

# Reactions to a Price Increase: What Makes it Seem Fair

Marcos G. Avila<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fordham University Emerita

*Received: 6 December 2012 Accepted: 2 January 2013 Published: 15 January 2013*

---

## Abstract

Findings -The Focus groups generally supported the basic fairness model, although with a few modifications and additions. Culture affects understandings of appropriate behavior. Research limitations/implications -To a great extent, the difference in the Focus group participants' responses reflected the realities of their different environments. There are also no doubt differences in how different businesses operate. Such differences can lead to perceptual differences.

---

*Index terms*— prices, consumers, fairness, culture paper type research paper

## 1 Introduction

rice fairness is of growing interest to marketing researchers (e.g., Bolton, Warlop and Alba 2003; Campbell 1999; Maxwell 2002; Xia, Monroe and Cox 2004, Mayer and Avila, 2011). It is also of obvious interest to managers since profit is a direct function of price, and being able to increase a price depends on whether the increase is perceived to be fair. Earlier research (Maxwell 1995) concluded that price increases will generally be considered unfair because they are detrimental to the consumer's utility, but seller's can make an increase seem fair by having a socially acceptable justification. This conclusion is depicted in the Basic Fairness Model of Rutte and Messick (1995).

## 2 II.

## 3 Basic Fairness Model

The Rutte and Messick (1995) integrated model of fairness is a generalized model of how judgments of fairness are triggered and acted upon. The contention is that an adverse outcome causes a person to feel distress, which motivates a concern for fairness. If the action is judged fair, then the outcome is reevaluated and accepted. The recipient of the adverse outcome "may experience disappointment, but not injustice" (Rutte and Messick 1995, p. 242). In contrast, if the action is judged unfair, the person will feel intensified stress and will contemplated retaliatory actions.

The purpose of this study is to determine if the Basic Fairness Model (Rutte and Messick 1995) is supported across cultures in Brazil, Germany and the United States. Each of these countries is the largest economic power in their respective continents. Each has a different cultural and economic system. Corroborating evidence from all three would provide strong support for the model. Differences would suggest other factors that should be considered.

## 4 III.

## 5 Structured Focus Groups

To test the model across cultures, structured focus groups were conducted in Germany, Brazil and the United States. The focus group method was considered the most appropriate method to gain insights in customers' feelings and perceptions (Morgan 1996).

## 6 FOCUS GROUP RESPONSES

---

41 Four sessions were conducted in each country. There were between five and eight participants in each group,  
42 evenly divided between males and females. To maintain sampling equivalence, all groups were composed of  
43 business students. To minimize the problems of translation equivalence, each group was presented with the same  
44 structured set of short scenarios developed by Mayer and Avila (2004). 1. You learn that Service Company "X"  
45 has increased the price for its services by 20%. 2. How does that make you feel? 3. Does it make a difference  
46 that Company "X" says the reasons for the price increase were: [a.] cost increases by suppliers, [2.] a new salary  
47 agreement with employees.

48 5. Another newspaper reports that Company "X" raised its prices after the government announced that it  
49 intends to set price controls on the kinds of services "X" offers. 6. An important economic analyst said on ABC  
50 yesterday that Company "X" increased prices together with all the other companies of the sector, an act that  
51 could be considered the forming of a cartel. 7. Company "X" was a health insurer. 8. Sorry? that's wrong.  
52 Company "X" was really a gym center. 9. Wrong again? Company "X" was actually a telecommunications  
53 provider. 10. All the focus group sessions were both videotaped and manually recorded. The following is a  
54 summary of the responses.

55 IV.

## 56 6 Focus Group Responses

57 Outcome Evaluation: There was consensus that a 20% increase is a large amount. In all three countries, the  
58 question of the base price was an issue: a 20% increase on 100 is a major concern; a 20% increase on 1 is minor.

59 Brazil: "My first impression is that a 20% increase is unfair." "Right off the bat, 20% seems quite high and  
60 unfair." "How much do I spend on this service? 20% of how much? Another R\$10, for example, for an internet  
61 provider or a newspaper subscription is irrelevant."

