



Research Article

# Impulsive Buying Among Tiktok Users (Study on Gen Z)

Imam Gozali<sup>1</sup>, Hidayah Sri Pamungkas<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang; Indonesia; e-mail: [imam-gozali@untagsmg.ac.id](mailto:imam-gozali@untagsmg.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup> Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang; Indonesia; e-mail: [hidayahpamungkas202@gmail.com](mailto:hidayahpamungkas202@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding Author: **Imam Gozali**

**Abstract:** This study aims to determine how much influence digital marketing strategies (content marketing, affiliate marketing and flash sales) have in encouraging impulsive purchasing behavior in Gen Z. The population of this study consists of all Generation Z TikTok users in Indonesia, with an unknown total number. The research method employed is a quantitative approach using a survey of 100 respondents selected through convenience sampling. The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with inferential analysis or classical assumption testing. The results show that, partially, all three independent variables have a positive and significant effect on impulsive buying. Flash Sales have the greatest effectiveness influence, with a multiple regression coefficient value of 0.275. Although Flash Sales are statistically the most effective, descriptive analysis results indicate that affiliate marketing has the highest level of effectiveness based on the respondents' average score of 21.69. Therefore, an optimal digital marketing strategy can leverage all three methods to enhance impulsive buying behavior.

**Keywords:** affiliate marketing flash sale, content marketing, impulsive buying

## 1. Introduction

The development of technology and communication in the digital era has brought about major changes in various aspects of life, one of which is in people's consumption patterns. The emergence of the social commerce trend, which combines social interaction with buying and selling activities through digital platforms, is clear evidence of this change. This concept is in line with the thinking of Marketing 5.0 which emphasizes the importance of integrating technology with humanism values to create a more personal and relevant shopping experience (Nainggolan et al., 2023).

In Indonesia, the growth of social commerce is increasingly rapid, supported by an increase in internet and smartphone users. The value of social commerce transactions is estimated to reach IDR 300 trillion in 2025, jumping from IDR 44 trillion in 2022 (Gianie, 2023). Platforms like TikTok, Instagram, and Facebook are driving this trend, with Generation Z being the most dominant user group. Born between 1997 and 2012, this generation represents around 27.94% of Indonesia's total population and is known to be very adept at using technology (Qothrunnada, 2024).

Social commerce now offers features such as online stores, shopping carts, and user preference-based advertising, all integrated into social media platforms (Bakrie, 2024). According to Kastenholz (2022), more than 97% of social commerce users are from Generation Z, reinforcing the importance of understanding their consumption patterns in the digital age. This change has shifted the traditional shopping paradigm to a more instant and impulse-based shopping experience.

One platform that has greatly benefited from this trend is TikTok. Based on data from Santika (2023), the 18–24 age group is the largest TikTok user in Indonesia, reaching 34.9% of total users. TikTok, which was initially known only as a short video sharing platform, has now developed the TikTok Shop service that allows users to shop while enjoying entertainment content. TikTok optimizes strategies such as Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sale to increase impulsive purchases. Generation Z, which has a

Received: 16 June, 2025

Revised: 30 June, 2025

Accepted: 14 July, 2025

Published: 16 July, 2025

Curr. Ver.: 16 July, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

tendency to be consumptive and a high desire to follow trends, is the strategic target of this approach (Eliot Simangunsong, 2018). Impulse purchases in the digital context, according to Kotler et al. (2017), are triggered by content that is able to attract attention and arouse emotional urges to buy without careful planning. Although a number of previous studies have shown that Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sale have an effect on impulsive purchases, the results are still mixed. Several studies such as Kurniawan & Nugroho (2024) and Mahendra Indriawan & Hari Santoso (2023) found a significant positive effect, while other studies such as Edwin & Fitriyah (2024) and Putri & Hayu (2024) showed different results, depending on the strategy and platform used. This variation shows that the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies is highly dependent on the characteristics of the audience and the social media used.

