

The Influence of Hedonic Shopping Motivation and Self-Control on the Impulsive Buying Tendency

Aurelia Ardhani Nathania¹, Andi Supandi Suaid Koentary²

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia^{1 2}

andisk@ui.ac.id

Abstract

The increasing trend of Shopee PayLater usage, particularly among college students who do not have an income, warrants attention as many use it for recreational purposes without sufficient self-control, thus increasing the tendency for impulsive buying that can lead to uncontrolled financial burdens. This study has a hypothesis that hedonic shopping motivation and self-control have a significant influence on impulsive purchasing tendencies among Shopee PayLater users. The participants consisted of 141 college students aged 18–25 who actively use SPayLater. Multiple regression analysis showed that both hedonic shopping motivation ($\beta = .20$, 95% CI [.09, .31]) and self-control ($\beta = -.57$, 95% CI [-.68, -.44]) significantly influence impulsive buying tendency. The higher the hedonic motivation and the lower the self-control, the higher the tendency for impulsive buying (Impulsive Buying Tendency = $4.41 + .20$ (Hedonic Motivation) – $.57$ (Self-Control)). This study contributes to consumer psychology literature regarding the use of pay later services and provides insights to the public on the importance of managing emotional impulses and enhancing self-control.

Keywords: digital payment, hedonic shopping motivation, impulsive buying tendency, online shopping, pay later, self-control

Abstrak

Peningkatan tren penggunaan Shopee PayLater, khususnya di kalangan mahasiswa yang belum memiliki penghasilan, perlu mendapat perhatian karena banyak yang menggunakannya untuk tujuan rekreatif tanpa pengendalian diri yang memadai, sehingga meningkatkan kecenderungan pembelian impulsif yang dapat menimbulkan beban keuangan yang tidak terkendali. Penelitian ini mengajukan hipotesis bahwa motivasi belanja hedonis dan kontrol diri memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap kecenderungan pembelian impulsif pada pengguna Shopee PayLater. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini terdiri dari 141 mahasiswa berusia 18–25 tahun yang aktif menggunakan SPayLater. Analisis regresi berganda menunjukkan bahwa baik motivasi belanja hedonis ($\beta = .20$, 95% CI [.09, .31]) maupun kontrol diri ($\beta = -.57$, 95% CI [-.68, -.44]) secara signifikan memengaruhi kecenderungan pembelian impulsif. Semakin tinggi motivasi hedonis dan semakin rendah kontrol diri, maka semakin tinggi pula kecenderungan pembelian impulsif (Kecenderungan Pembelian Impulsif = $4,41 + .20$ (Motivasi Hedonis) – $.57$ (Kontrol Diri)). Penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi pada literatur psikologi konsumen terkait penggunaan layanan pay later serta memberikan wawasan kepada masyarakat mengenai pentingnya mengelola dorongan emosional dan meningkatkan kontrol diri.

Kata kunci: belanja daring; kecenderungan pembelian impulsif; kontrol diri; motivasi belanja hedonis; pembayaran digital; pay later.

Introduction

The number of e-commerce transactions in Indonesia continues to show an increase, especially among the younger generation. The ease of shopping without having to come to a physical store, accompanied by promos, discounts, and free shipping, makes e-commerce part of the lifestyle of modern society. Data from the Ministry of Trade shows that the number of e-commerce users continues to increase from 58.63 million in 2023 to 65.65 million in 2024, with total online transactions reaching IDR 478 trillion (Purnomo, 2024). Shopee e-commerce is in the top position with the most clicks (Statista, 2025), and its popularity is strengthened by various marketing strategies such as the fully integrated pay later (PayLater) service. This service allows consumers to make purchases instantly with deferred payments, and has become an increasingly popular payment option (Gerrans et al., 2021).

