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The day after Thanksgiving in the U.S. is called Black Friday (BF) and serves as the traditional start to the holiday shopping season (Shay, 2015). BF represents a unique consumption ritual that blends traditional shopping for better deals with holiday rituals for social relations (Thomas and Peters, 2011). Known for deep discounts (e.g., doorbusters), BF shopping manifests adventure, competition and urgency around getting great deals. With doorbuster deals and festive shopping environments on BF, many families in the U.S. have come to enjoy BF as one of the popular social activities during the Thanksgiving holidays (Thomas and Peters, 2011). Although online shopping on BF outpaced instore shopping in 2016 (Wahba, 2016), BF is still important (David, 2016) for several reasons: it is one of the most important shopping days for malls and stores, it is the biggest sales day of the Thanksgiving weekend, and more people shop on BF than any other day during Thanksgiving week (Halkias, 2016). Although Cyber Monday is gaining popularity, BF shopping continues to be popular because of an abundance of doorbuster deals, instant gratification, and the benefit of social shopping (VerHaar, 2015). Some shoppers are loyal to BF and anticipate having fun shopping on BF while getting doorbuster deals (Sander, 2013).

The popularity of BF is not limited to the U.S. Several countries have adopted BF (e.g., U.K., Canada, South Africa, and South Korea) or created another big shopping day inspired by BF (e.g., China and Mexico). The U.K. adopted BF in 2011 (Silverman and Sawer, 2014). Following U.S. BF retail business models, both Sainsbury’s and Tesco embraced not only deep discounts, but also early openings on BF (Munbodh, 2015). Canadian retailers began to offer BF sales to stem the tide of Canadians shopping U.S. stores.
on BF (Harris, 2016). South Africa introduced Black Friday in 2014 with staggering discounts and consumer frenzy (Chutel and Kazeem, 2016). In South Korea, retail businesses embraced U.S.-inspired BF in order to boost consumer markets (Park, 2014). Thus, the popularity of BF shopping has had a profound impact on the global consumer culture.

Despite its considerable impact on the global consumer culture, BF shopping has received somewhat limited scholarly attention (Lennon et al., 2011; Lennon et al., 2014; Swilley and Goldsmith, 2013; Thomas and Peters, 2011). Thomas and Peters found that BF shopping was a new consumption ritual for generations of (mostly female) family members and close friends. Some BF shoppers reported the competitive shopping environment on BF was fun and exciting, similar to a game show or a great race. In their research on BF shopping and Cyber Monday shopping, Swilley and Goldsmith found that consumers enjoyed socializing with others when shopping on BF and also enjoyed the inviting atmospherics (i.e., holiday decorations). Motivated by media headlines about casualties on BF and growing public concerns about safety, some researchers investigated factors leading to consumer misbehavior on BF; they found that BF shoppers’ effort involved in BF planning and perceptions of inequity resulting from unpleasant fellow shoppers led to BF consumer misbehavior (Lennon et al., 2011; Lennon et al., 2014).

Building onto extant research in the context of BF, this study aims to determine antecedents and consequences of consumer emotion experienced on BF. Popular press accounts of BF shopping often reference emotion in the context of BF shopping. For example, the NY Times reported consumers’ frustration and anger at merchants who advertise doorbusters, but stock few advertised items (Barbaro, 2006). Other popular press
accounts also highlight emotional shoppers, calling BF shoppers frantic, frenzied, upset, frustrated, angry, and crazy (Carr, 2008; Chutel and Kazeem, 2016; Dahlgren, 2011). U.K. shoppers have also been termed excited and angry on BF (Glanfield et al., 2014). BF shoppers are also described as thrilled and festive. Some BF shoppers were found to enjoy arousal as a result of the intense competition and the thrill of the hunt for great deals (Thomas and Peters, 2011).

Despite frequent association with both negative and positive emotion in the context of BF, empirical research is lacking to fully understand consumer emotions on BF; about what triggers various emotions (antecedents) and what role emotions evoked during BF shopping play in consumer evaluation of their shopping experience on BF (consequence). Evaluation of the BF shopping experience is important due to its likely impact on consumer decision-making. Consumer evaluation reflects a personal assessment of the value consumers perceive from shopping on BF (Knutson et al., 2006). Prior research has supported the significant role of emotion on evaluations of store image and decision satisfaction in a retail context (Kim and Lennon, 2011).

Addressing existing gaps in literature, both the antecedents and consequence of consumer emotions on BF are investigated. Drawing on psychological theories (General Aggression Model, Schema theory and Discrepancy-evaluation theory of emotion), both situational (e.g., goal blockage/attainment) and personal (e.g., prior BF experience and expectations about BF) factors as antecedents to emotions experienced on BF were tested. Consumer evaluation of BF as a consequence of consumer emotion experienced on BF was further examined. The findings offer practical implications for retailers, suggesting
management strategies to evoke emotions that would positively impact consumers’
evaluation of their BF shopping experience. Additionally, the findings further offer
implications for consumers about how to manage BF shopping for consumer well-being.

Literature Review

Antecedents to Emotion

Simpson et al. (2011) reported that shoppers displayed both positive and negative emotions
on BF but did not identify specific factors evoking those emotions. Anderson and Bushman
(2002) suggested that behavioral responses are influenced by both situational (context) and
personal variables, and the influence is mediated in part by affective variables. It was
postulated that both a situational variable (goal blockage/attainment) and personal factors
(prior BF experience and expectations about BF) are antecedents to emotions experienced on
BF.

