Reprisal, retribution and requital: Investigating customer retaliation
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Abstract

Customers, regardless of context or culture, will go to any extreme to retaliate against an offending service provider. Retaliation is an action taken in return for an injury or offense [Huefner, J.C. and H.K. Hunt, “Consumer retaliation as a response to dissatisfaction,” J Consum Satisf Dissatisfaction Complaining Behav, (2000); 13, 61–82.]. To date, research has had only a limited discussion of customer’s use of anti-consumption behaviors as an expression of retaliation. This study uses qualitative methods to demonstrate that the motivations for retaliation extend beyond simply “getting even,” customers retaliate to teach the service provider a lesson or to save others from the same fate. The research identifies specific roles taken by customers as they retaliate, the emotions of customers and store issues that are at the root of these behaviors. In addition, the authors categorize a range of retaliatory behaviors as follows: cost/loss; consumption prevention; voice, exit and betrayal; and boycotting.
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1. Introduction

One day in 1997, Richard Hatch rode to his local Wal-Mart at 7 a.m. to be the first in line to buy a new batch of Tamagotchis — a popular Japanese electronic “pet”. During the purchase he got into a shouting match with a Wal-Mart employee and as a result was banned from the store. In retaliation, Hatch hired a Web design expert and launched Walmartsucks.com, a site devoted to attacking this retailer. The site became a popular public forum for disgruntled Wal-Mart customers and employees. Wal-Mart was so threatened by the site that its attorneys sent a letter to Hatch threatening “necessary action” unless the site was taken down within 48 hours. Hatch ignored the threat and the complaint site has since been used by millions and featured in the popular press. The success of Walmartsucks.com has inspired other disgruntled shoppers, and sparked the creation of a variety of brand and retailer complaint websites (www.businessweek.com/).

While Hatch’s retaliation was motivated by revenge, some customers engage in retaliatory behaviors for more noble reasons such as protecting others from harm. For example, a group of disgruntled business people retaliated against a hotel, whose night clerk gave away their guaranteed room reservation. The group retaliated by drafting a scathing PowerPoint presentation about their experiences. The presentation outlined the inadequacies of the frontline staff and the cost of not addressing this problem to the hotel management. The group retaliated by drafting a scathing PowerPoint presentation about their experiences. The presentation outlined the inadequacies of the frontline staff and the cost of not addressing this problem to the hotel management. The group retaliated by drafting a scathing PowerPoint presentation about their experiences. The presentation outlined the inadequacies of the frontline staff and the cost of not addressing this problem to the hotel management. When the business people sent the presentation to hotel management they also forwarded it to friends and relatives so that they would be protected from a similar fate (http://www.hyperorg.com).

Revenge is profitable, gratitude is expensive. (Gibbon, 1776)
presentation was spread virally throughout the Internet and was featured in several national publications and news outlets. These sorts of incidences demonstrate the damage an angry customer can inflict, and the importance of having corporate reputation strategies that manage retaliation — specifically Internet complaint sites (Bailey, 2004).

Oftentimes scarcity prevents customers from ending their consumption practices; there are no alternatives, so they retaliate by making transactions difficult or costly. For example, a Brazilian man gained notoriety by retaliating against a store in Rio de Janeiro. Ernesto Do Couto waited in line for almost six hours to have his credit checked, only for it to be rejected. Mr. Couto then saved 32,052 coins over two years to pay for his next purchases at the shop. The transaction required 11 shop assistants and lasted three hours. After the incident Mr. Couto said “I spent two years putting all the coins together, it was a lot of work, but I feel that I’ve got my revenge now.” (http://www.int.iol.com.za).

Customers, regardless of context or culture, will go to extremes to exact their revenge. Acts of anti-consumption and the solicitation of social support are the key tools used in retaliation. This behavior is done by the withholding of consumption, the seeking of unlimited amounts of social support through negative word of mouth, and/or the creation of public displays of protest. These incidences also show that the motives for retaliation go beyond simply getting even.

