

## Men (and Women) Shopping on the Darkside: Consumer Misbehavior on Black Friday

Sharron J. Lennon, Indiana University, USA  
Jaeha Lee, North Dakota State University, USA  
Minjeong Kim, Oregon State University, USA  
Kim K. P. Johnson, University of Minnesota, USA

Keywords: Black Friday, misbehavior, promotions

Black Friday (BF) has been studied as a consumption event (Thomas & Peters, 2011) and as a site for consumer misbehavior (Lennon, Johnson, & Lee, 2011). BF is a unique shopping event (Thomas & Peters, 2011); most major retailers participate with extended hours and doorbuster promotions. Since the goal of promotions is to make people want things (Anderson & Bushman, 2002), BF promotions may incentivize consumer misbehavior on BF.

Men and women shop on BF (Newport, 2012) but men are more aggressive than women (Anderson & Bushman, 2002); they vandalize more (Van Vliet, 1984), shoplift more (Krasnovsky & Lane, 1998), and retaliate more (Huefner & Hunt, 2000). Thus, men may misbehave on BF. Youth is also negatively related to misbehavior (Daunt & Harris, 2011).

Since BF misbehavior is aggressive, the General Aggression Model (GAM) was used to guide our research (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Anderson and Bushman hold that situational variables such as promotions and personal variables such as narcissism affect aggression. Narcissists are subject to aggression because they have a sense of entitlement. According to the GAM, scripts formed through experiences (e.g., BF experience) can also affect aggression. Applying the GAM to BF misbehavior, we assessed personal variables: demographics (sex, age), BF experience, and personality traits (narcissism, social desirability). Social desirability is the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. Lennon et al. (2011) found people who scored high in social desirability reported less BF misbehavior. Social desirability is important to study because it has been overlooked in most marketing research and can compromise research findings if not accounted for (King & Bruner, 2000). Our research purpose was to investigate the effects of personal variables and promotions on BF misbehavior. Based on the previous rationale and the GAM six hypotheses were developed. Type of BF promotion (H1) and sex (H2) affect BF misbehavior. Age (H3) and social desirability (H4) are negatively related to BF misbehavior. BF shopping experience (H5) and narcissism (H6) are positively related to BF misbehavior.

Three BF scenarios were created that varied in terms of the promotion. In two scenarios the BF shopper was unable to purchase doorbusters either due to a stockout (Stockout) or a promotional restriction (Wait in line). In the third scenario the shopper was able to purchase advertised items at promotional prices (Doorbuster). Scenarios were pilot tested with 56 (F=29; M=27) Midwest university students who read each scenario and rated emotions and cognitions evoked by each scenario. Repeated measures ANOVAs found no effect for sex on ratings and found that emotions and cognitions varied by scenario; thus, the manipulation was successful.

The Registrar of a mid-Atlantic public university provided randomly selected male ( $n=3600$ ) and female ( $n=3600$ ) students' emails. A link was emailed to an online experiment

which contained the research variables; all used a 7 point format, were established measures, and were valid and reliable. After suitable intervals first and second reminder emails were sent. Out of 576 completed, only 402 (M=125, F=277) had shopped in stores on BF and were used in analyses.

ANCOVA was used to test hypotheses. The design was a 3 (BF promotional scenario) by 2 (sex of respondent) by 2 (product: apparel or smartphone) between subjects experiment with 4 covariates: age, BF experience, narcissism, and social desirability. The main effect for product was nonsignificant ( $F_{1, 379} = 1.821, p > .15$ ), so responses were collapsed across products, resulting in a 3 by 2 ANCOVA. The scenario by sex interaction was nonsignificant. There was a main effect for scenario ( $F_{2, 385} = 3.386, p < .05$ ); Sidak comparisons found that the doorbuster promotion resulted in less BF misbehavior than the wait in line promotion ( $p < .05$ ). There was a main effect for sex ( $F_{1, 385} = 4.238, p < .05$ ), since men reported more BF misbehavior than women. Age was nonsignificant and social desirability was negatively related to BF misbehavior ( $b = -.175, t_{385} = -3.962, p < .0001$ ), while BF experience ( $b = .079, t_{385} = 2.479, p < .05$ ) and narcissism were positively related to BF misbehavior ( $b = .207, t_{385} = 3.619, p < .0001$ ). Thus, all hypotheses were supported, except for age. It is possible that with another sample and more variability in age the negative effect for age would also be found.

Results demonstrate the importance of studying men and women to extend knowledge of BF misbehavior. Using two different products (apparel, smartphones) extends the external validity of the results. Since social desirability was related to lower reported BF misbehavior, it should be included in all studies of BF misbehavior. Future research needs to examine how personal characteristics interact with situational factors on BF to influence BF misbehaviors.

#### References

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 27-51.
- Daunt, K. L., & Harris, L. C. (2011). Customers acting badly: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *Journal of Business Research, 64*, 1034-1042.
- Huefner, J. C., & Hunt, H. K. (2000). Consumer retaliation as a response to dissatisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior, 13*, 61-82.
- King, M. F., & Bruner, G. C. (2000). Social desirability bias: A neglected aspect of validity testing. *Psychology & Marketing, 17*(2), 79-103.
- Krasnovsky, T., & Lane, R. C. (1998). Shoplifting: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 3*(3), 219-235.
- Lennon, S. J., Johnson, K. K. P., & Lee, J. (2011). A perfect storm for consumer misbehavior: Shopping on Black Friday. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 29*, 119-134.
- Newport, F. (2012, November 23). Black Friday shopping mostly for the young. Retrieved January 30, 2013 from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/158927/black-friday-shopping-mostly-young.aspx>
- Thomas, J. B., & Peters, C. (2011). An exploratory investigation of Black Friday consumption rituals. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 39*, 522-537.
- Van Vliet, W. (1984). Vandalism: an assessment agenda. In C. Levy-Leboyer (Ed.), *Vandalism: Behaviour and motivations*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.