Situational factors

Drawing on the General Aggression Model or GAM (Anderson and Bushman, 2002),
whether or not goals are blocked/attained is a situational factor that gives rise to consumer
emotions on BF. According to the GAM, knowledge structures or schema are developed
through experience, are linked to emotion, and guide behavioral responses. Goal blockage is
common on BF (Barbaro, 2006) either from stockouts or from promotional restrictions (e.g.,
barring consumers from receiving a discount if they have not made their purchase by the
deadline). Goals are also blocked in other ways on BF. Consumers in a rush to get to another
store are often forced to wait in long lines to get into the stores and again to make a purchase;
their goals are blocked when other shoppers cut ahead of them in line. When goals are
blocked, shoppers are likely to experience negative emotion. At other times, BF shoppers experience goal attainment, which may result in positive emotion when they get doorbuster deals.

Prior research in a retailing context offers empirical evidence that supports a relationship between goal blockage and negative emotion (Kalamas et al., 2008; Kim and Lennon, 2011). Kalamas et al. investigated negative affective reactions to a firm’s service failures. In one manipulation the goal to obtain reimbursement for damaged clothing was blocked when reimbursement was refused. Exposure to this manipulation evoked more anger in research participants than exposure to a neutral situation. In Kim and Lennon’s research, the goal to purchase a garment was blocked via stockouts, which evoked negative emotions. In addition, participants exposed to two stockouts experienced significantly more negative emotion as compared to participants exposed to only one stockout. On the flip side, if shoppers experience goal attainment (e.g., getting reimbursed for damaged goods, getting doorbuster deals) rather than goal blockage, it is reasonable to expect they will experience positive emotion. In fact, in two studies Schindler (1998) found that consumers who receive discounts experience positive emotion as a result. Thus, the following hypothesis was developed.

H1: BF Goal blockage (attainment) evokes negative (positive) emotions on BF.

**Personal factors.** Drawing on Schema theory (Wyer, 1980) and the Discrepancy-evaluation theory of emotion (Mandler, 1984), we anticipate that BF expectations shaped by prior BF experience set the stage for emotions to occur. Schema theory (Wyer, 1980) explains what shapes expectations. A schema is an organized mental knowledge structure
abstracted from experience about people and events. We form expectations based on past experience and knowledge of a specific type of product, service, or event (Wyer, 1980). Event schemas describe typical sequences of behaviors in various contexts (Abelson, 1981). In a shopping context, people develop a shopping schema based on prior experience. Applied to a BF context, event schemas on BF are likely to include the sequence of events surrounding doorbuster deals and be formed based on past BF shopping experience and/or learning via media promotions. BF shoppers who have successfully secured doorbuster deals in the past are likely to expect to attain doorbuster deals in the future. Since schemas are formed based on experience and schemas guide expectations, then experience shapes expectations.

In a general retail context, Hou, Wu, and Hu (2013) found that experience with a retailer was positively related to patronage intent. This finding may imply that a positive (negative) experience with a retailer shaped an expectation for future positive (negative) experiences with that retailer. These ideas are consistent with Wood and Moreau’s research (2006) in which product experience shaped expectations. Thus, it is reasonable to expect a positive relationship between BF experience and expectations for BF shopping. Therefore, the following hypothesis was developed.

H2: Consumers’ prior BF shopping experience is positively related to their expectations about BF.

Expectations are associated with emotion (Dizén and Berenbaum, 2008; Mandler, 1984). Mandler, in his Discrepancy-evaluation theory of emotion, explained that discrepancies between what consumers expect and what they experience evoke emotions.
According to consumer satisfaction theories (Oliver, 1993), discrepancies between consumers’ expectations for a product, service, or event and their evaluations of the product, service, or event determine consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In turn, the subsequent satisfaction or dissatisfaction can lead to positive or negative emotions. In support of these relationships, Wood and Moreau (2006) found that disconfirmation of expectations evoked both positive and negative emotions.

In the context of BF, consumers may have different levels of expectations about BF based on their prior experience, and their expectations about BF are likely to determine their emotional reaction to BF goal blockage or attainment. When expectations are not met, consumers are likely to experience negative emotion. The intensity of negative emotion is likely to be highly influenced by expectations. With high expectations for getting doorbuster deals, a consumer may experience intense negative emotion such as anger, whereas someone with low expectations may experience milder negative emotion such as disappointment. Similarly, emotion evoked when getting doorbuster deals is also influenced by the consumers’ BF expectations. Based on this rationale and previous research findings, the following hypothesis was developed.

H3: Expectations about BF are positively related to emotional reactions to BF goal blockage/attainment.

Consumer Emotion and BF Evaluation

Various emotions such as frustration, anger, upset, thrill, motivation, and excitement that consumers experience on BF have been reported in popular press articles (Barbaro, 2006; Carr, 2008; Dahlgren, 2011; Glanfield et al., 2014; Pekala, 2012). In addition, researchers...
have observed shoppers displaying both positive and negative emotions on BF (Simpson et al., 2011). Positive emotions observed were excitement and happiness, whereas observed negative emotions included anger, anxiety, belligerence, disgust, distress, irritability, sadness, and tension.

Positive emotion has a significant positive effect on behavioral intent in both online (Lee and Thorson, 2009) and offline retail environments (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982). Wood and Moreau (2006) found that both positive and negative emotion affect evaluation in the context of innovative products. Focusing only on the effect of negative emotion on evaluations, Kalamas et al. (2008) found that anger evoked when reimbursement for damaged clothing was denied was significantly related to evaluations of the service experience resulting in dissatisfaction and perceived unfairness. In Kim and Lennon’s (2011) research the negative emotion evoked by stockouts negatively influenced evaluations of store image and decision satisfaction. Based on this rationale, the following hypothesis was developed.