Acts of customer retaliation are somewhat common. Customer/employee altercations comprise thirty percent of workplace violence incidents according to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (www.crimelibrary.com). The stories cited earlier illustrate that customer retaliation can be damaging; therefore, it represents a significant threat to service providers. Given that customer retaliation can result in significant material loss, psychological damage to employees, or a thrashing of brand image (Fullerton and Punj, 1997; p. 336), further examination of this relationship is warranted.

Retaliation typically occurs in response to a perceived injustice and is a way to restore one’s sense of justice (Murphy, 1993). Retaliation can be fueled by a customer’s lack of patience, dissatisfaction with a product or service, discourteous service from the provider, and/or mistakes or promises that are not kept (www.crimelibrary.com). While there has been some work on categorizing retaliatory behaviors, little is known about the motivations or cognitive processing that customers use to choose a particular behavior.

Huefner and Hunt (2000) identify six categories for customer retaliation as a response to a dissatisfying service experience - cost/loss, vandalism, trashing, stealing, negative word of mouth, and personal attack (see Table 1).

The current research builds upon this prior work by looking at situational and emotional antecedents of retaliation and how these precursors affect the types of retaliatory behavior used by customers against service providers. This research will ultimately guide service providers to better anticipate and diminish either the occurrence, or the severity, of customer’s retaliatory behaviors, in addition to calling on researchers to expand the range of emotions, behaviors, and intent considered when developing anti-consumption theory.

2. Retaliatory behavior

Retaliation is “an action taken in return for an injury or offense” (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000), while a retaliatory customer is one who works to get even with a service or retail provider. Retaliation is studied in a variety of disciplines and contexts including strategy and management (Kuester et al., 1999) where the research shows that it is a common occurrence. However, some researchers incorrectly
classify retaliation as a set of dysfunctional customer behaviors which are driven by mental illness, opportunism, and thrill-seeking (Fullerton and Punj, 1997).

Retaliation is not an impulsive act; rather, it is often the outcome of cognitive processing (Beugré, 2005). The first step in the process of retaliation is when customers perceive that a service provider’s action is harmful or wrong (Aquino et al., 2001). Next, customers assign blame to the service provider (Aquino et al., 2001; Beugré, 2005) which triggers the customer’s anger and rage, thereby increasing the likelihood of retaliation (Allred, 1999). The final step is determining the type of action to take and who will be the target of that action (Aquino et al., 2001; Beugré, 2005). While we know what sort of incidences trigger retaliatory behavior, theory has yet to uncover how customers’ cognitive processes lead them to select particular acts of retaliation. Therefore, the authors use three research questions (RQ) as a framework for qualitative study:

RQ1 What are the retaliatory behaviors customers engage in when a service experience is perceived as being injurious?

RQ2 What are the motivations for customer retaliatory behavior?

RQ3 What are the consequences and outcomes for customer retaliatory behaviors?

3. Methodology

The authors utilized a grounded theory approach in the data collection phase (Glaser and Strauss, 1997) in order to uncover relevant conditions, responses of actors to these conditions and the consequences of the actor’s response (Corbin and Strauss, 1990). Through open interviews the research uncovers the patterns of behavior and motivations that believe retaliation (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Multiple data collection methods are used in three separate studies in order to triangulate and identify common themes.

3.1. Study one

In the first study, the authors conducted fifteen in-depth interviews with customers who confessed to retaliating against a service provider. Using a loosely structured interview guide the researchers asked respondents to recount a time when they retaliated against a service provider. Probing questions uncovered the reasoning process and intended outcomes that preceded the retaliatory act. The intent of this approach was to elicit inductive information from the respondents. The project’s three primary researchers coded the interview transcripts separately and identified key themes which were then used to develop a questionnaire for study two.

3.2. Study two

Seventy-five students from a large southeastern university were asked to complete a questionnaire, which contained a series of open-ended questions. The questionnaire asked each respondent to detail incidences of retaliatory behavior. The students received extra credit in exchange for their participation.

