

## Chapter 13

# “Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations: Ethical Statements and Mottos (and Responsibility)

**Jo Ann Oravec**

*University of Wisconsin – Whitewater, USA*

### **ABSTRACT**

*Societal pressures on high tech organizations to define and disseminate their ethical stances are increasing as the influences of the technologies involved expand. Many Internet-based businesses have emerged in the past decades; growing numbers of them have developed some kind of moral declaration in the form of mottos or ethical statements. For example, the corporate motto “don’t be evil” (often linked with Google/Alphabet) has generated considerable controversy about social and cultural impacts of search engines. After addressing the origins of these mottos and statements, this chapter projects the future of such ethical manifestations in the context of critically-important privacy, security, and economic concerns. The chapter analyzes potential influences of the ethical expressions on corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives. The chapter analyzes issues of whether “large-grained” corporate mottos can indeed serve to supply social and ethical guidance for organizations as opposed to more complex, detailed codes of ethics or comparable attempts at moral clarification.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

*Evil is whatever Sergey [Brin] says is evil. - Eric Schmidt, former Executive Chairman of Google, as quoted in Vise and Malseed (2005)*

How do organizations make sense of the panoply of ethical issues they face, especially in rapidly-changing technological and social environments? Challenges are expanding for high tech research and development organizations as their technologies grow in societal impact (Broeders & Taylor, 2017), from considering the problems of young people confronting cyberbullies (Oravec, 2012) to the use of social media

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-4197-4.ch013

## ***“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations***

by terrorist organizations (Callahan, 2017; Tsesis, 2017). Some organizations develop and disseminate detailed ethical codes (Lere & Gaumnitz, 2007), others develop mottos or statements that encapsulate their positions and possibly focus the attentions of their stakeholders on critical matters (Kornberger & Brown, 2007; Martin, 2012). Internet-based organizations often have only a short timeframe for establishing reputations and setting ethical tones (since technologies shift quickly in prominence, along with corporate identities), and clues to their corporate culture can be vital to observers and stakeholders. This chapter deals with these issues through exploring the origins and societal influences of Google’s “don’t be evil” ethical motto and related corporate ethical statements and initiatives; in the past decade it expands these insights to the corporate social responsibility (CSR) efforts of other Internet-based organizations. What role could the notion of “evil” (associated with powerful and evocative theological and spiritual values) play in considering the actions of an Internet company? Why did “don’t be evil” as a motto have such a powerful and lasting influence on the ethical cultures of Internet business, reaching well beyond Google itself and into other information technology companies? An assortment of ethical dimensions has been debated in the light of the “don’t be evil” motto, including the fairness and legitimacy of various information-related practices (Hoofnagle, 2009).

Analyses of how corporate mottos and related statements are utilized in the social construction of organizational activity can be useful for researchers, public policy analysts, and investors who wish to understand an organization’s ethical perspectives and approaches. Answers to these questions may also be of assistance to organizations that are endeavoring to craft their own ethical expressions and communications as well as participate more fully in CSR efforts. Besio and Pronzini (2014) write that “morality becomes available to organizations as a medium that can be re-specified according to their internal dynamics” (p. 287), using such modalities as ethical codes, statements, and mottos in these efforts. From a critical perspective, the development of such ethical expressions is apparently unsettling to some organizational participants; for example, ethical codes and other detailed statements can be used as “instruments to further domination” rather than as means for enlightening and informing participants (Helin & Sandström, 2010; Helin, Jensen, Sandström, & Clegg, 2011). Winkler (2011) discusses how some ethical codes place employees in subordinate positions as “passive receivers of rules and regulations” who have “a need to be monitored and controlled by the higher levels of the corporate hierarchy” (p. 653), which runs counter to the expressed perspective of some Internet-based organizations. The process of code development should include individuals such as designers and engineers who may have special insight into how technologies may evolve (van Wynsberghe & Robbins, 2014). Ethical code development often provides a platform for the delineation of organizational perspectives and policies on critically-important matters, and their dissemination and discussion can produce otherwise-shielded insights about organizational conditions (Lere & Gaumnitz, 2007). In contrast, mottos are “larger grained” and often convey sweeping ideals rather than specific guidance (Martin, 2012).

## **ROOTS OF GOOGLE’S “DON’T BE EVIL” MOTTO**

Google (a part of Alphabet Corporation) is a US entity that was incorporated on September 4, 1998 as a privately held company operating in a Menlo Park, California garage; Google’s initial public offering (IPO) was on August 19, 2004, at least three years after the motto was coined and adopted. Google’s impact as an organization has been considerable: for example, the word “googling” has become a commonly-used term that was entered into the *Oxford English Dictionary* in 2006 (Auletta, 2009). Using the search

engine Google to locate information linked to individuals, destinations, and events has become part of everyday functioning in the US and many other Western nations (Levy, 2011; Vaidhyanathan, 2011). Google has also spawned a large assortment of other information technology applications, including autonomous motor vehicles and the withdrawn commercial item Google *Glass* (Hodson, 2014; Wolf *et al.*, 2016), both of which generated substantial security- and safety-related concerns. In the past decades, many organizations have developed mottos that have been integrated into their identities (Martin, 2012); examples include Alcoholics Anonymous’ “One day at a time.” Ethical efforts can be a major part of organizational identity work (Kornberger & Brown, 2007), and for relatively new organizations, such as those in high tech arenas, these efforts can be especially formative. For Google, the combination of motto development and ethical discourse has been particularly powerful. As described in this chapter, the “don’t be evil” motto has been mentioned in many books, articles, and blogs in both critical and supportive ways, often emerging when issues of consequence for Google materialize. As of May 2017, it was still visible in some ethically-themed Google web statements and materials although it has been superseded by Alphabet-issued communications. The statement “Employees of Alphabet and its subsidiaries and controlled affiliates should do the right thing—follow the law, act honorably, and treat each other with respect “has been cited in Alphabet’s code of conduct (Basu, 2015).

