Volume 7 Issue 2 (2026) Pages 571 - 580
Economics and Digital Business Review
e-ISSN: 2774-2563

The Influence Of *Influencer Marketing*, Fomo, And *Brand Image* On *Impulsive Buying* Of Timephoria On Tiktok

Kharisma Ratu Rania[1], Ahmad Jaenudin[2]
[1,2] Department of Economics Education, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Semarang

Abstract

The present inquiry assesses whether Influencer Marketing, Fear of Missing Out (FOMO), and Brand Image account for Impulsive Buying of Timephoria cosmetics through TikTok among female undergraduates at Universitas Negeri Semarang. A quantitative design was applied to responses from 106 participants selected through criterion-based sampling. Eligibility required enrollment in the 2023 cohort, regular TikTok use, prior exposure to Timephoria-related posts, and at least one purchase of the brand through the application. Information was obtained with a questionnaire offering five Likert response options and processed through multiple linear regression in IBM SPSS Statistics 26. The estimates show that Influencer Marketing and FOMO each contribute positively and meaningfully to Impulsive Buying, while Brand Image does not provide a statistically supported independent contribution. Influencer Marketing yields the largest standardized coefficient ($\beta = 0.320$). These outcomes imply that immediate cosmetic transactions on TikTok arise from both persuasive promotional exposure and consumers' emotional concern about falling behind current trends. The inquiry broadens discussion of purchasing conduct within social-commerce environments and offers practical direction for cosmetic firms seeking to design more effective promotional communication on short-video platforms.

Keywords: *Influencer Marketing*, *Impulsive Buying*, *Fear of Missing Out*, *Brand Image*

Copyright (c) 2026 Kharisma Ratu Rania

✉ Corresponding author :
Email Address : kharismaratu18@students.unnes.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Digital technology has reshaped the route consumers follow before completing a purchase. Product information can now be located, alternatives can be compared, and transactions can be finalized within the same online environment. This shift is especially apparent in social commerce, where interpersonal interaction, commercial media, and electronic purchasing facilities operate together. TikTok has become a prominent example by combining brief videos, livestream selling, customer commentary, personalized recommendations, and an embedded shopping function. Consequently, the interval between first encountering an item and buying it is considerably shorter than in conventional promotional settings (Haile Gebrselassie et al., 2024).

DataReportal (2025) identifies Indonesia as one of TikTok's largest national user bases. More than 125 million active accounts are reported in the country, and over 43% of users fall within the 18-24 age category. This age range closely corresponds with university students and forms an important segment of Generation Z.

Generation Z generally includes individuals born between 1997 and 2012. Members of this cohort have developed in an environment where internet access and digital devices are embedded in everyday life (Daffa et al., 2024). Online platforms therefore function not only as communication channels but also as major references when consumption alternatives are considered, including choices involving cosmetic products. These habits make younger consumers particularly responsive to persuasive online cues that may produce sudden and previously unintended transactions. The ZAP Clinic & MarkPlus report (2024) likewise records strong engagement among young women with beauty trends, product demonstrations, and digital shopping activities.

Purchasing cosmetics through TikTok is closely related to Impulsive Buying. Rook (1987) describes this conduct as an intense desire to acquire an item that emerges abruptly and is followed by limited prior consideration. In a digital marketplace, such urgency may arise after viewers encounter creator endorsements, customer testimonials, viral visibility, short-duration offers, simplified payment procedures, or direct shopping links. Djamhari et al. (2024) further show that online promotional incentives, FOMO, and electronic payment facilities can establish conditions that favor immediate buying.

Timephoria is among the cosmetic labels that make extensive use of TikTok for commercial communication. The company presents a futuristic identity through distinctive visual elements, contemporary packaging, and beauty narratives intended to appeal to younger audiences (TimePhoria, 2026). Products such as lip cream, cushion foundation, and lip stain are introduced through tutorials, comparative demonstrations, creator reviews, and livestream sessions. Repeated encounters with this material may strengthen favorable product impressions, intensify curiosity, and prompt a rapid transaction.

The topic warrants academic attention because Impulsive Buying on TikTok cannot be adequately explained through one determinant. Influencer Marketing operates as an environmental cue that can increase product credibility and consumer interest (Lou & Yuan, 2019). FOMO represents an internal concern about being excluded from popular experiences or emerging trends (Przybylski et al., 2013). Brand Image, meanwhile, may reduce perceived uncertainty because labels with favorable associations are generally more readily considered and accepted (Keller, 2013).