H4: Consumers’ emotions on BF are positively related to their evaluation of BF shopping experience.

Method

BF Shopping Scenario Stimuli

Three BF shopping scenario manipulations reflecting common goal blockage/attainment situations on BF were adopted from previous research (Lennon, Kim, Lee, & Johnson, 2017). Originally developed from popular press reports (Barbaro, 2006) and class discussions, scenarios included two types of goal blockage often experienced during BF shopping and a
typical BF doorbuster deal (goal attainment) (See Table 1 for all scenarios). In two conditions the BF shopper was unable to purchase advertised items either due to a stockout (Stockout) or to a promotional restriction (Wait in Line). In the third condition the shopper was able to purchase advertised items at promotional prices (Doorbuster). A manipulation check of the three shopping scenarios was successful (see Lennon et al., 2017).

Table 1. Experimental Manipulations

| Text common to all three scenarios | On Black Friday you leave the house at around 3 a.m. to get in line at one of your favorite retailers. You read in the Thanksgiving Day advertisements that this retailer is offering 50% off their apparel. You are interested in getting cashmere sweaters for several of your family members. For their door buster special, you get an additional 20% off if you purchase before 7 a.m. This means you can afford to get everyone that you want a very nice gift this holiday season. You arrive at the mall at 4 a.m. and begin standing in line. At the time the doors open at 5 a.m., you estimate that there are probably at least 250 people standing in line waiting to get in. The doors open.

| Wait in Line | You find the merchandise you want to purchase and begin waiting in a very long line. The line moves very slowly. You are getting tired holding your merchandise and standing in line. The retailer has only six checkouts and some people are bringing armfuls of merchandise to the service area. By 7:05 am, you still have not reached the cashier. You are told that you will not receive the door buster special discount on your merchandise because it is now after 7.

| Stockout | You move as quickly as possible to the area of the store where the sweaters are located. You see others already in line with cashmere sweaters. However, when you reach the sweater area, you find the tables empty. At 5:10 a.m. after waiting in line for an hour to get into the store, you find an associate who tells you that the cashmere sweaters are all sold out and no rain checks will be issued.

| Doorbuster | You find the merchandise you want to purchase and begin waiting in a very long line. The line moves very slowly. You are getting tired holding your merchandise and standing in line. The retailer has only six checkouts and some people are bringing armfuls of merchandise to the service area. By 6:55 a.m., you make it to the cashier. You receive the door buster special discount and are able to get everything you wanted at 70% off of the regular retail price. |
Pretest

A pretest was conducted to establish content validity of emotion items selected for the study and test the relationship between the three scenarios and emotional responses. Student volunteers \((n = 99)\) were solicited from classes and were from the same general pool as those in the main study. After reading one of the three BF shopping scenarios, respondents completed a series of Likert items. Emotion was measured with 87 seven-point items from the research literature that were applicable to a BF shopping context (Burns and Neisner, 2006; Dizén and Berenbaum, 2008; Kim and Lennon, 2011; Richins, 1997; Schimmack and Diener, 1997; Shaver et al., 1987). Participants were instructed to rate the extent to which they experienced each emotion after reading their assigned BF scenario using 7-point scales (extremely strongly/not at all). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) yielded two emotion factors (positive, negative); \(\alpha = .83\) and \(.94\) respectively.

MANOVA revealed significant differences due to BF shopping scenarios on positive and negative emotions, \(F_{4, 190} = 27.37, p < .0001\). Follow-up ANOVAs revealed significant effects for scenarios on both positive \(F_{2, 96} = 30.53, p < .0001\) and negative emotion \(F_{2, 96} = 39.83, p < .0001\). Tukey’s post hoc comparisons found that people in the Doorbuster condition experienced significantly stronger positive emotion \((M = 2.73, SD = 1.32)\) than people in the Wait in Line condition \((M = 1.26, SD = 1.13)\) or the Stockout condition \((M = .72, SD = .62)\), both \(ps < .05\). Tukey’s post hoc comparisons also found that people in the Wait in Line condition experienced stronger negative emotion \((M = 4.38, SD = 1.07)\) than people in the Stockout condition \((M = 3.59, SD = 1.32)\) or in the Doorbuster condition \((M = 1.90, SD = 1.24)\), both \(ps < .05\). These results demonstrate empirical support for the effect of
goal blockage (attainment) on emotion evoked on BF, consistent with predictions. Thus, the manipulations were deemed successful.

**Instrument Development**

All measures, with one exception, were adopted from prior literature and had established acceptable reliability and validity. Minor revisions on wording were made to reflect a BF shopping context. Prior BF experience was measured with six 5-point scale items with bipolar endpoints adapted to address BF shopping experiences (Kim & Lennon, 2011). Expectations about BF were assessed with two sets of expectation measures to capture both expectations of BF deals and specific expectations in terms of retailer performance on BF.

