

Impulse Buying: How Fashion Involvement in Generation Z Affects Their Purchases

Tety Elida

Gunadarma University, Management Information System, Indonesia <u>tety@staff.gunadarma.ac.id</u> https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5940-7364

Ari WB Raharjo

Gunadarma University, Economic Faculty, Indonesia <u>ariraharjo@staff.gunadarma.ac.id</u> <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4779-1044</u>

Abstract

This study aims to examine impulse buying behavior towards fashion products in Generation Z with gender as a group analysis. Data was collected from 444 students at a university in West Java, Indonesia. The structural equation model partial least square (SEM-PLS) analysis was conducted to analyze the relationship between variables and test a series of hypotheses. Price Discounts, Store Atmosphere, and Fashion Involvement significantly affect Impulse Buying. There are differences in impulse buying behavior between men and women. This research fills the limited literature on SOR theory involving fashion involvement as an organism.

Keyword: Impulse Buying, Consumer Behavior, Fashion Involvement, Gen Z Behavior, Online Shopping.

1. INTRODUCTION

Impulse buying behavior has been a phenomenon that has attracted attention in consumer behavior research over the past few decades (Aiolfi et al., 2022; Atulkar & Kesari, 2018; Hashmi et al., 2020; Kumagai & Nagasawa, 2022; Lee & Chen, 2021; Lin et al., 2022; Mohan et al., 2013; Peng & Kim, 2014; Shen & Khalifa, 2012; Sun et al., 2023). This phenomenon is mainly due to lifestyle changes and technological developments affecting people's shopping. The emergence of various e-commerce platforms has made the shopping process easier. Generation Z is primarily influenced by impulse buying behavior (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021; Munsch, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021).

The behavior of Generation Z is considered materialistic (Flurry & Swimberghe, 2016), tend to be sensitive to trends and lifestyles (Johnson & Im, 2014; Razzaq et al., 2018; Slater & Demangeot, 2021), always want to look fashionable to encourage them to buy items that can show their identity (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021). Generation Z is sensitive to the positive stimuli often offered by fashion products (Muhammad et al., 2023), which are often associated with social, environmental, and multiculturalism issues and trends (Johnson & Im, 2014; Razzaq et al., 2018; Slater & Demangeot, 2021). This positive stimulus elicits positive emotions, thus triggering impulsive buying behavior (Gupta & Gentry, 2018; Muhammad et al., 2023). Generation Z

consumers are, therefore, susceptible to impulsive purchasing (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021; Munsch, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021).

On the other hand, impulse buying behavior shows the seller's ability to carry out his sales strategy (Aiolfi et al., 2022). Researching impulse buying is crucial for businesses to comprehend consumer behavior and ensure their market survival. Today's fashion market is very competitive, characterized by many emerging online retailers with various brands (Keegan et al., 2021). The good news is that the proportion of Generation *Z*, which amounts to 41%, can be an opportunity for fashion businesses to expand the market. Further, several studies have found that Generation *Z* actively buys and consumer groups (Azhar et al., 2023; Nghia et al., 2020; Van den Bergh et al., 2023). Therefore, an area that requires investigation is how marketers can adapt their sales strategies for online platforms, with a specific focus on fashion products targeted towards Generation *Z*.

The SOR (Stimulus Organism Response) Theory is extensively applied to the investigation of impulsive purchasing (Chan et al., 2017; Lavuri & Thaichon, 2023; Lin et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023; Zafar et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2022). Existing research demonstrates that both internal and external stimuli induce the phenomenon of impulse purchasing (Abdelsalam et al., 2020; Keegan et al., 2021; Redine et al., 2023). These external stimuli include environmental conditions and marketing methods (Dawson & Kim, 2010; Huo et al., 2023). In online shopping, web quality can express environmental conditions (Huo et al., 2023; Keegan et al., 2021). In accordance with the framework postulated by Keegan et al. (2021), the aforementioned external stimuli foster the development of hedonistic tendencies, positive and negative emotions, and engagement with fashion, which are conceptualized as organisms within the SOR model. Moreover, this particular organism is classified as an internal stimulus with the potential to stimulate impulsive buying.

The conducted research predominantly employs hedonism (Çavuşoğlu et al., 2020; Hashmi et al., 2020; Lee & Wu, 2017; Park & Lin, 2020; Peng & Kim, 2014; Vieira et al., 2018) and positive or negative emotions (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021; Hashmi et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2022) as proxies of organisms. The investigation of fashion involvement as an internal stimulus remains limited. The research model employed in this study is Fashion Involvement, which is deemed suitable due to its focus on the impulsive purchase of fashion products. Furthermore, the attributes associated with Generation Z-a propensity for perpetual trend-following and a desire to appear fashionable—indicate a profound interest in fashion. Furthermore, existing literature suggests that women acquire fashion items out of sheer passion, while men do so out of necessity (Workman & Studak, 2006; Workman & Lee, 2011). Further investigation is warranted to determine whether selling fashion items to men and women necessitates distinct approaches. Thus, this study aims to examine the impulse buying behavior of fashion products in Generation Z with gender as a group analysis.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES 2.1. SOR

Organismal Response Theory (SOR) is a model that can explain how stimuli affect organisms, which then process those stimuli and produce specific behavioral responses (Russell & Mehrabian, 1974). In the marketing context, this stimulus will cause consumers to be willing to classify, interact, and identify pages and increase their desire to return to the page to buy goods or vice versa (De Luca & Botelho, 2021).

The term "organism" in the SOR model refers to the individual or person who responds to the stimulus (Russell & Mehrabian, 1974). The organism is an active and mediating factor that

processes the stimulus and generates a response based on internal feelings or behavior (Chen et al., 2019; Hashmi et al., 2020; Richard & Chebat, 2016; Russell & Mehrabian, 1974; Shen & Khalifa, 2012). Organisme memainkan peran penting dalam membentuk respon terhadap suatu stimulus dan respon tersebut dapat dipengaruhi oleh berbagai faktor, seperti emosi dan proses kognitif (Chan et al., 2017; Floh & Madlberger, 2013; Li et al., 2022).