Earlier empirical work has addressed several links among these constructs. Pandiangan et al. (2024) reported that creator-led promotion contributes to spontaneous Skintific purchases among Generation Z users of TikTok Shop. Muharam et al. (2023) identified FOMO as an important explanation for immediate transactions among TikTok Shop consumers in Semarang. Aulasari et al. (2025) also evaluated the role of brand-related perceptions in beauty-product buying. Nevertheless, evidence remains limited for a model that evaluates Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image together in the specific setting of Timephoria cosmetics on TikTok.

The participants selected for this inquiry were female students from the 2023 undergraduate intake at Universitas Negeri Semarang. This group was considered appropriate because its demographic profile corresponds with both the product category and the digital channel being examined. As members of Generation Z, these students frequently interact with short-video media, beauty-related material, and online retail features. Accordingly, the inquiry determines the separate and combined contributions of Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image to Impulsive Buying of Timephoria products through TikTok.

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

METHODOLOGY

A quantitative analytical strategy was adopted because the observations were expressed as numerical scores and interpreted with statistical procedures. An associative explanatory design was used to estimate how Influencer Marketing, Fear of Missing Out (FOMO), and Brand Image correspond with Impulsive Buying (Sugiyono, 2023).

The target population comprised active female undergraduates from the 2023 intake at Universitas Negeri Semarang who regularly used TikTok, had encountered Timephoria cosmetic material on the platform, and had previously purchased a Timephoria product through TikTok. Because no definitive record was available for the number of individuals satisfying every requirement, the minimum participant total was calculated with the Lemeshow formula. At a 95% confidence level, an assumed proportion of 0.50, and a 10% margin of error, the computation produced 96.04 and was rounded upward to a minimum of 100 respondents.

Participants were recruited purposively because inclusion depended on predetermined characteristics that matched the purpose of the inquiry. Responses were collected through a structured instrument with five Likert categories, ranging from 1 for 'strongly disagree' to 5 for 'strongly agree.' Before the primary distribution, the questionnaire was trialed with 30 respondents to determine the adequacy of its items. The eligibility requirements were: (1) active female undergraduate status in the 2023 Universitas Negeri Semarang intake, (2) regular TikTok use, (3) prior exposure to Timephoria cosmetic content on TikTok, and (4) a previous Timephoria purchase through the application.

Item adequacy was evaluated with Pearson's product-moment coefficient. A statement was retained when its observed correlation exceeded the applicable critical value at the 5% level. Internal consistency was then assessed through Cronbach's Alpha, with a coefficient above 0.70 treated as acceptable (Ghozali, 2021). The principal calculations employed multiple linear regression in IBM SPSS Statistics 26. Before coefficient and hypothesis estimation, residual normality was checked with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov procedure, predictor overlap was inspected through tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), and unequal error variance was assessed with the Glejser method. Individual effects were evaluated using t statistics, the overall specification was examined with an F statistic, and explanatory power was summarized by R squared.

Table 1 Construct Definitions and Measurement Dimensions

Construct	Measurement Dimensions	Reference
Influencer Marketing	Appeal of the content, creator trustworthiness, persuasiveness of recommendations, and subject-matter competence	Shanmim & Azam (2024)
FOMO	Concern about missing shared experiences, continuous information checking, comparison with others, and anxiety about passing trends	Kaloti et al. (2021)
Brand Image	Salience, favorability, and distinctiveness of associations linked to the brand	Keller (2013)
Impulsive Buying	Sudden purchase action, limited prior evaluation, affective urgency, regret after buying, and responsiveness to situational cues	Djamhari et al. (2024)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

Validity Test

Table 2 Item Screening Outcomes

Construct	Initial Items	Accepted Items	Removed Items
Impulsive Buying	15	15	0
Influencer Marketing	12	11	1
Fear of Missing out	12	11	1
Brand Image	9	9	0
Total	48	46	2

The preliminary instrument contained 48 statements. Item-level screening identified two statements that failed to satisfy the required correlation criterion, so both were removed before the principal calculations were performed. The remaining 46 statements met the acceptance standard and were retained as measurement items.

Reliability Test

Table 3 Internal Consistency Results

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Benchmark	Decision
Impulsive Buying	0,876	0,70	Acceptable
Influencer Marketing	0,822	0,70	Acceptable
Fear Of Missing Out	0,852	0,70	Acceptable
Brand Image	0,787	0,70	Acceptable

Cronbach's Alpha reached 0.876 for Impulsive Buying (Y), 0.822 for Influencer Marketing (X1), 0.852 for FOMO (X2), and 0.787 for Brand Image (X3). Every coefficient remained above the predetermined benchmark of 0.70. The retained statements for all four constructs therefore demonstrated adequate internal consistency and were suitable for subsequent processing.

