Factors Influencing Online Impulsive Buying Behavior in Indonesia
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**Abstract.** Technology based era has brought market into higher level competition, online shopping has set the new standard for customer-marketer transaction. Prior study held in developed country has resulted variety of customers online shopping motives, as an emerging country where online transaction amount starts to significantly increase, marketer’s challenges in Indonesia is to acknowledge the driven factors of Indonesian online impulsive buying behavior. The construct of this study reflects to customer’s hedonic browsing behavior and utilitarian browsing behavior that motivates them to make an online impulsive buying decision. This study has constructed the models based on prior study related to online impulsive buying in several countries and proposed promotion, positive emotion, and psychological distance as variable predictors. This study validated the framework using Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Result implicates that Indonesian customers are dominated with impulsive yet efficient-first type of customers.
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Introduction

In the technology-based era, the online buying phenomenon has been spread around the world, and researchers believed it has boosted the number of sales and became one of the most promising advantages of creating business opportunities in the marketplace. Nielsen Company's (2016) research stated that the number of sales in the U.S. increased to $340 billion in 2016. Not only the U.S. and Europe, some Asian country such as South Korea has grown a significant number of sales by using an online platform, as a matter of fact as an Asian internet leader, Nielsen Company (2016) stated that South Korea in 2016 had reached $37 billion, which is mostly categorized as fashion-related products. In Indonesia, according to one of the Bank Indonesia directors, around 24 million people are doing online shopping and spent approximately $5 billion in 2016 and even increased Indonesian economic growth to 5% (CNN Indonesia 2017). These facts are showing that Asian society has strong online buying behavior that increases throughout the years. A study that conducted in the field of marketing from both academic and practices point of view there is a minimum of 40% and could reach a number of 80% sales in the market represent an example of society’s impulsive buying behavior with a variety of product tested (Amos, Holmes, & Keneson, 2014), given the facts of society impulsive buying behavior researcher believe that online buying, web browsing and any other internet shopping activities could be the drive of impulsive buying behavior (Gupta, 2011).

Referring to Tayibnapis, Wuryaningsih, & Gora (2018), 50% of the total population of Indonesia has familiar with using the internet. It has been the new methods that facilitate all kinds of activities and to develop the digital technology-based industries. In their study, they also mentioned the average expenditure of IDR 6.5 million per year had been resulted from online shopping transactions in Indonesia by the year 2017. A similar result is shown in Amanah, Harahap, & Lisnawati (2017) that stated in 2017 Indonesia has approximately 215 million internet users by 2020 and predicted approximately 119 million people in Indonesia would actively shopping through online markets by the year 2025. According to Wardhana & Pradana (2016) the ease that online shopping offers became the reason customer’s keep using it. Aruna & Santhi's (2015) study indicates the motives behind Indonesian massive online shopping tendency is impulsive buying behavior, especially in generation-Y. Thus, this study is constructed to understand what factors that mostly be considered to shop online in an emerging country. Hopefully, by using this approach to the research, the markets could understand the factors to drive society’s online impulsive buying behavior and put their strategies on the proper segmentation

Online Impulsive Buying Behavior Factors

Impulsive buying behavior could be defined as an unplanned decision of buying things based on stimulus drive to eagerly having some things that are seen in an immediate event, and diminished regard for its consequences (Gardner & Rook, 1988; Verplanken & Sato, 2011; Widawati, 2011). In Indonesia, impulsive buying factors could be seen in the study of Devi & Saini (2015), which believed demography factors could influence customer's decision-making. Referring to Hendra, Wirza, & Irawan (2015), Indonesian online shopping reduces the amount of travel to shop habit. We could also understand from both study by Devi & Saini (2015) and Hidayanto, Saifulhaq, & Handayani (2012) that Indonesian are more into chasing an output with less effort, while other countries are focus more on the customers' experience and personality traits of the customers as stated in Aragoncillo & Orús (2018); and Chen & Lee (2008) study.

