
UNDERSTANDING THE APPLICABILITY OF UTILITARIANISM ETHICS TO BUSINESS PRACTICES WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE PROBLEM OF CONSUMER DECEPTION AND PRODUCT SAFETY

Mohammad Amin Parvin and Mohammad Manzoor Malik¹

ABSTRACT

Utilitarian ethics provides a compelling framework for addressing ethical challenges in contemporary business practices, particularly concerning consumer deception and product safety. This paper explores the intersection of utilitarian principles with modern business dynamics, highlighting conflicts arising from profit-driven motives conflicting with the ethical imperatives of maximizing overall happiness and minimizing harm. Drawing on foundational works by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, the study examines utilitarianism's core tenets—such as the greatest happiness principle and consequentialism—and their application within business contexts. The analysis identifies specific instances of consumer deception and compromised product safety as manifestations of businesses prioritizing short-term gains over long-term societal well-being. It proposes a solution model grounded in Stakeholder Capitalism and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), advocating for ethical decision-making that integrates stakeholder interests and promotes transparency and sustainability.

By aligning utilitarian ethics with pragmatic business strategies, organizations can navigate ethical dilemmas effectively while contributing positively to societal welfare and enhancing long-term competitiveness. This research contributes to the ongoing discourse on business ethics by offering insights into reconciling utilitarian principles with contemporary business realities, thereby fostering a more ethical and sustainable business environment.

Keywords: Utilitarianism; Business Ethics; Stakeholder Capitalism; Corporate Social Responsibility

Introduction

Utilitarian ethics and modern business practices often find themselves at odds with businesses prioritizing self-interest over the collective well-being advocated by utilitarian scholars. Based on which there is a need to seek the dissection of this conflict by utilizing utilitarianism as a theoretical framework to shed light on the clashes between ethical principles and business models, while also proposing solutions to mitigate adverse implications. The focus of this study centers around the core tenets of utilitarianism, including the greatest happiness principle, consequentialism, and long-term thinking, examining their application within contemporary business contexts, and based on analysis of where utilitarian principles align with modern business practices and where they diverge, it aims to elucidate the severity of the problem arising from this misalignment. Theoretical approaches provide the groundwork for this study, bolstered by data gathered from a variety of sources, including academic literature, books, articles, and online resources, and through the integration of utilitarian ethics into business practices, it argues that businesses can maintain long-term competitiveness by prioritizing the well-being of the majority over short-term gains for a select few.

The Problem

The gap between utilitarian ideals and modern business practices has presented a pressing concern because utilitarian philosophy advocates for advancing collective well-being while businesses often prioritize shareholder profits which lead to ethical quandaries and negative repercussions such as environmental degradation and labor exploitation. Therefore, this critical analysis investigates into specific issues such as consumer deception and product safety, which serve as examples of businesses' profit-centric ethos and illustrate their interconnectedness and long-term impact on society.

Solution Model

In response to this ethical problem, a solution model emerges which includes principles of Stakeholder Capitalism and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and reconcile utilitarian ethics with pragmatic business strategies. Such as, Stakeholder Capitalism has advocated for a broader business responsibility which has focus on diverse stakeholders, while later extending ethical considerations beyond financial gains to amplify utilitarian principles. This model emphasizes transparency, stakeholder engagement, and long-term sustainability as essential for modern businesses to navigate ethical dilemmas and foster societal well-being, and the integration of social and environmental dimensions into decision-making processes. Then, businesses can manage conflicts and contribute to the greater societal welfare.

The conflict between utilitarian ethics and contemporary business models underlines the imperative to harmonize utilitarian principles with evolving business requirements, and the putting of the main focus on specific issues like consumer deception and product safety, and it explores how the implementation of a utilitarian solution model can bridge this conflict and advance corporate social responsibility in modern business practices.²

Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a philosophical theory rooted in the maximization of overall happiness or utility, and holds profound implications for ethical decision-making within the realm of business.³ This ethical framework, pioneered by Jeremy Bentham and further refined by John Stuart Mill, evaluates the morality of actions based on their outcomes, emphasizing the net balance of happiness over suffering for all relevant parties. Utilitarianism finds its origins in Jeremy Bentham's seminal work, where he introduced the "greatest happiness principle" and proposed that the moral value of an action should be determined by its capacity to maximize pleasure and minimize pain.⁴ Building upon Bentham's groundwork, John Stuart Mill distinguished between higher and lower pleasures, emphasizing the significance of intellectual and moral fulfilment over mere physical indulgence.⁵

At its core, utilitarianism revolves around the central goal of maximizing happiness and minimizing suffering for the greatest number of individuals.⁶ It posits that the moral rightness of an action is solely determined by its consequences, prioritizing outcomes over intentions. Additionally, utilitarianism underscores the importance of impartiality, requiring individuals to consider the well-being of all affected parties without bias or favoritism. While utilitarianism offers a compelling framework for ethical decision-making, it faces challenges in practice. Critics argue that accurately quantifying pleasure and pain to determine the morality of actions can be complex and subjective. Furthermore, the consequentialist nature of utilitarianism raises concerns about the potential justification of morally questionable actions if the end result maximizes overall happiness.

Central to utilitarianism is the concept of utility, which refers to the net balance of happiness over suffering.⁷ Actions are evaluated based on their utility, with morally right actions being those that produce the greatest overall happiness. This principle guides ethical decision-making by emphasizing the importance of maximizing happiness and minimizing suffering for all stakeholders involved.

