



The Pleasure Trap: The Effects of a Hedonic Lifestyle and Scarcity on Impulsive Buying among Generation Z E-Commerce Users in Karawang Regency

Della Amelia¹, Lania Muharsih², Holy Greateda³
Universitas Buana Perjuangan Karawang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author:  ps22.dellaamelia210@ubpkarawang.ac.id

ABSTRACT

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received
August 13, 2026
Revised
Oktober 12, 2026
Accepted
Oktober 14, 2026

Technological and internet developments have encouraged the public to increasingly rely on digital services, including online shopping through e-commerce platforms, dominated by Generation Z users. Marketing strategies in e-commerce, such as flash sales and live streaming, tend to combine hedonic pleasure and scarcity, which can trigger impulsive buying. This study aimed to determine the effect of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity on impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency. This study used a quantitative approach with a causal design. The sampling technique used was non-probability convenience sampling with 385 Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency, determined using the Cochran formula. The instruments used were the Impulsive Buying Tendency Scale (IBTS), Hedonic Lifestyle Scale, and Scarcity Scale. The partial test results showed that hedonic lifestyle had a significant positive effect on impulsive buying (Sig. 0.000; $p < 0.05$), and scarcity also had a significant positive effect (Sig. 0.000; $p < 0.05$). The simultaneous test results showed that hedonic lifestyle and scarcity together significantly affected impulsive buying, with an F value of 292.846 (Sig. 0.000; $p < 0.05$). The R Square of 0.605 indicated that both variables contributed 60.5% to impulsive buying. This study showed that a hedonic lifestyle was more dominant in influencing impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency.

Keywords: *Hedonic Lifestyle, Scarcity, Impulsive Buying, Generation Z, E-commerce*

How to cite

Amelia, D., Muharsih, L., & Greateda, H. (2026). The Pleasure Trap: The Effects of a Hedonic Lifestyle and Scarcity on Impulsive Buying among Generation Z E-Commerce Users in Karawang Regency. *Journal of Society Counseling*. 4(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59388/josc.v4i3.1043>

Journal Homepage

<https://journal.scidacplus.com/index.php/josc>

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Published by

ScidacPlus

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of information technology and the internet has made people increasingly dependent on digital services, influencing various aspects of life, particularly the economy (Maduwu et al., 2025). The Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association (APJII) reported that 235 million Indonesians, or 81.72% of the total population, were connected to the internet in 2026 (APJII, 2026). High internet use has transformed commerce and consumer

purchasing decisions. Online shopping has become increasingly dominant because it is considered easy and practical, whereas offline shopping requires consumers to visit sellers in person (Sapitri et al., 2024). Permatasari and Kuswadi (as cited in Hendrayani et al., 2025) added that social media integrated with e-commerce enables people in Indonesia to shop online quickly, particularly because consumers often rely on other users' feedback before purchasing. However, exposure to online marketing stimuli can also encourage spontaneous and unplanned purchases, known as impulsive buying (Zulfiqar et al., 2018).

A preliminary study conducted on November 14, 2025, using Google Forms with 55 Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency selected through convenience sampling provided an initial picture of impulsive buying. The preliminary questionnaire asked about age, status, e-commerce platforms used, the desire to follow trends, and purchasing experiences during flash sales. A total of 70.9% of respondents stated that their purchases were driven by the desire to follow trends, while 83.6% had purchased products after seeing a flash sale. This preliminary study was exploratory and separate from the main study; therefore, its data were not included in the analysis. Instead, they were used only to illustrate the initial phenomenon and inform the development of the main research instrument, which was administered to 385 respondents.

Among various e-commerce user groups, Generation Z is one of the most prominent segments. Generation Z refers to people born between 1997 and 2012, who grew up during the rapid development of digital technology and the internet (Dimock, 2019; Sari et al., 2025). Because the main data collection took place in 2026, individuals born between 1997 and 2012 were aged 14–29 at the time of the study. This age range formed the respondents' inclusion criteria and was reflected in the demographic age categories (14–17, 18–21, 22–25, and 26–29 years). According to Utamanyu and Muazam (as cited in Utamanyu & Darmastuti, 2022), Generation Z accounts for approximately 85% of e-commerce transactions, making it one of the most active online-shopping groups. Their dominance is supported by their status as digital natives, having grown accustomed to using digital technology in everyday activities, including shopping (Sari et al., 2025). According to APJII's 2026 survey, TikTok was among the social media platforms most frequently accessed by Generation Z (31.8%), while Shopee (47.5%) and TikTok Shop (33.4%) dominated e-commerce use.