Emotions and hedonic experiences are strongly related to sensory stimulation. In the previous study that has been done by (Dameyasani & Abraham, 2013), impulsivity is the lack or the absence of self-control. To complete the statement, Verplanken & Sato (2011) stated that in terms of impulse buying, self-control includes thinking about how to spend money, avoiding displays of products, or managing emotional passion associated with products. A study conducted by Verhagen & Van Dolen (2011) believed that positive emotion factor in online impulsive buying behavior should be stimulated using a calm, friendly, knowledgeable, and fun site with an attractive assortment. Fahd & Sugiarto (2015) in their study explains positive emotions as customers main driven factors to impulsively shop online, making an exciting, enthusiastic, and inspiring shopping experience for the customers would emerge their positive emotions that leads to their shopping impulsivity. Emotional consumption experience is distantly related to shopping pleasure, including the delight of receiving something in the shopping process (Handayani, Anshori, Usman, & Mudjanarko, 2018), which explains why shopping experience such as communication style, shopping enjoyment, and user interface could be an important factor to drive the customers' emotion in online shopping context (Verhagen & Van Dolen, 2011). Thus, previous research showing evidence that positive emotion is easier to be driven in an online shopping context rather than negative emotion.

According to Poorrezaei & Heinze (2014) study, customer engagement could be driven by referring to customer's personality traits using persuasive communication theory. Persuasive interaction implies to explain how consumers interpret and elaborate persuasive signals, whether positive or negative, to construct their actions towards an item or individual (Poorrezaei & Heinze, 2014). Subjective evaluation of consumers might appear when they evaluate two products. This statement is concluded by Roy & Ng (2012) in their research which believes that consumer tends to focus on hedonic attributes when evaluating two products and show a greater preference for the product that is stronger on its hedonic claims.

Park, Kim, Funches, & Foxx (2012) divides E-impulsive buying behavior into two categories, utilitarian browsing and hedonic browsing. The basic theory of this study comes from Chen & Lee (2008) that defined Utilitarian consumer behavior as goal-oriented, pragmatic, and well-reasoned attitudes which result from a situational-involved consumer collecting information out of necessity rather than as recreation, while hedonic browsing defined as an action result of emotional arousals, fun, and playfulness during the shopping process. Sometimes consumers shop online for both hedonic and utilitarian browsing behavior. The engagement of the marketers would drive their subjective thoughts into shopping online hedonically and/or utilitarianly.

Promotions are effective to stimulate and attract new consumers to make an initial purchase (Darke & Dahl, 2003). A study by M. Park & Lennon (2009) concluded that promotion to a well-known brand name was a powerful factor directly influencing consumers' purchase intention. However, consumers' perception of unexpected promotions to a smaller brand name may also stimulate impulsive and unplanned buying. The argument is strengthened by Oliver & Shor (2003), who stated that people tend to have a positive perception of product value when promotional strategy is applied. Although promotional strategy is believed as an important factor, it is believed that the promotion should target the consumer properly (Shor & Oliver, 2006). Consumers with lower impulse purchase tendencies usually spend more money than those who make impulse purchases more frequently (Hultén & Vanyushyn, 2014)

Psychological distance is a personal concept that comes by subjective experiences. In the beginning, Trope, Liberman, & Wakslak (2007), stated that psychological distance affects people's thoughts during decision-making processes. Then, Liberman & Trope (2014) in their recent study, redefined their concept; Psychological distance is an extent of divergence from direct experience of a person, exact place, and exact time along the dimensions of time, space, social perspective, or hypotheticality.

The ability to complete transactions between a spatially separated seller and the buyer has been the most important part of all; consumers later achieve their shopping object through the delivery system and bypassing the time and effort that the consumer used to struggle with. This showing that people are willing to psychologically cost their trust to an online shopping marketers to ease their shopping process, bypassing through the time they need to spend and location that they need to access to make a purchase (Kaju & Maglio, 2018). Consumer's psychological distance mindset tend to avoid risk and exhibit preferences for the familiar rather than for the unknown (Edwards, Lee, & Ferle, 2013). Consumers tend to make an impulse purchase when their cognitive framework of psychological distance is affecting their subjective concept of efficiency.

Park et al. (2012) study shown hedonic browsers act as moderators between price attributes and online impulsive buying behavior. Similar study has been done in Indonesia by Astuti et al. (2020), which shows significances between promotion and online impulsive buying behavior. It is known that marketers are trying to gain consumer's loyalty by keeping consumers satisfaction which later provokes their impulsivity on the same website in the future.

The delightful process of shopping is believed to be caused by the emotional experience of a consumer (Handayani et al., 2018). Rahayu (2017) stated that positive emotions such as increase tendency of shopping when feeling happy and increase the tendency of unplanned shopping when feeling happy would generate consumers online impulsive buying behavior. Positive emotion is often related to consumers' hedonic value. The engagement of hedonic value might come to the consumers through promotions and advertisements (Bridges & Florsheim, 2008).