The ethical issues that Internet organizations such as Google face are expanding in ethical complexity and social importance as well as legal and political scrutiny. The Internet search engine results pertaining to oneself, another individual, or an organization can indeed have substantial impacts on wellbeing; an assortment of issues involving the fairness and the overall legitimacy of related information collection and analysis practices have arisen in the past two decades, as will be described in this chapter. Introducing the notion of evil into the discussion of issues that are often detailed and technical (although critically important) can be problematic, providing a level of analysis that is often at odds with the finely-grained real-life technical and economic situations precipitated by Google’s operations. About a decade ago (as lamented in *Wired* magazine), General Electric’s website had fifteen pages focused on its integrity policy and Nortel’s website had thirty-four pages (McHugh, 2003), in contrast with Google’s more concise treatment of comparable ethical issues.

As outlined in an assortment of published narratives and analyses, the “evil” notion does provide an evocative and perhaps frightening linkage of Google’s various high technology efforts with potential harms (Healey & Woods, 2017). For example, the dossier systems that served to destroy the reputations of so many individuals in some European nations decades ago still convey dark symbols of oppression (Pfaff, 2001). Rather than forcing Google to examine its central business operations in depth in the light of the harms that such information collection can engender, the “don’t be evil” motto had often apparently served as a diversion from this task, at least for many of its US stakeholders. Delivering the expression “don’t be evil” (as many Google personnel apparently do in a variety of circumstances, as evidenced by hundreds of newspaper and video sources) has often served as a substitute for the intense ethical engagement required for an organization of Google’s size and scope. For example, Google employee number 59, Douglas Edwards (2011), describes the motto as an “electrified moral fence” (p. xi) which protected the organization from intense and challenging discussions about its ethical status. Google has interpreted its own motto in current corporate communications (its website as of March 2013) in the following way:

*“Don’t be evil.” Googlers generally apply those words to how we serve our users. But “Don’t be evil” is much more than that. Yes, it’s about providing our users unbiased access to information, focusing on their needs and giving them the best products and services that we can. But it’s also about doing the*

## **“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations**

*right thing more generally – following the law, acting honorably and treating each other with respect. (Alphabet Investor Relations, 2013)*

Hoofnagle (2009) has claimed that following the law (as Google proclaims above) is not in itself a substantial ethical statement, and that Google should abandon the “don’t be evil” motto as an “albatross” because of the motto’s disconnection from its original context. Most major search engines and social media platforms are owned and controlled by corporate interests that often construe themselves as responsible to some extent to shareholders, employees, and other stakeholders; as corporations, search engine organizations are indeed obligated to follow the laws of the states and nations in which they provide services, and are not often applauded as being “ethical” for doing so. Despite these and other critiques, Google was considered as the second most socially responsible corporation in the world according to a Reputation Institute survey conducted of 47,000 individuals from fifteen nations (Sandoval, 2013, p. 5) and is still held in high regard as a public brand in the US (Gabl, Wieser, & Hemetsberger, 2016).

## **GENERATING THE “DON’T BE EVIL” MOTTO**

Historical accounts of the development of ideas can certainly be flawed; however, the related legends and memories can have their own forms of significance as they are used to reconstruct a company’s or technology’s history (Oravec, 1996). The origin of the Google motto has been associated with two separate Google figures. Google engineer and employee number 23 Paul Buchheit (creator of Gmail and prototype developer of Google AdSense) reportedly produced the phrase at a 2001 meeting about corporate values (Levy, 2011); according to a different account, another Google engineer, Amit Patel, may have delivered the “don’t be evil” line in 1999 (Moses, 2008). An assortment of subsequent interpretations of the motto by Google personnel have emerged, giving some small clues as to how the motto was treated in context through the years at Google. For example, Google’s Executive Chairman (and former CEO) Eric Schmidt and Chief Economist (then Google analyst) Hal Varian stated in *Newsweek* in 2005 that “Much has been written about Google’s slogan, but we really try to live by it, particularly in the ranks of management... We foster to create an atmosphere of tolerance and respect, not a company full of yes men” (p. 17). Conformity to corporate behavior is apparently considered a form of “evil” in this analysis, possibly in attempts to frame Google as a different kind of entity than the more traditional corporation. In consonance with this theme, in a letter to potential investors prior to Google’s 2004 IPO, co-founders Brin and Page stated their overall direction for Google in terms of the unconventional:

*Google is not a conventional company. We do not intend to become one. Throughout Google’s evolution as a privately held company, we have managed Google differently. We have also emphasized an atmosphere of creativity and challenge, which has helped us provide unbiased, accurate and free access to information for those who rely on us around the world ... Serving our end users is at the heart of what we do and remains our number one priority. (Google Founders Letter, [investor.google.com/ipo\\_letter.html](http://investor.google.com/ipo_letter.html))*

The “don’t be evil” motto is often discussed by Google personnel in ways that shed very little light on the organization’s ethical perspectives. For example, Google co-founder Larry Page stated in an interview in *Playboy*, “As for ‘Don’t be evil,’ we have tried to define precisely what it means to be a force for good — always do the right, ethical thing. Ultimately ‘Don’t be evil’ seems the easiest way to express

it” (Sheff, 2004, p. x). In response to a question by the interviewer “What would you do if you had to choose between compromising search results and being unavailable to millions of Chinese?” Google co-founder Sergey Brin responded “These are difficult questions, difficult challenges. Sometimes the ‘Don’t Be Evil’ policy leads to many discussions about what exactly is evil” (Sheff, 2004, p. x). Rather than providing a strong sense of direction or guidance, the “don’t be evil” motto appears particularly unhelpful in these responses by Page and Brin, whatever its strengths in terms of pithiness and memorability. Marissa Mayer, Google employee number 20 and now CEO of Yahoo, reportedly framed the motto in the following terms in 2008:

*It really wasn’t like an elected, ordained motto...I think that ‘Don’t Be Evil’ is a very easy thing to point at when you see Google doing something that you personally don’t like; it’s a very easy thing to point out so it does get targeted a lot.*

Mayer described the 2001 process of Google’s selection of the motto from among ten different candidate mottos; the motto was reportedly chosen because it “stuck,” was “catchy,” and “encompassed everything else” (Moses, 2008, p. 3).

