Universitas: Journal of Global Research and Innovation
Excellence. Quality. Reliability. Service | Contributing to the body of Knowledge

Shop Now, Regret Later: The Role of Fear of Missing Out (FOMO) and Social Influence on Consumers' Purchasing Intentions

Erlyn E. Tejerero, Jherie Lyn A. Venus, King Darrel B. Villaflor, Jerico B. Villasin, Hanna V. Reambonanza
Rizal Technological University
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22789302

ABSTRACT

It is important to understand that limited-time offers, social comparison, online reviews, and influencer content are all factors that amplify the consumers' experience at these digital marketplaces, and that the impact of fear of missing out (FOMO) and social influence on consumers' purchasing decisions has not been sufficiently studied in the local context. This study aimed to identify the magnitude of FOMO, social influence, and purchase intention; test the relationships among them; identify differences in FOMO magnitude across demographic groups; and formulate a strategy for informed purchasing decisions. The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational-comparative design, with 175 employed consumers (age 18-29) who have previously bought products in Mandaluyong City as respondents. The researcher gathered the data using a four-point survey questionnaire with a high coefficient of internal consistency for the main parts of the instrument (Cronbach's alpha = .945–.959). The statistical tools employed were means, standard deviations, Pearson correlation, and analysis of variance. Overall, participants showed high FOMO, especially in compulsive checking, social comparison, and fear of being left out, and low emotional impulsivity. The other high scores were for social influence and purchasing intention. FOMO dimensions were highly and positively correlated with purchasing intention ($r = .622–.686$, $p < .001$), and social-influence dimensions also exhibited positive and similarly strong relationships ($r = .620–.723$, $p < .001$). FOMO was generally similar across demographic groups, except for certain age and platform-preference groups. The results suggest that psychological urgency and socially mediated cues influence purchasing intentions together. Consumer education and digital-literacy programs, clear promotions, spending tools, and ethical influencer practices are recommended to help with conscious and responsible buying.

Keywords: *consumer behavior, digital marketing, fear of missing out, online shopping, purchasing intention, social influence, young consumers*

INTRODUCTION

Digital technology and social media have transformed consumer purchasing behavior through online marketplaces, livestream selling, influencer endorsements, algorithm-generated advertisements, and limited-time promotions. These marketing practices may intensify fear of missing out (FOMO) and social influence, encouraging consumers to make hurried or impulsive purchasing decisions. This concern is particularly relevant in the Philippines, where social media and online shopping are widely integrated into consumers' daily activities.

Despite the growing use of digital marketing strategies, the combined relationship between FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention remains insufficiently examined among young Filipino consumers. Therefore, this study investigates how psychological triggers and social cues relate to the purchasing intentions of employed consumers aged 18-29 in Mandaluyong City. It also examines differences in FOMO across demographic groups.

The findings may support consumer education, responsible purchasing, and ethical digital marketing. They may also benefit Office Administration students and professionals by strengthening their understanding of consumer communication, customer engagement, social media practices, and ethical marketing support.

Research Problem

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, monthly income, frequency of online shopping, and preferred online platform?
2. What is the level of fear of missing out among consumers in terms of anxiety about being left out, social comparison, compulsive checking behavior, and emotional impulsivity?
3. What is the extent of social influence affecting consumer behavior in terms of exposure to social stimuli, compliance (superficial conformity), identification (desire to belong), internalization (value acceptance), and behavior or attitude change?
4. What is the level of consumers' purchasing intention in terms of external stimuli, organism (internal response), and behavioral response?
5. Is there a significant relationship between fear of missing out (FOMO) and consumers' purchasing intention?
6. Is there a significant relationship between social influence and consumers' purchasing intention?
7. Are there significant differences in the level of fear of missing out (FOMO) when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile?
8. What strategic plan can be proposed to develop online purchasing decisions?

Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that employed consumers aged 18-29 in Mandaluyong City had sufficient online shopping experience and provided honest, informed responses. The validated instrument and selected statistical procedures were considered appropriate for measuring and analyzing FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention. These methodological and theoretical assumptions guided the study but did not determine the hypotheses or findings, which emerged from statistical analysis.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine how fear of missing out (FOMO) and social influence affect the purchasing intentions of individuals in Mandaluyong City when making decisions about buying online and in physical stores.