Referring to Edwards et al. (2013); and Liberman & Trope (2014), in this study, psychological distance is defined as the degree of deviation from an individual's subjective perspectives to conjecture the unidentified dimensions of time and space. It explained that psychological distance is influenced by the customer's perception of efficiency, the ease to shop anytime and anywhere, which similar to utilitarian browsing behavior's factors. In the Indonesian context, it is also mentioned in Andani (2015) study that utilitarian browsing behavior could be identified if the customers are considering product information, quality, and efficiency.

Thus, based on previous explanation, this study proposed a model contains eight hypotheses; (H1) Promotions on shopping website positively influences consumers online impulsive buying behavior; (H2) Promotions on shopping websites positively related to hedonic browsing behavior; (H3) Emotions on shopping website positively influences consumers online impulsive buying behavior; (H4) Emotions on shopping websites positively related to hedonic browsing behavior; (H5) Psychological distance on shopping website positively related to utilitarian browsing behavior; (H6) Psychological distance on shopping websites positively influences consumer's online impulsive buying behavior; (H7) Hedonic browsing on shopping websites positively influences consumer's online impulsive buying behavior; (H8) Utilitarian browsing on shopping websites positively influences consumer's online impulsive buying behavior.

*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework*

Research Methods

**Table 1**

**Respondents’ Demographic Information**

| Respondents Profile | N | % |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Male | 132 | 40.62% |
|   | Female | 193 | 59.38% |
| Age | 18-24 | 101 | 31.00% |
|   | 25-34 | 166 | 51.00% |
|   | 35-44 | 25 | 7.60% |
|   | >45 | 37 | 11.40% |
| Occupation | Student | 75 | 23.00% |
|   | Entrepreneur | 28 | 8.62% |
|   | Housewife | 16 | 5.00% |
|   | Employees | 138 | 42.50% |
|   | Freelance | 31 | 9.50% |
|   | Other | 37 | 11.38% |
| Online Shopping Frequency in last 3 months | 1-2x | 81 | 24.92% |
| 3-4x | 80 | 24.62% |
| >4x | 164 | 50.46% |

This study validated the framework of online impulsive buying behavior in Indonesia using a quantitative approach. Variables are constructed based on previous research related to impulse buying behavior. The questionnaire was given to respondents that have experienced in using the online shop, and specifically, respondents with a minimum of one purchase in the last three months. Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the condition described in each item on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). This research is designed for the “simple random sampling’ method with respondents who have become accustomed to online shopping. The age category of this research is divided into 4, 18-24 years old, 25-34 years old, 35-44 years old, and 45 or above. This category is referring to Nusarika & Purnami (2015).

The research began with questionnaire related to the respondent’s profile to briefly examine the respondent demographic situation. Questionnaire was given to 325 people (N = 325) with 132 male respondents (40.62%), and 193 female respondents (59.38%). There are 101 respondents (31%) with age intervals between 18 to 24 years old, 166 respondents (51%) with age intervals between 25 to 34 years old, 25 respondents (7.6%) with age intervals between 35 to 44 years old, and more than 45 years old with 37 respondents (11.4%). The data of this survey is analyzed using SmartPLS of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM); SmartPLS is used due to its significance of analyzing model with moderator and provides less contradictory results than regression analysis in terms of detecting moderation effects (Ramli, Latan, & Nartea, 2018).

Psychometrics analysis is used to assess whether the questionnaire is fit to the research variables. According to the newest guidelines written by (Henseler, Hubona, & Ray, 2016), there are three main measures were used to test the reliability; internal consistency as result of Cronbach alpha and composite reliability (value should be more than 0.7), convergent validity or also known as average variance extracted (value should be more than 0.5), and outer loadings (value should be more than at least 0.6, outer loadings that fall between 0.4 and 0.7 can be retained if the value of composite reliability and average variance extracted (AVE) are already above the minimum requirements of the threshold). Discriminant validity is examined with the Fornell-Larcker (1971) criterion and cross-loadings factor. This research is using an iterative analysis approach using PLS-SEM analysis by examining the outer loadings or the loadings of each item on their respective construct or latent variables (Blunch, 2012; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014; Henseler et al., 2016).

Results and Discussion

The structural model illustrated in Figure.1 shows only significant standardized path coefficients. The three online impulsive buying behvior factors are significantly related to web browsing (hedonic and utilitarian browsing); however, only psychological distance factors that found to be directly affects online impulsive buying behavior. The estimated model accounts for 40.2 % of the total variance in online impulsive buying behavior.

