



Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Public Relations Review



Why values matter – how public relations professionals can draw on moral foundations theory

Graeme Trayner

Vice President, Brand and Communications Practice, Greenberg Quinlan Rosner, 212 231 0050, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Available online xxx

Keywords:
Values
Psychology
Qualitative research
Reputation
Politics
Insight

ABSTRACT

This paper will explain why corporate public relations practitioners need to draw on the role values play in how people weigh up issues, brands, and claims—and how this knowledge can lead to more powerful and resonant communications.

Understanding the role of values in driving attitudes and behaviors is crucial for four reasons:

- 1 The new polarized, politicized, and value-driven public information environment requires corporate communicators and other public relations professionals to understand how people's identity and values hardwire their decisions and actions.
- 2 In this environment, information alone is not enough to change opinion. Facts and figures are often dismissed or are rejected when they go against people's sense of identity or existing values, making connecting to deep-seated motivations crucial.
- 3 Communicators need to explore what is in the background of people's opinions—not just the foreground. They must go beyond an over-reliance on rational responses to direct questions and an obsession with dry metrics. Mapping out rational opinions against nonconscious values unearths more textured insights and communication strategies.
- 4 The communications sector needs to play a rapid catch-up game with marketing, which grasp the role of motivation and identity in informing people's attitudes, and are pioneering more effective methods to get a rounded perspective on how we act.

Coming out of psychology, moral foundations theory, with its focus on how people's core values inform attitudes and decisions, provides a powerful analytic and interpretative framework to understand and navigate this new polarized and political environment.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. The politicized communication landscape

Across political and business markets, a rising emotionality is visible in electoral campaigns and discourses about business (Frayne, 2013). Candidates, business leaders, and organizations face often shrill and aggressive criticism, given “institutions are the only way society has found to enable people to cope with primitive feelings like dependence, rage, and hate” (Miller & Khaleelee, 1985).

This new environment manifests in a range of ways:

E-mail address: gtrayner@gqrr.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.016>
0363-8111/© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article in press as: Trayner, G. Why values matter – how public relations professionals can draw on moral foundations theory. *Public Relations Review* (2016), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.016>

- Identity shapes political party and candidate preferences and signals tribal loyalty or common values. From the Tea Party in the US to UKIP and Podemos in Europe, deep-seated needs around status and self-respect, alongside specific economic and social justice demands (also value-laden), inform political movements.
- We see the rise of “political shopping” (Hertz, 2003), where ethical consumerism or buying products to overtly signal values and beliefs are more mainstream.
- The increased aggression in the public information environment is driven in part by changes in the media landscape. In a 24/7 news cycle with bitter competition, media outlets have to shout louder for attention, and as a result, leaders and organizations often have to deal with a “permanent acupuncture of criticism” (D’Ancona, 2013). Social media also often rewards the immediate and instinctive over the considered and balanced.
- The growing prevalence of conspiracy thinking and anti-establishment views impact businesses and organizations (Trayner, 2015). Healthy skepticism about power can morph into a never-ending desire to take on an enemy who is intent on undermining a way of life, whether the threat is immigrants, bankers, the European Union or multinational corporations.
- Organizations and leaders of all kinds find themselves pulled into “culture wars”—and are expected to have a stance on contentious social and ethical choices, particularly in the United States. Companies like Starbucks, Chick-Fil-A, and Hobby Lobby have joined or been drawn into debates on gay marriage, gun ownership, race relations and immigration.
- Tied to operating in a media landscape where brands often have to deal with highly emotional and aggressive criticism, companies find themselves drawn into “moral panics”—short, intense bursts of anger directed at institutions seen as infringing on values. These include issues like the use of data, supply chain choices, or marketing aimed at children (Cohen, 1972).

To manage this treacherous and at times toxic environment, communicators need to tap into new ways of thinking, and understand the more nuanced terrain around human motivation, values and emotions.