62 Germany: "20% is a lot of money!" "I think this raise in prices of 20% is really high." "20% is too much!"  
63 "That's a raise of one-fifth! That's quite considerable. Rutte and Messick (1995) depicts a fairness judgment as  
64 intervening between distress and the reaction to that distress. However, in the Focus groups, a possible direct  
65 path was suggested. Particularly with the German respondents, anger at the price increase appeared strong  
66 enough to lead them directly to thoughts of retribution.

67 Germany: "20% is too high no matter which reason is given." "I would leave immediately! I always choose  
68 the cheapest one." "I make the decision because of the price and not because of the reasons." "I think that most  
69 people do not care about the reasons." "I see that in my own family when there is a tax increase –price increase,  
70 whatever –the justification does not matter. They are simply annoyed." "They think it's unjust."

71 Justification: Although some respondents, particularly in Germany, were angry enough not even to consider  
72 whether the price increase was justified, others demonstrated an intense need for some sort of justification.

73 Brazil: "All this could be minimized if there were an explanation that could reduce that feeling of unfairness."  
74 "What is the reason?" "I stop and ask myself what the reason for the increase is this time." "I'd want an  
75 explanation from the company." "If they had a justification? perhaps I would accept it."

76 Germany: "They should tell us the reason."

77 "Why did he do that? It raises interest." "I ask myself why. Why does he require 20% more now?" "I'd ask  
78 why the company has raised its prices." "That has to be justified." "I'm interested in the justification for the price  
79 increases." "If I understand the reason, I will be more disposed to pay."

80 United States: "My first reaction would be 'Why?'" "Why are they increasing their prices by 20%?" "I'd  
81 want to know a reason." "I think (a reason) helps to justify the price increases. When I know why the price has  
82 increased, I don't mind as much." "I'd look for more information first, then I'd make a decision."

83 The literature suggests two basic justifications for actions: Distributive Justice (Deutsch 1985) and Procedural  
84 Justice (Thibaut and Walker 1975). Distributive Justice pertains to the judged fairness of the outcome, which  
85 in this case is that the price has been increased by 20%. Procedural Justice pertains to the judged fairness of the  
86 process leading to that outcome. "Reciprocity" or "equity" applies to the equality of the exchange: "tit for tat"  
87 or "quid pro quo." "Equality" refers to the similarity of outputs for different people. The overriding justification  
88 for a price increase, according to the respondents in all focus groups, was equity: the equivalence of what they got  
89 in return for the money they had to give up. If the price was increased 20%, they wanted the service to improve  
90 20%. Brazil: "Whenever I see an increase, I think about having a benefit in return." "Has the company tried to  
91 offer me something more?" "People see that 20% increase as unfair because they don't see any improvement in  
92 the service." Germany: "If you pay more, you would like to get better performance." "If there is a quality increase  
93 connected with the increase of prices, in this case you have a trade-off." "If the service would change, it would  
94 be OK." "I'd ask myself if the quality has changed or remained constant. If it has changed, a raise might be  
95 justified." United States: "I'd want to know what I'm getting for the 20%." "If they raise the prices they should  
96 improve the service." "If you saw that they gave more value for your money, gave you more services, it would be  
97 justifiable."

99 The concern for equality of distribution has primarily been researched as it pertains to wages. At least in the  
100 focus groups, it did not seem to apply to consumer exchange. No one in Brazil and only one or two in Germany  
101 and the United States mentioned it.

102 Germany: "I know for example that she is paying less than I am. Until now I have not been too annoyed about  
103 paying a bit more than she does. I haven't really cared about it. Maybe I would if they increased." United States:  
104 "It's just not right that someone who never goes (to a doctor) has to pay the same premiums as someone who goes  
105 all the time." Procedural Justice pertains to the judged fairness of the process: is the method by which the price  
106 was determined a fair process? When a seller takes an action that is disadvantageous to the buyer, a reason is  
107 expected. One reason that has been recognized as a justification for a price increase is an increase in costs (Okun  
108 1981; Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler 1986). Recently, however, sellers have been under pressure to increase  
109 efficiency rather than to increase price. So, although increased prices are justified when uncontrollable costs like  
110 oil price increase, costs were not automatically accepted as a legitimate reason by Focus group participants. They  
111 wanted to know whether the company's competitors are also increasing their prices.

