

Authors

Nava Ashraf

London School of Economics and Political Science

James Berry

Cornell University

Jesse Shapiro

Brown University

American Economic Review 100(December 2010): 2383–2400
<http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?id=10.1257/aer.100.3.2383>

Can Higher Prices Stimulate Product Use? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Zambia

By NAVA ASHRAF, JAMES BERRY, AND JESSE M. SHAPIRO*

The controversy over how much to charge for health products in the developing world rests, in part, on whether higher prices can increase use, either by targeting distribution to high-use households (a screening effect), or by stimulating use psychologically through a sunk-cost effect. We develop a methodology for separating these two effects. We implement the methodology in a field experiment in Zambia using door-to-door marketing of a home water purification solution. We find evidence of economically important screening effects. By contrast, we find no consistent evidence of sunk-cost effects. (JEL C93, D12, H11, M3, O12)

Nonprofit approaches to the distribution of health products in developing countries are often grouped into “social marketing” and “public health” categories, with the former emphasizing retail sales and the latter emphasizing free distribution through health clinics. Advocates of the public health approach often object to the use of prices to mediate distribution. Critics of pricing argue that “charging people for basic health care...[is] unfair,”¹ and that fees ensure that goods only reach “the richest of the poor.”² Advocates of pricing counter that “when products are given away free, the recipient often does not value them or even use them.”³

The latter argument is commonly interpreted to mean that higher prices cause greater product use through a *sunk-cost effect* (Richard Thaler 1980; Erik Eyster 2002). An equally plausible

* About: Harvard Business School, Baker Library 443, Boston, MA 02163 (e-mail: nashraf@hbs.edu); Berry: Department of Economics, Cornell University, 406 Ezra Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853 (e-mail: jmberry@cornell.edu); Shapiro: University of Chicago Booth School of Business, 5807 South Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637 (e-mail: jesse.shapiro@chicagobooth.edu). We are grateful to Guy Berke, Stephen Brülhauer, Dan Donahue, Ruth Eyal, Matthew Gertler, Jerry Green, Alkis Hadjikyriakou, Koen Klaesens, David Kishen, Larry Katz, Michael Kremer, Stephen Ladd, Steve Levitt, John Liu, Kevin M. Murphy, Shanes O’Donnell, Avi Pante, Matt Rognlie, Mark Rosenzweig, Peter Reiss, Michael Sheldene, Daniel Squire, and Michael Tait, and to Tom C. Thorngren, Jennifer Wadsworth, and seminar participants at the Harvard Business School, the University of Chicago, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the London School of Economics, the Paris-Jouyatha Sciences Économiques, the Institut d’Économie Industrielle, Toulouse, the UQAM/CIREQ Conference on Development Economics, Yale University, Washington University in St. Louis, and Princeton University for helpful comments and Rob Quirk at the Center for Disease Control for his guidance on the technical aspects of water testing and treatment. We wish to thank Steve Chapman, Research Director of Population Services International (PSI) for his support, and the Society for Family Health in Zambia for its support. This paper partially draws from our earlier work (Eyster, T. J. Nalepa, and J. M. Shapiro 2008). Rasa Milena, Maria Moporis, Nichola Sheldy, Bruce McMillan, and Shanes Carey de Brauwere, Marie-Hélène Cloutier provided outstanding assistance with our in-depth interviews on alternative uses of Chlorin, and Edney Jack provided numerous insights based on her field experience. Emily Guar provided invaluable in-depth interviews to learn more about alternative uses of Chlorin. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Division of Faculty Research and Development at Harvard Business School, the George and Otto Schucker Graduate Institute of Technology, and the National Research Faculty Fellowship at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

¹ Rose, Hilary. 2006. “Missing Out Patients in Four Countries.” *Spectre*, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, June 15, 2006. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100624165649/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Media-Room-Speeches-and-articles/2006-an-aid-Meeting-on-prisoners-in-prison-countries/>

² McNeil, Donald G., Jr. 2008. “A Program to Fight Malaria in Africa Drives Questions.” *New York Times*, June 11.

³ Population Services International (PSI). 2006. “What is Social Marketing?” http://www.psi.org/resource/pubs/what_is_social_marketing (accessed September 4, 2008).

Can Higher Prices Stimulate Product Use? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Zambia

The controversy over how much to charge for health products in the developing world rests, in part, on whether higher prices can increase use, either by targeting distribution to high-use households (a screening effect), or by stimulating use psychologically through a sunk-cost effect. We develop a methodology for separating these two effects. We implement the methodology in a field experiment in Zambia using door-to-door marketing of a home water

purification solution. We find evidence of economically important screening effects. By contrast, we find no consistent evidence of sunk-cost effects.

December 01, 2010