2. Information alone is not enough

Research in a breadth of fields shows rational arguments alone cannot sway opinions and that unconscious factors, like emotions, play a pivotal role. Communications solely based on facts and rational arguments run the following risks:

- A predominantly fact-based approach is likely to get lost in the “data smog” and barely noticed in an immensely crowded media environment; or alternatively, it can be seen as self-justifying attempts to make a case (Shenk, 1998). When the average person is bombarded by 3000 messages a day, just getting noticed is hard enough.
- Psychology shows that facts that jar against our pre-existing assumptions make us more likely to discount the new information. We double-down on our existing views. This “backfire effect” means our beliefs can get stronger in response to being challenged by new information (McRaney, 2012).
- In a similar vein, research indicates that new information is rejected when it threatens our sense of identity. New facts and figures trigger negative emotions and feelings, which then impair the comprehension and pickup of new perspectives. Indeed, efforts at persuasion fail or backfire, as “the old perspective is now burning more fiercely in the person’s consciousness” (Fradera, 2016).
- Neuroscience shows that emotions often trump rational factors when it comes to decision-making. Our emotional reactions to issues, debates, or brands often over-rule a more rational and considered perspective; our initial, intuitive response to a topic is a much more accurate read on our true feelings than a post-rationalized view on a debate.

In this environment, communicators—and the people and organizations they serve—need to realize that facts and figures are no longer enough. In order to gain attention, and then shift someone’s stance or actions, communications need to be rooted in core values and linked to a broader repertoire of emotions.

3. Why communicators need to play catch-up

Candidates and parties have dealt with this challenging environment for longer than their counterparts in business. They better understand the need to appeal to values alongside forward fact-based arguments. Al From, one of the pioneers behind the New Democrat movement in the 1980s and 1990s, argues political policies need to be an embodiment of values. Citing remarks by Tony Blair, branding means “giving the politics a clear definition, so that voters would instantly recognize the values and ideas associated with it and be able to differentiate them from those of political adversaries” (From, 2013).

As corporate leaders grapple with an increasingly hostile public environment—indeed, one that is inherently politicized—communicators need to ensure strategies, messaging and initiatives telegraph values and motivations.

However, communicators, particularly those operating in communications research, need to update their thinking to meet these demands. They must move beyond the current obsession with data analytics and widen their repertoire. Otherwise, communicators run the risk of being left behind their counterparts in marketing, who utilize more nuanced qualitative techniques.

Analytics has been lauded as the future of communications. From social media evaluation to big data, we are witnessing the shift from a traditional gut instinct approach to a more insight-led method of designing campaigns. In an information space where currents of influence are more diffuse, and where the amount of consumer-generated content results in an avalanche of tweets, posts, and videos every day, understanding people's attitudes through quantitative data mining is now rightly part of the communicator's skillset.

But in a rush to ground communications in data, the communication's sector is in danger of focusing on only one side of how to understand motivations and behavior, ceding ground to other advisors and techniques that engage with the more emotive, human, and linguistic side. Advertising planner Robin Hafitz (2014) shows opinion research is bifurcating into either 'high tech' or 'high touch' approaches.

However, the communication sector's focus on 'high tech' approaches makes them less aware of the value of 'high touch' approaches. Communications researchers are boxing themselves into a data-mining evaluation cul-de-sac, while their peers and colleagues in marketing research are moving far ahead, and have a much better handle on how to analyze the current information environment using more textured frameworks.

From a range of different yet complementary vantage points, marketers and marketing researchers better understand the role emotion plays in decision-making, the contribution of nonconscious factors in shaping behavior, and what this means for organizations and leaders:

- **Exploring implicit and explicit drives.** Moving beyond a divide between emotion and rationality—which marketing thinker Phil Barden's suggests is too vague, and almost misleading—marketing research is teasing out the difference between explicit benefits (I want my clothes cleaned, I need a savings account) and more implicit pay-offs (I want to look wise, protect my family) (Barden, 2013).
- **Understanding the background as well as the foreground.** As consumer psychologist Roy Langmaid outlines, effective research looks at the background as well as the foreground of people's perceptions, and starts with an acknowledgement that people often hide more than they show—a heightened risk in the inherently artificial format of a focus group or survey. What is crucial instead is how to reveal the hidden factors and wiring behind decisions, stances, and behaviors (Langmaid, 2014).
- **Assessing the role of non-conscious factors.** Much of consumer decision-making happens at an intuitive or instinctive level, with people being "strangers to ourselves" (Wilson, 2004). Innovations in consumer research techniques, such as facial coding and implicit association testing, detect these instinctual responses. Other techniques from the psychoanalytic tradition, including the heavy use of projective techniques and enabling devices, also get at the real roots of why people act and feel the way they do.
- **Detecting evolutionary drivers.** Joanna Chrzanowska (2014) has looked at how the work of evolutionary psychologists, such as Kenrick and Griskevicius, applies to this area of research. Specifically, how evolutionary needs around status, self-protection and mate retention influence how we decide and act. Self-protection, for example, comes across in how we avoid threats and ally ourselves with leaders or larger groups.