Hypothesis H1 (β = 0.090, p <0.173) and Hypothesis H4 (β = 0.076, p <0.267) are rejected since it has shown shows the poor level of influence and not significant, we could assume that PMTN and PSTE do not significantly related to IMPB. Hypothesis H2 (β = 0.224, p <0.001) and Hypothesis H3 (β = 0.436, p <0.001) are both indicated that each PMTN and PSTE has positive influence on HDBW variable. Hypothesis H5 (β = 0.706, p <0.001) and Hypothesis H6 (β = 0.138, p <0.04) are both showing PSYD variables are positively influencing UTBW and IMPB. Although Hypothesis H6 is showing low coefficient values (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Kuppelwieser, 2014), the variables would be significant if the p-values requirement are fulfilled; however, it might indicate Hypothesis H6 has small merit in managerial implications. Hypothesis H7 (β = 0.533, p <0.001) and Hypothesis H8 (β = -0.179, p <0.01) are showing that both HDBW and UTBW are significantly related to IMPB. However, Hypothesis H7 (β = 0.533, p <0.001) are showing positive interactions while Hypothesis H8 (β = -0.179, p <0.01) shown a negative interaction, this was caused by the hedonic nature of impulsive behavior, but both Hypothesis H7 and Hypothesis H8 are valid. This study also includes the moderating effect to describe HDBW and UTBW as the moderator to produce IMPB. Hypothesis H2 (β = 0.224, p <0.001) PMTN → HDBW and Hypothesis H3 (β = 0.436, p <0.001) PSTE → HDBW, showing both promotion and positive emotion factors are positively related to online impulsive buying behavior through moderating effect since Hypothesis H5 has t value 8.824 (p <0.001) and Hypothesis H8 t value 2.662 (p <0.01) then it shows more solid support for the efficiency and effectiveness hypotheses, although H8 seems to be less consistent as the model predicted it to be negative (Chin & Dibbern, 2010).

**Table 2**

**Full-Scale Study Results of the Outer Loadings, Cronbach Alpha, Composite Reliability**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable and Construct** | **Mean** | **Loading Value** | **Composite Reliability** | **Average Variance Extracted (AVE)** | **Cronbach's Alpha** |
| **Hedonic Browsing Behavior** | Shopping is a special experience | 3.65 | 0.761 | 0.902 | 0.649 | 0.864 |
| Shopping is one alternative to overcoming stress | 3.43 | 0.812 |
| I often losing track of time when shopping online because of the fun of choosing items | 3.15 | 0.837 |
| I shop online because of the pleasure of interacting and exchanging information with colleagues of the products | 2.83 | 0.841 |
| I shop online to follow the new fashion trends or try out new models | 2.66 | 0.773 |
| **Online Impulsive Buying Behavior** | I often make online purchases spontaneously | 3.30 | 0.761 | 0.884 | 0.605 | 0.836 |
| I often buy goods online without considering the consequences of purchasing | 2.55 | 0.782 |
| I often feel the trouble of refraining from limiting the number of purchases as needed | 2.53 | 0.857 |
| Great deals can increase my shopping interest immediately | 3.61 | 0.733 |
| The latest Model could suddenly increase my shopping interest | 2.87 | 0.746 |
| **Promotion** | Consumers interested in buying products offered with promotion using cashback | 3.92 | 0.673 | 0.815 | 0.527 | 0.699 |
| Consumers interested in buying products offered with promotion using price-off/rebate | 4.56 | 0.608 |
| Consumers interested in buying products offered with promotion using bonus packs/bundling | 3.50 | 0.785 |
| Consumers interested in buying products offered with promotion using free premium gifts | 3.46 | 0.810 |
| **Positive Emotion** | I feel online shopping gives a certain sensation | 3.67 | 0.783 | 0.926 | 0.715 | 0.900 |
| Shopping online makes me feel happy | 3.75 | 0.896 |
| I feel energetically if I'm shopping online | 3.58 | 0.918 |
| I feel comfortable when I shop online | 3.91 | 0.838 |
| I feel satisfied after shopping online | 3.79 | 0.782 |
| **Psychological Distance** | I shop online because it can be done anytime | 4.58 | 0.846 | 0.858 | 0.553 | 0.790 |
| I shop online because it can be done anywhere | 4.64 | 0.837 |
| Online shopping habits make me feel the distance between me and the seller is closer | 3.50 | 0.564 |
| I feel that shopping online is more efficient in time and energy | 4.45 | 0.770 |
| Compared to other online shopping sites, the usual online shopping sites I use are safely reliable | 4.23 | 0.660 |
| **Utilitarian Browsing Behavior** | I am looking for the best price and quality when shopping online | 4.62 | 0.724 | 0.796 | 0.566 | 0.631 |
| I'm using an online shopping app to get information about the products I would buy | 4.49 | 0.700 |
| I shop online because of the ease offered | 4.49 | 0.827 |

