



(MUDIMA)



The Relationship Between Emotional Regulation and *Social Presence* on *Impulsive Buying* Behavior in Gen Z

Yan Tamara Rosyida^{1*}, IGAA Noviekayati², Dyan Evita Santi³

University of 17 August 1945 Surabaya

Corresponding Author: Yan Tamara Rosyida 1522200024@surel.untag-sby.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: *Impulsive Buying*, Emotional Regulation, Social Presence, Gen Z

Received : 1 February

Revised : 22 March

Accepted : 25 April

©2026 Rosyida, Noviekayati, Santi: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the relationship between emotional regulation and *Social Presence* on *Impulsive Buying* behavior among Gen Z. This correlational study involved 121 randomly selected Gen Z participants in Surabaya. Data were collected via a questionnaire measuring levels of emotional regulation, *Social Presence*, and *Impulsive Buying*. The results indicate a highly significant simultaneous relationship between emotional regulation and *Social Presence* on *Impulsive Buying* ($F = 12.480$, $p = 0.00$; $p < 0.01$), a highly significant negative relationship between emotional regulation and *impulsive buying* ($t = -3.262$ and $p = 0.001$; $p < 0.01$), and a highly significant positive relationship between *social presence* and *impulsive buying* ($t = 4.581$ and $p = 0.000$; $p < 0.01$). These findings indicate that emotional regulation and *Social Presence* may help reduce *Impulsive Buying* among Gen Z

INTRODUCTION

The rapid pace of modernization has had a significant impact on the lives of Indonesians, encompassing lifestyle, socio-cultural, economic, and technological aspects (Agustin et al., 2024). One tangible manifestation of this technological advancement is evident in changes to shopping behavior. Whereas shopping was previously conducted exclusively in-store or at shopping centers (offline), the advent of digitalization now allows these activities to be carried out online (Dewi, 2024). Currently, Indonesians tend to prefer shopping through digital platforms or e-commerce sites such as Shopee, Tokopedia, Lazada, and others (Utama et al., 2024). This growth in e-commerce aims to increase consumer interest in the products offered (Marits & Zaerofi, 2023). Technological advancements also make it easier for people to meet their daily needs through internet access, while simultaneously driving competition among sellers to promote products and boost purchase rates (Agustin et al., 2024).

Shopping activities are now predominantly conducted online via e-commerce platforms, where goods and services can be bought and sold without requiring buyers and sellers to meet in person at a store. Online shopping has become a trend, prompting e-commerce companies to compete by offering the best promotions and services to attract consumers. Based on available data, Chong & Ali (2022) demonstrated that Indonesians tend to choose Shopee as their primary shopping platform over others such as Lazada, Blibli, Tokopedia, and Bukalapak. This finding is further supported by Ahdiat (2023), who states that Shopee is highly popular due to its attractive marketing strategies, including flash sales, free shipping, discounts, and other promotions.

The public's tendency to engage in online shopping in the digital era has also fostered a consumerist culture. This consumerist culture has even evolved into a pattern passed down from one generation to the next in Indonesia (Pratama et al., 2023). The rapid development of the digital era has also brought significant changes to public

consumption behavior. According to data from Statista Market Insights (Maulan et al., 2024), in 2022, the number of e-commerce users in Indonesia reached 178.94 million, an increase of 12.79% from 2021. Additionally, the total transaction value conducted by the Indonesian public reached 476.3 trillion. This significant increase indicates that the public's consumption behavior continues to rise.

Data on e-commerce usage is further supported by Utama et al. (2024), who predict that the number of e-commerce users from 2017 to 2024 will continue to increase annually. In 2017, there were 70.8 million users, rising to 87.5 million in 2018, 112.1 million in 2019, 129.9 million in 2020, 148.5 million in 2021, 166.1 million in 2022, 180.6 million in 2023, and reaching 189.6 million in 2024. Additionally, a survey by Nisaputra (2023) of 1,086 respondents aged 18–55 years found that 63% preferred to shop online. This is due to various benefits, such as time- and energy-efficiency, ease of comparing prices across stores, availability of promotions like free shipping and cashback, a variety of payment methods, a wide range of products, and ease of reading reviews from other buyers.

Issues related to consumer behavior are often referred to as "*impulsive buying*." *Impulsive buying* is a form of spontaneous purchasing behavior without prior planning, leading individuals to make quick decisions to buy a product without deep consideration of the consequences (Ugyur, 2018). Issues related to *impulsive buying* in Indonesia, based on data from Handayani et al. (2021), indicate that 21% of shoppers never plan what they will buy. Factors that cause people to engage in impulse buying, as outlined by Nisaputra (2023), include a strong desire to purchase an item, self-reward, being tempted by attractive promotions, and being lured by discounts from *platforms* (such as twin-date discounts), free shipping offers, *cashback*, and shopping *vouchers*.