Normality Test

Table 4 Residual Normality Diagnostics

Statistic	Value
N	106
Residual Mean	0,000
Residual SD	1,680
K-S Statistic	0,064
Two-tailed p	0,200

Residual distribution was evaluated through the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov procedure. Based on 106 observations, the calculation generated a statistic of 0.064 and a two-tailed probability of 0.200. Because the probability was greater than 0.05, no material departure from normality was detected. The distributional requirement for the regression specification was therefore fulfilled.

Multicollinearity Test

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

Table 5 Collinearity Diagnostics

Predictor	Tolerance	VIF
Influencer Marketing	0,690	1,449
Fear Of Missing Out	0,743	1,346
Brand Image	0,700	1,428

Potential redundancy among the explanatory constructs was inspected before the coefficient model was estimated. Tolerance values were 0.690 for Influencer Marketing, 0.743 for FOMO, and 0.700 for Brand Image, while the corresponding VIF values were 1.449, 1.346, and 1.428. Each tolerance statistic remained well above 0.10 and every VIF was far below 10. These figures indicate that problematic collinearity was not present among the predictors.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 6 Glejser Test Outcomes

Predictor	p-value
Influencer Marketing	0,763
Fear Of Missing Out	0,285
Brand Image	0,548

The Glejser calculation returned probability values of 0.763 for Influencer Marketing, 0.285 for FOMO, and 0.548 for Brand Image. None of these values fell below the 0.05 decision boundary. Accordingly, the available evidence does not show a systematic association between the predictors and residual magnitude, indicating that the constant-variance requirement was adequately met.

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Table 7 Regression Coefficient Estimates

Predictor	B	Std.Eror	p-value	Beta
Constant	37,642	4,224	0,000	
Influencer Marketing	0,274	0,085	0,002	0,320
Fear Of Missing Out	0,233	0,078	0,004	0,285
Brand Image	0,061	0,109	0,576	0,056

The estimated coefficient model can be expressed as follows:

Y = 37,642+ 0,274X1 + 0,233X2 + 0,061X3

The intercept of 37.642 represents the expected Impulsive Buying score when all three explanatory variables are mathematically assigned a value of zero. Such a condition has little practical meaning because the measurement scales do not realistically indicate a complete absence of Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image. The intercept mainly functions as the baseline element of the coefficient model.

A. The unstandardized coefficient for Influencer Marketing (X_1) was 0.274. With the remaining predictors held unchanged, a one-point rise in Influencer Marketing corresponds with an estimated 0.274-point increase in Impulsive Buying. Its probability value of 0.002 is below 0.05, indicating a positive contribution that is statistically supported.

B. FOMO (X_2) produced an unstandardized coefficient of 0.233. After Influencer Marketing and Brand Image are controlled, a one-point increase in FOMO corresponds with an estimated 0.233-point elevation in Impulsive Buying. The associated probability of 0.004 confirms that this upward contribution is meaningful.

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

C. Brand Image (X_3) yielded an unstandardized estimate of 0.061. Although the coefficient points upward, its probability value reached 0.576. Because this value exceeds 0.05, the observed contribution cannot be distinguished statistically from zero in the examined sample.

The standardized coefficients clarify the relative strength of the predictors. Influencer Marketing records the largest beta value at 0.320, followed by FOMO at 0.285, whereas Brand Image produces a considerably smaller beta of 0.056. Influencer Marketing therefore provides the strongest independent explanation of Impulsive Buying among the constructs included in the model.

Partial Test

Table 8 Individual Coefficient Tests

Predictor	t Statistic	p-value
Influencer Marketing	3,207	0,002
Fear Of Missing Out	2,966	0,004
Brand Image	0,561	0,576

Influencer Marketing (X_1) generated a t statistic of 3.207 with a probability of 0.002, supporting an upward contribution to Impulsive Buying. FOMO (X_2) returned a t statistic of 2.966 and a probability of 0.004, so its independent contribution is also supported. Brand Image (X_3) by contrast, produced a t statistic of 0.561 with a probability of 0.576. This result does not support a separate effect of Brand Image on Impulsive Buying.