The response can be described as consumer reaction, which can be in the form of approach or avoidance behavior De Luca & Botelho (2021) in this study further expressed as a proxy for impulse purchases (see also Zafar et al., 2021). The behavioral approach is where a consumer stays on the web page and carries out a product search process that ends with the purchase process. Avoidance behavior is the opposite.

2.2. Impulse Buying

Impulse buying is unplanned and unexpected when a consumer receives certain stimuli that create a strong urge to buy (Beatty & Elizabeth Ferrell, 1998). Another definition states that impulse buying is a process mechanism in the individual domain that occurs when consumers experience a sudden and persistent urge to buy something immediately (Chan et al., 2017).

If referring to studies conducted, several factors can predict impulse buying behavior: consumer characteristics, marketing-related, website-related, and social-related (Abdelsalam et al., 2020; Redine et al., 2023). An examination of the information presented by Huo et al. (2023) reveals that it is essentially identical to the marketing and environmental factors discussed by Abdelsalam et al. (2020) and Redine et al. (2023). These factors are stimuli that will encourage impulse buying behavior in online shopping (Chan et al., 2017; Hashmi et al., 2020; Li et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023; Xiao et al., 2022; Zafar et al., 2021). Thus, the Stimulus Organism Response (SOR) model approach became the rationale for this study.

External stimulus in the form of marketing-related factors includes discount prices, promotions, and merchandise ((Büyükdağ et al., 2020; Çavuşoğlu et al., 2020; Iyer et al., 2020; Sheehan et al., 2019). Other external stimuli are website-related factors such as store atmosphere (Atulkar & Kesari, 2018; Geng et al., 2020; Hashmi et al., 2020; Mohan et al., 2013; Xiao et al., 2022). In accordance with the subject matter of this study, which primarily concerns students who generally have constrained financial resources, price reductions are hypothesized to be stimuli that influence purchasing behavior. Another external stimulus that was selected was the ambiance of the online store, as Generation Z predominantly makes fashion purchases via e-commerce platforms or social media.

The existing literature identifies fashion involvement, hedonism, and normative influences as internal stimuli that contribute to the emergence of impulsive fashion consumption. (Keegan et al., 2021). Higher interest in fashion will increase positive emotions and the likelihood of impulsive purchases (Liapati et al., 2015). Pentecost & Andrews (2010) state that fashion-oriented consumers are more likely to purchase impulse to satisfy hedonistic preferences such as style and image. Related to the characteristics of Generation Z, who tend to follow fashion and lifestyle trends, fashion involvement is the right choice as a proxy for organisms. Based on this exposure, the model predicts the impulse buying behavior of fashion products listed in Figure 1. Thus, the major hypothesis that can be developed in this research model is that impulse buying of fashion can be predicted based on discount prices and store atmosphere with fashion involvement as an intervening variable.



Figure 1. Research Model

2.3. Fashion Involvement

Fashion involvement is consumer involvement in a fashion product driven by the need and interest in the product (O'Cass, 2004; Zhang & Kim, 2013). Customers who are highly engaged in fashion trends form positive attitudes and tend to buy products that provide the desired social prestige (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2000; Summer et al., 2006). Another definition states fashion involvement refers to consumer interest in fashion and is an essential dimension of consumer lifestyle that influences purchasing decisions and consumption behavior (Naderi, 2013; Nam et al., 2007).

Several studies on Indonesian consumers, in general, show a significant relationship between fashion involvement and impulse buying (Pramestya & Widagda, 2020; Tirtayasa et al., 2020; Wayan et al., 2023). Cengiz (2017) also showed the same findings in Turkey and Liapati et al. (2015) in Korea. However, there are different findings put forward by Dewi et al. (2015), who state that fashion involvement has no significant effect on impulse buying. Related to the characteristics of Generation Z, who always follow trends and lifestyles (Johnson & Im, 2014; Razzaq et al., 2018; Slater & Demangeot, 2021)), and involvement with a product will increase the activity of obtaining the product (Zhang & Kim, 2013) so the tendency to impulse buying is higher. This phenomenon is also reinforced by Pentecost & Andrews (2010), who state that fashion-oriented consumers are more likely to make impulse purchases. This can be constructed through minor hypotheses:

H1: Fashion Involvement has a positive and significant relationship with impulse buying in fashion products

2.4. Price Discount

Price is commonly regarded as a determinant of purchasing choices (Büyükdağ et al., 2020; Çavuşoğlu et al., 2020; Sheehan et al., 2019). Sellers may employ a discount price strategy to stimulate impulsive purchases (Lee & Chen, 2021; Lin et al., 2022; Peng & Kim, 2014). The magnitude of the discount affects purchase intentions dynamically over an online shopping experience, indicating that consumers enjoy the process of finding and using discounts (Sheehan et al., 2019). In online shopping, consumers always look for the best deals, as the price is an attractive stimulant in this environment (Aiolfi et al., 2022; Atulkar & Kesari, 2018). Discounts can be considered an incentive to get people to shop, making shopping more enjoyable and satisfying (Lee & Chen-Yu, 2018). Discounts can enhance the emotional experience of online shopping and stimulate purchase intentions (Huo et al., 2023; Lee & Chen-Yu, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2021).

