Fairness Perceptions in Marketing Strategy and Across the Marketing Mix: An Integrative Review and Call to Action

[in press, *Consumer Psychology Review*]

Elizabeth M.S. Friedman*

Columbia University

Franklin Shaddy*

University of California, Los Angeles

*The first and second authors contributed equally and are listed alphabetically.

Elizabeth M.S. Friedman (e.friedman@columbia.edu) is Associate Professor of Marketing at Columbia Business School, 665 W 130th Street, New York, NY 10027. Franklin Shaddy (franklin.shaddy@anderson.ucla.edu) is Associate Professor of Marketing and Behavioral Decision Making at the UCLA Anderson School of Management, 110 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095. The authors thank Olivia Walker for research assistance, and Ryan Hamilton and Kathleen Vohs for feedback.

Abstract

Fairness is a foundational and highly consequential construct in marketing, shaping purchase intentions, brand attitudes, complaints, boycotts, and word-of-mouth. Yet extant consumer research has largely concentrated on price fairness, leaving fairness across the rest of marketing strategy and the marketing mix comparatively underexplored. This review makes three contributions. First, we review and integrate the field's three theoretical foundations: dual entitlement, inequity aversion, and moralized cognition. Second, we organize recent findings in the fairness literature around two managerial frameworks: strategy (segmentation, targeting, and positioning) and tactics (promotion, place, and product, in addition to price). Third, we highlight understudied areas and topics across the full range of marketing activities and issue a call to action for future research.

Keywords: fairness; price fairness; morality; ethics; marketing strategy; marketing mix; consumer welfare

Introduction

Fairness is a foundational topic in marketing. For decades, research in consumer behavior has explored how fairness perceptions affect everything from purchase intentions and brand attitudes to complaints, boycotts, and negative word-of-mouth (e.g., Bolton, Warlop, & Alba, 2003; Campbell, 1999; Kahneman, Knetsch, & Thaler, 1986; Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004).

Much of this work, however, has concentrated on perceptions of price fairness (as opposed to perceptions of fairness across the full range of marketing activities). Anchored in the dual entitlement principle (Kahneman et al., 1986), models of inequity aversion (Fehr & Schmidt, 1999), and moral foundations theory (Haidt, 2012), a robust literature has emerged to explain when and why consumers view certain prices and price changes as fair versus unfair, and how such perceptions affect consumer behavior (e.g., Campbell, Pomerance, & Percival Carter, 2025; Chen, Bolton, Ng, Lee, & Wang, 2018; Habel, Schons, Alavi, & Wieseke, 2016).

At the same time, the scope of this work has expanded considerably in recent years, moving beyond perceptions of price fairness to other facets of marketing strategy and the marketing mix. For example, topics have included fairness perceptions in advertising (Haltman, Jin, Donnelly, & Reczek, 2026), algorithmic decision-making (Duani, Barasch, & Morwitz, 2024; Lambrecht & Tucker, 2019), and targeting (Shaddy, Friedman, & Toubia, 2026), as well as firm-level factors such as organizational structure (Du, Dahl, & White, 2026; Khan & Kalra, 2022) and employee compensation (Mohan, Schlager, Deshpandé, & Norton, 2018); Schlager, Mohan, DeCelles, & Norton, 2021). Notably, in each of these cases, fairness perceptions have nothing to do with the price a consumer pays, yet they nevertheless systematically shape downstream attitudes and behavior in meaningful ways.

The aims of this article are threefold. First, we trace the theoretical foundations on which contemporary fairness research builds and highlight common themes across them. Second, we review recent research on fairness and, importantly, organize these findings around two common managerial frameworks: marketing strategy (STP: segmentation, targeting, and positioning) and the marketing mix (the four Ps: price, promotion, place, and product). Third, we explain how the resulting conceptual scaffolding we introduce not only helps further bridge marketing theory with marketing practice, but also surfaces understudied areas and topics beyond price fairness, characterizing important opportunities for future research.

Fairness Perceptions: Conceptualization and Consequences

Fairness is ultimately a feeling—a ubiquitous, universal, and highly consequential feeling, to be sure—defined as a general or global sense of whether a process, action, or outcome seems appropriate, legitimate, and just (Colquitt & Rodell, 2015; Lupfer et al., 2000). These perceptions do not require any normative standard (i.e., whether such feelings are right or wrong, rational or irrational, justified or not). Rather, they are inherently subjective, and can differ from person to person and context to context.

Most consumers maintain an intuitive sense of what is fair and what is not. They "know it when they see it," to parallel U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's classic definition of pornography (1964). For example, if a retailer were to quadruple the price of bottled water or electric generators in the path of a hurricane, most consumers would agree that doing so would be unfair. Regardless of what the economic laws of supply and demand might prescribe, people know and feel, with conviction, that price gouging is fundamentally wrong. More broadly, unfairness is one of the most universal moral reactions humans report, across cultures, societies, demographics, and developmental stages—and even extends to other species (Brosnan & De Waal, 2003; Güth et al., 1982; Henrich et al., 2001; Shaw & Olson, 2012).

Perceptions of unfairness are often a direct consequence of marketing decisions, and can cause consumers to punish firms engaged in practices that are viewed as unfair—even when those practices may seem economically justified. For example, in order to protect their profit margins, firms would have to charge more for adaptive innovations targeted to disabled customers (because such products are more costly to develop and manufacture). Yet charging high prices to vulnerable populations also triggers accusations of unfairness (Essa et al., 2026). These perceptions can limit otherwise efficient market activities and result in seemingly perverse incentives—in this case, disincentivizing welfare-enhancing innovation for disabled customers. Given the managerial tension between objective economic outcomes and subjective feelings of unfairness, it is imperative for research in consumer behavior to continue to advance broader theories of fairness as a first-order goal.

This is especially critical in light of the fact that what is actually perceived as fair or unfair in the marketplace is constantly shifting, and both marketing theory and practice must evolve alongside these changing norms. Indeed, reactions to pay equity, environmental responsibility, and corporate governance have shifted markedly over even short time horizons (e.g., Bebchuk & Tallarita, 2022; Mohan, Norton, & Deshpandé, 2018; White, Habib, & Hardisty, 2019). For instance, only as recently as 2019 did 181 CEOs in the Business Roundtable sign a "Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation" that rejected the long-standing principle of shareholder primacy in favor of "stakeholder" capitalism—committing to value creation not only for shareholders, but also to customers, employees, suppliers, and communities, more broadly

(Business Roundtable, 2019). Moreover, the rise of benefit corporations ("b-corps"; i.e., for-profit companies that commit to broader accountability beyond just shareholders) suggests consumers today may care a great deal more about fairness and equity than previous generations. Proactively reexamining how consumers perceive many long-standing practices—such as hiring procedures, pricing conventions, allocation rules, and default policies—can avoid triggering unanticipated (and potentially harmful) consequences.

Theoretical Foundations

Broadly, recent research in consumer behavior exploring perceptions of fairness draws from three main theoretical foundations, which are rooted in judgment and decision-making, economics, and psychology, respectively. The first is anchored in the dual entitlement principle (Kahneman et al., 1986), which proposes that consumers are entitled to a reasonable reference transaction (i.e., the price they have come to expect from past exchanges), and firms to a reasonable reference profit. According to the dual entitlement principle, therefore, it will seem more fair for a firm to raise prices in response to an input cost increase (i.e., to protect its profit margins), but less fair if it were to do so in response to a demand shock (i.e., to capture additional consumer surplus). A rich and well-developed literature has explored and extended this basic framework—examining, for example, the role of cost transparency, reference price comparisons, perceived firm motives, changes in quality, and different cultural and institutional contexts (e.g., Bolton et al., 2003; Campbell, 1999; Chen et al., 2018; Friedman & Toubia, 2022; Xia et al., 2004).

A second tradition is rooted in behavioral economics, and is based on inequity aversion (i.e., the finding that people are often willing to sacrifice their own payoff to reduce differences between their and others' payoffs; Fehr & Schmidt, 1999). Here, consumers are modeled as evaluating not only their own outcomes, but also the outcomes of others, with negative utility resulting from inequality. Marketing scholars have used this framework to analyze how firms can signal fairness to inequity-averse customers through price and quality (Guo & Jiang, 2016), pricing within distribution channels (Cui & Mallucci, 2016), disclosing margins and input costs (Mohan, Buell, & John, 2020), and employing "pay what you want" and other participative pricing schemes that let consumers resolve inequity concerns themselves (Jang & Chu, 2012; Regner, 2015). A key insight is that consumers actively and systematically interpret firms' strategic choices as signals of whether they are being treated fairly.

The third originates in psychology and is largely based on moral foundations theory (Haidt, 2012), which proposes that human moral judgment rests on several distinct foundations (e.g., care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, sanctity/degradation, and liberty/oppression), as well as on work on moralized cognition (Rozin, 1999; Skitka et al., 2021; Tetlock, 2003), which examines how attitudes may be expressed as moral convictions rather than as mere preferences. Research in consumer behavior has adopted these frameworks to explain how consumers' ideological beliefs shape their moral judgments in markets. For example, liberals object to bodily markets (e.g., sex work, commercial surrogacy, or buying and selling organs) on exploitation grounds, while conservatives object on sanctity grounds (Goenka & van Osselaer, 2023), and consumers react negatively when communally-focused organizations (e.g., religious institutions, pharmaceutical firms) employ overtly commercial pricing strategies (McGraw, Schwartz, & Tetlock, 2012). More broadly, consumers naturally view markets and marketplace exchanges in lay economic terms (Shaddy, Hagen, & Hamilton, 2025), which are fundamentally moralized (Bhattacharjee & Dana, 2024).

A number of shared themes cut across these three areas. For example, the organizational justice framework in management theory distinguishes the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice) from the fairness of the process (procedural justice) and the fairness of interpersonal treatment (interactional justice; Greenberg, 1987, 1990; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Distributive fairness is fundamentally comparative, such as whether the price one consumer pays is fair, given what they have paid in the past, what other consumers pay, or what the product costs to produce. Procedural fairness defines justness based on the manner by which an outcome was determined, such as whether the allocation rule a firm uses to ration scarce inventory helps direct limited goods and services to those who most want or need them (Shaddy & Shah, 2022). Meanwhile, interactional fairness concerns the treatment of key stakeholders, such as whether a firm communicates its decisions respectfully and transparently (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt & Rodell, 2015; Greenberg, 1993).

Importantly, the three theoretical foundations described above (the dual entitlement principle, inequity aversion, and moral foundations theory) can be viewed through the lens of these justice dimensions. Dual entitlement, for example, blends distributive and procedural reasoning. Consumers evaluate not only whether the price is fair relative to a reference point, but also whether the reasons underlying the change are appropriate. Inequity aversion can be interpreted as a largely distributive question, focusing on the equity of outcomes across all parties to an exchange. Moralized cognition, meanwhile, touches on all three, with procedural and interactional concerns typically carrying similar weight to distributive concerns.

Before reviewing recent research on fairness in consumer behavior, we believe several conceptual common denominators are worth highlighting. The first is whether a firm's action causes harm, either to the consumer, to society, or to third parties (Campbell et al., 2025; Xu, Bolton, & Winterich, 2021). For example, a price hike on a lifesaving drug provokes more outrage than an identical hike on a luxury good, because the former inflicts real harm on vulnerable people (i.e., by limiting access). The second concerns the firm's motives—whether they are driven by self-serving profit-seeking versus genuine prosocial concerns (Chernev & Blair, 2015, 2021; Edinger-Schons, Sipilä, Sen, Mende, & Wieseke, 2018; Lee, Bolton, & Winterich, 2017; Park et al., 2026; Silver, Kelly, & Small, 2021). Positioning on a social or ethical issue will generate goodwill when the firm's values appear to align sincerely with the cause it endorses, but the same action will provoke skepticism or even backlash when it appears opportunistic. The third is norm violation—that is, whether a firm's action breaches a shared expectation about how outcomes should be allocated (e.g., equally vs. in proportion to contribution) or how a given relationship should operate (e.g., communal sharing vs. market exchange; Bentley, Rajagopal, & Kulow, 2025; Chen et al., 2018; Cui & Mallucci, 2016). For instance, because norms are reference-dependent, practices that were once seen as unfair can come to seem acceptable as they diffuse and become standard (Haws & Bearden, 2006).

We next turn to a review of the broader literature, organized around firms' strategic choice regarding which consumers to serve and how they choose to position themselves in the market. Together, these decisions reflect marketing strategy (segmentation, targeting, and positioning).

Segmentation, Targeting, and Positioning (STP)

Marketing strategy comprises three distinct elements: segmentation, targeting, and positioning (STP). Segmentation describes the process of identifying distinct groups of customers in the marketplace, based on meaningful differences in their wants, needs, behaviors, or psychographic characteristics. Targeting refers to selecting which of those segments to serve. Finally, positioning involves establishing a differentiated value proposition (relative to competitors) for the targeted segment (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

Each of these strategic decisions can be viewed through a fairness lens. Segmentation and targeting, for example, fundamentally require identifying differences among potential customers on the basis of some observable, identifiable, or accessible attribute(s), and then prioritizing one group (i.e., the targeted segment) over others (i.e., the non-targeted segments). Thus, to the extent that segmentation and targeting effectively include some while excluding others, such strategies may activate moral or ethical concerns about harm or betrayal (Haidt, 2012). Positioning, too, can be viewed as more or less fair, depending on whether the underlying value proposition is viewed as authentic and genuine or self-interested and manipulative.

Segmentation

Marketers rely on a wide range of consumer attributes to identify distinct groups of customers (i.e., segments). These include demographic variables like race, gender, and political orientation, as well as behavioral and psychographic characteristics such as identity, personality, and values. The premise of segmentation is that consumers within a segment resemble one another more than they resemble those who belong to other segments (Smith, 1956)—not only in their needs and preferences, but in how they are expected to respond to the marketing mix. A segment is useful precisely because its members are expected to react to the same marketing mix in systematically similar ways (e.g., they value the same product features, respond to the same promotional appeals, gravitate toward the same channels, or have comparable willingness-to-pay).

A key insight is that if responses to the marketing mix vary systematically across segments, then so too might their perceptions of fairness. To that end, in this section, we examine segmentation through a fairness lens, to suggest various demographic, behavioral, and psychographic variables that recent work has linked to concerns about morality, ethics, and fairness in the marketplace. That is, rather than asking which segments might respond more to a discount (i.e., a classic strategic consideration in segmentation), we identify factors that suggest which segments might be most attuned to whether that discount seems fair.