Referring to the proposed hypothesis mentioned earlier in the study, we could examine that most of the hypotheses were proven to be significantly related according to the data presented above. Yi & Jai (2020) research showing the reason why Hypothesis 4 in this study is rejected as their study concluded positive emotion could not directly stimulate impulse buying behavior; instead, it should be managed simultaneously with consumers’ desires. Hypothesis 1 is supported by Kim & Eastin (2011) study result that stated although customers’ are exploring various product information and marketing promotions, they would not be induced to buy impulsively. Thus, consistent with Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 4, several previous studies (Park et al., 2012; Verhagen & Van Dolen, 2011; Yi & Jai, 2020) supported both Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 arguments that customers hedonic browsing tendency is affected by their positive emotion and promotion strategies.

**Table 3**

**Fornell-Larcker Criterion**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Construct** | **AVE** | **Fornell-Larcker Criterion** |
| **Hedonic Browsing Behavior** | **Online Impulsive Buying Behavior** | **Positive Emotion** | **Promotion** | **Psychological Distance** | **Utilitarian Browsing Behavior** |
| **Hedonic Browsing Behavior** | **0.649** | **0.806** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Online Impulsive Buying Behavior** | **0.605** | 0.611 | **0.778** |  |  |  |  |
| **Positive Emotion** | **0.715** | 0.555 | 0.403 | **0.846** |  |  |  |
| **Promotion** | **0.527** | 0.415 | 0.339 | 0.411 | **0.726** |  |  |
| **Psychological Distance** | **0.553** | 0.369 | 0.288 | 0.576 | 0.404 | **0.744** |  |
| **Utilitarian Browsing Behavior** | **0.566** | 0.290 | 0.139 | 0.479 | 0.331 | 0.706 | **0.752** |

Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 explain that both promotion (PMTN) and positive emotion (PSTE) are significantly influence customer’s hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW). Hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW) is mainly driven by customers cognition and emotion (Alvarez-Milán, Felix, Rauschnabel, & Hinsch, 2018); this finding explains why customers tend to browse hedonically when they are in a good mood (Harris, 2019), and firm’s promotional strategy successfully intrigued them to browse (Liu, Zhang, Huang, Zhang, & Zhao, 2020). Aligned with Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3, Hypothesis 7 explains hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW) is significantly influence online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). A similar finding has been discovered by Park, Kim, Funches, & Foxx (2012) study, which concluded hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW) acts as a moderating variable and found significantly influenced online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB); this study has reflected the same result with different variables. Relating to Alvarez-Milán, Felix, Rauschnabel, & Hinsch’s (2018) experimental study findings, we could conclude that emotion, cognitive and behavior of the customers are the main drivers to activate customer impulsivity.

The next findings would be focused on psychological distance (PSYD) variables, how it affects utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBWand online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). Hypothesis 5 explains how psychological distance (PSYD) is strongly affecting utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBW). It indicates that utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBW) is affected by customers’ perception of efficiency and risk avoidance factors (Vonkeman, Verhagen, & van Dolen, 2017). Consumers are influenced mainly by the immediate impact of consumption. As utilitarian browsing encouraged a proximal purchase (psychological distance is proximal), Zheng, Yuan, Bian, Wang, & Huang (2020) concluded that psychological distance effect would enhance as well.

**Table 4**

**Path Coefficients and VIF**

| **Hypotheses Label** | **Path** | **Path Coefficient** | **Collinearity** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **β** | **p-value** | **Result** | **VIF** | **Result** |
| H1 | **PMTN → IMPB** | 0.090 | 0.173 | RejectH1 | 1.344 | No Collinearity |
| H2 | **PMTN → HDBW** | 0.224 | 0.000\*\*\* | AcceptH2 | 1.203 | No Collinearity |
| H3 | **PSTE → HDBW** | 0.463 | 0.000\*\*\* | AcceptH3 | 1.203 | No Collinearity |
| H4 | **PSTE → IMPB** | 0.076 | 0.267 | RejectH4 | 1.929 | No Collinearity |
| H5 | **PSYD → UTBW** | 0.706 | 0.000\*\*\* | AcceptH5 | 1.000 | No Collinearity |
| H6 | **PSYD → IMPB** | 0.138 | 0.04\*\* | AcceptH6 | 2.400 | No Collinearity |
| H7 | **HDBW → IMPB** | 0.533 | 0.000\*\*\* | AcceptH7 | 1.540 | No Collinearity |
| H8 | **UTBW ↑ IMPB** | -0.179 | 0.008\*\* | AcceptH8 | 2.032 | No Collinearity |