Theoretical Framework

Kelman's Social Influence Theory explains that behavioral intentions are shaped through compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when individuals conform to gain approval or avoid rejection; identification develops when they adopt behaviors to maintain desired relationships; and internalization occurs when accepted behaviors align with their personal values. Although these processes may produce behavioral or attitudinal changes, each operates through different motivations.

Self-Determination Theory explains FOMO through anxiety about exclusion, social comparison, compulsive checking, and emotional impulsivity. Such psychological reactions can lead people to check their online activities excessively, compare themselves with others, and act impulsively.

The Stimulus-Organism-Response Model also explains how external factors such as product scarcity, promotions, and brand appeal affect consumers' internal appraisal and reaction. These internal responses can result in purchasing intention, switching to a competitor, post-purchase regret, or dissatisfaction. Cognitive Dissonance Theory is relevant to this process because discrepancies between expectations and actual product experiences can lead to post-purchase psychological tension and affect future purchase decisions.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational-comparative design and purposive sampling to recruit 175 employed consumers who shop online in Mandaluyong City. A four-point Likert-scale questionnaire with high reliability (alpha = .945-.959) was used to collect data. Weighted means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and analysis of variance were applied at the .05 significance level. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and respondent confidentiality was maintained in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

Research Design

This study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational-comparative survey. The descriptive component assessed respondents' levels of FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention. The correlational component investigated relationships among these variables, while the comparative component examined whether FOMO differed across groups. This design allowed the researchers to record each variable numerically and analyze the data statistically without manipulating the variables.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in Mandaluyong City, Philippines, where participants were consistently exposed to digital connectivity, online shopping and advertising, influencer marketing, and time-limited promotions associated with the variables studied.

Participants or Data Sources

The respondents were 175 employed consumers aged 18-29 from the selected Mandaluyong City barangays of Barangka Drive, Addition Hills, and Plainview. Respondents were selected through purposive sampling based on their online-shopping experience and exposure to social media, digital advertisements, influencer marketing, and promotional content. Individuals who did not meet the age, employment, location, and online-shopping requirements were excluded. Their experiences provided relevant information about FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention.

Research Instruments or Materials

The researchers developed an expert-validated questionnaire divided into four sections: demographic profile, FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention. The principal variables were measured using a four-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Reliability analysis showed high internal consistency for FOMO (alpha = .953), social influence (alpha = .959), and purchasing intention (alpha = .945). Standard deviations of .620-.713 were also reported as indicating consistent responses and supporting the instrument's suitability for quantitative data collection.

Data Gathering Procedure

The questionnaire was validated by the research adviser and panel members, pilot-tested for reliability, and modified. After permission was obtained from the relevant authorities, the researchers purposively recruited 175 respondents, who completed the instrument through Google Forms. Informed consent was obtained, participation was voluntary, and responses were anonymous. The collected data were checked for completeness, coded, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Completed responses were checked, coded, and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequencies and percentages summarized the respondents' demographic profiles; weighted means and standard deviations determined the levels and variability of FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention; and Cronbach's alpha assessed internal consistency. Pearson correlation examined relationships between FOMO, social influence, and purchasing intention, while analysis of variance tested differences in FOMO across demographic groups. All inferential tests used a .05 significance level.

Ethical Considerations

Fairness, respect, voluntary participation, and participant protection were observed. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose, procedures, and their right to withdraw without penalty, and informed consent was obtained. Responses were kept confidential, information was presented anonymously, and data were used only for academic research in accordance with Republic Act No. 10173 (Data Privacy Act of 2012). Data collection was minimized to reduce disruption or risk, and records were stored securely and shared only with the researchers. Potential conflicts of interest or relevant affiliations were to be disclosed to support objectivity and integrity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results revealed that most respondents were young adult women and regular users of e-commerce and social-media platforms. FOMO was high, particularly for compulsive checking, comparison with others, and anxiety about being left out, while emotional impulsivity was relatively low. Social influence and purchasing intention were also rated high; promotions, online reviews, influencer content, peer behavior, and brand appeal affected purchasing decisions. Purchasing intention was positively related to the FOMO dimensions ($r = .622$-$.686$, $p < .001$), and social-influence dimensions had positive and significant relationships with purchasing intention ($r = .620$-$.723$, $p < .001$). FOMO generally did not differ across demographic categories, although selected age and platform categories showed differences. The findings highlight the need for consumer education, digital literacy, and ethical marketing practices to support informed purchasing and reduce consumerism driven by urgency and social pressure.