One of the reasons for the increasing interest in pay later is the flexibility and convenience. The trend of using pay later has increased significantly with annual growth reaching 144.35% since 2019 (GoodStats, 2024), and 24.53% service growth was recorded in 2024 (Triwibowo, 2025). This service is widely used by Generation Z and Millennials, most of whom are still in high school and college students (Triwibowo, 2025). Shopee Pay Later (SPayLater) is the most popular service with a usage rate of 77% (Populix, 2023), and is generally used for consumptive needs such as entertainment, not productive needs (Adiprasetyo & Surjandy, 2024). The rise of digital transactions and technological convenience has been identified as a key driver of the increasing prevalence of impulsive buying behavior in contemporary society (Sheruly & Koentary, 2023). This raises concerns about impulsive buying, which in consumer psychology refers to sudden purchases without careful consideration (Chan et al., 2017). Prior studies indicate that consumers often do not act rationally in online purchasing contexts, as buying decisions are frequently driven by immediate stimuli and emotional responses rather than careful planning (Adri, et.al. 2021).

Impulsive buying tendency is closely related to two psychological factors, hedonic shopping motivation and self-control. Hedonic shopping motivation drives individuals to seek emotional pleasure when shopping (Tsao & Chang, 2010), while self-control plays an important role in inhibiting momentary urges for long-term goals (Arifin & Milla, 2020). College students as part of emerging adulthood, self-control is still in the development stage, so they are more susceptible to impulsive consumption (Papalia & Martorell, 2021; Firdaus et al., 2022). Several Indonesian studies have shown that both hedonic shopping motivation and self-control have a significant effect on impulsive buying (Abdurachman et al., 2023; Fadillah & Sosialita, 2024; Salamba & Ambarwati, 2023; Sari et al., 2023; Sufyan et al., 2024), but not many have differentiated between impulsive buying behavior and tendencies conceptually (Badgaiyan et al., 2016; Sun & Wu, 2011).

Impulsive buying tendencies reflect an individual's psychological potential to behave impulsively, although it is not necessarily manifested in action (Rook & Fisher, 1995; Beatty & Ferrel, 1998). This study is important because it can provide insights into the importance of managing hedonic shopping motivation and improving self-control to avoid tendencies and behaviors related to impulsive buying, especially in online shopping that uses digital payment methods such as pay-later services. Based on the evaluation of Furgani's study (2020), as well as suggestions from Hidayat (2023) and Kardena and Rozi (2024), the author focuses the study on the influence of hedonic shopping motivation and self-control on impulsive buying tendencies, especially in college student users of SPayLater. College students are the right group because they are in a psychological and social situation that allows the interaction between hedonic drives, unstable self-control, and access to digital credit services to trigger impulsive shopping tendencies.

Impulsive buying tendency (IBT) is an individual characteristic to make sudden purchases without rational consideration, influenced by emotional urges and internal conflicts (Rook, 1987; Rook & Fisher, 1995; Beatty & Ferrell, 1998; Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001; Winarti, 2015). Verplanken and Herabadi (2001) divided IBT into two aspects, namely the cognitive aspect which reflects low planning in decision making and the affective aspect which reflects emotional urges and pleasure when shopping. IBT is

different from impulsive buying behavior because it is dispositional and does not always result in purchasing actions (Sun & Wu, 2011; Badgaiyan et al., 2016). Factors influencing IBT include personality traits (extraversion and conscientiousness), self-control, consumer drives (materialism and hedonism), culture (individualist vs. collectivist), and availability of money, including pay later services (Ajouz et al., 2014; Badgaiyan & Verma, 2014; Beatty & Ferrell, 1998; Herabadi et al., 2009; Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001). This study used scale from Badgaiyan et al. (2016) consisting of two dimensions (cognitive and affective), which have been adapted into Indonesian by Saragih (2016). Psychometrically, this questionnaire demonstrated good reliability and validity. The reliability test results showed $\alpha = .89$, while the results of the factor analysis through the component matrix analysis indicated that each item had factor loading values ranging from $\lambda = .509$ to $.853$.