Studying the influence of the Google motto and related ethical communications on CSR is a challenge. The success of Google in the past decade has come with a substantial amount of positive publicity, and highly affirmative accounts of its activities and managerial style are often delivered by academics as well as journalists. These include Jeff Jarvis’ *What Would Google Do? Reverse-Engineering the Fastest Growing Company in the History of the World* (2011), in which Google’s operations are held in an almost religiously high regard, as reflected in the title of the book as well as Laszlo Bock’s *Work Rules!: Insights from Inside Google that Will Transform How you Live and Lead* (2015). Whatever “evil” is associated with Google, the organization has received fairly little in terms of direct punishment in the US. Healey and Woods (2017) outline examples of the “quasi-religious ideology that obscures the moral and political-economic gatekeeping power of technology elites” (p. 2). In “Don’t Be Evil, but Don’t Miss the Train,” Hardy’s (2012) *New York Times* analysis places Google with very little retribution for its various infractions involving Google Street View, a mapping and photo application:

*The latest brouhaha, of course, involves the strange tale of Street View, Google’s project to photograph the entire world, one street at a time, for its maps feature. It turns out Google was collecting more than just images: federal authorities have dinged the company for lifting personal data off Wi-Fi systems, too, including e-mails and passwords. (Hardy, 2012, p. x)*

Google was merely presented with an SEC (US Securities and Exchange Commission) fine of \$25,000 for its privacy breaches related to Street View. With its positive momentum and publicity in the past decade, obtaining objective accounts of Google’s activities as well as analyses of its impacts has been somewhat difficult, at least in recent US contexts.

In terms of inspiring a generation of comparable corporate mottos, the traces of Google’s influence are apparent: in a 2010 BBC interview, Evan Williams (co-founder of Twitter) stated that his organization’s goal is “to be a force for good” (Grace, 2010). The Internet application PeekYou subsequently adopted the motto “Be Good for Goodness Sake” (*PRWeb*, 2010), with its CEO Michael Hussey delivering the following as an explanation: “We realize we are playing with some stiff competition and we don’t want to fall behind on the innovation curve... Hearing about all the Good things going on in our market space,

we thought...you know...let’s just ‘Be Good for Goodness Sake’...” Hussey explicitly related to both Google’s and Twitter’s mottos in his discussion of PeekYou’s newly-launched motto.

## **TOWARD “SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE”: FACEBOOK’S FORMER AND UPDATED MOTTOS**

Facebook Corporation has taken on a number of online service roles, including forms of search as well as personal expression and community connection. Mark Zuckerberg’s influence as founder and CEO has often been associated with support for initiative and creativity (Koseoglu, Liu, and Shalley, 2017; Mayer, 2017), with the Facebook motto of “to give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected” emphasizing empowerment. However, the less-reflective “move fast and break things” motto has also been associated with the company (Taplin, 2017). Facebook has often supported the notion of the individual human being as defined in and through association with a particular, unique Facebook page (Werbin, Lipton, & Bowman, 2017).

In February 2017, Facebook’s previous mottos and statements were replaced with ones that emphasize the concept of “social infrastructure”:

*... in a remarkable letter published today, CEO Mark Zuckerberg acknowledged the severe shortcomings and blind spots that his company’s mission created. Going forward, he said, the company will consider what happens after it connects people — and try to manage those effects for the better. “In times like these,” Zuckerberg wrote, “the most important thing we at Facebook can do is develop the social infrastructure to give people the power to build a global community that works for all of us.” (Newton, 2017)*

Facebook’s founder has been well-known for personal and organizational philanthropy, as described by Goldman (2016): “In December 2015, Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg and his wife Priscilla Chan announced their intention to commit an estimated \$45 billion in Facebook stock to improve the state of the world via a limited liability company (LLC) instead of a traditional foundation” (p. 2). He also has strongly supported particular political causes such as immigration. However, dedication of the Facebook organization as a whole toward certain social goals can extend influence even beyond any individual’s personal wealth, so the ethical statements and mottos disseminated by Facebook are of importance.

Search engines and social media platforms are not considered public utilities in the US and many other nations, despite their considerable impacts on everyday activities (Jarvis, 2011; Vaidhyanathan, 2011); Blevins (2012) has construed search engines as “gatekeepers” that “enjoy disproportionate influence over modern speech” (p. 353). As utilities, they would be placed under more intense scrutiny and controls than they are today, although this situation may change as computer networking plays greater roles in everyday life. The notion that centralized governments would themselves construct and manage large-scale online search services and social interaction venues is unsettling, possibly leading to an East German-style dossier system (Pfaff, 2001) in which personally-identifiable information would be managed by agencies without the protections that competitive forces and various forms of oversight and scrutiny may provide. Google’s and Facebook’s current applications and expressed societal aspirations may indeed be linked with some substantial societal concerns, but there could be larger, immanent and as of yet poorly defined, evils looming in these venues.

Google’s largely positive treatment in the US has had some notable exceptions. For instance, Google received an emotional attack from the late Steve Jobs in 2010, then CEO of Apple Corporation, for its frequent use of the “don’t be evil” phrase despite its highly competitive practices:

*We did not enter the search business, Jobs said. They entered the phone business. Make no mistake they want to kill the iPhone. We won’t let them, he says. Someone else asks something on a different topic, but there’s no getting Jobs off this rant. I want to go back to that other question first and say one more thing, he says. This don’t be evil mantra: “It’s bullshit.” Audience roars. (Abell, 2010)*

Steve Jobs and Eric Schmidt (then CEO of Google) were once crafting a closer relationship for their companies than is portrayed in the above remarks and related expletive (Stone and Helft, 2010), with new joint ventures and other connections planned. Eric Schmidt’s departure from Apple’s board in 2009 (reportedly because of potential anti-trust concerns) may have been linked with the obvious tension between the two companies, an analysis of which is beyond the scope of this chapter.