Expectations of BF deals were assessed using sixteen 5-point Likert items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$) developed by Dizén and Berenbaum (2008) for basic psychological research. Expectations of retailer performance on BF were assessed with nineteen 7-point Likert items adapted from Parasuraman *et al.* (1988); Cronbach’s $\alpha$s ranged from .87 to .90. Three additional items of BF expectations were developed by the researchers to complement existing expectation scales to fully capture consumer expectations about BF. These items used the same 7-point Likert format. To measure emotion, the same 87 emotion items as in the pretest were used. Evaluation of BF shopping was assessed using five 5-point Likert items from Knutson *et al.* (2006). Demographic information was also gathered. All items from multi-item scales are included in Table 2.
Figure 1. Conceptual Model
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Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Items (factor loadings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior BF Experience</td>
<td>Prior BF Experience (Eigenvalue = 4.78, Variance Accounted for = 79.73%, Cronbach’s α = .95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often have you shopped on Black Friday? (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often have you purchased on Black Friday? (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often have you shopped for apparel or accessories on Black Friday? (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often have you purchased apparel or accessories on Black Friday? (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many apparel items did you buy when you last shopped on Black Friday? (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much do you normally spend when you buy apparel on Black Friday? (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of BF Deals</td>
<td>Positive expectations of BF deals (Eigenvalue = 7.28, Variance Accounted for = 42.53%, Cronbach’s α = .91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I am able to purchase the items I am looking for on Black Friday at the advertised discount, my life will be perfect (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be problem-free (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be complete (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be great (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I am able to purchase the items I am looking for on Black Friday at the advertised discount, I would think I am perfect (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am impressive (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am worthwhile (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am great (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative expectations of BF deals (Eigenvalue = 3.59, Variance Accounted for = 22.43%, Cronbach’s α = .95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I am NOT able to purchase the items I am looking for on Black Friday at the advertised discount, my life will be meaningless (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be a mess (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be a disaster (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my life will be empty (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I am NOT able to purchase the items I am looking for on Black Friday at the advertised discount, I would think I am worthless (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am a failure (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am no good (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…I would think I am inadequate (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer Performance Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations of retailer capability (Eigenvalue = 6.04, Variance Accounted for = 31.78%, Cronbach’s α = .89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the store promises to do something by a certain time on Black Friday, it should do so (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stores should be physically appealing on Black Friday. (.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees should be well dressed and neat on Black Friday. (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The employees should be willing to help customers on Black Friday. (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The store should be dependable on Black Friday. (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees should be polite on Black Friday. (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customers should be able to trust employees on Black Friday. (.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores should have enough inventory to meet customer demand on Black Friday. (.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores should make items easy to find on Black Friday. (.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When customers have problems on Black Friday, retailers should be sympathetic. (.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers should be dependable on Black Friday. (.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores should have up-to-date equipment on Black Friday. (.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of lack of customer service (Eigenvalue = 2.12, Variance Accounted for = 11.16%, Cronbach’s α = .65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay if employees are too busy to help customers on Black Friday. (.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should not be expected to give customers individual attention on Black Friday. (.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unrealistic to expect employees to have their customer’s best interest at heart on Black Friday. (.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Evaluation of the BF Experience |
| Evaluation (Eigenvalue = 4.01, Variance Accounted for = 80.12%, Cronbach’s α = .94) |
| I benefited from Black Friday shopping (.89) |
| Black Friday shopping added value for me (.89) |
| Black Friday shopping experience was consistent with what I expected (.76) |
| Black Friday shopping offered the value I required (.92) |
| Black Friday shopping offered what it promised (.86) |

| Emotions |
| Negative emotion (Eigenvalue = 26.84, Variance Accounted for = 30.85%, Cronbach’s α = .97) |
| Cheated (.72) | Displeased (.73) | Humiliated (.65) | Remorseful (.65) |
| Confused (.62) | Distressed (.65) | Indignant (.60) | Revolted (.72) |
| Contemptuous (.64) | Distrustful (.70) | Insignificant (.63) | Sad (.71) |
| Depressed (.72) | Dominated (.62) | Livid (.75) | Sulky (.64) |
| Discontented (.71) | Enraged (.84) | Mad (.76) | Unfulfilled (.77) |
| Discouraged (.71) | Furious (.78) | Miserable (.68) | Upset (.78) |
| Disgusted (.78) | Helpless (.61) | Outraged (.84) |
| Dismayed (.77) | Hostile (.72) | Regretful (.68) |
| Positive emotion (Eigenvalue = 19.49, Variance Accounted for = 22.4%, Cronbach’s α = .97) |
| Cheerful (.84) | Excited (.86) | Hopeful (.61) | Thrilled (.83) |
| Contented (.73) | Exhilarated (.82) | Interested (.73) | Triumphant (.81) |
| Delighted (.83) | Glad (.90) | Joyful (.91) |
| Elated (.74) | Good (.89) | Jubilant (.83) |
| Enthusiastic (.86) | Happy (.91) | Pleased (.88) |

http://www.jrconsumers.com/Academic_Articles/issue_32/
Procedure

Students were recruited with in-class announcements at four U.S. universities to participate in an online experiment. Students participated as part of an optional course activity. A URL was provided that linked participants to a letter explaining the nature of the research. If students agreed to participate they were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions (e.g., Doorbuster, Stockouts, or Wait in Line) and responded to the research questionnaire.

Results

Sample Characteristics

A total of 339 people with prior BF experience participated in the research. Participants were predominantly women (96.2%) and Caucasian Americans (83.5%). Their average age was 21.0 (SD = 3.6). About 73% of the participants had purchased three or fewer apparel items on BF and over 45% of the participants spent between $25 and $100 for apparel purchases on BF.