Political Ideology

Political ideology shapes a wide range of consumer preferences and behavior. For example, liberals place greater weight on the individualizing foundations of fairness and harm, whereas conservatives focus more on binding foundations such as loyalty, authority, and sanctity (Goenka & van Osselaer, 2019, 2023). Consequently, the same firm action may be perceived as wrong by both groups, but for different reasons. Consider commercial surrogacy, which is widely viewed as taboo (Fiske & Tetlock, 1997; McGraw & Tetlock, 2005). Recent work finds that liberals object on exploitation grounds, whereas conservatives object on sanctity grounds (Goenka & van Osselaer, 2023). A similar distinction characterizes donation behaviors. For example, although liberals and conservatives give similar amounts of money overall, liberals tend to give smaller amounts to a greater number of charities, since they are driven by social justice and a desire to eliminate broad inequality (Farmer, Kidwell, & Hardesty, 2020). Conservatives, on the other hand, tend to endorse social order, leading them to give to fewer, select charities, in order to protect those groups' members.

Ideology shapes not only which violations register as unfair, but also the propensity to act on those appraisals. Liberals are less inclined to accept system-justifying rationales for firm conduct and more inclined to question and challenge it (Jung, Garbarino, Briley, & Wynhausen, 2017). For example, a large-scale analysis of complaint databases from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission found that liberals were likelier than conservatives to both file complaints and dispute unsatisfactory resolutions (Jung et al., 2017). They are also more willing to engage in politically motivated buying and boycotting (Jost et al., 2017), and to avoid companies who disclose high CEO-to-worker pay ratios (Mohan et al., 2018).

This activism can extend to consumers' own transgressions against firms. Liberals are more likely to punish firms with significant market power by abusing return policies and sharing passwords, invoking a "Robin Hood" justification (Lin, Keinan, Chang, & Lehmann, 2026). Ideology also affects punishment directed not at firms but at other consumers who transgress, depending on whether the person is consuming an ethical or conventional brand. When a person commits a moral transgression (e.g., parking illegally), observers decide how harshly that person should be punished according to whether the transgressor uses an ethically positioned brand (i.e., one espousing social or environmental values) versus a conventional one (Allard & McFerran, 2022). Liberals punish ethical-brand users less than conventional-brand users for the same act, extending the benefit of the doubt to someone expressing similar values. Perceived unfairness thus not only shapes evaluations of firms and other consumers, but also morally licenses action against them.

Culture and Religion

Recent work extending the dual entitlement principle (Kahneman et al., 1986) has shown that it is culturally moderated, due to differences in relationship norms (Chen, Bolton, Ng, Lee, & Wang, 2018). Specifically, in individualistic cultures with exchange norms, consumers expect firms to act out of self-interest and are therefore more tolerant of price increases in response to demand shocks. In collectivist cultures with communal norms, however, consumers expect firms to behave benevolently toward the community, and demand-driven price hikes violate that expectation.

Other important cross-cultural differences include tightness-versus-looseness (i.e., the degree to which social norms are explicit and strictly enforced; Gelfand et al., 2011; Li, Gordon, & Gelfand, 2017) and power-distance beliefs (i.e., the extent to which consumers accept hierarchy and inequality as legitimate; Hofstede, 2001; Oyserman, 2006; Zhang, Winterich, & Mittal, 2010). Both shape how forgiving consumers are of bad behavior by firms. Consumers in loose cultures (e.g., the United States) punish transgressions in proportion to their severity, regardless of whether the offending brand is local or foreign. Consumers in tight cultures (e.g., China and South Korea), on the other hand, are more lenient toward local brands (Ge, Jo, & Sarigollu, 2023). Relatedly, consumers low in power-distance beliefs feel greater empathy for the victims of corporate wrongdoing and accordingly judge transgressing firms more harshly than consumers high in power-distance beliefs, who are more accepting of power asymmetries (Xu, Bolton, & Winterich, 2021).

Religiosity also shapes fairness judgments, but in opposing directions, because it both raises moral standards (leading to harsher judgments) and instills a motive to forgive (leading to more leniency; Casidy, Duhachek, Singh, & Tamaddoni, 2021). For example, a large-scale analysis of Yelp reviews found that reviews tend to be lower in religious communities due to a greater sensitivity to fairness violations. Yet when religious considerations are salient (e.g., on Sundays), consumers are more forgiving, attenuating negative word-of-mouth (WOM). Moreover, because religious traditions weight offenses and forgiveness differently, reactions to the same firm action may diverge across faiths (Mathras et al., 2016), underscoring the nuanced effects of religiosity on fairness judgments.

Race

Race is a social categorization (Grier, Thomas, & Johnson, 2019) that has historically shaped marketplace treatment of consumers and informed fairness perceptions as a result. Critical Race Theory (CRT) emphasizes that racism in markets is structural rather than incidental, reflecting marketplace institutions rather than failures of individual actors within them (Poole et al., 2021). For instance, for most of the twentieth century, managers viewed the “mass market” as largely comprising white consumers, while people of color were classified as “multicultural” (Rosa-Salas, 2019).

Differential treatment by race is documented across virtually every marketing domain. An analysis of 81 federal court cases alleging consumer racial discrimination found that violations vary along three dimensions: subtle versus overt treatment, degradation versus outright denial of service, and the presence or absence of criminal suspicion (Harris, Henderson, & Williams, 2005). Such discrimination can range from ambiguous slights to categorical exclusion. For example, racial minorities experience systematically higher rejection rates in mortgage lending (O’Neil & Roscigno, 2025) and on peer-to-peer platforms (e.g., Airbnb, Kickstarter; Edelman, Luca, & Svirsky, 2017). Because racial minorities repeatedly experience discrimination, their self-concepts suffer beyond the immediate transaction, leading them, over the long run, to feel fettered, alone, discriminated against, and subservient, and reducing their perceptions of self-esteem, self-autonomy, and self-efficacy (Bone, Christensen, & Williams, 2014).

Racial minorities are thus much more likely to anticipate and detect discrimination. For example, Black consumers report routinely encountering surveillance, slow service, and presumptions of an inability to pay in retail environments, whereas White consumers report no such differential treatment (Crockett, 2017; Henderson, Hakstian, & Williams, 2016; Pittman Claytor, 2019). Because overt discrimination is prohibited by law, mistreatment of racial minorities is often subtle (e.g., a long wait, a salesperson hovering nearby, a declined return), and racial majorities do not spontaneously appraise such acts as discriminatory. Racial minorities thus adopt anticipatory tactics to preempt unfair treatment before it occurs, such as code-switching, conspicuous displays of credit cards (i.e., signaling ability to pay), and dressing formally when shopping (Crockett, 2017; Pittman Claytor, 2019). Such strategies are prevalent among the Black middle class, highlighting how race-based fairness dynamics persist independently of economic reality in the marketplace.

Gender

A robust literature has established that women are, on average, more communally oriented and other-focused than men, whereas men are relatively more agentic and self-focused (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015). This communal orientation shapes fairness judgments in two key ways: it heightens women's sensitivity to firm transgressions and shapes their receptiveness to firms' prosocial appeals.

First, women punish fairness violations more harshly than men. Women report greater moral outrage in response to unethical corporate behavior, increasing their willingness to boycott brands (Lindenmeier, Schleer, & Pricl, 2012). Relative to men, women also avoid patronizing firms that maintain gender pay gaps among their employees, and this difference is mediated by perceived unfairness—an effect corroborated by field evidence from social media posts before and after the United Kingdom mandated gender pay gap disclosure (Schlager et al., 2021). However, this gender difference does not extend to pay gaps (e.g., CEO-to-worker ratios) that do not differentially threaten women. Personal vulnerability thus appears to be a key mechanism explaining these differences (Glick & Fiske, 2001). For example, in a scenario where a product caused harm, women were more likely to blame the company than men (Laufer & Gillespie, 2004). Women's attributions reflect empathy for the victims—they can more easily imagine a similar harm befalling them. Men's attributions, however, reflect a more detached assessment of the company against impersonal standards of fairness and justice (i.e., a moral-equity norm).

Second, women's communal orientation similarly shapes their reactions to firms' prosocial actions and appeals. This is because women are more motivated than men to bring their moral actions in line with their ideal moral identity. For example, among women who had not recently given to charity, a moral identity prime (e.g., "Thank you for being a compassionate and helpful member") increased donations, allowing them to close the gap between their actual and ideal self-concepts; the same prime did not increase donations for men to the same extent (Shang, Reed, Sargeant, & Carpenter, 2020). Women also prefer charity appeals emphasizing help to others, whereas men prefer appeals emphasizing benefits to the self and their in-group, differences mediated by women's more care-oriented (vs. men's more justice-oriented) worldviews (Brunel & Nelson, 2000; cf. Jaffee & Hyde, 2000). Similarly, sympathy-based charitable appeals are more persuasive for women, while pride-based appeals work relatively better for men (Kemp, Kennett-Hensel, & Kees, 2013). Women's other-focus thus acts as a kind of double-edged sword, increasing their responsiveness to firms' appeals to do good *and* causing them to become more punitive when firms do harm.

Vulnerability and Marginalization

Beyond any single identity category (e.g., race or gender), consumer segments can be viewed as differing along two broader axes of disadvantage. The first is vulnerability—the degree to which restricted access to and control over resources inhibits consumers' ability to function in the marketplace (Hill & Sharma, 2020; Mende, Bradford, Roggeveen, Scott, & Zavala, 2024). The second is marginalization—the degree to which consumers' identities are excluded from or stigmatized by dominant marketplace structures (Arsel, Crockett, & Scott, 2022). The two often co-occur but are distinct, as vulnerability concerns resources, while marginalization relates to position.

Vulnerability shifts both fairness baselines and the meaning of firm actions. Consumers in more unequal societies are less satisfied with their status quo because inequality directs social comparisons upward, changing perceptions of what counts as "enough" and whether existing allocations are legitimate (Dolifka, Christensen, & Shaddy, 2025; Goya-Tocchetto & Payne, 2022). Financially constrained consumers evaluate products, communications, and prices through the lens of their disadvantage, such that actions a firm intends as helpful can register as unfair or demeaning (Hamilton et al., 2019). For instance, value branding—where firms promote lower-priced budget products—can lead customers to infer that the firm believes they are poor. Similarly, financially constrained consumers report being treated worse during service encounters and feel less standing to contest unfavorable outcomes, such as billing errors or denied fees (Sudbury-Riley, Hunter-Jones, Al-Abdin, & Haenlein, 2024). Indeed, providers on peer-to-peer platforms (e.g., Airbnb) infer lower socioeconomic status and thus reduced trustworthiness from customers in regions with greater economic inequality, and are thus less willing to serve them (Xiang, Pandelaere, & Todorovic, 2026).

Marginalization shapes not only how consumers are treated but how they anticipate being treated, and by whom. Consumers with stigmatized identities attend closely to organizational cues (e.g., imagery, diversity signals, physical spaces, or frontline service interactions) that signal whether they are welcomed and valued, and use these cues to infer a firm's ideology and whether the firm is likely to treat them fairly (Chaney, Sanchez, & Maimon, 2019). These expectations then spill over into preferences and behaviors. For example, when their identity is salient, historically marginalized consumers are more likely to choose algorithmic over human service providers, since they expect humans will be more biased toward them than an algorithm (Kim, Biswas, Szocs, & Jenkins, 2026). Low-income consumers, unlike high-income consumers, face harsher judgment when paying a premium for ethical products (Olson, McFerran, Morales, & Dahl, 2016). At the same time, when high-income consumers are observed enjoying luxury products, they are viewed as less deserving of such consumption when their wealth was perceived to be unearned (vs. earned; Lee, Baumgartner, & Winterich, 2018).

Finally, these dimensions of disadvantage do not combine additively. An intersectional perspective holds that marketplace experiences arise due to the combination of overlapping social categories (i.e., race, gender, class), since all consumers occupy multiple categories and experience cycles of both privilege and oppression during their lives (Uduehi, Saint Clair, & Crabbe, 2025). The marketplace treatment of, say, Black women cannot be inferred from the experiences of Black consumers and women considered separately. It is critical, therefore, that segment-level theories and findings about fairness perceptions acknowledge and incorporate the reality that many consumers sit at intersections that cut across categories (see Opportunities for Future Research).

Targeting

If fairness perceptions in segmentation concern how different groups of consumers react to firms' actions (both positive and negative), fairness perceptions in targeting concern how the firm's choice of *whom to serve* is perceived. A small but growing body of work has begun to explore how consumers evaluate targeting decisions through a fairness lens, and how these perceptions can potentially limit otherwise efficient or mutually beneficial economic exchanges.

The Discrimination and Intentionality Framework

Recent work provides a useful general framework for understanding fairness perceptions in targeting. Shaddy, Friedman, and Toubia (2026) develop an account for explaining when demographic targeting—serving consumers on the basis of race, gender, or age, and so on—will be viewed as more or less acceptable. Specifically, they propose that consumers evaluate the fairness of targeting along two dimensions: the extent to which it is discriminatory (i.e., based on attributes that are irrelevant and/or uncontrollable) and whether the discrimination is believed to be intentional (i.e., knowingly or willingly bringing about an avoidable outcome).

The more demographic targeting is viewed as discriminatory and intentional, the more it is perceived as unfair. Appraisals of discrimination depend on both relevance—whether belonging to the targeted demographic group is diagnostic of preferences (Shaddy & Shah, 2018)—and controllability—the extent to which consumers have agency over their own membership in the targeted group. That is, when group membership clearly signals preferences, demographic targeting can prove useful in matching interested customers to products and services that uniquely suit their needs (e.g., Band-Aid offers "OurTone" bandages in a variety of skin tone shades; D'Angelo, Dunn, & Valsesia, 2025), bolstering relevance. Or, when membership in the targeted demographic group is believed to be more changeable by consumers themselves (e.g., where they live, as opposed to their age), targeting that group is also more justifiable, reinforcing controllability. Consequently, these factors suggest levers that managers can use to attenuate perceptions of unfairness: (a) improving relevance (e.g., with market research), (b) increasing controllability (e.g., offering opt-in policies), or (c) reducing perceived intentionality (e.g., when a firm has limited resources) each reduce unfairness perceptions resulting from demographic targeting. This framework moreover potentially helps explain why behavioral targeting is generally not viewed as unfair or inappropriate, because behaviors are viewed as relatively more controllable and relevant (i.e., correlated with preferences) than demographic characteristics.