Demographic Profile of Respondents - Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18 - 20 years old	46	26%
21- 23 years old	68	39%
24 - 26 years old	34	19%
27 - 29 years old	27	15%
Total	175	100%

Table No. 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Age

Respondents aged 21-23 comprised the largest group (68; 39%), followed by those aged 18-20 (46; 26%), 24-26 (34; 19%), and 27-29 (27; 15%). Thus, the findings primarily represent young adults who are highly engaged in digital activities and online consumption. This profile is relevant because younger consumers' frequent social-media exposure may increase their susceptibility to FOMO and social influences when making purchasing decisions.

Demographic Profile of Respondents - Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	58	33%
Female	117	67%
Total	175	100%

Table No. 2. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Sex

Most respondents were female (117; 67%), while males accounted for 58 respondents (33%). Although both sexes were represented, the higher proportion of female participants indicates that the findings may reflect female consumers' experiences more strongly. The unequal distribution should be considered when interpreting results concerning social influence and purchasing behavior.

Demographic Profile of Respondents - Monthly Income

Monthly Income	Frequency	Percentage
₱10,000 to ₱15,000	50	29%
More than ₱15,000	31	18%
Prefer not to say	94	54%
Total	175	100%

Table No. 3. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Monthly Income

Most respondents declined to disclose their monthly income (94; 54%), limiting interpretation of their socioeconomic profile. Among those who reported income, 50 respondents (29%) earned PHP 10,000-PHP 15,000, while 31 (18%) earned more than PHP 15,000. Conclusions about relationships between income, FOMO, and purchasing intention should therefore be interpreted cautiously because of the high level of income nondisclosure.

Demographic Profile of Respondents - Frequency of Online Shopping

Frequency of Online Shopping	Frequency	Percentage
Never	1	1%
Rarely	29	17%

Frequency of Online Shopping	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	100	57%
Often	31	18%
Very Often	14	8%
Total	175	100%

Table No. 4. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Frequency of Online Shopping

Most respondents shopped online 'sometimes' (100; 57%), followed by 'often' (31; 18%), 'rarely' (29; 17%), 'very often' (14; 8%), and 'never' (1; 1%). Respondents generally had regular exposure to online-shopping environments where promotions, influencer content, social pressure, and FOMO-related triggers may shape purchasing intentions, although most shopped online only moderately.

Demographic Profile of Respondents - Preferred Online Platform

Preferred Online Platform	Frequency	Percentage
E-Commerce Marketplace (Shopee and Lazada)	73	42%
Social Media Marketplace (TikTok, Facebook, or Instagram)	71	41%
Brand/Retailer Website	17	10%
Livestreams (TikTok and Facebook)	14	8%
Total	175	100%

Table No. 5. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Preferred Online Platform

E-commerce marketplaces such as Shopee and Lazada were the most preferred platforms (73; 42%), closely followed by social-media marketplaces such as TikTok, Facebook, and Instagram (71; 41%). Brand or retailer websites (17; 10%) and livestream-selling platforms (14; 8%) were less preferred. Respondents primarily used interactive, promotion-driven platforms where discounts, reviews, trending products, and influencer content may intensify social influence and FOMO-related purchasing decisions.