Based on this phenomenon, research on impulsive purchasing decisions on TikTok users, especially Gen Z, was conducted to fill the gap in the literature and examine the extent to which Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sales are effective in encouraging impulsive purchases. This study aims to determine how much influence digital marketing strategies (content marketing, affiliate marketing and flash sales) have in encouraging impulsive buying behavior in Gen Z..

## **2. Research Method**

The method used in this study is a quantitative method with an associative research type, because this study aims to determine the relationship between variables using statistical procedures. This study focuses on measuring the extent of influence of Content

marketing, Affiliate marketing, and Flash Sale on impulsive purchases of TikTok users from Generation Z.

The population in this study is all Generation Z TikTok users in Indonesia, with an unknown population size. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling, which is a sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunities for each member of the population to be selected as a sample. The sampling method used is convenience sampling, which is sampling based on the ease of access of respondents who are in accordance with the research criteria (Etikan, 2016). The respondent criteria in this study are: 1) Generation Z (born 1997–2012), 2) Domiciled in Indonesia, 3) Have an active TikTok application and account.

Primary data in this study were collected through an online questionnaire using Google Form, using a 5-point Likert scale to measure respondents' responses to each variable. This study involved 100 respondents selected based on these criteria. The data analysis technique used in this study was multiple linear regression analysis with the help of SPSS 23 software. In addition, classical assumption tests were also carried out such as normality tests, multicollinearity tests, heteroscedasticity tests, and linearity tests to ensure the validity of the regression model, as well as hypothesis tests

## **3. Results And Discussion**

### **3.1 Instrument Testing**

The research instrument testing (pilot test) includes validity tests and reliability tests conducted on 30 respondents, which are part of the total research sample (100 respondents) and have characteristics, namely Generation Z who actively use TikTok. Statistical results related to validity and reliability tests are shown in the following table:

**Table 1.** Validity and Reliability Test

| <u>Variabel</u>                 | <u>Cronbach Alpha</u> |   | $\alpha$ | Ket                                  | Item  | <u>r Hitung</u> |   | $r$<br>Tabel | Ket                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|-----------------|---|--------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Impulse buying</i> (Y)       | 0,748                 | > | 0,6      | R<br>E<br>L<br>I<br>A<br>B<br>E<br>L | Y.1   | 0,879           | > | 0.296        | V<br>A<br>L<br>I<br>D |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | Y.2   | 0,750           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | Y.3   | 0,540           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | Y.4   | 0,622           |   |              |                       |
| <i>Content marketing</i> (X1)   | 0,836                 |   |          |                                      | X.1.1 | 0,489           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.1.2 | 0,802           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.1.3 | 0,754           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.1.4 | 0,817           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.1.5 | 0,877           |   |              |                       |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> (X2) | 0,882                 |   |          |                                      | X.2.1 | 0,778           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.2.2 | 0,851           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.2.3 | 0,699           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.2.4 | 0,630           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.2.5 | 0,785           |   |              |                       |
| <i>Flash Sale</i> (X3)          | 0,851                 |   |          |                                      | X.3.1 | 0,778           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.3.2 | 0,805           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.3.3 | 0,615           |   |              |                       |
|                                 |                       |   |          |                                      | X.3.4 | 0,636           |   |              |                       |

Source: Primary data processing results, 2025

Based on Table 1. the instrument test consisting of validity test and reliability test shows that the results of the data tested are reliable and valid, using r table with a significance level for one-way test. So it can be concluded that the research instrument used has met the validity and reliability test standards, which can be seen that all r Calculation values > r Table and Crombach Alpha values > 0.60

Inferential Analysis. As for the results of this classical assumption test are shown in Table 2 to Table 6.