Identity Signaling

The decision to target one segment over the other is often one that carries with it an implicit signal of what identity seems to be valued by firms. As a result, behaviorally targeted ads can function as implied social labels, even when they do not contain any explicit labeling to that end (Summers, Smith, & Reczek, 2016). These identity signals can provoke both positive and negative reactions, depending on who receives them. For example, members of distinctive minority groups tend to respond more favorably to advertising that targets their group as a form of recognition; however, a *non-target market* effect can also occur, in which members of non-distinctive majority groups feel ignored (Aaker, Brumbaugh, & Grier, 2000; Grier & Brumbaugh, 1999). Momentary identity salience (i.e., ethnic primes that increase self-awareness) can further help or hinder responsiveness to targeted appeals (Forehand & Deshpandé, 2001).

Firms can likewise use targeting to signal their own values. Stigmatized-identity cues in consumer spaces (e.g., gender-inclusive restrooms, racial-diversity awards) communicate egalitarian principles, from which consumers infer a firm's social-dominance orientation (Chaney, Sanchez, & Maimon, 2019). Relatedly, when recruitment websites included racial diversity cues, both Black and White customers spent more time viewing them, although this increase was larger among Black individuals (who found the organization more attractive as a potential employer; Walker, Feild, Bernerth, & Becton, 2012). Altogether, this work suggests that consumers actively diagnose targeting decisions as signals of organizational values.

Algorithmic Targeting

Beyond whether a firm targets a particular segment, how it engages in targeting—and, in particular, how much it seems to know about customers—can similarly shape fairness perceptions and trust judgments. The key finding in this area is that highly personalized appeals are viewed negatively when their basis is not transparent or justified. For example, conspicuously tailored email solicitations perform worse than less personalized versions, due to skepticism about how the firm knows so much about recipients (White, Zahay, Thorbjørnsen, & Shavitt, 2008). In general, while personalization generally improves ad effectiveness when firms collect and use consumer information overtly, it can backfire when data are collected covertly, due to increased feelings of vulnerability (Aguirre, Mahr, Grewal, de Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2015).

More broadly, what separates an acceptable use of consumer data from a privacy violation is whether it conforms to lay beliefs about how information should flow behind-the-scenes (Kim, Barasz, & John, 2019). For example, data gathered firsthand by a company on its own website feels more acceptable as a basis for targeting and personalization than data collected by third parties and imported from elsewhere. Similarly, information volunteered by consumers themselves is also more permissible to use than information merely inferred by firms (Kim et al., 2019).

Positioning

Positioning refers to the act of crafting a firm's offering and image to occupy a distinctive and valued place in the minds of the targeted segment (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Whereas segmentation identifies distinct groups of customers and targeting involves selecting one or more to serve, positioning establishes the basis on which a firm differentiates itself from competitors. Increasingly, firms have positioned on the values they stand for, the prosocial motives they pursue, and the kind of moral agent they wish to be seen as. A growing body of work has examined how consumers parse such claims through a fairness lens, drawing inferences about whether a firm's prosocial or moral positioning is authentic, self-interested, or manipulative.

Differentiation Based on Values

Consumers do not evaluate prosocial or moral positioning on its face but rather consider what it reveals about the firm's underlying motive(s). As with targeting, the same claim can help or hinder, depending on whether consumers infer that firms are acting out of genuine moral concern or profit-maximizing self-interest (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli, & Schwarz, 2006).

Given that the value of prosocial differentiation hinges on perceived sincerity, much of this literature focuses on the cues that authenticate or undermine those inferences. Altruistic claims can lead to negative appraisals when selfish or self-interested benefits to the firm are suspected or obvious (Forehand & Grier, 2003). For example, product appeals for sustainable goods that contain only an intrinsic appeal (e.g., "save the planet") are more effective than those that combine both an intrinsic appeal with an extrinsic one (e.g., "save the planet and save money"), because the mixed framing seems less authentic (Edinger-Schons, Sipilä, Sen, Mende,

& Wieseke, 2018). For a similar reason, when a firm promotes prosocial positioning by engaging in charitable giving, smaller periodic donations outperform a single lump sum, because periodicity seems more authentic (Park, Leng, Gonzalez, Watson, Valsesia, & Cryder, 2026). Moreover, for those whose identity overlaps heavily with a brand, the brand's good deeds (i.e., the values it espouses) vicariously license less generous behavior (via pride) while its transgressions vicariously cleanse (via guilt; Newman & Brucks, 2018). For example, consumers strongly attached to the Nike brand gave less in a subsequent dictator game after reading about Nike's corporate social responsibility practices and more after reading about its misconduct.

Beyond perceived sincerity, how well positioning aligns with moral objectives can shape consumer judgments. For instance, care or welfare missions perform better when they evoke compassion, while fairness or justice missions perform better when they evoke gratitude (Goenka & van Osselaer, 2019). Further, moral attributes are processed categorically (good vs. bad) rather than continuously, which leads consumers to value alternatives that are superior on a nonalignable moral difference (e.g., donates to charity vs. reduces waste) and inferior on an alignable moral difference (e.g., high vs. low service speed; Park, Cho, Kim, Lee, & Park, 2025). The extent to which positioning aligns with consumers' own values matters, as well. Firms that engage in corporate political advocacy tend to repel consumers who oppose the stance more strongly than it attracts those who support it (Hydock, Paharia, & Blair, 2020). However, because small-share brands have few existing customers to alienate and many prospective ones to potentially persuade, taking a strong stance can produce a net gain for them.

Differentiation Through Strategy and Structure

Consumers infer moral character from the structure or organization of firms, which is costlier to fabricate and thus provides more credible signals of their underlying values. For example, companies that are first movers on a particular prosocial stance appear genuinely motivated, while followers seem less so, even when their social impact is equal or greater (Silver, Kelly, & Small, 2021). Consumers praised TOMS for pioneering its one-for-one shoe donation model (i.e., donating a pair for every pair purchased), but criticized BOBS by Skechers as a knock-off, even though BOBS both matched the one-for-one donation model and extended donations beyond shoes (e.g., funding animal shelters).

A firm's corporate structure serves as another important cue. For example, flatter organizational hierarchies elicit more positive consumer responses, because consumers infer that they uphold egalitarian values (Du et al., 2026). In a similar vein, diverse representation among a firm's frontline employees and managers raises the perceived morality of the firm, due to the belief that diverse teams are better at perspective-taking (Khan & Kalra, 2022). Finally, minority ownership (e.g., Black- or woman-owned designations) can furthermore buffer brands from product (but not moral) failures, through an underdog-empathy mechanism (Uduehi & Barnes, 2025).

Recent research has also explored how positioning based on warmth versus competence shapes preferences and behavior. In business settings (as opposed to person perception), competence drives purchase intentions more strongly than warmth, which leads consumers to be less willing to purchase from nonprofits than for-profits (Aaker, Vohs, & Mogilner, 2010; Xu, Bolton, & Winterich, 2021). Underdog positioning moderates this effect (Kirmani, Hamilton, Thompson, & Lantzy, 2017), by making salient a company's humble origins, lack of resources, and struggle against the odds, increasing both empathy and identification with the brand

(Paharia, Keinan, Avery, & Schor, 2011). Company size also affects moral evaluations, primarily by setting different expectations about warmth versus competence. Specifically, consumers expect greater warmth from small than from large firms, and thus are willing to punish small firms more harshly when they behave coldly or unfairly (Yang, Aggarwal, & McGill, 2019). The broader communal orientation of firms matters, as well. For example, social ventures are increasingly run by for-profit companies, which can pit a firm's social mission against its profit orientation (Bhattacharjee, Dana, & Baron, 2017), triggering a penalty relative to conventional for-profits (without a social mission) and nonprofits (Lee, Bolton, & Winterich, 2017).

Other structural and operational features can convey positive firm intentions toward the broader community. Specifically, when a company discloses how much it pays the worker to produce a product or deliver a service—and, importantly, when that wage seems fair—consumers are more likely to choose it, buy from it, and even pay a premium (alleviating the guilt caused by unfair pay; Stich et al., 2025). Consumers also avoid buying from firms with high CEO-to-worker pay ratios (Mohan et al., 2018). Firms that freely share innovation knowledge, through patent pledges or open-source policies, are evaluated more favorably, because consumers infer that freely shared knowledge benefits society (i.e., the *open-design effect*; Maier, Schreier, & Dahl, 2025). Crowdfunded products are likewise preferred, and command higher willingness to pay, partly because consumers believe crowdfunding reduces marketplace inequality—though the effect inverts for high-stakes categories (e.g., medical or safety products), where it instead signals amateurism (Acar, Dahl, Fuchs, & Schreier, 2021).

Price, Promotion, Place, and Product (the "Four Ps")

The marketing mix comprises the four Ps—price, promotion, place, and product—which together encompass the set of tactics a firm uses to execute its strategy (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Price refers not only to the amount consumers pay, but also to discounts and allowances, payment method (e.g., cash or credit), format (e.g., all-in vs. partitioned; Morwitz et al., 1998), and payment timing (e.g., "buy-now-pay-later"; Maesen & Ang, 2025). Promotion describes how a firm communicates its positioning, spanning advertising copy, media channels (e.g., direct mail, television, billboards), sales and discounts, public relations, and personal selling. Place is defined by distribution decisions—which sales channels to pursue (e.g., online vs. brick-and-mortar), where to locate retail stores, inventory management, and logistics. Finally, product includes the offering itself (e.g., a good or service), as well as its features, branding, design, quality, packaging, and any ancillary services (e.g., warranties and returns).

Although marketing strategy treats the four Ps as an integrated set of tactical decisions, consumer fairness research has engaged with each less evenly. Decades of work have scrutinized pricing fairness, while the fairness of firm actions across promotion, place, and product has drawn comparatively less attention. Encouragingly, that gap has closed considerably in recent years. We organize this section around the four Ps, highlighting recent advancements in each area, and begin with the relatively more mature field of price fairness, followed by the other three (which we encourage future research to continue to expand).

Price

Fairness research has long centered on price, and understandably so: price is the most visible and consumer-facing aspect of any marketplace exchange. It most directly impacts their wallets, and it is the one they most readily compare to salient reference points across people, across time, and across channels (Bolton, Warlop, & Alba, 2003; Campbell, 1999). In light of the deep price fairness literature spanning decades (see Xia et al., 2004, for a review), we trace five new threads that reflect novel areas of progress.

The Moral Harm Model

The most significant recent advancement in organizing the broader literature on price fairness is the *moral harm model* (Campbell et al., 2025), which argues that perceptions of price fairness ultimately rest on inferences about harm—to consumers, to third parties, and to society. According to the moral harm model, the inferred harm of a price (and thus its fairness) is jointly shaped by the vulnerability of the targeted customers, the welfare impact of the product itself, and the firm's overall pricing strategy (e.g., how much profit is extracted per transaction). By implicating harm as a common conceptual denominator, the model is able to parsimoniously explain a range of otherwise disparate findings, including why an unchanged price can feel unfair (e.g., when input costs have fallen), why a price cut can feel unfair (e.g., a discount on cigarettes, which encourages harmful consumption), and why paying more than others can at times feel fairer (e.g., when those who pay less are vulnerable).

Related recent research corroborates this harm-based view of price fairness. For example, innovations targeted at customers with disabilities (e.g., Nike's hands-free Go FlyEase sneakers, Microsoft's adaptive Xbox controller for gamers with physical impairments) are costly to develop, yet they generate enormous value for underserved segments. Pricing them in line with those higher input costs is nonetheless judged as exploitative, however, precisely because the targeted segments seem vulnerable (Essa et al., 2026). The result is a pernicious disincentive that may dissuade firms from bringing innovative products to market, and thus serve the very customers who need them the most.

A complementary line of work asks what prices communicate about morality. Because consumers are inequity-averse (i.e., disfavoring unequal outcomes; Fehr & Schmidt, 1999), prices double as signals about whom the firm is serving and on what terms. Guo (2015) formalizes this reasoning in a model of fair selling, showing that, counterintuitively, inequity-averse buyers can perceive a higher price as fairer when they infer that doing so allows the firm to serve a broader set of customers, rather than a narrower slice (Guo & Jiang, 2016). Altogether, the harm-based view of price fairness (Campbell et al., 2025) is often misaligned with economic rationality, since low prices are not always viewed more favorably.

Algorithmic and Dynamic Pricing

Perhaps more than any other tactic, price has been increasingly dominated by the use of algorithms, which automate price-setting without direct involvement by human decision-makers (Spann et al., 2025). Given widespread aversion to algorithms (Dietvorst, Simmons, & Massey, 2015), the default reaction has been suspicion, triggering accusations of unfair pricing practices (Haws & Bearden, 2006). For example, Wendy's disclosed in 2024 that it would test dynamic pricing for its fast-food items, immediately engendering accusations of price gouging and calls for a boycott (Fadulu, 2024); similarly, in 2023 AMC proposed its ill-fated and quickly eliminated "Sightline" program, which charged more for centrally located theater seats (Sinnenberg, 2023). However, while consumers generally judge algorithm-set prices as less fair than manager-set prices (Duani, Barasch, & Morwitz, 2024), the pattern actually reverses when algorithmic price discrimination is based on demographic characteristics, because machines seem less deliberately exploitative than humans.

A key mechanism underlying aversion to the use of algorithms in price is trust. When consumers encounter algorithm-set prices, they are more willing to search for alternatives, because the algorithm violates the expectation of consistent, transparent treatment, decreasing trust as a result (Garbarino & Lee, 2003; Vomberg, Homburg, & Sarantopoulos, 2024). Recent work has identified several moderators. For example, while personalizing prices with algorithms can theoretically improve efficiency—picking up on meaningful differences in preference strength, for example (Shaddy & Shah, 2018)—consumers are especially sensitive to whether algorithms are accurate. Consumers also tolerate algorithms more when they price discriminate across broader segments, as opposed to individual consumers (Priester, Robbert, & Roth, 2020). For example, personalized pricing based on shoppers' GPS coordinates felt less fair than identical personalized pricing justified by past purchases. Finally, despite inherent differences in overhead costs, consumers nevertheless do not believe it is fair to charge more at a physical store than on its website (Homburg, Lauer, & Vomberg, 2019). At the same time, negative reactions to dynamic pricing tend to soften as it becomes a norm in certain markets (e.g., flights, hotels, surge pricing on ride-hailing apps; Kimes, 1994; Vomberg et al., 2024).