E-commerce platforms now offer various features that facilitate online shopping. Live-streaming features allow buyers to ask sellers directly about product details (Mausul & Ma'mun, 2024), while flash sales and countdown timers are often combined to make buyers feel that they must decide quickly (Adhianto & Faried, 2025). Flash sales offer products below their regular prices but are available only for a short period and in limited quantities (Lamis et al., 2022). Marketplaces such as Tokopedia, Shopee, TikTok Shop, and Lazada display these offers prominently to attract buyers with competitive prices (Kristo et al., 2024). The combination of live streaming, limited offers, short-term discounts, and persuasive host communication may encourage impulsive buying (Maqvira et al., 2025). Devina et al. (2025) emphasized that perceived interactivity in features such as Shopee Live and TikTok Shop Live can encourage impulsive buying, particularly among young consumers. In this study, these features are treated as the online-shopping context that presents the two stimuli under investigation, rather than as research variables. The pleasure, entertainment, and active interaction associated with live streaming represent hedonic experiences measured through the hedonic lifestyle variable, whereas limited stock and time in flash sales and countdown timers represent scarcity messages measured through scarcity, including limited quantity scarcity (LQS) and limited time scarcity

(LTS) (Wu et al., 2021). In other words, hedonic lifestyle and scarcity are the predictors tested in this study, while e-commerce features provide the setting in which Generation Z encounters them.

Spontaneous responses to consumer marketing stimuli are consistent with the concept of impulsive buying. According to Verplanken and Herabadi (as cited in Gunawan & Kartasasmita, 2025), impulsive buying is a spontaneous purchase made without careful planning. Similarly, Rook (as cited in Aprilia & Septila, 2017) described impulsive buying as an experience involving a strong and urgent urge to purchase immediately, often accompanied by emotional conflict and a tendency to disregard negative consequences. Based on these definitions, Verplanken and Herabadi (2001) distinguish two aspects of impulsive buying: the cognitive aspect, characterized by insufficient planning and consideration, and the affective aspect, which involves the emotions, feelings, and urges accompanying impulsive purchases. Impulsive buying may ultimately have negative consequences, including wasteful spending, regret, and financial problems (Gunawan & Kartasasmita, 2025).

Zulfiqar et al. (2018) identified several factors that may influence impulsive buying, including sales promotions, advertising, personal factors, store environments, online factors, demographic factors, situational factors, and social factors. Engel et al. (as cited in Giswananda & Mastuti, 2025) identified personal factors as important lifestyle-related influences. In this regard, Chan et al. (as cited in Lamis et al., 2022) classified the factors associated with impulsive buying into two groups: consumer characteristics, such as a tendency toward hedonic purchasing, and external factors, such as promotional offers and the shopping media used. Badgaiyan et al. (as cited in Mertaningrum et al., 2023) added that impulsive buying is often driven by hedonic goals, with purchasing decisions occurring without planning, unintentionally, and rapidly in response to marketing stimuli.

Solomon (as cited in Khairat et al., 2018) views a hedonic lifestyle as consumers' tendency to spend time having fun, interacting socially, and seeking attention from their surroundings. Kotler and Keller (as cited in Ananda et al., 2021) describe three aspects of a hedonic lifestyle: activities, interests, and opinions. Hidayat et al. (2025) noted that psychological and personality factors directly shape shopping patterns. Studies by Fani et al. (2025) and Dzaky and Prasetyo (2025) consistently show that a hedonic lifestyle has a positive and significant effect on impulsive buying among e-commerce users, especially when consumers prioritize pleasure and immediate gratification facilitated by convenient transactions and sales promotions.

In addition to a hedonic lifestyle, impulsive buying may be triggered by scarcity-based promotional marketing strategies (Aurellia & Siregar, 2025). Wu et al. (2021) define scarcity as a promotional message that creates a sense of urgency, making consumers feel rushed when making decisions. They distinguish two main types: Limited Quantity Scarcity (LQS), which uses limited product stock as an attraction, and Limited Time Scarcity (LTS), which refers to offers available only for a specified period and encourages consumers to purchase before the offer expires. Verhagen et al. (as cited in Asriadi et al., 2025) explain that online impulsive buying is often triggered by situational pressure, such as limited time or product availability. Guo et al. (2023) added that LQS strategies in e-commerce live streaming can shorten the time consumers spend searching for product information before purchasing, particularly among highly impulsive consumers. Similarly, Lamis et al. (2022) found that quantity and time scarcity increase consumers' arousal and fear of missing out. Thus, scarcity strategies can accelerate spontaneous purchasing decisions. This is reinforced by Widyariini et al. (2025), who found that exposure to scarcity cues significantly encourages impulsive buying.