An understanding of such drivers links the proximate causes of our behavior—the causes and motivations we can talk about with others—with the ultimate causes of behavior—the causes and motivations we find difficult, if not impossible, to articulate (Kenrick & Griskevicius, 2013).

While these new perspectives and methodologies are applicable to understanding corporate reputations and communications, limitations exist. By their very nature, marketing research techniques are designed to gain insights into the impulses around purchasing goods and services; they are often used to learn about impulsive and quick behaviors or actions in areas of low consideration to consumers, for example looking at products in the supermarket aisle.

In order to make these fit for communications, we need to merge these new insights on the role of the nonconscious and implicit factors with a way of understanding how people process more substantive issues and grapple with larger debates and topics. To truly understand how people are processing messaging and communications, we need to synthesize these new approaches within marketing with a theory from psychology: moral foundations theory.

4. Applying moral foundations theory to communications

Moral foundations theory provides a lens through which to analyze perceptions research and a framework to structure and organize communications and messaging

Created by a group of social and cultural psychologists, moral foundations theory looks at how we arrive at our moral attitudes. Echoing research on the role of the nonconscious and implicit factors in decision-making, moral foundations theory is based on the premise that our instinctual reaction to issues and debates is hugely impactful, and how we intuitively feel about a topic matters more than how we may post-rationalize a stance. Making the connection to deep-seated values is then the key to opinion and behavior change.

Moral foundation theory claims there is an innate, "learned before experience," script of morality. Our evolutionary development drafted this script based on common evolutionary problems all humans have faced. Jonathan Haidt has outlined this initial draft's taxonomy of moral foundations, which function in a similar way to "taste buds on our tongues;" they create an array of different moral practices depending on the combination, but the base components are the same. Haidt's research

suggests six foundations: fairness, care, authority, sanctity, freedom and loyalty. Importantly, each foundation has a positive and negative side, to help explain adverse reactions to issues.

However, recognizing individual agency and cultural influences, Haidt argues that institutions, cultures, and individuals modify some of the script, creating the plethora of moral practices and beliefs in the world. Using the analogy of an audio equalizer, Haidt sees the moral mind as representing a series of slider switches, with each switch representing a different foundation. Each culture or group emphasizes certain switches, dialing some up, and others down.

A preliminary study showed that world region, in this case the East versus the West, aligned with traditional moral views of each cultural region: Eastern cultures have slightly higher loyalty and sanctity concerns compared to Western cultures (Graham 2011). Additionally, the theory can explain external differences in moral practices for the same foundation. For example, in India bowing your head shows respect for authority, while in many parts of the southern United States using someone's last name or title shows respect for authority. Regardless of the different culturally learned acts, the base foundation and script remains the same.

Applied to politics, the theory sheds light on what drives conservative and liberal positions, and how different arguments resonate depending on which moral foundations are activated (Haidt, 2012). In the world of politics and campaigns, different causes base their appeals on different foundations, or "taste buds": liberal causes emphasize values around care and fairness, and conservative movements draw more on freedom and authority.

Haidt suggests conservatives have been more successful politically as they play to the full spectrum of sensibilities, whereas liberals will tend to focus their arguments on a smaller repertoire. Many left-wing arguments about social and economic justice aim to spark anger at the lack of fairness or the need to care for the weak, whereas conservative arguments about social issues or foreign policy/justice will cover a wider range, including loyalty to the nation, respect for leadership, and/or the sanctity of a particular institution or way of life.

While they were originally designed to shed light on political attitudes, the set of six foundations prove applicable to looking at corporate issues and debates in the current politicized landscape.

● **Fairness vs. Cheating:** Fairness revolves around proportional sharing or anger at those who game the system. Liberal causes tend to center on social justice causes, and the need to ensure a fair share of resources, whether money or power. On the right, it can be seen in the antipathy towards those who break the rules or rig the system, for example, "benefit cheats".

In the aftermath of the financial crisis of 2008, the fairness foundation has come to the fore of discussion about corporate activity. From both the left and right, anger is directed at Wall Street and multinational companies, with both Trump and Sanders supporters seeing big companies as breaking the rules and stacking the deck against the American worker. Hostility against corporate tax breaks, most recently seen in reaction to the Panama Papers and criticisms of multinational tax arrangements in Europe, is also informed by a strong sense of the public being cheated.