Simultaneous Test

Table 9 Overall Regression Significance

Model	F	p
Reg.	14,521	0,000

The complete coefficient specification produced an F statistic of 14.521 and a probability of 0.000. Since this probability is below 0.05, the three explanatory constructs, when considered together, improve the prediction of Impulsive Buying. The proposed collective contribution of Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image is therefore supported.

Coefficient of Determination

Table 10 Model Explanatory Power

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Eror
0,547	0,299	0,279	1,705

The multiple correlation coefficient was 0.547, while R squared reached 0.299 and the adjusted value was 0.279. These figures show that Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image account for 29.9% of the observed differences in Impulsive Buying. The other 70.1% is attributable to determinants that were not incorporated into the present analytical specification.

Effect of Influencer Marketing on Impulsive Buying

The coefficient test establishes that Influencer Marketing increases the likelihood of an immediate Timephoria transaction. Female students who regard creator content as engaging, dependable, useful, and relevant appear more inclined to purchase without an

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

extended evaluation period. Demonstrations and recommendations from creators perceived as knowledgeable or relatable can simplify product appraisal and accelerate a buying response.

The proposed relationship is consequently supported. More favorable evaluations of Influencer Marketing correspond with a stronger tendency toward Impulsive Buying. Visually compelling presentations and persuasive endorsements may generate curiosity, excitement, and an expectation that the promoted product should be tried promptly. TikTok intensifies this mechanism by distributing commercial messages in a brief, interactive, and readily accessible format. Influencers therefore operate not only as information providers but also as credibility intermediaries who reduce uncertainty and encourage rapid action.

Descriptive scores place Influencer Marketing in the high category. Most respondents consequently evaluated Timephoria-related creator communication favorably. Influencers were generally viewed as capable of explaining product functions, demonstrating use, and presenting convincing personal experiences. Their attractiveness, credibility, and compatibility with the intended audience can make commercial messages easier to accept, thereby reducing the need for extensive comparison before purchase.

This evidence is consistent with Pandiangan et al. (2024), who identified influencer activity as an important digital cue in beauty-product transactions conducted through TikTok Shop. Their work emphasizes that the platform exposes younger consumers to persuasive material capable of accelerating a purchase. Lou & Yuan (2019) similarly explain that credible creators and valuable messages strengthen confidence in sponsored social-media content. Related conclusions were offered by Shamim & Azam (2024) and Kholidah et al. (2024) who associate influencer communication with a greater inclination toward spontaneous buying. For Timephoria, tutorials, product demonstrations, reviews, and livestream presentations can therefore function as effective commercial prompts.

Under the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) perspective, Influencer Marketing represents an environmental input that initiates the decision sequence. TikTok users first encounter creator-delivered promotional material, interpret it cognitively and emotionally, and may then display a rapid purchasing response. This movement from external exposure to internal evaluation and subsequent action is consistent with the mechanism proposed by (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974).

Effect of FOMO on Impulsive Buying

The statistical output also shows that FOMO raises consumers' inclination to obtain Timephoria products without prior planning. Its standardized beta of 0.285 places it behind Influencer Marketing but above Brand Image. Concern about failing to participate in current beauty trends therefore appears capable of shortening the time students require before making a purchase.

Descriptive scores classify FOMO in the high category. A substantial share of respondents reported discomfort when they could not follow developing trends or quickly obtain products receiving broad online attention. They also displayed strong interest in updated product information and greater readiness to transact when an item appeared popular among peers, creators, or other TikTok users. Continuous exposure can consequently create the impression that a viral product should be acquired without delay.

The proposed FOMO relationship is therefore supported. As anxiety about missing a trend, discount, or shared digital experience becomes stronger, consumers are more likely to reduce the deliberation that normally precedes a transaction. TikTok's recommendation system can reinforce this process by repeatedly displaying material similar to previous viewing activity. When recurring exposure is accompanied by favorable creator commentary and visible engagement from other users, purchasing may be driven more by the wish to avoid exclusion than by a careful evaluation of actual need.

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

Przybylski et al. (2013) portray FOMO as an emotional condition connected with concern about remaining detached from rewarding experiences enjoyed by others. Yuwono & Sudradjat, (2025) likewise indicate that this condition can shorten the route to a purchase, particularly when consumers fear losing an attractive opportunity or falling behind a visible beauty trend. The present outcome also corresponds with Muharam et al. (2023), Habib & Almamy (2025) and Kumalasari & Aditama (2025), whose evidence identifies FOMO as an important psychological driver of immediate transactions in social-media and TikTok Shop settings.

