

THE MARKETING OF NEUROMARKETING: BRAND DIFFERENTIATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY PROMINENT NEUROMARKETING FIRMS TO ATTRACT MEDIA CLIENTS

Walter S. McDowell
University of Miami
wmcdowell@miami.edu

Steven J. Dick
University of Louisiana, Lafayette
Dick@louisiana.edu

ABSTRACT Many media-based companies, such as networks, program producers, and production studios, are captivated by the promises made by the burgeoning field of *neuromarketing*. Market research firms specializing in brain-imaging techniques claim to reveal powerful subconscious audience dispositions and motivations unobtainable from conventional self-report research methods. A qualitative content analysis of the marketing strategies of 22 prominent neuromarketing websites discovered an array of brand differentiation techniques intended to either (a) legitimize the underlying science of neuromarketing or (b) attract clients through proprietary services. The study concludes with some applied and conceptual criticism of this research tool and a cautionary note for media firms interested in adopting it.

KEY WORDS: audiences, research, strategy, marketing, suppliers

Although initially attracting the interest of advertising clients, neuromarketing in recent years has fostered a growing curiosity among media-based companies, such as networks, program producers, and production studios that are looking for ways to win the hearts and minds of audiences. For example a major study investigating the validity of neuromarketing conducted by the Advertising Research Foundation

Copyright © 2013 Journal of Media Business Studies. Walter S. McDowell and Steven J. Dick, "The Marketing Of Neuromarketing: Brand Differentiation Strategies Employed By Prominent Neuro-marketing Firms To Attract Media Clients," 10(1): 25-40 (2013).

(ARF) received financial sponsorship support from a diverse group of established media entities, including ESPN, MTV Networks, NBC Universal, and Turner Enterprises (ARF, 2011). Responding to the competitive explosion in multi-platform distribution, media companies more than ever are seeking a competitive edge in nurturing their brands (Chan-Olmsted, 2011; Treutler, Levine & Marci, 2010).

A simple Internet search will reveal dozens of private companies claiming to be involved with “neuroimaging”, “biometrics”, “neuro-physiological measurement” or similar jargon. For convenience, these brain-imaging measurement services have been consolidated under the common rubric of *neuromarketing*. All promise to reveal powerful subconscious audience dispositions and motivations unobtainable from conventional self-report research methods.

Businesses providing all sorts of products and services face the dual challenges of attracting new customers, while preventing current customers from defecting to competitors. Often, before individual business brands can compete effectively, the overarching commodity or product category also must be marketed appropriately. This is true particularly when the commodity is unfamiliar and somewhat controversial (Keller, 2008). The burgeoning business enterprise of neuromarketing is such an example. That is, the underlying science (i.e. neuroscience) common to all competing firms must be differentiated from other marketing approaches and embraced by potential clients.

With the initial goal of identifying and categorizing the various differentiation strategies employed by these firms to attract and retain business clients, the researchers conducted a qualitative content analysis of 22 prominent neuromarketing company websites. Emphasizing more of a grounded theory approach, the researchers scrutinized what these firms *say about themselves* and in particular, statements and images intended to differentiate themselves from other types of research in general and from direct business rivals in particular.

This study begins with an overview of neuromarketing today and underscores a recent neuromarketing inquiry conducted by the Advertising Research Foundation (ARF), which was the initial inspiration for this study. Next, we provide summations of business to business brand differentiation principles in conjunction with niche theory and explain how these precepts served as a conceptual framework for generating the research question and the reasoning behind using a qualitative methodology to answer it. The operational components of the study are then presented, including the website selection process, constant comparative coding schemes, and reliability checks. Findings of this exercise are presented along with verbatim examples. Finally, the paper concludes with additional insights, limitations and a recommendation for media businesses to exercise some critical thinking about the promises and perils of embracing neuromarketing.