Hedonic shopping motivation is an emotional drive that arises from pleasant experiences during shopping activities, such as pleasure, entertainment, and emotional involvement (Babin et al., 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Tsao & Chang, 2010). In contrast to utilitarian motivation that focuses on efficiency and function, hedonic motivation is oriented towards the emotional value of the shopping process itself. Consumers with this tendency are more interested in the sensation, fantasy, and pleasure offered by shopping activities (Herabadi et al., 2009). In this study, hedonic shopping motivation is understood as a unidimensional construct, not as the opposite of utilitarian motivation. Factors that influence hedonic shopping motivation include a sense of adventure, authority and status (To et al., 2007), ease of use, and cognitive absorption such as curiosity, control, enjoyment, and full involvement (Chang et al., 2023). To measure this construct, this study used the Hedonic Motivation Scale from Tsao and Chang (2010), which consists of 6 statements and has been adapted into Indonesian by Oktarianti (2014). Psychometrically, the hedonic shopping motivation questionnaire demonstrated a reliability of $\alpha = .908$, while the construct validity test using corrected item-total correlation showed values ranging from $CrIT = .629$ to $CrIT = .810$.

Self-control is an individual's ability to regulate behavior, thoughts, and emotions in line with long-term goals, either by inhibiting negative impulses or initiating positive actions (Baumeister, 2002; de Ridder et al., 2011, 2012; Tangney et al., 2004). This concept includes two dimensions, namely inhibition which is the ability to restrain unwanted responses and initiation which is the ability to initiate and maintain behavior that supports goals (de Ridder et al., 2011). These two dimensions complement each other in directing individuals to act according to self- and social standards, and adapt to environmental demands (Arifin & Milla, 2020). Factors that influence self-control include age, temperament, attention, effortful process, executive function, and family and cultural environment (Fox & Calkins, 2003; Ghufron & Suminta, 2010; Papalia & Martorell, 2021). This study used the Indonesian version of the Brief Self-Control Scale by Arifin and Milla (2020), which was developed based on the two-dimensional model of de Ridder et al. (2011). This scale consists of 10 statements, six statements each measuring inhibition and four statements measuring initiation. The self-control measurement scale developed by Arifin and Milla (2020) demonstrated a reliability of $\alpha = .81$. The construct validity test using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) indicated that the two-dimensional model showed a good fit, with values of $CFI = .97$, $RMSEA = .04$, and $SRMR = .05$.

The impulsive buying tendency among college students who use pay later services, such as SPayLater, is influenced by two important psychological aspects, namely hedonic shopping motivation and self-control. College students aged 18–25 years tend to be in a phase of suboptimal self-control development (Firdaus et al., 2022) and are more easily motivated by pleasure when shopping (Adiprasetyo & Surjandy, 2024; Triwibowo, 2025). Hedonic shopping motivation has been shown to have a positive effect on the impulsive buying tendency (Herabadi et al., 2009; Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001). Research by Lins et al. (2015) and Furgani (2020) shows that the stronger a person's hedonic shopping motivation, the higher their tendency to make impulsive buying, especially when supported by promotions and ease of transactions in e-commerce. On the other hand, self-control also plays an important role in influencing the tendency of impulsive buying. Individuals with low self-control tend to act more easily on momentary impulses and are less able to consider long-term consequences (Arifin &

Milla, 2020; Badgaiyan et al., 2016; Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001). In the context of college students, weak self-control often makes them more susceptible to making impulsive buying (Papalia & Martorell, 2021), especially when faced with temptations such as easy payments with the pay later feature. Hidayat (2023) and Kardenia and Rozi (2024) found that both hedonic shopping motivation and self-control contributed significantly to impulsive buying. Therefore, in this study it is assumed that the impulsive buying tendency is influenced by hedonic urges in shopping and the individual's ability to control these urges.

Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational and cross-sectional design to determine the effect of hedonic shopping motivation and self-control on impulsive buying tendencies of SPayLater user among college students. This design was chosen because it is appropriate to describe the dynamics of the relationship between variables at one measurement time (Gravetter & Forzano 2018).