Level of Fear of Missing Out - Anxiety About Being Left Out

Anxiety of Being Left Out	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1.I feel bothered when I miss limited- time online deals.	2.64	0.87	Agree
2. I get anxious when I see others buying trending items.	2.17	0.93	Disagree
3. I feel pressured when I think others are taking advantage of a sale.	2.41	0.97	Disagree
4. I worry that I am missing something important online.	2.55	0.92	Agree
5. I feel uneasy when friends talk about recent purchases	2.25	0.95	Disagree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.40	0.93	Disagree

Table No. 6. Respondents' Assessment of Fear of Missing Out in Terms of Anxiety About Being Left Out

Respondents generally disagreed that they experienced anxiety about being left out (WM = 2.40, SD = 0.93). They were more affected by limited-time deals and missed online opportunities than by others' purchases or discussions. Promotional urgency therefore appeared to influence purchasing decisions more strongly than peer-related pressure.

Level of Fear of Missing Out - Social Comparison

Social Comparison	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I compare my purchases with what others buy on social media.	2.51	0.95	Agree
2. I feel the need to keep up with trends that people around me follow.	2.24	0.94	Disagree
3. Seeing others buy something makes me consider buying too.	2.64	0.90	Agree
4. I feel more satisfied with my purchases when others approve them.	2.94	0.90	Agree

Social Comparison	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
5. I sometimes doubt my choices if they differ from what the most people buy	2.63	0.88	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.59	0.91	Agree

Table No. 7. Respondents' Assessment of Fear of Missing Out in Terms of Social Comparison

Level of Fear of Missing Out - Compulsive Checking Behavior

Compulsive Checking Behavior	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I frequently check online stores to avoid missing out on discounts	2.82	0.88	Agree
2. I monitor flash sales even if I do not plan to buy anything.	2.80	0.86	Agree
3. I browse online platforms repeatedly to stay updated with new offers.	2.74	0.93	Agree
4. I check my favorite online shops several times.	2.84	0.89	Agree
5. I feel compelled to act quickly when I see limited offers.	2.53	0.95	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.75	0.90	Agree

Table No. 8. Respondents' Assessment of Fear of Missing Out in Terms of Compulsive Checking Behavior

Respondents generally demonstrated compulsive checking behavior (WM = 2.75, SD = 0.90). Frequently checking favorite online shops received the highest rating, while acting quickly on limited offers received the lowest. FOMO was therefore expressed more through repeated monitoring of online stores than through immediate purchasing action.

Level of Fear of Missing Out - Emotional Impulsivity

Emotional Impulsivity	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I buy items immediately because I fear they might sell out.	2.44	0.90	Disagree
2. I often make purchases based on sudden emotions triggered by posts.	2.49	0.92	Disagree

Emotional Impulsivity	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
3. I quickly decide to buy when I see that only a few stocks are left.	2.50	0.94	Agree
4. I make impulsive purchases when seeing “limited time offers”	2.49	0.96	Disagree
5. I sometimes buy products even when I feel unsure because I fear of missing out.	2.22	0.96	Disagree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.43	0.94	Disagree

Table No. 9. Respondents' Assessment of Fear of Missing Out in Terms of Emotional Impulsivity

Respondents generally disagreed with the emotional-impulsivity statements (WM = 2.43, SD = 0.94).

Extent of Social Influence - Exposure to Social Stimuli

Exposure to Social Stimuli	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I pay attention to social media content when making decision.	2.98	0.83	Agree
2. Online reviews influence my perception of products or services.	3.35	0.74	Agree
3. I am affected by influencers when deciding what to buy	2.84	0.87	Agree
4. Fear appeals in advertisements make me consider my choices.	2.91	0.81	Agree
5. I often notice persuasive messages in media that shape my awareness of products.	3.02	0.78	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	3.02	0.81	Agree

Table No. 10. Respondents' Assessment of Social Influence in Terms of Exposure to Social Stimuli

Respondents were influenced by social and digital-marketing stimuli (WM = 3.02, SD = 0.81). Online reviews received the highest rating, while influencer content received the lowest. Consumers appeared to rely more on reviews and persuasive product information than on influencer endorsements when making purchasing decisions.