Within the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) framework, FOMO represents the internal psychological condition generated after consumers encounter platform-based cues. Influencer Marketing and brand-related information are first received from the TikTok environment. These inputs may activate anxiety about exclusion or lateness, which then increases the probability of an Impulsive Buying response (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974).

Effect of Brand Image on Impulsive Buying

The empirical evidence does not establish an independent contribution of Brand Image to Impulsive Buying. Although the estimated coefficient points upward, the probability of 0.576 indicates that the relationship lacks statistical support. Favorable opinions about Timephoria therefore do not automatically generate an immediate buying response.

Descriptive results nevertheless place Brand Image in the high category. Respondents commonly regarded Timephoria as recognizable, favorably positioned, and capable of creating a distinctive impression relative to competing cosmetic labels. These positive evaluations, however, were not accompanied by a corresponding increase in spontaneous transactions. Consumers may appreciate the brand while still considering other elements before deciding to buy.

The hypothesis concerning Brand Image must consequently be rejected. A plausible explanation lies in the situational character of shopping through TikTok, where immediate transactions may be shaped more strongly by creator demonstrations, viral visibility, temporary discounts, livestream interaction, and FOMO. Brand-related perceptions generally develop over a longer period and can support familiarity or future preference, whereas Impulsive Buying often arises from a short-lived emotional or environmental cue. Positive recognition of Timephoria alone may therefore be insufficient to trigger an unplanned purchase.

This conclusion corresponds with Sanjaya & Abdurrahman (2025), who did not identify a separate Brand Image contribution to Impulsive Buying among Skintific consumers on TikTok. Tambun et al. (2024) similarly reported that immediate purchasing was explained more effectively by contextual incentives, including promotional discounts, than by brand evaluation. Aulasari et al. (2025) also indicate that favorable associations with a cosmetic label may not be enough to activate rapid buying. Together, these results suggest that an additional situational or emotional prompt is often required

From the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) standpoint developed by Mehrabian and Russell (1974), Brand Image may be viewed as an external cue received by consumers. An environmental cue, however, does not necessarily produce a behavioral outcome unless it activates a sufficiently strong internal condition, such as excitement, urgency, desire, or fear of losing an opportunity. In the present sample, favorable views of Timephoria apparently did not create an internal state intense enough to produce Impulsive Buying. Influencer Marketing was more effective in shaping consumers' reactions, while FOMO supplied the emotional urgency that encouraged rapid action.

Simultaneous Effects of Influencer Marketing, Fear of Missing Out (FOMO), and Brand Image on Impulsive Buying

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

The overall F calculation yielded a value of 14.521 with a probability of 0.000. The coefficient specification is therefore meaningful when Influencer Marketing, FOMO, and Brand Image are entered together. Although Brand Image does not demonstrate a separate contribution, the three constructs collectively account for a statistically supported portion of Impulsive Buying of Timephoria cosmetics through TikTok.

This outcome illustrates that spontaneous purchasing cannot be understood through one isolated influence. TikTok users encounter commercial messages from creators, observe the popularity of particular products, form brand-related evaluations, and experience emotional pressure to remain involved in ongoing trends. These components operate within the same social-commerce environment and can jointly strengthen readiness to complete an unplanned transaction.

CONCLUSION

The analysis shows that Influencer Marketing is the strongest predictor of immediate Timephoria purchases among female students at Universitas Negeri Semarang. Creator material perceived as persuasive, credible, visually engaging, and useful can shorten the consideration process and increase readiness to transact. FOMO also contributes meaningfully: students who are more concerned about falling behind current TikTok trends display a greater tendency to acquire cosmetic products without advance planning. Brand Image, in contrast, does not independently explain Impulsive Buying, even though respondents generally evaluate Timephoria favorably.

For Timephoria and other cosmetic companies, the evidence emphasizes the value of selecting trustworthy creators and producing material that corresponds with the interests, communication habits, and aesthetic preferences of younger audiences. Maintaining favorable brand associations remains strategically relevant, although those associations may require stronger situational cues before they generate an immediate transaction. For consumers, especially female university students, the results underline the importance of recognizing emotional urgency while using social-commerce applications. Subsequent inquiries may extend the analytical framework by incorporating price incentives, electronic word-of-mouth (e-WOM), pleasure-oriented shopping motives, perceived benefits, or other psychological determinants. Broader participant coverage across different institutions and geographical settings would also improve the generalizability of later evidence.

