

CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Data Screening

Before the main analysis, a data screening process was conducted to ensure that only relevant respondents were included in the study. The screening was designed to select participants whose experiences matched the research topic.

To pass the screening, respondents had to meet these requirements:

- They must be active social media users.
- They must have bought a product within the past 6 months.
- They must state what product they bought.
- They must indicate that their purchase was influenced by friends, reviews, or online content.

Using Google Forms to collect the data, there were a total of 227 Respondents exceeding the minimum sample size of 95 - 190.

Table 2 - Respondent Summary

	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Total Respondents	227	100%
Failed Screening	67	29.5%
Passed Screening	160	70.5%

4.2 Respondent Profile

The respondents of the questionnaire were individuals who are active social media users and have purchased a product within the last six months. They were selected because they have experience with online content, reviews, or recommendations that may influence purchasing decisions. These respondents are considered suitable for this study because they are relevant to the variables being examined, namely peer groups, electronic word of mouth (eWOM), fear of missing out (FOMO), and purchase decision.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

This section presents the mean and standard deviation for all indicators related to Peer Groups, eWOM, FOMO, and Purchase Decision. The descriptive statistics help give a general idea of how respondents perceived each variable as a whole.

The results show that eWOM and Purchase Decision generally recorded higher mean values compared to FOMO and Peer Groups. For the Peer Groups variable, mean values ranged from 3.400 to 3.837, which suggests that respondents moderately agreed that peer groups influence their purchasing behavior. PG4 recorded the highest mean at 3.837, while PG3 had the lowest at 3.400. The standard deviation ranged from 1.100 to 1.236, pointing to a moderate level of variation in how respondents answered.

For eWOM, mean values ranged from 3.625 to 4.200, reflecting relatively high agreement among respondents on the influence of online reviews and recommendations on purchasing decisions. eWOM4 had the highest mean at 4.200, followed closely by eWOM1 at 4.181, while eWOM6 had the lowest at 3.625. The standard deviation for eWOM ranged from 0.774 to 1.100, which was lower compared to the other variables. This suggests that respondents were more consistent in their views on how eWOM affects their purchasing decisions.

The FOMO variable recorded mean values ranging from 3.038 to 3.625, indicating moderate levels of Fear of Missing Out among respondents. FOMO5 had the highest mean at 3.625, while FOMO3 recorded the lowest at 3.038. FOMO also showed the highest standard deviation range among all variables, from 1.177 to 1.482, which means respondents differed quite a bit in how strongly they experienced anxiety or concern about missing out on trends or opportunities.

For Purchase Decision, mean values ranged from 4.006 to 4.375, which were the highest across all variables, indicating that respondents generally showed strong purchase decision tendencies. PD2 had the highest mean at 4.375, reflecting strong agreement on willingness to make purchases, while PD3 had the lowest at 4.006. The standard deviation ranged from 0.820 to 0.997, suggesting that respondents were fairly consistent in their responses for this variable.

Overall, the descriptive statistics show that respondents agreed most strongly with statements related to eWOM and Purchase Decision, which suggests that online recommendations and digital interactions play an important role in shaping purchasing behavior. FOMO, on the other hand, showed the most varied responses, indicating that not all respondents experience the fear of missing out at the same level.

Table 3 - Descriptive Statistics

Interpretation Scale:

Mean Range	Interpretation
1.00 - 1.80	Very Low
1.81 - 2.60	Low
2.61 - 3.40	Moderate
3.41 - 4.20	High
4.21 - 5.00	Very High