**Table 2.** Normality Test

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test        |                         |             |                         |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
|                                           |                         |             | Unstandardized Residual |
| N                                         |                         |             | 100                     |
| Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>          | Mean                    |             | ,0000000                |
|                                           | Std. Deviation          |             | 1,62390687              |
| Most Extreme Differences                  | Absolute                |             | ,065                    |
|                                           | Positive                |             | ,049                    |
|                                           | Negative                |             | -,065                   |
| Test Statistic                            |                         |             | ,065                    |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) <sup>c</sup>       |                         |             | ,200 <sup>d</sup>       |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (2- tailed) <sup>e</sup> | Sig.                    |             | ,389                    |
|                                           | 99% Confidence Interval | Lower Bound | ,376                    |
|                                           |                         | Upper Bound | ,402                    |

Source: Results of Primary Data Processing SPSS Statistics 30, 2025

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the sig value > 0.05 is 0.200. This value can be concluded that the residual data is normally distributed and the regression modal has met the normality assumption.

**Table 3.** Homogeneity Test Results

| <b>Tests of Homogeneity of Variances</b> |                                      | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2    | Sig. |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
| <i>Content marketing</i>                 | Based on Mean                        | 2,113            | 7   | 92     | ,050 |
|                                          | Based on Median                      | 1,634            | 7   | 92     | ,136 |
|                                          | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 1,634            | 7   | 83,664 | ,137 |
|                                          | Based on trimmed mean                | 2,119            | 7   | 92     | ,049 |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i>               | Based on Mean                        | 1,502            | 7   | 91     | ,176 |
|                                          | Based on Median                      | ,873             | 7   | 91     | ,531 |
|                                          | Based on Median and with adjusted df | ,873             | 7   | 72,679 | ,532 |
|                                          | Based on trimmed mean                | 1,539            | 7   | 91     | ,164 |
| <i>Flash Sale</i>                        | Based on Mean                        | 1,409            | 7   | 91     | ,211 |
|                                          | Based on Median                      | 1,052            | 7   | 91     | ,401 |
|                                          | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 1,052            | 7   | 81,384 | ,402 |
|                                          | Based on trimmed mean                | 1,391            | 7   | 91     | ,219 |

Source: Primary data processing results, 2025

Based on the results of the homogeneity test using the Levene Test in the table above, it shows that the significant value of Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sale is greater than the significant value (0.05), so the data in this study is homogeneous and means that the sample data studied has the same variance (measure of data distribution). These results can be ascertained that the effectiveness of each marketing strategy can be compared fairly.

**Table 4.** Linearity Test Results

| <u>Statistic</u>           | <b>Significant Value<br/>Deviation<br/>from<br/>Linearity</b> |   | <b>Significance Level</b> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| <i>Content marketing</i>   | 0,086                                                         | > | 0,05                      |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | 0,079                                                         |   |                           |
| <i>Flash Sale</i>          | 0,335                                                         |   |                           |

Source: Results of processing Primary data SPSS Statistics 30, 2025

Based on the table, it can be seen that Content marketing, Affiliate marketing, and Flash Sale have a significance value greater than 0.05. This shows that the data from all independent variables have a linear data model pattern, so that regression analysis can be carried out.

**Table 5.** Multicollinearity Test Results

| <u>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></u> |                            | <b>Collinearity Statistics</b> |       |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| Model                           |                            | Tolerance                      | VIF   |
| 1                               | <i>Content marketing</i>   | ,618                           | 1,617 |
|                                 | <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | ,513                           | 1,948 |
|                                 | <i>Flash Sale</i>          | ,539                           | 1,855 |

a. Dependent Variable: Impulse buying

Source: Results of primary data processing SPSS Statistics 30, 2025

Based on the table above, Content marketing has a tolerance value of  $0.618 > 0.1$  and a VIF of  $1.617 < 10$ , which means that Content marketing does not experience multicollinearity. Affiliate marketing has a tolerance value of  $0.513 > 0.1$  and a VIF of  $1.948 < 10$ , so Affiliate marketing does not experience multicollinearity. Then Flash Sale has a tolerance value of  $0.539 > 0.1$  and a VIF of  $1.855 < 10$ , so Flash Sale does not experience multicollinearity.