3.3. Study three

The authors used the findings from studies 1 and 2 to develop the final draft of the questionnaire used in study three (Appendix B). Interviewers were chosen from an upper-level marketing class and were trained on data collection techniques. To minimize bias, the interviewers were not aware of the intent of the research, and were instructed to recruit and administer written questionnaires to two known acquaintances. The interviewer’s prior relationship with the respondent was used in order to address any social desirability concerns (i.e. perceptions that the explanation or identification of retaliatory behaviors may reflect poorly on the respondent as a person). Interviewers received extra course credit for their efforts.

Three hundred surveys were collected. The validity of the questionnaire responses was gauged through peer debriefings (Belk et al., 1988) and a small follow-up investigation (Elliott et al., 1999). Conducted by the primary researchers, the follow-up interviews that questioned and confirmed various aspects of respondents’ answers were conducted using a random sample of 10% of the respondents. Three judges coded the written responses to the questionnaire with an inter-rater reliability of over 95%. Discussions resolved the differences in coding, thereby allowing the findings reported to reflect a consensus of the three reviewers (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

Although separate guidelines were used to obtain information from subjects during study two and three, the identified themes and codes were similar enough to be presented together in the discussion and findings sections. The demographics of the final respondent sample show that 45% of respondents are male and 80% are college educated. The age range for respondents was 18–65 with the average age being 22 years.

4. Qualitative research findings

4.1. Retaliatory behaviors customers engage in (RQ1)

The authors categorized the ranges of retaliatory behaviors as cost/loss, aggression and power, consumption prevention, voice, exit and betrayal, and boycotting (see Fig. 1).

Cost/loss — when customers interact with a service provider they are more sensitive to losses incurred than they are to the benefits of interaction (Bolton, 1998). When interviewing the subjects about retaliation, the incidents that prompted retaliation involved a loss. The losses were of three types — financial, social or time. Financial loss is any loss of money or value. Social loss is a perceived loss of dignity or respect during the transaction. Loss of time occurs when the transaction with the service provider takes longer than anticipated. A sense of loss is significant in determining retaliatory behaviors.

Prior studies on retaliation only focus on the specific costs and losses that service providers incur from retaliatory
behaviors such as trashing, vandalism, theft, and personal attack (Huefner and Hunt, 2000). The current study finds that a cost/loss experience by customers is mirrored back to the service provider in the customers’ retaliatory behaviors. For example, when a customer purchases a defective product they suffer both financial and time losses. If a customer retaliates to such losses, he or she will consciously choose a behavior that will cost the service provider money and time, such as trashing or vandalizing the service provider’s facility.

“After a long hard day, I pulled into a fast food restaurant to order dinner. I tried to place my order but I was asked to hold—even though there was no one else in the drive-thru. I was slightly annoyed. After waiting a long time, I got to place my order but they didn’t have what I really wanted. After I got home, which was ten minutes away; I realized my order was wrong—now I am furious. So, I go back to the restaurant. You would think after all the hassle they would be willing to do whatever it took to satisfy me. But the manager refused to correct my order and refund my money. So I refused to move. I put my car in park and demanded satisfaction. Then the manager said he was calling the police. Then I just took my food inside the place and dumped it all out onto their cleanly mopped floor.” (Male, 23)

Aggression and power — when customers have a negative interaction with a service provider, issues of power and status become more salient to them (Kim et al., 1998). Baron and Neuman (1996) argue that aggression takes one of three forms — expressions of hostility, obstructionism, or overt hostility. Expressions of hostility occur most often and include behaviors that are verbal or symbolic in nature (e.g., cursing, shouting, or giving dirty looks to a service provider). Obstructionism includes passive acts committed with the intent of impeding the organization’s goals and objectives (e.g., blocking the lines, paying with pennies). Overt hostility involves actions that constitute an actual physical assault, sabotage, or theft. The subjects in this study expressed all three types of aggression.

“I was at Wendy’s in line deciding what to order. I don’t know what happened but the girl taking orders went ahead and took the person’s order that was standing behind me. When I told her I was next she was rude and also gave me the wrong drink.” (Male, 28)

Confirming the previous explanation of aggression, the consumer went on to react in a strongly aggressive manner.