Utilitarian Practices in Business

Utilitarian ethics resonate remarkably well with various critical aspects of modern business practices, providing a strong foundation for ethical decision-making and strategic alignment.⁸ Businesses that adhere to utilitarian principles prioritize customer satisfaction, resource optimization, and long-term strategic planning to enhance overall well-being. Scholars recognize the contributions of Bentham and Mill to utilitarianism while advocating for a broad interpretation of its terms. They emphasize the fundamental role of pleasure and pain in driving human actions and decision-making processes.

Consumer Deception and Product Safety

In the rapidly evolving landscape of technology and business, advancements in digitalization and global connectivity have brought efficiency and flexibility but also introduced ethical challenges. The integration of internet processes has transformed traditional business functions such as sales, marketing, and communication, necessitating heightened corporate responsibility and ethics.⁹ Organizational ethical environments have become increasingly complex, encompassing liability, workplace safety, child labor, bribery, internet crimes, and privacy threats. Social media has imposed new ethical standards, including information disclosure and conflict of interest, further complicating ethical considerations.¹⁰ Financial management faces challenges like financial fraud exemplified by scandals such as Enron. Workplace issues like harassment, discrimination, and safety persist, underscoring the need for ethical values at all organizational levels.¹¹

Consumer fraud manifests in various marketing forms, including false advertising, exaggerated claims, and misleading packaging. In today's competitive landscape, businesses often resort to fraudulent practices to bolster sales, compromising consumer trust and safety.¹² Misrepresentation of product benefits, lack of scientific evidence, and undisclosed fees erode consumer trust, while compromised product safety poses health risks.¹³ Consumers experiences financial and health repercussions from deceptive

practices, leading to diminished trust in businesses and financial losses. The repercussions extend beyond individual consumers, affecting societal trust and the overall economy.¹⁴

Balancing fundraising with ethical considerations poses a challenge for businesses, emphasizing the importance of transparency, honesty, and accountability in business practices.¹⁵ Privacy breaches and misuse of user data in the digital realm pose risks to individuals and organizations, necessitating effective strategies to safeguard privacy and trust.¹⁶ Unauthorized data access, cyber-attacks, and improper data use undermine consumer trust and compromise data security, leading to identity theft and financial fraud.¹⁷ Businesses must integrate privacy considerations into their operations through frameworks like Privacy by Design to build and maintain user trust.¹⁸ Consumer deception and product safety are issues with far-reaching implications for individuals, businesses, and society while legal recourse and consumer protection laws play crucial roles to resolve deceptive practices and safeguarding consumer rights.¹⁹ Utilitarian principles must guide business practices which can mitigate deceptive advertising and uphold consumer welfare.²⁰

Deceptive advertising exploits information gaps between businesses and consumers because they use misleading claims, false endorsements and hidden fees and manipulate perceptions and influence purchasing decisions.²¹ A few real-life examples like Volkswagen's emissions scandal and Juul Labs' misrepresented e-cigarettes are very important to consider the consequences to prioritize short-term gains over ethical considerations.²² This is because profit-driven motives often lead businesses to engage in deceptive practices, facilitated by lax regulations and enforcement mechanisms.²³ The consequences of consumer deception extend beyond financial losses, impacting societal trust and well-being.²⁴ Compromised product safety poses significant risks to consumer health and well-being, with examples like Takata's faulty airbags showcasing the dire consequences of design defects and regulatory failures.²⁵ Personal injury lawyers play a vital role in holding manufacturers accountable and advocating for consumer rights.²⁶ Consumer decision-making is influenced

by psychological factors like motivation and perception, which deceptive marketing exploits to manipulate purchasing behavior.²⁷

Consumer learning significantly influences attitudes and behaviors towards products, with deceptive marketing exploiting this by disseminating false information, as seen in Volkswagen's Dieselgate scandal.²⁸ Attitudes and beliefs shape consumer behavior, manipulated by deceptive marketing practices like Coca-Cola's promotion of sugary beverages as healthy despite evidence suggesting otherwise.²⁹ Personality traits, self-concept, and lifestyles affect consumer decision-making, with companies like Nike leveraging endorsements to target specific traits and lifestyles for brand loyalty.³⁰ Emotions drive consumer behavior, exploited by deceptive marketing to elicit desired responses, exemplified by Dove's emotionally resonant messaging challenging beauty standards.³¹ Trust is fundamental but eroded by deceptive marketing practices, exemplified by Facebook's mishandling of user data, leading to skepticism and reduced engagement.³²

Digital environments pose privacy risks, including data breaches and identity theft, highlighted by incidents like the 2013 Target data breach.³³ Data leaks and breaches compromise consumer privacy, as seen in the 2019 Capital One breach, exacerbating risks of identity theft.³⁴ Electronic surveillance, exemplified by Facebook and Google's data collection practices, raises concerns about privacy and data exploitation.³⁵ Social media manipulation and disinformation, fueled by algorithmic amplification and deepfake technology, undermine trust and exacerbate privacy concerns.³⁶ Ethical dilemmas in digital marketing include data privacy, negative advertising, pricing practices, and targeted marketing, requiring transparency and ethical integrity to build consumer trust.³⁷