● **Freedom vs. Oppression:** Freedom is a powerful concept, and can be seen either as a desire to be left alone and/or others to be left alone. In both politics and business, we can see it in the wariness toward power, and a fear of oppression from either the state or big business (for example, Washington, Big Pharma), or a desire to champion the underdog. In public affairs, anti-regulation campaigns often draw deeply on the freedom foundation in their efforts to pushback against the "nanny state," "Big Brother," or overzealous legislation.

As we have worked to apply this foundation to corporate challenges, we have found it useful to look at concept of freedom in terms of having the latitude to explore, in the broadest sense. This latitude is a powerful motivation that successful brands tap into; whether that is the sense of creativity and self-expression successful tech brands aim to elicit or the promise of re-invention tied up in the globalization messaging of many prominent corporations.

● **Loyalty vs. Betrayal:** Loyalty revolves around attachment to a group, and in political conflicts, groups or collective identity is often defined in opposition to others. As a value, it connects to a deep human identification with causes and symbols, and anger at those who break the rules or transgress against the group. Politics is an intensely tribal activity, with activists often applying the emotions of sports fandom to how they identify with a political cause.

In a corporate setting, where the emotion can be less visible, we can see it in how a particular customer segment or employee group expects a strong loyalty from a business or owner, or how a group of customers self-identify with a specific brand. As multinationals grapple with perceived obligations around jobs and community contributions in local markets, the loyalty foundation is often at the forefront of concerns.

● **Sanctity vs. Disgust:** Sanctity places a premium on purity and cleanliness in the broadest sense and venerates the sacred. Tied up with this is the desire to avoid threats and an evolutionary need to avoid risk. Sanctity emerges in the highly emotive "culture wars" over deeply contentious topics like gay marriage, abortion, and civil rights, with both sides seeking to connect to people's definition of purity.

In commerce, sanctity is one of the primary drivers behind the rise of "ethical consumerism", from the focus on organic and unprocessed ingredients to the emergence of brands with overt social purpose such as Tom's or the Honest Company. We can also see it in brands that champion purity and self-discovery, like Lululemon or SoulCycle.

● **Authority or Status vs. Disrespect:** Haidt sees authority in the upward respect toward a superior power, whether that is a state, church, or other form of power. It underlines leadership, attachment to the flag or other symbols of national identity, and reverence toward higher religious authorities

In the corporate arena, we have found status provides a more meaningful and applicable term to use, rather than authority. Status speaks to the need for empowerment and self-actualization that successful campaigns often need to tap into, and

the desire for respect to be given by companies and institutions. Conversely, exploring when self-esteem and identity is challenged is important because attacks on perceived status can be destructive to corporate reputation.

● **Care vs. Harm:** Care revolves around protecting those at risk or those who have made sacrifices for a group. NGO and charity campaigns trigger this care value through appeals to help the needy or oppressed people(s). Conservative causes will often center on protecting those who have made a sacrifice, for example, championing veterans' rights.

In the corporate arena, corporate communications aims to show how a company cares about and protects its customers—a major theme in financial services communications or championing those on the front line of service.

In comparison to other often-used frameworks in corporate communications, such as reputation drivers, this theory and approaches adds more nuance and richness to how we can think through issues. Well-known areas of thinking, such as behavioral economics and “nudge theory” are better suited to exploring decision-making toward products and services, not for understanding how we look at issues of the utmost importance to ourselves, our families, communities and nations.

What is crucial to understand is the power of these worldviews, and how distinctive values drive our attitudes and stances on an instinctive level; for example, citing the work of Philip Tetlock, Thomas Edsall outlines how conservatives show distinctive values: they are less tolerant of compromise, see the world in “us” and “them” terms, and are more motivated to punish rule breakers and deter free riders (Edsall, 2012). All of these relate to the core foundations conservatives hold significantly more dear than liberals: authority, loyalty, and purity (Haidt, 2012).

Knowing this means even these seemingly intractable stances can be altered by drafting communications appealing to these foundations. Moral foundation theories rich, layered understanding of how worldviews and values inform reactions to issues, in this case even seemingly intransigent ones, is incredibly valuable to communicators and signposts how to shape effective campaigns.

5. How moral foundations theory can enrich communications

In the corporate arena, applying moral foundations theory can benefit communicators by giving us a powerful lens through which to interpret opinion research and an organizing framework for communications and messaging in an emotive and volatile landscape.