OVERVIEW OF NEUROMARKETING

For decades, the advertising and media industries have relied on conventional self-report surveys, experiments and focus groups to measure the wants, needs and attitudes of consumers and audiences. In terms of predicting subsequent human actions in the marketplace, the results of these studies often have been disappointing. One explanation for these shortcomings has been the belief that subconsciously embedded, emotional drivers, rarely detected by conventional self-report research methodologies, have a profound influence on individual choice. One alternative approach to access these hidden persuaders has been to use certain biological measures as substitutes for language-based self-reports (Martin, & Morich, 2011). Recent technological breakthroughs in the speed, efficiency, and mobility of highly sophisticated neurological measures have led to the exponential growth of a viable business enterprise typically called neuromarketing (Ariely & Berns, 2010; Hubert & Kenning, 2008; Lee, Broderick & Chamberlain, 2007).

The basic technology underpinning neuromarketing is not new, particularly Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), Electroencephalography (EEG), Magnetoencephalography (MEG) and facial Electromyography” (fEMG) and indeed medical science has validated their usefulness in diagnosing all sorts of physical maladies from epilepsy to brain tumors, but the transition to marketing research has generated some confusion and controversy. As a result, not all advertising and media research professionals have embraced wholeheartedly this methodology. (Perrachione & Perrachione, 2008). Exaggerating the capabilities of neuroscience has led some critics to dismiss the entire field as unsubstantiated hype or “snake oil” (Ariely & Berns, 2010; Murphy & Reiner, 2008; Easter & McClendon, 2010). A related issue is that although neuromarketing has its origins in medicine and academia, which are rooted in the ethos of full disclosure, neuromarketing is a business endeavor with a natural aversion to sharing information with rival participants in a marketplace.

Responding to the growing concern over the efficacy and ethics of neuromarketing, the Advertising Research Foundation (ARF) in the fall of 2010 launched a NeuroStandards Collaboration study. Below is an excerpt from the final report released in 2011 (ARF Project, 2011).

Because of the promise of these new approaches, we have seen a large increase in vendors employing such methods ... This has led to a problem for marketers: given the complexity of the science underlying these methods it is difficult for marketers to decide which approach is best for their objectives... Vendors often make strong claims about their new measures and methods but they have not published in peer-reviewed journals examined by independent experts. This makes it difficult... (for) different vendors use different techniques and it is unclear in some cases what science is being used (P.2).

A thorough summary of the lengthy report is beyond the scope of this study, but essentially the ARF review panel found many operational problems, such as small, non-representative samples, confounding instrumentation issues, artificial testing environments, poor validation of measures and constructs, missing statistical disclosures and misleading interpretations of findings. The ARF study mentioned only briefly the marketing strategies used by these firms to attract clients and therefore, this void served as the inspiration for this study. The researchers' intent was not to become embroiled in the ongoing debates concerning the usefulness of proprietary hardware, software and analytical procedures employed by these firms. Instead, we wanted to supplement the findings of this project by examining the business to business strategies employed by these firms to differentiate themselves in the eyes of potential clients.

Business to Business Brand Differentiation

In order to survive and prosper in a highly competitive marketplace, individual firms must distinguish themselves from their competitors and this is no less true for struggling neuromarketing enterprises. In terms of academic research, business-to-business (B2B) brand marketing strategies have received far less attention than those of business to consumer (B2C) strategies (Kotler & Waldemar, 2010). From a brand management perspective, a lack of adequate differentiation among competitors causes customers to regard the product or service as a mere *commodity*, interchangeable with other products of the same type or genre. In some situations, competitors must step back and focus on the acceptance of the commodity itself (or product category) before embarking on a more individualized branding effort.

Presuming the broad commodity has been adopted by the marketplace, the *brand equity* of a specific product or service constitutes its strong, valuable and hard-to-imitate characteristics that enable it to attract and retain customers in the face of competition. At the conceptual core of all brand management principles and best practices is the concept of *differentiation*. In simple terms, successful brands must be perceived as different from their rivals. (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003; Keller, 2008; Kotler & Waldemar, 2010). Strategic management scholars Carpenter, & Sanders (2009) assert that "A firm that understands why its customers regularly choose its products or services over those of competitors has identified its *differentiators*." (p.16)

Along these same lines of thought, John Dimmick (2003) in his seminal work on niche theory maintains that the ultimate goal for a media industry or an individual media firm should be to cultivate a niche that prospers without exhausting its energies fighting too many similar competitors for the same limited resources. Furthermore, the key to competing and coexisting within a crowded marketplace is differentiation. This can be expressed in terms of niche breadth, niche overlap and other diagnostic measures that cultivate a sustained strategic advantage. From a marketing communication perspective,

these strategic advantages must be communicated to appropriate audiences. In this case the targeted audiences predominantly are advertising agencies and media companies.