Solution based on Utilitarian Principles

Utilitarianism, aiming for the "greatest good for the greatest number," revolves around pursuing happiness and avoiding harm. However, its fundamental assumptions reveal complexities. It doesn't dictate right from wrong but equates happiness with right and pain with

wrong, raising questions about morality's core principles.³⁸ The concern for the majority's welfare in utilitarianism can pose leadership dilemmas, especially when decisions favor many impact minorities. This prompts a crucial inquiry: Can the well-being of some be sacrificed for the benefit of the majority? Utilitarianism might not provide a definitive answer, potentially leading to ethical challenges.³⁹ Critics argue that while utilitarianism promotes rational decision-making, it overlooks challenges in attaining true reason, allowing individuals to exploit moral discourse under the guise of rationality. Moreover, it neglects essential aspects of human experience like justice, culture, and emotions, raising doubts about its ability to address moral complexities adequately.⁴⁰

Since the dawn of consciousness, humanity has grappled with concepts of good and evil, giving rise to ethics as a philosophical discipline. Jeremy Bentham, considered the father of utilitarianism, significantly influenced the evolution of ethical philosophy with his ideas.⁴¹ Born into a legal family in 1748, Jeremy Bentham sought to reform the British legal system amid profound social changes. His seminal work, "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation" (1789), laid the foundation for his philosophy, asserting that pleasure and pain govern human behavior.⁴² Bentham's consequentialist ethical theory, grounded in the principle of utility, evaluates actions based on their consequences rather than intentions. He emphasized the importance of actions leading to good outcomes, dismissing the significance of intent (Ibid, p. 9). Bentham introduced the utilitarian calculus, considering factors like intensity, duration, certainty, and proximity to assess pleasure and pain. Despite its utility, his theory faced criticisms. Some argued that it condones immoral actions if they serve the greater good, while others pointed to its simplistic view of human motivation and health.⁴³

Nevertheless, utilitarianism remains influential in law, politics, and societal design. Later scholars, such as GE Moore, RM Hare, and JS Mill, refined the theory to address its shortcomings. Utilitarianism continues to shape legal concepts, drive ethical discussions, and pose challenges in various domains.⁴⁴ In contemporary discourse, focus shifts to applying

utilitarian principles in labor ethics, particularly influenced by Mill's ideas. This nuanced approach reflects the complexity of utilitarianism and its practical implications. Examining Miller's contributions sheds light on ethical decision-making processes in business contexts, bridging theory with real-world applications.⁴⁵ In the 1970s, the Ford Pinto exemplified the challenges of applying utilitarian principles to business decisions. Ford President Lee Iacocca faced pressure to meet the demand for the small, fuel-efficient car despite safety concerns. The Pinto's flawed design, particularly its vulnerable fuel tank placement, raised ethical dilemmas about prioritizing profits over consumer safety.⁴⁶

Utilitarian analysis weighed the costs of safety upgrades against potential human harm. Ford estimated the cost of fixing the tank at \$137 million, compared to projecting the potential casualties from accidents. Ultimately, Ford chose not to recall the Pinto which led to tragic consequences, including deaths and serious injuries from fuel-related accidents; therefore, this case has highlighted the challenge of balancing ethics with business realities and highlights the difficulty of translating moral principles into actionable decisions, especially when lives are at stake. Utilitarianism prompts crucial reflections on corporate ethics, legal operations, and the imperative of prioritizing human welfare.⁴⁷

Applying utilitarian principles to commercial decisions is difficult, as shown by the Ford Pinto case, and the example shows ethical issues when precise moral judgement criteria are used to minimize suffering and maximize happiness.⁴⁸ Financial advantages vs human costs provoke arguments in economic evaluations of life and health. Profit over safety increases social problems and ignores long-term effects for short-term gains. The lawsuit emphasizes corporate ethics, transparency, justice, and ethics over profits which makes businesses rethink ethics, norms, and regulations because the Ford Pinto lawsuit casts doubt on Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian theory of happiness for everyone. Bentham's methodology examines activities based on their effects and mass benefit, the instance shows moral complexity when financial measures outweigh human well-being, and individual rights and utilitarianism clash,

generating problems about justice and ethical trade-offs.⁴⁹ Bentham's legacy encourages critical analysis of utility notions in corporate ethics while Miller's analysis is smart but fails to solve ethical issues like the Pinto case, and utilitarianism's inability to balance monetary worth with human wellbeing and individual rights shows its shortcomings in complex ethical situations. As the Pinto case shows, utilitarianism fails to handle complex ethical issues in commercial decision-making by reducing morality to quantitative criteria, which ignore qualitative human well-being.

Consumer fraud and dangerous products are major issues in today's competitive business environment, and deceptive marketing, misleading ads, and concealed fees are common ways for companies to gain an edge, undermining consumer trust. These actions damage consumer confidence and public health and safety while unethical activities such as making claims about product benefits without scientific evidence, unclear terms and fees, and neglecting product safety for cost savings damage consumer trust.⁵⁰ These behaviors have societal and economic consequences as well as money losses and product returns, and businesses can improve customer connections by prioritizing long-term well-being and ethical business operations because openness, honesty, and responsibility boost brand reputation and customer trust.