Preliminary Analyses

Multi-item measures were subjected to EFA and reliability analyses (Cronbach’s αs = .83 – .95). See Table 2 for details and statistics related to these analyses. The maximum likelihood estimation was used to conduct EFA on all multi-item measures to check dimensionality. The prior BF experience items yielded one factor with six items that accounted for 79.73% of the variance (Cronbach’s α = .95). EFA on the 16 BF expectation items yielded two correlated BF expectation factors (r = .32, p < .0001), which were combined in a composite score; negative BF expectation items were reverse scored and summed with positive BF expectation
items. The combined factors (positive and negative) accounted for 68% of the variance (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$ and .95, respectively). The expectation factor was labeled as ‘expectations of BF deals.’ EFA on the 19 retailer performance expectation items yielded two factors containing 15 items. The two factors together accounted for 43% of the variance. The first factor containing 12 items was named ‘expectations of retailer capability’ (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$) and the other factor containing 3 items was named ‘expectations of lack of customer service’ (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .65$). Thus, three expectation variables (expectations of BF deals, expectations of retailer capability, and expectations of lack of customer service) were used for hypotheses testing.

Consistent with the pretest, EFA on the 87 emotion items yielded two factors containing 47 items. The two factors together accounted for 53.3% of the variance. The first factor, negative emotion, included 30 items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$) and the second factor, positive emotion, contained 17 items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$). Both emotion factors included items reflecting a wide spectrum of emotion in terms of intensity. For example, positive emotion items ranged from happy and contented to thrilled and triumphant. Negative emotion items also ranged from sad and discontented to furious and livid. Table 2 lists all emotion items. EFA on the 5 BF shopping evaluation items yielded one factor accounting for 80.1% of the variance (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .94$). For all multi-item measures, composite scores were used for hypotheses testing.

**Hypothesis Testing**

MANOVA was used to test H1 about goal blockage (attainment) as a situational antecedent to consumer emotions on BF. The overall multivariate test showed that goal blockage
(attainment) affected emotions, $F_{2,672} = 53.71, p < .0001$, supporting H1. Follow-up ANOVAs showed that goal blockage affected negative emotion, $F_{2,336} = 46.20, p < .0001$ and goal attainment affected positive emotion, $F_{2,336} = 92.03, p < .0001$. Tukey cell comparisons found that negative emotion was significantly different across all three conditions ($ps < .001$). Negative emotion was highest in the Wait in Line condition ($M = 2.82, SD = 1.45$) as compared to the Stockout condition ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.43$) or the Doorbuster condition ($M = 1.23, SD = 1.18$). For positive emotion only two of the cell comparisons were significantly different ($p < .001$). Positive emotion was greater in the Doorbuster condition ($M = 2.65, SD = 1.50$) than either the Stockout ($M = .64, SD = 1.19$) or the Wait in Line condition ($M = .76, SD = 1.09$).

Path analysis was used to test the other hypotheses in the conceptual model (see Figure 1). Maximum likelihood estimation indicated an acceptable model fit. The model yielded a Chi-square value of 19.64 ($p < 0.01$), a NFI of .95, an IFI of .97, a CFI of .97, and a RMSEA of 0.07. The results of the path analysis showed that prior experience shopping on BF was positively related to expectations of BF deals, $\beta = .24, t = 4.50, p < .0001$, and to expectations of retailer capability, $\beta = .19, t = 3.48, p < .001$. However prior shopping experience on BF was not related to expectations of lack of customer service, $p = .41$. Thus H2 was partially supported.

For H3 examining the role of consumer expectations of BF as a personal antecedent to emotions on BF, path analysis showed that expectations of BF deals were positively related to both negative emotion, $\beta = .27, t = 5.24, p < .0001$ and positive emotion, $\beta = .26, t = 5.01, p < .0001$. Expectations of retailer capability were positively related to negative emotion, $\beta =$
.11, \( t = 2.02, p < .05 \) but not related to positive emotion, \( p = .99 \). Expectations of lack of customer service were negatively related to positive emotion, \( \beta = -.14, t = -2.56, p < .05 \), but not related to negative emotion, \( p = .51 \). H3 was partially supported.

For H4 examining consumer evaluation of BF shopping as a consequence of consumer emotions on BF, path analysis further showed that only positive emotion was positively related to evaluation of BF shopping, \( \beta = .14, t = 3.44, p < .0001 \), whereas negative emotion was not related to evaluation of BF shopping, \( p = .41 \). Thus, H4 was partially supported.
Post-hoc Decomposition of Effects

Decomposition of effects was conducted to further examine the underlying process by which prior BF experience impacted evaluation of BF shopping. As shown in Table 3, prior experience on BF had significant indirect effects on both negative emotion and positive emotion via expectations. In particular, prior BF experience impacted negative emotion through expectations of BF deals and expectations of retailer capability, while it impacted positive emotion through expectations of BF deals. Prior BF shopping experience had a strong direct impact on evaluation of BF shopping and expectations of BF deals had a significant indirect impact on evaluation via positive emotion.
Table 3. Decomposition of Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for the Hypothesized Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Total effect</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of BF deals</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.24 (4.50)***</td>
<td>.24 (4.50)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of retailer capability</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.19 (3.48)***</td>
<td>.19 (3.48)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of lack of customer service</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.05 (.82)***</td>
<td>.05 (.82)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.09 (3.48)***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09 (3.48)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of BF deals</td>
<td>.27 (5.24)***</td>
<td>.27 (5.24)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of retailer capability</td>
<td>.11 (1.96)*</td>
<td>.11 (1.96)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of lack of customer service</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotion</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.06 (2.15)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06 (2.15)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of BF deals</td>
<td>.26 (5.01)***</td>
<td>.26 (5.01)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of retailer capability</td>
<td>-.00**</td>
<td>-.00**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of lack of customer service</td>
<td>-.14 (2.56)*</td>
<td>-.14 (2.56)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of BF Shopping experience</td>
<td>Prior BF experience</td>
<td>.67 (20.39)***</td>
<td>.66 (19.47)***</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of BF deals</td>
<td>.05 (2.12)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.05 (2.12)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of retailer capability</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of lack of customer service</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive emotion</td>
<td>.14 (3.33)*</td>
<td>.14 (3.33)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The research purposes were to determine antecedents to emotions on BF and examine the role of consumer emotions in the context of BF. Drawing on psychology theories and consumer literature, two types of antecedents to BF emotions; situational (i.e., goal blockage/attainment) and personal (i.e., prior BF experience and expectations) were identified and empirically tested using U.S. college students with prior BF shopping experience. Using an extensive list of emotions, emotion items relevant to the context of BF were identified and yielded consistent results in both pretest and the main study. Further examined was to what extent emotions experienced on BF, as a function of expectations of BF and goal blockage/attainment, impacted consumer evaluation of their BF shopping experience.