References:

Aulasari, U., Gilang Permata, A., & Indra Pratama, F. (2025). The effect of brand image on impulsive buying behavior of Skintific consumers. *Archetype: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi dan Terapan*, *7*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.30651/arc.v7i2.25432

DataReportal. (2025). *Digital 2025: Indonesia*. https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2025-indonesia

Deandra Rafiq Daffa, Dave Arthuro, Jovanes Agus Fernanda, & Muh. Bintang Widya Pratama. (2024). Gen-Z: Eksplorasi Identitas Budaya dan Tantangan Sosial Dalam Era Digital. *Jurnal Insan Pendidikan dan Sosial Humaniora*, *2*(2), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.59581/jipsoshum-widyakarya.v2i2.3112

Djamhari, S. I., Mustika, M. D., Sjabadhyni, B., & Ndaru, A. R. P. (2024). Impulsive buying in the digital age: Investigating the dynamics of sales promotion, FOMO, and digital payment methods. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2419484

Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26* (Edisi 10). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037

Habib, S., & Almamy, A. (2025). Impact of FOMO on social media engagement and impulse buying of lifestyle products: Mediation analysis. *Journal of Innovative Digital Transformation*, *2*(2), 176–195. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIDT-01-2025-0004

Haile Gebrselassie, Abebe Bikila, & Derartu Tulu. (2024). Consumer Behavior in the Era of Digital Marketing: Trends and Challenges. *Proceeding of The International Conference on Economics and Business*, *3*(2), 112–116. https://doi.org/10.55606/iceb.v3i2.475

Keller, K. L. (2013). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Kholidah, R., Ramdan, A. M., & Sauri, S. (2024). Analisis social media influencer terhadap impulse buying melalui content marketing sebagai variabel mediasi pada pengguna kosmetik di Indonesia. *COSTING: Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting*, *7*(5). https://doi.org/10.31539/costing.v7i5.11481

Kumalasari, E., & Aditama, R. R. A. (2025). Pengaruh FOMO (Fear of Missing Out), positive emotion, dan shopping lifestyle terhadap impulse buying di TikTok Shop: Survei pada mahasiswa di Surakarta. *PENG: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, *3*(1), 933–949. https://doi.org/10.62710/f2pnra66

Lou, C., & Yuan, S. (2019). Influencer marketing: How message value and credibility affect consumer trust of branded content on social media. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *19*(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2018.1533501

Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. MIT Press.

Muharam, G. M., Sulistiya, D., Sari, N., Zikrinawati, K., & Fahmy, Z. (2023). The effect of Fear of Missing Out (FoMO) and peer conformity on impulsive buying in Semarang City students: Study on TikTok Shop consumers. *Experimental Student Experiences*, *4*(1), 687–695. https://doi.org/10.58330/ese.v1i8.277

Pandiangan, V. M., Tumbuan, W. J. F. A., & Saerang, R. T. (2024). The influence of product quality, lifestyle, and influencer marketing on impulse buying of Skintific products at the TikTok Shop among Generation Z. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v12i01.54183

Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013a). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of Fear of Missing Out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(4), 1841–1848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.014

Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013b). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(4), 1841–1848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.014

Rook, D. W. (1987). The buying impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *14*(2), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.1086/209105

Sanjaya, T. F. (t.t.). *Pengaruh SalesPromotion,ShoppingLifestyle,HedonicShopping Value,BrandImageTerhadap ImpluseBuyingPada Produk Skincare Skintific di Media Sosial Tiktok*.

Shamim, K., & Azam, M. (2024). The power of social media influencers: Unveiling the impact on consumers' impulse buying behaviour. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03796-7

Sugiyono. (2023). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Tambun, L. H., Mangantar, M., & Poluan, J. G. (2024). Pengaruh brand image, social media marketing, discount terhadap impulse buying pada produk Converse di Manado Town Square. Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi, 12(3), 58–69. https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v12i03.56459

TimePhoria. (2026). *About us*. https://us.timephoria.com/pages/about-us-2

Yuwono, D. S., & Sudradjat, R. H. (2025). Influence of influencer marketing, e-WOM on Timephoria purchase decisions via TikTok, mediated by FOMO. *Eduvest: Journal of Universal Studies*, *5*(11), 13838–13853. https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v5i11.51885

ZAP Clinic, & MarkPlus, Inc. (2024). *ZAP Beauty Index 2024*. https://zapclinic.com/files/ZAP_Beauty_Index_2024.pdf

DOI : 10.37531/ecotal.v7i2.4037