Participants were college students aged 18–25 years who shopped at Shopee e-commerce and used the SPayLater service at least twice in the past month. The sample was selected using purposive sampling technique and the questionnaire was distributed through social media. The number of participants was determined through the G*Power calculation with two predictors in linear multiple regression, resulting in a minimum requirement of 107 participants to achieve an adequate power level at a significance of .05.

Three measuring instruments were used in this study. Impulsive buying tendency was measured using a scale from Saragih (2016) which was adapted from Badgaiyan and Verma (2014) and has two dimensions, namely cognitive and affective, with a total of eight statements. Hedonic shopping motivation was measured using a scale adapted from Tsao and Chang (2010) by Oktarianti (2014) which consisted of six statements. Meanwhile, self-control was measured using the Indonesian version of the Brief Self-Control Scale by Arifin and Milla (2020) which consisted of ten statements and covered two dimensions, namely inhibition and initiation. The three instruments have shown good psychometric characteristics. In this study, all the instruments used a six-point Likert scale (strongly disagree–strongly agree).

The questionnaire was compiled in Google Form, starting from informed consent, demographic data, and the three variable questionnaires. The questionnaire was distributed for one month via social media along with an e-wallet balance draw incentive. After the data was collected, data cleaning was carried out using careless response detection methods, such as self-reported measures of engagement, response time analysis, longstring analysis, and Mahalanobis Distance.

Data analysis was performed using SPSS and R. Descriptive analysis was used to describe the minimum and maximum values, mean, and standard deviation for each variable. Before conducting a multiple regression test, a classical assumption test was conducted to ensure the feasibility of the model. Hypothesis testing used multiple regression to determine the effect of hedonic shopping motivation and self-control on impulsive buying tendency. The model used is in the form of a linear equation where impulsive buying tendency are predicted by both hedonic shopping motivation and self-control.

Results and Discussion

Results

The study successfully collected 277 participants, but 96 participants were eliminated because they did not meet the criteria as participants (college students aged 18–25 years, actively shopping online on e-commerce Shopee, and making at least two transactions with SPayLater in the last month). After the data cleaning process, 40 participants were identified as having careless responding and therefore needed

to be eliminated. Finally, 141 participants who met the criteria were ready for further analysis. Below is an overview of the study participants based on demographic data, SPayLater usage, and types of goods frequently purchased.

Table 1. Participant Demographic

Characteristics	f	%
Gender		
Female	105	74.47
Male	36	25.53
Age		
18	16	11.35
19	31	21.99
20	22	15.60
21	32	22.70
22	22	15.60
23	14	9.93
24	2	1.42
25	2	1.42
Education		
Diploma	10	7.09
Undergraduate	131	92.91
Domicile		
Jakarta	42	29.79
West Java	41	29.08
Central Java and Yogyakarta	15	10.64
East Java	14	9.93
Bali	10	7.09
Banten	8	5.67
Sumatera	8	5.68
Sulawesi	2	1.42
Kalimantan	1	.71

Table 2. Usage of SPayLater

Characteristics	<i>f</i>	%
Duration of Use		
Less than 1 month	7	4.96
1-2 months	22	15.60
3-6 months	36	25.53
More than 6 months	76	53.90
Number of transactions in the last 1 month		
2-3 times	104	73.76
More than 3 times	37	26.24
Transaction nominal in the last 1 month		
Less than IDR 50.000	3	2.13
IDR 50.000 to 100.000	26	18.44
IDR 100.001 to Rp250.000	48	34.04
IDR 250.001 to Rp500.000	29	20.57
IDR 500.001 to Rp750.000	14	9.93
IDR 750.001 to Rp1.000.000	8	5.67
More than IDR 1.000.000	13	9.22

Table 3. Types of Goods Frequently Purchased

Types of Goods	<i>f</i>	%
Beauty Products, Personal Care	86	60.99
Clothing, Fashion Accessories	75	53.19
Food/Drinks	52	36.68
Electronics, Gadgets	25	17.73
Digital Products (Apps, Streaming Subscriptions)	25	17.73
Hobby Products, Sports	20	14.18
Household appliance	19	13.48
Books, Stationery	13	9.22
Toys	2	1.42
Etc.	6	4.26