First, common goal blockage/attainment situations on BF were identified as situational antecedents to emotions on BF. Three BF shopping scenarios were used to simulate BF shopping experience and examine the role of goal blockage/attainment in evoking consumer emotional reactions. Specifically, the Stockout and the Wait in Line conditions (the goal blockage situations) were associated with increased negative emotion as compared to the Doorbuster condition (the goal attainment situation). Furthermore, a significant difference in the intensity of negative emotion was found between the Wait in Line and the Stockout scenarios; the Wait in Line scenario led to greater negative emotion than the Stockout scenario. Perceived inequity may explain why the Wait in Line scenario led to more negative emotion than the Stockout scenario. BF shoppers may perceive injustice after having waited in line to get the deal. Perhaps stockouts are more common and more
expected for doorbuster items than unsuccessfully waiting in line to pay for them. In prior BF research by Lennon et al. (2014), perception of inequity was a major variable driving consumer misbehavior on BF. Furthermore, in the Wait in Line condition, the specific retailer was likely to be held accountable and blamed for the policy (Kelley, 1967) because not all retailers have such a policy on BF whereas most retailers do experience BF stockouts. While there are no direct connections between goal blockage conditions and specific emotion items, a wide range of emotional intensity expressed by research participants indicate that experiencing intense negative emotions are likely when facing goal blockage on BF.

This study identified three dimensions of expectations consumers may have about BF (i.e., expectations of BF deals, expectations of retailer capability, and expectations of lack of customer service) reflecting a wide range of expectations BF shoppers have. Consistent with the expectations literature and Schema theory (Wyer, 1980), prior BF experience was highly influential in affecting expectations people have developed about BF. The examination of the relationships between prior BF experience and expectations of BF offer interesting insights about what BF shoppers expect on BF. First, prior experience shopping on BF was positively related to expectations of BF deals. This may mean that participants who keep coming back to shop on BF may do so because they have had obtained numerous BF deals resulting in their holding inflated expectations for their BF shopping. Further, prior experience shopping on BF was positively related to expectations of retailer capability, reflecting BF shoppers’ clear expectations for both great deals and a satisfactory shopping experience. However, prior BF experience was not related to expectations for lack of customer service, a finding that is consistent with consumer expectation of retailer capability. Contrary to a common belief that
minimal customer service is expected on BF, participants with prior BF experience did not expect minimal customer service on BF. This finding may suggest that a shopping schema developed based on regular shopping experience over time may spill over to consumer expectations of BF shopping, whereas retailers assume that their customers would be accepting of a lack of customer service in exchange for the offer of deeply discounted products. Unlike other shopping contexts (e.g., discount stores) where consumers generally expect minimal customer service, these consumers appear to expect retailers to uphold their customer service performance on BF while offering deep BF promotions. In fact, with more shoppers than usual out hunting for BF deals, there is likely to be an even greater need for retailers to assist customers with their shopping and checking out.

For the relationships between expectations of BF and emotions experienced on BF, expectations of BF deals were positively related to both negative emotion and positive emotion, providing empirical support for the role of expectations in shaping consumer emotions. As a personal factor, different expectations consumers had about BF deals and shopping served as a basis for various emotional responses when encountering goal blockage or attainment. When shoppers had high expectations of BF deals, such high expectations led to stronger emotional reactions when encountering goal blockage (attainment).

Expectations of retailer capability increased negative emotion. Consistent with literature on satisfaction (Wyer, 1980) and Mandler’s (1984) Discrepancy-evaluation theory of emotion, the finding suggests that these BF shoppers expect retailers to perform at their usual level (i.e., general shopping schema) and this expectation may evoke negative emotional reactions to BF goal blockage. In contrast to expectations of retailer capability,
expectations for lack of customer service on BF reduced participants’ positive emotional reactions. Holding low expectations for (lack of) customer service on BF did not increase negative emotion, rather it decreased positive emotion. When participants indicated they had high expectations for BF deals and retailers’ capability on BF, their expectations inflated their negative emotions. However, when participants had low expectations for customer service, such expectations deflated positive emotions. Together, these findings indicate the enduring impact of a general shopping schema. Participants appeared to hold retailers accountable for serving customers and managing their retail performance on BF. To these participants, getting BF deals perhaps was not a trade-off for lack of customer service.

