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Are you “in” or are you “out”?: Impact of FoMO (Fear of Missing Out) on Generation Z’s Masstige-brand Apparel Consumption
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Abstract: This research explored the effect of fear of missing out (FoMO) on Generation Z’s consumption behavior of masstige brand apparel. Partial least squares – structural equation modeling was used in this study. This study used random sampling to select 307 respondents in the target age group of 16–27 from De La Salle University. In the overall framework, results showed that FoMO affected motivation (with p-values ≤ 0.05). Furthermore, FoMO significantly affected the belief-based constructs of Theory of Planned Behavior, except for behavior and perceived behavioral control. The study suggests that marketers should strive to develop strategies and FoMO appeals that manipulate Generation Z consumers’ motivation to purchase masstige brand apparel. This present study shows that the construct of FoMO affects the deliberative process of the purchasing behavior of Generation Z consumers. Furthermore, the study leads the way for further study in the concept of FoMO.
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Technological advancement is still very much evident in the current zeitgeist. As technology continues to advance, consumer decisions and purchasing behaviors proactively change as a response to the proliferation of modern tools such as social media. As of January 2017, people in the Philippines alone spend 4 hours and 17 minutes per day on socializing, sharing, and communicating on social media with components of their social network (Kemp, 2017). According to Simon Kemp (2017), even though search engines like Google are still leading in assisting consumers in their pre-purchase behavior, social media is slated to rival search engines for discovery, especially among younger buyers. It is in this aspect where social media increasingly provides many forms of social information.

Firms, therefore, have to find important factors that affect consumer behavior to generate revenue. One of these factors that have become prevalent in these current times of social media use is the phenomenon that has been termed “fear of missing out” or FoMO. It is defined as a “pervasive apprehension that others might be having rewarding experiences from which one is absent, FoMO is characterized by the desire to stay continually connected with what others are doing” (Przybylski et al., 2013, p. 1841). Fueled by efficient access to real-time information brought about by these social media networks, FoMO has seen increased
interest and writing from academics who are trying to address this phenomenon.

As part of understanding the effects of FoMO, the present research applies an integration of motivation and belief-based perspective in the form of the self-determination theory (SDT) and the theory of planned behavior (TPB). The research would allow a deeper understanding of FoMO and explore its motivational and behavioral correlates.

**Theoretical Framework: Integrated Theoretical Model of the Psychosocial Determinants of Health-Related Behavior**

In this integrated theoretical model are three conceptual bases. Firstly, people pull from the motivational variables defined by SDT when they make judgments that are belief-based in the TPB. Secondly, according to Hagger et al. (2012), “motivational orientations from self-determination theory reflect an individual’s perceived motivational orientation in a given context, while the theory of planned behavior constructs reflect an individual’s expectancies regarding future behavioral engagement” (p. 383). From this construct, it can be expected that there is a higher possibility that consumers who participate in a specific behavior because of self-determined reasons will form attitudes and control perceptions that are consistent with their motivational orientations and will consequently shape intentions, which will see them performing a behavior that fulfills the individual’s motives. Lastly, the SDT motivational orientations need to be conveyed into intentions towards specific behaviors that aid the objective and results consistent with their motivational orientation (Elliot, McGregor, & Thrash, 2002). Therefore, intentions show the desire of an individual to undertake a specific behavior because of the stimulation of their motivational orientations from SDT.

The integrated model created by Hagger et al. (2012) establishes a motivational series in which the belief-based factors of the theory of planned behavior, which are attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral controls, mediates the outcomes of autonomous motives from SDT on intentions and actual behavior.

Literatures that want to identify the psychosocial antecedents of behavior have often limited their method to single theories or explanatory systems. According to Hagger (2009), such techniques may be limited for two reasons: redundancy and limited scope. Studies that employ a single-theory approach do not solve the superfluity in the indicators of behavior, such as factors that have a similar meaning but have labels that are different from each other. Furthermore, the scope is narrow for the amalgamation of various approaches to complement the explanation of the behavioral phenomena under scrutiny. Hagger et al. (2012) viewed theoretical synthesis as highly valued because “it contributes to the development of comprehensive yet parsimonious explanations of health behavior” (p. 381). In other words, combining theories could explain the different factors and processes that influence behavior more comprehensively.

In relation to the theoretical framework that this research is grounded on, researchers have tested the integration of SDT and TPB because it explained the processes that underlie motivated behavior (e.g., Ntoumanis, 2001; Sarrazin et al., 2002; Standage, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2003; Wilson & Rodgers, 2004). Several researchers have put forward that organismic theories of motivation, like self-determination theory, has the potential to present answers to where social cognitive theory constructs originated from (Andersen et al., 2000; Deci & Ryan, 1985). The synthesis is grounded on the connection between autonomous motivation and the beliefs that support the direct antecedents of intentions: attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

Ajzen (1985) put forward that attitudes and perceived behavioral control consist of beliefs that certain outcomes are caused by a behavior that is under that individual’s control. Nevertheless, like many social cognitive theories, TPB is unclear in why these beliefs are pursued (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The theory does not differentiate beliefs about outcomes that are self-determined (the individual chooses to pursue and are relevant to their passion) and non-self-determined (outcomes that individuals feel forced to do because of a sense of obligation). Beliefs about outcomes can either be interpreted as either self-determined (autonomous) or non-self-determined (controlled) reasons for engaging in a behavior.