Impulsive buying behavior is found in various cities across Indonesia. In Mataram City, a study by Rahayu et al. (2024) revealed a 66% increase in impulsive purchases driven by numerous promotions, particularly "twin-date" promotions,

which significantly influence spontaneous purchasing decisions. A similar phenomenon occurs in Purwakarta, where a study of 100 Generation Z respondents aged 18–25 revealed that e-commerce features significantly influence impulsive behavior. This is driven by emotional factors, such as mood, which reinforce the urge to make unplanned purchases (Marhumi, 2024).

In Batam City, *impulsive buying* behavior is heavily influenced by lifestyle and the quality of products offered (Sihombing & Sukati, 2022). Meanwhile, in Surabaya, this behavior also poses a unique challenge, particularly among college students. Urban lifestyles and exposure to social media further influence their online shopping habits (Ramadhan, 2024).

Interview results from eight Generation Z individuals in Surabaya indicate that they frequently purchase nonessential items online. This is driven by various factors, such as discounts, peer influence, exposure to live streams and product reviews on social media or e-commerce platforms, and attraction to the product's design or appearance. They also acknowledge that impulsive buying behavior often arises when they are under pressure or stress, whether from school or work. Most respondents expressed regret after purchasing due to its impact on their financial situation, although some believed the item could still be used in the future.

From a psychological perspective, *impulsive buying* behavior is an intriguing topic for research because it involves emotional and social aspects in the purchasing decision-making process, particularly among Generation Z (Gen Z) (Chen et al., 2020). Gen Z consists of individuals born between 1997 and 2012 and is known as a generation of digital natives who are highly familiar with and connected to technology and social media (Arnett, 2020). This generation grew up amid rapid technological advancements, resulting in a high level of awareness and engagement with the internet (Wijoyo et al., 2020).

Key characteristics of Gen Z include a tendency toward technological dependence, a commitment to freedom and individualism, and a prioritization of

speed in obtaining information. This is because they are accustomed to using the internet and thus require quick and practical access to information (Berkup, 2014). Additionally, this generation tends to have less stable emotional states, which can ultimately influence their consumption behavior, including a tendency toward impulsive buying.

Impulsive buying occurs due to various factors; Ugyur (2018) identifies factors influencing *impulsive buying*, including a lack of purchase planning and careful consideration, overly strong emotional responses, and making purchases without prior planning, which affects their behavior when buying goods. Verplanken & Herabadi (2001) also identified factors influencing *impulsive buying* as comprising internal and external factors, where internal factors include age, gender, self-esteem, mood, and emotional intelligence. External factors in *impulsive buying* include the store environment, product marketing techniques, and product display.

One cause of *impulsive buying* is a lack of self-regulation (Aditya, 2023). Emotional regulation is an individual's ability to manage and control their emotions in various situations (Sheppes et al., 2019). From a psychological perspective, individuals with low emotional regulation tend to be more susceptible to *impulsive buying* behavior, especially when experiencing emotional stress (Suri et al., 2021). The inability to control emotions can drive a person to make impulsive purchases as a coping mechanism against stress or emotional discomfort (Liu et al., 2022). This indicates that cognitive and affective factors influence individual consumption behavior, particularly among Gen Z, who are still developing self-control.

In addition to internal factors such as emotional regulation, external factors also play a significant role in *impulsive buying* behavior. External factors include those outside the individual, one of which is *Social Presence*. *Social Presence* refers to the presence of others, whether direct or indirect, that can influence a person's shopping decisions (Hwang et al., 2020). This social presence can increase psychological pressure during the purchasing decision-making process, whether through

interactions with friends and family or via social media (Zhao & Shukla, 2021). In the context of *online* shopping, the influence of customer reviews, algorithm-based recommendations, and psychology-based marketing strategies can reinforce the impulse to make a purchase (Kim & Johnson, 2020), particularly among Gen Z, who are more susceptible to social influence.

Several previous studies have examined the relationship between emotion regulation and *impulsive buying* behavior. For example, a study by Dhandra (2020) showed that poor emotion regulation correlates with higher levels of *impulsive buying*, particularly among individuals experiencing high stress. Research conducted by Putri (2019) also showed that emotional regulation has a significant influence on *impulsive buying* among adolescents, with the most significant dimensions being *cognitive reappraisal* and *expressive suppression*. This relationship is negative; thus, the higher the emotional regulation, the lower the level of *impulsive buying* among adolescents, and the lower the emotional regulation, the higher the level of *impulsive buying*.

Research by Williams & Grisham (2011) indicates a significant relationship between emotional regulation and *impulsive buying*. Individuals who struggle with emotional regulation are prone to *impulsive buying* because they tend to act hastily when experiencing negative emotions. *Impulsive buying* tends to provide momentary pleasure that can reduce an individual's negative emotions, but its effects are only temporary and can lead to feelings of guilt and stress.