Prioritizing customer health and happiness while minimizing harm is utilitarian which requires transparent corporate procedures, accurate scientific information, and behavioral model alignment to ensure ethical conduct. A Code of Business Conduct that emphasizes ethics and clearly defines product information sharing can boost consumer trust and loyalty while building a strong brand requires ethical business practices, which can be difficult to balance with financial interests.⁵¹ Businesses can build long-term customer connections by being ethical, respecting clients, and prioritizing their well-being over short-term gains. Businesses can prioritize customer trust and well-being by constantly examining marketing techniques and product claims for ethicality using utilitarianism. Public disclosure of ethical and environmental practices builds consumer trust,

enabling individuals to make educated decisions and benefiting society. Participation in decision-making by different stakeholders guarantees that all parties' wants and interests are considered, consistent with utilitarian principles of maximizing enjoyment and minimizing harm. Fairness and equity are crucial to distributing goods and marketing benefits evenly among communities. Utilitarian solutions prioritize enjoyment, long-term rewards, and ethical cost-benefit analysis. Transparent information sharing builds trust and responsibility in organizations, improves consumer satisfaction, and benefits society. In keeping with utilitarian goals of maximizing happiness for the most people, firms can uphold ethical standards, promote consumer welfare, and increase long-term profitability by prioritizing honest communication and accountability. Businesses should create utilitarian business codes to aid ethical decision-making and these codes ensure that business actions benefit society by prioritizing the greatest good for the greatest number.⁵² Utilitarian techniques aim to link business goals with ethics including transparency, honesty, and consumer rights while businesses encourage good rather than harm by setting explicit employee and corporate behavior norms.

A strong code of conduct promotes accountability and conformity, reflecting utilitarian values of society benefit, and businesses build consumer trust and satisfaction by setting ethical standards for product development, marketing, customer interactions, and data privacy. Companies must prioritize product safety to maximize happiness and minimize harm. Research, development, and testing guarantee products satisfy strict safety requirements, reducing customer risk and exhibiting ethical conduct. Even at higher expense, proactively identifying and addressing safety issues shows a commitment to consumer welfare over short-term profit and this investment reduces damage and boosts brand trust and profitability.⁵³ Utilitarian fairness and happiness require inclusive stakeholder engagement. Companies can understand the ethical consequences of their actions and make decisions that benefit all stakeholders by combining feedback from consumers, employees, suppliers, and regulatory organizations.

Stakeholder involvement in decision-making improves accountability, openness, and trust, benefiting all parties, and utilitarian ideas emphasize examining several views to create judgements that maximize happiness and minimize damage. Business procedures must be fair and equal to prioritize long-term social well-being over short-term profits. This requires equal benefit distribution across communities and avoiding marketing stereotypes and biases. To protect consumers and advance society, companies should prioritize ethical marketing and product claims. Consumer trust and credibility require transparency, honesty, and industry norms. Toyota's 2010 brake system recall shows the significance of consumer safety and openness in business. The incident highlighted the importance of ethical decision-making and accountability in market trust and reputation. The Toyota brake system recall was caused by mechanical, software, and design problems that caused unintended acceleration and braking. Toyota issued many safety recalls due to regulator and consumer advocacy organization complaints.⁵⁴ The company's crisis management caused reputational and financial damage, with legal actions aggravating matters.

To choose the right action, utilitarianism, which seeks to maximize happiness and minimize damage, advises weighing the consequences. In the Toyota recall, consumers, employees, shareholders, regulators, and the public—each with their own interests—were involved in the decision-making process, exposing the complicated ethical issues. Toyota's response to the brake system error involved a utilitarian approach to decision-making, weighing the short-term costs and inconvenience against the long-term benefits of ensuring safety and preserving trust in the brand. While initiating a recall incurred short-term costs and logistical challenges for Toyota and its customers, prioritizing consumer safety and trust aligned with utilitarian principles of maximizing overall happiness and minimizing harm.⁵⁵

The decision-making process began with identifying and assessing the problem through internal investigations and consultations with experts to understand the potential risks and consequences. Toyota's leadership

evaluated various factors, including the potential impact on consumer safety, brand reputation, and stakeholder trust, before deciding to initiate a recall. This decision reflected ethical leadership and a commitment to prioritizing consumer welfare, consistent with utilitarian principles. Toyota's handling of the brake system recall demonstrated strengths in prioritizing consumer safety and taking proactive measures through the recall; however, there were also weaknesses, including potential delays in identifying and addressing the problem, and challenges in effectively communicating with consumers and stakeholders.

Future companies should prioritize consumer welfare and safety over short-term profits when faced with ethical dilemmas while adopting a utilitarian perspective can guide decisions that maximize overall happiness and minimize harm, even if it means sacrificing immediate financial gains. Transparent communication and reporting are crucial for maintaining trust and transparency with stakeholders, enabling informed decision-making among consumers.⁵⁶ Engaging with stakeholders allows companies to consider diverse perspectives and interests, ensuring that decisions are fair and inclusive, aligning with utilitarian principles of maximizing overall happiness. Incorporating behavioral insights can enhance the effectiveness of ethical decision-making processes, aligning ethical principles with consumer preferences and expectations. Upholding ethical principles should be a cornerstone of all business operations. Future companies should establish ethical guidelines and codes of conduct that prioritize integrity, honesty, and responsibility, fostering a culture of trust and integrity. Learning from case studies like Toyota's brake system recall highlights the importance of ethical decision-making in corporate governance.

Utilitarian principles provide a valuable framework for ethical decision-making, emphasizing the welfare of consumers and society, and by prioritizing ethical considerations over short-term profits, companies can contribute to a more ethical and sustainable business environment, fostering trust, transparency, and accountability in business practices. Ultimately, prioritizing ethical considerations contributes to the overall

happiness and well-being of society, building a more resilient and sustainable business model. In the contemporary business landscape, conducting a utilitarian assessment of costs and benefits is crucial to prioritize actions that maximize overall happiness and minimize harm to society because transparency in reporting and respect for all stakeholders in corporate operations promote ethical ideals and the greater good. Transparent reporting on ethical practices, impact evaluations, and sustainability goals helps consumers make values-based decisions while clear communication gives consumers the information they need to weigh costs and advantages.