Variable	Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Peer Groups	PG 1	3.731	1.160	High
	PG 2	3.788	1.180	High
	PG 3	3.400	1.236	Moderate
	PG 4	3.837	1.100	High
eWOM	eWOM 1	4.181	0.774	High
	eWOM 2	4.106	0.826	High

	eWOM 3	3.994	0.884	High
	eWOM 4	4.200	0.835	High
	eWOM 5	3.962	0.928	High
	eWOM 6	3.625	1.100	High
FOMO	FOMO 1	3.062	1.268	Moderate
	FOMO 2	3.062	1.482	Moderate
	FOMO 3	3.038	1.414	Moderate
	FOMO 4	3.425	1.287	High
	FOMO 5	3.625	1.177	High
	FOMO 6	3.388	1.470	Moderate
Purchase Decision	PD 1	4.112	0.901	High
	PD 2	4.375	0.820	Very High
	PD 3	4.006	0.997	High

4.4 Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model assessment was conducted to evaluate the validity and reliability of the constructs used in this study. According to Hair et al. (2019), the measurement model in PLS-SEM is assessed through convergent validity, internal consistency reliability, and discriminant validity. The evaluation includes examining outer loadings, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability (CR), Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

4.4.1 Outer Loadings

Table 4 - Outer Loadings

	FOMO	Peer Groups	Purchase Decision	eWOM
FOMO 1	0.859			
FOMO 2	0.902			
FOMO 3	0.882			
FOMO 4	0.883			
FOMO 5	0.842			
FOMO 6	0.882			
PG 1		0.824		
PG 2		0.863		
PG 3		0.808		
PG 4		0.819		
PD 1			0.890	
PD 2			0.843	

PD 3			0.892	
eWOM 1				0.649
eWOM 2				0.747
eWOM 3				0.711
eWOM 4				0.765
eWOM 5				0.843
eWOM 6				0.837

The outer loading results show how strongly each indicator is connected to its corresponding construct. According to Hair et al. (2019), an outer loading value of 0.70 or above is considered acceptable because it means the indicator explains at least 50% of the variance of the construct. In this study, most indicators met this threshold, which shows that the indicators reliably represent their respective constructs.

For the Peer Groups construct, all indicators had loading values between 0.808 and 0.863. PG2 came in with the highest loading at 0.863, making it the strongest indicator for this construct, while PG3 had the lowest at 0.808, though it still passed the recommended threshold. Overall, these results suggest that all Peer Groups indicators are consistently measuring the influence of peer groups on consumer behavior.

For eWOM, loading values ranged from 0.649 to 0.843. Most indicators were above the 0.70 threshold, which is acceptable. However, eWOM1 recorded a loading of 0.649, which is slightly below the ideal cut-off. Even so, the indicator was kept in the model because it was still above the minimum acceptable level of 0.60 and did not negatively affect the overall reliability and AVE of the eWOM construct. Hair et al. (2019) also note that indicators with loadings between 0.40 and 0.70 can be retained as long as they contribute to the content validity of the construct.

For the FOMO construct, all indicators had very strong loading values ranging from 0.842 to 0.902. FOMO2 recorded the highest loading at 0.902, which means it is the

strongest representation of the Fear of Missing Out feeling among respondents. The consistently high values across all FOMO indicators suggest that they are measuring the same underlying concept well.

For the Purchase Decision construct, loading values ranged from 0.843 to 0.892. PD3 had the highest loading at 0.892, followed closely by PD1 at 0.890, both of which strongly represent respondents' purchase decision behavior. These results confirm that the indicators are a good fit for measuring purchase decision in this study.

Overall, the outer loading results show that the indicators in this study have satisfactory reliability. Since most loading values exceeded the recommended threshold and all constructs had acceptable AVE and Composite Reliability values, all indicators were kept for the structural model analysis.

4.4.2 Internal Consistency Reliability and Convergent Validity

Table 5 - Reliability and Convergent Validity

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
FOMO	0.939	0.942	0.951	0.766
Peer Groups	0.848	0.848	0.898	0.687
Purchase Decision	0.847	0.855	0.908	0.766
eWOM	0.857	0.885	0.892	0.580

This section assesses the reliability and validity of the constructs used in this study. Internal consistency reliability looks at how consistently the indicators of a construct measure the same concept, while convergent validity checks whether the indicators of

a construct are closely related to one another. According to Hair et al. (2019), internal consistency reliability is measured using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability (CR), where values above 0.70 are considered acceptable. Convergent validity is measured using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where values above 0.50 mean that the construct explains more than half of the variance of its indicators.