**Table 6.** Heteroscedasticity Test Results

| Model                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t      | Sig. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|
|                            | B                           | Std. Error |                                |        |      |
| 1 (Constant)               | 1,839                       | 1,226      |                                | 1,500  | ,137 |
| <i>Content marketing</i>   | ,022                        | ,070       | ,041                           | ,315   | ,753 |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | ,015                        | ,060       | ,035                           | ,248   | ,805 |
| <i>Flash Sala</i>          | -,081                       | ,067       | -,166                          | -1,207 | ,231 |

a. Dependent Variable: ABS\_RES

Source: Results of primary data processing SPSS Statistics 30, 2025

To confirm the results of the heteroscedasticity test, the researcher conducted a Glejser test. With the provision that if the significant value between the independent variable and the absolute residual is greater than 0.05, there is no heteroscedasticity. Then based on Table 4.13, all variables have significant values of more than 0.05.

### 3.2 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is a statistical method used to study the relationship between one dependent variable (the variable to be predicted or explained) and one or more independent variables (explanatory variables). which aims to 1) Predict the value of the dependent variable based on the value of the independent variable 2) Assess the strength of the relationship between variables and 3) Know the form of the relationship (positive/negative, linear/non-linear) between the variables

**Table 7.** Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

| Model                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t     | Sig. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------|------|
|                            | B                           | Std. Error |                                |       |      |
| 1 (Constant)               | 1,456                       | 2,091      |                                | ,696  | ,488 |
| <i>Content marketing</i>   | ,253                        | ,119       | ,216                           | 2,132 | ,036 |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | ,220                        | ,103       | ,239                           | 2,143 | ,035 |
| <i>Flash Sale</i>          | ,288                        | ,114       | ,275                           | 2,528 | ,013 |

a. Dependent Variable: Impulse buying

Source: Primary data processing results, 2025

Based on Table 7. the equation can be calculated:

$$Y = 0.216X_1 + 0.239 X_2 + 0.275 X_3.$$

The regression equation can be explained as follows:

- The multiple regression coefficient value of the Content marketing variable ( $X_1$ ) shows a positive value of 0.216, which indicates a change for the better. If Content marketing increases by 0.216, then impulsive buying will also increase by the same amount, namely 0.216, and vice versa.

- The multiple regression coefficient value of the Affiliate marketing variable (X2) shows a positive value of 0.239, which indicates a change for the better. If Affiliate marketing increases by 0.239, then impulsive buying will also increase by the same amount, namely 0.239, and vice versa.
- The multiple regression coefficient value of the Flash Sale variable (X3) shows a positive value of 0.275, which indicates a change for the better. If Flash Sale increases by 0.275, then impulsive purchases will also increase by the same amount, namely 0.275, and vice versa.

**Table 8.** Results of the Determination Coefficient Test ( $R^2$ )

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | ,623 <sup>a</sup> | ,388     | ,369              | 1,64909                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), X3, X1, X2

b. Dependent Variable: Y (Impulse buying)

Source: Primary data processing results, 2025

Based on Table 8. the coefficient of determination test shows that there is an influence between the independent variables on the related variables. In this study, an adjusted R Square value of 0.369 or 36.9% can be obtained, which means that the value of Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sale influences impulsive buying by 36.9% while the remaining 63.1% is influenced by other variables, which are not explained by this study.