Extent of Social Influence - Compliance (Superficial Conformity)

Compliance (Superficial Conformity)	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I sometimes change my behavior just to fit in with others.	2.40	0.98	Disagree
2. I follow trends even if I don't fully agree with them.	2.17	0.94	Disagree
3. I purchase items because they are popular, not because I truly need them	2.25	1.01	Disagree
4. I conform to group expectations even when I feel uncertain.	2.36	0.96	Disagree
5. I adjust my actions to avoid standing out in social situations	2.50	0.89	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.34	0.96	Disagree

Table No. 11. Respondents' Assessment of Social Influence in Terms of Compliance (Superficial Conformity)

Respondents generally resisted superficial conformity (WM = 2.34, SD = 0.96). Although they adjusted their actions to avoid standing out, they generally did not follow trends, purchase popular items unnecessarily, or conform to group expectations. Social acceptance therefore exerted limited influence on their purchasing behavior.

Extent of Social Influence - Identification (Desire to Belong)

Identification (Desire to Belong)	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I adopt behaviors to be more like people I admire	2.53	0.88	Agree
2. I feel motivated to act in ways that make me accepted by peers.	2.55	0.88	Agree
3. I change my preferences to align with those of influencers I admire.	2.29	0.94	Disagree
4. I imitate styles or habits of people I look up to.	2.60	0.92	Agree

Identification (Desire to Belong)	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
5. I feel more confident when my choices match those of my social circle.	2.56	0.88	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.51	0.90	Agree

Table No. 12. Respondents' Assessment of Social Influence in Terms of Identification (Desire to Belong)

Respondents generally identified with people they admired or wanted to belong with (WM = 2.51, SD = 0.90). They were more likely to imitate admired individuals and align with their social circle than to change their preferences based on influencers. Personal and peer relationships therefore influenced them more than online personalities.

3. Extent of Social Influence - Internalization (Value Acceptance)

Internalization (Value Acceptance)	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I adopt beliefs because they align with my personal values.	2.99	0.77	Agree
2. I change my behavior when I genuinely believe in the message.	3.03	0.79	Agree
3. I continue certain behaviors even when social pressure is absent.	2.95	0.82	Agree
4. I integrate persuasive messages into my long-term worldview.	2.87	0.82	Agree
5. I act on messages when they align with my personal values.	2.97	0.76	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.96	0.79	Agree

Table No. 13. Respondents' Assessment of Social Influence in Terms of Internalization (Value Acceptance)

Respondents generally internalized messages that aligned with their personal beliefs and values (WM = 2.96, SD = 0.79). Genuine belief in a message received the highest rating, while integrating persuasive messages into a long-term worldview received the lowest. Social influence became stronger when messages were personally meaningful and value-consistent.

3. Extent of Social Influence - Behavior or Attitude Change

Behavior or Attitude Change	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Exposure to social messages has influenced my purchase decisions.	2.88	0.80	Agree
2. I have changed my beliefs due to persuasive content.	2.71	0.87	Agree
3. I engage more with brands or communities after being influenced by social stimuli.	2.66	0.85	Agree
4. I have altered my lifestyle choices because of persuasive social messages.	2.66	0.84	Agree
5. I more likely to support causes or movements after being exposed to persuasive communication.	2.82	0.81	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.75	0.83	Agree

Table No. 14. Respondents' Assessment of Social Influence in Terms of Behavior or Attitude Change

Respondents agreed that social messages influenced their behavior and attitudes (WM = 2.75, SD = 0.83). Purchasing decisions received the highest rating, while brand engagement and lifestyle changes received the lowest. Persuasive social content affected immediate consumer decisions more strongly than sustained behavioral changes.

Purchasing Intention - External Influences

External Influences	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Limited-time offers make me feel I must buy quickly.	2.61	0.93	Agree
2. Discounts and promotions strongly influence my purchase decisions.	2.97	0.80	Agree
3. I am more likely to buy products from brands I find attractive.	3.04	0.81	Agree
4. If a product is shown as exclusive, I am more inclined to buy it.	2.75	0.86	Agree

External Influences	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
5. Messages like "buy now" make me decide faster.	2.39	0.97	Disagree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.75	0.87	Agree

Table No. 15. Respondents' Assessment of Purchasing Intention in Terms of External Influences

Respondents agreed that external marketing factors influenced their purchasing intentions (WM = 2.75, SD = 0.87). Brand attractiveness received the highest rating, followed by discounts and promotions, while direct 'buy now' messages received the lowest. Perceived brand appeal and promotional value were more influential than explicit pressure to purchase immediately.

Purchasing Intention - Organism (Internal Responses)

Organism (Internal Responses)	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I often buy things without much prior planning.	2.58	1.00	Agree
2. When I see a product I like, I feel the urge to buy it immediately.	2.73	0.90	Agree
3. I develop strong opinions about brands based on my experiences	3.02	0.86	Agree
4. My interest in a product increases when it comes with a promotion	2.90	0.86	Agree
5. I trust brands that are well-known and have a good reputation	3.21	0.77	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.89	0.88	Agree

Table No. 16. Respondents' Assessment of Purchasing Intention in Terms of Organism (Internal Responses)

Respondents agreed that internal evaluations influenced their purchasing intentions (WM = 2.89, SD = 0.88). Trust in well-known brands received the highest rating, while purchasing without prior planning received the lowest. Brand reputation and personal experience therefore influenced purchasing intention more strongly than unplanned buying tendencies.

Purchasing Intention - Behavioral Response

Behavioral Response	Weighted Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I intend to buy products that appeal to me even If I don't urgently need them	2.49	0.98	Disagree
2. I often regret purchases made on impulse.	2.75	0.86	Agree
3. I sometimes switch brands if another brand offers better promotions or appeal.	2.97	0.85	Agree
4. If I am satisfied with a brand, I continue buying its products	3.21	0.82	Agree
5. I sometimes change my purchase decision based on new information or promotions.	2.99	0.83	Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	2.88	0.87	Agree

Table No. 17. Respondents' Assessment of Purchasing Intention in Terms of Behavioral Response

Respondents agreed that marketing information and brand experiences influenced their behavioral responses (WM = 2.88, SD = 0.87). Continued purchasing from satisfactory brands received the highest rating, while buying appealing but unnecessary products received the lowest. Brand satisfaction, new information, and promotional value influenced purchasing behavior more strongly than product appeal alone.

Relationship Between FOMO and Purchasing Intention

Level of Fear of Missing Out		Level of Consumer's Purchasing Intention	Verbal Interpretation	Relationship Level	Decision	Interpretation
Anxiety of Being Left Out	Pearson's r	0.622	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship

Level of Fear of Missing Out		Level of Consumer's Purchasing Intention	Verbal Interpretation	Relationship Level	Decision	Interpretation
Social Comparison	Pearson's r	0.686	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
Compulsive Checking Behavior	Pearson's r	0.685	Strongly Agree	Relationship Level	Decision	Interpretation
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship

Table No. 18. Relationship Matrix Between Fear of Missing Out and Consumers' Purchasing Intention

Significant positive relationships were reported between all FOMO dimensions and purchasing intention ($p < .001$). Emotional impulsivity had the strongest reported relationship ($r = .734$), followed by social comparison ($r = .686$), compulsive checking behavior ($r = .685$), and anxiety about being left out ($r = .622$). The null hypotheses were rejected. Stronger FOMO-related emotions and behaviors were associated with higher purchasing intention, although actual purchases may still depend on needs, budgets, and situational factors. The findings were described as consistent with Beikverdi et al. (2024) and Saavedra and Bautista (2020), who identified FOMO as a psychological trigger of buying interest.

6. Relationship Between Social Influence and Purchasing Intention

Extent of Social Influence		Level of Consumer's Purchasing Intention	Verbal Interpretation	Relationship Level	Decision	Interpretation
Exposure to Social Stimuli	Pearson's r	0.721	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship

Extent of Social Influence		Level of Consumer's Purchasing Intention	Verbal Interpretation	Relationship Level	Decision	Interpretation
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
Compliance (Superficial Conformity)	Pearson's r	0.620	Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
Identification (Desire to belong)	Pearson's r	0.691	Strongly Agree	Strong	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship
	P Value	<.001	Strongly Agree	Relationship Level	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is significant Relationship

Table No. 19. Relationship Matrix Between Social Influence and Consumers' Purchasing Intention

Exposure to social stimuli (r = .721), identification (r = .691), and compliance (r = .620) showed strong, significant positive relationships with purchasing intention (p < .001). The null hypotheses were rejected, indicating that higher social influence was associated with stronger purchasing intention.

7. Differences in FOMO by Demographic Profile

Variables	Grouping	f	df	p	Decision	Interpretation
Age	18-20 years old	1.09	26	0.427	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	21-23 years old	0.62	31	0.914	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	24-26 years old	3.35	21	0.018	Reject Null Hypothesis	With Significant Difference
	27 -29 years old	0.67	16	0.914	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
Sex	Male	0.97	33	0.545	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference

Variables	Grouping	f	df	p	Decision	Interpretation
	Female	0.84	42	0.723	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
Monthly Income	10,000 to 15,000	0.76	26	0.754	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	More than 15,000	0.37	18	0.971	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Prefer not to say	1.32	38	0.171	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
Frequency of Online Shopping	Never	0.36	6	0.856	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Often	1.68	20	0.214	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Rarely	1.31	20	0.362	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Sometimes	1.43	41	0.102	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Very Often	0.71	731	0.705	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
Preferred Online Platform	E-Commerce Marketplace	1.91	11	0.027	Reject Null Hypothesis	With Significant Difference
	Social media	0.44	31	0.990	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Brand/Retailer Website	0.88	11	0.613	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference
	Livestream	3.26	11	0.258	Accept Null Hypothesis	No Significant Difference

Table No. 20. Analysis of Variance of Fear of Missing Out When Grouped According to Demographic Profile

Most profile categories did not differ significantly with respect to FOMO. Respondents aged 18-20, 21-23, and 27-29 showed no significant differences, whereas the 24-26 age group showed a significant difference (F = 3.35, p = .018). No significant differences were reported by sex or monthly-income category. Online-shopping frequency also showed no significant differences. For preferred platform, the e-commerce-marketplace group showed a significant difference (F = 1.91, p = .027), while no significant differences were reported for social-media marketplaces, brand or retailer websites, and livestream platforms. The manuscript relates these findings to emotional and behavioral responses, social influence, peer interaction, and online engagement, noting that trends, influencer marketing, promotions, and continual exposure to online content may intensify FOMO regardless of sociodemographic characteristics.

8. Proposed Strategic Plan for Online Purchasing Decisions

Rationale

The results suggest that FOMO and social influence, including exposure to social-media content, promotions, peer attitudes and behavior, and brand messages, significantly affect consumers' purchasing intention. Because respondents showed high engagement with e-commerce and social-media marketplaces, a strategic plan is needed to encourage responsible purchasing and guide businesses in developing responsible and effective digital-marketing strategies.

Objectives

1. Raise consumer awareness of FOMO-driven and socially influenced purchasing behavior.
2. Promote responsible and mindful online purchasing decisions.
3. Assist online sellers and marketers in developing sound, ethical marketing tactics.
4. Reduce impulse-buying pressure created by scarcity, urgency, and social pressure.
5. Enhance consumers' critical analysis of online advertisements and promotions.

Target Beneficiaries

1. Online consumers, particularly young adults aged 18-29.
2. Students and young professionals engaged in e-commerce activities.
3. Businesses that sell online and use digital marketing.
4. Consumer-welfare groups and educational institutions.

Strategic Interventions and Activities

Key Area	Strategy	Activities	Expected Output
Consumer Awareness	FOMO Awareness Campaign	Social-media seminars and infographics on FOMO and impulse buying	Increased awareness of emotional triggers
Digital Literacy	Smart Online Shopping Education	Webinars on evaluating advertisements, false urgency, and online reviews	Improved decision-making skills
Responsible Consumption	Mindful Buying Program	Budget-planning workshops and 'need versus want' training	Reduced impulsive purchases
Social Influence Control	Critical Media Consumption Training	Workshops on influencer marketing and persuasion tactics	Better resistance to peer and social pressure
Business Ethics	Ethical Marketing Promotion	Guidelines for sellers on responsible advertising without misleading urgency	Fair and transparent marketing practices

Key Area	Strategy	Activities	Expected Output
Consumer Reflection Tools	Decision Delay Strategy	Campaigns encouraging a 24-hour rule before buying	Reduced impulse-buying behavior

Table No. 21. Strategic Interventions and Activities

Implementation Plan

Phase	Duration	Objectives	Major Activities	Expected Outputs	Evaluation Indicators
1. Preparation	1 month	Establish the resources and partnerships required for implementation.	Develop seminar materials; coordinate with stakeholders; secure speakers; prepare the schedule, venue, platforms, and logistics.	Approved materials, confirmed speakers, implementation schedule, and logistical plan	Availability and approval of materials, speakers, schedule, and resources
2. Awareness Campaign	2 months	Increase public awareness of FOMO, impulse buying, and responsible online shopping.	Conduct Facebook and TikTok awareness sessions; publish digital infographics; organize webinars and school-based information drives; launch the '24-Hour Rule Before Buying' campaign.	Awareness materials, social-media campaign, webinars, and information sessions	Number of participants, views, shares, comments, reactions, and campaign reach
3. Training and Workshops	2-3 months	Strengthen digital-consumer literacy and responsible purchasing skills.	Conduct consumer-education and digital-literacy sessions; discuss online advertising, FOMO, and social influence; administer online quizzes and interactive exercises.	Trained participants with improved ability to recognize FOMO-related purchasing triggers	Attendance, participation, quiz results, and pre-test/post-test scores
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	1 month	Assess the program's effectiveness and identify areas for improvement.	Administer feedback forms and post-implementation surveys; compare pre-test and post-test results; assess changes in awareness, decision-making, and impulsive-buying behavior.	Evaluation report and recommendations for future implementation	Changes in scores and reported behavior, participant feedback, and identified improvement areas

Table No. 22. Strategic Plan Implementation

General Discussion

The findings indicate that FOMO and social influence are significantly associated with young consumers' purchasing intentions. FOMO was expressed primarily through social comparison and compulsive checking, while social influence operated through online content, personal values, brand reputation, reviews, and promotions rather than direct group pressure. These results support Kelman's Social Influence Theory and the Stimulus-Organism-Response Model by showing how digital stimuli and internal evaluations relate to purchasing responses.

The study contributes to consumer-behavior research by integrating psychological and social explanations of online purchasing intention. It also supports digital-literacy programs, responsible purchasing practices, and ethical marketing. However, purposive sampling, self-reported data, selected locations, and the cross-sectional design limit the findings. Future studies should use broader samples, include additional locations, and use longitudinal or mixed-methods approaches.

REFERENCES

Adaba, G. B., Frimpong, F., & Mwainyekule, L. (2025). Empirical analysis of social media influencers' effect on consumer purchase intentions and behavior. *Platforms, 3*(3), Article 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/platforms3030011

Beikverdi, L., Sipilä, J., & Tarkiainen, A. (2024). Post-purchase effects of impulse buying: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 23*(3), 1512-1527. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.2287

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-621. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015

Elsayed, H. A. E. (2025). Fear of missing out and its impact: Exploring relationships with social media use, psychological well-being, and academic performance among university students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, Article 1582572. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1582572

Eze, M. (2025). The role of micro-influencers in niche digital marketing strategies in Africa: Impact on consumer engagement and brand loyalty. *International Journal of Marketing Studies, 17*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v17n1p1

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*(1), 51-60. https://doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200106

Li, W., Chen, S., Wang, M., & Liu, Y. (2023). The effect of fear of missing out on mental health: Differences in different solitude behaviors. *BMC Psychology, 11*, Article 319. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01184-5

Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). 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

Rozgonjuk, D., Sindermann, C., Elhai, J. D., & Montag, C. (2022). Fear of missing out (FoMO), social media use, and problematic smartphone use. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 865702. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865702

Sudrajad, I., & Edastama, P. (2025). The role of fear of missing out on purchase intention through the use of PayLater services. *Quantitative Economics and Management Studies, 6*(5), 792-799. https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.qems4155

Tang, X., Hanif, M. S., Haider, N., Rizwan, A., & Khurshid, A. (2024). From friends to feedback: Effect of social influence on mobile shopping in the post-COVID era. *Sustainability, 16*(12), Article 5134. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16125134