5.1. Lens and framework

By providing an analytical and interpretative framework to understand our ultimate motivations, we can make the link between people's direct answers and more implicit values. In a similar vein to how applying the framework of evolutionary psychology to consumer feedback shows implicit motivations, bringing moral foundations theory to bear on opinion research reveals what is both driving sentiment—and how to move perceptions.

When looking at corporate communications, we can evaluate how different messaging evokes different foundations, and where it goes against foundations. Do we evoke fairness, appeal to status, or speak to sanctity? In a competitive situation, either on an issue campaign or when considering a brand choice, applying the framework can expose where weaknesses lie and where the opposition is vulnerable.

This rich insight then provides the organizing framework for successful communications for varied communication challenges. As part of efforts to create structure behind corporate communications, communications teams have often used a set of reputation drivers to provide the organizing structure. However, these can be incredibly static, relying on generic terms such as “financial performance” and “social responsibility”. With its focus on opposing concepts, a framework based on moral foundations can lead to a more nuanced positioning, and how best to manage competitive marketplace dynamics.

5.2. Understanding ambivalence

Assessing how an issue plays out across a range of moral foundations is helpful when many individual's stances towards issues and debates are shaped by a profound sense of ambivalence. Through this framework, we can tease out people's competing tensions or paradoxes on issues.

As the economics journalist turned activist Paul Mason argues, drawing on thinking from anthropology and sociology, people operate in a society where individual identity can be a fluid construct. We adopt different personas and profiles depending on needs, aspirations, and responses to events (Mason, 2012).

In contrast to much reputation indices or brand barometers that rely on the comforting illusion of people having a single and uniform persona, the nuance and texture of the foundations framework allows us to plot out how an issue plays out depending on a consumer's or citizen's multiple perspectives, and when different personas come to the fore. For example, an initial reading of attitudes toward immigration may result in a conclusion that public attitudes are unremittingly hostile, shaped by a fear of “the other”, with illegal immigration being blamed for all society's woes; and, if it was tackled, many national issues would be miraculously solved, freeing up spending on health and education and securing our safety.

Indeed, anti-immigration messages trigger foundations about being protected from harm, not being cheated, and the sanctity of the homeland. However, as seen in public reactions to images of child refugees who had lost their lives in the Mediterranean, foundations around caring for the most vulnerable, freedom from persecution, and emotions around compassion can be evoked, shifting opinions and stances. Beyond this immediate, highly emotive reaction, stories of how

immigrants, or the second generation, drive business growth, foster communities, and serve their nation can trigger the loyalty foundation.

In our work with brands and companies in an overtly political landscape, we also often see a tension between the views people may express as a citizen versus how people think and act as a consumer: we may say we do not trust Wall Street, but we trust our bank not to siphon off cash from our checking account. We want data privacy, but we also want our search browser to know that we are looking for a dry cleaner in our neighborhood, not on the other side of the country. Applying the more nuanced values framework to bear allows us to understand what foundations are coming to the fore, and where an approach may not be balancing competing demands.

As more and more of the corporate communicator's role will be to bridge the chasm between private expertise and public understanding, this framework will be more crucial. Many of today's policy challenges—from working out our energy mix, to the use of biotechnology, and the role of the capital markets—require high levels of technical knowledge to fully comprehend. As the Financial Times writer Gillian Tett highlights, much innovation in business can be impenetrable to outsiders who don't get the jargon (think hedge funds, biosimilars or net neutrality) (Tett, 2015). Moral foundations theory helps us build public knowledge by understanding which foundations to evoke, and consequently making information seep in, rather than be ignored, building reassurance and trust in the long run.

5.3. Speaking to the full repertoire

The framework ensures messaging corresponds to a full palette of values, which is evident of successful campaigns: they connect with multiple values, rather than rely on one call to action.

As New York Times journalist Jo Becker describes, gay marriage equality advocates in the U.S. won in part through a campaign aimed at bridging a broad set of values (Becker, 2014). Becker outlines how the cause gathered momentum by widening the lens from solely talking about gaining equal access to benefits and legal rights open to straight couples, to a broader narrative about core American values around fairness, freedom and a level playing field. It made people with a myriad of perspectives believe it was consistent with their values:

“Republicans arguing it was consistent with conservative values of fidelity and commitment, athletes arguing it was consistent with fair play, CEOs arguing it was good for business and the economy, religious leaders calling on people to ‘love thy neighbor as thyself’, and foreign policy hawks pointing out that some of the most antigay countries in the world were also the most vehemently anti-Western” (Becker, 2014).