Media Businesses as Brands

Over the past decade or so the academy has witnessed increased research activity dealing with media as brands (Chan-Olmsted, 2011; McDowell, 2006). Media-based companies are now using the same consumer research methodologies that advertisers use to sort out the attitudinal and behavioral characteristics of audiences that “consume” media content. Even journalism has been determined to be a relevant area for media brand research, recognizing that audiences can have an emotional attachment to a news source. (McDowell, 2011).

Competing media firms desperately seek new ways to differentiate themselves from audience competitors and consequently look to research firms for innovative research techniques. Responding to this need, research firms seek to differentiate themselves from rival services, seeking to establish a desirable commodity and an exclusive business to business brand.

Given the aforementioned circumstances, the essential research question for this case study can be posited in the following manner: *What commodity and brand differentiation strategies do neuromarketing firms communicate to prospective business customers?*

METHOD

A convenient and valid assessment of a company’s strategic communication strategies can be obtained by studying its official website. In addition to presenting perfunctory facts about the company, most websites today are intended to be marketing tools designed to attract interest and inquiries from potential clients (Kotler & Waldemar, 2010). Consequently, the researchers decided to use these websites as the primary source for answering the study’s research question.

The researchers chose a purposive sample of 22 prominent neuromarketing firms. Prominence was based on a number of criteria. First, the study included all firms that participated in the above-mentioned ARF Neurostandards Collaborative Project. Additional firms were selected based on the notoriety they have received over a previous year in various advertising and media industry publications, such as *Advertising Age* and *Broadcasting and Cable*. Although not a random sample of all such firms, the researchers believe this collection offers an effective representation of the most active firms in the neuromarketing arena today.

To assess differentiation strategies, the researchers adopted a qualitative content analysis methodology. The social sciences have provided many definitions of qualitative content analysis but one that is

quite appropriate for this particular study is “Any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meaning” (Patton, 2002, p.453). Unlike a more statistical-based, quantitative approach, qualitative analysis goes beyond merely counting explicit words or phrases. Instead, it **examines themes and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text**. Such an observation might be expressed in a single word, a phrase, image, or reference. Given these circumstances, the researchers took a grounded theory approach, which uses successive levels of abstraction through comparative analysis techniques (Charmaz, 2010). This approach does not necessarily mean that the process must be devoid completely of any preconceived theory. To the contrary, Zhang & Wildemuth, (2009) maintain that in some circumstances a “directed” analysis is appropriate, whereby a theory-based conceptual framework is useful as the researchers immerse themselves in the data and allow categories and themes to emerge. This qualitative approach has been used in similar studies. For instance, McDowell (2004) conducted a qualitative content analysis of cable network business-to-business advertising. For this study, the researchers sought textual statements that could be interpreted readily as differentiation strategies intended to attract prospective customers. With this in mind, the researchers did not want to be distracted by stylistic issues such as graphic design or site navigation features that did not portray a strategic advantage.

Coding Procedures and Constant Comparative Data Analysis

Following the guidelines of the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis pioneered by Glaser & Strauss (1967) and adapted for media studies by Wimmer & Dominick (2011), this project consisted of two coders working at first independently on the same 22 websites. These sites were assigned in batches of five or six, wherein the coders would stop and compare notes. The process consisted of four steps:

1. **Comparative assignment of incidents to categories.**
2. **Elaboration and refinement of categories.**
3. **Searching for relationships and themes among categories.**
4. **Simplifying and integrating data into a coherent theoretical structure.**

Responding to the original research question, the **unit of analysis was any message that revealed directly or indirectly a marketing strategy**. These elements may include images, phrases, or secondary internet links used to inform the potential client. Appropriate categories emerged from these statements. The first five websites served as a pilot study to assure that the coders were identifying similar phenomena. Of course perfect agreement was impossible because this was an interpretive rather than a mere counting exercise but eventually, through much discussion and

negotiation, an acceptable coding scheme evolved. As expected, the analysis began with many categories but gradually, as each subsequent batch was examined and prior collected data were reevaluated, the number and configurations of categories were revised and consolidated into broader, more holistic themes.