**Table 9.** t-Test Results (Partial Test)

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|                            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1 (Constant)               | 1,456                       | 2,091      |                           | ,696  | ,488 |
| <i>Content marketing</i>   | ,253                        | ,119       | ,216                      | 2,132 | ,036 |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | ,220                        | ,103       | ,239                      | 2,143 | ,035 |
| <i>Flash Sale</i>          | ,288                        | ,114       | ,275                      | 2,528 | ,013 |

a. Dependent Variable: Impulse buying

Source: Results of primary data processing SPSS Statistics 30, 2025 Based on Table 9. then it can be analyzed as follows:

- The coefficient value of the Content marketing variable is  $0.216 > 0$  with a calculated t value  $> t$  table, which is  $2.132 > 1.660$  and sig  $0.036 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the Content marketing variable has a positive and significant effect on impulsive buying.
- The coefficient value of the Affiliate marketing variable is  $0.239 > 0$  with a calculated t value  $> t$  table, which is  $2.143 > 1.660$  and sig  $0.035 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the Affiliate marketing variable has a positive and significant effect on impulsive buying.
- The coefficient value of the Flash Sale variable is  $0.275 > 0$  with a calculated t value  $> t$  table, which is  $2.528 > 1.660$  and sig  $0.013 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the Flash Sale variable has a positive and significant effect on impulsive purchases.

## **4. Discussion**

### **4.1. The Influence of Content Marketing on Impulse Buying**

The results of the regression test show that the Content Marketing variable has a positive and significant effect on impulse buying. This is evidenced by the t-value of 2.132, which is greater than the t-table of 1.985, and the significance value (Sig.) Of 0.036, which is less than 0.05. Thus, the H1 hypothesis is accepted, which means that Content Marketing has a significant influence on impulse buying in Generation Z TikTok users.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Indriawan & Santoso (2023), which shows that digital content-based marketing can increase consumer emotional involvement and encourage unplanned purchases. This is because interesting, creative, and relevant marketing content can form a positive perception of a product. In this study, the majority of respondents also showed interest in content that was visually appealing and had a persuasive narrative, which ultimately influenced their impulsive purchasing decisions.

### **4.2. The Influence of Affiliate Marketing on Impulse Purchases**

Based on the results of multiple linear regression, the Affiliate marketing variable is also proven to have a significant influence on impulse purchases. This is indicated by the calculated t value of 2.143, which is greater than the t table of 1.660, with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.035, which is less than 0.05. Thus, the hypothesis H<sub>2</sub> is accepted, which means that Affiliate marketing has a positive and significant effect on impulse purchases in Generation Z TikTok users.

The results of this study are reinforced by a study conducted by Fateekha Lireeh & Moh. Faizin (2023), which found that Affiliate marketing on social media platforms such as TikTok can increase consumer trust in a product. Trust in affiliates and perceived usefulness are the main factors in encouraging impulse purchases. In this study, the majority of respondents stated that they were more likely to buy products recommended by an affiliate they trusted compared to conventional advertising.

### **4.3. The Influence of Flash Sale on Impulse Purchases**

Regression analysis shows that the Flash Sale variable has the most dominant influence on impulse purchases compared to other marketing strategies. This is evidenced by the calculated t value of 2.528, which is greater than the t table of 1.660, and the significance value (Sig.) of 0.013, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis H<sub>3</sub> is accepted, which means that Flash Sale has a significant effect on impulse purchases in Generation Z TikTok users. This finding is consistent with research conducted by Bih et al. (2023), which found that urgency-based strategies, such as Flash Sale, create psychological pressure that drives impulsive shopping behavior. In this study, the majority of respondents stated that they were motivated to buy products during the Flash Sale period because of time constraints and limited stock. This is in accordance with the theory of Kotler & Keller (2006), which states that urgency in marketing can accelerate the purchasing decision-making process.

### **4.4. Descriptive Analysis Results**

In addition to the results of multiple linear regression, this study also conducted a descriptive analysis to see how respondents assessed the effectiveness of each marketing strategy in influencing impulsive purchasing decisions. Descriptive analysis aims to determine the level of effectiveness of digital marketing strategies (Content Marketing, Affiliate Marketing and Flash Sale) and the intensity of impulsive purchases based on the average score of all respondents' answers.