Previous research has examined *social presence* and *impulsive buying*. Research by Park et al. (2021) found that social presence in *online* shopping environments can increase the tendency toward *impulsive buying* through social pressure and purchase-decision urgency. However, these studies tend to examine these factors separately, without considering the interaction between emotional regulation and *social presence* in shaping *impulsive buying* behavior among Gen Z. The novelty of this study lies in its approach, which integrates two key

factors—emotional regulation and *Social Presence*—into a single analytical model to understand *Impulsive Buying* behavior among Gen Z. Thus, this study is expected to provide a more comprehensive insight into how psychological and social factors interact to influence impulsive consumption behavior.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the relationship between emotion regulation and *social presence* on *impulsive buying* behavior among Gen Z from a psychological perspective. This study is expected to provide theoretical contributions to the field of consumer psychology, as well as practical implications for designing psychological interventions to help individuals develop better emotion-regulation skills and reduce their tendency toward impulse *buying*.

METHODS

This study employs a quantitative correlational approach. The sampling method utilized a *non-probability sampling* technique, which involves sampling until the minimum quota of subjects is met (Sugiyono, 2020). The sample size was calculated using G*Power with an effect size of 0.3, a significance level of 0.05, and a power of 0.95, yielding a minimum sample size of 115 respondents. The study included 121 Gen Z respondents, grouped by gender, age, and the *e-commerce* platforms they frequently use. The male respondents numbered 42, while the female respondents numbered 79. The study's respondents were also grouped by age, ranging from 15 to 28 years, with the 20-year-old group being the most dominant, comprising 15 respondents. The *e-commerce* platforms used by the respondents varied: 1 respondent used Lazada, 100 used Shopee, 6 used TikTok Shop, and 14 used Tokopedia.

This study employed a quantitative design using a Likert scale. Data collection utilized a questionnaire measuring *Impulsive Buying*, *Social Presence*, and Emotional Regulation. Scale measurement was conducted using 5 response options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The development of the

measurement instruments involved several tests, including validity and reliability tests, assumption tests, normality tests, linearity tests, multicollinearity tests, and heteroscedasticity tests.

The first hypothesis of this study is that Emotional Regulation and *Social Presence* have a simultaneous relationship with *Impulsive Buying* among Gen Z; the second hypothesis is that Emotional Regulation has a negative relationship with *Impulsive Buying* among Gen Z; and the third

hypothesis is that *Social Presence* has a positive relationship with *Impulsive Buying* among Gen Z.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study conducted several tests, as follows:

1. Validity Test

A measurement instrument is considered valid if it measures what it is intended to measure and provides relevant information in accordance with the measurement objectives (Sugiyono, 2017).

a. Validity of the *Impulsive Buying* Scale

Table 1. Results of the Validity Test for the *Impulsive Buying* Scale

Analysis Round	Initial Number of Items	Number of Items Eliminated	Number of Remaining Items	Corrected Item Total Correlation Index
1	10	-	10	0.633 – 0.961

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Window

The results of the item discrimination analysis conducted on 37 respondents indicate that the first round of the item discrimination test showed

that all items were valid, with *corrected item-total correlation indices* ranging from 0.633 to 0.961.

b. Validity of the Emotional Regulation Scale

Table 2. Results of the Emotional Regulation Scale Validity Test

Analysis Round	Initial Number of Items	Number of Items Eliminated	Number of Remaining Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation Index
1	28	-	28	0.487 – 0.917

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the item discrimination test conducted with 37 respondents showed that, in the first round, the corrected item-total correlation scores

ranged from 0.487 to 0.917, and all 28 items were deemed valid.

c. Validity of the *Social Presence* Scale

Table 3. Results of the *Social Presence* Validity Test

Analysis Round	Initial Number of Items	Number of Items Eliminated	Number of Remaining Items	Index Total Item Correlation
1	28	-	28	0.487 – 0.917
2	32	-	32	0.348 – 0.953

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the item discrimination test conducted on 37 respondents showed that in the first round, the corrected item-total correlation scores ranged from 0.605 to 0.951, with 32 valid items and 8 items eliminated from a total of 40 items on the

Social Presence scale. Item discrimination testing conducted in the second round showed that no items were eliminated, with corrected item-total correlation scores ranging from 0.348 to 0.953.

2. Reliability Test

The reliability of a measurement instrument can be assessed by examining whether it yields

relatively consistent results when the same subject is tested again (Azwar, 2013).

a. Reliability of the *Impulsive Buying* Scale

Table 4. Results of the Reliability Test for the *Impulsive Buying* Scale

Analysis Round	Initial Number of Items	Number of Valid Items	Number of Items Eliminated	Reliability
1	10	10	-	0.934

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Window

The results of the reliability test for the *Impulsive Buying* scale, which involved 37 respondents using IBM SPSS Version 25, showed a *Cronbach's alpha* of 0.960 after a single analysis.