## **ETHICAL DISCOURSE INVOLVING DATA COLLECTION, SEARCH, AND SOCIAL MEDIA: CAN ETHICAL MOTTOS AND CODES BE OF HELP?**

Consideration of search engines and social media in information-related concerns is playing a growing role in ethical discourse on a variety of fronts. Along with negative information associated with an individual or organization, inaccurate fabrications or even rumors and planted misinformation can emerge in Internet searches. Zimmer (2008) characterizes search engines as intimately involved in violations of personal privacy in the US, providing an “infrastructure of dataveillance” (p. 77). Blackman (2008), Oravec (2003), and Ozer (2012) propose a right to one’s digital identity even within the legal and social configurations of the US and its various states, although many social and legal scholars are not optimistic about the prospects. The popularity of books such as *Search and Destroy: Why You Can’t Trust Google Inc.* (Cleland & Brodsky, 2011), *Privacy and Big Data* (Craig & Ludloff, 2011), *I Know Who You Are and I Saw What You Did: Social Networks and the Death of Privacy* (Andrews, 2012), and *Data and Goliath: The Hidden Battles to Collect Your Data and Control Your World* (Schneier, 2015) demonstrates some of the emerging disquiet about the use of search engines and social networks for the collection and search of information about individuals. There are considerable international variations in how such information is handled in social and economic contexts, with particular privacy protections in place in some nations and not in others.

Despite the generally positive treatment of Google and Alphabet Corporation as a whole in the US by various governmental and press entities in the past decade, there are a growing number of concerns about the social value of high levels of information collection and the ready availability of powerful search engines, such as those raised later in this chapter as well as in Andrews (2012) and Cleland and Brodsky (2011). For instance, many concerns about the online reputations of children have also emerged and there are a number of services that monitor children’s online traces for reputation-related problems. Associating individuals throughout their lifespans with digital information generated while they are minors presents a kind of unfairness, especially given the difference in how minors engage in social media in contrast with adults (Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2012). These associations can potentially limit the individuals’ life chances based on traces linked to conduct while a minor or to a cyberbully’s fabrica-

## ***“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations***

tions and constructions (Oravec, 2012). Google (along with many other search engine corporations) has been considered as to recognize its potential roles in mitigating the ill effects of information collection and search by being more responsive to individuals who have apparently been harmed, a labor-intensive process (Sevignani, 2017). Google’s approach to these sensitive matters has largely construed it in the role of receiving extraordinary profits from search engine mechanisms but bearing little responsibility for the negative impacts of their utilization. Sandoval (2013) states that “Google needs to commodify user data in order to generate profit and thus contributes to the commercialization of the Internet and the surveillance and exploitation of Internet users” (p. 51), and thus is faced with essential conflicts between ethical and financial objectives. Sevignani (2017) describes how Facebook and other Internet service providers are able to gain economically from the efforts of their participants:

*Web service owners ensure that users are excluded from the profit generating conditions and the profit itself through private property rights in the means of communication, classification, and surveillance... Internet service owners are able to appropriate the wealth that is mainly created by users in their online time: Without the users’ activity, social media could not sell anything to the advertising industry and could not be profitable. (p. 96)*

The number and variety of Internet data collection efforts dealing with individuals (such as government-produced records, marketing-related information, etc.) have increased dramatically; questions about personal privacy are not solely about governmental “Big Brother” intrusions (as outlined in Etzioni, 2012) but also about how corporations such as Google impact the lives of individuals through their own information collection and retrieval practices (Urist, 2006). Some perspectives toward search engine operations have construed them as displaying search results neutrally and without bias; Goldman (2006) describes the “demise” of such “utopian” viewpoints as more detailed aspects of the mechanisms behind the engines are revealed. An assortment of conferences is held about search engine heuristics and operations, such as the Search Engine Strategies (SES) meetings held yearly in New York City, in which experts speculate as to the best way for individuals and organizations to deal with search-related matters. Early iterations of search engine technology were designed simply to provide users with hyperlinks to various websites. In contrast, some of today’s search engines assist users to “locate and access information online, as well as communicate, collaborate, navigate, and organize their lives” (Zimmer, 2010, p. 507).

International differences in perspectives toward Internet data mining and more specifically the collection and dissemination of personally-identifiable information add complexities to questions about the legitimacy of search engine operations. In the European Union, personally-identifiable information is to be collected with the permission of the individuals involved and then used only for the specific purposes for which it was collected; after its intended use it is to be deleted (Ausloos, 2012; Bélanger & Crossler, 2011; Townend, 2017). In contrast, in the US personally-identifiable information is often collected and disseminated in ways that often provide little recourse in the cases of reuse of the data or correction of errors; if an organization collects the information, it generally can be utilized by it for various, unspecified purposes unless there is a particular law that stipulates use limitations. An “opt-in” approach toward personally-identifiable information collection and dissemination is prevalent in European Union practices (in which individuals are explicitly given the opportunity to participate in the information-collection practice or have their information removed). Ausloos (2012) discusses the “right to be forgotten” rooted in various European Union contexts in which information about individuals can be removed from already-existing databanks. In December 2012, the European Parliament outlined “Digital



Freedom” measures that more closely integrate various positions on online products and services into its trade and development policies; the Parliament clarified that in the digital sphere individuals have “fundamental rights which deserve equal protection as traditional human rights” (Schaake, 2012, para. 2). In contrast, the US primarily has “opt-out” approaches (if at all), which have information collection and dissemination about individuals as the default. These approaches require that individuals take specific steps to request organizations to delete traces pertaining to themselves or otherwise be removed from the information-related practices. The approaches also place few restrictions on search engines such as those operated by Google. Development of more detailed ethical statements on the part of Google and other Internet-based organizations could indeed raise issues that would be difficult to resolve; however, these issues will need to be confronted at some point, as various international perspectives bring them to the surface.

In the past decade, the European Union (EU) has directly approached Google on a number of data collection and dissemination matters, with potential fines and sanctions in the balance (in contrast with the more lenient approach of the US government as previously outlined). For example, Pfanner and O’Brien (2012) describe how Google has been challenged:

*In a letter to Larry Page, the chief executive of Google, 27 European data-protection agencies asked the company to modify its global privacy policy that governs dozens of Google online services — including the flagship search engine, Android mobile phone apps and YouTube videos — so that users have a clearer understanding of what personal data is being collected and can better control how that information is shared with advertisers. (p. B-1)*

In his response to the EU’s position, Google CEO Larry Page stated that “Virtually everything that we want to do, I think, is somewhat at odds with locking down all of your information for uses you haven’t contemplated yet” (Miller, 2012, para. 2). Larry Page is here clearly differentiating Google’s potentially-opportunistic perspective toward information reuse from that of the EU.