Based on **Table 1.**, **Table 2.**, and **Table 3.**, it is known that the majority of participants in this study were female (74.47%), aged 21 years (22.70%), and currently pursuing a bachelor's degree (92.91%). Majority of participants live in Jakarta (29.79%). In using SPayLater, more than half of the participants have used it for more than 6 months (53.90%), with a transaction frequency in the last month of 2-3 times (73.36%). The most common transaction nominal ranges from IDR 100,001–IDR 250,000 (34.04%).

Judging from the type of goods purchased, the most dominant category is beauty and personal care products (60.99%), followed by clothing and fashion accessories (53.19%).

Table 4. Descriptives

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Impulsive Buying Tendency	1.00	5.62	2.66	.99
Hedonic Shopping Motivation	1.83	6.00	4.66	.99
Self Control	1.40	6.00	4.01	.84

The descriptive of variables based on the total score of each participant which was then divided by the number of statements in each variable. Thus, the possible score range for each variable is $X = 1.00-6.00$. Based on **Table 4.**, the participants' impulsive buying tendency are at a low to moderate level ($M = 2.66$, $SD = .99$), with a wide distribution of scores across the scale range. Meanwhile, hedonic shopping motivation tends to be high ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .99$), indicated by an average approaching the upper limit of the scale and a distribution of responses in the middle to upper range. For self-control, the average score is at a moderate to high level ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .84$), with a fairly wide variation in scores and a relatively even distribution, indicating that participants generally have fairly good but varied self-control.

Before conducting the regression analysis, the author first conducted a series of classical assumption tests to ensure the feasibility of the model. The normality test was conducted using the Shapiro-Wilk method. The results showed that the data on the variables of impulsive buying tendency and hedonic shopping motivations were not normally distributed ($p < .05$), while the data on the self-control variable were normally distributed ($p > .05$). However, the residual value of the regression model showed a normal distribution ($p = .945$), so the assumption of residual normality was still met. Furthermore, the multicollinearity test showed that the Tolerance and VIF values for both independent variables were within safe limits (Tolerance = .961 and VIF = 1.041), which means that there were no multicollinearity problems in the regression model. However, based on the Glejser test, both independent variables had significance values below .05 ($p = .041$ and $p = .009$), which indicated symptoms of heteroscedasticity in the model. Finally, the linearity test shows that both hedonic shopping motivation and self-control have a linear relationship to impulsive buying tendency (p Linearity $< .05$ and p Deviation from Linearity $> .05$). This indicates that the regression model meets the linearity assumption and is worthy of being continued to the next stage of analysis.

Considering that the data of the impulsive buying tendency and hedonic shopping motivation variables are not normally distributed and the results of the Glejser test indicate symptoms of heteroscedasticity, the multiple regression analysis in this study was conducted using the bootstrapping method. This method was chosen because it does not change the original data structure and is able to produce more robust parameter estimates and standard errors without having to rely on the fulfillment of the normality assumption (Field, 2013).

Table 5. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with Bootstrapping

<i>Predictor</i>	<i>b</i>		β		<i>sr</i> ²		<i>r</i>	<i>fit</i>
	<i>b</i>	95% [LL, UL]	β	95% [LL, UL]	<i>sr</i> ²	95% CI [LL, UL]		
(Intercept)	4.41**	[3.52, 5.27]						
Hedonic Shopping Motivation	.20**	[.09, .32]	.20	[.09, .31]	.043	[.008, .096]	.316**	
Self Control	-.67**	[-.81, -.50]	-.57	[-.68, -.44]	.313	[.182, .445]	.611**	
								$R^2 = .417^{**}$
								95% CI [.27, .55]