“I was furious and while I was eating I thought of an idea. I went into the restroom and poured soup all over the place and rolled the room with all the toilet paper. I made it as dirty as I could. I had my fun and never went there again.” (Male, 28)

The planning of an event shows that retaliatory behaviors are the result of a deliberate cognitive process and not an impulsive act. However, even when an audience is not present, obstructionism often guides the retaliatory act. Customers know that profit is a key goal of an organization, so they choose behaviors that may impede that goal.

“One day me and my fiancé went into Subway. He had told me about a bad experience that he had there so we decided that we were going to get even with Subway for their behavior. I ordered a foot long BLT loaded. I had tomatoes, onions, lettuce, pickles, banana peppers, olives, and vinegar, oil, and salt and pepper. Then my fiancé ordered a tuna salad and a six inch club. He got the works also. After the man finished making his sandwich he ran us up. I began looking into my purse as if I was going to pay and then I started acting like I had left my money at the house. My fiancé started fussing at me and told the man we would be right back. The man got very upset and told us that next time we come to make sure that we had money. It made us feel great inside.” (Female, 26)

“About five years ago I went to rent a steam cleaner for my home. When I got to the store I decided to buy one for $350. When I made it home it didn’t work. So, I took it back to trade it for another but they wouldn’t take it back. So I decided to leave the store come again later rent another steam cleaner and take all the good usable parts off of it and put them on mine and take the other one back to them with all the broken parts.” (Female, 32)

“I purchased some meat at a grocery store and when I opened it I found it was spoiled (really smelled). I really hate taking things back and when I arrived back [at] the grocery [I] just left it opened and put it the outside trash can nearest the front door.” (Male, 48).

While aggression/power and cost/loss guide the type of retaliatory behavior, the ranges of behaviors customers display

| Table 1 Huefner and Hunt (2000) retaliatory behaviors |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Retaliatory behavior | Definition |
| Cost/loss | A specific effort to cost the store money by creating extra work, spoiling products, placing false orders, etc. (p. 65) |
| Vandalism | The destruction or damage of something in order to “get back” at the business (p. 65) |
| Trashing | Making a mess by either dumping clothes or products on the floor, or making a mess in a restaurant (p. 66) |
| Stealing | Taking a product without paying for it in order to “get back” at the business, not just to obtain the product for nothing (p. 66) |
| Negative word of mouth | Telling others of one’s dissatisfactory experience (or some exaggerated version) with the intent to hurt the business. Stories do not represent mere warnings to others, the intent had to be clearly one to hurt the business (p. 67) |
| Personal attack | A specific effort to in some way hurt the salesperson or manager either through abusive language, negative feedback to supervisors, or physical aggression (p. 67) |
in the marketplace fall into the following categories: consumption prevention, voice, exit, betrayal, and boycotting. 

Consumption prevention — preventing consumption by other customers is another form of obstructionism that customers use to retaliate. This category of retaliatory behaviors, while it includes word of mouth, is much broader than the word of mouth category used by Huefner and Hunt (2000). Negative word of mouth is restricted to verbal or text communication with the intent of dissuading customers from making a purchase (Huefner and Hunt, 2000). The retaliation stories found in the current research indicates that word of mouth is only one of many tools that customers will use to prevent consumption by others.

“I was very upset when I purchased a laptop from CompUSA. They wanted the money more than customer satisfaction. The only thing I did to get back at them is to tell people not to go there. I work in the computer department at BestBuy so when I tell people and my friends not to go to CompUSA it does have an impact on them.” (Male, 22)

“The salesperson didn’t apologize and that made me very upset. After I left the department I came back and moved around a couple of folded items to other sections of the department store.” (Female, 32)

Voice, exit and betrayal — the majority of subjects chose retaliatory behaviors that correspond with dissatisfied customer behavior (e.g. exit and voice; Hirschman, 1970). Retaliating by either complaining or ending their relationship with the store led many customers to feel vindicated. However, for some, the retaliation did not stop at that point. Instead, respondents indicate that an open announcement to the offending firms’ competitors regarding their choice to switch providers can be used as a form of protest. Some felt that this act of protest demonstrates to the offending firm the depth of their dissatisfaction.