Signaling Moral Values Through Price

Price also serves as a vehicle for signaling corporate social responsibility (CSR), with mixed consequences. Corporate social responsibility practices have been shown to trigger a warm glow (Bhattacharya, Good, Sardashti, & Peloza, 2021), which can boost purchase intentions and valuation (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). A brand that funds environmental causes is also assumed to make better products, resulting in lower perceived purchase risk (Chernev & Blair, 2015). Visible pro-social practices can have the opposite effect, however, when consumers infer that a firm is charging more to finance those good deeds (Habel, Schons, Alavi, & Wieseke, 2016).

Information about how much a firm pays its employees can also mediate perceptions of price fairness. For example, transaction-level cost transparency (e.g., Everlane discloses line-by-line cost of goods sold for each product it sells; Clifford, 2014) offers valuable context for how a particular price was set. However, socio-moral surcharges—breaking out extra costs for carbon offsets, living-wage subsidies, or fair-trade fees as separate line items—can backfire, because the company appears to be offloading responsibility, resulting in even more negative reactions than when simply folding the cost into the headline price (Goenka & Bagchi, 2025). How consumers apply these standards depends partly on how human the brand seems. For example, independent-minded consumers react more negatively to distributive unfairness (e.g., a price hike) from a humanized brand, whereas interdependent consumers, more attuned to relationship norms, react more negatively to procedural unfairness (e.g., mishandled complaints; Kwak, Puzakova, & Rocereto, 2017).

Promotion

Promotion is perhaps the fastest-growing arena for consumer fairness research outside of price, as well as the most thematically varied. Where price fairness asks whether a particular number is justified, promotion fairness asks whether a firm's communications are honest, respectful, and authentic.

Price Promotions

Price promotions—temporary and tangible monetary incentives (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000; Shaddy & Lee, 2020)—have been shown to elicit dramatically different reactions, depending on how they are framed. For example, firms sometimes offer "threshold" discounts ("$5 off orders over $10"), which can feel like the fairer deal to consumers, relative to monetarily equivalent capped promotions ("50% off, up to $5"), despite being economically equivalent (Yi, Hardisty, Griffin, & Allard, 2026). Similarly, trade-offs between time and money are judged differently depending on their framing: asking consumers to spend time to save money (e.g., the ride-hailing app Lyft offers "Wait & Save" discounts) is perceived as fairer than asking them to spend money to save time (e.g., Uber, a direct competitor to Lyft, promotes "Priority Pickup"), even when the exchanges are normatively equivalent (e.g., spending $5 to save five minutes vs. spending five minutes to save $5; Trupia & Shaddy, 2025).

Price promotions can also misfire when they collide with identity. For example, a product tied to a stigmatized identity (e.g., a Black Lives Matter mug), when discounted, triggers reactance among members of that group, who interpret the markdown as a signal that their identity is devalued (Du, Millet, Aydinli, & Argo, 2025). However, non-monetary promotions (e.g., buy-one-get-one-free, or free shipping) attenuate the effect, as does an in-group company identity or the simultaneous discounting of non-stigmatized-identity products, by assuaging concerns about disrespect.

Political and Activist Messaging

As brands increasingly take public stances on hot-button issues, recent work has identified key risks. For example, consumers who disagree with a particular brand's political stance turn negatively against the company, while those who agree do not update their views in a correspondingly positive manner (Mukherjee & Althuizen, 2020). This suggests consumers punish a violation of their moral beliefs more than they reward an endorsement. What seems to separate credible activism from inauthentic endorsement is whether the activism aligns with a brand's overall messaging, purpose, and values (i.e., its positioning). When they do not—such as when a firm with a large gender pay gap launches a feminist ad campaign—consumers accuse them of "woke washing" (Vredenburg, Kapitan, Spry, & Kemper, 2020). A key moderator of these reactions is regulatory focus: promotion-focused consumers show moral balancing (i.e., deviating from the moral stance of their past actions) across sequential decisions, while prevention-focused consumers show moral consistency (i.e., repeating their past moral or immoral decisions; Schwabe et al., 2018).

Diversity in Advertising

Eisend, Muldrow, and Rosengren (2023) reviewed diversity in advertising along gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and age, documenting persistent underrepresentation that results in unfairness perceptions mainly when representation feels contrived. Meanwhile, Campbell, Sands, McFerran, and Mavrommatis (2025) analyzed 337 articles across age, beauty, body size, gender, LGBTQIA+, ability, and race, and distilled key mechanisms that recur. Habituation—growing accustomed to seeing diversity—generally has positive effects that build with exposure; social comparison arises when viewers see a gap between themselves and the people depicted and can cut either way depending on whether the comparison flatters or threatens (e.g., Bower, 2001; Richins, 1991); identification—seeing oneself reflected in ads—is generally positive (e.g., Bond & Farrell, 2020), but can turn negative when accompanied by reactance—a perceived loss of freedom in how a group is (or is not) shown; finally, authenticity reflects how genuine an ad and its messaging seem (e.g., Åkestam et al., 2017).

Misalignment of values and representation can lead to numerous negative downstream consequences. For example, inclusive marketing backfires when diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) initiatives aimed at dissociative groups alienate consumers who do not belong to them (Hassan, McGowan, & Shiu, 2025). Such backlash can originate in moral foundations. Liberals, prioritizing fairness, respond positively to depictions of historically underrepresented identities across the board, whereas conservatives, who value purity/sanctity, react negatively to identities they perceive as violating both agency and normative expectations (e.g., an obese, transgender, or hijab-wearing model; Haltman, Jin, Donnelly, & Reczek, 2026). Similar reactance can arise when identity-based labeling (e.g., “Dryer Sheets for Men”) alienates customers when those labels evoke stereotypes about a marginalized identity (i.e., women or racial minorities), by triggering categorization threat (in which consumers feel reduced to a single identity; Kim, Barasz, Norton, & John, 2023). The negative effect of identity appeals is thus reduced when multiple identities are evoked, or the appeal is seen as a necessary point of differentiation.

Algorithmic Promotion

As with pricing, increasingly, no human is involved in the process by which ads are served, particularly in online retail settings. Machine-learning systems now automate the buying and placement of digital advertising almost exclusively online, drawing from real-time behavioral and demographic data to predict who is likeliest to convert. In doing so, however, they can promote unintended discriminatory outcomes. For example, when a deliberately gender-neutral STEM job ad was placed on social media, it was shown to fewer women than men—not intentionally, but because women are costlier to reach online (i.e., so a cost-minimizing algorithm routed the ad toward men; Lambrecht & Tucker, 2019). Similar cases of algorithmic discrimination have been documented in other contexts: services for background checks were more likely to be displayed to consumers with traditionally African-American names (Sweeney, 2013), and ads for executive coaching services in India were less likely to be displayed to women (Datta et al., 2015). While intentionality has traditionally been viewed as a key ingredient for fairness perceptions, firms may still suffer reputational costs when consumers cannot observe their intentions and thus infer discriminatory intent.

Place

Place (distribution) governs where and how consumers acquire or obtain products and services from firms. This encompasses channels strategy (e.g., brick-and-mortar vs. online), service environments (e.g., store design), and channel partners (e.g., direct-to-consumer vs. business-to-business). Place fundamentally shapes access, and as such raises fundamental questions of justness.

Service Failure and Customer Relationship Management

A basic fairness question in place is who is served, and how. In these contexts, feelings of exclusion matter a great deal. For example, being explicitly rejected by a salesperson, versus merely ignored, produces more vivid mental imagery of the slight and a more concrete mindset, which in turn shifts consumers toward tangible, visual forms of redress (e.g., a replacement product rather than an apology; Sinha & Lu, 2019). The presence of identity-relevant signals in consumer spaces—a gender-inclusive restroom, or the display of a racial diversity award—can improve fairness perceptions (Chaney, Sanchez, & Remedios, 2018) and buttress against service failure (Kaiser et al., 2013). Beyond a single encounter, consumers hold firms to relational norms across the life of the relationship—and react sharply when those norms are breached. When firms enact seemingly sensible customer relationship management policies at the point-of-sale—such as refusing service or mishandling complaints—fairness violations and backlash can result, even when the dismissed customers were themselves at fault (Lepthien, Papies, Clement, & Melnyk, 2017).

Algorithmic and Automated Service

As firms increasingly automate service encounters, fairness perceptions hinge on which customers seem to be advantaged (vs. disadvantaged). For example, identical service is rated worse when a bot rather than a human delivers it, because consumers infer the firm automated to cut costs at their expense—an unfair split of the "automation surplus" (Castelo et al., 2023). Bots are now commonly used in negotiation with consumers, as well, which can erode the customer-firm relationship over time (Chaudhuri & De Bruyn, 2026).

Crucially, algorithmic service is not uniformly disfavored. While consumers resist algorithmic decision-makers in morally weighty trade-offs (e.g., insurance coverage, parole decisions) because they assume machines reason consequentially rather than deontologically (Dietvorst & Bartels, 2022), this aversion attenuates in high-corruption settings, where algorithms look comparatively trustworthy (Castelo, 2024). Similarly, marginalized consumers tend to prefer algorithmic to human service in identity-salient contexts, anticipating discrimination from human staff (Kim et al., 2026). This is consistent with recent work suggesting that providers on peer-to-peer platforms (e.g., Airbnb, ride-sharing) infer lower socioeconomic status and trustworthiness from consumers located in more economically unequal regions, and are correspondingly less willing to serve them. Algorithmic service can thus yield costs and benefits with respect to fairness perceptions, depending on who the consumer is and how they expect to be treated.

Product

Product refers to anything that can be offered to a market to satisfy a want or need (and need not necessarily be a physical good; Kotler & Keller, 2016). This includes not only decisions about functional attributes and performance levels, but also the augmented services and guarantees around it, including the symbolic meaning carried by its brand.

Ethical Products and Ethical Attributes

In general, consumers believe it is unethical to sell harmful products (e.g., cigarettes, alcohol)—even when there is latent demand—and particularly when those products are targeted at vulnerable segments (Smith & Cooper-Martin, 1997). Disapproval increases with both the harmfulness of the product itself and with the perceived vulnerability of the targeted group. Relatedly, consumers regard some goods as objectionable because they believe they should not be bought and sold at all. For example, bodily markets—sex work, surrogacy, the buying and selling of organs—trigger negative reactions based on different moral foundations (Goenka & van Osselaer, 2023).

Conversely, consumers find ethical products and products with ethical attributes appealing, and are often willing to pay a premium for them (Auger et al., 2003; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Trudel & Cotte, 2009). This preference can result in counterintuitive results, however. For example, consumers maintain a lay belief that paper products are sustainable while plastic products are not. They thus judge plastic-plus-paper overpackaging as more environmentally friendly than plastic alone, even though the combination of paper and plastic generates more material waste (Sokolova, Krishna, & Doring, 2023). Consumers also often engage with product attributes through willful ignorance. For example, when evaluating positive ethical information (e.g., fair-labor certification) versus negative ethical information (e.g., child labor), consumers are more likely to remember those that are positive, rather than negative, in order to justify consumption (i.e., thereby resolving a want-should tension; Reczek, Irwin, Zane, & Ehrich, 2018). Moreover, consumers who willfully ignore ethical information subsequently feel licensed to denigrate more ethical consumers to defuse the threat of unfavorable social comparison, reducing their own future ethical behavior (Zane, Irwin, & Reczek, 2016).

Meanwhile, made-to-order products (e.g., a custom-built sofa) make consumers feel more personally responsible for how it was produced than a made-to-stock one, magnifying both guilt for unethical production and gratification for ethical production (Paharia, 2020).

When firms publicize their corporate social responsibility practices—philanthropy, ethical labor, environmental commitments, transparent governance—these beliefs can spill over into judgments of product attributes. For example, prosocial behavior by a firm can cast a "moral halo" around the product: participants who tasted wine rated it as better-tasting when told the winemaker donated to charity, compared to when the same wine was tasted without the additional pro-social information (Chernev & Blair, 2015). The same pattern arises for sustainability practices, by reinforcing positive inferences about the underlying prosocial motives of the firm (Chernev & Blair, 2021). Corporate social responsibility practices can thus help facilitate brand extensions. For example, maintaining a socially responsible reputation (e.g., as Ben & Jerry's ice cream has done) bolsters desire to support the brand more generally, and thus lifts evaluations of new products that might otherwise seem like a poor fit for the firm (e.g., Ben & Jerry's vitamins; Johnson, Mao, Lefebvre, & Ganesh, 2019). In general, these social responsibility cues generalize across categories, whereas competence cues do not.

Versioning and Shrinkflation

Versioning refers to the price discrimination practice of creating limited-capability models by removing or degrading features from an existing product—a strategy that tends to be viewed as highly unfair, due to the belief that doing so unnecessarily destroys value (which otherwise could have been unlocked cost-free; Gershoff, Kivetz, & Keinan, 2012). As more and more physical goods are controlled and operated by software, firms can now engage in versioning even more efficiently—and surreptitiously. For example, BMW faced public backlash when introducing a paid subscription for heated seats (Hurd, 2026), while Tesla uses software to place extra battery capacity behind a paywall—a practice that only became apparent when it unlocked additional range for drivers in the path of Hurricane Irma (Chappell, 2017). This latter case is a particularly poignant illustration of how fairness perceptions can often run counter to what otherwise might have been intended as a gesture of goodwill (e.g., helping consumers during a natural disaster), due to feelings of betrayal (Garbas et al., 2023) and the violation of ownership norms (Morewedge, Monga, Palmatier, Shu, & Small, 2021; Peck & Luangrath, 2023).