** $p < .01$

Discussions

Multiple regression analysis shows the results of the coefficient of determination of $R^2 = .417$, $p < .01$ both independent variables have a significant influence on the impulsive buying tendency. Statistically, hedonic shopping motivation and self-control indicate that psychological factors play a significant role, explaining 41.7% of the variation in impulsive buying tendency (Table 5.). In more detail, hedonic shopping motivation has a significant positive influence with a coefficient of $\beta = .20$. Conversely, self-control has a significant negative effect on the impulsive buying tendency, with a coefficient of $\beta = -.57$. The regression model produced from this study is as follows.

$$\text{Impulse Buying Tendency} = 4.41 + .20 (\text{Hedonic Shopping Motivation}) - .57 (\text{Self-Control})$$

Hedonic shopping motivations, in particular, have a positive influence on impulsive buying tendency. This aligns with previous research findings that explain that shopping activities can be a means of pursuing pleasure, entertainment, and emotional experiences (Furgani, 2020; Tsao & Chang, 2010). In this study, which has a different context with online shopping and uses pay-later payments, the enjoyable shopping experience is enhanced by easy access, attractive promotions, and an attractive e-commerce display (Susanto et al., 2024). The types of goods most frequently and frequently purchased also tend to be products related to self-expression and personal pleasure, such as clothing, personal care, and entertainment products. Other products, such as electronics and gadgets, remain primarily driven by hedonic motivations.

Meanwhile, self-control has been shown to negatively impact impulse buying tendency. Individuals with low self-control tend to be unable to resist momentary urges and are more easily driven by emotional impulses when shopping (Arifin & Milla, 2020; Verplanken & Herabadi, 2001). This suggests that the impact of a lack of self-control, the convenience and pleasure offered by services like SPayLater, can actually trigger impulsive buying. Interestingly, the results of the multiple regression analysis in this study found that self-control had a greater influence than hedonic shopping motivation, indicating that self-control is a more dominant factor in curbing impulsive buying tendency of shopee paylater users among college students.

Despite providing insights into impulsive buying tendency in online shopping, this study has several limitations. The use of a closed-ended questionnaire limits the exploration of deeper psychological dynamics. Furthermore, the measurement tool used was not specifically designed for the context of SPayLater usage, and the analysis was not linked to other variables such as demographic background or interactions between variables. Future research is expected to explore these aspects further using

additional qualitative approaches, such as creating open-ended questions and conducting interviews with participants, and expanding the scope of pay later services beyond SPayLater to make the findings more representative of users of other pay later service providers.

Conclusion

This study aims to determine the effect of hedonic shopping motivation and self-control on impulsive buying tendency in college students who use SPayLater. A total of 277 college students participated in this study, but only data from 141 participants were processed further. Based on the results of statistical analysis, it was found that hedonic shopping motivation and self-control had a significant effect on impulsive buying tendency. These results are in line with the initial assumption, namely that impulsive buying tendency increase when hedonic shopping motivation is high and self-control is low. In addition, this study also found that the effect of self-control on impulsive buying tendency was greater than the effect of hedonic shopping motivation.

References

- Abdurachman, A., Arifah, A. N., Lestari, D. F., & Ridwan, R. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi belanja hedonis terhadap pembelian impulsif di e-commerce shopee pada generasi milenial. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 11(1), 205-212. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v11i1.2005>
- Adiprasetyo, A., & Surjandy. (2024). Analysis of the essential motivation and challenge factors of the buy now, pay later service among Indonesian university students. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 571, 06005. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202457106005>
- Adri, E. V., Setiawan, D., & Methindo, O. (2021). Relationship of conformity with adolescent impulsion buying behavior on fashion products in marketplace with self-control as a moderating variable. *TAZKIYA Journal of Psychology*. 9(2). 133-143. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v9i2.22523>
- Ajouz, M., Abuamria, F., Shehadeh, M., Abu-AlSondos, I. A., Aldulaimi, S. H., & Abdeldayem, M. (2024). Exploring the cascade: How buy-now-pay-later platforms fuel impulse buying tendency and the subsequent impact on sustainability. *International Conference in Emerging Technologies for Sustainability and Intelligent Systems (ICETISIS)*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icetsis61505.2024.10459552>
- Arifin, H. H., & Milla, M. N. (2020). Adaptasi dan properti psikometrik skala kontrol diri ringkas versi Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial*, 18(2), 179-195. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2020.18>
- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 644–656. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209376>
- Badgaiyan, A. J., & Verma, A. (2014). Intrinsic factors affecting impulsive buying behaviour—Evidence from India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(4), 537–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.04.003>
- Badgaiyan, A. J., Verma, A., & Dixit, S. (2016). Impulsive buying tendency: Measuring important relationships with a new perspective and an indigenous scale. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, 28(4), 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2016.08.009>
- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Ego depletion and self-control failure: An energy model of the self's executive function. *Self and Identity*, 1(2), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/152988602317319302>
- Beatty, S. E., & Ferrell, M. E. (1998). Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal of Retailing*, 74(2), 169–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(99\)80092-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(99)80092-X)