An increasing amount of information about the everyday matters involving individuals is being recorded, processed, and disseminated through social media and mobile Internet applications, making Internet-related practices into matters that are of importance to nearly everyone (Anders, 2008; Baker, 2008; Ford, 2011; Grimmelmann, 2010; Oravec, 2013). The “contextual integrity” of Google results can be problematic, especially when a small subset of the results returned is generally viewed by searchers (Zimmer, 2010). Search engine operations can subsequently have negative implications for the wellbeing of individuals, in some cases requiring some level of oversight (Wirtz & Lwin, 2009). For example, with the high levels of access to personally-identifiable information available online and organized through Google and other search engines, a large number of employers do extensive Internet searches and social media investigations before committing to a new hire even in relatively mundane hiring contexts (Auletta, 2009; Clark & Roberts, 2010; Davidson et al., 2012; McPeak, 2014; Oravec, 2004). Individuals are being evaluated for employment with information gleaned from their online interactions and communications, including what political opinions they have expressed online or social media groups joined.

The complexities of the ethical issues that Internet-based organizations are encountering are considerable: for example, many individuals willingly share intimate details through social media such as Facebook and various political affiliations and economic interactions are easily determined online, so the role of these organizations in collecting and disseminating this information in ways that respect individual privacy is complex. The US has had relatively little time to assimilate search engines and

## ***“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations***

social media into everyday life, though some pioneering efforts to develop legislation curbing various abuses have been emerging (Nilsson, 2012; Ozer, 2012, Stallworth, 2012; Tsesis, 2017). Internet-related organizations have the particularly difficult task of balancing free speech norms with their responsibilities to monitor and control some forms of problematic online interactions and images (Johnson, 2016). The maintenance of online reputations can involve comparably-complex concerns: some companies specialize in helping individuals and organizations “clean up” their online profiles by attempting to alter the way that they are viewed in Google, Twitter, and Facebook search results (Oravec, 2013, 2017; Sullivan, 2011). Pfaff (2001) describes a set of unfortunate and often tragic social accommodations to dossier collection in East Germany. Pfaff also relates how quickly and definitively individuals turned against dossier strategies as the social and political climate shifted, which is a potential outcome in the related situation with Google and various search engines and social media systems. Today, organizations such as Google are largely treated in a positive way, but conditions can change (especially in particular international contexts).

Mottos can indeed help organizations in “crystallizing attitudes, eliciting resolve, and guiding conduct.” (Martin, 2011, p. 49) but may not provide specific directions and perspectives, especially in the problematic situations outlined in this paper. Efforts to develop and disseminate ethical codes (and not just rely on a motto or statement) can strengthen organizations for the long term and the variety of challenges they may face in the future. Education efforts in schools as well as workplace settings can help empower participants better to develop and utilize ethical codes and mottos (Brinkman, Sims, & Nelson, 2011; Oravec, 1999) as well as interpret the ones produced by organizations.

## **CONCLUSION**

### **Ethical Mottos and Statements in CSR Initiatives**

*The ultimate search engine would understand exactly what you mean and give back exactly what you want. - Larry Page (quoted in Prather, 2002, p. x)*

Ethical mottos and statements produced by top management have become a part of the public discourse about a number of high tech companies, especially Google and its parent Alphabet Corporation. These mottos and statements “function in the moral space between abstract ethical theory and contextual moral judgment” (Martin, 2011, p. 49), often becoming part of an organization’s identity without providing specific guidance in multi-faceted moral cases. Such complex cases are certainly emerging in the realm of Internet applications, especially in the sensitive realms of health care, human resources, and children’s wellbeing. In their analysis of the operations of DeepMind (a British-based artificial intelligence (AI) subsidiary of Alphabet) Powles and Hodson (2017) state that “digital pioneers who claim to be committed to the public interest must do better than to pursue secretive deals and specious claims in something as important as the health of populations” (p. 14). Taddeo and Floridi (2016) state that the moral responsibilities of online service providers such as Google/Alphabet, Twitter, and Facebook are especially difficult because of “their gatekeeping function, their corporate social responsibilities, and their role in implementing and fostering human rights” (p. 1575). Google as a corporate entity has escaped many of

the potential dangers and attacks involved with having such a powerful role in individuals’ lives, perhaps in part because of how it has itself introduced the term “evil” into discourse on these matters. However, without more specific and detailed outlines of how Google as a corporation is related to the broader communities of which it is a part, public dialogue with Google is difficult to engender. Individuals who are not directly connected to Google’s top management are left to guess as to what directions it is taking in various social initiatives. Although Google management has produced insights about its supposed accomplishments (Schmidt & Rosenberg, 2014) deep reflection about ethical situations can open the organization to controversy and perhaps even legal issues. In the realm of social media, as Facebook and Twitter in the US are “weaponized” (Callahan, 2017; Tsesis, 2017) by terrorists and other negative influences, new attention is being directed toward corporate ethical approaches and social responsibility.

Search engine and social media processes and practices can produce results that are problematic in many ways, often manipulated or lacking context and possibly even planted by someone with malicious intent (Oravec, 2017). For the past decade, Google and Facebook did little to block the access to this malicious material and in many ways profited from such accessibility. However, in the past years, by framing the debate about its ethics with the term “evil” as a focus, Google has shifted the discourse from privacy to larger-grained concerns, and perhaps even theology. More delicate and perhaps sophisticated ethical and social analyses (such as outlined in the examples provided in Hoofnagle, 2009; Mayer-Schonberger, 2009; and Ozer, 2012) are eschewed by Google in favor of analysis at a larger, nearly religious level. In their analysis of changing technological and economic conditions, Zheng, Luo, and Wang (2014) “Maintaining ethical codes and social responsibility is more challenging because of the complicated moral conflicts and idiosyncratic norm standards” (p. 405). A form of discourse rooted in simplistic mottos has framed Google in terms of exceptionalism, rather than being part of the long traditions of moral thinking in information technology ethics.