Firms also now commonly covertly engage in a practice known as shrinkflation, whereby a product's size or quantity is reduced, while holding its price constant (the net effect of which is to increase the per-unit cost). Recent work has documented "shrinkflation aversion," in which the same economic change is viewed as less fair when it is implemented through downsizing, rather than a corresponding price increase, because the former feels deceptive (Evangelidis, 2024). A core tenet of the dual entitlement principle (Kahneman et al., 1986) is that when a price increase is transparently the result of a real increase in input costs, fairness perceptions do not suffer. Shrinkflation aversion hints that consumers object less to the economics of the adjustment than to its concealment. This logic also extends to quality in the form of a "skimpflation penalty" (Evangelidis, 2026), whereby reducing a product's quality while holding its size and price constant is judged more unfair than either downsizing or increasing its price, because changes to quality are regarded as less transparent. Consumers similarly disfavor slack filling, the practice of leaving packages partially empty, which also feels deceptive (Wilkins, Beckenuyte, & Butt, 2016). While consumer inattention to downsizing has facilitated such practices—indeed, an analysis of grocery scanner data suggests downsizing is roughly five times more common than upsizing (Janssen & Kasinger, 2025)—recent research has found that doing so is not without risk.

Branding

An essential component of product, branding refers to the development of a set of identifiers and associations that distinguish goods and services in the marketplace. Consumers maintain and truly value the relationships they cultivate with brands. Foundational work on consumer-brand relationships argues that consumers form differentiated relational bonds with brands, which can either buffer or amplify positive versus negative reactions (Fournier, 1998). On the buffering side, consumers with strong self-brand connections are often motivated to protect their self-identity in the face of negative feedback (because they have incorporated the brand into their self-concept). When brands transgress, however, their own self-image is threatened, so they often respond by defending their favored brands (Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, & Unnava, 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, & Burnkrant, 2001; Cheng, White, & Chaplin, 2012).

Ultimately, highly connected consumers view brands as extensions of the self (Belk, 2013) and form psychological contracts with them. The most committed consumers are thus the likeliest to judge firms the most harshly. For example, even a minor brand violation (e.g., quietly ending a loyalty discount) can feel like a broken promise and provoke backlash (Montgomery, Raju, Desai, & Unnava, 2018; Trump, 2014). Moreover, when highly favored brands are attacked, such as by negative reviews, some consumers view it as unfair. The result, paradoxically, is that negative reviews can sometimes increase support, because observers empathize with a company that they see as unjustly wronged (Allard, Dunn, & White, 2020). Similarly, recent work has found that consumers who are strongly attached to a brand experience reactance when a social media influencer receives preferential treatment (e.g., in the form of paid endorsement or through their receipt of free products and services), because those extra benefits seem to benefit similar others, breaching the implicit contract (Bentley, Rajagopal, & Kulow, 2025). A related dynamic holds for loyalty programs, which lavish perks on high-status members. They can be viewed as unfair favoritism by some consumers, based on the extent to which they accept social hierarchy (Wang & Lalwani, 2019).

Opportunities for Future Research: A Call to Action

As illuminated by our review, decades of research on consumer fairness perceptions have yielded a rich literature exploring price, but our systematic review of this work across both marketing strategy (e.g., segmentation, targeting, and positioning) and the marketing mix (e.g., price, promotion, place, and product) surfaces a number of potential blind spots, which we view as exciting opportunities for future work.

This is notable because while price is clearly the most consumer-facing and immediately salient of the four Ps, the modern marketplace environment is full of kindling that might otherwise not catch flame if not for the virality of social media. Backlash and controversies relating to everything from access and representation to culture and identity now regularly become overnight sensations (e.g., Bud Light's pro-LGBTQ ad campaign, Nike's endorsement of Colin Kaepernick; Shepherd, Athar, & Zaboli, 2024), underscoring the importance of elucidating fairness perceptions across the entire range of marketing activities (not just price). To that end, the aim of this final section is to promote theory development and the discovery of practical insights in segmentation, targeting, and positioning, as well as place, product, and promotion.

Segmentation, Targeting, and Positioning

Individual Differences and Intersectionality Across Segments

The literature reviewed in the segmentation section largely focused on demographic and cultural categories (e.g., Edelman et al., 2017; Henderson et al., 2016), but fairness reactions may depend equally as much on other observable and actionable variables that have been comparatively less studied. These variables could include what consumers buy, their loyalty to a brand, what they disclose to firms, and what values they hold and espouse. Loyalty is an obvious starting point, given that strong brand relationships can either buffer firms against blame or sharpen reactions to broken contracts, depending on the nature of the underlying consumer-brand relationship (Montgomery et al., 2018). In many cases, a firm’s most valuable customers may also be its most critical.

To that end, we believe two segments are worth flagging as promising avenues for future research. The first is privacy disposition. Marketers already sort customers into privacy fundamentalists, pragmatists, and the unconcerned (Kumaraguru & Cranor, 2005), segments that plausibly diverge in whether personalized targeting is valued or regarded as unfair surveillance. The second comprises consumers who express ethical, prosocial, or pro-environmental values.

These segments are extra motivated by fairness concerns. Thus, reframing fairness sensitivity as something firms can understand based on the data they already collect, rather than based on uncontrollable or irrelevant demographic characteristics (Shaddy et al., 2026; Tomova Shakur & Phillips, 2022), may be deemed more appropriate. Ultimately, firms need to understand which consumers are most sensitive to these concerns (and when), and modify their behavior and communications accordingly.

As emphasized in the above segmentation section, extant findings should be viewed as starting points rather than as complete accounts, because consumers occupy multiple categories at once, and their marketplace experiences are shaped by the unique intersections of those categories (Uduehi et al., 2025). We thus regard the adoption of an intersectional view of fairness as a key imperative for marketing research—one that raises questions current research does not directly tackle. This is because fairness violations that implicate a combination of marginalized identities may provoke qualitatively different reactions than what might be implied by studying the sum of their parts in isolation. Given that the consumers who are most sensitive to and potentially harmed by unfair practices often sit at the intersection of multiple demographic categories (e.g., race, gender, or socioeconomic status), the gap between their lived experience and the literature's single-axis designs reflects a potential blind spot that we hope to be generative in addressing.

The Dynamics of Fairness

Most extant fairness research relies on one-shot experimental designs. However, fairness perceptions constantly evolve over the course of the customer journey, and violations can and do often compound over time. How fairness judgments accumulate, how trust is rebuilt after a violation, and whether a reservoir of prior goodwill buffers against later transgressions are questions that single-transaction paradigms cannot address, which we believe warrant pursuit of longitudinal and relational designs.

Our review of segmentation treats fairness sensitivity largely as a between-consumer trait, but the fairness concerns undoubtedly vary within-consumer, across time, context, and situation. Identity salience already surfaces as an important moderator across many recent findings in this review—ethnic primes shift responsiveness to targeted appeals (Forehand & Deshpandé, 2001), and marginalized consumers' channel preferences depend on whether their identity is salient (Kim et al., 2026). A natural extension is to ask what momentarily activates fairness concerns—such as scarcity or financial strain (Paley, Tully, & Sharma, 2019; Tully, Hershfield, & Meyvis, 2015), recent exposure to a fairness violation (whether one's own, a firm's, a stranger's, or on social media), the framing of a choice in communal versus market terms (Grayson, 2014; McGraw, Schwartz, & Tetlock, 2012), or even mood (Lee-Wingate & Corfman, 2010). Research in this area might thus benefit from broader reorientation around not simply identifying consumers who are chronically attuned to unfair practices, but further uncovering the antecedents for when any particular consumer becomes more so. In other words, rather than asking who cares about fairness, future work might probe when they care.

Algorithmic Targeting

Our review of targeting leans on the insight that perceived intentionality is central to evaluating the fairness of targeting decisions (Shaddy et al., 2026). Yet, as noted, because targeting is increasingly executed by algorithms optimizing on behavioral data, discriminatory outcomes can arise without any discriminatory intent (Lambrecht & Tucker, 2019). This severs the traditional link between disparate outcomes and harmful intentions, and raises questions extant frameworks have only begun to address: how do consumers infer intentionality when no human is directly accountable for the decision, and whom do they hold responsible? Does the moral logic of "the algorithm did it" excuse firms or exacerbate reactions? These are meaningful questions, because the inferential processes central to existing fairness theories—which largely rely on perceived intentionality (Knobe, 2003)—may operate quite differently when the actor is a nonhuman algorithm or AI. That a fundamentally different psychology may underlie perceptions of fairness in such contexts is a potentially defining question for the field.

A related frontier concerns the perverse incentives that operate across different segments. If targeting vulnerable segments invites accusations of exploitation (Essa et al., 2026), and discounting stigmatized-identity products is viewed as disrespectful (Du et al., 2025), firms may rationally under-serve precisely the consumers that such reactions aim to protect. Mapping out the underlying factors that affect when fairness concerns expand versus contract the set of consumers a firm is willing to serve is critical, with direct consumer welfare implications.

Evolving Signals of Sincerity and Authenticity in Positioning

A key takeaway of our review of fairness research relevant to positioning is that prosocial and moral differentiation succeeds only when consumers infer sincere and authentic motives, as opposed to strategic or profit-seeking self-interest (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli, & Schwarz, 2006). But as consumers grow more adept at detecting "woke washing" (Vredenburg, Kapitan, Spry, &

Kemper, 2020), the cues that once authenticated prosocial motives may lose their diagnostic value, leading firms to pursue costlier signals (e.g., first-mover status, contractual commitments, third-party certification). Future work could examine, for example, whether the proliferation of ethical labels and pro-social certifications eventually produces fatigue or cynicism. Additionally, structural signals that are more difficult to fake (e.g., flat organizational hierarchies, minority ownership, open-access commitments; Du et al., 2025; Maier et al., 2025; Uduehi & Barnes, 2025) may become especially valuable. We thus believe that better understanding the broader psychological principles that systematically boost signaling value—or, conversely, invite heightened scrutiny—would be generative for follow-up research (as opposed to studying any specific or static cue in isolation).

Fairness for Non-Consumer Stakeholders

Nearly all the work we have reviewed herein concerns fairness toward firms' customers themselves. Yet consumers are increasingly willing to punish firms for perceived violations that they do not personally experience, including unfair treatment of workers (e.g., gig labor, warehouse conditions, wage practices), suppliers, competitors, and the environment, which reflect third-party victims. The stakeholder-capitalism framing now common in corporate discourse (Business Roundtable, 2019) speaks to this question directly, and we believe research in consumer behavior may benefit from similarly widening its frame to identify, explore, and explain fairness for non-consumer stakeholders.

Place

Of all the marketing tactics (i.e., the four Ps), we regard place as having received the thinnest coverage to date in consumer behavior. Because place encompasses a wide range of critical questions regarding where, how, and to whom firms make their offerings accessible, there are potentially enormous implications for consumer welfare for better understanding fairness perceptions in this context.

Retail Deserts

Perhaps the most basic question in place is where to locate everything from retail stores, bank branches, pharmacies, and fulfillment centers—decisions that directly affect which consumers can practically access goods and services, and when. For example, when firms choose to open and operate grocery stores in more affluent neighborhoods and not impoverished ones, “food deserts” can result, limiting access to fresh produce and healthy options for lower-income communities (Walker, Keane, & Burke, 2010). More broadly, the provision of healthcare (e.g., hospitals, urgent care facilities, pharmacies) and logistics infrastructure (e.g., warehouses, shipping centers, pickup and drop-off locations) raise clear fairness questions regarding who benefits from greater access to vital goods and services. For example, Amazon was recently discovered to have excluded many majority-Black ZIP codes from its Prime same-day delivery service—a clear and vivid example of how channel strategies can directly lead to racially disparate outcomes, absent any overt discriminatory intent (Associated Press, 2024). How consumers react to such disparities—when exclusion is an unavoidable byproduct of profit-maximizing logistics decisions—is an almost entirely open question.

Algorithmic Discrimination by Geography

Algorithmic discrimination can result in differential (and often illegal) treatment of consumers across protected classes (e.g., race and gender), and has accordingly received a great deal of attention across psychology, economics, and public policy (e.g., Favaretto, Clercq, & Elger, 2019; Kleinberg, Ludwig, Mullainathan, & Sunstein, 2018; Kordzadeh & Ghasemaghaei, 2022). And while algorithmic discrimination has been studied in consumer behavior with respect to price (Duani, Barasch, & Morwitz, 2024; Priester, Robbert, & Roth, 2020) and promotion (Datta, Tschantz, & Datta, 2015; Lambrecht & Tucker, 2019; Sweeney, 2013), a promising extension would be to explore how the use of algorithms in distribution might similarly result in appraisals of unfair discrimination.

Consider, for example (as noted above), recent work demonstrating that human providers on peer-to-peer platforms (e.g., Airbnb, Uber) are less willing to serve lower socioeconomic status areas. Given that many AI technologies are often trained on those very human judgments and decisions, we believe the potential for discriminatory treatment by algorithms and AI is equally (if not more) likely. In other words, access will only continue to be increasingly mediated by platforms that automatically ration, surge, or withdraw service dynamically—without any direct human input or oversight. As a result, when delivery fees vary by area, or when platforms infer neighborhood-level demand and adjust availability accordingly, consumers will undoubtedly view such differential treatment as unfair. How companies might deploy such tools fairly characterizes an important open question.

Channel Frictions

One of the first questions any marketing manager must answer with respect to channel strategy is where and how consumers will acquire or obtain products and services from firms (e.g., brick-and-mortar vs. online). Oftentimes, prices, availability, and even inventory differ across such channels—creating differential frictions that manifest as differential availability. A natural question, then, is when online and in-store prices diverge, or when the best purchase terms require using an app, signing up for a membership, or require data sharing with firms, access will necessarily accrue unevenly. Whether consumers perceive such channel-based disparities as fair—and how those perceptions track their own position in the digital divide—is a tractable and timely question.

Relatedly, beyond asymmetric availability of goods and services, many firms now impose asymmetric frictions on consumers, such as various return fees, closed-loop returns, and account bans for costly customers (i.e., those who take advantage of or abuse return policies). Many companies (e.g., gyms, subscription services) have been accused of intentionally creating complicated cancellation processes that make it significantly more difficult to quit than to sign up, drawing the ire of customers and regulators alike. How consumers judge frictions that are selectively imposed by firms, and whether procedural fairness norms extend to the effort a firm demands of its customers, characterizes another largely unexamined question.