Nevertheless, previous studies have generally examined the two predictors separately. The effect of hedonic lifestyle on impulsive buying was demonstrated by Fani et al. (2025) and Dzaky and Prasetyo (2025), while the effect of scarcity was documented by Wu et al. (2021), Lamis et al. (2022), Guo et al. (2023), and Widyariini et al. (2025). A study combining both variables (Aurellia & Siregar, 2025) examined K-pop merchandise purchases within a particular fan community rather than Generation Z e-commerce shopping. Therefore, the novelty of this study lies in testing hedonic lifestyle and scarcity simultaneously in one model and comparing the relative strength of their effects among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency, a population that has not previously been examined in this context.

Based on the discussion above, this study aimed to: (1) test the positive and significant effect of hedonic lifestyle on impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency (H1); (2) test the positive and significant effect of scarcity on impulsive buying in this population (H2); and (3) test the simultaneous positive and significant effects of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity on impulsive buying (H3). The three hypotheses were examined using a quantitative approach with a causal design and multiple linear regression analysis.

Literature Review

Impulsive Buying

Arisandy (2017) describes impulsive buying as consumer behavior characterized by spontaneous purchasing decisions made without careful planning. It emerges suddenly, accompanied by a strong urge to buy something immediately without considering potential consequences. Verplanken and Herabadi (as cited in Gunawan & Kartasmita, 2025) define impulsive buying as a spontaneous purchase made without careful planning and accompanied by mixed feelings arising from emotional urges. They further identify two aspects: cognitive and affective. The cognitive aspect is reflected in limited planning and consideration before purchasing, whereas the affective aspect involves the emotions, feelings, and urges accompanying the purchase. These two aspects provide the theoretical basis for examining the effects of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity in this study. A hedonic lifestyle operates internally, as pleasure-oriented consumers treat shopping as a source of emotional satisfaction, strengthening the affective aspect while weakening planning (the cognitive aspect) (Badgaiyan, as cited in Mertaningrum et al., 2023). By contrast, scarcity acts as external situational pressure: a sense of urgency (Wu et al., 2021) shortens information search and deliberation (Guo et al., 2023) while triggering arousal associated with fear of missing out (Lamis et al., 2022). Both may lead to the “feeling and no thinking” pattern central to impulsive buying (Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001).

Hedonic Lifestyle

Kotler and Keller (as cited in Ananda et al., 2021) define a hedonic lifestyle as a way of living expressed through activities, interests, and opinions. Supporting this view, Wells and Tigert (as cited in Azzahra et al., 2024) describe a hedonic lifestyle as consumers’ use of time and money, reflected in activities outside the home, interests, and opinions directed toward pleasure and material enjoyment as primary life priorities. According to Wells and Tigert (as cited in Ananda et al., 2021), its aspects are: (1) activities, referring to observable actions and, in this measurement, the reasons behind those actions; (2) interests, referring to the degree of attention given to particular objects, events, or topics; and (3) opinions, referring to consumers’ verbal or written responses to stimuli.

Scarcity

Wu et al. (2021) define scarcity as a promotional message that creates a sense of urgency, making consumers feel rushed when making decisions. Similarly, Walras (as cited in Guo et al., 2023) defines scarcity as a condition in which something useful is available only in limited quantities. Wu et al. (2021) distinguish two main types of scarcity: Limited Quantity Scarcity (LQS), a promotional strategy that uses limited product stock to attract consumers, and Limited Time Scarcity (LTS), a promotion available only for a specified period that encourages consumers to buy before the offer ends.

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative approach with a predictive correlational design. This design was selected because data were collected through a cross-sectional survey at a single point in time; thus, the analysis examined the ability of independent variables to predict the dependent variable rather than establishing a strong causal relationship. Data were collected using the Impulsive Buying Tendency Scale (IBTS), Hedonic Lifestyle Scale, and Scarcity Scale. The target population comprised Generation Z individuals born between 1997 and 2012, residing in Karawang Regency, and actively using e-commerce. The sample was recruited through non-probability sampling, specifically convenience sampling. The sample size was determined using Cochran's formula because the total population of Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency was unknown and treated as infinite. With a 5% margin of error, the minimum sample size was 385 respondents.

The three scales were adapted from instruments developed by previous researchers using the same procedure: (1) adjusting item wording from the source instruments into contextual Indonesian suitable for Generation Z e-commerce users; (2) assessing content validity and item readability by three experts using Aiken's V, with a decision threshold of ≥ 0.60 ; items that did not meet the criterion were revised or removed; (3) piloting the instruments with 50 Generation Z e-commerce users outside the research sample to obtain empirical validity evidence through item-total correlations and Cronbach's alpha reliability; and (4) determining the final items for the main data collection.