“I went to the company’s biggest competitor to shop instead — and I made sure they (the offending firm) knew why I was choosing them. I made a big point of indicating why I switched!”(Female, 26)

“Once, when I had horrible service at a place, I stood outside of the restaurant and told other customers not to go in.” (Male, 21)

Boycotting — customers may choose to endure personal hardships in retaliating by boycotting or slowing their purchasing frequency. Boycotting is employed even when the particular product or service offering is scarce. While customers appear to know that the gesture is largely insignificant, it is a way to give voice to their dissatisfaction.

“I just didn’t shop there for a long time. Eventually I knew I would have to go back, but they had to do without my business for a long time. It was a small thing to do probably, but it was my way of showing them how I felt about the situation.”(Female, 31)

4.2. The motivations for customer retaliatory behavior (RQ2)

Knowing what people do to retaliate is only part of the story; the motivations for retaliation are also important to the current research. In general, the trigger for retaliation is the perception of injustice or lack of fairness. Fairness is judged across three domains of justice — distributive, procedural, and interactional (Tax et al., 1998). Distributive justice concerns the fairness of the outcomes; procedural justice is the fairness of the service provider’s policy and its application; and interactional justice is an assessment of the interpersonal aspect of the service provider’s treatment (Tax et al., 1998). The findings suggest that customers perceive an injustice when they feel that their time, money, business and/or feelings are disregarded or are considered unimportant by the offending firm. Time and money represent an investment in the outcome of the service experience, while garnering respect is consistent with evaluations of interactional justice. Sights in interactional justice are most likely to elicit a retaliatory response. Multiple offenses against the customer by a provider also significantly increase the likelihood that the customer will retaliate.

“It wasn’t just one thing — they wouldn’t refund my money, they were condescending in front of other people in the store which made me feel stupid, and they didn’t care at all. They didn’t do a single thing right.” (Female, 40)

Although a wide range of service and product failures are reported by the respondents, the most common source or issue that sparks retaliation is lack of interactional justice. Apparently, poor or antagonistic service recovery behaviors incite a customer’s need to retaliate. When a customer is ignored or denied a voice, the inclination is to retaliate. This is consistent with other research which demonstrates that injustice or slights in interpersonal interactions are most often at the root of retaliatory behaviors (Greenberg and Alge, 1998).

“The sales representative simply wouldn’t listen to me. They didn’t care so why should I care about them or the store? I felt so angry — I just wanted to fight!”(Male, 29).

The interviews did not highlight or uncover any issues relative to procedural justice — customers either were not aware of the service provider’s policy regarding complaint handling or the policy was not salient. Previous studies show that when individuals are aware that organizations have policies in place to handle offended customers, the likelihood of retaliation decreases (Aquino et al., 2006).

4.3. Roles of retaliation

When the researchers asked about the reasons for retaliation, respondents suggest three primary motivations — the need to
Poor service

Avenger — customers assume the role of avenger when they want to teach the service provider a lesson. A key predictor of whether an individual will become an avenger is the customer’s perceived power or status within the transaction. When a person feels she or he is lower in status than the offending service provider, there is a fear of counter-measures and she or he is less likely to retaliate. For example, customers often refuse to complain or return an unsatisfactory meal for fear that the service staff will sabotage the food when it is returned (Kim et al., 1998). Avenging customers may think that an aggressive response is necessary to punish or teach the service provider a lesson about social deference.

“Sometimes you just feel like you have to teach them a lesson — that they can’t just act like that, they have to be shown or they don’t get it.” (Male, 33)

“I felt like a crusader against a large company ripping people off.” (Female, 20)

Approximately 34% of the reported retaliations were altruistically motivated. Similar to the avenger demographics, most altruistically-motivated retaliations are committed by men (84%). The findings also indicate that the exchange between frontline employees and customers incite most of the altruistically motivated retaliatory behaviors with 33% attributed to poor service and 19% to rude service.

Victim — victim motivated retaliation occurs when customers feel that they have no power over the service provider’s current or future behaviors. These customers perceive that any action they take will be insignificant and will not change the situation. They have a low sense of self-efficacy, and when self-efficacy is low, defending the little status you possess can become a powerful source of motivation (Aquino and Douglass, 2003). Therefore, those who are motivated to retaliate because they feel threatened tend to, admittedly, over-react in their retaliatory efforts.