RESULTS

The following section provides an itemized analysis of the differentiation categories (i.e. strategies) accompanied in most cases by typical quotations transcribed directly from the websites.

Positioning the Neuromarketing Technique against other Research Options

Essentially **firms invested considerable effort in positioning this biology-based approach** as an alternative to conventional self-report methodologies. In particular, they emphasized the ability to tap into the latent, subconscious (or unconscious) workings of the mind. The following quotations are indicative of this observation.

“Neuromarketing delves beyond the limits of long established consumer group testing.” (Neurotise).

“... memory, learning, emotion, and decision making. These processes are largely inaccessible though introspection alone...” (Neurosense).

“Survey methods typically do not capture the influence of unconscious associations or conformity effects” (NeuroCompass).

“... (We) scientifically measure consumer reactions to content at a level that the individual is not aware of consciously” (Neuro-Insight).

“We look beyond the spoken word” (FKF Research).

“95% of consumers purchasing behaviors are guided by unconscious buying process” (BrainImpact).

“... (We) employ recent developments in neuroscience to delve into the black box of the mind of the consumer” (Millward Brown).

“Neuromarketing measures below the surface, like the iceberg below the water” (Mindlab).

Most of these firms delved into the **notion of emotion as the core component of this subconscious inquiry** and the most persuasive reason

for taking advantage of neuroscience. The following quotations exemplify this focus on emotion.

“Our firm... measures the emotional connection people have with advertising and brands” (Affectiva).

“Emotional engagement can have a powerful impact on memory” (Mindmetric).

“Emotions drive action” (Sensory Logic).

“Emotions play a large part in shaping our preferences” (NeuroCompass).

Establishing Expertise and Credentials

Firms touted their expertise and credentials typically by mentioning affiliations with academia or with the scientific communities. Many firms have hired experts from these fields as consultants or partners and provide lengthy biographies. The following quotes offer a glimpse of this marketing tactic.

“The technology was first developed by Professor Richard Slerstein and his co-workers. ... at the Swinburne University of technology” (Neuro-Insight).

... (We use) internationally renowned neuroscientists from the top British universities (Neurosense).

“Our team is composed of world-renowned neuroscientists, market researchers, psychologists, mathematicians and statisticians” (NeuroCompass).

“You can be assured that you are selecting a company who embraces the latest neuroscientific methods” (Neurotise).

“...He has a Bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the London School of Economics, and a PhD in Functional Brain Imaging from the University of Oxford (Neurosense).

“...academic research as well as the proprietary work we have done for Fortune 500 companies” (FKF Research).

History and Size

Another aspect of establishing credibility is to inform the prospective client of the history and size of the company. Most neuromarketing firms are relatively new to the scene but a few can be regarded as legacy

brands with a long history. In addition, the size of these companies varied greatly. Some appear to be rather small, concentrating on only a few services, while others are much larger, offering many services beyond neuromarketing. Furthermore, a number of companies are partners with or subsidiaries of a big, more established firm.

“With 82 offices in 52 countries, we work with 90% of the top 100 global brands...” (Millward Brown).

“NeuroFocus is proud to announce we are now a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Nielsen Company” (NeuroFocus).

“Established in 1999, the team has over ten years’ experience” (Neurosense).

Unique Products and Services

An important challenge for these competitors is that they essentially use the same basic equipment. Consequently, they must demonstrate **specialized uses of this equipment**, coupled with proprietary hardware attachments, software analysis, or secret mathematical algorithms. The quotations below are typical.

“... (We are) a market research company that uses unique brain-imaging technology to measure how the brain responds to communication” (Neuro-Insight).

“...custom-built psychological assessment tools” (Neurosense).

“The analysis collapses the stimulus into a total brain function distribution to gain both a clear macro and micro view of the study material” (Sands Research).

“(We use) the only known measure that distinguishes positive from negative emotional response.” (Gallup & Robinson).

“We can literally map the human mind.” (FKF Research).

“Effective neuroscience made easy.” (MindMetic).