Transparent reporting on ethics, environmental effect, and social responsibility is essential for companies. Trust, confidence, and customer well-being increase, and clear reporting techniques also allow consumers to hold corporations accountable and promote industry-wide ethics. This is because utilitarianism requires respecting all business stakeholders' rights and interests which means prioritizing behaviors that maximize enjoyment and minimize social harm over short-term financial rewards.⁵⁷ Companies can promote justice, equity, and social cohesion by engaging stakeholders and considering varied perspectives and interests, and they should prioritize consumers, employees, suppliers, local communities, and the environment when making decisions. For instance, the Functional Behavior Model and Planned Behavior Theory can guide decision-making and enhance trust and well-being. Promoting positive activities and sustainable practices requires understanding consumer behavior and ethical marketing tactics, and they can transform their culture into one of trust, openness, and responsibility by using behavioral insights to make ethical decisions. Prioritizing ethics promotes social well-being and a sustainable business environment.

Conclusion

Utilitarian principles and modern corporate tactics clash over maximizing enjoyment and short-term profit because modern firms frequently prioritize shareholder profits and rapid financial advantages

over societal well-being, contrary to utilitarianism, and this conflict could harm society and ethics by degrading the environment, exploiting labor, and causing inequality. Companies can reconcile utilitarian principles with modern business methods to apply ethical decision-making for sustainable corporate operations and long-term societal well-being and the proposed solution model uses Stakeholder Capitalism and CSR as a framework. According to utilitarian ideas of maximizing happiness, Stakeholder Capitalism encourages enterprises to prioritize various stakeholders' well-being. CSR efforts integrate social and environmental factors into corporate operations to promote ethical decision-making and minimize harm and improve society. Future research should examine numerous areas to better grasp this ethical dilemma, and stakeholder-centric approaches can improve business performance and society over time, according to longitudinal studies while comparative analyses across industries and regions could reveal contextual factors affecting business ethics. Additionally, interdisciplinary study combining ideas from different fields can help organizations grasp ethical challenges while qualitative studies using in-depth interviews and case studies can reveal stakeholders' ethical decision-making perspectives.

ENDNOTES

¹ Mohammad Amin Parvin has completed his Ph.D. in the Program of Philosophy and Religion at Assumption University of Thailand. Dr. Mohammad Manzoor Malik is the program director of the Program in Philosophy and Religion at Assumption University of Thailand.

² A. Gustafson, "In Defense of a Utilitarian Business Ethic," *Business and Society Review* 118, no. 3 (2013): 325-360, p. 17.

³ R. E. Goodin, *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 13-29.

⁴ Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (Dover Publications, 1789), pp. 5-9.

⁵ John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism* (Parker, Son, and Bourn, 1863), pp. 45-67.

⁶ Geoffrey Scarre, *Utilitarianism* (Routledge, 2020), pp. 2-10.

⁷ Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (History of Economic Thought Books, 1781), p. 4.

⁸ John R. Boatright, *Ethics and the Conduct of Business* (Pearson Education India, 2000), p. 12.

⁹ Mohammad T. Nuseir and Ahmad Ghandour, "Ethical Issues in Modern Business Management," *International Journal of Procurement Management* 12, no. 5 (2019): 592-605., p. 2.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 5.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 7.

¹² Ginger Zhe Jin and Liad Wagman, "Big Data at the Crossroads of Antitrust and Consumer Protection," *Information Economics and Policy* 54 (2021): 100865., p. 5.

¹³ Zhiqiang Fang Chen and Ying Cheng, "Consumer Response to Fake News about Brands on Social Media: The Effects of Self-Efficacy, Media Trust, and Persuasion Knowledge on Brand Trust," *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 29, no. 2 (2020): 188-198., p. 4.

¹⁴ Mirjana Maksimović and Vladimir Vujović, "Internet of Things Based E-Health Systems: Ideas, Expectations and Concerns," in *Handbook of Large-Scale Distributed Computing in Smart Healthcare*, 241-280 (2017), p. 8.

¹⁵ Taryn Vian, "Anti-Corruption, Transparency and Accountability in Health: Concepts, Frameworks, and Approaches," *Global Health Action* 13, sup1 (2020): 1694744., p. 10.

¹⁶ Ibrahim H. Elifoglu, Ilker Abel, and Ozgur Taşseven, "Minimizing Insider Threat Risk with Behavioral Monitoring," *Review of Business* 38, no. 2 (2018): 61-73., p. 12.

¹⁷Nida Akhtar, Bilal Kerim, Yusuf Perwej, Anurag Tiwari, and Shagufta Praveen, "A Comprehensive Overview of Privacy and Data Security for Cloud Storage," *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science Engineering and Technology* (2021)., p. 6.

¹⁸Irit Hadar et al., "Privacy by Designers: Software Developers' Privacy Mindset," *Empirical Software Engineering* 23 (2018): 259-289., p. 3.

¹⁹Tarek A. R. Kameel, Mohamed E. Kandeel, and Mohammad A. Alkrisheh, "Consumer Protection from Misleading Online Advertisements: An Analytical Study in UAE Law," in *2022 International Arab Conference on Information Technology (ACIT)*, 2022., p. 8.

²⁰Alexis Sconyers, "Corporations, Social Media, & Advertising: Deceptive, Profitable, or Just Smart Marketing," *J. Corp. L.* 43 (2017): 417., p. 9.