This indicates that the *Impulsive Buying* scale has a good level of reliability.

b. Reliability of the Emotional Regulation Scale

Table 5. Results of the Emotional Regulation Scale Reliability Test

Analysis Round	Initial Number of Items	Number of Valid Items	Number of Items Excluded	Reliability
1	28	28	-	0.980

The results of the reliability test conducted on 37 respondents using IBM SPSS version 25 showed that the *Cronbach's Alpha* reliability coefficient reached 0.980 after a single round of

analysis, indicating that the emotional regulation scale has a very high level of reliability.

c. Reliability of the *Social Presence* Scale

Table 6. Results of the Reliability Test for the *Social Presence* Scale

Round of Analysis	Initial Number of Items	Number of Valid Items	Number of Items Eliminated	Reliability
1	40	32	8	0.960
2	32	32	-	0.977

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the reliability test for the *Social Presence* scale, involving 37 respondents and conducted in IBM SPSS Version 25, showed a *Cronbach's alpha* of 0.977 after two analyses. This

indicates that the *Social Presence* scale has a good level of reliability.

3. Normality Test

Table 7. Results of the Distribution Normality Test

Kolmogorov-Smirnov			
Z	df	p	Notes
0.078	121	0.070	Normal ($p > 0.05$)

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The normality test aims to determine whether the distribution of the research data is normal. The normality test used is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and its significance is assessed. Data with a significance value (p) > 0.05 is considered normally distributed, while data with a significance value (p) < 0.05 is considered not normally distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test for the Impulsive Buying variable yielded a significance level of 0.070; therefore, the variable is normally distributed.

4. Linearity Test

The linearity test was conducted to examine the direction of the relationship in the study, specifically whether it is linear. The linearity test was performed by examining the "Deviation from Linearity Sig." value: the data is considered linear when "Deviation from Linearity Sig." > 0.05 , and non-linear when "Deviation from Linearity Sig." < 0.05 .

Table 8. Linearity Test Results

Variable	F Deviation From Linearity	p	Description
Emotional Regulation – <i>Impulsive Buying</i>	0.251	1.188	Linear ($p > 0.05$)
<i>Social Presence</i> – <i>Impulsive Buying</i>	0.562	0.948	Linear ($p > 0.05$)

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the linearity test for the emotional regulation variable with *Impulsive Buying* yielded a p-value of 0.251 ($p > 0.05$) with an F-value of 1.188, indicating a linear relationship between the emotional regulation variable and *Impulsive Buying*. The results of the linearity test of the *Social Presence* variable with *Impulsive Buying* yielded a p-value of 0.562 ($p > 0.05$) with an F-value of 0.948, indicating a linear relationship between *Social Presence* and *Impulsive Buying*.

5. Results of the Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to examine the relationship among the independent variables in the regression model. The multicollinearity test was conducted by examining the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and tolerance values. A regression model is free of multicollinearity when the tolerance value approaches 1, and the VIF threshold is 10; thus, when the VIF value is > 0.10 , multicollinearity does not occur.

Table 9. Results of the Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Collinearity Statistic		
	Tolerance	VIF	Description
Emotional Regulation – <i>Social Presence</i>	0.912 (>0.10)	1.096 (<10.00)	No Multicollinearity.

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the multicollinearity test for the emotional regulation and *Social Presence* variables showed a tolerance of $0.912 > 0.10$ and a VIF of $1.096 < 10.0$, indicating no multicollinearity between the variables.

6. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to determine whether the regression model exhibits

unequal variances across observations, using Spearman's rho. This is assessed by examining the significance level (p), where the regression model is free from heteroscedasticity when the significance level (p) > 0.05 , and is said to exhibit heteroscedasticity when the significance level (p) < 0.05 .

Table 10. Results of the Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	Spearman's Rho Correlation	p	Notes	Conclusion
Emotional Regulation - ABS_RES	-0.114	0.213	p > 0.05	No Heteroscedasticity.
<i>Social Presence</i> – ABS_RES	-0.006	0.952	p > 0.05	No Heteroscedasticity.

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The results of the heteroscedasticity test for the emotional regulation and *Social Presence* variables using Spearman's rho correlation with ABS_RES indicate that the emotional regulation variable has a correlation with ABS_RES of -0.114 with a significance value of 0.213, and the *Social Presence* variable with ABS_RES is -0.006 with a significance value of 0.952, indicating the absence of heteroscedasticity in both variables.

The first hypothesis explains the relationship among emotional regulation, social presence, and impulsive buying, wherein individuals who engage in impulsive buying purchase items without planning, making it difficult for them to exercise self-control or consider their ego or the emotions they experience. Emotions need to be regulated because individuals with strong emotional regulation can exercise self-control while shopping. This makes emotional regulation a necessary effort to accept emotions and control existing impulsive behavior (Gratz & Roemer, 2004). Interactions within social relationships during shopping also play a significant role, as social presence can foster a sense of intimacy and closeness (Belderrain, 2006). This fosters trust in a product and the experience associated with it, leading others to desire purchasing the item and resulting in impulsive buying behavior.

Impulsive buying also frequently occurs, particularly with the rapid advancement of

technology, which enables people to shop online. Various factors, such as self-reward, temptation by promotions, and attractive discounts (Nisputra, 2023), make it difficult for individuals to resist the urge to buy. This difficulty is compounded by the high level of social presence among both sellers and buyers, which influences people's purchasing decisions. Zhang & Shi (2022) suggest that communication between sellers and among other buyers influences purchases; the experiences of other users with the product, along with in-depth information sharing, encourage individuals to make impulsive purchases due to a sense of connection.