Many of these services have been given clever names, some of which are trademarked but few have been patented.

Practical Benefits to the Client

In terms of how these unique services can benefit a client, we found that these **firms typically divided their branding messages into two subgroups**. The first addresses the **customer or audience revelations** that

will be provided. The second aims at the **client's bottom line** measurable outcomes. Items below are typical.

“Don't rely on focus groups and consumers' ability to express their opinions about your products, let their minds speak for themselves.” (MindSign)

“Interpreting subconscious reactions that consumers will not or cannot articulate” (Neurosense).

“Neuromarketing: Understanding the Buy Buttons in Your Customer's Brain.” (SalesBrain)

“...we can scientifically define the difference between campaign success and failure.” (Neuro-Insight)

“You will be able to help your company market your product more efficiently” (MindSign).

“We are category leaders and offer a low cost high volume and high value business model” (Mindmetic).

“Why continue to throw good money after bad? “Neurometrix technology will allow you to make better informed business decisions, improve sales and enhance brand efficiency” (MindLab).

“We bring the understanding of commercial markets and consumer thought; emotion, decision making and behavior together to create marketing that works.” (Whitematter).

“We save our customers (be they corporate advertisers, advertising agencies or market research firms) both time and money.” (Sands Research).

“... improves the ROI of your existing marketing and sales efforts. (SalesBrian).

Listing Satisfied Customers

Perhaps the most persuasive way for any business to attract new customers is to **provide a list of satisfied customers**, preferably accompanied by glowing testimonials. Typically, clients were identified as “Fortune 500 companies” (FKF), “Top 50 Megabrands” (Sensory Logic), or testimonials from “VP Research of a top 10 global advertising agency” (NeuroCompass).

Ethics

Coinciding with the strategy of establishing a firm's expertise and credentials was a mention of professional ethics espoused by many companies. A forthright statement of ethics can assuage client apprehensions about a somewhat controversial research tool. Examples are presented below.

"We strive to adhere to the same standards for protecting subjects that are used by peer-reviewed journals" (FKF Research).

"We are determined to bring scientific rigor, ethics, and transparency into all that we do and to drive the industry to similar high standards. As such, NeuroCompass is fully accredited by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) as established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services" (NeuroCompass).

"All our experiments undergo intense scrutiny by the Central Research Ethics Committee in the UK" (Neurosense).

"..(We have) joined other vendors in the industry in subscribing to the guidelines below for thorough due diligence within the neurological market research industry" (Sands Research).

Consolidation of Categories and the Issue of Transparency

The strategic marketing categories presented so far can be consolidated into two overarching differentiation themes intended to either (a) legitimize the underlying science of neuromarketing as a unique commodity or (b) promote the proprietary services of a firm as a unique brand. This two-way division is a bit artificial because in many cases these two themes intertwined as many firms boasted about their unique scientific expertise and credentials, while legitimizing the field in general.

In addition, the researchers observed another theme that permeated almost all of the websites; a lack of transparency concerning proprietary hardware, procedures and data. Not providing full disclosure is in fact a type of "strategy." That is, they do not want to reveal trade secrets to competitors yet at the same time, they do want to be sufficiently open to support neuroscience as a legitimate research paradigm. For example, as mentioned earlier, neuromarketing focuses on human emotion of which there is robust peer-reviewed literature, but the individually branded companies conduct private studies introducing their own proprietary jargon, such as "emotional involvement", "emotional attachment", "emotional engagement", and "emotional dimensions."

This final observation resonates with a more generalizable topic of how science-based companies are challenged to differentiate proprietary strategic advantages without divulging important details for fear of

exposing legally unprotected information or designs. A company can protect confidential information (i.e. *trade secrets*) through non-compete and non-disclosure contracts with its employees, however, the lack of formal protection, such as a patent, means that a third party is not prevented from independently duplicating and using the secret information once it is discovered. In many instances companies use trademarks, but a trademark is merely a name for something. More stalwart protections, such as *patents* or *copyrights* would be more useful but rarely can these named products qualify for such protection.