Starting with Cronbach's Alpha, all constructs in this study recorded values above the 0.70 threshold, ranging from 0.847 to 0.939. FOMO had the highest Cronbach's Alpha at 0.939, which shows excellent consistency among its indicators. Peer Groups and Purchase Decision both came in above 0.84, also reflecting strong reliability. The eWOM construct recorded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.857, which confirms that its indicators are consistently measuring the concept of electronic word of mouth.

For Composite Reliability, all constructs also exceeded the 0.70 threshold, with values ranging from 0.892 to 0.951. Once again, FOMO recorded the highest CR value at 0.951, showing very strong internal consistency. Purchase Decision followed with a CR of 0.908, while Peer Groups and eWOM recorded values of 0.898 and 0.892. These results confirm that all constructs are reliable enough for further analysis.

In terms of convergent validity, all constructs recorded AVE values above the 0.50 threshold, ranging from 0.580 to 0.766. FOMO and Purchase Decision both had the highest AVE at 0.766, meaning their indicators explain a large proportion of the variance within each construct. Peer Groups recorded an AVE of 0.687, while eWOM had the lowest AVE at 0.580. Although eWOM had the lowest value among the four constructs, it still passed the minimum threshold, which means its convergent validity is still acceptable.

Overall, all constructs in this study met the recommended thresholds for Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, and AVE as suggested by Hair et al. (2019). This means the measurement model is considered reliable and valid, and can be used for the structural model analysis.

4.4.3 Discriminant Validity

Table 6 - HTMT (Matrix)

	FOMO	Peer Groups	Purchase Decision	eWOM
FOMO				
Peer Groups	0.827			
Purchase Decision	0.530	0.576		
eWOM	0.525	0.537	0.665	

Discriminant validity was tested to check whether each construct in the research model is different enough from the other constructs. Basically, it looks at whether the indicators of one construct are measuring something different from what the other constructs are measuring. According to Hair et al. (2019), discriminant validity can be checked using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT), where values below 0.90 are considered acceptable. The lower the HTMT value, the more distinct the constructs are from one another.

The results show that all HTMT values in this study were below the 0.90 threshold, which means all constructs have acceptable discriminant validity. The highest HTMT value was between Peer Groups and FOMO at 0.827. Even though this is a relatively high value compared to the others, it still falls below the threshold, meaning that Peer Groups and FOMO are still considered distinct from each other. This makes sense within the framework of this study, where peer groups are treated as an external social factor while FOMO is an internal psychological response.

The HTMT value between Purchase Decision and eWOM was 0.665, which reflects a moderate relationship between the two while still showing sufficient discriminant validity. The remaining HTMT values, which were between FOMO and Purchase Decision (0.530), Peer Groups and Purchase Decision (0.576), and eWOM and

FOMO (0.525), were all well below the threshold. This confirms that each construct is measuring its own unique concept within the model. The generally low HTMT values also suggest that respondents were able to tell the difference between social influence factors, psychological responses, and behavioral outcomes. For example, respondents saw Peer Groups and eWOM as two different types of social influence, while FOMO and Purchase Decision were seen as separate psychological and behavioral concepts. This is important because it shows that the variables in this study are not measuring the same things and each one contributes something different to explaining consumer behavior.

Overall, the HTMT results confirm that all constructs in this study have satisfactory discriminant validity. Since all values were below the 0.90 threshold, the constructs can be considered distinct from one another and suitable for the structural model analysis. This also means that the measurement model is valid and that each variable represents a different concept within the proposed framework.