Rook (1987) explains that impulse buying arises from a spontaneous urge to purchase goods, leading to a lack of rational consideration. This can happen due to low and ineffective emotion regulation strategies, which in turn influence impulsive purchasing. This is further supported by Overveld (2016), who notes that ineffective emotion regulation strategies tend to increase impulsive buying as a stress-coping mechanism. Ugyur (2018) also noted that overly strong emotional responses tend to lead individuals toward impulsive buying, particularly when the surrounding environment exerts strong social influence; this influence makes it increasingly difficult for individuals to control themselves, thereby increasing the likelihood of impulsive buying.

Table 11. Results of Simultaneous Regression Analysis

Variables	F	p	Description
Emotional regulation and <i>social presence</i> with <i>impulsive buying</i>	12.480	0.00	Significant (p < 0.01) Hypothesis accepted

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The second hypothesis examines the relationship between emotion regulation and impulsive buying, consistent with previous research indicating that emotion regulation influences impulsive buying (Williams & Grisham, 2011; Kayyal, 2023; Fang et al., 2022). This occurs because individuals have difficulty effectively accepting and managing their emotions, leading them to use impulsive shopping as a coping strategy. Impulsive buying influences how an individual regulates their emotions (Cachon-Rodriguez, 2023). Gratz & Roemer (2004) explain that a factor influencing emotional regulation is a lack of ability to accept emotional responses, causing a person to view their emotions as something negative. This is compounded by poor impulse control, leading

individuals to engage in impulsive buying when their emotions are running high.

Poor emotional control, compounded by a lack of emotional awareness, makes it difficult for individuals to understand their own feelings (Gratz & Roemer, 2004). Individuals find it increasingly difficult to interpret and identify their feelings, leading them to use impulsive buying as an escape mechanism in their coping strategies, due to differing perspectives on how to modify existing emotional responses (Strongman, 2003). The urge to buy can be suppressed when a person can control themselves and their emotions, making emotion regulation a crucial factor in impulsive buying behavior (Verma, 2024).

Table 12. Results of Partial Regression Analysis

Variable	t	p	Description
Emotional regulation – <i>impulsive buying</i>	-3.262	0.001	Significant (p < 0.01)
			Hypothesis accepted

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

The third hypothesis posits a positive relationship between social presence and impulsive buying, consistent with previous studies (Andika et al., 2023; Sanger et al., 2024; Ranaa et al., 2023; Sawarsa, 2023). This occurs because interactions with the seller, as well as the involvement of other buyers, can foster a sense of belonging and increase the desire to shop impulsively. A person's emotional state strongly influences impulsive buying (Sanger, 2024; Andika et al., 2023). Impulsive purchasing occurs due to the ability to engage in direct interactions; thus, when buyers have questions about the products being sold, they can ask the seller directly, and when the seller provides positive feedback, it makes buyers more easily tempted to purchase the item. The seller's positive response creates a sense of urgency that drives individuals to

make a purchase, especially during live streaming (Oktavia, 2023).

Social presence refers to the feelings individuals experience when they can engage in intimate, tangible interactions through remote media (Zhang & Shi, 2022), which can lead to greater engagement and impulsive purchases. Engagement can arise in various situations; sellers who provide detailed information tend to increase purchases, as they can effectively showcase their products. Additionally, interactions between buyers and sellers about a product can increase the likelihood of impulsive purchases by facilitating the exchange of product information; for example, sharing positive purchase testimonials on an e-commerce platform tends to boost purchases on that platform (Felton & Jackson, 2021).

Table 13. Results of Partial Regression Analysis

Variable	t	p	Description
<i>Social presence – impulsive buying</i>	4.581	0.000	Significant (p < 0.01) Hypothesis accepted

Source: SPSS Version 25.0 for Windows

This study focuses on Generation Z, which is closely connected to the development of information technology (Arnett, 2020; Wijoyo et al., 2020). Amanda et al. (2024) describe Generation Z as a key demographic in the rapid advancement of technology, making online shopping a major influence on spontaneous and unplanned purchases compared to the past. This sense of spontaneity arises because today's shopping platforms have become increasingly sophisticated, and the e-commerce experience is well-defined, making Gen Z prone to impulsive purchases—especially since they prefer quick, simple information (Berkup, 2014). This influences individuals' emotional regulation, supported by Gen Z's preference for time efficiency in shopping, making e-commerce the preferred choice for online shopping (Utama et al., 2024), which is further facilitated by Gen Z's ability to view reviews from other buyers or ask sellers online, creating a sense of intimacy that supports Gen Z's online shopping behavior.

The respondents in this study were also predominantly Gen Z and used various e-commerce platforms, namely Lazada, Shopee, TikTok Shop, and Tokopedia. The majority of study respondents used Shopee as their shopping platform. This aligns with the findings of Dewi (2024) and Maulan et al. (2024), who noted that Shopee is the most-visited e-commerce site due to the ease of access it offers for shopping. The promotions offered on these e-commerce platforms also vary, including twin-date promotions, free shipping, and cashback, which entice consumers to make impulsive purchases and foster a sense of ownership. Moreover, since Gen Z is inseparable from smartphone use, they often make spontaneous purchases.

The respondents in this study were predominantly female, totaling 79 participants. In this context, women are more prone to impulsive buying behavior due to differences in emotionality between women and men (Tulungen, 2013). Women tend to be more emotional when their desires are fulfilled, find it easier to feel happy, and are more easily tempted by attractive, affordable items, which leads them to shop online more frequently than men do. Ozdemir & Akcay (2019) also noted that the feminine gender has a positive influence on impulsive buying behavior, consistent with the findings of Prakash et al. (2017), who observed that women tend to shop more impulsively compared to men.

CONCLUSION

The rapid pace of change in today's world has a significant impact on daily life, particularly on shopping habits. While shopping was previously done primarily offline, it is now also conducted online through e-commerce. This consumerist culture is widespread, especially in the digital age, where it is readily embraced by Gen Z, who value time efficiency—for example, online shopping. Emotional instability can influence impulsive buying behavior, which often stems from a lack of emotional regulation. Additionally, social presence—the influence of interactions with friends, family, and social media—affects an individual's impulsive purchasing decisions. This study examined the relationship between emotional regulation, social presence, and impulsive buying among Gen Z.

The results of this study are as follows:

1. The first hypothesis that emotional regulation and *social presence* have a simultaneous relationship with Gen Z's

impulsive buying was accepted. This implies that individuals prone to *impulsive buying* tend to struggle with self-control and prioritize their own interests. When social presence is present, this can create a sense of closeness, fostering trust and experiences that lead them to purchase the item, resulting in *impulsive buying* behavior.

2. The second hypothesis—that emotional regulation has a negative relationship with *impulsive buying* among Gen Z—was accepted. This implies that the higher the level of emotional regulation among Gen Z, the lower the level of impulsive buying; conversely, the lower the level of emotional regulation, the higher the level of *impulsive buying*.
3. The third hypothesis—that *social presence* has a positive relationship with *impulsive buying* among Gen Z—was accepted. This implies that the higher Gen Z's *social presence*, the higher their *impulsive buying*; conversely, the lower their *social presence*, the lower their *impulsive buying*.

Recommendations for Gen Z include identifying the triggers of emotional behavior experienced when making a purchase. Gen Z needs to recognize their emotions and understand that the solution to their problems is not solely through shopping; thus, they can create *an emotional journal* by recording their feelings and emotional patterns. Gen Z can also practice emotional regulation to shop with more stable emotions, for example, by giving themselves positive affirmations when feeling exhausted, using relaxation techniques while shopping *online*, and reflecting on the item's urgency. Gen Z can also join supportive communities to interact positively with those around them. Suggestions for e-commerce include adding features that delay a buyer's decision during the purchasing process, such as a time-limited reminder to prompt Gen Z to consider the items they intend to buy. E-commerce platforms can also incorporate more emotionally resonant designs to encourage purchases, such as displaying empathetic messages