- Chan, T. K. H., Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, Z. W. Y. (2017). The state of online impulse-buying research: A literature analysis. *Information & Management*, 54(2), 204–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.06.001>
- Chang, Y. W., Hsu, P. Y., Chen, J., Shiau, W. L., & Xu, N. (2023). Utilitarian and/or hedonic shopping – consumer motivation to purchase in Smart Stores. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 123(3), 821–842. <https://doi.org/10.1108/imds-04-2022-0250>
- De Ridder, D. T., De Boer, B. J., Lugtig, P., Bakker, A. B., & van Hooft, E. A. (2011). Not doing bad things is not equivalent to doing the right thing: Distinguishing between inhibitory and initiatory self-control. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(7), 1006–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.015>
- De Ridder, D. T., Lensvelt-Mulders, G., Finkenauer, C., Stok, F. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2012). Taking stock of self-control: A meta-analysis of how trait self-control relates to a wide range of behaviors. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(1), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311418749>
- Fadillah, M. F., & Sosialita, T. D. (2024). *Pengaruh self-control terhadap impulsive buying pada dewasa awal yang bermain game online* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Airlangga). Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Airlangga.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics: And sex and drugs and rock “n” roll*. Sage Publications.
- Firdaus, M. M. F., Himawati, D., & Arianty, M. (2022). Kontrol diri pada mahasiswa selama pembelajaran jarak jauh. *HUMANIS: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 14(1), 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.52166/humanis.v14i1.2831>
- Fox, N. A., & Calkins, S. D. (2003). The development of self-control of emotion: intrinsic and extrinsic influences. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023622324898>
- Furgani, A. D. (2020). *Pengaruh motivasi belanja hedonis dan kepribadian HEXACO terhadap kecenderungan impulsive buying pada mahasiswa* (Skripsi, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta). Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Gerrans, P., Baur, D. G., & Lavagna-Slater, S. (2021). Fintech and responsibility: Buy-now-pay-later arrangements. *Australian Journal of Management*, 47(3), 474–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03128962211032448>
- Ghufron, M. N., & Suminta, R. R. (2010). *Kontrol diri*. In *Teori-teori Psikologi* (pp. 21–32). essay, Ar-Ruzz Media.
- GoodStats. (2024, Agustus 17). *Pengguna paylater Indonesia tumbuh 17 kali lipat dalam 5 tahun terakhir*. <https://goodstats.id/article/pengguna-paylater-indonesia-tumbuh-17-kali-lipat-dalam-5-tahun-terakhir-355VL>
- Gravetter, F. J., & Forzano, L. A. B. (2018). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences*. Cengage Learning.
- Herabadi, A. G., Verplanken, B., & van den Berge, H. (2009). Consumption experience of impulse buying in Indonesia: Emotional arousal and hedonistic considerations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2008.01266.x>
- Hidayat T. N. (2023). *Pengaruh self-control, hedonic shopping motivations, dan faktor demografi terhadap impulsive buying pengguna e-commerce Shopee* (Skripsi, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta). Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(3), 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298204600314>