4.5 Structural Model Assessment

The structural model assessment was carried out to look at the relationships between the constructs and to test the hypotheses proposed in this study. According to Hair et al. (2019), the structural model in PLS-SEM is evaluated by looking at path coefficients, t-statistics, p-values, coefficient of determination (R^2), and mediation analysis through specific indirect effects. Bootstrapping was also used to check whether the relationships between variables are statistically significant. In this study, a hypothesis is considered supported when the p-value is below 0.05 and the t-statistic is above 1.96.

4.5.1 Collinearity Assessment

Table 7 - Inner VIF Values

	FOMO	Peer Groups	Purchase Decision	eWOM
FOMO			2.409	
Peer Groups	1.291		2.314	
Purchase Decision				
eWOM	1.291		1.384	

Collinearity assessment was done to check whether the predictor constructs in the structural model are too highly correlated with one another. According to Hair et al. (2019), collinearity can be checked using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), where values below 5.0 mean that collinearity is not a concern, and values below 3.0 are considered ideal.

The results show that all Inner VIF values in this study were below the 5.0 threshold. For the FOMO construct, both Peer Groups and eWOM recorded VIF values of 1.291, which is very low and indicates that these two variables do not strongly overlap when it comes to explaining FOMO.

For the Purchase Decision construct, VIF values ranged from 1.384 to 2.409. FOMO had the highest VIF at 2.409, followed by Peer Groups at 2.314 and eWOM at 1.384. Even though FOMO and Peer Groups had relatively higher VIF values compared to eWOM, all values were still well below the 5.0 threshold, meaning there are no serious collinearity issues in the structural model.

Overall, the Inner VIF results show that the predictor constructs are independent enough from one another and do not cause multicollinearity problems in the model. This means the structural model is suitable for hypothesis testing and further interpretation.

4.5.2 Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing

Table 8 - Path Coefficients

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values
eWOM -> FOMO	0.197	0.196	0.064	3.083	0.002
eWOM -> PD	0.428	0.431	0.095	4.522	0.000
FOMO -> PD	0.111	0.114	0.112	0.985	0.325
PG -> FOMO	0.652	0.654	0.049	13.285	0.000
PG -> PD	0.206	0.205	0.110	1.883	0.060

The results show that Peer Groups have a positive and significant effect on FOMO ($\beta = 0.652$, $t = 13.285$, $p = 0.000$). Since the p-value is below 0.05 and the t-statistic is above 1.96, H1 is supported. This means that the stronger the influence from peer groups, the more likely consumers are to feel Fear of Missing Out. The high path coefficient also shows that Peer Groups are the strongest predictor of FOMO in this study, suggesting that consumers are more likely to experience FOMO when they are influenced by the people around them.

The results also show that eWOM has a positive and significant effect on FOMO ($\beta = 0.197$, $t = 3.083$, $p = 0.002$), meaning H2 is supported. This means that online reviews, recommendations, and discussions can increase consumers' feelings of missing out on products or experiences. That said, the effect of eWOM on FOMO is noticeably weaker than that of Peer Groups, as seen from the smaller path coefficient. Still, the findings confirm that online social interaction does play a part in triggering FOMO among consumers.

On the other hand, the relationship between FOMO and Purchase Decision was found to be positive but not significant ($\beta = 0.111$, $t = 0.985$, $p = 0.325$). Since the p-value is above 0.05 and the t-statistic is below 1.96, H3 is not supported. This means that even though respondents may experience Fear of Missing Out, it does not necessarily push them toward making a purchase. A possible reason for this is that consumers may still weigh other factors such as product usefulness, price, or personal preference before actually deciding to buy something.

The direct relationship between Peer Groups and Purchase Decision was also found to be positive but not significant ($\beta = 0.206$, $t = 1.883$, $p = 0.060$), so H4 is not supported. While peer influence may spark interest in a product, it does not appear to be strong enough on its own to directly drive purchasing decisions. This suggests that even though consumers may be socially or emotionally affected by their peers, they still tend to make purchasing decisions on their own terms.