For this neuromarketing study the website typically featured an introductory crash course in neuroscience (i.e. the commodity) followed by a slick but nonetheless superficial explanation of some exclusive contraption or computer software identified by a clever trademark owned by the firm (i.e. the brand). Examples include “Q Sensor”, “Biometric Monitoring System”, “Neurometri²”, “MindGlove”, “Touchpoint”, “AccuTrak”, and “Neuro Engagement Score.” The bottom line in terms of transparency is that these websites provide potential customers far more sizzle than steak.

DISCUSSION

This study took a qualitative approach to understand how neuromarketing research firms differentiate themselves to potential media business clients. Company websites were selected as valid and convenient means of assessing the neuromarketing landscape. A content analysis of 22 websites revealed several distinct differentiation categories that were consolidated into two broad strategic themes of promoting neuroscience in general (i.e. as a commodity) and promoting distinguishing brand characteristics of individual firms in particular (i.e. as brands). In addition, a disconcerting lack of transparency for proprietary services was construed as a strategy exhibited among most websites. For the most part these burgeoning, science-based businesses are not regulated by law or by custom. Therefore, caveat *emptor*. Yes, the notion of *ethics* was created as a separate differentiation category in this study but the focus of these ethical statements primarily was on the ethical treatment of participants as human subjects, not on the reliability and validity of the science underlying the proprietary service.

We offer some criticism and a cautionary note for media firms succumbing to the often exaggerated promises of this controversial research tool. First, we found significant *operational issues* - the necessary “nuts and bolts” components of any research endeavor, regardless of its conceptual underpinnings. As stated in prior sections of this study and in the summary of the ARF study, more rigor and transparency is needed concerning items such as small, non-representative samples, confounding instrumentation issues, artificial testing environments, missing or misleading statistical disclosures.

A second and more troublesome area of concern were *conceptual issues* and in particular, issues of defining exactly what is being measured. Neuromarketing suffers from excessive reductionism; the philosophical premise that the world's apparent complexity can be explained by deconstructing it into ever smaller and simpler parts. This has been the predominant paradigm of science over the past two centuries and while it has been responsible for tremendous successes, it has limits in terms of the desired *level* explanation of a phenomenon. Neuromarketing attempts to explain higher order human attitudes and behavior by reducing these phenomena into lower order “particle” analyses, relying on the disciplines of biology, chemistry and physics. Of course human thoughts and actions ultimately depended on these particles to exist. For example, molecules in the brain surely have something to do with experiencing what we call emotion, but to boast that by quantitatively measuring this biochemical activity we can uncover highly abstract, and supposedly repressed attitudes about a media product is a stretch for us. Neuromarketing is reductionism run amok and media businesses interested in this type of audience research need to scrutinize not only the more mundane operational protocols employed by a firm but also the firm’s promised insights.

Limitations of the Study

First, using only company websites could be construed as a limitation. Perhaps an examination of other marketing tools, such as person-to-person sales messages and meeting displays, might have offered information not found on a website. Although personal interviews with company representatives either in person or via telephone may have added a different perspective, this would have violated our desire to observe just the formal “public” presentations of a firm’s marketing strategies.

Second, not every neuromarketing company website was analyzed. Those selected in this purposive sample covered what the researchers believed to be “prominent firms” but in fact, a formalized random sample was not acquired and perhaps an inadvertent bias was introduced in the findings.

Third, additional coders examining the same websites might have increased the projects reliability or what many qualitative researchers call “trustworthiness.”

Finally, some may criticize the chosen methodology. Diehard positivists can lament the qualitative shortcomings of coding based on interpretation rather than quantification and the lack of a mathematically-based intercoder reliability statistic. Indeed, the researchers could have conducted quantitative content analysis but a more interpretive, qualitative approach seemed better suited for our purposes.

Recommendations for Future Research

Analyzing how marketing firms market themselves from a business to business communication frame of reference, employing a qualitative methodology is not common in academia or in the private sector. Consequently, we encourage the use of this research technique for future inquiries. Narrowing our focus specifically to neuromarketing, the field needs much theory-based, peer-reviewed research to clarify what it can and cannot provide media businesses.