112 Brazil: "If it's because of costs, a situation where they have to raise prices, then the increase is fair." "If I  
113 hear that a company is increasing a price, but the competition isn't, then I see it as an injustice." "The feeling  
114 of unfairness is bigger if the company increases the price by itself. It's either being inefficient or unfair."

115 Germany: It has to be comprehensible why the rise in prices is taking place." "Especially external causes like  
116 government regulators or taxes are comprehensible." "If I can understand it, then it's not all that bad." "I'd also  
117 need more exact information." "It is important to have transparency to see the sense behind things." United  
118 States: "I would understand why the cost goes up because of the suppliers; it's out of your hands sometimes."  
119 "I think its understandable if the price of a commodity increases, like coffee beans, for everyone to increase their  
120 prices. Or for airlines: if their fuel cost increased, then I'd be okay with the price increases."

121 In all three countries it appears that management today is held responsible for managing their suppliers. If  
122 suppliers' costs increase, management is expected either to find another supplier or to share the burden of the  
123 cost increase with their customers: Brazil: "I'm more likely to think that the reasons they gave for the increase  
124 are more due to their inefficiency and that of the sector. Don't they have the means to absorb such costs?" "To  
125 be fair, for example, if the costs for the company have increased 10% and it is passing 5% on to me, then it's fair  
126 -the company is reducing its profit margin a bit and sharing the cost with me." Germany: "You have to consider  
127 if (the price increase is) caused by inefficiencies or by a raise in resource prices." "Suppliers are always reason  
128 number one when it comes to a raise in prices. For the average consumer that is barely believable." "They should  
129 reduce their margin and share the burden." United States: "I feel like that's their cost of business. Why are they  
130 necessarily passing the cost onto me? Have they taken steps to gain efficiencies on their end?" "I would think  
131 they should be a better negotiator with your suppliers if possible. I mean only to a certain extent they can do  
132 that."

133 An increase in employee wages is more acceptable reason for a price increase in Germany and the United  
134 States than in Brazil. This is understandable in Germany since the country is known for the social concern that  
135 underlies its economy. The reason in the United States may be that the Focus group participants themselves  
136 identified with employees Brazil: "Fair reason? "New salary agreement? I doubt that it was over 6%. I really  
137 doubt it". "I'd question justifications like that. It doesn't hold water. Too fuzzy. Has there been a strike?  
138 "Has there been any negotiations with the union? How much was personnel's increase? 30%? 40%?" Germany:  
139 "A wage settlement would be perfectly understandable." "Wage settlements are a very good thing in Germany.  
140 They secure working conditions and workers' rights." "This is better than having jobs shifted to other countries."  
141 "(A wage increase) is fairer than (a cost increase). It's more understandable knowing that the employees profit."  
142 United States: "Definitely paying people more, giving them more benefits justifies (a price increase) for me." "I  
143 wouldn't mind the cost increase so much if it were in fact for legitimate reasons such that they do give more  
144 money to their employees." "If I'm going to pay more to fly because employees are actually going to get what  
145 they deserve, I think that's fine."©

146 Self-Serving Bias to Fairness: As Messick and Sentis (1983) showed, fairness has a self-serving bias. For  
147 example, whether equity or equality is preferred depends on which rule will most benefit the individual. Whether  
148 a process is found procedurally fair depends on whether it is advantageous to the individual. The same bias was  
149 clear in all the respondents' view of fairness. First they asked themselves if the price increase affected them or  
150 not. If the price increase did not affect them, then most of them did not care, even if it adversely affected others.