²¹David M. Boush, Marian Friestad, and Peter Wright, *Deception in the Marketplace: The Psychology of Deceptive Persuasion and Consumer Self-Protection* (Routledge, 2015)., p. 5.

²²Willem Jong and Victor van der Linde, "Clean Diesel and Dirty Scandal: The Echo of Volkswagen's Dieseldgate in an Intra-Industry Setting," *Public Relations Review* 48, no. 1 (2022): 102146., p. 7.

²³Paul Heidhues, Botond Köszegi, and Takeshi Murooka, "Inferior Products and Profitable Deception," *The Review of Economic Studies* 84, no. 1 (2016): 323-356., p. 5.

²⁴Julia Held and Claas Christian Germelmann, "Deceived or Not Deceived: How Food Consumers Perceive Deception," *Advances in Consumer Research* 42 (2014): 313-317., p. 6.

²⁵Yi Chen, "Deontology to Judge the Ethical Business Actions: The Case of Takata," *Open Journal of Business and Management* 7, no. 2 (2019): 783-787., p. 3.

²⁶Myo Min Kyaw, "Legal Concept of Product Liability," MERAL Portal, 2014., p. 17.

²⁷T. Jisana, "Consumer Behaviour Models: An Overview," *Sai Om Journal of Commerce & Management* 1, no. 5 (2014): 34-43.

²⁸David L. Mothersbaugh and Del I. Hawkins, *Consumer Behavior: Building Marketing Strategy* (McGraw-Hill, 2016)., p. 6.

²⁹Nirav B. Gajjar, "Factors Affecting Consumer Behavior," *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences* 1, no. 2 (2013): 10-15., p. 4.

³⁰S. Sathish and Anbu Rajamohan, "Consumer Behaviour and Lifestyle Marketing," *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research* 1, no. 10 (2012): 152-166.

³¹ Chirag Achar, Jiyeon So, Nidhi Agrawal, and Adam Duhachek, "What We Feel and Why We Buy: The Influence of Emotions on Consumer Decision-Making," *Current Opinion in Psychology* 10 (2016): 166-170., p. 2.

³² Allan Kimmel and Allan J. Kimmel, *Psychological Foundations of Marketing: The Keys to Consumer Behavior* (Routledge, 2018)., p. 6.

³³ Kristen D. Martin, Ankur Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier, "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance," *Journal of Marketing* 81, no. 1 (2017): 36-58., p. 4.

³⁴ Saqib Khan, Igor Kabanov, Yuxuan Hua, and Stuart Madnick, "A Systematic Analysis of the Capital One Data Breach: Critical Lessons Learned," *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security* 26, no. 1 (2022): Article 3, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3546068>., p. 6.

³⁵ Dina Srinivasan, "The Antitrust Case Against Facebook: A Monopolist's Journey towards Pervasive Surveillance in Spite of Consumers' Preference for Privacy," *Berkeley Business Law Journal* 16 (2019): 39., p. 2.

³⁶ Giovanni Di Domenico, Jennifer Sit, Alessio Ishizaka, and Daniel Nunan, "Fake News, Social Media and Marketing: A Systematic Review," *Journal of Business Research* 124 (2021): 329-341., p. 5.

³⁷ Shelby D. Hunt, John E. Mello, and George D. Deitz, *Marketing* (McGraw-Hill, 2021)., p. 11.

³⁸ Tim Mulgan, *Understanding Utilitarianism* (Routledge, 2014)., p. 12.

³⁹ Vijay Krishna and John Morgan, "Majority Rule and Utilitarian Welfare," *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 7, no. 4 (2015): 339-375., p. 3.

⁴⁰ Juan Sierra, "Reason, Emotion and Human Rights," *Criterio Jurídico Garantista* 3, no. 4 (2011)., p. 4.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 4.

⁴² Jeremy Bentham, "Of the Principle of Utility," *Ethics* 20, no. 4 (1994): 306-312., p. 6.

⁴³ Ilir Ajvazi, "Critique of Bentham's Utilitarianism" (2022), p. 6.

⁴⁴ Tom Patrick and Susan Werkhoven, *An Analysis of John Stuart Mills's Utilitarianism* (Macat Library, 2017), p. 8.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 7.

⁴⁶ Stephanie Strother, "When Making Money Is More Important Than Saving Lives: Revisiting the Ford Pinto Case," *Journal of International & Interdisciplinary Business Research* 5, no. 1 (2018): 166-181., p. 3.

⁴⁷ Patrick T. Hester and Kevin M. Adams, "Ford Pinto Case Study," in *Systemic Decision Making: Fundamentals for Addressing Problems and Messes* (Springer International Publishing, 2017), 351-384, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54672-8_17., p. 5.

⁴⁸Stephanie Strother, "When Making Money Is More Important Than Saving Lives: Revisiting the Ford Pinto Case," *Journal of International & Interdisciplinary Business Research* 5, no. 1 (2018): 166-181, p. 3.

⁴⁹Mark Rossow, "Ethics: An Alternative Account of the Ford Pinto Case," 2015., p. 1.

⁵⁰Admin, "Handout: Utilitarianism and Business: Ford Pinto Case," *Philosophical Investigations*, 2018, accessed April 4, <https://peped.org/philosophicalinvestigations/utilitarianism-and-business-ford-pinto-case/>, p. 7.

⁵¹Rudy Setiawan et al., "Business Ethics Code of Ethics and Business Conduct Petra Christian University," 2020., p. 9.