Literature has not examined the direct relationship between discount and fashion involvement. But Alanadoly & Salem (2022) state price significantly moderates the relationship between fashion involvement and product information. The findings of Mortimer et al. (2022) state that a person involved in fashion, in addition to having good information about the product, also knows how to acquire the product at a lower price. With limited literature, the relationship between price discount and fashion involvement can be built on the following minor hypotheses:

H2: Price Discount is predicted to have a positive and significant relationship with fashion involvement

2.5. Store Atmosphere

The store atmosphere is designed to influence customer mood and behavior (Ahmed & Ting, 2020; Albarq, 2021; Calvo-Porral & Lévy-Mangin, 2021; Xiao et al., 2022). The online store atmosphere includes web page design, navigation, colors, fonts, images, and videos (Zhao et al., 2022). These characteristics are expected to create a positive shopping experience, encouraging customers to surf, shop, and buy products (Lin et al., 2022). An online store's interactivity and information technology (IIT) can affect consumer perception of the online retail environment, shopping enjoyment, and patronage behavior towards online retailers (Kim et al., 2007).

Online media that contain information and images play an essential role in fashion involvement. Visual information that allows clothing to be viewed from multiple angles and is cognitively processed faster than text (McCormick & Livett, 2012). This situation encourages hedonism Parboteeah et al. (2009) and hedonism tends to be responded to by impulsive purchases (Çavuşoğlu et al., 2020; Hashmi et al., 2020; Park & Lin, 2020). Another study states that fashion involvement is closely related to lifestyle, and this relationship will be further strengthened by exposure to the media (Sun & Guo, 2017). Similar findings were also stated by Celik & Kocaman (2017), that the readiness to use technology in online shopping significantly affects fashion involvement. Based on this literature, the following minor hypotheses can be built:

H3: Store atmosphere is predicted to have a positive and significant relationship with fashion involvement

2.6. Gender

Literature shows the influence of gender on impulse buying behavior (Atulkar & Kesari, 2018; Bhatia, 2019; Djafarova & Bowes, 2021). Different things are shown by Büyükdağ et al. (2020), which states that there is no gender difference in impulse buying behavior. Other literature says that women are more impulsive than men (Bratko et al., 2013), and there is a tendency for women to have higher fashion involvement than men (Lim & Park, 2011; Sun & Guo, 2017; Workman & Lee, 2011). Based on this literature, hypothesis 4 can be made as follows:

H4: There are differences in impulse buying behavior between men and women

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sampling and Data Collection

The respondents of this study were students aged 18 to 22 years who had purchased fashion products on the e-commerce platform and Instagram social media. Data was collected using a questionnaire in the form of a Google form distributed to 30 WhatsApp class groups at a university in West Java. Data collection was carried out from August to December 2022. The research model (Figure 1) specifies that a minimum sample size of ten times the number of constructs in each variable is required (Hair et al., 2017). The number of indicators built as proxies for each construct is five items, so a minimum of 4 times 5 or 200 sample size is needed for this study. The number of participants that can be used during the distribution of the questionnaire is 444. Thus, a sample size of as many as 444 is considered usable in this study.

3.2. Research instruments and measurements

Price Discounts, Store Atmosphere, Fashion Involvement, and Impulse Buying are latent variables developed based on previous research. Each variable is measured using five items. Measurement of the Price Discount variable was adopted by Çavuşoğlu et al. (2020), the variable Store Atmosphere by Xiao et al. (2022), and Fashion involvement was taken by Keegan et al. (2021). Meanwhile, measurements for Impulse Buying are taken from Aiolfi et al. (2022) and Atulkar & Kesari (2018). The items on each latent variable were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree"; 5 = "strongly agree"). Before data collection, questionnaires were tested against 30 samples in the population. All constructs are declared valid and reliable. Questions about gender and pages frequently used in fashion shopping were also included in the questionnaire.

3.3. Data Analysis

The PLS-SEM analysis technique was employed in this study due to its multivariate nature, which enables a simultaneous examination of all relationships between variables in the conceptual model, including structural and measurement components (Hair et al., 2019). The software used is SmartPLS 3.2.9. According to Hair et al. (2019), the measurement and structural models must be evaluated at PLS-SEM. The measurement model evaluates convergent validity, internal consistency, and discriminant validity, while the structural model assesses the predictive ability of the model based on R², Q², and path coefficients (Hair et al., 2019).

4. RESULT

4.1. Descriptif Data

Fashion purchases made by 202 men and 242 women on E-Commerce platforms and Instagram are listed in Table 1. Shopee and Instagram are two of the E-commerce platforms that are widely used to buy fashion. When viewed based on the distribution of gender in each online store, the type of store chosen by men and women to buy fashion is relatively no different.

| Online Shop | Shopee | Lazada | Instagram | Tokopedia | Zalora | Total |
|-------------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Female | 23,20 | 3,38 | 24,10 | 2,70 | 1,13 | 54,50 |
| Male | 20,04 | 2,70 | 19,82 | 2,03 | 0,90 | 45,50 |
| Total | 43,24 | 6,08 | 43,92 | 4,73 | 2,03 | 100,00 |

 Table 1. Distribution (%) of Online Stores by Gender

4.2. Measurement Model

The first step in the measurement model evaluation is to evaluate the convergent validity of each item viewed based on the outer loading value. An item is declared reliable if the outer loading value is more significant than 0.708 (Hair et al., 2019). In this case, the value of all outer loadings is more significant than 0.708 (Table 2). The test continues to check the convergent validity value of each construct based on the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value. An acceptable AVE value of 0.5 or higher states that the construct can account for at least 50% of the item's variance (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the AVE value of each construct is at a value of 0.601 - 0.831.

The second step in the measurement model evaluation is to evaluate internal consistency, namely Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach alpha values (Hair et al., 2019). A construct is considered consistent if the CR value is more significant than 0.7 and the Cronbach alpha value (Hair et al., 2017). In this case, the CR and Cronbach alpha values are 0.796 – 0.879 (Table 2.)

| | Construct/Items | Loading | VIF | Cronbach'alpha | CR | AVE |
|------|--------------------------------------|---------|-------|----------------|--------|-------|
| | | Factors | | | 0.01.6 | |
| | Price Discount | | | 0,877 | 0,916 | 0,732 |
| X1.1 | When shopping, I look for day-of- | 0,824 | 2,015 | | | |
| | the-week deals. | | | | | |
| X1.2 | I like holiday sales at stores. | 0,891 | 2,776 | | | |
| X1.3 | Special day discounts encourage | 0,875 | 2,508 | | | |
| | me to buy. | | | | | |
| X1.4 | On sale days, I check everything in | 0,829 | 1,960 | | | |
| | the store. | | | | | |
| | Store Atmosphere | | | 0,825 | 0,884 | 0,656 |
| X2.1 | The store feels welcoming. | 0,768 | 1,622 | | | |
| X2.2 | The store is well-organized and | 0,834 | 1,868 | | | |
| | accessible. | | | | | |
| X2.3 | The product displays are visible. | 0,852 | 2,038 | | | |
| X2.4 | The store provides concise product | 0,782 | 1,673 | | | |
| | information. | | | | | |
| | Fashion Involvement | | | 0,796 | 0,907 | 0,831 |
| X3.3 | I usually shop at online stores that | 0,915 | 1,777 | | | |
| | specialize in the latest fashion | | | | | |
| X3.5 | I usually have one or more outfits | 0,907 | 1,777 | | | |
| | in the latest style | | | | | |
| | Impulse Buying | | | 0,834 | 0,883 | 0,601 |
| Y1 | When shopping, I stick to my list. | 0,779 | 1,721 | | | |
| Y2 | I often buy unplanned items when | 0,808 | 1,880 | | | |
| | shopping. | | | | | |
| Y3 | I buy things without planning to. | 0,789 | 1,758 | | | |
| Y4 | It's fun to make a last-minute | 0,772 | 1,717 | | | |
| | purchase. | | | | | |
| Y5 | When I see something I like, I buv | 0,727 | 1,569 | | | |
| | it without thinking. | , | | | | |

The next step is to evaluate the validity of the discriminant, which shows the extent to which a construct empirically differs from other constructs in the research model. One that can be used is the Fornell-Larcker criteria. Each statement will have the best quality when the correlation matrix shows that the first construct has a more significant correlation coefficient than the other constructs below it, and the second construct hints at the same thing (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). At this stage, one item on Price Discount and Store Atmosphere and three items on Fashion Involvement must be dropped to get a matrix according to the Fornell-Larcker criteria. Table 3 shows that the matrix formed already states that each construct differs.

Table 3. Measurement Model: Discriminant Validity Fornell-Larcker Criterion

| | Price Discount | Store Atmosphere | Fashion Involvement | Impulse Buying |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Price Discount | 0,855 | | | |
| Store Atmosphere | 0,845 | 0,810 | | |
| Fashion Involvement | 0,795 | 0,794 | 0,911 | |
| Impulse Buying | 0,663 | 0,690 | 0,689 | 0,775 |

4.3. Structural Model

Before analyzing structural relationships, collinearity should be checked to ensure that there is no bias in the regression results. Ideally, the variance inflation factor (VIF) value should be lower than 3 (Hair et al., 2019). In this model, all VIF values are smaller than 3, with a value range of 1.569 - 2.776 (Table 2).

The bootstrapping process using 10,000 sub-samples was used to evaluate significant indicators and path coefficient values (Hair et al., 2022). Evaluation of the model using the coefficient of determination (R^2), cross-validated redundancy (Q^2), and path coefficient (Hair et al., 2019). In this study, the R^2 value of 0.685 (Table 4) shows the strength of the influence of Price Discounts and Store Atmosphere on Fashion Involvement. Meanwhile, the R^2 value of 0.475 shows the effect of price discount, store atmosphere, and fashion involvement on impulse buying.

Further, to assess the accuracy of model predictions based on empirical data, the value of Q^2 is calculated (Hair et al., 2019). The Q^2 value for Fashion Involvement is 0.561, and the Q^2 for Impulse buying is 0.282 (Table 4). Based on these results, Fashion Involvement can be predicted well based on Price Discounts and Store Atmosphere, while Impulse Buying predictions based on Fashion Involvement are moderate.

| | | | | Coefficient | Р | Coefficient of | Predictive |
|--------------------------------|----------|----|---------|-------------|--------|-------------------|------------|
| | | | | | Values | determination | Relevance |
| | | | | | | (R ²) | (Q^2) |
| Price | Discount | -> | Fashion | 0,434 | 0.000 | 0,685 | 0,561 |
| Involvement | | | | | | | |
| Store Atmosphere -> Fashion | | | | 0,427 | 0.000 | | |
| Involve | ment | | | | | | |
| Fashion Involvement -> Impulse | | | | 0,689 | 0.000 | 0,475 | 0,282 |
| Buying | | | | | | | |

| I able 4. Situctular Mouer | Т | able | 4. | Structural | Model |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|----|------------|-------|
|-----------------------------------|---|------|----|------------|-------|

Testing of hypotheses is expressed based on path coefficients, as shown in Table 4. The relationship between Price Discount and Fashion Involvement of 0.434 is significant because the p-value is smaller than 0.05. Thus, Hypothesis 2 is acceptable. A significant relationship was also shown in the Store Atmosphere variable to Fashion Involvement (H3) and Fashion Involvement to Impulse Buying (H1). Thus, all hypotheses are acceptable, meaning a significant relationship exists between all exogenous variables and their endogenous variables.

| Table 5. Multi-Group Analysis by Gender | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------|----------|--|--|
| | Path | Coefficients-diff | P Values | | |
| | (Pria - v | wanita) | | | |
| Price Discount -> Fashion Involvement | -0,055 | | 0,323 | | |
| Store Atmosphere -> Fashion Involvement | 0,087 | | 0,240 | | |
| Fashion Involvement -> Impulse Buying | 0,153 | | 0,002 | | |

The results of multi-group analysis based on gender found no difference between men and women in the relationship between Price Discount and Fashion Involvement, which was realized with a p-value greater than 0.05. Likewise, with the relationship between Store Atmosphere and Fashion Involvement. Different results are shown in the relationship between Fashion Involvement and Impulse Buying, which states there are differences in Impulse Buying behavior between men and women. Based on these results, hypothesis 4 is acceptable.