First, impulsive buying was measured using the Impulsive Buying Tendency Scale (IBTS), adapted from Muharshih (2025) based on Verplanken and Herabadi's (2001) theory and measuring cognitive and affective aspects. The IBTS comprised 11 items covering both aspects and used a seven-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree). Example items included "Most of my purchases have been planned in advance" and "I often buy without thinking."

Second, hedonic lifestyle was measured using the Hedonic Lifestyle Scale, adapted from Ananda et al. (2021) based on Wells and Tigert's theory and covering activities, interests, and opinions. The scale was initially developed with 30 items and subsequently reduced to 20 items across the three aspects. It used a four-point Likert scale (1 = Not at All Appropriate to 4 = Very Appropriate). Example items included "I am interested in beauty treatments that are currently trending" and "I feel happy when buying newly released products."

Third, scarcity was measured using the Scarcity Scale, adapted from Lamis et al. (2022) based on Wu et al.'s (2021) theory. It covered two dimensions: limited quantity scarcity (LQS) and limited time scarcity (LTS). Three experts assessed the scale's content validity using Aiken's V. All items obtained values between 0.60 and 1, exceeding the validity threshold ($V = 0.60$);

therefore, all eight items were considered content-valid. The final scale consisted of eight items using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Example items included “I feel that the time available for shopping during a flash sale is limited” and “When shopping during a flash sale, I feel anxious about the remaining shopping time.”

The three instruments—the Impulsive Buying Tendency Scale (IBTS), Hedonic Lifestyle Scale, and Scarcity Scale—were piloted and tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha in SPSS for Windows version 25.0. The IBTS had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.875, with validity coefficients (*r*) ranging from 0.396 to 0.724. The Hedonic Lifestyle Scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.903, with validity coefficients ranging from 0.370 to 0.705. The Scarcity Scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.724, with validity coefficients ranging from 0.370 to 0.521. These results indicated adequate reliability and validity for the purposes of this study.

HASIL DAN PEMBAHASAN

Before presenting the main analyses, this section describes the respondents’ characteristics to provide context for the data. Demographic information included gender, age, shopping frequency, and e-commerce platform, which are important for examining the effects of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity on impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency.

Table 1. Demographic Data

No.	Category	Description	Male f(%)	Female f(%)
1.	Age	14-17 Years	12(7,7%)	20(8,7%)
		18-21 Years	45(29,0%)	96(41,7%)
		22-25 Years	63(40,6%)	85(37,0%)
		26-29 Years	35(22,6%)	29(12,6%)
2.	Shopping frequency (last 3 months)	1-2 times	8(5,2%)	7(3,0%)
		3-5 times	79(51,0%)	101(43,9%)
		6-10 times	50(32,3%)	78(33,9%)
		More than 10 times	18(11,6%)	44(19,1%)
3.	Platform e-commerce	Shopee	86(55,5%)	152(66,1%)
		Tokopedia	20(12,9%)	19(8,3%)
		TikTok Shop	35(22,6%)	41(17,8%)
		Lazada	10(6,5%)	14(6,1%)
		Blibli	4(2,6%)	4(1,7%)
Total respondents (n)			155(100,0%)	230(100,0%)

As shown in Table 1, the 385 respondents were predominantly women aged 18–25 who engaged in online shopping relatively frequently; most reported shopping three to five times during the previous three months. Shopee was the most widely used e-commerce platform (66.1%), considerably ahead of platforms such as TikTok Shop and Tokopedia.

Table 2. Classical Assumption Test Results

Test	Variable	Value	Criterion	Result
Normality (K-S test of residuals)	Residual Model	Sig. 0,200	>0,05	Normally Distributed Residuals (Assumption Met)

Test	Variable	Value	Criterion	Result
Multicollinearity	Hedonic	Tolerance	Tolerance >	Multicollinearity-Free (Assumptions Met)
	Lifestyle	0,991; VIF 1,009	0,10 / VIF < 10	
	Scarcity	Tolerance 0,991; VIF 1,009		
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser)	Hedonic	Sig. 0,007	> 0,05	Indications of mild heteroscedasticity
	Lifestyle			
	Scarcity	Sig. 0,215		Heteroscedasticity does not occur

The classical assumption test results are presented in Table 2. Normality was tested on the regression residuals using the one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, yielding a significance value of 0.200 ($p > 0.05$), indicating normally distributed residuals. The multicollinearity test yielded a tolerance value of 0.991 ($VIF = 1.009$) for both independent variables, indicating no multicollinearity. In the Glejser heteroscedasticity test, scarcity did not indicate heteroscedasticity ($Sig. = 0.215$; $p > 0.05$), whereas hedonic lifestyle indicated mild heteroscedasticity ($Sig. = 0.007$; $p < 0.05$). This indication did not alter the hypothesis-testing conclusions because heteroscedasticity does not bias the regression coefficients, and the t-values in the partial tests (Table 4) were well above the critical values. This issue is reported as a model limitation.