Utilization of search engines indeed often has considerable social and economic consequences, as outlined by this article. For many individuals, the act of “googling” has become a substantial aspect of effective personal and professional functioning. We can only guess as to whether Google would have behaved differently as a company if it had generated, disseminated, and championed a detailed corporate code rather than the “don’t be evil” motto. Google could have funded and participated in large-scale societal discussions of the various issues involving search engines, including those of fairness and reputation. These issues bring to the surface many important matters concerning individual rights, for example, how organizations retain and disseminate information that is linked with an individual and in some national contexts more fully belongs to that individual. These issues (comparable to those associated with discussions involving state-established dossiers) also give international variations in information collection and dissemination renewed importance; nations can gain from observing each other’s examples about the benefits and detriments of different information handling perspectives. Google, along with its parent company Alphabet and other high-tech organizations, can indeed learn from the actions of the EU relating to information-related services that include personally-identifiable data, investing time and effort into establishing dialogue with the EU and other nations.

The corporate social responsibility (CSR) issues discussed in this chapter pertain not just to Google and Facebook but to the wide variety of Internet applications that incorporate search and social media functions and utilize personally-identifiable information (Fuchs, 2012; Strutin, 2011) as well as various educational technology initiatives (Spector, 2016). Social and ethical concerns should be addressed at

## **“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations**

all levels of the organizations involved, including that of the designers and engineers whose ideas are put into concrete, implementable forms (Lurie & Mark, 2016; van Wynsberghe & Robbins, 2014). The benefits of unfettered Internet data collection and search need to be weighed against the assortment of other personal and professional interests at stake as well as (and most importantly) the overall legitimacy of the collection and mining of those data. Intense and detailed societal discourse on the potential “evils” associated with search engines and other Internet applications is indeed called for, not just the development and dissemination of a motto, however memorable and influential it may be.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abell, J. C. (2010, January 30). Google’s ‘Don’t Be Evil’ mantra is “Bullshit,” Adobe is lazy: Apple’s Steve Jobs. *Wired*. Retrieved March 17, 2013 from <http://www.wired.com/business/2010/01/googles-dont-be-evil-mantra-is-bullshit-adobe-is-lazy-apples-steve-jobs/>
- Adee, S. (2011). Keeping Up e-ppearances. *New Scientist*, 209(2800), 46–49. doi:10.1016/S0262-4079(11)60399-0
- Alphabet Investor Relations. (2013). Retrieved August 28, 2017, from <http://investor.google.com/corporate/code-of-conduct.html>
- Anders, G. (2008, January 9). As economy slows, reputation takes on added meaning. *Wall Street Journal - Eastern Edition*, A2.
- Andrews, L. (2012). *I know who you are and I saw what you did: Social networks and the death of privacy*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Aula, P. (2011). Meshworked reputation: Publicists’ views on the reputational impacts of online communication. *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 28–36. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.09.008
- Auletta, K. (2009). *Googled: The end of the world as we know it*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Ausloos, J. (2012). The “Right to be Forgotten” – Worth remembering? *Computer Law & Security Review*, 28(2), 143–152. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2012.01.006
- Baker, R. (2008). Defamation and the moral community. *Deakin Law Review*, 13(1), 1–35. doi:10.21153/dlr2008vol13no1art151
- Bar-Ilan, J. (2007). Manipulating search engine algorithms: The case of Google. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 5(2/3), 155–166. doi:10.1108/14779960710837623
- Barnett, C. (2010). Managing your personal “brand” online. *Quill*, 98(2), 23.
- Bauer, T. (2014). The responsibilities of social networking companies: Applying political CSR theory to Google, Facebook and Twitter. *Critical Studies on Corporate Responsibility, Governance and Sustainability*, 6, 259–282.

- Bélanger, F., & Crossler, R. E. (2011). Privacy in the Digital Age: A review of information privacy research in information systems. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 35(4), 1017–1042. doi:10.2307/41409971
- Besio, C., & Pronzini, A. (2014). Morality, ethics, and values outside and inside organizations: An example of the discourse on climate change. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(3), 287–300. doi:10.1007/10551-013-1641-2
- Blackman, J. (2008). Omniveillance, Google, privacy in public, and the right to your digital identity: A tort for recording and disseminating an individual’s image over the internet. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 49, 313–393.
- Blevins, J. (2012). The new scarcity: A First Amendment framework for regulating access to digital platforms. *Tennessee Law Review*, 79, 353–416.
- Bock, L. (2015). Work rules!: Insights from inside Google that will transform how you live and lead. Hachette UK.
- Brinkman, J., Sims, R. R., & Nelson, L. J. (2011). Business ethics across the curriculum? *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, 8, 83–104.
- Broeders, D., & Taylor, L. (2017). Does great power come with great responsibility? The need to talk about corporate political responsibility. In *The Responsibilities of Online Service Providers* (pp. 315–323). Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-47852-4\_17
- Buchheit, P. (2008). Interview (with Jessica Livingston). In J. Livingston (Ed.), *Founders at work: Stories of startups’ early days* (pp. 181–172). New York: Springer.
- Butler, T. J. (2010). The realities of relying on doctor-patient non-disclosure agreements for reputational protection. *Health Lawyer*, 22(5), 23–29.
- Callahan, G. (2017). Attacking ISIL on Twitter: Addressing ethical responsibility in the weaponization of social media. *Intersect: The Stanford Journal of Science, Technology and Society*, 10(2), 1–20.
- Christofides, M., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2012). “Hey Mom, what’s on your Facebook?” Comparing Facebook disclosure and privacy in adolescents and adults. *Social Psychological & Personality Science*, 3(1), 149–154. doi:10.1177/1948550611408619
- Claburn, T. (2011, June 16). Google suggests Googling yourself. *Information Week*, 15.
- Clark, L. A., & Roberts, S. J. (2010). Employer’s use of social networking sites: A socially irresponsible practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(4), 507–525. doi:10.1007/10551-010-0436-y
- Cleland, S., & Brodsky, I. (2011). *Search and destroy: Why you can’t trust Google Inc.* New York: Telescope Books.
- Comisky, H. A., & Taylor, W. M. (2010). Don’t be a twit: Avoiding the ethical pitfalls facing lawyers utilizing social media in three important arenas- discovery, communications with judges and jurors, and marketing. *Temple Political & Civil Rights Law Review*, 20, 297.

**“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations**

Craig, T., & Ludloff, M. E. (2011). *Privacy and big data*. New York: O’Reilly.