Product

Planned Obsolescence and the Right to Repair

Designing products for shortened lifespans or restricted repair—through component serialization, software-locked parts, and a growing number of right-to-repair laws—is an issue that has attracted much attention in business ethics, law, and engineering (Guiltinan, 2009; Perzanowski, 2022). These practices can depress value perceptions and willingness-to-pay (Kuppelwieser et al., 2019), yet little work in marketing has explored when and why such policies are viewed as unfair. This is a notable gap that is ripe for additional exploration, because planned obsolescence and right to repair restrictions trigger many of the negative inferences about firm motives cited above. For example, when versions of products seem to coincidentally fail the moment a new version is released—an accusation recently levied at Apple, a controversy termed "batterygate" (Sarhan, 2017)—consumers may attribute such failures to profit-seeking motives, mirroring those that underlie unfairness perceptions in pricing (e.g., Campbell, 1999; Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004). The costs incurred may moreover accrue to society writ large, when the additional waste and replacement burden constitutes third-party harm.

AI Provenance and Authenticity

As products are written, designed, or voiced by generative AI, another open question is when undisclosed AI provenance is experienced as deceptive—and, separately, why consumers object to the use of AI in production (even when product quality is held constant). Recent work has shown that consumers dislike AI-produced goods and services (Longoni, Bonezzi, & Morewedge, 2019), and they specifically disfavor AI in hedonic and taste-based domains where human judgment is especially valued (Longoni & Cian, 2022). Given these findings, firms may face a perverse incentive to obfuscate or otherwise hide their use of AI, which consumers likely view as fundamentally deceptive and potentially inauthentic or tainted (Newman & Dhar, 2014). Moreover, the use of AI often directly displaces human labor, which consumers find aversive (Fuchs, Schreier, & van Osselaer, 2015; Goenka & Bagchi, 2024). Identifying not only the downstream consequences of AI concealment, but also factors that may soften negative reactions will be critical for broader acceptance of such tools in production.

Promotion

Social Media and Influencer Marketing

As noted above, fairness violations are no longer private grievances between a firm and a wronged consumer. Any transgression now carries with it the potential to be broadcast widely on social media. This has heightened the need to understand why some transgressions snowball into public relations disasters, while others fail to proliferate. When a single unfair act or practice can become a viral referendum overnight, backlash has increasingly become collective and coordinated, through boycotts, organized review "bombing" (Payne, 2024), and cancellation campaigns—all of which are now facilitated by social media.

Additionally, we view the rise of social media influencers—which has quickly become a key tool in promotion (Pan, Blut, Ghiassaleh, & Lee, 2025; Pei & Mayzlin, 2022)—as a comparatively underexamined topic for fairness research. Much like potential issues surrounding AI provenance in production may trigger reactance, so too might concerns about the adequacy of sponsorship disclosure, deceptive paid reviews, and the breach of parasocial relationship trust when followers learn a recommendation was “purchased” by an advertiser (cf. Bentley et al., 2025). The stakes are even higher for the promotion of highly regulated products and services (e.g., healthcare, housing), where the resulting harm is magnified by the vulnerability of certain classes of consumers (cf. Arsel, Crockett, & Scott, 2022).

Generative AI in Advertising

Finally, deepfaked endorsements, synthetic influencers, and AI-generated representation (i.e., images of people who are not real) pose a particularly novel problem. Given that depictions of diversity in advertising tend to yield positive brand outcomes when they are perceived as authentic gestures of inclusion (Campbell, Sands, McFerran, & Mavrommatis, 2025), consumers may be especially sensitive to similar efforts produced by AI. We expect contrived tokenism (whether intentional or not) to feel intensely inauthentic. For example, a synthetic Black model or a fabricated disabled spokesperson may run the risk of appearing to appropriate the mere appearance of representation, while delivering none of its inclusionary substance.

Concluding Remarks

The existing fairness literature was built largely on a single marketing tactic (price), individual consumers (as the unit of observation), one-shot transactions (as the key paradigm), and the psychology of human decision-makers. We believe there remains ample and exciting opportunity to extend and expand this work to other underexplored areas, across both marketing strategy (segmentation, targeting, and positioning) and the broader marketing mix (promotion, place, and product, in addition to price). Heeding this call to action will not only increase the breadth and depth of fairness research in consumer behavior, but also magnify the scope and impact of what we view as one of the most fertile and important topics in marketing.

References

Aaker, J. L., Brumbaugh, A. M., & Grier, S. A. (2000). Nontarget markets and viewer distinctiveness: The impact of target marketing on advertising attitudes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(3), 127–140. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP0903_1

Aaker, J., Vohs, K. D., & Mogilner, C. (2010). Nonprofits are seen as warm and for-profits as competent: Firm stereotypes matter. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(2), 224–237. https://doi.org/10.1086/651566

Acar, O. A., Dahl, D. W., Fuchs, C., & Schreier, M. (2021). The signal value of crowdfunded products. *Journal of Marketing Research, 58*(4), 644–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437211012451

Aguirre, E., Mahr, D., Grewal, D., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2015). Unraveling the personalization paradox: The effect of information collection and trust-building strategies on online advertisement effectiveness. *Journal of Retailing, 91*(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2014.09.005

Ahluwalia, R., Burnkrant, R. E., & Unnava, H. R. (2000). Consumer response to negative publicity: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Marketing Research, 37*(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.37.2.203.18734

Ahluwalia, R., Unnava, H. R., & Burnkrant, R. E. (2001). The moderating role of commitment on the spillover effect of marketing communications. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(4), 458–470. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.4.458.18903

Åkestam, N., Rosengren, S., & Dahlen, M. (2017). Advertising "like a girl": Toward a better understanding of "femvertising" and its effects. *Psychology & Marketing, 34*(8), 795–806. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21023

Allard, T., Dunn, L. H., & White, K. (2020). Negative reviews, positive impact: Consumer empathetic responding to unfair word of mouth. *Journal of Marketing, 84*(4), 86–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920924389

Allard, T., & McFerran, B. (2022). Ethical branding in a divided world: How political orientation motivates reactions to marketplace transgressions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 32*(4), 551–572. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1270

Arsel, Z., Crockett, D., & Scott, M. L. (2022). Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in the Journal of Consumer Research: A curation and research agenda. *Journal of Consumer Research, 48*(5), 920–933. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucab057

Associated Press. (2024, December 4). District of Columbia says Amazon secretly stopped fast deliveries to 2 predominantly Black ZIP codes. *AP News*. https://apnews.com/article/amazon-dc-delivery-prime-exclusion-680a15c55f9b64efddbfee93ba7ad8b6

Auger, P., Burke, P., Devinney, T. M., & Louviere, J. J. (2003). *What will consumers pay for social product features? Journal of Business Ethics, 42*(3), 281–304. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022212816261

Bebchuk, L. A., & Tallarita, R. (2022). *Will corporations deliver value to all stakeholders? Vanderbilt Law Review, 75*(4), 1031–1091.

Belk, R. W. (2013). Extended self in a digital world. *Journal of Consumer Research, 40*(3), 477–500. https://doi.org/10.1086/671052

Bentley, K., Rajagopal, P., & Kulow, K. (2025). Unfaithful brands: How brand attachment can lead to negative responses to influencer marketing campaigns. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 35*(2), 169–184. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1432

Bhattacharjee, A., & Dana, J. (2024). Lay economic reasoning: An integrative review and call to action. *Consumer Psychology Review, 7*(1), 3-39.

Bhattacharjee, A., Dana, J., & Baron, J. (2017). Anti-profit beliefs: How people neglect the societal benefits of profit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(5), 671–696. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000093

Bhattacharya, A., Good, V., Sardashti, H., & Peloza, J. (2021). Beyond warm glow: The risk-mitigating effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR). *Journal of Business Ethics, 171*(2), 317–336. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04445-0

Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review, 47*(1), 9–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/41166284

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.

Bolton, L. E., Warlop, L., & Alba, J. W. (2003). Consumer perceptions of price (un)fairness. *Journal of Consumer Research, 29*(4), 474–491. https://doi.org/10.1086/346244

Bond, B. J., & Farrell, J. R. (2020). Does depicting gay couples in ads influence behavioral intentions? How appeal for ads with gay models can drive intentions to purchase and recommend. *Journal of Advertising Research, 60*(2), 208-221.

Bone, S. A., Christensen, G. L., & Williams, J. D. (2014). Rejected, shackled, and alone: The impact of systemic restricted choice on minority consumers' construction of self. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(2), 451–474. https://doi.org/10.1086/676689

Bower, A. B. (2001). Highly attractive models in advertising and the women who loathe them: The implications of negative affect for spokesperson effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising, 30*(3), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2001.10673645

Brosnan, S. F., & de Waal, F. B. M. (2003). Monkeys reject unequal pay. *Nature, 425*(6955), 297–299. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01963

Brunel, F. F., & Nelson, M. R. (2000). Explaining gendered responses to "help-self" and "help-others" charity ad appeals: The mediating role of world-views. *Journal of Advertising, 29*(3), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2000.10673614

Business Roundtable. (2019, August 19). *Statement on the purpose of a corporation*. https://www.businessroundtable.org/business-roundtable-redefines-the-purpose-of-a-corporation-to-promote-an-economy-that-serves-all-americans

Campbell, C., Sands, S., McFerran, B., & Mavrommatis, A. (2025). Diversity representation in advertising. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 53*(2), 588–616. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00994-8

Campbell, M. C. (1999). Perceptions of price unfairness: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing Research, 36*(2), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379903600204

Campbell, M. C., Pomerance, J., & Percival Carter, E. L. (2025). Painful prices: The moral harm model of price fairness. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf045

Casidy, R., Duhachek, A., Singh, V., & Tamaddoni, A. (2021). Religious belief, religious priming, and negative word of mouth. *Journal of Marketing Research, 58*(4), 762–781. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437211011196

Castelo, N. (2024). Perceived corruption reduces algorithm aversion. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 34*(2), 326–333. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1373

Castelo, N., Boegershausen, J., Hildebrand, C., & Henkel, A. P. (2023). Understanding and improving consumer reactions to service bots. *Journal of Consumer Research, 50*(4), 848–863. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucad023

Chandon, P., Wansink, B., & Laurent, G. (2000). A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing, 64*(4), 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.64.4.65.18071

Chaney, K. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Maimon, M. R. (2019). Stigmatized-identity cues in consumer spaces. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 29*(1), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1075

Chaney, K. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Remedios, J. D. (2018). We are in this together: How the presence of similarly stereotyped allies buffers against identity threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 79*, 410–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.09.005

Chappell, B. (2017, September 12). *Tesla remotely expanded car batteries near Irma's path, and questions linger*. NPR. https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/09/12/550445863/tesla-remotely-expanded-car-batteries-near-irmas-path-and-questions-linger

Chaudhuri, S., & De Bruyn, A. (2026). Bots bargaining with humans: Building AI super-bargainers with algorithmic anthropomorphization. *Journal of Marketing Research, 63*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437251375323

Chen, H., Bolton, L. E., Ng, S., Lee, D., & Wang, D. (2018). Culture, relationship norms, and dual entitlement. *Journal of Consumer Research, 45*(1), 1-20.

Cheng, S. Y. Y., White, T. B., & Chaplin, L. N. (2012). The effects of self-brand connections on responses to brand failure: A new look at the consumer–brand relationship. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22*(2), 280–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.05.005

Chernev, A., & Blair, S. (2015). Doing well by doing good: The benevolent halo of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(6), 1412–1425. https://doi.org/10.1086/680089

Chernev, A., & Blair, S. (2021). When sustainability is not a liability: The halo effect of marketplace morality. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 31*(3), 551–569. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1195

Clifford, C. (2014, March 25). This company wants its customers to know exactly how much it is making from them. *Entrepreneur*. https://www.entrepreneur.com/starting-a-business/this-company-wants-its-customers-to-know-exactly-how-much/232444

Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2015). Measuring justice and fairness. In R. S. Cropanzano & M. L. Ambrose (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace* (pp. 187–202). Oxford University Press.

Crockett, D. (2017). Paths to respectability: Consumption and stigma management in the contemporary Black middle class. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44(3), 554–581. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx049

Cui, T. H., & Mallucci, P. (2016). Fairness ideals in distribution channels. *Journal of Marketing Research, 53*(6), 969–987. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.12.0093

D'Angelo, J. K., Dunn, L., & Valsesia, F. (2025). Is this for me? Differential responses to skin tone inclusivity initiatives by underrepresented consumers and represented consumers. *Journal of Marketing*, 89(2), 25–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429241268634

Datta, A., Tschantz, M. C., & Datta, A. (2015). Automated experiments on ad privacy settings: A tale of opacity, choice, and discrimination. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies, 2015*(1), 92–112. https://doi.org/10.1515/popets-2015-0007

Dietvorst, B. J., & Bartels, D. M. (2022). Consumers object to algorithms making morally relevant tradeoffs because of algorithms' consequentialist decision strategies. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 32*(3), 404–424. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1266

Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(1), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033

Dolifka, D., Christensen, K. L., & Shaddy, F. (2025). Highlighting opportunities (versus outcomes) increases support for economic redistribution. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 16(4), 422-432.

Du, G., Dahl, D. W., & White, K. (2026). Why horizontal organizations don't fall flat: Organizational structure shapes perceptions of egalitarianism and company warmth. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 53(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf041

Du, G., Millet, K., Aydinli, A., & Argo, J. J. (2025). Disrespectful promotions: The negative impact of price promotions on products symbolically linked to stigmatized identities.

Journal of Marketing Research, 62(4), 624–644. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437241293065

Duani, N., Barasch, A., & Morwitz, V. G. (2024). Demographic pricing in the digital age: Assessing fairness perceptions in algorithmic versus human-based price discrimination. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research, 9*(3), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1086/729440

Edelman, B., Luca, M., & Svirsky, D. (2017). Racial discrimination in the sharing economy: Evidence from a field experiment. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 9*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20160213

Edinger-Schons, L. M., Sipilä, J., Sen, S., Mende, G., & Wieseke, J. (2018). Are two reasons better than one? The role of appeal type in consumer responses to sustainable products. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(4), 644–664. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1032

Eisend, M., Muldrow, A. F., & Rosengren, S. (2023). Diversity and inclusion in advertising research. *International Journal of Advertising, 42*(1), 52–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2022.2122252

Essa, M., Boegershausen, J., & Paolacci, G. (2026). Limiting accessibility: How targeting consumers with disabilities constrains acceptable prices for innovations. *Journal of Consumer Research*.