⁵²Giuseppe Attanasio, Niccolò Preghenella, Alberto F. De Toni, and Cinzia Battistella, "Stakeholder Engagement in Business Models for Sustainability: The Stakeholder Value Flow Model for Sustainable Development," *Business Strategy and the Environment* 31, no. 3 (2022): 860-874., p. 5.

⁵³Gargi Bhaduri and Jung E. Ha-Brookshire, "Do Transparent Business Practices Pay? Exploration of Transparency and Consumer Purchase Intention," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 29, no. 2 (2011): 135-149., p. 5.

⁵⁴Chris Piotrowski and Roger W. Guyette Jr., "Toyota Recall Crisis: Public Attitudes on Leadership and," *Organization Development Journal* 28, no. 2 (2010): 89-97., p. 6.

⁵⁵S. Taneja, Michael G. Pryor, and Sandra M. Sewell, "Toyota Recalls: A Strategic Leadership Perspective," *International Journal of Business and Public Administration* 9 (2012): 125+, <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A335070907/AONE?u=anon~a4fd0498&sid=googleScholar&xid=a1ebc6e3>., p. 17.

⁵⁶Jaehyung Choi and Socheol Lee, "Lessons from a Crisis: An Analysis of Toyota's Handling of the Recall Crisis," *Journal of Public Affairs* 18, no. 2 (2018): e1688, <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1688>., p. 5.

⁵⁷Makoto Sakurai, "Impact of Toyota Recall on Corporate Reputation," *城西国際大学紀要/城西国際大学紀要委員会 編* 19 (2011): 73-89., p. 3.

REFERENCES

- Admin. "Handout: Utilitarianism and Business: Ford Pinto Case." *Philosophical Investigations*, 2018. Accessed April 4, <https://peped.org/philosophicalinvestigations/utilitarianism-and-business-ford-pinto-case/>.
- Ajvazi, Ilir. "Critique of Bentham's Utilitarianism." 2022.
- Achar, Chirag, Jiyeon So, Nidhi Agrawal, and Adam Duhachek. "What We Feel and Why We Buy: The Influence of Emotions on Consumer Decision-Making." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 10 (2016): 166-170.
- Akhtar, Nida, Bilal Kerim, Yusuf Perwej, Anurag Tiwari, and Shagufta Praveen. "A Comprehensive Overview of Privacy and Data Security for Cloud Storage." *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science Engineering and Technology* (2021).
- Attanasio, Giuseppe, Niccolò Preghenella, Alberto F. De Toni, and Cinzia Battistella. "Stakeholder Engagement in Business Models for Sustainability: The Stakeholder Value Flow Model for Sustainable Development." *Business Strategy and the Environment* 31, no. 3 (2022): 860-874.
- Bentham, Jeremy. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Dover Publications, 1789.
- Bentham, Jeremy. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. History of Economic Thought Books, 1781.
- Bentham, Jeremy. "Of the Principle of Utility." *Ethics* 20, no. 4 (1994): 306-312.
- Bhaduri, Gargi, and Jung E. Ha-Brookshire. "Do Transparent Business Practices Pay? Exploration of Transparency and Consumer Purchase Intention." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 29, no. 2 (2011): 135-149.

- Boatright, John R. *Ethics and the Conduct of Business*. Pearson Education India, 2000.
- Boush, David M., Marian Friestad, and Peter Wright. *Deception in the Marketplace: The Psychology of Deceptive Persuasion and Consumer Self-Protection*. Routledge, 2015.
- Chen, Zhiqiang Fang, and Ying Cheng. "Consumer Response to Fake News about Brands on Social Media: The Effects of Self-Efficacy, Media Trust, and Persuasion Knowledge on Brand Trust." *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 29, no. 2 (2020): 188-198.
- Chen, Yi. "Deontology to Judge the Ethical Business Actions: The Case of Takata." *Open Journal of Business and Management* 7, no. 2 (2019): 783-787.
- Choi, Jaehyung, and Soochaeol Lee. "Lessons from a Crisis: An Analysis of Toyota's Handling of the Recall Crisis." *Journal of Public Affairs* 18, no. 2 (2018): e1688. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1688>.
- Di Domenico, Giovanni, Jennifer Sit, Alessio Ishizaka, and Daniel Nunan. "Fake News, Social Media and Marketing: A Systematic Review." *Journal of Business Research* 124 (2021): 329-341.
- Elifoglu, Ibrahim H., Ilker Abel, and Ozgur Taşseven. "Minimizing Insider Threat Risk with Behavioral Monitoring." *Review of Business* 38, no. 2 (2018): 61-73.
- Gajjar, Nirav B. "Factors Affecting Consumer Behavior." *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences* 1, no. 2 (2013): 10-15.
- Goodin, R. E. *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gustafson, A. "In Defense of a Utilitarian Business Ethic." *Business and Society Review* 118, no. 3 (2013): 325-360.
- Hadar, Irit, Tali Hasson, Osnat Ayalon, Eran Toch, Menny Birnhack, Shmuel Sherman, and Anat Balissa. "Privacy by Designers:

- Software Developers' Privacy Mindset." *Empirical Software Engineering* 23 (2018): 259-289.
- Heidhues, Paul, Botond Köszegi, and Takeshi Murooka. "Inferior Products and Profitable Deception." *The Review of Economic Studies* 84, no. 1 (2016): 323-356.
- Held, Julia, and Claas Christian Germelmann. "Deceived or Not Deceived: How Food Consumers Perceive Deception." *Advances in Consumer Research* 42 (2014): 313-317.
- Hester, Patrick T., and Kevin M. Adams. "Ford Pinto Case Study." In *Systemic Decision Making: Fundamentals for Addressing Problems and Messes*, 351-384. Springer International Publishing, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54672-8_17.
- Hunt, Shelby D., John E. Mello, and George D. Deitz. *Marketing*. McGraw-Hill, 2021.
- Jin, Ginger Zhe, and Liad Wagman. "Big Data at the Crossroads of Antitrust and Consumer Protection." *Information Economics and Policy* 54 (2021): 100865.
- Jisana, T. "Consumer Behaviour Models: An Overview." *Sai Om Journal of Commerce & Management* 1, no. 5 (2014): 34-43.
- Jong, Willem, and Victor van der Linde. "Clean Diesel and Dirty Scandal: The Echo of Volkswagen's Dieselgate in an Intra-Industry Setting." *Public Relations Review* 48, no. 1 (2022): 102146.
- Kameel, Tarek A. R., Mohamed E. Kandeel, and Mohammad A. Alkrisheh. "Consumer Protection from Misleading Online Advertisements: An Analytical Study in UAE Law." In *2022 International Arab Conference on Information Technology (ACIT)*, 2022.
- Khan, Saqib, Igor Kabanov, Yuxuan Hua, and Stuart Madnick. "A Systematic Analysis of the Capital One Data Breach: Critical Lessons Learned." *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security* 26, no. 1 (2022): Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3546068>.
- Kimmel, Allan, and Allan J. Kimmel. *Psychological Foundations of*

- Marketing: The Keys to Consumer Behavior*. Routledge, 2018.
- Krishna, Vijay, and John Morgan. "Majority Rule and Utilitarian Welfare." *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 7, no. 4 (2015): 339-375.
- Kyaw, Myo Min. "Legal Concept of Product Liability." *MERAL Portal*, 2014.
- Maksimović, Mirjana, and Vladimir Vujović. "Internet of Things Based E-Health Systems: Ideas, Expectations and Concerns." In *Handbook of Large-Scale Distributed Computing in Smart Healthcare*, 241-280. 2017.
- Martin, Kristen D., Ankur Borah, and Robert W. Palmatier. "Data Privacy: Effects on Customer and Firm Performance." *Journal of Marketing* 81, no. 1 (2017): 36-58.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn, 1863.
- Mothersbaugh, David L., and Del I. Hawkins. *Consumer Behavior: Building Marketing Strategy*. McGraw-Hill, 2016.
- Mulgan, Tim. *Understanding Utilitarianism*. Routledge, 2014.
- Museir, Mohammad T., and Ahmad Ghandour. "Ethical Issues in Modern Business Management." *International Journal of Procurement Management* 12, no. 5 (2019): 592-605.
- Nuseir, Mohammad T., and Ahmad Ghandour. "Ethical Issues in Modern Business Management." *International Journal of Procurement Management* 12, no. 5 (2019): 592-605.
- Patrick, Tom, and Susan Werkhoven. *An Analysis of John Stuart Mills's Utilitarianism*. Macat Library, 2017.
- Piotrowski, Chris, and Roger W. Guyette Jr. "Toyota Recall Crisis: Public Attitudes on Leadership and." *Organization Development Journal* 28, no. 2 (2010): 89-97.
- Rossow, Mark. "Ethics: An Alternative Account of the Ford Pinto Case." 2015.

- Sakurai, Makoto. "Impact of Toyota Recall on Corporate Reputation." 城
西国際大学紀要/城西国際大学紀要委員会 編 19 (2011): 73-89.
- Sathish, S., and Anbu Rajamohan. "Consumer Behaviour and Lifestyle
Marketing." *International Journal of Marketing, Financial
Services & Management Research* 1, no. 10 (2012): 152-166.
- Scarre, Geoffrey. *Utilitarianism*. Routledge, 2020.
- Sconyers, Alexis. "Corporations, Social Media, & Advertising: Deceptive,
Profitable, or Just Smart Marketing." *J. Corp. L.* 43 (2017): 417.
- Setiawan, Rudy, Lina P. L. Cavaliere, Mohamed Mohideen, Nor A. Jalil,
Kautsar Koti, Ameer Haleem, and Grace Christabel. "Business
Ethics Code of Ethics and Business Conduct Petra Christian
University." 2020.
- Sierra, Juan. "Reason, Emotion and Human Rights." *Criterio Jurídico
Garantista* 3, no. 4 (2011).
- Srinivasan, Dina. "The Antitrust Case Against Facebook: A Monopolist's
Journey towards Pervasive Surveillance in Spite of Consumers'
Preference for Privacy." *Berkeley Business Law Journal* 16 (2019):
39.
- Strother, Stephanie. "When Making Money Is More Important Than Saving
Lives: Revisiting the Ford Pinto Case." *Journal of International
& Interdisciplinary Business Research* 5, no. 1 (2018): 166-181.
- Taneja, S., Michael G. Pryor, and Sandra M. Sewell. "Toyota
Recalls: A Strategic Leadership Perspective." *International
Journal of Business and Public Administration* 9 (2012):
125+. [https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A335070907/
AONE?u=anon~a4fd0498&sid=googleScholar&xid=a1ebc6e3](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A335070907/AONE?u=anon~a4fd0498&sid=googleScholar&xid=a1ebc6e3).
- Vian, Taryn. "Anti-Corruption, Transparency and Accountability in
Health: Concepts, Frameworks, and Approaches." *Global Health
Action* 13, sup1 (2020): 1694744.