Table 3. Linearity Test

Variable	Deviation from Linearity (Sig.)	Side Significance	Result
Hedonic Lifestyle Impulsive Buying	.447	0,05	Linear (Assumption Met)
Scarcity Pembelian Impulif	.847	0,05	Linear (Assumption Met)

As shown in Table 3, the significance value for Deviation from Linearity was 0.447 ($p > 0.05$) for hedonic lifestyle and 0.847 ($p > 0.05$) for scarcity. Both values exceeded 0.05, indicating no significant deviation from linearity in the relationships between each independent variable and the dependent variable. Therefore, the relationships of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity with impulsive buying can be considered linear, and the linearity assumption was met.

Table 4. Partial Tests

Model		Coefficients ^a							
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	8.368	1.394		6.002	.000			
	Hedonic Lifestyle	.373	.022	.542	16.774	.000	.590	.651	.539
	Scarcity	.481	.030	.510	15.779	.000	.561	.628	.507
a. Dependent Variable: Impulsive Buying									

The partial test showed that hedonic lifestyle had a regression coefficient of 0.373 and a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.001$), indicating that hedonic lifestyle positively and significantly predicted impulsive buying. Thus, H1 was accepted. Scarcity had a regression coefficient of 0.481 and a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.001$), indicating that scarcity also positively and significantly predicted impulsive buying. Thus, H2 was accepted.

Both variables showed positive predictive relationships with impulsive buying. Multiple linear regression produced the equation $Y = 8.368 + 0.373X_1 + 0.481X_2$. The hedonic lifestyle coefficient ($b = 0.373$) indicates that a one-unit increase in the hedonic lifestyle score was associated with a 0.373-unit increase in the impulsive buying score, assuming the other variable remained constant. Similarly, the scarcity coefficient ($b = 0.481$) indicates that a one-unit increase in the scarcity score was associated with a 0.481-unit increase in impulsive buying. The constant of 8.368 represents the mathematical intercept and is not interpreted substantively because the predictor scales do not include zero; interpretation therefore focuses on the regression coefficients and their significance.

Table 5. Simultaneous Test

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3369.392	2	1684.696	292.846	.000b
	Residual	2197.585	382	5.753		
	Total	5566.977	384			

a. Dependent Variable: Impulsive Buying

b. Predictors: (Constant), Scarcity, Hedonic Lifestyle

The simultaneous test results in Table 5 showed an F value of 292.846 and a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.001$); therefore, H3 was accepted, and H0 was rejected. These results indicate that hedonic lifestyle and scarcity jointly and positively predicted impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency.

Table 6. Coefficient of Determination

<i>Model Summary^b</i>				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.778 ^a	.605	.603	2.399

a. Predictors: (Constant), Scarcity, Hedonic Lifestyle

b. Dependent Variable: Impulsive Buying

As shown in Table 6, the correlation coefficient (R) was 0.778, indicating a strong relationship between hedonic lifestyle, scarcity, and impulsive buying. The R-squared value of 0.605 indicates that the regression model explained 60.5% of the variance in impulsive buying scores in the sample, while the remaining 39.5% was unexplained by the model. The adjusted R-squared value of 0.603 indicates that the model explained 60.3% of the variation in impulsive buying after adjustment for the number of independent variables.

Table 7. Categorization Results

Variable	Low	Moderate	High
Impulsive Buying	63(16,4%)	266(69,1%)	56(14,5%)

Variable	Low	Moderate	High
Hedonic Lifestyle	60(15,6%)	279(72,5%)	46(11,9%)
Scarcity	55(14,3%)	259(67,3%)	71(18,4%)

The three variables were categorized using the empirical mean (M) and standard deviation (SD): low scores were below $M - 1$ SD, moderate scores fell within $M \pm 1$ SD, and high scores were above $M + 1$ SD. As shown in Table 7, most respondents fell into the moderate category for all three variables. This suggests that Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency engage in spontaneous shopping to a moderate extent: impulsive buying (69.1%) and hedonic lifestyle (72.5%) were generally moderate rather than dominant lifestyle patterns, while scarcity (67.3%) also played a role in shopping behavior.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the effects of hedonic lifestyle and scarcity on impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency. The hypothesis tests showed that hedonic lifestyle and scarcity jointly had a significant effect on impulsive buying. Each variable also had a significant partial effect on impulsive buying in this population.