**Table 10.** Descriptive Analysis Results

| <b>Variable</b>            | <b>Mean</b> |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Impulse buying</i>      | 16,45       |
| <i>Content marketing</i>   | 21,56       |
| <i>Affiliate marketing</i> | 21,69       |
| <i>Flash Sale</i>          | 16,54       |

Source: Primary data processing results, 2025

The results of the descriptive analysis show that Affiliate marketing has the highest average score (21.69), followed by Content marketing (21.56), and Flash Sale has the lowest average (16.54).

This shows that although the results of the hypothesis test show that Flash Sale has the most dominant influence statistically, respondents are more likely to rate Affiliate marketing as a more effective strategy in influencing impulsive purchasing decisions.

Thus, although Flash Sale is more dominant in regression, Affiliate marketing is superior in terms of consumer trust and preference, which can have a long-term impact on impulsive purchasing behavior. Therefore, the most optimal marketing strategy is not only relying on Flash Sale, but also integrating Affiliate marketing and Content marketing to create a stronger marketing effect.

#### 4.5. The Most Effective Variable

From the results of the regression analysis, it is known that the Flash Sale strategy has the most dominant influence on impulsive purchases, with a regression coefficient value ( $\beta$ ) of 0.275, which is higher than Content marketing ( $\beta = 0.216$ ) and Affiliate marketing ( $\beta = 0.239$ ). This shows that statistically, strategies based on urgency and stock scarcity are more effective in encouraging impulsive buying behavior. However, the results of the descriptive analysis show that Affiliate marketing has a higher level of trust in the eyes of respondents.

These results provide insight for business actors that Flash Sale is the most effective marketing strategy in encouraging impulsive purchases. However, to achieve optimal results, this strategy can be combined with Affiliate marketing and Content marketing, so that it can increase the level of consumer engagement and encourage higher impulsive purchases.

### 5. Conclusion

This study aims to test the effect of content marketing, affiliate marketing and flash sales on impulsive purchases of Generation Z TikTok users, using multiple linear regression analysis and partial t-test.

The results of the study show that content marketing has a positive and significant effect on impulsive purchases, with a calculated t value of  $2.132 > t$  table 1.660 and a significance of  $0.036 < 0.05$ . This means that an effective content marketing strategy increases the tendency of impulsive purchases. Affiliate marketing also has a positive and significant effect, with a calculated t value of  $2.143 > t$  table 1.660 and a significance of  $0.035 < 0.05$ . This shows that trust in affiliates drives impulsive purchases. Flash Sale has the most dominant effect on impulsive purchases, with a calculated t value of  $2.528 > t$  table 1.660 and a significance of  $0.013 < 0.05$ , proving its effectiveness through creating a sense of urgency and scarcity. Descriptive analysis shows that affiliate marketing received the highest average perception score from respondents (21.69), followed by Content marketing (21.56) and Flash Sale (16.54). Thus, although Flash Sale is more dominant statistically, affiliate marketing is more believed to be the most effective strategy. The optimal marketing strategy is to integrate flash sale, affiliate marketing, and content marketing to strengthen trust, engagement, and encourage long-term impulse buying.