when users open the app after a long workday. Additionally, they can use promotional campaigns that foster deeper emotional engagement, such as exchanging shopping points for free counseling sessions, enabling Gen Z to regulate their emotions through counseling better.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. (2004). Social Presence in Online Conferences: What Makes People 'Real'?. *Malaysian Journal of Distance Education*, 6(2), 1–22.
- Aditya, D. (2023). The Relationship Between Self-Regulation and Impulsive Buying of Items in Online Games During Early Adulthood. *Fenomena*, 32(1), 36–43.
- Ahdiat, A. (2023). Shopee Visitors Are Increasing; How Are Other E-Commerce Platforms Faring?. At <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/> (accessed March 23, 2025).
- Amanda, S. et al. (2024). The Influence of Social Media, Shopping Lifestyle, and Customer Experience on Gen Z's Impulse Buying Behavior via E-Commerce. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 1(2), 171–180.
- Andika et al. (2023). From Interaction to Transaction: Analyzing the Influence of Social Presence on Impulsive Purchasing in Live Streaming Commerce. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Management*, 16(3), 455–472.
- Arnett, J. J. (2020). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Agustin, L. et al. (2024). Analysis of Differences in Online Impulsive Buying Behavior Between Gen Z and Gen Y from the Perspective of Hedonic Shopping Motivation (Survey of Shopee E-Commerce Users in the City of Tasikmalaya). *Journal of Business, Management, and Accounting*, 1(1), 61–72.
- Azwar, S. (2012). *Reliability and Validity*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Azwar, S. (2017). *Psychological Research Methods*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Beatty, S. & Ferrell, M. (1998). Impulsive Buying: Modeling Its Precursors. *Journal of Retailing*, 74(2), 169–191.
- Belderrain, Y. (2006). Distance Education Trends: Integrating New Techniques to Foster Student Interactions and Collaboration. *Distance Education*, 27(2), 139–154.
- Berkup, S. (2014). Working with Generations X and Y in the Generation Z Era: Managing Different Generations in the Business World. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 218.
- Biocca, F. et al. (2003). Toward a More Robust Theory and Measure of Social Presence: Review and Suggested Criteria. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 12(5), 456–480.
- Chen, Y., Wang, J., & Lee, H. (2020). Impulsive buying behavior in the digital age: The role of social media influence and emotional regulation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 30(4), 589–604.
- Chong, D. & Ali, H. (2022). Literature Review: Competitive Strategy, Competitive Advantages, and Marketing Performance on E-Commerce Shopee Indonesia. *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*, 3(2), 299–309.
- Dewi, K. (2024). The Correlation Between Shopee's Twin Date Festival and Gen Z's Impulsive Buying Behavior in Ngabang District. *Iltizam Journal of Shariah Economic Research*, 8(1), 94–103.
- Dhendra, T. K. (2020). Does emotional regulation mediate the relationship between stress and impulsive buying?. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 57, 102221.
- Fei, T. et al. (2022). Curriculum Design of Virtual Simulation Experiment of Thermistor Temperature Measurement Characteristics Based on Educational Psychology. *IJNP*, 25, 43–44.
- Felton, W. & Jackson, R. (2021). Presence: A Review. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 38, 1–18.
- Gratz, K. & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional Assessment of Emotion Regulation and Dysregulation: Development, Factor Structure, and Initial Validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26, 41–54.
- Gross, J. & Thompson, R. (2007). Emotion Regulation: Conceptual Foundations. *Handbook of Emotion Regulation*, edited by James J. Gross. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Gunawardena, C. (1995). Social Presence Theory and Implications for Interaction and Collaborative Learning in Computer Conferences. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 1(2&3), 147–166.
- Gyurak, A. et al. (2011). Explicit and Implicit Emotion Regulation: A Dual-Process Framework. *Cognition and Emotion*. USA: Psychology Press. 25(3), 400–412.
- Handayani, R. et al. (2021). The Effect of Hedonic Shopping Motivation on Impulse Purchase of Fashion Products During the Pandemic (Case Study on Generation Z Consumers of Several E-Commerce Platforms in Bandung). *Review of International Geographical Educational Online*, 11(3), 1571–1578.
- Hwang, Y., Kim, H., & Choi, J. (2020). The role of social presence in e-commerce: Implications for impulse buying and trust formation—Computers in Human Behavior, 109, 106361.
- Kacen, J. & Lee, J. (2008). The Influence of Culture on Consumer Impulsive Buying Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(2), 163–176.
- Kim, J., & Johnson, K. K. P. (2020). The power of social influence: How online reviews and recommendations drive impulsive purchasing behavior. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 50, 136–150.
- Kayyal, A. (2023). Emotional Regulation, Personality, and Impulsive Buying Behavior Among College Students. Unpublished dissertation. Mahatma Gandhi University.
- Kredivo & Katadata Insight Center. (2023). Online shopping trends in Indonesia: 2023 e-commerce report. Kredivo. <https://katadata.co.id>.
- Liu, R., Zhang, X., & Wang, Y. (2022). Emotion regulation and impulse buying: Understanding the psychological coping