- Kardena, D. G., & Rozi, F. (2024). Pengaruh self-control dan hedonic shopping motivation terhadap impulsive buying. *Instructional Development Journal*, 7(2), 354–361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24014/idj.v7i2.30114>
- Lins, S., Dóka, Á., Bottequin, E., Odabašić, A., Pavlović, S., Merchán, A., Hylander, F. (2015). The effects of having, feeling, and thinking on impulse buying in Eeuropean adolescents. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 27(5), 414–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2015.1027028>
- Oktarianti, K. (2014). *Pengaruh motivasi belanja utilitarian dan motivasi belanja hedonic terhadap purchase intention pada konsumen belanja online* (Skripsi, Universitas Indonesia). Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Indonesia.
- Papalia, D., & Martorell, G. (2021). *Experience human development (14th Ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Populix. (2023). *Unveiling Indonesia's financial evolution: Fintech lending and paylater adoption*. <https://info.populix.co/articles/report/fintech-lending-and-paylater/>
- Purnomo, H. (2024). *Transaksi online di Indonesia diprediksi capai RP 487 T tahun ini*. detiksumut. <https://www.detik.com/sumut/bisnis/d-7684601/transaksi-online-di-indonesia-diprediksi-capai-rp-487-t-tahun-ini>
- Rook, D. W. (1987). The buying impulse. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(2), 189–199. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209105>
- Rook, D. W., & Fisher, R. J. (1995). Normative influences on impulsive buying behavior. *Journal of consumer research*, 22(3), 305-313. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209452>
- 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.
- Saragih, R. D. (2016). *Analisis pengaruh faktor intrinsik terhadap pembelian impulsif produk pakaian* (Skripsi, Universitas Indonesia). Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Indonesia.
- Sari, N. K., Safar, I., & Gimbo, C. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi belanja hedonis terhadap pembelian impulsif pada fitur tiktok shop di Kota Makassar. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 6(2), 653-666.
- Sherully, I., & Koentary, A. S. S. (2023). The effect of parasocial relationship on online impulsive buying tendency: Exploring the role of financial literacy and self-control. *TAZKIYA Journal of Psychology*. 11(2). 114-131. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v11i2.31281>
- Statista. (2025, January 17). *Indonesia: E-commerce sites by monthly traffic 2024*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/869700/indonesia-top-10-e-commerce-sites/>
- Sufyan, A., Dewanti, A. C., & Lorenza, L. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi belanja hedonis terhadap impulse buying pada generasi z di Sleman. *MANABIS: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 3(4), 148-157. <https://doi.org/10.54259/manabis.v3i4.3866>
- Sun, T., & Wu, G. (2011). Trait predictors of online impulsive buying tendency: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(3), 337–346. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190307>
- Susanto, D., Apriza, M. W., & Mutriarsih, T. (2024). Usage of buy now pay later, hedonic motivation, and impulse buying among gen z in e-commerce shopee. *Asian Journal of Management Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 4(2). <https://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc>

- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271–324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x>
- To, P. L., Liao, C., & Lin, T. H. (2007). Shopping motivations on internet: A study based on utilitarian and hedonic value. *Technovation*, 27(12), 774–787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2007.01.001>
- Triwibowo, D. R. (2025). *Gen Z dan milenial pakai paylater untuk kebutuhan konsumtif*. Kompas.id. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/gen-z-dan-milenial-pakai-paylater-untuk-konsumtif-bukan-produktif>
- Tsao, W. C., & Chang, H. R. (2010). Exploring the impact of personality traits on online shopping behavior. *African journal of business management*, 4(9), 1800.
- Winarti, A. (2015). Struktur dan pengukuran terhadap pembelian impulsif: Uji validitas konstruk Neo Personality Inventory – Revised (NEO PI–R) versi bahasa Indonesia. *JP3I (Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi Dan Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v4i1.9283>
- Verplanken, B., & Herabadi, A. (2001). Individual differences in impulse buying tendency: Feeling and no thinking. *European Journal of personality*, 15(S1), S71-S83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.423>