Evangelidis, I. (2024). Frontiers: Shrinkflation aversion: When and why product size decreases are seen as more unfair than equivalent price increases. *Marketing Science, 43*(2), 280–288. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2023.0269

Evangelidis, I. (2026). Skimpflation penalty: Decreases in product quality trigger stronger consumer reactions than decreases in size or increases in price. *Journal of Consumer Research*, ucag019.

Fadulu, L. (2024, February 27). ‘Dynamic Pricing’ for Burgers and Shakes? Wendy’s Will Give It a Whirl. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2024/02/27/business/wendys-prices-inflation.html

Farmer, A., Kidwell, B., & Hardesty, D. M. (2020). Helping a few a lot or many a little: Political ideology and charitable giving. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 30*(4), 614–630. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1164

Favaretto, M., De Clercq, E., & Elger, B. S. (2019). Big data and discrimination: Perils, promises and solutions. A systematic review. *Journal of Big Data, 6*, Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-019-0177-4

Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114*(3), 817–868. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355399556151

Fiske, A. P., & Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo trade-offs: Reactions to transactions that transgress the spheres of justice. *Political Psychology, 18*(2), 255–297. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00058

Forehand, M. R., & Deshpandé, R. (2001). What we see makes us who we are: Priming ethnic self-awareness and advertising response. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(3), 336–348. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.3.336.18871

Forehand, M. R., & Grier, S. (2003). When is honesty the best policy? The effect of stated company intent on consumer skepticism. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 13*(3), 349–356. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1303_15

Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 24*(4), 343–373. https://doi.org/10.1086/209515

Friedman, E., & Toubia, O. (2022). Pricing fairness in a pandemic: Navigating unintended changes to value or cost. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1086/711850

Fuchs, C., Schreier, M., & van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2015). *The handmade effect: What's love got to do with it? Journal of Marketing, 79*(2), 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.14.0018

Garbarino, E., & Lee, O. F. (2003). Dynamic pricing in internet retail: Effects on consumer trust. *Psychology & Marketing, 20*(6), 495–513. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10084

Garbas, J., Schubach, S. A., Mende, M., Scott, M. L., & Schumann, J. H. (2023). You want to sell this to me twice!? How perceptions of betrayal may undermine internal product upgrades. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 51*(2), 286–309. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-022-00881-8

Ge, J., Jo, M.-S., & Sarıgöllü, E. (2023). *How does cultural tightness-looseness affect attitudes toward a local vs foreign brand transgression? International Marketing Review, 40*(6), 1456–1479. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-06-2022-0151

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., Duan, L., Almaliach, A., Ang, S., Arnadottir, J., Aycan, Z., Boehnke, K., Boski, P., Cabecinhas, R., Chan, D., Chhokar, J., D'Amato, A., Ferrer, M., Fischlmayr, I. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011).

Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100–1104. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754

Gershoff, A. D., Kivetz, R., & Keinan, A. (2012). Consumer response to versioning: How brands' production methods affect perceptions of unfairness. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(2), 382–398. https://doi.org/10.1086/663777

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109

Goenka, S., & Bagchi, R. (2024). *The ethical edge: When consumers prefer labor (vs. material) cost justifications for price increases* (MSI Working Paper No. 24-121). Marketing Science Institute. https://www.msi.org/working-paper/the-ethical-edge-when-consumers-prefer-labor-vs-material-cost-justifications-for-price-increases/

Goenka, S., & Bagchi, R. (2025). Price partitioning of socio-moral surcharges. *Journal of Consumer Research, 51*(5), 873–895. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucae034

Goenka, S., & van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2019). Charities can increase the effectiveness of donation appeals by using a morally congruent positive emotion. *Journal of Consumer Research, 46*(4), 774–790. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz012

Goenka, S., & van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2023). Why is it wrong to sell your body? Understanding liberals' versus conservatives' moral objections to bodily markets. *Journal of Marketing, 87*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429211046936

Goya-Tocchetto, D., & Payne, B. K. (2022). How economic inequality shapes thought and action. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 32*(1), 146–161. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1277

Grayson, K. (2014). Morality and the marketplace [Editorial]. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(2), vii–ix. https://doi.org/10.1086/676601

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306437

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16(2), 399–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208

Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54*(1), 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1993.1004

Grier, S. A., & Brumbaugh, A. M. (1999). Noticing cultural differences: Ad meanings created by target and non-target markets. *Journal of Advertising, 28*(1), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1999.10673578

Grier, S. A., Thomas, K. D., & Johnson, G. D. (2019). Re-imagining the marketplace: Addressing race in academic marketing research. *Consumption Markets & Culture, 22*(1), 91–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2017.1413800

Guiltinan, J. (2009). Creative destruction and destructive creations: Environmental ethics and planned obsolescence. *Journal of Business Ethics, 89*(Suppl. 1), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9907-9

Guo, L. (2015). Inequity aversion and fair selling. *Journal of Marketing Research, 52*(1), 77-89.

Guo, X., & Jiang, B. (2016). Signaling through price and quality to consumers with fairness concerns. *Journal of Marketing Research, 53*(6), 988–1000. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.15.0323

Güth, W., Schmittberger, R., & Schwarze, B. (1982). An experimental analysis of ultimatum bargaining. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 3*(4), 367–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681(82)90011-7

Habel, J., Schons, L. M., Alavi, S., & Wieseke, J. (2016). Warm glow or extra charge? The ambivalent effect of corporate social responsibility activities on customers' perceived price fairness. *Journal of Marketing, 80*(1), 84–105. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.14.0389

Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Pantheon Books.

Haltman, C., Jin, J., Donnelly, G. E., & Reczek, R. W. (2026). A framework for understanding consumer response to the depiction of historically underrepresented identities in marketing communications. *Journal of Consumer Research*. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucag010

Hamilton, R. W., Mittal, C., Shah, A., Thompson, D. V., & Griskevicius, V. (2019). How financial constraints influence consumer behavior: An integrative framework. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 29*(2), 285–305. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1074

Harris, A.-M. G., Henderson, G. R., & Williams, J. D. (2005). Courting customers: Assessing consumer racial profiling and other marketplace discrimination. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 24*(1), 163–171. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.24.1.163.63893

Hassan, L. M., McGowan, M., & Shiu, E. (2025). They're not my people: When inclusive marketing backfires. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 53*(2), 563–587. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-025-01105-5

Haws, K. L., & Bearden, W. O. (2006). Dynamic pricing and consumer fairness perceptions. *Journal of Consumer Research, 33*(3), 304–311. https://doi.org/10.1086/508435

Henderson, G. R., Hakstian, A.-M., & Williams, J. D. (2016). *Consumer equality: Race and the American marketplace*. Praeger.

Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., & McElreath, R. (2001). In search of Homo economicus: Behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *American Economic Review, 91*(2), 73–78. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.2.73

Hill, R. P., & Sharma, E. (2020). Consumer vulnerability. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 30*(3), 551–570. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1161

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Homburg, C., Lauer, K., & Vomberg, A. (2019). *The multichannel pricing dilemma: Do consumers accept higher offline than online prices? International Journal of Research in Marketing, 36*(4), 597–612. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2019.01.006

Hurd, B. (2026, February 4). *BMW commits to subscriptions even after heated seat debacle*. The Drive. https://www.thedrive.com/news/bmw-commits-to-subscriptions-even-after-heated-seat-debacle

Hydock, C., Paharia, N., & Blair, S. (2020). Should your brand pick a side? How market share determines the impact of corporate political advocacy. *Journal of Marketing Research, 57*(6), 1135–1151. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243720947682

Jaffee, S., & Hyde, J. S. (2000). Gender differences in moral orientation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(5), 703–726. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.703

Jang, H., & Chu, W. (2012). Are consumers acting fairly toward companies? An examination of pay-what-you-want pricing. *Journal of Macromarketing, 32*(4), 348–360. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146712448193

Janssen, A., & Kasinger, J. (2025). Shrinkflation and consumer demand. *Marketing Science, 45*(1), 142–158. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2024.0948

Johnson, Z. S., Mao, H., Lefebvre, S., & Ganesh, J. (2019). Good guys can finish first: How brand reputation affects extension evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 29*(4), 565–583. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1109

Jost, J. T., Langer, M., Badaan, V., Azevedo, F., Etchezahar, E., Ungaretti, J., & Hennes, E. P. (2017). Ideology and the limits of self-interest: System justification motivation and conservative advantages in mass politics. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science, 3*(3), e1–e26. https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000127

Jung, K., Garbarino, E., Briley, D. A., & Wynhausen, J. (2017). Blue and red voices: Effects of political ideology on consumers' complaining and disputing behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research, 44*(3), 477–499. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx037

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. (1986). Fairness as a constraint on profit seeking: Entitlements in the market. *The American Economic Review, 76*(4), 728–741.

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 504–519.

Kemp, E., Kennett-Hensel, P. A., & Kees, J. (2013). Pulling on the heartstrings: Examining the effects of emotions and gender in persuasive appeals. *Journal of Advertising, 42*(1), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2012.749084

Khan, U., & Kalra, A. (2022). It's good to be different: How diversity impacts judgments of moral behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research, 49*(2), 177–201. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucab061

Kim, T., Barasz, K., & John, L. K. (2019). Why am I seeing this ad? The effect of ad transparency on ad effectiveness. *Journal of Consumer Research, 45*(5), 906–932. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy039

Kim, T., Barasz, K., Norton, M. I., & John, L. K. (2023). Calculators for women: When identity-based appeals alienate consumers. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research, 8*(1), 72–82. https://doi.org/10.1086/722691

Kim, Y., Biswas, D., Szocs, C., & Jenkins, K. (2026). Human or AI? Identity salience enhances historically marginalized (but not privileged) consumers' choice of algorithmic service providers. *Journal of Marketing*.

Kimes, S. E. (1994). Perceived fairness of yield management. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 35*(1), 22–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/001088049403500102

Kirmani, A., Hamilton, R. W., Thompson, D. V., & Lantzy, S. (2017). Doing well versus doing good: The differential effect of underdog positioning on moral and competent service providers. *Journal of Marketing, 81*(1), 103–117. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0369

Kleinberg, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Sunstein, C. R. (2018). Discrimination in the age of algorithms. *Journal of Legal Analysis, 10*, 113–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laz001

Knobe, J. (2003). Intentional action and side effects in ordinary language. *Analysis, 63*(3), 190–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8284.00419

Kordzadeh, N., & Ghasemaghaei, M. (2022). Algorithmic bias: Review, synthesis, and future research directions. *European Journal of Information Systems, 31*(3), 388–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927212

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Kumaraguru, P., & Cranor, L. F. (2005). *Privacy indexes: A survey of Westin's studies* (Technical Report No. CMU-ISRI-05-138). Carnegie Mellon University, Institute for Software Research International. https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~ponguru/CMU-ISRI-05-138.pdf

Kuppelwieser, V. G., Klaus, P., Manthiou, A., & Boujena, O. (2019). Consumer responses to planned obsolescence. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 47*, 157-165.

Kwak, H., Puzakova, M., & Rocereto, J. F. (2017). When brand anthropomorphism alters perceptions of justice: The moderating role of self-construal. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 34*(4), 851–871. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2017.04.002

Lambrecht, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Algorithmic bias? An empirical study of apparent gender-based discrimination in the display of STEM career ads. *Management Science, 65*(7), 2966–2981. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3093

Laufer, D., & Gillespie, K. (2004). Differences in consumer attributions of blame between men and women: The role of perceived vulnerability and empathic concern. *Psychology & Marketing, 21*(2), 141–157. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10119

Lee, S., Baumgartner, H., & Winterich, K. P. (2018). Did they earn it? Observing unearned luxury consumption decreases brand attitude when observers value fairness. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(3), 412–436. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1028

Lee, S., Bolton, L. E., & Winterich, K. P. (2017). To profit or not to profit? The role of greed perceptions in consumer support for social ventures. *Journal of Consumer Research, 44*(4), 853–876. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx071

Lee-Wingate, S. N., & Corfman, K. P. (2010). A little something for me and maybe for you, too: Promotions that relieve guilt. *Marketing Letters, 21*(4), 385–395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-009-9093-2

Lepthien, A., Papies, D., Clement, M., & Melnyk, V. (2017). The ugly side of customer management—Consumer reactions to firm-initiated contract terminations. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 34*(4), 829–850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2017.02.001

Li, R., Gordon, S., & Gelfand, M. J. (2017). Tightness–looseness: A new framework to understand consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 27*(3), 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2017.04.001

Lin, J. D., Keinan, A., Chang, H. H., & Lehmann, D. R. (2026). Robin Hood effect in transgressions against firms: How political ideology shapes consumer justifications. *Journal of Consumer Research, 52*(6), 1102–1125. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf053

Lindenmeier, J., Schleer, C., & Pricl, D. (2012). Consumer outrage: Emotional reactions to unethical corporate behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 65*(9), 1364–1373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.09.022

Longoni, C., Bonezzi, A., & Morewedge, C. K. (2019). Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. *Journal of Consumer Research, 46*(4), 629–650. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz013

Longoni, C., & Cian, L. (2022). Artificial intelligence in utilitarian vs. hedonic contexts: The "word-of-machine" effect. *Journal of Marketing, 86*(1), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920957347

Lupfer, M. B., Weeks, M., & Dupuis, S. (2000). *How pervasive is the negativity bias in judgments based on character appraisal? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(11), 1353–1366. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200263003

Maesen, S., & Ang, D. (2025). Buy now, pay later: Impact of installment payments on customer purchases. *Journal of Marketing*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429241282414

Maier, L., Schreier, M., & Dahl, D. W. (2025). The open design effect. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437251373034

Mathras, D., Cohen, A. B., Mandel, N., & Mick, D. G. (2016). The effects of religion on consumer behavior: A conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 26*(2), 298–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2015.08.001

McGraw, A. P., Schwartz, J. A., & Tetlock, P. E. (2012). From the commercial to the communal: Reframing taboo trade-offs in religious and pharmaceutical marketing. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(1), 157–173. https://doi.org/10.1086/662070

McGraw, A. P., & Tetlock, P. E. (2005). Taboo trade-offs, relational framing, and the acceptability of exchanges. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15*(1), 2–15. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1501_2

Mende, M., Bradford, T. W., Roggeveen, A. L., Scott, M. L., & Zavala Treviño, M. (2024). Consumer vulnerability dynamics and marketing: Conceptual foundations and future research opportunities. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 52*(5), 1301–1322. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01039-4

Meyers-Levy, J., & Loken, B. (2015). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25*(1), 129–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.06.003

Mohan, B., Buell, R. W., & John, L. K. (2020). Lifting the veil: The benefits of cost transparency. *Marketing Science, 39*(6), 1105–1121. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2019.1200

Mohan, B., Schlager, T., Deshpandé, R., & Norton, M. I. (2018). Consumers avoid buying from firms with higher CEO-to-worker pay ratios. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(2), 344–352. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1033

Montgomery, N. V., Raju, S., Desai, K. K., & Unnava, H. R. (2018). When good consumers turn bad: Psychological contract breach in committed brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(3), 437–449. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1015

Morewedge, C. K., Monga, A., Palmatier, R. W., Shu, S. B., & Small, D. A. (2021). Evolution of consumption: A psychological ownership framework. *Journal of Marketing, 85*(1), 196–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920957007

Morwitz, V. G., Greenleaf, E. A., & Johnson, E. J. (1998). Divide and prosper: Consumers' reactions to partitioned prices. *Journal of Marketing Research, 35*(4), 453–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379803500404

Mukherjee, S., & Althuizen, N. (2020). *Brand activism: Does courting controversy help or hurt a brand? International Journal of Research in Marketing, 37*(4), 772–788. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2020.02.008

Newman, G. E., & Dhar, R. (2014). Authenticity is contagious: Brand essence and the original source of production. *Journal of Marketing Research, 51*(3), 371–386. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0022

Newman, K. P., & Brucks, M. (2018). The influence of corporate social responsibility efforts on the moral behavior of high self-brand overlap consumers. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(2), 253–271. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1027

O'Neil, M. M., & Roscigno, V. J. (2025). Racial/Ethnic inequality & contemporary disparities in mortgage lending. *PloS one, 20*(1), e0308121.