## References

- [1]. Bakrie, U. (2024). Out of 3 social commerce in Indonesia, which one do you use often? Bakrie.ac.id. <https://bakrie.ac.id/articles/588-dari-3-social-commerce-di-indonesia-ini-mana-yang-sering-kamu-gunakan.html>
- [2]. Bih, A. K., Widarko, A., & Khalikussabir. (2023). The influence of shopping lifestyle, electronic word of mouth and flash sale on impulsive purchases on social commerce TikTok Shop (Case study on student users of TikTok Shop in Malang City). *E-Journal of Management Research*, 12(1), 1317–1324.
- [3]. Eliot Simangunsong. (2018). Generation-Z buying behavior in Indonesia: Opportunities for retail businesses. *MIX: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 8(2), 243–253.
- [4]. Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- [5]. Fateekha Lireeh, D., & Faizin, M. (2023). The influence of TikTok affiliate marketing and ease of application access on consumer impulse buying (Case study of young people in Ponorogo Regency). *Niqosiya: Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 3(2), 394–402. <https://doi.org/10.21154/niqosiya.v3i2.2543>
- [6]. Gianie. (2023). After “e-commerce”, “social commerce” appears. Kompas.id. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/riset/2023/04/27/setelah-e-commerce-muncul-social-commerce>
- [7]. Gunawan, N., Limantoro, S. D., Istijanto, I., Handoko, R., & Rustandi, F. U. (2021). Factors influencing consumer impulsive purchases on m-commerce. *Indonesian Branding Study*, 3(2), 172–192. <https://doi.org/10.21632/kbi.3.2.172-192>
- [8]. Gunelius, S. (2011). *Content marketing for dummies*. Wiley Publishing, Inc. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=AW-pB5YPV8oC>
- [9]. Kastenholz, C. (2022). Gen Z and the rise of social commerce. Forbes.com. <https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesagencycouncil/2021/05/17/gen-z-and-the-rise-of-social-commerce/>
- [10]. Kotler, P. T., & Armstrong, G. (2017). *Principles of marketing* (17th global ed.). Pearson. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00295839>
- [11]. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing management*. Pearson.
- [12]. Kurniawan, R. A., & Nugroho, R. H. (2024). The influence of content marketing, live streaming and flash sale on impulse buying of TikTok Shop application users in Surabaya: A study of users in 2022–2023. *Reslaj: Religion Education Social Laa Roiba Journal*, 6(4), 2367–2379. <https://doi.org/10.47467/reslaj.v6i4.1319>
- [13]. Mahendra Indriawan, B., & Hari Santoso, I. (2023). The influence of sales promotion, content marketing, and shopping lifestyle content creator TikTok on impulse buying decisions on Shopee e-commerce. *Jurnal Ekombis Review*, 11(1), 905–914. <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v11i1>
- [14]. Nainggolan, H., & Hastuti, D. (2023). *Marketing management (Implementation of marketing management in the industrial revolution 4.0 towards the era of society 5.0)* (Sepriano, Ed.). PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=MGuuEAAAQBAJ>
- [15]. Putri, G. M. L., & Hayu, R. (2024). The influence of affiliate marketing content, FYP algorithm, and e-WOM on TikTok social media on Generation Z purchasing decisions (Study on Generation Z in Indonesia). *COSTING: Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting*, 7(4), 10823–10833.
- [16]. Qothrunnada, K. (2024). What year is Gen Z? This is the range of birth years and their characteristics. Detik.com. <https://www.detik.com/edu/detikpedia/d-7436833/gen-z-itu-tahun-berapa-ini-rentang-tahun-kelahiran-dan-cirinya>
- [17]. Rahman, F. (2022). Affiliate marketing practices on e-commerce platforms in the review of Islamic economic law. *Istidlal: Journal of Islamic Economics and Law*, 6(1), 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.35316/istidlal.v6i1.407>
- [18]. RevoU. (2024). Affiliate marketing. Kominfo. <https://www.revou.co/kosakata/affiliate-marketing>
- [19]. Santika, E. F. (2023). The young group is the biggest user of TikTok, how old are they? Databoks.katadata.co.id. <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/media/statistik/3997760dd2e3fd3/kelompok-anak-muda-jadi-pengguna-terbesar-tiktok-usia-berapa-menye>
- [20]. Septiyani, S., & Hadi, E. D. (2024). The influence of flash sale, live streaming and hedonic shopping motivation on impulse buying (Study of Berrybenka product purchases on Shopee application users). *JESYA: Journal of Economics and Sharia Economics*, 7(1), 970–980. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v7i1.1505>