Hedonic lifestyle was found to positively and significantly predict impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency. Theoretically, this relationship can be explained by hedonic consumers, who regard shopping not merely as a means of meeting needs but as a source of pleasure in itself (Solomon, as cited in Khairat et al., 2018). Anticipated emotional satisfaction strengthens the affective aspect of impulsive buying, while functional considerations and planning—the core of the cognitive aspect—are pushed aside, producing the “feeling and no thinking” pattern characteristic of impulsive buying (Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001). More specifically, the three aspects of hedonic lifestyle (Kotler & Keller, as cited in Ananda et al., 2021) are expressed within the online-shopping ecosystem. Activities are reflected in Generation Z users browsing marketplaces, watching live streams, and monitoring flash sales as routines and forms of entertainment. Interests are reflected in strong attention to trending products and new releases, reinforced by platform recommendation algorithms that continually present relevant shopping stimuli. Opinions are reflected when consumers view spontaneous purchases as a reasonable form of self-reward, reducing negative evaluations of unplanned purchases. These aspects reinforce one another, allowing online marketing stimuli designed to provide pleasure to precede rational consideration in purchasing decisions.

These findings are consistent with Fani et al. (2025) and Dzaky and Prasetyo (2025) among e-commerce users, as well as Maqvira et al. (2025), who found that a hedonic lifestyle encouraged impulsive buying among Generation Z TikTok Shop users, and Aurellia and Siregar (2025), who demonstrated the role of hedonic shopping motivation in impulse buying. Thus, this study reinforces evidence across contexts that hedonic orientation is a strong predictor of impulsive buying in online-shopping environments. However, the findings require nuance: most respondents had a moderate hedonic lifestyle (72.5%), suggesting that pleasure-seeking is present in shopping but has not become a dominant habit or priority. One possible explanation is that many respondents were students, whose purchasing power may limit the full expression of a hedonic lifestyle. Hedonic urges may therefore be expressed through relatively low-value purchases made fairly frequently, a pattern reflected in the demographic data, where most respondents shopped three to five times in the previous three months (Table 1).

Scarcity was also found to positively and significantly predict impulsive buying. Scarcity messages create a sense of urgency that shortens cognitive deliberation and triggers arousal

associated with fear of missing out (Wu et al., 2021; Lamis et al., 2022), encouraging spontaneous purchasing decisions. This finding aligns with Verhagen et al. (as cited in Asriadi et al., 2025) and is consistent with Bahar et al. (2024) and Widyariini et al. (2025). The Scarcity Scale covered two dimensions based on Wu et al. (2021): limited quantity scarcity (LQS, limited stock) and limited time scarcity (LTS, limited time). However, this study analyzed the total score, so the contribution of each dimension could not be separated. Future studies should examine the two dimensions independently. The categorization results showed that most respondents had a moderate level of perceived scarcity (67.3%), indicating that urgency was noticeable but not strong, consistent with the respondents' generally moderate tendency toward impulsive buying.

Together, the two variables significantly predicted impulsive buying. The model explained 60.5% of the variance in impulsive buying scores, while the remaining 39.5% was unexplained and may relate to factors beyond the scope of this study, such as individual characteristics, the shopping environment, and social influence (Zulfiqar et al., 2018). These findings suggest that impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users is associated not only with the pursuit of personal satisfaction but also with perceived scarcity created by businesses through limited-time sales and promotional live streams (Lamis et al., 2022; Guo et al., 2023). The categorization results showed that most respondents had a moderate level of impulsive buying (69.1%), indicating that although Generation Z in Karawang Regency is exposed to hedonic and scarcity-related shopping stimuli, the overall tendency has not reached an extreme level.

This study has several limitations. The sample was restricted to Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency, and the use of convenience sampling limits the generalizability of the findings. The cross-sectional design also limits causal interpretation; therefore, the findings are more appropriately understood as predictive relationships between variables. In addition, online self-report data may be subject to response biases, such as the desire to present oneself favorably, and respondents' circumstances while completing the questionnaire could not be verified. Finally, the study examined only two predictors, although other variables may also be associated with impulsive buying.

CONCLUSION

The results indicate that hedonic lifestyle positively and significantly predicted impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency (H1 accepted), as did scarcity (H2 accepted). Together, the two variables positively and significantly predicted impulsive buying (H3 accepted), with the model explaining 60.5% of the variance in impulsive buying scores (adjusted R-squared = 0.603). Categorization results showed that most respondents fell into the moderate category for hedonic lifestyle (72.5%), scarcity (67.3%), and impulsive buying (69.1%). These findings indicate that moderate hedonic orientation and perceptions of scarcity correspond to a moderate tendency toward impulsive buying among Generation Z e-commerce users in Karawang Regency. These findings may inform three groups. For Generation Z consumers, recognizing that the combination of shopping pleasure and scarcity cues (flash-sale time limits and limited stock) can trigger unplanned purchases may help them pause before deciding to buy. For e-commerce businesses, the effectiveness of these stimuli entails an ethical responsibility: information about stock and time limits should be accurate and should not be manipulated in ways that undermine consumer trust. Future researchers are encouraged to examine other variables, test LQS and LTS separately, and use probability sampling across a wider geographical area.