For eWOM and Purchase Decision, the results show a positive and significant effect ($\beta = 0.428$, $t = 4.522$, $p = 0.000$), meaning H5 is supported. This indicates that online reviews, recommendations, and consumer discussions play a significant role in influencing purchasing decisions. Among all the variables that affect Purchase Decision, eWOM showed the strongest direct effect, which suggests that consumers heavily rely on information and opinions shared online before deciding to buy a product.

Overall, the structural model results show that both Peer Groups and eWOM significantly influence FOMO, while only eWOM has a significant direct effect on Purchase Decision. FOMO, on the other hand, did not significantly influence Purchase Decision in this study.

4.5.3 Coefficient Determination (R^2)

Table 9 - R^2 Values

	R-square	R-square adjusted
FOMO	0.585	0.581
Purchase Decision	0.404	0.396

The coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to measure how well the structural model predicts the endogenous constructs. According to Hair et al. (2019), the R^2 value shows how much of the variance in an endogenous construct can be explained by its predictor constructs. As a general guide, R^2 values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 are described as substantial, moderate, and weak respectively.

The R^2 value for FOMO was 0.585, which means that Peer Groups and eWOM together explain 58.5% of the variance in FOMO. This falls under the moderate category, suggesting that both variables have a reasonably good ability to predict consumers' feelings of Fear of Missing Out. The remaining 41.5% of the variance may come from other factors that were not included in this study.

For Purchase Decision, the R^2 value was 0.404, meaning that Peer Groups, eWOM, and FOMO together explain 40.4% of the variance in Purchase Decision. This also falls under the moderate category, though it suggests that a large portion of what influences purchase decisions, around 59.6%, may still come from other variables outside the scope of this study, such as price, product quality, brand image, personal preference, or financial factors.

The adjusted R^2 values were slightly lower than the R^2 values for both constructs, with FOMO recording 0.581 and Purchase Decision recording 0.396. The small difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 values suggests that the model is fairly stable and is not significantly overestimating its predictive power.

Overall, the R^2 results show that the structural model has a moderate level of explanatory power. Peer Groups and eWOM are meaningful predictors of FOMO,

while all three variables, Peer Groups, eWOM, and FOMO, collectively contribute to explaining consumers' Purchase Decision.

4.5.4 Effect Size (f^2)

Table 10 - f^2 Values

	FOMO	Peer Groups	Purchase Decision	eWOM
FOMO			0.009	
Peer Groups	0.792		0.031	
Purchase Decision				
eWOM	0.072		0.222	®

Effect size (f^2) was assessed to find out how strongly each predictor construct affects the endogenous constructs in the structural model. According to Hair et al. (2019), f^2 values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 indicate small, medium, and large effect sizes respectively. This analysis helps show how much each predictor construct actually contributes to explaining the dependent construct.

The results show that Peer Groups had a large effect on FOMO, with an f^2 value of 0.792. This means that Peer Groups make a very strong contribution to explaining consumers' feelings of Fear of Missing Out, which suggests that the influence of friends and social groups plays a major role in developing FOMO among respondents.

For eWOM on FOMO, the f^2 value was 0.072, which falls under the small effect size category. Even though eWOM was found to significantly influence FOMO, its contribution is much weaker compared to Peer Groups. This means that while online reviews and recommendations do play a part in triggering FOMO, they do not have nearly as strong an impact as direct peer influence.

When it comes to Purchase Decision, eWOM recorded an f^2 value of 0.222, which indicates a medium effect size. This shows that eWOM makes a meaningful

contribution to consumers' purchase decisions, and that consumers rely quite a bit on online opinions, reviews, and recommendations when deciding whether to buy something.

Peer Groups, on the other hand, showed a small effect on Purchase Decision with an f^2 value of 0.031. This suggests that even though peer groups influence consumers socially, their direct contribution to actual purchasing decisions is relatively weak. In a similar way, FOMO recorded an f^2 value of 0.009 on Purchase Decision, which indicates no meaningful effect. This is consistent with the earlier hypothesis testing results, where FOMO was also found not to significantly influence Purchase Decision.