This should give communicators confidence to move beyond the unrelenting focus on having one core message, to thinking more about how communications should touch upon a broad set of values, gaining strength through richness and diversity.

In the corporate arena, the implication of the focus on values is to think in terms of “the meta message” rather than just talking points on specific themes. In Bill Clinton's words, elections at the bottom level are about specific issues, but then it is about “the big-deal idea. What's this election about? What's the meta message?” (Fallows, 2003). By using moral foundations theory as the main analytical framework, and identifying what deep drives are at play underneath topline attitudes, we can pinpoint how to strike the most meaningful and resonant connection across the different issues we need to address.

6. Values as well as metrics

In this politicized environment, business leaders and corporations are expected to convey their values and ethos. They must go beyond dry talking points. In a media environment which has little time for corporatespeak, and a public mood which is highly skeptical of institutional motives, finding the right tone is harder than ever before. The public relations industry's focus on metrics, evaluation, and measurement is welcome, but quite simply is not the complete nor fully adequate solution to the challenges modern businesses face. Values matter too.

Much has been written about how modern political campaigns have embraced big data, applying sophisticated micro-targeting to mobilize turnout and supporters. What is often missed though is how a winning candidate or campaign is still primarily about striking an authentic tone, and making a deep, emotive connection with voters.

Political leaders have had longer to deal with this new, treacherous public environment, and corporate communicators would be wise not to just draw on data mining from the campaigning, but also how successful campaigns connect to our deep-seated values and motivations.

Acknowledgements

Assistance provided by Jonathan Johnson, Jasmine Hernandez, and Leora Hanser was greatly appreciated, and many thanks too to Jeremy Rosner for his input.

References

Barden, P. (2013). *Decoded: The science behind why we buy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing Inc.

Please cite this article in press as: Trayner, G. Why values matter – how public relations professionals can draw on moral foundations theory. *Public Relations Review* (2016), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.016>

- Becker, J. (2014). *Forcing the spring: Inside the fight for marriage equality*. New York, NY: Penguin Group USA.
- Chrzanowska, J. (2014). *Unconscious plus added power*. [Retrieved from:]. <http://www.aqr.org.uk/a/20141221-unconscious-plus-power>
- Cohen, S. (1972). *Folk devils and moral panics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- D'Ancona, M. (2013). *In it together: The inside story of the coalition government*. New York, NY: Penguin Group USA.
- Edsall, T. B. (2012). *The age of austerity: How scarcity will remake American politics*. New York, NY: Anchor/Vintage Books.
- Fallows, J. (2003). Post-president for life. In *The atlantic*. [Retrieved from].
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2003/03/post-president-for-life/302683/>
- Fradera, A. (2016). *Why is it so hard to persuade people with facts?* [Retrieved from].
<http://digest.bps.org.uk/2016/02/why-is-it-so-hard-to-persuade-people.html>
- Frayne, J. (2013). *Meet the people*. Hampshire, UK: Harriman House.
- From, A. (2013). *The new democrats and the return to power*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Hafitz, R. (2014). *Remarks from the role of planning through the ages*. New York, NY: PSFK.
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Hertz, N. (2003). *The silent takeover: Global capitalism and the death of democracy*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Griskevicius, V. (2013). *The rational animal: How evolution made us smarter than we think*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Langmaid, R. (2014). *Remarks from worldwide qualitative research conference*. Budapest, HU: AQR/QRCA.
- Mason, P. (2012). *Why it's kicking off everywhere: The new global revolutions*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso Books.
- McRaney, D. (2012). *You are not so smart: Why you have too many friends on facebook, why your memory is mostly fiction, and 46 other ways you're deluding yourself*. New York, NY: Avery Publishing.
- Miller, E., & Khaleelee, O. (1985). Beyond the small group: Society as an intelligible field of study. In M. Pines (Ed.), *Bion and group psychotherapy* (pp. 354–385). London UK: Routledge.
- Shenk, D. (1998). *Data smog: Surviving the information glut*. New York, NY: HarperOne.
- Tett, G. (2015). *The silo effect: The peril of expertise and the promise of breaking down barriers*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Trayner, G. (2015). Is someone out to get you? In *The association for qualitative research*. Retrieved from.
<http://www.aqr.org.uk/a/20151202-conspiracy-thinking>
- Wilson, T. D. (2004). *Strangers to ourselves: Discovering the adaptive unconscious*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.