Only positive emotion impacted evaluation of BF shopping. This finding is consistent with research that showed that preconsumption emotion guides customers’ evaluations of an experience (Mattila and Wirtz, 2000). Despite media reports of angry customers acting out and resulting casualties during BF shopping, these BF shoppers were fairly positive about their BF shopping. Their expectations of BF deals led to positive emotion when getting the deals, which in turn enhanced their evaluation of their BF shopping experience. In a situation in which their expectations of BF deals were not met, negative emotion was evoked. However negative emotion as a response to goal blockage did not influence participants’ evaluation of their BF shopping experience.

Another noteworthy finding is the adverse relationship between consumer expectations for lack of customer service and positive emotion. This finding may support the notion that BF shopping is about more than simply getting doorbuster deals. As reported by Thomas and Peters (2011), BF shopping has become a consumption ritual for many
consumers. Some people may enjoy BF shopping due to time spent with their close family members and friends as well as the thrill of bargain hunting. This view helps explain why expectations of retailer capability increased negative emotion and expectations of lack of customer service reduced positive emotion. As compared to receiving adequate customer service, BF shopping as a social activity with families and friends will be less enjoyable with inadequate customer service. These findings call for immediate attention among retailers. It is critical not only to offer deep discounts, but also to provide BF shoppers with an enjoyable shopping experience with adequate customer service. The goals of retailers need to go beyond minimizing negative emotions BF shoppers experience, to capitalizing on positive emotions BF shoppers experience from quality customer service and enjoyable shopping experiences. It would also be important for retailers to manage shoppers’ expectations in a way that expectations for lack of customer service can turn into customer delight by providing good service leading to positive emotion and thus positive evaluation. Taken together, the results from expectations of retailer capability and expectations of lack of customer service suggest that participants’ BF shopping schemas do not deviate much from their general shopping schema about being able to depend on retailers to meet their needs.

Additionally, the demographic characteristics of these research participants (i.e., predominantly women) further offer additional insights into the findings. Prior researchers have reported that women value the social aspects of BF shopping (Thomas and Peters, 2011) and tend to be loyal BF shoppers (Sander, 2013). Thomas and Peters also reported having participants who had shopped on BF for an average of 12.1 years. Despite negative emotion
experienced as a result of goal blockage, the process of the hunt and the fun enjoyed during BF shopping perhaps mitigated the impact of negative emotion on evaluation.

Finally, the post-hoc decomposition of effects showed a strong positive effect for prior BF experience on evaluation of BF shopping. This result in combination with the others suggests that those with ample prior BF experience continue to shop on BF presumably because they have been successful and, hence, evaluate their BF shopping positively.

**Implications**

The empirical findings offer both theoretical implications for the field of consumer research and practical implications for retailers and consumers. One key theoretical contribution is the conceptual and empirical identification of emotion items relevant to BF. Thirty negative and seventeen positive emotion items were found relevant to BF shopping contexts. Emotion items varied to a great extent in terms of their emotional intensity. These emotion items are expected to provide useful tools for future researchers who examine consumers in the context of BF or other heavily promoted retail events. Considering that BF has been adopted by other countries (i.e., Chutel and Kazeem, 2016; Park, 2014; Silverman and Sawer, 2014) and retail price competition has continued to increase, the emotion items identified will be useful for other researchers. Findings also provide empirical support for psychological theories such as General Aggression Model, Schema theory and Discrepancy-evaluation theory of emotion in the context of BF shopping and add new insights into consumer emotions. In the following section, implications for retailers and consumers are discussed respectively.

*Implications for Retailers*
Both situational (goal blockage/attainment) and personal (prior BF experience and BF expectations) factors were identified as antecedents to consumer emotion. This study offers empirical evidence of how such antecedents impact consumer behavior on BF. Although not all antecedents to consumer emotions on BF are under retailers’ immediate control (e.g., prior BF experience, stockouts), the results suggest that retailers may wish to take steps to purposely manage customer expectations and ultimately future BF shopping experiences, which become prior experience for the near future.

Consumer expectations of BF go beyond getting BF deals and include expecting the same enjoyable shopping experience usually associated with shopping, as well as quality customer service. This finding suggests that retailers need to keep in mind that excitement and anticipation evoked by media hype can result in adverse outcomes when managed poorly (e.g., stockouts, wait in line). For expectations for BF deals, consumer expectations often get inflated due to heavy promotions of BF deals. Promotion of BF deals need to provide prospective BF shoppers with accurate and clear information about restrictions. For example, large font size can be used to communicate limited amounts of merchandise and promotional conditions in all forms of BF advertising. Also since warning consumers of stockouts before shopping reduces negative emotion (Kim and Lennon, 2011), in-store signs can be used and updated to inform shoppers of the availability of doorbuster items.

Another strategy is to use social media or store mobile apps to provide real-time inventory information on promotional items. Using mobile phones, shoppers can check product availability and thus can manage their shopping effectively. While many retailers may worry that such information could take excitement away, if managed well, mobile apps
or social media can create engaging in-store experiences like Pokémon GO that would satisfy BF shoppers who enjoy the competitive shopping environment on BF (Sander, 2013; Thomas and Peters, 2011). Taking these steps can contribute to developing realistic expectations, while making BF shopping fun and engaging, evoking positive emotion during BF shopping. Furthermore, shifting the emphasis of BF shopping from focusing solely on doorbuster deals to a focus on BF festivity as a holiday tradition could benefit retailers in the long run especially in the time of rising Cyber Monday popularity and e-commerce in general.