REFERENCES

- Adhianto, C., & Faried, A. A. (2025). Pengaruh live streaming dan countdown timer pada tiktok shop terhadap perilaku impulse buying pada generasi z. In *Jurnal Manajemen dan Penelitian Akuntansi (JUMPA)* (Vol. 18, Number 1).
- Ananda, R., Ratnaningtyas, A., & Prihandini, G. R. (2021). *Pengaruh gaya hidup hedonis terhadap impulsive buying pada mahasiswi pengguna e-commerce shopee*.
- Aprilia, E. D., & Septila, R. (2017). Impulse buying pada mahasiswa di banda aceh. *Psikoislamedia : Jurnal Psikologi*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.22373/psikoislamedia.v2i2.2449>
- Arisandy, D. (2017). *Kontrol diri ditinjau dari impulsive buying pada belanja online*.
- Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia. (2026). Hasil Survei Penetrasi dan Perilaku Pengguna Internet Indonesia 2026. Jakarta: Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia.
- Asriadi, A., Tambaru, R., & Evrianti, H. (2025). Pembelian impulsif di kalangan gen Z saat flash sale: peran mediasi emosi dan peran moderasi adiksi media sosial. *Jurnal Samudra Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 16(2), 337–348. <https://doi.org/10.33059/jseb.v16i2.11010>
- Aurellia, R., & Siregar, O. M. (2025). Pengaruh scarcity marketing dan hedonic shopping motivation terhadap impulse buying pada pembelian merchandise k-pop di weverse Shop (studi pada penggemar seventeen di aplikasi X). *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Riset Pendidikan*, 4(1), 5008-5014. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v4i1.2494>
- Azzahra, S. A., Amelasih, P., & Haniwati, H. (2024). Gambaran gaya hidup hedonisme pada remaja di SMA X surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dan Karya Mahasiswa*, 2(2), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jikma.v2i2.1703>
- Bahar, A. C., Efendi, A., & Nugeraha, P. (2024). Marketing strategy of scarcity messages in thrift fashion sales to influence impulse buying behavior in customer. *Jurnal Kompetitif Bisnis*, 2, No 4, 208.
- Devina, D., Purwanti, S., Sucipta, J. A. W., & Kristian, D. (2025). Persepsi generasi z terhadap fitur shopee live yang mendorong perilaku pembelian impulsif saat berbelanja di e-commerce shopee. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v5i6.32223>
- Dimock, M. (2019) Defining Generasiersations: *Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generasieration-z-begins>
- Dzaky, M. F., & Prasetyo, B. (2025). Pengaruhpenginaan paylater, gaya hidup hedonis, dan promosi penjualan terhadap impulsive buying behavior pada mahasiswa pengguna aplikasi shopee di kota bandung. *Musytari: Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi, Dan Ekonomi*, 19, No 11. <https://doi.org/10.8734/mnmae.v1i2.359>
- Fani, A. F. A., Nurhikmah, N., & Koanda, N. (2025). Gaya Hidup Hedonisme terhadap Impulsive Buying melalui E-Commerce pada Dewasa Awal. *Jurnal Psikologi Karakter*, 5(1), 120–125. <https://doi.org/10.56326/jpk.v5i1.5586>
- Giswananda, A. F., & Mastuti, E. (2025). Literature Review : Faktor Internal Impulsive Buying Pada Remaja Putri Yang Melakukan Online Shopping. *Jurnal Syntax Fusion*, 4(05), 242–249. <https://doi.org/10.54543/fusion.v4i05.411>
- Gunawan, A. A., & Kartasasmita, S. (2025). Kecerdasan emosional dan perilaku pembelian impulsif: studi kuantitatif pada mahasiswa pengguna e-commerce. *Riwayat: Educational*