Overall, the effect size results show that Peer Groups are the strongest predictor of FOMO, while eWOM has the strongest contribution toward Purchase Decision. FOMO, on the other hand, had only a very minimal effect on purchase decisions in this study.

4.6 Mediation Analysis

Table 11 - Specific Indirect Effects

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P value
PG -> FOMO -> PD	0.072	0.074	0.075	0.969	0.333
eWOM -> FOMO -> PD	0.022	0.023	0.025	0.871	0.384

Mediation analysis was done to check whether FOMO mediates the relationship between Peer Groups and Purchase Decision, as well as between eWOM and Purchase Decision. The mediation effect was tested using the Specific Indirect Effects from the bootstrapping results. According to Hair et al. (2019), mediation is considered to exist when the indirect effect is statistically significant, which means the p-value needs to be below 0.05 and the t-statistic needs to be above 1.96.

The results show that the indirect effect of Peer Groups on Purchase Decision through FOMO was positive but not significant ($\beta = 0.072$, $t = 0.969$, $p = 0.333$). Since the p-value was above 0.05 and the t-statistic was below 1.96, the mediation effect was not supported. This means that even though Peer Groups significantly influence FOMO, FOMO does not significantly carry that influence forward to affect Purchase Decision.

In the same way, the indirect effect of eWOM on Purchase Decision through FOMO was also positive but not significant ($\beta = 0.022$, $t = 0.871$, $p = 0.384$), meaning FOMO does not mediate the relationship between eWOM and Purchase Decision either. Even though eWOM significantly affects FOMO, the level of FOMO triggered was not strong enough to then significantly affect consumers' purchase decisions.

These findings suggest that FOMO does not play a meaningful mediating role in this study. Consumers may feel Fear of Missing Out because of peer influence or online recommendations, but those feelings do not necessarily push them to make an actual purchase. This could be because consumers still take other things into account before buying, such as price, product usefulness, financial ability, or personal preference.

Overall, the mediation analysis shows that FOMO does not significantly mediate the relationship between the social influence variables and Purchase Decision. As a result, the indirect effects proposed in this study were not supported.

4.7 Discussions and Findings

4.7.1 The Effect of Peer Groups on FOMO

The results of this study showed that Peer Groups have a positive and significant effect on FOMO. Therefore, H1 was supported. This indicates that consumers are more likely to experience Fear of Missing Out when they are influenced by their friends or social groups. The findings suggest that individuals tend to compare themselves with others and feel pressured when they see people around them purchasing or discussing certain products.

This finding is consistent with the S-O-R framework, where Peer Groups act as the stimulus that affects consumers' internal psychological state, represented by FOMO. The result also supports previous studies which found that social influence and peer interaction can trigger feelings of anxiety about missing out on experiences or opportunities enjoyed by others (Dwisuardinata & Darma, 2023; Bui et al., 2025).

In today's digital environment, consumers are constantly exposed to their peers' activities through social media and online communication platforms. Seeing friends purchase trending products or share positive experiences may increase consumers' desire to keep up with others, which eventually triggers FOMO. This explains why Peer Groups recorded the strongest effect on FOMO in this study.

4.7.2 The Effect of eWOM on FOMO

The findings also revealed that eWOM has a positive and significant effect on FOMO. Thus, H2 was supported. This indicates that online reviews, recommendations, ratings, and discussions can increase consumers' feelings of Fear of Missing Out.

The result supports previous studies which suggested that electronic word-of-mouth influences consumers' emotions and perceptions by exposing them to information about products and experiences shared by other users (Putri et al., 2024; Ardianti & Sofyan, 2024). When consumers repeatedly encounter positive reviews or trending

discussions online, they may feel concerned about missing opportunities to own or experience the product themselves.