*Notes: \*\*\* p < 0.01, \*\* p < 0.05, \* p < 0.1*

Liu et al. (2020) explore the field by validating online customer’s behaviors will increase based on high-level construal aspects as psychological distance increases, which in line with Hypothesis 6, where psychological distance (PSYD) found to be significantly affecting online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). Consumer’s mindset of risk avoidance occur due to their minimum experience or source of information, and the drive to make several different types of impulsive purchases is more likely to appear if the customer feels more familiar with the online retailer or showing less psychological distance between customer and retailer (Edwards et al., 2013).

The last findings is Hypothesis 8, where utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBW) acts as a moderating factor between psychological distance (PSYD) and online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). Although these factors found to be a significant influence, yet the sign of the coefficient is negative, which means the total effect of the predictor is lower than the sum of the individual effects. This result is similar to a prior study by Park et al. (2012), which stated that utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBW) is not strongly moderates variables with online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). X. Zheng, Men, Yang, & Gong (2019) study resulted that utilitarian browsing behavior has an indirect effect to online impulsive buying behavior through the moderating effect of hedonic browsing behavior. Thus, we could conclude that the significance of hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW) is higher than utilitarian browsing behavior (UTBW) in Indonesian. A similar result also is shown in another Asian country such as South Korea (E. J. Park et al., 2012) and China (X. Zheng et al., 2019). It implies that society online impulsive buying behavior is easier to develop through their hedonic browsing behavior rather than the utilitarian browsing behavior.

Conclusions

Noticing the research in different countries came from a variety of variables and might result in different outputs; this study resulted some interesting insights with a study held in an emerging country. First, among promotion (PMTN), positive emotion (PSTE), and psychological distance (PSYD), only psychological distance (PSYD) that found to be directly affecting online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB) in customer’s mindset of shopping online. Second, as a moderating factor, hedonic browsing behavior (HDBW) made promotion (PMTN) and positive emotion (PSTE) resulted in different outcomes to online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB). Referring to the analysis of the moderating effect, it could be concluded that positive emotion and promotion could trigger customer’s hedonic browsing behavior and help marketers drive customer’s online impulsive buying behavior. Third, a study relating psychological distance with online impulsive buying behavior in Indonesia is still understudied, yet this study has shown that psychological distance (PSYD) is significantly affecting online impulsive buying behavior (IMPB); however, it is not necessary to moderate by utilitarian browsing behavior (HDBW). Lastly, concluded from all results, we could understand that Indonesian consumers are often intrigued mostly by their own hedonic browsing behavior. The result analysis of this study has given an insight that there is potential of hedonic browsing behavior in moderating the process of impulsive buying behavior, but utilitarian browsing behavior does not seem to highly affect the moderation process of online impulsive buying behavior. Based on this result, marketers should focus on what factors could drive customer’s hedonic browsing behavior.

Regardless of the insight that this study contributes, there are also several limitations that should be observed for future research development. First, the data collection of this study was held during a world-scale pandemic, covid-19; the result might be biased since the customer’s perspective of shopping might be shifted. Second, due to time restriction, this research is limited to 325 respondents, with around 100 people identified as Institut Teknologi Bandung academics. Further study should increase the size of the sample and spread the questionnaire to more variety of demographics to obtain a better result. Third, promotion and positive emotion in prior studies were found to be directly affecting online impulsive buying behavior while this study failed to prove it, however by focusing further study on moderating effect might give different outcomes since this study is mostly focused on moderating factors. Fourth, studying the relationship between psychological distance and online impulsive buying behavior is still considered something new in Indonesia. Utilitarian browsing behavior found as a weak factor moderating psychological distance to online impulsive buying behavior; thus, further study needs to focus on whether hedonic browsing behavior could moderate utilitarian browsing behavior and psychological distance with online impulsive buying behavior to see the possibilities whether utilitarian browsing behavior has an indirect effect to online impulsive buying behavior, through hedonic browsing behavior. Lastly, a variety of selection should be included in factors affecting online impulsive buying behavior that moderated by utilitarian browsing behavior.
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