- Journal of History and Humanities*, 8(4), 7676–7683.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v8i4.50635>
- Guo, Y., Chen, X., & Wang, C. (2023). Consumer information search in live-streaming: product involvement and the moderating role of scarcity promotion and impulsiveness. *Sustainability*, 15(14), 11361. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151411361>
- Hendrayani, E., Prawirosumarto, S., Lusiana, L., & Putra, R. S. (2025). The influence of social media and online shopping habits on consumer behavior and social identity in indonesia's digital economy. *SISTEMASI*, 14(6), 2918. <https://doi.org/10.32520/stmsi.v14i6.5502>
- Hidayat, R. N., Sholahuddin, A., Firmansyah, I. A., Fathoni, Baskara, M. P., & Prasetyo, Y. (2025). Pengaruh gaya hidup hedonisme dan minimalis terhadap pola konsumsi mahasiswa ekonomi 4A universitas nurul jadid. *Jurnal Penelitian Nusantara*, 1, No 7, 197–204. <https://doi.org/10.59435/menulis.v1i7.524>
- Khairat, M., Yusri, N. A., & Yuliana, S. (2018). Hubungan gaya hidup hedonis dengan perilaku konsumtif pada mahasiswi. *Al-Qalb: Jurnal Psikologi Islam*, 9, No 2(2), 130–139. <https://doi.org/10.15548/alqalb.v9i2.861>
- Krisito, R. E., Musnaini, Fazri, A., & Khotib, W. (2024). Pengaruh promosi gratis ongkir dan countdown time terhadap impulse buying pada aplikasi shopee. *Wahyudil Khotib INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4, No 3, 18140–18153. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i3.12706>
- Lamis, S. F., Handayani, P. W., & Fitriani, W. R. (2022). Impulse buying during flash sales in the online marketplace. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2068402>
- Maduwu, B., Nopeline, N., & Purba, M. L. (2025). Analisis pengaruh pengguna internet dan transaksi e-commerce terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi indonesia tahun 2011-2023. *AT TARIIZ: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Islam*, 4, No 3. <https://doi.org/10.62668/attariiz.v4i03.1712>
- Maqvira, M., Musnaini, & Roza, S. (2025). Pengaruh live streaming dan gaya hidup hedonis terhadap perilaku pembelian impulsive buying pada pengguna tiktok shop di kalangan generasi z kota jambi. *Jurnal Media Akademik (JMA)*, 3(11), 3031–5220. <https://doi.org/10.62281>
- Mausul, C. D., & Ma'mun, M. S. (2024). Pengaruh live streaming tiktok shop (studi minat pembelian pengguna live streaming di akun media sosial tikTok @imazanhijab). *Karimah Tauhid*, 3(2), 2391–2400. <https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i2.12063>
- Mertaningrum, N. L. P. E., Giantari, I. G. A. K., Ekawati, N. W., & Setiawan, P. Y. (2023). Perilaku belanja impulsif secara online. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 12(3), 605–616. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v12i3.70463>
- Salamba, D. C., & Ambarwati, K. D. (2023). Hubungan antara kontrol diri dengan impulsive buying produk fashion di masa pandemi pada mahasiswa melalui aplikasi belanja online. *Economics and Digital Business Review*, 4(1), 929-939. <https://doi.org/10.37531/ecotal.v4i1.455>
- Sapitri, A., Khoiriyah, A. S. N., Sintiwati, S., & Suyatna, R. G. (2024). Analisis Perbedaan Antara Pengalaman Pembelian Online Dan Offline Dalam Mempengaruhi Prilaku Konsumen. *Jurnal Bintang Manajemen*, 2(1), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jubima.v2i1.2608>

- Sari, I. A. P., Wibowo, U., Syarifah, S., Amri, W. A. A., & Septiana, T. (2025). Analisis loyalitas gen z terhadap layanan e-commerce. *Jurnal Minfo Polgan*, 14(2), 2840–2849. <https://doi.org/10.33395/jmp.v14i2.15486>
- Utamanyu, R. A., & Darmastuti, R. (2022). Budaya belanja online generasi Z dan generasi milenial di jawa tengah (studi kasus produk kecantikan di online shop beauty by asame). *Scriptura*, 12(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.9744/scriptura.12.1.58-71>
- Verplanken, B., & Herabadi, A. (2001). Individual differences in impulse buying tendency: Feeling and no thinking. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(1 SUPPL.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.423>
- Widyariini, L. A., Lilihata, C. F., & Agrippina, Y. R. (2025). Fomo pada e-commerce: pengaruh limited quantity, limited time, discount, free shipping terhadap arousal dan impulse buying. *Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship*, 7(1), 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.46229/bee.v7i1.1018>
- Wu, Y., Xin, L., Li, D., Yu, J., & Guo, J. (2021). How does scarcity promotion lead to impulse purchase in the online market? A field experiment. *Information & Management*, 58(1), 103283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2020.103283>
- Zulfiqar, J., Ambreen, G., & Fateen Bushra, M. (2018). A Comprehensive Literature Review of Impulse Buying Behavior. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Sciences Journal Homepage*, 11, 94–104. www.akademiabaru.com/arsbs.html
-

Copyright Holder :

© Amelia, D., Muharsih, L., & Greata, H. (2026).

First Publication Rights :

© Journal of Society Counseling

This article is under:

