. Marketing is determined by relationships in which power is unevenly distributed between stakeholders that can often be detrimental to different publics (Robin and Reidenbach 1993:100). Such inequitable relationships need to be specifically addressed by distributive justice principles (Robin and Reidenbach 1993).

Exchange as distribution is a basic concept in marketing and works very well as long as each party to an exchange has something the other party values, and if both parties are on an even playing field. But the exchange concept becomes problematic when some party to an exchange (e.g., the poor, the children, the elderly, the minorities, the poor countries) does not have something (e.g., money, resources, advantage, skills, information, opportunity) the other party values or is burdened with undeserved social disadvantages. Under these circumstances the marketing exchange is generally imbalanced in favor of the marketers (Alwitt 1995; Andreasen 1975, 1993, 1995; Ringold 1995).

In the arena of global marketing, some consumers are naturally disadvantaged based on race, color, gender, geography and nationality (Andreasen 1975), and hence, are vulnerable (Andreasen 1988; Andreasen and Manning 1990). The moral right to be treated as free and equal persons is the basic foundation of distributive justice (Vlastos 1962). For example, target-marketing to vulnerable minorities or using coercive channel power against competing

products in retail stores are marketing strategies that may be productive and profitable, and hence they are justifiable on utilitarian grounds. They may not explicitly violate consumer rights or duties, and hence, they are justified on deontological grounds. But in as much as they unevenly distribute costs and burdens, rights and duties across various stakeholders such as consumers and local communities, competitors and channel members, they violate distributive justice.

Global marketing Ethics as a Challenge to Global Prosperity

With the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, the fall of Communism, the dissolution of U. S. S. R., the demise of the command economies in general, and the enormous advances in communication and transportation technologies, the world is progressively changing. It is becoming a giant customs union (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998), a mega common market (Levitt 1983; Ohmae 1990), a global economic union (Czinkota and Ronkainen 1995), a virtual Eurodollar monetary union (Keegan 1995), and possibly, a political union during the early Third Millennium (Jeannet and Hennessey 1998). With all these movements global business ethical responsibilities in general and global marketing ethical responsibilities in particular, increase.

The *Preamble* to the *Caux Principles* suggests that global markets and globalization of markets imply the following: a) the increasing mobility of employment, capital, produce and technology across countries and trade regions; b) current international laws and market forces are necessary but insufficient guides for business conduct; c) responsibility for the politics and actions of business and respect for the dignity and interests of its stakeholders are fundamental, and d) shared values, including a commitment to shared prosperity are as important for a global community as for communities of smaller scale. All four points need concrete global marketing micro ethical imperatives that we have suggested to make them realistic and motivating. Global distributive justice in marketing calls for global cooperation, trusting inter-country and inter-firm trade relationships (Corsten and Kumar 2005; Narayandas and Rangan 2004), and global environmental and developmental responsibilities of corporate global citizenship (Logsdon and Wood 2005). The U. S. Government can offer leadership in this regard (see Aaronson 2005; Mascarenhas, Kesavan and Bernachi 2005a) and so can the U. S. Global corporations (e.g., Levi & Strauss, and Nike). Even the poor of the third world countries can be profitable (Prahalad 2004).

REFERENCES

- Aaronson, S. A.(2005). Minding our Business: What the United States Government has done and can do to ensure that U. S. Multinationals act Responsibly in Foreign Markets,*Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(1) pp:175-185.
- Alwitt, L. F.(1995). Marketing and the Poor,*American Behavioral Scientist*, 38 (4) pp:564-77.
- Andreasen, A. R.(1975).*The Disadvantaged Consumer*, New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Andreasen, A. R.(1982).Disadvantaged Hispanic Consumers: Research Perspectives and Agenda, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 16pp :46-61.
- Andreasen, A. R. (1984).Life Status Changes and Changes in Consumer Preferences and Satisfaction, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 pp:784-94.
- Andreasen, A. R. (1988).Consumer Complaints and Redress: What we Know and What we don't Know," in E. Scott Maynes(ed.), *The Frontier of Research in the Consumer Interest*, Columbia, MO: American Council on Consumer Interest, pp:675-722.
- Andreasen, A. R. and Manning, J.(1990). The Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining of Vulnerable Consumers,*Journal of Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*,3 pp:12-20.
- Andrews, C. J. Netemeyer, R.G, Burton, S. Moberg, D. P. and Christiansen, A. (2004). Understanding Adolescent Intentions to Smoke: An Examination of Relationships among Social Influence, Prior Trial Behavior and Anti-tobacco Campaign Advertising, *Journal of Marketing*, July, 68 pp:110-123.
- Bartels, R. (1968). Are Domestic and International Marketing Dissimilar? *Journal of Marketing*, July, 36 pp:56-61.
- Bazerman, M. H.(1985).Norms of Distributive Justice in Interest Arbitration,*Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 38 pp:558-70.
- Beauchamp, L.T., and Norman E. B.(1993).*Ethical Theory and Business* Fourth edition; Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- entice-Hall Inc.
- Bowie, N. E.(1971). *Toward a New Theory of Distributive Justice*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