Olson, J. G., McFerran, B., Morales, A. C., & Dahl, D. W. (2016). Wealth and welfare: Divergent moral reactions to ethical consumer choices. *Journal of Consumer Research, 42*(6), 879–896. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv096

Oyserman, D. (2006). High power, low power, and equality: Culture beyond individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16*(4), 352–356. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1604_6

Paharia, N. (2020). Who receives credit or blame? The effects of made-to-order production on responses to unethical and ethical company production practices. *Journal of Marketing, 84*(1), 88–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919887161

Paharia, N., Keinan, A., Avery, J., & Schor, J. B. (2011). The underdog effect: The marketing of disadvantage and determination through brand biography. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(5), 775–790. https://doi.org/10.1086/656219

Paley, A., Tully, S. M., & Sharma, E. (2019). Too constrained to converse: The effect of financial constraints on word of mouth. *Journal of Consumer Research, 45*(5), 889–905. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy036

Pan, M., Blut, M., Ghiassaleh, A., & Lee, Z. W. Y. (2025). Influencer marketing effectiveness: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 53*(1), 52–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01052-7

Park, A. B., Leng, Y., Gonzalez, F. J., Watson, J., Valsesia, F., & Cryder, C. (2026). Consumers prefer that corporations donate periodically. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437261423538

Park, S. K., Cho, Y., Kim, J., Lee, J., & Park, J. (2025). Consumer moral decision making: The impact of alignable versus nonalignable differences. *Journal of Consumer Research, 52*(2), 288–307. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucae065

Payne, W. B. (2024). Review bombing the platformed city: Contested political speech in online local reviews. *Big Data & Society, 11*(3), 20539517241275879.

Peck, J., & Luangrath, A. W. (2023). A review and future avenues for psychological ownership in consumer research. *Consumer Psychology Review, 6*(1), 52–74. https://doi.org/10.1002/arcp.1084

Pei, A., & Mayzlin, D. (2022). Influencing social media influencers through affiliation. *Marketing Science, 41*(3), 593–615. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2021.1322

Perzanowski, A. (2022). *The right to repair: Reclaiming the things we own*. Cambridge University Press.

Pittman Claytor, C. (2019). Are black consumers a bellwether for the nation? How research on blacks can foreground our understanding of race in the marketplace. In G. D. Johnson, K. D. Thomas, A. K. Harrison, & S. A. Grier (Eds.), *Race in the marketplace: Crossing critical boundaries* (pp. 153–172). Palgrave Macmillan.

Poole, S. M., Grier, S. A., Thomas, K. D., Sobande, F., Ekpo, A. E., Torres, L. T., ... & Henderson, G. R. (2021). Operationalizing critical race theory in the marketplace. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 40*(2), 126-142.

Priester, A., Robbert, T., & Roth, S. (2020). A special price just for you: Effects of personalized dynamic pricing on consumer fairness perceptions. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management, 19*(2), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41272-019-00224-3

Reczek, R. W., Irwin, J. R., Zane, D. M., & Ehrich, K. R. (2018). That's not how I remember it: Willfully ignorant memory for ethical product attribute information. *Journal of Consumer Research, 45*(1), 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx120

Regner, T. (2015). Why consumers pay voluntarily: Evidence from online music. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 57*, 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2014.10.006

Richins, M. L. (1991). Social comparison and the idealized images of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 18*(1), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1086/209242

Rosa-Salas, M. (2019). Making the mass white: How racial segregation shaped consumer segmentation. In G. D. Johnson, K. D. Thomas, A. K. Harrison, & S. A. Grier (Eds.), *Race in the marketplace: Crossing critical boundaries* (pp. 21–38). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11711-5_2

Rozin, P. (1999). The process of moralization. *Psychological Science, 10*(3), 218–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00139

Sarhan, A. (2017, December 22). Planned obsolescence: Apple is not the only culprit. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/adamsarhan/2017/12/22/planned-obsolescence-apple-is-not-the-only-culprit/

Schlager, T., Mohan, B., DeCelles, K. A., & Norton, M. I. (2021). Consumers—especially women—avoid buying from firms with higher gender pay gaps. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 31*(3), 518–531. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1219

Schwabe, M., Dose, D. B., & Walsh, G. (2018). Every saint has a past, and every sinner has a future: Influences of regulatory focus on consumers' moral self-regulation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 28*(2), 234-252.

Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(2), 225–243. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838

Shaddy, F., Friedman, E. M. S., & Toubia, O. (2026). Fairness perceptions in demographic targeting. *Journal of Consumer Research, 53*(1), 22–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf012

Shaddy, F., Hagen, L., & Hamilton, R. (2025). When the rent is too damn high: Why people prefer demand- versus supply-oriented policy solutions to scarcity. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5249803

Shaddy, F., & Lee, L. (2020). Price promotions cause impatience. *Journal of Marketing Research, 57*(1), 118–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719871946

Shaddy, F., & Shah, A. K. (2018). Deciding who gets what, fairly. *Journal of Consumer Research, 45*(4), 833–848. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy022

Shaddy, F., & Shah, A. K. (2022). When to use markets, lines, and lotteries: How beliefs about fairness depend on beliefs about preferences. *Journal of Marketing, 86*(3), 140–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429211030686

Shang, J., Reed, A., II, Sargeant, A., & Carpenter, K. (2020). Marketplace donations: The role of moral identity discrepancy and gender. *Journal of Marketing Research, 57*(2), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719892592

Shaw, A., & Olson, K. R. (2012). Children discard a resource to avoid inequity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*(2), 382–395. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025907

Shepherd, S., Teymouri A., H., & Zaboli, S. (2024). On the political right, the customer is always right: Political ideology, entitlement, and complaining. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 34*(1), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1366

Silver, I., Kelly, B., & Small, D. A. (2021). Selfless first movers and self-interested followers: Order of entry signals purity of motive in pursuit of the greater good. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 31*(3), 501–517. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1228

Sinha, J., & Lu, F.-C. (2019). Ignored or rejected: Retail exclusion effects on construal levels and consumer responses to compensation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 46*(4), 791–807. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz021

Sinnenberg, J. (2023, February 6). *Your favorite movie theater seat probably just got more expensive*. WLOS. https://wlos.com/news/entertainment/your-favorite-movie-theater-seat-probably-just-got-more-expensive-sightline-amc-theaters-amc-stubs-movies-cinema-income-finances-inflation-ticket-prices-blockbuster-lord-of-the-rings-avatar-the-way-of-water-tolkein

Skitka, L. J., Hanson, B. E., Morgan, G. S., & Wisneski, D. C. (2021). The psychology of moral conviction. *Annual Review of Psychology, 72*, 347–366. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-063020-030612

Smith, N. C., & Cooper-Martin, E. (1997). Ethics and target marketing: The role of product harm and consumer vulnerability. *Journal of Marketing, 61*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299706100301

Smith, W. R. (1956). Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing strategies. *Journal of Marketing, 21*(1), 3–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224295602100102

Sokolova, T., Krishna, A., & Döring, T. (2023). Paper meets plastic: The perceived environmental friendliness of product packaging. *Journal of Consumer Research, 50*(3), 468-491.

Spann, M., Bertini, M., Koenigsberg, O., Zeithammer, R., Aparicio, D., Chen, Y., Fantini, F., Jin, G. Z., Morwitz, V., Popkowski Leszczyc, P. T. L., Vitorino, M. A., Yalcin Williams, G., & Yoo, H. (2025). Algorithmic pricing: Implications for marketing strategy and regulation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2025.05.001

Stich, L., Ungemach, C., Fuchs, C., Spann, M., Ziano, I., & Schumpe, B. M. (2025). Transaction-level wage transparency: How fair wage disclosure affects consumer preferences. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 42(3), 844–865. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2024.11.006

Sudbury-Riley, L., Hunter-Jones, P., Al-Abdin, A., & Haenlein, M. (2024). When the road is rocky: Investigating the role of vulnerability in consumer journeys. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 52*(4), 1045–1068. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01011-2

Summers, C. A., Smith, R. W., & Reczek, R. W. (2016). An audience of one: Behaviorally targeted ads as implied social labels. *Journal of Consumer Research, 43*(1), 156–178. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucw012

Sweeney, L. (2013). Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Communications of the ACM, 56*(5), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1145/2447976.2447990

Tetlock, P. E. (2003). Thinking the unthinkable: Sacred values and taboo cognitions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 7*(7), 320–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00135-9

Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tomova Shakur, T. K., & Phillips, L. T. (2022). What counts as discrimination? How principles of merit shape fairness of demographic decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Trudel, R., & Cotte, J. (2009). *Does it pay to be good? MIT Sloan Management Review, 50*(2), 61–68.

Trump, R. K. (2014). Connected consumers' responses to negative brand actions: The roles of transgression self-relevance and domain. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(9), 1824–1830. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.12.007

Trupia, M. G., & Shaddy, F. (2025). "No time to buy": Asking consumers to spend time to save money is perceived as fairer than asking them to spend money to save time. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 35(3), 450-462.

Tully, S. M., Hershfield, H. E., & Meyvis, T. (2015). Seeking lasting enjoyment with limited money: Financial constraints increase preference for material goods over experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research, 42*(1), 59–75. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv007

Uduehi, E., & Barnes, A. J. (2025). The Minority Ownership Awareness Effect: When Promoting Minority Ownership Increases Brand Evaluations. *Journal of Marketing, 89*(3), 60-77.

Uduehi, E., Saint Clair, J. K., & Crabbe, R. (2025). Intersectionality in marketing: A paradigm for understanding understudied consumers. *Journal of Marketing, 89*(2), 7–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429241258493

Vomberg, A., Homburg, C., & Sarantopoulos, P. (2024). Algorithmic pricing: Effects on consumer trust and price search. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2024.10.006

Vredenburg, J., Kapitan, S., Spry, A., & Kemper, J. A. (2020). *Brands taking a stand: Authentic brand activism or woke washing? Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 39*(4), 444–460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743915620947359

Walker, H. J., Feild, H. S., Bernerth, J. B., & Becton, J. B. (2012). Diversity cues on recruitment websites: Investigating the effects on job seekers' information processing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 214–224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025847

Walker, R. E., Keane, C. R., & Burke, J. G. (2010). Disparities and access to healthy food in the United States: A review of food deserts literature. *Health & Place, 16*(5), 876-884.

Wang, J. J., & Lalwani, A. K. (2019). The distinct influence of power distance perception and power distance values on customer satisfaction in response to loyalty programs. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 36*(4), 580-596.

White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. *Journal of Marketing, 83*(3), 22–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919825649

White, T. B., Zahay, D. L., Thorbjørnsen, H., & Shavitt, S. (2008). Getting too personal: Reactance to highly personalized email solicitations. *Marketing Letters, 19*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-007-9027-9

Wilkins, S., Beckenuyte, C., & Butt, M. M. (2016). Consumers' behavioural intentions after experiencing deception or cognitive dissonance caused by deceptive packaging, package downsizing or slack filling. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-01-2014-0036

Xia, L., Monroe, K. B., & Cox, J. L. (2004). The price is unfair! A conceptual framework of price fairness perceptions. *Journal of Marketing, 68*(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.1.42733

Xiang, J., Pandelaere, M., & Todorovic, D. (2026). Economic inequality hinders consumers' access to peer-to-peer services. *Journal of Marketing*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429261417972

Xu, H. (F.), Bolton, L. E., & Winterich, K. P. (2021). How do consumers react to company moral transgressions? The role of power distance belief and empathy for victims. *Journal of Consumer Research, 48*(1), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaa067

Yang, L. W., Aggarwal, P., & McGill, A. L. (2019). The 3 C's of anthropomorphism: Connection, comprehension, and competition. *Consumer Psychology Review, 3*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/arcp.1054

Yi, S., Hardisty, D. J., Griffin, D. W., & Allard, T. (2026). Promotion architecture: A deal fairness model of restricted price promotions. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf066

Yoon, Y., Gürhan-Canli, Z., & Schwarz, N. (2006). The effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities on companies with bad reputations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16*(4), 377–390. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1604_9

Zane, D. M., Irwin, J. R., & Reczek, R. W. (2016). Do less ethical consumers denigrate more ethical consumers? The effect of willful ignorance on judgments of others. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 26*(3), 337–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2015.10.002

Zhang, Y., Winterich, K. P., & Mittal, V. (2010). Power distance belief and impulsive buying. *Journal of Marketing Research, 47*(5), 945–954. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.47.5.945