From the perspective of the S-O-R framework, eWOM acts as an external stimulus that influences consumers' internal emotional response. However, compared to Peer Groups, the effect of eWOM on FOMO was weaker. One possible explanation is that consumers may trust direct influence from friends and close social groups more than opinions shared online by unknown users.

Nevertheless, the findings confirm that online communication and digital interaction remain important factors in shaping consumers' psychological responses in modern consumer behavior.

4.7.3 The Effect of FOMO on Purchase Decision

The results showed that FOMO does not have a significant effect on Purchase Decision. Therefore, H3 was not supported. Although consumers may experience feelings of Fear of Missing Out, these feelings do not necessarily lead directly to purchasing decisions.

This finding differs from several previous studies which found that FOMO positively influences consumer purchasing behavior (Putri et al., 2024; Ardianti & Sofyan, 2024). One possible explanation is that consumers in this study may still make rational considerations before purchasing products, such as evaluating product usefulness, price, financial capability, and personal needs.

Another possible reason is that not all products are highly associated with FOMO. Certain products may not create enough urgency or emotional attachment to encourage immediate purchasing behavior. As a result, consumers may experience FOMO emotionally but still choose not to purchase the product.

From the S-O-R perspective, although the organism component (FOMO) was successfully triggered by social influence, the emotional response was not strong enough to produce a significant behavioral response in the form of Purchase Decision.

4.7.4 The Effect of Peer Groups on Purchase Decision

The findings indicated that Peer Groups do not have a significant direct effect on Purchase Decision. Thus, H4 was not supported. Although peer influence may increase consumers' awareness and interest in products, it does not directly determine whether consumers will make a purchase.

One possible explanation is that consumers today are more independent and selective when making purchasing decisions. Even though they are influenced socially by friends or social groups, they may still evaluate products based on personal preferences and practical considerations before deciding to buy.

This finding suggests that social pressure alone may not be sufficient to directly influence purchase decisions. Instead, peer influence may mainly affect consumers emotionally, such as by creating interest or curiosity, rather than directly encouraging purchasing behavior.

The result also implies that consumers may rely more on information quality and online reviews rather than solely following their peers' behavior when making purchasing decisions.

4.7.5 The Effect of eWOM on Purchase Decision

The results showed that eWOM has a positive and significant effect on Purchase Decision. Therefore, H5 was supported. This finding indicates that online reviews, recommendations, and discussions strongly influence consumers' purchasing decisions.

Among all variables affecting Purchase Decision, eWOM demonstrated the strongest direct effect. This suggests that consumers highly rely on online information when evaluating products before making purchases. Positive reviews, ratings, and recommendations from other users may increase consumers' confidence and reduce uncertainty during the purchasing process.

This finding is consistent with previous studies which found that electronic word-of-mouth significantly affects consumer trust, product evaluation, and purchase intention (Dwisuardinata & Darma, 2023; Sundava, 2025). In the digital era, consumers are increasingly dependent on online information because it is easily accessible and provides insights from other users' experiences.

From the S-O-R perspective, eWOM acts as a strong external stimulus that directly influences consumers' behavioral responses. The result highlights the important role of digital communication and online consumer interaction in shaping modern purchasing behavior.

4.7.6 The Mediating Role of FOMO

The mediation analysis showed that FOMO does not significantly mediate the relationships between Peer Groups and Purchase Decision, as well as between eWOM and Purchase Decision. This means that although social influence variables significantly affect FOMO, FOMO itself does not significantly translate into purchasing behavior.

The findings suggest that consumers may experience emotional pressure or anxiety about missing out, but these feelings alone are not enough to directly influence purchasing decisions. Consumers may still consider other important factors such as product value, affordability, necessity, and personal preference before deciding to purchase a product.

This result indicates that FOMO may function more as an emotional reaction rather than a direct driver of consumer purchasing behavior in this study. Therefore, the mediating role of FOMO was not supported within the proposed research model.