5. DISCUSSION

This research proves that the impulse buying behavior model towards fashion products in Generation Z is acceptable. These findings confirm the framework model proposed by Keegan et al. (2021). When viewed based on the results of statistical tests in Table 4, the Price Discount and Store Atmosphere are pretty strong in influencing Fashion Involvement, with an R² of 0.685. This result shows that the push for fashion needs will increase with the stimulation of discounted prices and online shopping media with a welcoming, easily accessible display and clear product information. Meanwhile, discount prices, store atmosphere, and fashion involvement affect impulse buying with an R2 value of 0.475.

Partially, Fashion Involvement has a significant effect on impulse buying. This finding is in line with Cengiz (2017), Liapati et al. (2015), Pramestya & Widagda (2020), and Wayan et al. (2023). The influence of this variable on impulse buying is quite significant, at 0.689 (Table 4). This can be explained as follows: Generation Z, with characteristics sensitive to trends and lifestyles, tends to fulfill their fashion needs for the latest fashion, triggering impulse purchases.

Price discounts have a significant effect on Fashion Involvement. Although no literature has been found that shows the same relationship, in general, the findings of this study do not contradict previous studies. For example, Mortimer et al. (2022) state that consumers with high engagement with fashion tend to know product price and value better. They tend to buy products at a discount if they believe that the product has good value. Generation *Z*, who in this study are students, generally have limited money, so price discounts are sensitive. Discounts incentivize them to purchase fashion products immediately (Kim et al., 2007; Zhou et al., 2018). They are satisfied because they feel they have obtained savings with the difference in purchase price (Flavian et al., 2020; Mayhoub & Rabboh, 2022). With discounts, they can fulfill the desire to follow fashion at a lower product value. Thus, discount offers on social media and e-commerce pages can allegedly increase involvement in fashion.

The results of statistical tests show that store atmosphere significantly affects fashion involvement (Table 4). This result is in line with the findings of McCormick & Livett (2012) and Sun & Guo (2017), which state that online media can increase engagement in fashion. Practical product layout and placement can stimulate consumers to browse more products (Sharma & Bumb, 2022; Shoenberger & Kim, 2019). In addition, product visualization well increases sensation in shopping (Chang et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2007; Krasonikolakis et al., 2018). Another thing is that Generation Z, who grew up with technology and social media, and shopping experiences are often associated with self-expression (Lee & Chen, 2021), so this situation tends to create engagement with the product.

This research shows that the effect of discounts and online store displays on fashion engagement between men and women is no different. This finding is different from that proposed by Sun & Guo (2017), which also looked at the relationship of media exposure to fashion involvement in participants aged 18 to 30 years. Discrepancies in these findings are likely due to the skills in processing information in online stores in Generation *Z*, known as digital natives. So, in general, men and women respond equally to the stimulation of discounts and online media activities. In comparison, there are differences in impulse buying behavior between men and women influenced by fashion involvement. This phenomenon is alleged because women are more involved in fashion than men (Lim & Park, 2011; Sun & Guo, 2017; Workman & Lee, 2011), so they tend to respond to impulse purchases.

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

This research shows that price discounts and store atmosphere can predict impulse buying through fashion involvement. These findings indicate that an excellent online store atmosphere, in the form of a welcoming display, easy page navigation, accurate product information, and visualization, will trigger impulse purchases. In addition, an effective strategy in offering discounts can encourage impulsive behavior.

This study also shows differences in impulse buying behavior between men and women. Following the previous literature, women tend to have higher fashion involvement than men, so fashion trends, especially women's fashion, must continuously be updated by marketers.

This finding is an input for marketers, the first to maintain the atmosphere of their online store. The presence of online stores packaged as if consumers are shopping at offline stores needs to be considered. One alternative that can be done is a live sale where interaction between buyers and marketers can be done directly. In addition, it utilizes technology that allows product images to look real so that it seems as if consumers can hold and try the product.

Another thing that can be input for marketers is how to set the right price promotion strategy. Flash sales on specific dates will encourage impulse buying because consumers are limited to a limited time, so they cannot consider well whether the product offered is needed. On the other hand, business people are still responsible for educating their consumers to be wise in buying products. One form of education that can be provided is, for example, providing honest and accurate information about a product.

7. LIMITATIONS

This research has not specifically determined the fashion products that are the object of impulse buying carried out by participants. Different behavior towards shirts, bags, shoes, or accessories is possible. This point is important to note, considering that in online purchases, the object of purchase, the preference of men and women, is usually different (Pascual-Miguel et al., 2015). Both men and women have quite different perceptions of deepening the introduction of product details (Lin et al., 2019; Yi, 2022).