REFERENCES

- ARF Project. (2011). *Advertising Research Foundation. Neurostandards Collaboration Project*. Website. Retrieved August 25, 2012 from <http://www.thearf.org/assets/neurostandards-collaboration>.
- Ariely, D., & Berns, J.S. (2010). Neuromarketing: The hope and hype of neuroimaging in business. *Nature*. Section: *Perspective/ Science and Society*, 11, 284-292.
- Carpenter, M.A., & Sanders, W.G. (2009). *Strategic management. A dynamic perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Chan-Olmsted, S. M.(2011). Media branding in a changing world: Challenges and opportunities 2.0. *The International Journal on Media Management*. 13 (1), 3-20.
- Charmaz, K. (2010). *Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Dimmick, J. W. (2003). *Media competition and coexistence. The theory of the niche*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Easter, B., & McClendon. E. (September, 2010). Is Neuromarketing a fantasy or the future? It could give marketers an edge, but questions remain about effectiveness and ethics. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved October 10, 2011 from <http://adage.com/article/guest-columnists/neuromarketing-a-fantasy-future/145784/>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Hoeffler, S., & Keller, K. L. (2003). The marketing advantages of strong brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, 10, 421-445.
- Hubert., M, & Kenning, P. (2008). A current overview of consumer neuroscience. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 7, 272-292.
- Keller, K. L. (2008). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring and managing brand equity*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, p., & Waldemar, P. (2010). *B2B Brand Management*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Lee, N., Broderick, A. J., & Chamberlain, L. (2007). What is 'neuromarketing'? A discussion and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 63, 199-204.

- Martin, N., Morich, K. (2011). Unconscious mental processes in consumer choice: Toward a new model of consumer behavior. *Journal of Brand Management*, 18, 483-505.
- McDowell, W.S. (2011). The brand management crisis facing the business of journalism. *International Journal on Media Management*, 13 (1), 37-51.
- McDowell, W. S. (2006). Issues in marketing and branding. In A. B. Albarran, S. Chan-Olmsted, & M. O. Wirth, *Handbook of media management and economics* (pp. 229-250). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing
- McDowell, W.S. (2004). Selling the niche: A qualitative content analysis of cable network business-to-business advertising. *International Journal on Media Management*, 6, 217-225.
- Murphy, E, Illes, J, & Reiner, P.B. (2008). Neuroethics of neuromarketing. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 7, 293-302.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perrachione, Tyler K., & John R. Perrachione (2008). Brains and brands: Developing mutually informative research in neuroscience and marketing. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 7, 303-318.
- Treutler, T., Levine, B., & Marci, C.D. (2010). Biometrics and multi-platform messaging: The medium matters. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 50 (3), 243-249.
- Wimmer, R.D., & Dominick, J.R. (2011, 9th Edition). *Mass media research. An introduction*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. M Wildemuth, *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (pp. 22-44). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited

APPENDIX

Neuromarketing Firms Selected for Content Analysis

Affectiva. <http://www.affectiva.com>

Brainimpact. <http://www.brainimpact.eu/en/>

Buyology. http://www.martinlindstrom.com/index.php/cmsid__buyology_about

FKF Applied Research <http://www.fkfappliedresearch.com/>

Gallup & Robinson. <http://www.gallup-robinson.com/services.html>

Innerscope Research. <http://www.innerscoperesearch.com/>

Martin Linstrom. <http://www.martinlindstrom.com>

Millward Brown. www.millwardbrown.com

Mindlab International. <http://www.themindlab.org/>

Mindmetic. http://www.mindmetic.com/site/mindmetic_-_Product_mindOnline.html

MindSign. <http://mindsignonline.com/services.html>

MSW Research. http://www.mswresearch.com/about_whatwedo.html

Neuro-Insight. <http://www.neuro-insight.com/the-company/>

Nerotise. <http://neurotise.com/>

NeuroCompass. www.neurocompass.com

NeuroFocus. <http://www.neurofocus.com/>

Neurosense. <http://www.neurosense.com/>

One To One Insight. <http://www.onetooneglobal.com/insight/>

Salesbrain. <http://www.salesbrain.com/>

Sands Research. <http://www.sandsresearch.com/>

Sensory Logic. <http://www.sensorylogic.com/>

Whitematter Marketing. <http://whitemattermarketing.com/>

Copyright of Journal of Media Business Studies is the property of Journal of Media Business Studies and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.