Davison, H. K., Maraist, C. C., Hamilton, R. H., & Bing, M. N. (2012). To screen or not to screen? Using the Internet for selection decisions. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 24(1), 1–21. doi:10.1007/10672-011-9178-y

Edwards, D. (2011). *I’m feeling lucky: The confessions of Google Employee Number 59*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Etzioni, A. (2012). Privacy and the private realm. *Innovation (Abingdon)*, 25(1), 57–66. doi:10.1080/13511610.2012.655574

Ford, S. (2011). Reconceptualizing the public/private distinction in the Age of Information Technology. *Information Communication and Society*, 14(4), 550–567. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2011.562220

Fuchs, C. (2012). Political economy of privacy on Facebook. *Television & New Media*, 13(2), 139–159. doi:10.1177/1527476411415699

Gabl, S., Wieser, V. E., & Hemetsberger, A. (2016). Will we hate Google one day? In *A convention theory perspective on public brand evaluations* (Vol. 44, pp. 443–444). Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research.

Goldman, E. (2006). Search engine bias and the demise of search engine utopianism. *Yale Journal of Law & Technology*, 9, 111–234.

Goldman, P. (2016, February 29). How a new generation of business leaders views philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2016/02/how-a-new-generation-of-business-leaders-views-philanthropy>

Grace, C. (2010). Evan Williams says Twitter fundamental to government. *BBC News*, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/8563109.stm>

Greenberg, A. (2012). Is Zuckerberg’s ‘The Hacker Way’ letter Facebook’s ‘Don’t Be Evil’? And will he live up to it? *Forbes*.

Grimmelmann, J. (2010). Privacy as product safety. *Widener Law Journal*, 19(3), 793–827.

Healey, K., & Woods, R. H. Jr. (2017). Processing is not judgment, storage is not memory: A critique of Silicon Valley’s moral catechism. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 32(1), 2–15. doi:10.1080/23736992.2016.1258990 PMID:26811366

Helin, S., Jensen, T., Sandström, J., & Clegg, S. (2011). On the dark side of codes: Domination not enlightenment. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(1), 24–33. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2010.12.001

Helin, S., & Sandström, J. (2010). Resisting a corporate code of ethics and the reinforcement of management control. *Organization Studies*, 31(5), 583–604. doi:10.1177/0170840610372292

Hodson, H. (2014). Clever cars with Android and 4G keep you connected. *New Scientist*, 221(2952), 18. doi:10.1016/S0262-4079(14)60125-1

Hoffmeister, T. (2011). Google, gadgets, and guilt: Juror misconduct in the digital age. *University of Colorado Law Review*, 83, 409–470.

Hoofnagle, C. J. (2009). Beyond Google and evil: How policy makers, journalists and consumers should talk differently about Google and privacy. *First Monday*, 14(4-6).

Jarvis, J. (2011). *What would Google do? Reverse-engineering the fastest growing company in the history of the world*. New York: HarperBusiness.

Johnson, B. J. (2016). Facebook’s free speech balancing act: Corporate social responsibility and norms of online discourse. *University of Baltimore Journal of Media Law & Ethics*, 5(3/4), 19–37.

Kaiser, T. (2013, May 14). Google’s Eric Schmidt: “Don’t Be Evil” was stupid. Retrieved from <http://www.dailytech.com/Googles+Eric+Schmidt+Dont+Be+Evil+was+Stupid/article31544.htm>

Kornberger, M., & Brown, A. (2007). “Ethics” as a discursive resource for identity work. *Human Relations*, 60(3), 497–518. doi:10.1177/0018726707076692

Koseoglu, G., Liu, Y., & Shalley, C. E. (forthcoming). Working with creative leaders: Exploring the relationship between supervisors’ and subordinates’ creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Lehmberg, D., & Tangpong, C. (2016). Employee primacy and corporate slogans in Japanese and American firms’ communication in times of crisis. *International Journal of Business Communication*.

Lere, J. C., & Gaumnitz, B. (2007). Changing behavior by improving codes of ethics. *American Journal of Business*, 22(2), 7–18. doi:10.1108/19355181200700006

Levy, S. (2011). *In the plex: How Google thinks, works, and shapes our lives*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lurie, Y., & Mark, S. (2016). Professional ethics of software engineers: An ethical framework. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 22(2), 417–434. doi:10.1007/11948-015-9665-x PMID:26047575

Martin, M. W. (2011). Of mottos and morals. *The International Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 25(1), 49–60. doi:10.5840/ijap20112515

Martin, M. W. (2012). *Of mottos and morals: Simple words for complex virtues*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Mayer, D. (2017). The law and ethics of CEO social activism. *Journal of Law, Business Ethics*, 23, 21.

Mayer-Schonberger, V. (2009). *Delete: The virtue of forgetting in the digital age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

McHugh, J. (2003). Google vs. evil. *Wired*, 10(1), x.

McPeak, A. (2014). Social media snooping and its ethical bounds. *Arizona State Law Journal*, 46, 845–901.

Miller, C. C. (2012, October 17). Larry Page defends Google’s privacy policy. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/17/larry-page-defends-googles-privacy-policy/>

Moses, A. (2008, April 15). Don’t be evil or don’t lose value. *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved on March 17, 2013 from <http://www.smh.com.au/news/biztech/dont-be-evil/2008/04/15/1208025168177.html>