REFERENCES

- Abdelsalam, S., Salim, N., Alias, R. A., & Husain, O. (2020). Understanding Online Impulse Buying Behavior in Social Commerce: A Systematic Literature Review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 89041–89058. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2993671
- Ahmed, S., & Ting, D. H. (2020). Shopping cues: Conceptualization, scale development, and validation. *International Journal of Market Research*, 62(1), 95–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785319861897
- Aiolfi, S., Bellini, S., & Grandi, B. (2022). Using mobile while shopping in-store: a new model of impulse-buying behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 39(5), 432–444. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-05-2020-3823
- Alanadoly, A., & Salem, S. (2022). Fashion involvement, opinion-seeking and product variety as stimulators for fashion e-commerce: an investigated model based on S-O-R model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 34(10), 2410–2434. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-06-2021-0447
- Albarq, A. N. (2021). Effect of Web atmospherics and satisfaction on purchase behavior: stimulus– organism–response model. *Future Business Journal*, 7(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-021-00107-3

- Atulkar, S., & Kesari, B. (2018). Role of consumer traits and situational factors on impulse buying: does gender matter? *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 46(4), 386– 405. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-12-2016-0239
- Azhar, M., Akhtar, M. J., Rahman, M. N., & Khan, F. A. (2023). Measuring buying intention of generation Z on social networking sites: an application of social commerce adoption model. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1108/jeas-02-2022-0047
- Beatty, S. E., & Elizabeth Ferrell, M. (1998). Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal of Retailing*, 74(2), 161–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4359(98)90009-4
- Bhatia, V. (2019). Impact of fashion interest, materialism and internet addiction on e-compulsive buying behaviour of apparel. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, *10*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2018.1544502
- Bratko, D., Butkovic, A., & Bosnjak, M. (2013). Twin study of impulsive buying and its overlap with personality. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 34(1), 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000091
- Büyükdağ, N., Soysal, A. N., & Kitapci, O. (2020). The effect of specific discount pattern in terms of price promotions on perceived price attractiveness and purchase intention: An experimental research. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 55(March). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102112
- Calvo-Porral, C., & Lévy-Mangin, J. P. (2021). Examining the influence of store environment in hedonic and utilitarian shopping. *Administrative Sciences*, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11010006
- Çavuşoğlu, S., Demirağ, B., & Durmaz, Y. (2020). Investigation of the effect of hedonic shopping value on discounted product purchasing. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 31(3), 317–338. https://doi.org/10.1108/RIBS-04-2020-0034
- Celik, H., & Kocaman, R. (2017). Roles of self-monitoring, fashion involvement and technology readiness in an individual's propensity to use mobile shopping. *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, *19*(3–4), 166–182. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSIT-01-2017-0008
- Cengiz, H. (2017). Effect of the need for popularity on purchase decision involvement and impulse-buying behavior concerning fashion clothing. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, *8*(2), 113–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2016.1257358
- Chan, T. K. H., Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, Z. W. Y. (2017). The state of online impulse-buying research: A literature analysis. *Information and Management*, 54(2), 204–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.06.001
- Chang, Y. W., Hsu, P. Y., Chen, J., Shiau, W. L., & Xu, N. (2023). Utilitarian and/or hedonic shopping consumer motivation to purchase in smart stores. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 123(3), 821–842. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-04-2022-0250
- Chen, Y., Lu, Y., Wang, B., & Pan, Z. (2019). How do product recommendations affect impulse buying? An empirical study on WeChat social commerce. *Information and Management*, 56(2), 236–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2018.09.002
- Dawson, S., & Kim, M. (2010). Cues on apparel web sites that trigger impulse purchases. JournalofFashionMarketingandManagement,14(2),230–246.https://doi.org/10.1108/13612021011046084
- De Luca, R., & Botelho, D. (2021). The unconscious perception of smells as a driver of consumer responses: a framework integrating the emotion-cognition approach to scent marketing. *AMS Review*, *11*(1–2), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-019-00154-8
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., Moore, J. N., & Goebel, D. J. (2000). Prestige Clothing Shopping by

Consumers: A Confirmatory Assessment and Refinement of the Precon Scale with Managerial Implications . *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *8*(4), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2000.11501879

- Dewi, N. R., Suharyono, & Kumadji, S. (2015). Pengaruh Fashion Involvement dan Kecenderungan Hedonic Consumption Dengan Mediator Emosi Positif Terhadap Pembelian Impulsif Berorientasi Fashion (Survei Pada Pembeli Pakaian Di Mal Olympic Garden Kota Malang). Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB), 26(2), 1–10. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/86284-ID-pengaruh-fashion-involvemet-dankecender.pdf
- Djafarova, E., & Bowes, T. (2021). 'Instagram made Me buy it': Generation Z impulse purchases in fashion industry. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59(xxxx), 102345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102345
- Flavian, C., Guinaliu, M., & Lu, Y. (2020). Mobile payments adoption introducing mindfulness to better understand consumer behavior. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 38(7), 1575– 1599. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-01-2020-0039
- Floh, A., & Madlberger, M. (2013). The role of atmospheric cues in online impulse-buying behavior. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 12(6), 425–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2013.06.001
- Flurry, L. A., & Swimberghe, K. (2016). Consumer ethics of adolescents. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 24(1), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2016.1089766
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research This*, *18*(1), 39–50.
- Geng, R., Wang, S., Chen, X., Song, D., & Yu, J. (2020). Content marketing in e-commerce platforms in the internet celebrity economy. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 120(3), 464–485. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-05-2019-0270
- Gupta, S., & Gentry, J. W. (2018). Evaluating fast fashion: Examining its micro and the macro perspective. *Eco-Friendly and Fair: Fast Fashion and Consumer Behaviour, May 2018*, 15–24. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351058353-2
- Hair, J. F., Hult, T. G., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N., & Ray, S. (2022). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R: A Workbook. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, *31*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203
- Hair, J., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B., & Chong, A. Y. L. (2017). An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, *117*(3), 442–458. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-04-2016-0130
- Hashmi, H. B. A., Shu, C., & Haider, S. W. (2020). Moderating effect of hedonism on store environment-impulse buying nexus. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 48(5), 465–483. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-09-2019-0312
- Huo, C., Wang, X., Sadiq, M. W., & Pang, M. (2023). Exploring Factors Affecting Consumer's Impulse Buying Behavior in Live-Streaming Shopping: An Interactive Research Based Upon SOR Model. SAGE Open, 13(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231172678
- Iyer, G. R., Blut, M., Xiao, S. H., & Grewal, D. (2020). Impulse buying: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48(3), 384–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00670-w

- Johnson, K., & Im, H. (2014). Fashion and social responsibility. *Fashion, Style & Popular Culture*, 1(2), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1386/fspc.1.2.155_2
- Keegan, F., Ritch, E. L., & Siddiqui, N. (2021). The Changing Landscape of Consumerism -Advancing the SOR Framework of Stimuli that Encourages Impulsive Online Consumption. *New Perspectives on Critical Marketing and Consumer Society*, 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83909-554-220211003
- Kim, J., Fiore, A. M., & Lee, H. H. (2007). Influences of online store perception, shopping enjoyment, and shopping involvement on consumer patronage behavior towards an online retailer. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 14(2), 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2006.05.001
- Krasonikolakis, I., Vrechopoulos, A., Pouloudi, A., & Dimitriadis, S. (2018). Store layout effects on consumer behavior in 3D online stores. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(5–6), 1223–1256. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2015-0183
- Kumagai, K., & Nagasawa, S. (2022). Hedonic shopping experience, subjective well-being and brand luxury: a comparative discussion of physical stores and e-retailers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *34*(9), 1809–1826. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-04-2021-0256
- Lavuri, R., & Thaichon, P. (2023). Do extrinsic factors encourage shoppers' compulsive buying? Store environment and product characteristics. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 41(6), 722–740. https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-03-2023-0097
- Lee, C. H., & Chen, C. W. (2021). Impulse buying behaviors in live streaming commerce based on the stimulus-organism-response framework. *Information (Switzerland)*, 12(6), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/info12060241
- Lee, C. H., & Wu, J. J. (2017). Consumer online flow experience The relationship between utilitarian and hedonic value, satisfaction and unplanned purchase. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 117(10), 2452–2467. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-11-2016-0500
- Lee, J. E., & Chen-Yu, J. H. (2018). Effects of price discount on consumers' perceptions of savings, quality, and value for apparel products: mediating effect of price discount affect. *Fashion and Textiles*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-018-0128-2
- Li, M., Wang, Q., & Cao, Y. (2022). Understanding Consumer Online Impulse Buying in Live Streaming E-Commerce: A Stimulus-Organism-Response Framework. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19074378
- Liapati, G., Assiouras, I., & Decaudin, J. M. (2015). The role of fashion involvement, brand love and hedonic consumption tendency in fashion impulse purchasing. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 6(4), 251–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2015.1070679
- Lim, S., & Park, S. (2011). A Comparative Study on the Clothing Involvement, Price and Discount Influence of Consumer Satisfaction between Korea and the United States Soo-Kyeong. *Journal of the Korea Fashion & Costume Design Association*, 13(1), 1–10.
- Lin, S. C., Tseng, H. T., Shirazi, F., Hajli, N., & Tsai, P. T. (2022). Exploring factors influencing impulse buying in live streaming shopping: a stimulus-organism-response (SOR) perspective. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 35(6), 1383–1403. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-12-2021-0903
- Lin, X., Featherman, M., Brooks, S. L., & Hajli, N. (2019). Exploring Gender Differences in Online Consumer Purchase Decision Making: An Online Product Presentation Perspective. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 21(5), 1187–1201. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-018-9831-1
- Mayhoub, M. S., & Rabboh, E. H. (2022). Daylighting in shopping malls: Customer's perception, preference, and satisfaction. *Energy and Buildings*, 255, 111691.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2021.111691

- McCormick, H., & Livett, C. (2012). Analysing the influence of the presentation of fashion garments on young consumers' online behaviour. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *16*(1), 21–41. https://doi.org/10.1108/13612021211203014
- Mohan, G., Sivakumaran, B., & Sharma, P. (2013). Impact of store environment on impulse buying behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(10), 1711–1732. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2011-0110
- Mortimer, G., Grimmer, M., Grimmer, L., Wang, S., & Su, J. (2022). A cross cultural examination of "off-price" fashion shopping. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 50(12), 1494–1517. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-09-2021-0457
- Muhammad, A. S., Adeshola, I., & Isiaku, L. (2023). A mixed study on the "wow" of impulse purchase on Instagram: insights from Gen-Z in a collectivistic environment. *Young Consumers*. https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-04-2023-1728
- Munsch, A. (2021). Millennial and generation Z digital marketing communication and advertising effectiveness: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science: Bridging Asia and the World, 31*(1), 10–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2020.1808812
- Naderi, I. (2013). Beyond the fad: A critical review of consumer fashion involvement. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *37*(1), 84–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2011.01041.x
- Nam, J., Hamlin, R., Gam, H. J., Kang, J. H., Kim, J., Kumphai, P., Starr, C., & Richards, L. (2007). The fashion-conscious behaviours of mature female consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1), 102–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2006.00497.x
- Nghia, H. T., Olsen, S. O., & Trang, N. T. M. (2020). Shopping value, trust, and online shopping well-being: a duality approach. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, *38*(5), 545–558. https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-08-2019-0411
- O'Cass, A. (2004). Fashion clothing consumption: antecedents and consequences of fashion clothing involvement. *European Journal of Marketing*, *38*(7), 869–882. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560410539294
- Parboteeah, D. V., Valacich, J. S., & Wells, J. D. (2009). The influence of website characteristics on a consumer's urge to buy impulsively. *Information Systems Research*, 20(1), 60–78. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0157
- Park, H. J., & Lin, L. M. (2020). The effects of match-ups on the consumer attitudes toward internet celebrities and their live streaming contents in the context of product endorsement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 52(November 2018), 101934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101934
- Pascual-Miguel, F. J., Agudo-Peregrina, Á. F., & Chaparro-Peláez, J. (2015). Influences of gender and product type on online purchasing. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(7), 1550–1556. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.01.050
- Peng, C., & Kim, Y. G. (2014). Application of the Stimuli-Organism-Response (S-O-R) Framework to Online Shopping Behavior. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 13(November), 159–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2014.944437
- Pentecost, R., & Andrews, L. (2010). Fashion retailing and the bottom line: The effects of generational cohorts, gender, fashion fanship, attitudes and impulse buying on fashion expenditure. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 17(1), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2009.09.003
- Pramestya, N. L. P. U. M., & Widagda, I. J. A. (2020). the Role of Positive Emotion Mediates

Fashion Involvement on Impulse Buying. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)*, 4(9), 01–08. www.ajhssr.com

- Razzaq, A., Ansari, N. Y., Razzaq, Z., & Awan, H. M. (2018). The Impact of Fashion Involvement and Pro-Environmental Attitude on Sustainable Clothing Consumption: The Moderating Role of Islamic Religiosity. *SAGE Open*, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018774611
- Redine, A., Deshpande, S., Jebarajakirthy, C., & Surachartkumtonkun, J. (2023). Impulse buying: A systematic literature review and future research directions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 47(1), 3–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12862
- Richard, M. O., & Chebat, J. C. (2016). Modeling online consumer behavior: Preeminence of emotions and moderating influences of need for cognition and optimal stimulation level. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 541–553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.05.010
- Russell, J. A., & Mehrabian, A. (1974). Distinguishing anger and anxiety in terms of emotional response factors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(1), 79–83. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0035915
- Sharma, S., & Bumb, A. (2022). Femluencing: Integration of Femvertising and Influencer Marketing on Social Media. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 22(1), 95–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2022.2032493
- Sheehan, D., Hardesty, D. M., Ziegler, A. H., & Chen, H. (Allan). (2019). Consumer reactions to price discounts across online shopping experiences. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51(May), 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.06.001
- Shen, K. N., & Khalifa, M. (2012). System design effects on online impulse buying. *Internet Research*, 22(4), 396–425. https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241211250962
- Shoenberger, H., & Kim, E. (Anna). (2019). Product placement as leveraged marketing communications: the role of wishful identification, brand trust, and brand buying behaviours. *International Journal of Advertising*, 38(1), 50–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2017.1391678
- Slater, S., & Demangeot, C. (2021). Marketer acculturation to diversity needs: The case of modest fashion across two multicultural contexts. *Journal of Business Research*, 134(June), 702–715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.059
- Summer, T. A., Belleau, B. D., & Xu, Y. (2006). Predicting purchase intention of a controversial luxury apparel product. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 10(4), 405–419. https://doi.org/10.1108/13612020610701947
- Sun, J., Li, T., & Sun, S. (2023). Factors affecting users' impulse purchases in online group buying: online consumer reviews, countdowns and self-control. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-07-2022-0560
- Sun, Y., & Guo, S. (2017). Predicting fashion involvement by media use, social comparison, and lifestyle: An interaction model. *International Journal of Communication*, *11*, 4559–4582.
- Tirtayasa, S., Nevianda, M., & Syahrial, H. (2020). The Effect of Hedonic Shopping Motivation, Shopping Lifestyle And Fashion Involvement With Impulse Buying. *International Journal of Business Economics (IJBE)*, 2(1), 18–28. https://doi.org/10.30596/ijbe.v2i1.5715
- Van den Bergh, J., De Pelsmacker, P., & Worsley, B. (2023). Beyond labels: segmenting the Gen Z market for more effective marketing. *Young Consumers, September*. https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-03-2023-1707
- Venkatesh, V., Hoehle, H., Aloysius, J. A., & Nikkhah, H. R. (2021). Being at the cutting edge of online shopping: Role of recommendations and discounts on privacy perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 121(March), 106785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106785

- Vieira, V., Santini, F. O., & Araujo, C. F. (2018). A meta-analytic review of hedonic and utilitarian shopping values. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 35(4), 426–437. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-08-2016-1914
- Wayan, N., Ratna, R., & Adi, I. N. R. (2023). Shopping Lifestyle , Fashion Involvement , Hedonic Shopping Motivation , Positive Emotion , Impulse Buying E-Commerce. 4(6), 0–10.
- Workman, J. E., & Studak, C. M. (2006). Fashion consumers and fashion problem recognition style. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(1), 75–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2005.00451.x
- Workman, J., & Lee, S.-H. (2011). Materialism, fashion consumers and gender: a cross-cultural study. *Internasional Journal of Consumer Studies*, 35(1), 5758. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00935.x
- Xiao, Q., Siponen, M., Zhang, X., Lu, F., Chen, S. hua, & Mao, M. (2022). Impacts of platform design on consumer commitment and online review intention: does use context matter in dual-platform e-commerce? *Internet Research*, 32(5), 1496–1531. https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-03-2021-0152
- Yi, Y. (2022). The Perception on Online Shopping Risks of Different Genders. *Proceedings of the* 2022 2nd International Conference on Enterprise Management and Economic Development (ICEMED 2022), 656(Icemed), 1004–1014. https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220603.164
- Zafar, A. U., Qiu, J., Shahzad, M., Shen, J., Bhutto, T. A., & Irfan, M. (2021). Impulse buying in social commerce: bundle offer, top reviews, and emotional intelligence. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 33(4), 945–973. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-08-2019-0495
- Zhang, B., & Kim, J. H. (2013). Luxury fashion consumption in China: Factors affecting attitude and purchase intent. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 20(1), 68–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2012.10.007
- Zhang, L., Shao, Z., Li, X., & Feng, Y. (2021). Gamification and online impulse buying: The moderating effect of gender and age. *International Journal of Information Management*, 61(October), 102267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102267
- Zhao, Y., Li, Y., Wang, N., Zhou, R., & Luo, X. (Robert). (2022). A Meta-Analysis of Online Impulsive Buying and the Moderating Effect of Economic Development Level. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 24(5), 1667–1688. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10170-4
- Zhou, J., Xu, X., & Shen, B. (2018). Selling luxury fashion to conspicuous consumers in the presence of discount sensitivity behavior. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 25(6), 1763–1784. https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.12543