Respondents who feel victimized described a variety of emotions such as feeling cheated, unimportant, offended, and unappreciated. Feeling victimized by a firm drives most of these respondents to turn the tables on the firm — so instead of feeling victimized, the customer feels vindicated.

“Sometimes you just feel like you have to teach them a lesson — that they can’t just act like that, they have to be shown or they don’t get it.” (Male, 33)

“I felt like a crusader against a large company ripping people off.” (Female, 20)

About 20% of the retaliatory acts in the data result from an avenger motivation. Roughly 86% of all the avenger-motivated retaliations were from men. Results from a meta-analysis of social–psychological research is consistent with this finding in that it shows how women’s status in society is lower relative to men (Ridgeway and Diekema, 1989). Given the effects of societal conditioning, women will be less likely to feel their status was high enough to avenge an offending service provider.

Altruist — the altruist motivation comes from an urge to take action on behalf of others. According to Aquino, Bies, and Tripp (2006), altruists perceive that they have a higher status position than others. Therefore, altruists will use retaliatory behaviors as a means to protect others from service providers’ unjust actions.

“Sometimes you just feel like you have to teach them a lesson — that they can’t just act like that, they have to be shown or they don’t get it.” (Male, 33)

“I felt like a crusader against a large company ripping people off.” (Female, 20)

About 20% of the retaliatory acts in the data result from an avenger motivation. Roughly 86% of all the avenger-motivated retaliations were from men. Results from a meta-analysis of social–psychological research is consistent with this finding in that it shows how women’s status in society is lower relative to men (Ridgeway and Diekema, 1989). Given the effects of societal conditioning, women will be less likely to feel their status was high enough to avenge an offending service provider.

Altruist — the altruist motivation comes from an urge to take action on behalf of others. According to Aquino, Bies, and Tripp (2006), altruists perceive that they have a higher status position than others. Therefore, altruists will use retaliatory behaviors as a means to protect others from service providers’ unjust actions.

“I guess I feel like I’m helping to prevent the same thing from happening to other people. It’s already been done to me, but maybe I can change things at the company before it happens to somebody else.” (Male, 29)

“It’s not so much about getting even rather about making sure the same thing doesn’t happen to other people.” (Female, 20)

Approximately 34% of the reported retaliations were altruistically motivated. Similar to the avenger demographics, most altruistically-motivated retaliations are committed by men (84%). The findings also indicate that the exchange between frontline employees and customers incite most of the altruistically motivated retaliatory behaviors with 33% attributed to poor service and 19% to rude service.

Victim — victim motivated retaliation occurs when customers feel that they have no power over the service provider’s current or future behaviors. These customers perceive that any action they take will be insignificant and will not change the situation. They have a low sense of self-efficacy, and when self-efficacy is low, defending the little status you possess can become a powerful source of motivation (Aquino and Douglass, 2003). Therefore, those who are motivated to retaliate because they feel threatened tend to, admittedly, over-react in their retaliatory efforts.

Respondents who feel victimized described a variety of emotions such as feeling cheated, unimportant, offended, and unappreciated. Feeling victimized by a firm drives most of these respondents to turn the tables on the firm — so instead of feeling victimized, the customer feels vindicated.

“I guess I feel like I’m helping to prevent the same thing from happening to other people. It’s already been done to me, but maybe I can change things at the company before it happens to somebody else.” (Male, 29)

“It’s not so much about getting even rather about making sure the same thing doesn’t happen to other people.” (Female, 20)

Approximately 34% of the reported retaliations were altruistically motivated. Similar to the avenger demographics, most altruistically-motivated retaliations are committed by men (84%). The findings also indicate that the exchange between frontline employees and customers incite most of the altruistically motivated retaliatory behaviors with 33% attributed to poor service and 19% to rude service.
that prior to engaging in retaliatory behaviors, they experienced feelings of outrage including anger, frustration, annoyance, and dislike. There were also other feelings related to victimization such as helplessness, feeling robbed or cheated, and insignificance.

“I was extremely angry and upset. I felt helpless, like it didn’t matter to them that I was unhappy with my service.” (Male, 32)

“Mostly I just felt offended that the store did not care more about their customers.” (Female, 29)

4.4. The consequences and outcomes of customer retaliatory behavior (RQ3)

Retaliatory behaviors spark conflicting emotions such that customers may be satisfied that they made their point, but resentful because the service failure required them to use behaviors that are inconsistent with their self-image.

“At the time it makes you feel great but afterward there are always some hard feelings because I am not a person who likes to get even.” (Female, 22)

The positive emotional side of retaliation seems to come from a feeling of satisfaction or vindication, the negative emotions experienced are based on either resentment towards the offending firm, or regret the consumer feels over having to engage in retaliatory behaviors. Despite the mixture of emotions, most respondents feel that retaliatory behaviors restore a sense of equity and, consequently, the customers report feeling satisfied. Similarly, respondents identify feeling justified in their actions.

“If a firm does not feel bad about treating their customers wrong, I will not feel bad about getting them back.” (Male, 42)

“Getting even does not make me feel all warm and fuzzy inside it just gives me satisfaction to get my point across.” (Male, 30)

5. Conclusions and future research

Customer retaliation is a deliberate response to unfair treatment and can have a detrimental effect on company goals. The stories/data of retaliation described in this research show that customers often use the ways in which they consume as a tool for retaliation. Customers will not just stop or slow their own consumption practices through boycotting, they will also engage in preventive consumption (i.e. actively preventing or impeding other customers from consuming a targeted product or service). Companies can avoid acts of retaliation if interactional justice is maintained throughout the front-line employee customer interface. Additionally, service providers should establish and communicate their procedures for managing key contact employees who provide poor customer service. Customers are less likely to engage in retaliatory behavior if they feel mechanisms are in place to punish offending employees (Aquino et al., 2006).

Technology and the increasing competitiveness of the marketplace will further empower customers in the marketplace. More choices in service providers, purchasing power, and access to increasing amounts of social support will increase the possibility and range of customer retaliatory behaviors. Technology, particularly customer’s access to the Internet, heightens the importance of researching the use of preventive consumption as a form of retaliation. Also, retaliation studied here was restricted to a brick and mortar context. Future work can look at how retaliation and anti-consumption behaviors manifest in computer mediated contexts.

Most important to the field of anti-consumption however, are the findings which indicate that retaliation is deliberate and that customers often enact one of three roles when retaliating: avenger, altruist, or victim. Future research may wish to investigate how individual differences or contextual factors affect which roles customers adopt when retaliating.

Appendix A. Qualitative interview guide

All of us have experienced some dissatisfactory buying experiences at one time or another. Please help us to better understand this behavior by describing a situation in which you may have acted out against a firm for some reason. Tell us about a time when you may have retaliated.

1. Describe for me the event you are thinking about including what happened with the firm and how you reacted.

Can you think of other behaviors someone might engage in order to get even with a firm?

2. Have you ever experienced other negative/dissatisfactory buying experiences that upset you so much you considered or even decided to “get even” with the offending firm?

Please tell me about it? — When, where, how long ago was this?

3. How did the negative buying experience make you feel?

5. Did you try other ways to address this situation before trying to get even with the firm?

If not, why not?

If yes, what did you do and what happened?

6. How do you feel about the offending firm now?

7. What type of relationship did you have with the firm prior to this experience?

8. Please list any other ways you have tried to get even with firms?

9. How did those forms of “getting even” make you feel?

10. Demographic Information.

a. Age:
b. Sex:
c. Race:
d. Occupation:
e. Education level:
f. Income level:
Appendix A. Model of retaliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation for Retaliation</th>
<th>Roles of Retaliation</th>
<th>Behaviors of Retaliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product failure</td>
<td>Avenger</td>
<td>Cost/Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational: waiting, crowds, etc.</td>
<td>Altruist</td>
<td>Boycott and Purchasing slow down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service recovery failure</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Exit, Voice and Betrayal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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