A general shopping schema appears to apply to BF. Participants did not expect minimal customer service on BF as a trade-off for doorbuster deals. Retailers need to explore ways to offer pleasant shopping experiences with adequate customer service without incurring excessive long-term costs. One way to achieve this may involve the integration of self-service technology (e.g., kiosks or mobile devices) in stores. For example, often on BF, checkout lines are excessively long, making BF shopping unpleasant. Mobile devices can alleviate a long queue by having employees use mobile devices to check out customers or by enabling customers to checkout using their own mobile phones. Given that the Wait in Line condition evoked the highest negative emotion, retailers who want to have time limits on their promotions are recommended to implement strategies to better manage customer expectations regarding termination of promotions. The worst case for a shopper is to wait in line to get the doorbuster, reach the cashier to pay, and learn that she/he will not get the deal. Thus, it is critical to clearly inform shoppers about what is expected (i.e., getting in line by a specific time or paying by a specific time) in ads and store signage when offering time-limited doorbusters. Another strategy is for a line monitor to stamp the hands of people
waiting to checkout by the deadline; that way the cashier would know when to discontinue
the doorbuster price.

Another way to improve customer service is via staffing. Adding frontline salespeople
on the floor could offer customers help and keep stores organized; opening cashier lines
could make checkout traffic move quickly. Expectations for a lack of customer service
lowered positive emotions. Retailers may want to review their past BF performance by
analyzing customer traffic, stock levels, checkout lines, store environment, and in-store
videos and develop strategic plans to provide an adequate level of service. If retailers cannot
offer an adequate level of service, managing expectations may become meaningless. As
aforementioned, the integration of in-store technologies such as in-store kiosks and mobile
apps can provide assistance for BF shoppers. For example, Walmart has provided shoppers
with store maps that highlight the locations of popular products and larger gifts (“Walmart’s
Black Friday,” 2015).

The positive emotions that shoppers experience when they purchase some of their
desired items could outweigh the negative emotions such as disappointment. Thus, retailers
want to make sure that shoppers obtain at least “some” of their desired items. For example,
Walmart offered a “1-Hour Guarantee” that customers in designated areas of the store could
purchase selected items at the guaranteed price for one hour after the event start time
(Walmart’s Black Friday, 2015). For stockouts, customers can get items at the discounted
price before Christmas.

Implications for consumers
Consumers shop on BF for the deals and to enjoy time with friends and families. Furthermore, all consumers bring different experiences to the BF retail context, all of which influence their expectations. For shoppers to evaluate their BF experience in a positive way, they need to manage their expectations such that positive emotion is increased and negative emotion decreased or unaffected. Although negative emotion was not related to BF evaluation, it may be related to stress or confrontations with salespeople or other shoppers. Based on the results, the following are suggestions to facilitate a positive evaluation.

Expectations of retailer deals led to increases in both positive and negative emotion. Consumers are advised to temper their expectations of deals with realism. For example, consumers should read the promotional material carefully and note any special conditions or restrictions attached to it. Most retailers do not have an unlimited supply of advertised merchandise, so that should not be expected. Since the greatest level of negative emotion was evoked with the Wait in Line scenario, shoppers may wish to avoid attempting to capitalize on the time-limited promotions or find out how retailers manage their time-limited promotions before waiting in the line to check out. In reality, the expectation that one will be successful at getting every deal on the shopping list is unrealistic, will not serve shoppers well, and may lead to stress and irritation. Thus managing moderate expectations of BF shopping as informed BF shoppers can help them have a positive shopping experience.

With current technological advances, BF shoppers are empowered to strategically meet their BF shopping goals. If getting good BF deals is a priority, BF shoppers are encouraged to determine whether or not the promotion is available online prior to BF. Also consumers can easily conduct comparison shopping online to find best deals prior to BF.
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While it is still possible that the merchandise might be out of stock online, there would be no waiting in line. Furthermore, BF shoppers could also leverage their mobile technology while shopping in-store to get available best deals.

Expectations of retailer capability were positively related to negative emotion, while expectations for a lack of customer service were negatively related to positive emotion. BF consumers are advised to moderate their expectations for both types of retail service. While it is human nature to want and expect the same level of service on BF as on ordinary shopping days, it perhaps is not reasonable to expect it given the stress on the salespeople in terms of increased customer traffic, disarray in stores, and rushed and cranky shoppers.

Perhaps getting both BF deals and quality shopping experience are competing goals to accomplish at the same time. In fact, the shopping environment is likely to be highly hectic and unpleasant as shoppers seek doorbuster deals. BF shoppers could strategize their shopping trip to choose a few specific stores for BF deals and choose other stores or social activities (e.g., restaurant) for the time with family and friends.

Lastly, consumers may manage their emotions better when they know what they are (Markman, 2015). The findings offer insights regarding various emotional responses that consumer experience during BF shopping. An understanding of emotions they experience and possible causes (antecedents) will help BF shoppers manage their emotion effectively.

Future Research

Antecedents and consequences of consumer emotions on BF were investigated. To follow through on this topic, researchers could investigate the entire process of consumer behavior
on BF beyond evaluation of the BF experience and further examine how consumer emotions and evaluation of BF impact other aspects of consumer behavior including actual purchases, misbehavior, and patronage intentions. Furthermore, although students do shop on BF, non-student adults should also be investigated for generalizability. In particular, studying men in the context of BF can bring useful insights given likely sex differences. BF shopping is now a global phenomenon. Future research should explore how culture plays a role in what evokes consumer emotions on BF and how consumer emotions influence BF shopping experiences.
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