**“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations**

- Newton, C. (2017). Facebook just changed its mission, because the old one was broken. *The Verge*. Retrieved from <https://www.theverge.com/2017/2/16/14642164/facebook-mark-zuckerberg-letter-mission-statement>
- Nilsson, V. T. (2012). You’re not from around here, are you? Fighting deceptive marketing in the Twenty-first Century. *Arizona Law Review*, *54*, 801–828.
- Oravec, J. (1996). *Virtual individuals, virtual groups: Human dimensions of groupware and computer networking*. New York: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511574986
- Oravec, J. (2003). The transformation of privacy and anonymity: Beyond the “right to be let alone.” *Sociological Imagination*, *39*(1), 3–23.
- Oravec, J. (2004). The transparent knowledge worker: Weblogs and reputation mechanisms in KM Systems. *International Journal of Technology Management*, *28*(7/8), 767–775. doi:10.1504/IJTM.2004.005782
- Oravec, J. (2012). Bullying and mobbing in academe: Challenges for distance education and social media applications. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, *49*, 46–58.
- Oravec, J. (2013). Gaming Google: Some ethical issues involving online reputation management. *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, *10*, 61–81. doi:10.5840/jbee2013104
- Oravec, J. A. (1999). Integrating privacy studies into teacher education curricula. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, *8*(1), 55–70. doi:10.1080/14759399900200050
- Oravec, J. A. (2017). The manipulation of scholarly rating and measurement systems: Constructing excellence in an era of academic stardom. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *2*(4), 423–436. doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1301909
- Ozer, N. (2012). Putting online privacy above the fold: Building a social movement and creating corporate change. *New York University Review of Law & Social Change*, *36*, 215–281.
- Pannapacker, W. A. (2007). The inescapability of your past. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *53*(33), B11–B12.
- Pfaff, S. (2001). The limits of coercive surveillance: Social and penal control in the German Democratic Republic. *Punishment & Society*, *3*(3), 381–407. doi:10.1177/1462474501003003003
- Pfanner, E., & O’Brien, K. J. (2012, October 17). European privacy regulators warn Google on data-gathering policies. *New York Times*, B.1.
- Powles, J., & Hodson, H. (2017). Google DeepMind and healthcare in an age of algorithms. *Health and Technology*. doi:10.1007/12553-017-0179-1
- Prather, M. (2002, April). Ga-Ga for Google. *Entrepreneur Magazine*, p. x.
- PRWeb (2010, March 17). PeekYou announces new corporate slogan “Be Good for Goodness Sake.” Retrieved March 17, 2013 from <http://www.prweb.com/releases/peekyou/announces-new-slogan/prweb3739304.htm>



Sandoval, M. (2013). Corporate social (ir)responsibility in media and communication industries. *Javnost-The Public*, 20(3), 5–23. doi:10.1080/13183222.2013.11009120

Schaake, M. (2012, December 11). European Parliament endorses first ever digital freedom strategy. Retrieved December 11, 2012 from <http://www.marietjeschaake.eu/2012/12/european-parliament-endorses-first-ever-digital-freedom-strategy/>

Schmidt, E., & Rosenberg, J. (2014). *How Google works*. Hachette, UK.

Schmidt, E., & Varian, H. (2005, November 28). Google: Ten gold rules. *Newsweek*, 17.

Schneier, B. (2015). *Data and Goliath: The hidden battles to collect your data and control your world*. WW Norton & Company.

Schwartz, P. M., & Solove, D. J. (2011). The PII problem: Privacy and a new concept of personally identifiable information. *New York University Law Review*, 86, 1814–1890.

Sheff, D. (2004, September). Playboy interview: The Google guys. *Playboy*, x.

Spector, J. M. (2016). Ethics in educational technology: Towards a framework for ethical decision making in and for the discipline. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(5), 1003–1011. doi:10.1007/11423-016-9483-0

Stallworth, B. (2010). Future imperfect: Googling for principles in online behavioral advertising. *Federal Communications Law Journal*, 62(2), 465–491.

Stein, J., & Harrell, E. (2011). Your data, yourself. *Time*, 177(11), 40–46.

Stone, B., & Helft, M. (2010, March 13). Apple’s spat with Google is getting personal. *New York Times*.

Strutin, K. (2011). Social media and the vanishing points of ethical and constitutional boundaries. *Pace Law Review*, 31(1), 228–290.

Sullivan, P. (2011, June 11). Negative online data can be challenged, at a price. *The New York Times*, p. B6.

Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2016). The debate on the moral responsibilities of online service providers. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 22(6), 1575–1603. doi:10.1007/11948-015-9734-1 PMID:26613596

Taplin, J. (2017). *Move fast and break things: How Facebook, Google, and Amazon cornered culture and undermined democracy*. Macmillan.

Townend, J. (2017). Data protection and the ‘right to be forgotten’ in practice: A UK perspective. *International Journal of Legal Information*, 45(1), 28–33. doi:10.1017/qli.2017.2

Tsesis, A. (2017). Terrorist speech on social media. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 70, 651–708.

Urist, J. (2006). Who’s feeling lucky - skewed incentives, lack of transparency, and manipulation of Google search results under the DMCA. *Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial, and Commercial Law*, 1, 209–230.

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2011). *The Googlization of everything: (And why we should worry)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

**“Don’t Be Evil” and Beyond for High Tech Organizations**

van Wynsberghe, A., & Robbins, S. (2014). Ethicist as designer: A pragmatic approach to ethics in the lab. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 20(4), 947–961. doi:10.1007/11948-013-9498-4 PMID:24254219

Vise, D. A., & Malseed, M. (2005). *The Google story*. New York: Random House.

Werbin, K. C. (2012). Auto-biography: On the immanent commodification of personal information. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 17, 46–53.

Werbin, K. C., Lipton, M., & Bowman, M. J. (2017). The contextual integrity of the closet: Privacy, data mining and outing Facebook’s algorithmic logics. *Queer Studies in Media & Popular Culture*, 2(1), 29–47. doi:10.1386/qsmc.2.1.29\_1

Winkler, I. (2011). The representation of social actors in corporate codes of ethics: How code language positions internal actors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101(4), 653–665. doi:10.1007/10551-011-0762-8

Wirtz, J., & Lwin, M. O. (2009). Regulatory focus theory, trust, and privacy concern. *Journal of Service Research*, 12(2), 190–207. doi:10.1177/1094670509335772

Wolf, M. J., Wolf, M. J., Grodzinsky, F. S., Grodzinsky, F. S., Miller, K. W., & Miller, K. W. (2016). There’s something in your eye: Ethical implications of augmented visual field devices. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 14(3), 214–230. doi:10.1108/JICES-10-2015-0035

Zheng, Q., Luo, Y., & Wang, S. L. (2014). Moral degradation, business ethics, and corporate social responsibility in a transitional economy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(3), 405–421. doi:10.1007/10551-013-1668-4

Zimmer, M. (2008). The gaze of web search engines: How Google acts as an infrastructure of dataveillance. In A. Spink & M. Zimmer (Eds.), *Web Searching: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 77–99). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-75829-7\_6

Zimmer, M. (2010). Web search studies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on web search engines. In J. Hunsinger, L. Klastrup, & M. Allen (Eds.), *International Handbook of Internet Research* (Vol. 24, pp. 507-521).