- Budden C. and M. Budden.(2011). It is a Small World After All: Teaching Business Ethics In A Global Environment, *American Journal of Business Education*, 4(1) pp:161-164.
- Calman, K. C. (1994).The Ethics of Allocation of Scarce Health Care Resources: A View from the Center, *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 20 pp:71-4.
- Caplovitz, D. (1963). *The Poor Pay More: Consumer Practices of Low-Income Families*,New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Cateora, P. R. (1993). *International Marketing*.8th edition; Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Chan K.C., Fung, H. and Yau, J. (2009). Business Ethics Research: A Global Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95 pp:39-53.
- Chitakornkijsil P.(2011). Global Perspective of Business Ethics and Social Responsibility,*The international Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 4(1) pp:45-58.
- Choi C. J., Kim, S. W. and Kim, J. B.(2010). Globalizing Business Ethics Research and the Ethical Need to Include the Bottom-of-the-Pyramid Countries: Redefining the Global Triad as Business System and Institutions, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94 pp:299-306.
- Corsten, D. and Kumar, N.(2005). Do Suppliers benefit from Collaborative relationships with Large Retailers? An Empirical Investigation of Efficient Consumer Response Adoption, *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3) pp:80-94.
- Dabholkar, P., Johnston W. J. and Cathey, A. (1994). The Dynamics of Long-Term Business-to-Business Relationships, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (2) pp:130-45.
- Davids, M.(1999).Global Standards, Local Problems,*The Journal of Business Strategy*, 20(1)pp: 38-44.
- Deighton, J. and K.Grayson.(1995). Marketing and Seduction: Building Exchange Relationships by Managing Social Consensus,*Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(4) pp:660-76.
- Deutsch, M.(1985).*Distributive Justice: A Social-Psychological Perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Donaldson, T. and Duffee T.(1994). Toward a Unified Conception of Business Ethics: Integrative Social Contracts Theory,*Academy of Management Reviewm*, 19(2) pp:252-84.
- Donaldson, T., Duffee T. and Preston, L. E. (1995).The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications,*Academy of Management Review*, 20 pp:65-91.

- Donaldson, T. and Dunfee, T. W.(1997). *Business Ethics as Social Contracts*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Business School Press.
- Doney, P. M. and Cannon, J. P.(1997). An Examination of the Nature of Trust in Buyer-Seller Relationships,*Journal of Marketing*, April, 61 pp:35-51.
- Dunfee, T. W. (1991). Business Ethics and Extant Social Contracts,*Business Ethics Quarterly* 1 pp:23-51.
- Dunfee, T. W.and Donaldson, T.(1995). Contractual Business Ethics: Current Status and next Steps, *Business Ethics Quarterly*,5(21) pp:73-86.
- Faber, R.J. and T. C. O'Guinn.(1988). Compulsive Consumption and Credit Abuse,*Journal of Consumer Policy*, 11 (1) pp: 97-109.
- Faber, R. J., Christenson, G. A., deZwaan, M. and Mitchell, J. (1995).Two Forms of Compulsive Consumption: Comorbidity of Compulsive Buying and Binge Eating, *Journal of Consumer Research*, December, 22 pp:296-302.
- Feinberg, J.(1980). *Rights, Justice, and the Bounds of Liberty*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Feinberg, J.(1984)..*Harm to Others: The Moral Limits of Criminal Law*, 1, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Feinberg, R. A. (1986). Credit Cards as Spending Facilitating Stimuli: A Conditioning Interpretation, *Journal of Consumer Research*, December, 13 pp:348-356.
- Ferrell, O. C., Weaver, M. K. and Gresham, L.(1985). A Contingency Framework for Understanding Ethical Decision Making, *Journal of Marketing*, Summer, 49 pp:87-95.
- Ferrell, O. C. and Skinner, S. J.(1988). Ethical Behavior and Bureaucratic Structure in Marketing Research Organizations,*Journal of Marketing Research*, February, 25 pp:103-110.
- Ferrell, O. C., Gresham, L., and Fraedrich, J.(1989). A Synthesis of Ethical Decision Models for Marketing, *Journal of Macromarketing*, Fall, 9 pp: 55-64.
- Frankena, W. (1973).*Ethics*. 2nd ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Frankena, W. (1980).*Thinking About Morality*; Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Frazier, G. L. and Summers, J. O.(1984).The Use of Influence Strategies and their Application within Distribution Channels, *Journal of Marketing*, 48(3) pp: 43-55.
- Ganesan, S. (1993).Negotiation Strategies and the Nature of Channel Relationships, *Journal of MarketingResearch*, 30 (2) pp:183-203.
- Gundlach, G. T. (1995).Price Predation: Legal Limits and Antitrust Considerations,*Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Fall, 14 pp:278-90.
- Gundlach, G. T., Achrol, R. S. and Mentzer, J. T.(1995).The Structure of Commitment in Exchange, *Journal of Marketing*, January, 59 pp:78-92.
- Harris, P. R. and Moran, R. T.(2000).*Managing Cultural Differences*. 5th edition, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Hartman, L., Arnold, D. and Wokutch, R.(2003). *Rising above Sweatshops: Innovative Approaches to Global Labor Challenges*, Weston, CT: Praeger.
- Hunt, S. D. and Chonko, L. B.(1984).Marketing and Machiavellianism,*Journal of Marketing*, 48(3) pp: 30-42.
- Hunt, S. D. and Vitell, S. J.(1986). A General Theory of Marketing Ethics,*Journal of Macromarketing*, Spring, 6 pp: 5-16.
- Jeannet, J. and Hennessey, D. H.(1998). *Global Marketing Strategies*, 4th edition, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Johansson, J. K. (1997).*Global Marketing: Foreign Marketing, Local Marketing, and Global Management*, Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- Kaikati, J. and Label, W. A.(1980). American Bribery Legislation: An Obstacle to International Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, Fall, pp:38-43.
- Kamen, J. (1992).Price Filtering: Restricting Price Deals to those least likely to buy without them,*The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 1(3)pp: 45-51.
- Keegan, W. and Green, M. C.(2003).*Global Marketing*, 3rd Edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Laczniaak, G. R. and Murphy, P. E. (1993). *Ethical Marketing Decisions: The Higher Road*, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lee, J. (1996).Culture and Management – A Study of Small Chinese Family Business in Singapore, *Journal of Small Business Management*, July.

Levitt, T.(1983). The Globalization of Market,*Harvard Business review*, May-June, pp: 90-98.

Logsdon, J. M. and Wood, D. J.(2005).Global Business Citizenship and Voluntary Codes of Ethical Conduct, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(1) pp: 55-65.

Mascarenhas, O. A. J.(1978).Is Multinational Marketing a Generalization of the Domestic? *Management and Labor Studies*, 3(1) pp:18-30; XLRI, Jamshedpur 831001, INDIA.

Mascarenhas, O. A. J. (1990).An Empirical Methodology for the Ethical Assessment of Marketing Phenomena such as Casino Gambling, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(3)pp: 209-220.

Mascarenhas, O. A. J. (1991).Spousal Ethical Justifications of Casino Gambling: A Psychometric Analysis, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 25(1) pp:122-143.

Mascarenhas, O. A. J. (1995).Exonerating Unethical Marketing Executive Behaviors: A Diagnostic Approach, *Journal of Marketing*, 59(2) pp:43-57.

Mascarenhas, O. A., Kesavan, R. and Bernacchi, M. D.(2005). Governmental and Corporate Roles in Diffusing Development Technologies: Ethical Macromarketing Imperatives, *The Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 1(1&2) pp:271-292.

Mascarenhas, O. A., Kesavan, R. and Bernacchi, M. D.(2005). Progressive Reduction of Economic Inequality as a Macromarketing Task: A Rejoinder,*The Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 13(1&2) pp:313-318.

Mascarenhas, O. A., Kesavan, R. and Bernacchi, M. D.(2005). Global Marketing of Lifesaving Drugs: An Analogical Model,*The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22(7) pp:404-411.

McKinney J.A. and Moore, C. W. (2008). International Bribery: Does a written Code of Ethics Make a Difference in Perceptions of Business Professionals,*Journal of Business Ethics*, 79 pp:103-111.

Miller, L. K.(1992).*Transnational Corporations: A Selective Bibliography*, 1991-92. New York: The United Nations.

Narayandas, D. and Rangan, V. K.(2004).Building and Sustaining Buyer-Seller Relationships in Mature Industrial Markets,*Journal of Marketing*, 68(3) pp:63-77.

New York Department of Consumer Affairs.(1991).Invisible People: The Depiction of Minorities in Magazine Ads and Catalogs.The City of New York, Consumer Department Affairs.