- mechanism. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49(2), 234–252.
- Marhumi. (2024). The Influence of E-Commerce on Impulsive Buying Behavior Among Generation Z in Purwakarta City. *COSTING: Journal of Economic, Business, and Accounting*, 7(6), 7234–7246.
- Marits, S. & Zaerofi, A. (2023). Trust and Purchase Intention Model of Muslim Generation Z Consumers on E-Commerce (B2C) in Indonesia. *Journal of Management*, 180–190.
- Maulan, P. et al. (2024). Impulsive Buying Behavior: Implementation of the Technology Acceptance Model Approach in E-Commerce Purchase Decisions. *Journal of Business Informatics*. 6(2), 448–452.
- Nisaputra, R. (2023). Despite Economic Uncertainty, 67% of the Public Remains Enthusiastic About Online Shopping at <https://infobanknews.com/ekonomi-tak-pasti-67-masyarakat-malah-antusias-sambut-promosi-belanja-online/> (accessed March 23, 2025)
- Nisfiannoor, M. & Kartika, Y. (2004). The Relationship Between Emotional Regulation and Peer Group Acceptance Among Adolescents. *Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 160–178.
- Oktavia, S. (2023). The Role of Social Presence in Impulsive Buying Among TikTok Live-Streaming Shop Consumers Based on the S-O-R Framework. *Open Society Conference*, 1, 1-12.
- Overveld, M. (2016). Emotion Regulation Can Be Costly. A Study on the Effects of Emotion Regulation Strategies on Impulsive Purchases in Consumers. *Innovative Marketing*, 12(1), 41–49.
- Ozdemir, E. & Akcay, G. (2019). The Effect of Gender Identity on Consumers' Impulse Buying Behavior and the Moderating Role of Biological Sex. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 10(5), 1109–1125.
- Park, J. & Forney. (2006). A Structural Model of Fashion-Oriented Impulsive Buying Behavior. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 10(4), 433–446.
- Park, J., Cho, H., & Lee, D. (2021). The role of social presence in online shopping and its impact on impulse buying. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(1), 87–99.
- Populix. (2023). Report on Gen Z online shopping habits in Indonesia. Populix Research. <https://populix.co.id>. Prakash, G. et al. (2017). Gender Effects on Impulse Buying Behavior. *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*, 7(4), 1–12.
- Pratama, V. et al. (2023). The Influence of Hedonic Shopping Motives and Social Media Product Browsing on Online Impulse Buying of Fashion Products Among Gen-Z in Pangkalpinang. *SINOMIKA Journal: Scientific Publication in Economics and Accounting*, 1(5), 1057–1074.
- Putri, E. (2019). The Influence of Emotional Regulation, Internet Addiction, and Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence on Online Impulse Buying Among Adolescents. Unpublished Thesis. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Ranaa, N. (2023). The Effect of Social Presence on Impulsive Buying Behavior in TikTok Live Streams with Consumer Trust as an Intervening Variable (A Study on the Somethinc Brand). *Diponegoro Journal of Management*, 12(3), 1–14.
- Rahayu, N. et al. (2024). The Influence of Live Streamers and Twin-Date Promotions on Impulsive Buying (A Case Study of Shopee E-Commerce Users in Mataram City). *Journal Ganec Swara*, 18(1), 263–268.
- Ramadhan, A. et al. (2024). Self-Regulation and Impulsive Buying Among E-Commerce Users: A Study of Students in Surabaya. *Jambi Journal of Psychology*, 9(2), 54–60.
- Rook, D. (1987). The Buying Impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(2), 189–199.
- Sanger, K. et al. (2024). The Effect of Time Availability, Social Presence, and Emotional Condition on Impulsive Buying Behavior at Sociolla Store Manado Town Square. *EMBA Journal*, 12(3), 105–114.
- Sari, D. (2014). Analysis of Factors Influencing Online Consumers' Impulsive Purchases with Expenditures and Shopping Orientation as Mediating Variables. Petra Christian University. <http://www.petra.ac.id/>

- Sawarsa, B. et al. (2023). Social Presence in Live Streaming: A Catalyst for Impulsive Purchases. *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business and Management*, 5(1), 41–54.
- Sheppes, G., Suri, G., & Gross, J. J. (2019). Emotion regulation and decision making: A theoretical framework and review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(7), 571–593.
- Siregar, N. & Rini, Q. (2019). Regulation and Impulsive Buying of Fashion Products Among Female Adolescents Who Shop Online. *Journal of Psychology*, 12(2), 213–224.
- Short, J. et al. (1976). *The Social Psychology of Telecommunications*. New York: John Wiley.
- Sihombing, D. & Sukati, I. (2022). Analysis of the Influence of Promotions, Lifestyle, and Product Quality on Impulsive Buying on Shopee in Batam City. *eCo-Buss*, 5(2), 754–766.
- Solomon, M. (2011). *Consumer Behavior*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Strongman, K. (2003). *The Psychology of Emotion*. New Zealand: Department of Psychology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Suri, G., Sheppes, G., & Gross, J. J. (2021). How emotional regulation influences decision-making under stress: Implications for consumer behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 34(2), 345–361.
- Utama, N. et al. (2024). The Influence of E-Commerce on Impulsive Buying Behavior Among Generation Z. *Journal of Digital Management and Marketing*, 2(3), 218–226.
- Thompson, R. (1994). Emotion Regulation: A Theme in Search of Definition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59, 25–52.
- Tu, C. (2000). Online Learning Migration: From Social Learning Theory to Social Presence Theory in a CMC Environment. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 23(1), 27–37.
- Tulungen, C. (2013). Comparative Analysis of Impulse Buying Based on Gender Differences. *Journal EMBA*, 1(4), 1349–1357.
- Ugyur, E. (2018). Development of a Consumer Impulsive Buying Tendency Scale Using Mixed Methodology. *Beykoz Academy Journal*, 6(2), 125–141.
- Verma, S. (2024). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Impulse Buying Behavior. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development*, 9(7), 793–816.
- Verplanken, B. & Herabadi, A. (2001). Individual Differences in Impulsive Buying Tendency: Feeling and No Thinking. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(1), 71–83.
- Wang, L., Chen, Y., & Zhao, H. (2022). The psychological impact of impulsive buying: Anxiety, regret, and coping strategies. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 32(3), 421–438.
- Wijoyo, H. et al. (2020). Generation Z & the Fourth Industrial Revolution (July Issue).
- Williams, A., & Grisham, J. (2011). Impulsivity, Emotion Regulation, and Mindful Attentional Focus in Compulsive Buying. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 36, 451–457.
- Zhang, M., & Shi, G. (2022). Consumers' impulsive buying behavior in online shopping: the influence of social presence. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2022 (1).
- Zhao, Y., & Shukla, P. (2021). Social media influence on impulse buying: The power of reviews and recommendations. *Journal of Retailing*, 97(2), 216–231.