151 Brazil: "If you (the company) had an increase from your suppliers, that's your problem. I don't have anything  
152 to do with it! Negotiate better! I'm not interested in that." "They may have had the cost of inputs increased,  
153 I don't care. I'm not satisfied with my own salary." Germany: "I would ask whether this really concerns me.  
154 If I was not directly concerned, why should I be angry about it?" "It's not my problem if the service provider  
155 has problems with a cost increase of its suppliers." "As a consumer I am kind of selfish. I am a consumer and  
156 not a shareholder or associate of the company. I want to have lower prices or constant prices and I don't care  
157 if I make the profits of a company smaller because of this." United States: "My first reaction would be that  
158 this (increase of costs) has nothing to do with me." "I think that the same thing goes for the salary agreement,  
159 it's not our problem as the consumer." "I'm mean, frankly, I don't really care about the reasons Company 'X'  
160 has listed; I just ask myself what am I getting in return. I mean you can come up with any reason you want,

161 but I ultimately need to pay more money, so I'm going to ask what am I getting." Heightened Distress: When  
 162 the Focus group participants were given reasons for the price increase which they thought were unfair -reasons  
 163 like increasing profits or increasing the price prior to government price controls -their emotional outburst ranged  
 164 from increased annoyance to vituperation. The strength of this emotional outburst was clearly greater than that  
 165 which had resulted from the price increase by itself.

166 Brazil: "Every reason presented before was nonsense. I think I'd get really annoyed." "Screw that!" "I'd get  
 167 so pissed off! The company is obviously taking advantage of the situation." "The feeling of unfairness grows. I'm  
 168 even more upset." "If you felt uneasy about it before, now you're really angry." Germany: "There's no justification  
 169 for this." "The companies think that customers would be so stupid." "I would react emotionally and definitely  
 170 change suppliers." "I'd feel a little annoyed? well, extremely annoyed." "I would go overboard! It's brashness!"  
 171 "That's not fair." "I would be so angry! Absolute brashness! Boldness on top!" "I'd distrust them. I would not  
 172 accept that." United States: "Personally I am really outraged." "I'm upset. I feel totally manipulated at this  
 173 point." "I'd feel betrayed by the company." "You feel like you've lost trust to the company a little bit." "This  
 174 smells of greed." "Price gouging." "As a consumer you feel basically disemboweled as a result of this."

175 Reaction: There are various actions consumers can take when a price increase is judged unfair. One is simply  
 176 to do nothing as predicted by the Status Quo Bias (Samuelson and Zeckhauser 1988). Or they can complain  
 177 or search for alternatives so they can switch suppliers. Brazilians appear to feel that complaining will have no  
 178 impact. Germans also seem to search and switch more often than complain. Americans are more vocal in their  
 179 complaints. Do nothing: Participants in all three countries recognized that switching has a cost in both time and  
 180 effort as well as risk. They also recognized the benefit of established relationships.

181 Brazil: "At first (with a price increase), they'll just use the phone less. Then, they'll forget. They'll get used  
 182 to it. You'll have to swallow it and won't stop using it." "If you like the place, I think you won't leave." "Maybe  
 183 I'd stick to it if it were close to my place, friends, etc." "Knowing people sometimes makes you stay." Germany:  
 184 "The question is how difficult is switching companies?" "I think that often you do not think about it too much  
 185 and just accept things the way they are." "I believe that it is not only the reasons that are important, but also  
 186 the relationship with this service company. buying it." "There's a relationship." "I guess if you trust the person,  
 187 then maybe that's worth more than a slight increase." Stop using: Whether the participants would stop using a  
 188 service due to a 20% price increase depended on how easy it is to stop. Brazil: "(With a gym), it's easy -leave.  
 189 Go walk on the beach." "I'd take up another type of [physical] activity." "If I can, I'll stop using the service." "I  
 190 think that some people will go without health insurance just to avoid the price increase. They'll take the risk."  
 191 Germany: "I would cut back on consumption, if I can't avoid it completely." "It depends on the service. Is it a  
 192 service that I can avoid? Or is it not possible to avoid because I've become too accustomed to it already. If it's  
 193 a habit, you can't avoid it." United States: "If you don't want to pay for a gym you can go to the park and just  
 194 run. The gym is no priority." "Probably I wouldn't go as often for sure. I'm on budget." "I take fewer cabs (since  
 195 cab fares increased); I take the subway more."

196 Complain: Americans tend to be a complaining society, but, strangely, making a complaint was not mentioned  
 197 in any of the American Focus groups. The Brazilian groups, in contrast, made it clear that Brazilians have  
 198 recently learned to complain. The Germans, on the other hand, felt that complaining was inappropriate. They  
 199 believe that companies would not listen and would only be annoyed.

## 200 8 Brazil:

201 "We (Brazilians) have gotten less tolerant, more demanding about the quality of services. Everything has to work  
 202 OK." "When a problem comes up, the client complains sooner." "Even if you take a ride or reduce consumption,  
 203 you're still angry. You'll keep on complaining." Germany: "From my family nobody complained about (worsening  
 204 of insurance quality) because it doesn't get you anywhere. I still know from others that some customers did  
 205 complain and that the company was annoyed if there are always people calling and complaining." "When you  
 206 call there, there's only this person who takes the call, but I feel you only get on their nerves." "I would call if  
 207 there was a special department for complaints, otherwise it doesn't make sense to me calling just anyone and  
 208 being angry with that person." Search: Searching requires considerable effort, particularly when the purchase is  
 209 a complex one like health insurance. All the Focus group participants at least claimed that they would search  
 210 for alternatives when a price is increased 20%.

211 Brazil: "You can also look for a substitute; something else that'll do the trick." "You have to see if there is  
 212 competition and if it has also raised its prices. Then you do research on the market." "You get pissed off, but look  
 213 for something else." Germany: "I'd search for alternatives." "Perhaps I wouldn't switch instantly, but I would  
 214 look for alternatives." "What are the other companies doing?" "I think it's a jungle of rates. If I have enough  
 215 time to look at it thoroughly, I would change to a better offer." United States: "I guess that if the product's  
 216 a commodity, you can try to find something else." "You'd look around for the same products and services now  
 217 that information is so available to all of us. There's no product that's so unique that you cannot find anything  
 218 else like it." "I'd do more research. It's hard to just react to that not knowing what the rest of the industry's  
 219 doing." Power: Power in the marketplace is determined by the availability of alternatives. Due to the number of  
 220 alternatives, the three services -healthcare insurance, gyms, and mobile phone -were seen to have varying power,  
 221 with healthcare insurance having the most and gyms having the least. The amount of power sensitized the  
 222 consumers to issues of fairness. The Focus group participants in all countries objected particularly to monopolies

---

223 because of the imbalance of power. They objected to having no choice of alternatives because then they were  
224 stuck. That made them madder.

225 Brazil: "Companies can negotiate with each other, and you as a consumer, you can bargain, but you have less  
226 bargaining power." "You feel like you're at the mercy of the government, the electric company and the regulating  
227 agency." "That's totally unfair. You don't have a choice." "I get madder when I don't have any choice." "I think  
228 it's unfair because to be without a health plan is critical in certain situations." "They're messing with very  
229 sensitive things: illness, old people. So there'll always be a feeling of injustice." Germany: "If all companies  
230 increase their price, you are forced to accept that." "That is totally crazy! You cannot do anything! You have  
231 no power. You can say I accept or not use the service any more." United States: "I think with health insurance  
232 the price increases are less justified. With Starbucks, people have a choice, (but) people need health insurance."  
233 "In the case of a monopoly like the MTA (public transportation group), you're in kind of a lose-lose situation  
234 because you have no choice." "You feel you have no control and you're mad about it." Government Controls:  
235 Participants from the three countries had very different feelings about the role of government in prices. In Brazil,  
236 the participants both counted on the government to control inflation and distrusted the government because of  
237 corruption. In Germany, after WWII, the country embraced the free market economy along with a fierce belief  
238 that the Brazil: "(Price increases are fair if) the government decided on a surcharge." "Increases based on such  
239 contracts are fair. They may not seem fair to the consumer, but they are foreseen in the contract made with  
240 the government." "The problem is that when the government gets involved it seems that you are being duped. It  
241 makes it much harder to believe that the increase is really needed." Germany: "The government in general is not  
242 allowed to set prices. It would not be a free market economy." "I would rather accept high profits (than a price  
243 increase in anticipation of government price controls)." "I'd hate the government for (price controls) because I  
244 reject any price controls even if they are supposed to be for the consumers' sake." "Cartel controls do make sense,  
245 price controls do not."

246 United States: "What if there were price controls? What if the government was going to set the price on doing  
247 your hair?" "Then we need to write to the government because that's just something we can't have." "I wouldn't  
248 have any sort of opinion about it, to tell you the truth. I'd be like, 'Oh, price controls, government?' It wouldn't  
249 affect me in any way." "I hope that one day the government is going to put some control on these (healthcare  
250 insurance) prices because they increase from year to year consistently."

251 Trust in System: As with government control, Brazil and Germany are at opposite ends of the pole when it  
252 comes to trust in the economic system. Americans, again, are somewhere in the middle, although trust in business  
253 in the United States is at an all time low: 66% of respondents to a survey by Yankelovich (2004) believe that  
254 "if the opportunity arises, most businesses will take advantage of the public if they feel they are not likely to be  
255 found out." American's trust in financial institutions and markets has dropped significantly since 2008 economic  
256 crisis. The Chicago Booth/Kellogg School Financial Trust Index (2012) finds that only 23 percent of Americans  
257 say they trust the country's financial system. Such cynicism is even more evident in Brazil where consumers start  
258 with a prior distrust of sellers' actions. When the possibility of a cartel was suggested, the Brazilian participants  
259 tended to believe it. The Germans did not.

260 Brazil: "You tend to think that the company is taking advantage of you right off the bat." "It's a conspiracy  
261 -everybody is against you." "They're lying!" "In this case (of a possible cartel), my feeling of unfairness is  
262 reduced...it's just a cruel world." "It's the same as hearing on the radio that a federal Representative has been  
263 accused of stealing, corruption. Do I get upset? Yes. Is it new? No." "In Brazil we have a lot of difficulty in  
264 judging that sort of thing. There's very little transparency in relation to you do if all of them raise prices?" "I  
265 think we can be quite relaxed in Europe concerning this because our laws and regulations are quite strict. If  
266 something like this happens, the national and EU public authorities would be there right away and would check  
267 it. I personally would rely upon their evaluation." "I'd think twice about switching, even if a state company  
268 insured me. It's a matter of trust."

269 United States: "Being in the States, they're not allowed to have a cartel here. So I probably wouldn't care  
270 because I know that the governments going to back me up." "I would expect the government to do something."  
271 "I think I'd be suspicious of just about any of those (reasons for a price increase) if the raise was 20%. I'd feel  
272 like their cost increase is probably 8%, and they're using that to just go and jack up our prices to like 20%"  
273 "Sounds like a line they might be feeding you to try to pad their pockets." "They're not always doing what they  
274 say they're doing."

275 Satisfaction: Supporting the German's prior trust in the system is their prior satisfaction. This confirms  
276 research by Homburg, Hoyer and Koschate (2005) showing that satisfaction moderates the effect of judged  
277 unfairness. Brazilians, however, reported only dissatisfaction. The subject of satisfaction did not come up in any  
278 of the American groups.

279 Brazil: "The problem is that you're already dissatisfied with the service of this sector. "It upsets me more  
280 when I am already dissatisfied with the service: "I'm already paying too much for this awful service and on  
281 top of that it is going to go up?" Germany: "If I'm satisfied, I would perhaps accept (a price increase)." "My  
282 satisfaction with the company is decisive. It's about how nice people are, how fair the company is. If I've had  
283 good experiences, I would not change." "When a certain satisfaction prevails, you overlook an increase."

284 V.

## 285 9 Managerial Implications and Applications

286 The Focus groups generally supported the basic fairness model of Rutte and Messick (1995), although with a few  
287 modifications and additions (see Figure 1). First, the reciprocal paths between "distress"

## 288 10 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

289 Volume XIII Issue IX Version I Y 2013 ear ( ) investors or consumers. In more developed economies there are  
290 rules about the information passed on to people who are used to having these kinds of information. In Brazil we  
291 are too passive and we forget easily."

292 Germany: "It's pretty clear that there could be an agreement of some kind, but it could also be that costs have  
293 risen for all of them, for example because of their suppliers. Then it would be logical that everybody increases  
294 prices." "I would think it's because of a changed environment, not because of an agreement between companies."  
295 "But as a consumer, what can and "judgment of fairness" have been dotted to indicate that in some cases, the  
296 path from "distress" may lead directly to "retribution." In addition, the influence of culture, power and trust have  
297 been incorporated. Culture affects understandings of appropriate behavior. For example, Germans, a collectivist  
298 culture, think complaining only causes conflict; Brazilians, an emerging consumer society, take pride in their  
299 newlearned ability to complain. Part of a culture is the role of the government: what it is expected to do, what  
300 it is authorized to do. In this study, there was a stark contrast between the Germans trust in their government  
301 and the Brazilians lack of trust. Americans seemed to trust the government to step in when necessary. Trust  
302 affects how information is interpreted. In low trust societies, consumers are prepared to think the worst. When  
303 consumers are satisfied with a service, however, they are prepared to give the seller the benefit of the doubt.  
304 When they have established a relationship with sellers, they develop trust even if they started with none. The  
305 positive effect of good relationships was apparent in all three countries.

306 Power affects the impact of different industries on price fairness judgments. When an industry is more powerful,  
307 as in the case of healthcare insurance, consumers are sensitized to fairness concerns. They are, however, reluctant  
308 to react because the alternatives are not good. The result may be capitulation: purchasing the product despite  
309 being angry as indicated by the dotted arrow. The result however, may also be explosive anger. This was  
310 demonstrated by the fury of consumers who were charged outrageous prices for gasoline after hurricane Katrina,  
311 in 2005, in the United States. Also, in Brazil, during severe landslides occurred 2011 in Rio de Janeiro State,  
312 there were many angry consumers protesting in social networks about prices increases of essential items such as  
313 water and milk.

314 To a great extent, the difference in the Focus group participants' responses reflected the realities of their  
315 different environments. For example, in Brazil where inflation in past years has been in the double digits, may  
316 considered a 20% increase as not as high as it is considered in the United States and Germany.

317 Particularly in Germany where inflation of consumer goods is nearly negative, a 20% increase may well be  
318 perceived as exorbitant. There are also no doubt differences in how different businesses operate: gyms and  
319 mobile phones may be similar but not equivalent in different countries. Alternatives, for example, may be readily  
320 available in the United States but not in Brazil. Such differences can lead to perceptual differences. These  
321 potential differences are a limitation that has to be taken into consideration. Despite these limitations, the Focus  
322 groups did provide clear support for the basic fairness model. How people react to unfairness appears to be  
323 universal. <sup>1 2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

<sup>2</sup>Reactions to a Price Increase: What Makes it Seem Fair



Figure 1: Volume

2013  
ear  
Y  
Volume XIII Issue IX  
Version I  
( )  
Global Journal of Man-  
agement and Business  
Research

United States: "With products you get set in your ways. You expect prices to increase. So if it's a product I like, more than likely I'm going to keep buying it. Whether that upsets me or not, I'm still going to keep

Figure 2:



- 
- 324 [Yankelovich ( )] 'A Crisis of Confidence: Rebuilding the Bonds of Trust'. Yankelovich . *Customer Relationship*  
325 *Management Conference*, (Chicago IL) 2004.
- 326 [Mayer and Avila ( )] 'A Qualitative Investigation about Community Standards of Fairness in the Brazilian  
327 Market: Inferences, Emotions and Culture'. Veronica Mayer , Marcos G Avila . *Fordham Pricing Conference*,  
328 (New York City NY) 2004.
- 329 [Rutte and Messick ( )] 'An Integrated Model of Perceived Unfairness in Organizations'. Christel Rutte , David  
330 Messick . *Social Justice Research* 1995. 8 (3) p. .
- 331 [Bolton et al. ( )] 'Consumer Perceptions of Price (Un)Fairness'. Lisa Bolton , Luk Warlop , Joseph Alba . *Journal*  
332 *of Consumer Research* 2003. 29 p. .
- 333 [Homburg et al. ( )] 'Customers' Reactions to Price Increases: Do Customer Satisfaction and Perceived Motive  
334 Fairness Matter?'. Homburg , Wayne D Christian , Nicole Hoyer , Koschate . *Academy of Marketing Science*  
335 *Journal* 2005. 33 (1) p. .
- 336 [Deutsch ( )] Morton Deutsch . *Distributive Justice: A Social-Psychological Perspective*, (New Haven CT) 1985.  
337 Yale University Press.
- 338 [Anonymous (2011)] 'Em meio ao caos, produtos somem das lojas e preços disparam na Região Serrana do Rio'.  
339 Anonymous . *Jornal O Globo* 2011. April 5, 2012.
- 340 [Kahneman et al. ( )] 'Fairness as a Constraint on Profit Seeking: Entitlements in the Market'. Kahneman , Jack  
341 L Daniel , Richard Knetsch , Thaler . *American Economic Review* 1986. 76 (4) p. .
- 342 [Messick and Sentis (ed.) ( )] *Fairness, Preference and Fairness Biases*, David M Messick , Keith Sentis . Equity  
343 Theory, David Messick and Karen Cook eds (ed.) 1983. New York City NY: Praeger Publishers.
- 344 [Sapienza and Zingales (2012)] *Financial Trust Index. The Results: Wave 13*, P Sapienza , L Zingales .  
345 <http://www.financialtrustindex.org/resultswave13.htm> 2012. January. April 5, 2012.
- 346 [Morgan ( )] 'Focus Groups'. David L Morgan . *Annual Review of Sociology* 1996. 22 p. .
- 347 [Mayer and Avila ( )] 'of Unfairness in Price Increase: An Experimental Study'. Veronica Mayer , Marcos G Avila  
348 . *Balas Annual Conference*, (Santiago, Chile) 2011.
- 349 [Campbell (1999)] 'Perceptions of Price Fairness: Antecedents and Consequences'. Margaret Campbell . *Journal*  
350 *of Marketing Research* 1999. May. 36 p. .
- 351 [Okun ( )] *Prices and Quantities: A Macroeconomic Analysis. The Brookings Institution*, Arthur M Okun . 1981.  
352 Washington, DC. p. 143.
- 353 [Maxwell ( )] 'Rule-Based Price Fairness and its Effect on Willingness to Purchase'. Sarah Maxwell . *Journal of*  
354 *Economic Psychology* 2002. 23 (2) p. .
- 355 [Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988)] 'Status Quo Bias in Decision Making'. William Samuelson , Richard Zeck-  
356 hauser . *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 1988. March. 1 p. .
- 357 [Xia et al. (2004)] 'The Price is Unfair! A Conceptual Framework of Price Fairness Perceptions'. Lan Xia , Kent  
358 Monroe , Cox . *Journal of Marketing* 2004. October. 68 p. .
- 359 [Maxwell ( )] *The Price Is Wrong: Understanding What Makes a Price Seem Fair and the True Cost of Unfair*  
360 *Pricing*, Sarah Maxwell . 2008. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons.
- 361 [Thibaut and Walker ( )] John Thibaut , Laurens Walker . *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*, (ederal  
362 Justice: A Psychological AnalysisHillsdale NY) 1975. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 363 [Maxwell ( )] 'What Makes a Price Increase Seem 'Fair'?'. Sarah Maxwell . *An International Journal* 1995. 3 (4)  
364 p. . (Pricing Strategy and Practice)