- New York Department of Consumer Affairs.* (1992). *The Poor Pay More for Less: Part 2: Automobile Liability Insurance.* The City of New York, Consumer Department Affairs.
- Outka, G.(1987). Social Justice and Equal Access to Health Care," in *Bioethics*, 3rd edition, Thomas A Shannon, ed.Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 503-26.
- Perlmutter, H.(1969). The Torturous Evolution of the Multinational Corporation,*Columbia Journal of World Business*, January-February.
- Perlmutter, H. andD.Heenan.(1986). Cooperate to Compete Globally,*Harvard Business Review*, March-April, pp:136-52.
- Pies I. (2010). Value Creation, Management Competencies, and Global Corporate Citizenship: An Ordonomic Approach to Business Ethics in the Age of Globalization, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Spring, 94 pp:265-278.
- Prahalad, C. K.(2004). The Poor can be Profitable. *Fortune*.
- Purviance, S.M.(1993.)Kidney Transplantation Policy and Distributive Justice,*Business and Professional Ethics Journal*, 12(2) pp:19-37.
- Rawls, J.(1958). Justice as Fairness. *The Philosophical Review*, 67 pp: 164-94.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reidenbach, R. E. and Robin, D. P.(1988).Some Initial Steps toward Improving Measurement of Ethical Evaluations of Marketing Activities,*Journal of Business Ethics*, November, 7 pp:871-79.
- Reidenbach, R. E. and Robin, D. P. (1990). Toward the Development of a Multidimensional Scale for Improving Evaluations of Business Ethics,*Journal of Business Ethics*, August, 9 pp:639-53.
- Reidenbach, R. E., Robin, D. P. and Dawson, L.(1991).An Application and Extension of a Multidimensional Ethics Scale to SelectedMarketing Practices and Marketing Groups,*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Spring, 19 pp:83-92.
- Rescher, N. (1966). *Distributive Justice*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Ringold, D. J.(1995). Social Criticisms of Target Marketing: Process or Product?*The American Behavioral Scientist*,38(4) pp:578-92.

- Robin, D. P. and Reidenbach, E. R. (1986). A Pretheoretic Framework for Thinking about Ethical Issues in Marketing. Presented at the *1985 Macromarketing Conference*, Boulder, Colorado. Abstracted in *Journal of Macromarketing*, Fall, 5 pp: 61.
- Robin, D. P. and Reidenbach, E. R.(1987).Social Responsibility, Ethics, and Marketing Strategy: Closing the Gap between Concept and Application, *Journal of Marketing*, January, 51 pp:44-58.
- Robin, D. P. and Reidenbach, E. R. (1988).A Framework for Analyzing Ethical Issues in Marketing, *Business and Professional Ethics Journal*, 5(2) pp:3-22.
- Robin, D. P. and Reidenbach, E. R. (1993). Searching for a Place to Stand: Toward a Workable Ethical Philosophy for Marketing,*Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Spring, 12 pp:97-105.
- Ruland, V. (2002).*Conscience Across Borders: An Ethics of Global Rights and Religious Pluralism*, San Francisco: University of San Francisco.
- Ryan, J. A. (1942). *Distributive Justice*, third edition, New York, NY:Macmillan.
- Sheffet, M. J. (1983).Market Share Liability: A New Doctrine of Causation in Product Liability,*Journal of Marketing*, Winter, 47 pp:35-43.
- Sheffet, M. J. (1994). The Supreme Court and Predatory Pricing, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 13(1) pp:163-68.
- Sheffet, M. J. (1995). The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988: Did they change Corporate Behavior? *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Fall, 14 pp:290-300.
- Sethi, P. S. (2003). *Setting Global Standards: Guidelines for Creating Codes of Conduct in Multinational Corporations*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Sturdivant, F. D.(1969). *The Ghetto Marketplace*, New York: The Free Press.
- Terpstra, V. and David, K.(1991).*The Cultural Environment of International Business*, 3rd edition, Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Trout, D. D.(1993).*The Thin Red Line*, San Francisco: West Coast Regional Office, Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.
- Van W. W. and Bulte, C.V.(1992).The 4P Classification of the Marketing Mix Revisited, *Journal of Marketing*, October, 84 pp:83-94.
- Vence, D.L.(2003). Multicultural Marketing, *Marketing News*, January, 6 pp:10-11.

Vernon, R.(1966).International Investment and International Trade in the Product Cycle,*Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May, pp:80.

Vernon, R. (1979).The Product Cycle in a New International Environment,*Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, November,pp:40.

Vlastos, G.(1962). Justice and Equality.In*Social Justice*, Richard Brandt, ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 31-72.

Webster, F. E.(1995). The Lopez Affair: Industrial Procurement Strategy and Business Ethics. *Case Study*, Amos Tuck School of Business, Dartmouth College.

Wells, L. T.(1968). A Product Life Cycle for International Trade?" *Journal of Marketing*, July, 32 pp: 1-6.

Yip, G.(1995).*Total Global Strategy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.