

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the analysis conducted in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that:

1. Perceived scarcity does not have a positive effect on impulse buying.
2. Perceived scarcity has a positive effect on fear of missing out (FOMO).
3. Fear of missing out (FOMO) has a positive effect on impulse buying.
4. Fear of missing out (FOMO) mediates the relationship between perceived scarcity and impulse buying.
5. Hedonic shopping value moderates the relationship between perceived scarcity and impulse buying.

B. Implications

Theoretical and practical implications of the research results can be stated as follows:

1. Theoretical implications

There are several theoretical implications for future researchers, among others:

- a. This study provides a theoretical contribution for future researchers in the development of marketing behavior studies by integrating emotional factors such a FOMO and hedonic shopping value into impulsive behavior models, particularly in the context of the fashion industry.
- b. This research confirms the relevance of Stimulus Organism Response (SOR) Theory in explaining impulsive buying behavior,

where perceived scarcity (stimulus) influences impulse buying (response) through fear of missing out (organism) as an internal emotional response.

- c. This finding reinforces the theoretical understanding that FOMO becomes an important psychological mechanism that bridges the influence of external marketing stimuli on consumers' emotional reactions and behavior.
- d. The moderating role of hedonic shopping value in this study expands the study of consumer behavior theory by confirming that hedonic value does not always reinforce impulsive urges, but can weaken the influence of scarcity on impulsive purchases. This indicates that consumers with a hedonic shopping orientation tend to be calmer, more reflective, and enjoy the shopping process rather than being easily influenced by the pressure of scarcity.

2. Practical implications

Moreover, several practical implications can be used for marketers or brands, especially Rucas, among others:

- a. Rucas needs to manage perceptions of scarcity more evenly so as not to give the impression that the chances of obtaining the product are too small. Information about product limitations should be communicated in a measured way, for example, by limiting the number of purchases per consumer and providing a transparent digital queuing system.
- b. To leverage the FOMO effect more deeply, Rucas can create promotional strategies in the form of social media campaigns that highlight exclusivity and emotional engagement. For instance, make a countdown for each event or product release and create user-generated content, such as real reviews that show satisfaction after having limited Rucas products.

- c. To balance the hedonic shopping value, Rucas needs to strengthen the hedonic shopping experience, such as improving visual appearance, aesthetic design, interactive and entertaining content, and a pleasant shopping experience, rather than just emphasizing the urgency of purchasing. This will make consumers enjoy or like the purchasing process while reducing anxiety due to product scarcity.

C. Limitations and suggestions

In addition, this study has several limitations that need to be known and considered for further development in future studies, including:

1. There are still shortcomings in the description of respondent characteristics based on demographic aspects, which in this study are limited to gender, age, and income. In fact, the type of work has the potential to influence consumption patterns, income stability, and the intensity of consumer involvement in online shopping activities. Therefore, future studies should include analysis based on occupation or profession to obtain a more comprehensive overview of the relationship between occupation and consumption patterns, as well as consumer engagement with the brands.
2. The respondents in this study were all consumers of the Rucas brand who made purchases online. This means that the results of the study cannot be compared with consumer behavior in other purchasing channels, such as physical stores or offline events. Thus, the patterns of impulsivity found in this study are still limited to the context of online shopping.
3. Another limitation of this study is the rejection of one hypothesis, namely that the effect of perceived scarcity on impulse buying is significant but negative. This finding shows that the relationship between perceived scarcity and impulse buying is not always direct

and positive, and is likely to be influenced by other psychological or situational factors that have not been examined in this study. Therefore, further research is recommended to add other variables, such as self-control, perceived risk, or shopping fatigue to explain why the perception of scarcity in certain contexts can actually reduce impulsive behavior.

4. This study uses a cross-sectional survey approach, so the data only describes consumer behavior at a specific point in time. This approach is unable to capture changes in impulse buying behavior dynamically, especially in response to the periodic and repetitive release patterns of Rucas products. Therefore, this study cannot explain how changes in perceptions of scarcity and FOMO over time affect consumer behavior which is impulse buying.