For example, in the scenario of exercising to decrease weight, many people exercising to decrease their weight may be autonomous because they want to be healthy, and for them, it is a personally relevant goal. Thus, there is a higher probability that they will
actively seek opportunities to exercise to decrease weight. On the other hand, there is a low possibility that individuals who want to decrease their weight just to look good for others may pursue exercise to lose weight or may even steer clear of it because it is an external reinforcement. Therefore, SDT explains how these beliefs about outcomes can be explained as autonomous or controlling. The theory implies that motivation to participate in behaviors for autonomous or controlled motives influences people to shape beliefs consistent with these motives.

Hagger and Chatzisarantis’ (2009) meta-analysis of 34 studies integrating the TPB and SDT supported the theoretical integration and proposed motivational sequence. Results from the path analysis showed that autonomous motivation has a significant effect on the direct predictors of intention, particularly on attitudes and perceived behavioral control. Furthermore, the research showed a significant indirect effect of autonomous motivation on intentions through the mediation of the predictors of intention. This supported the theory that self-determined motives toward behaviors are related to individuals presenting attitudes and perceptions of control that are consistent with those motives. Previous theorists like Vallerand (2007) supported the relationship by clearly suggesting that autonomous motivation will predict cognitive beliefs regarding a target behavior.

**Generation Z**

Generation Z definitions vary according to the source. However, in a Euromonitor International (2011) report, they are defined as today’s group of tweens and teenagers who were born between 1991 to 2002. Other terms for Generation Z include “iGeneration,” “post-millennials,” or “net generation” because they have been born in the digital world with computers, mobile and gaming devices, and the Internet (Westlund, 2010). This generation needs to talk, get connected, and feel a sense of belonging to a set of peer groups. They read about fashion trends, electronic gadgets, video games, online games, and music in order to get that sense of belonging (Swain, 2007). In addition, they also discuss clothing and apparel with their social group. Complemented by their access to credit cards and high amounts of allowances from their parents, they tend to be highly brand conscious and loyal to brands they consider “cool,” as they do not like to compromise on the coolest product in comparison with their social group (Euromonitor, 2011). Friends have a significant influence on the purchase decision of this generation (Jain et al., 2014).

Generation Z individuals are conservative when it comes to their characteristics, lifestyles, and attitudes. They are more likely to comply with rules, standards, or laws, which means that they are less likely to engage in risks. This generation is more mindful of consequences and tends to be more responsible. Generation Z consumers check their behavior rather than expect other people to be there (Labi, 2008).

In addition, Generation Z consumers think independently when it comes to their life. This generation does not need guidance from gathering information on the Internet. They can visualize themselves changing places with others and project possible behaviors. They believe that they can change the world and make an impact on it. Generation Z consumers are confident and are adept at being optimistic (Langford, 2008; Simon, 2009; Benjamin, 2008). It has been observed by Euromonitor (2011), that Generation Z consumers are highly independent and self-centered; they live according to their own definition instead of relying on the ideas of people around them.

**Masstige Consumption**

Silverstein and Fiske (2003) defined “masstige luxuries” as the products that are subject to a luxury buying behavior, which is located at the convergence of exclusivity and mass consumption. Masstige or mass prestige goods command a premium over conventional products while still being priced well below super-premium or old-luxury goods. The term “masstige brands” explicitly shows its basic idea of brands offering prestige to the masses. Some researchers also use the term “new luxury” or “mass luxury” to classify these brands (Kapferer & Bastien, 2009). This type of behavior attracts a large number of consumers because they are attracted by the idea of luxurious living. Silverstein and Fiske (2003) named Coach, Godiva, Starbucks, and Victoria’s Secret as some of the brands that are masstige. Research by Truong et al. (2009) found that Ralph Lauren and Calvin Klein were considered as masstige brands.

Due to globalization and the sequential increase in wealth, developing rich market segments (Chow et al., 2001), and expansion of overseas travel, consumers of luxury goods are no longer boxed to the
traditional affluent elites. Included in the category of luxury consumers are younger, well-paid, modern, and extravagant people (Twitchell, 2003). Consumers are attracted to luxury goods because of many reasons. One of the key reasons is because of the symbolism that they fix unto them instead of the product attributes per se (Berthon et al., 2009; Han et al., 2010). To fuel consumption, brands that offer luxury goods leverage these particular meanings and themes.

Research has shown that luxury good is unique, rare, and not easily obtained by the masses (Dubois & Paternault, 1995). However, experimental observations in markets of luxury brands have shown that many are making their goods more accessible (Catry, 2003; Okonkwo, 2009). These brands want to seem exclusive and, at the same time, increase brand awareness and profits. To describe this phenomenon of expansion of luxury markets, researchers have used terms such as “democratization of luxury” (Kapferer, 2006; Rémaury, 2002) and “mass affluence” (Nunes et al., 2004).

Fear of Missing Out

Herman (2011) defined FoMO as an “emotional reaction resulting from the attitude of holding having options open to us - in high regard” (para. 12). According to him, three factors result in the FoMO experience: (1) the awareness of the consumer that there are a plethora of attractive options to choose from; (2) the consumer’s conceived ability to use up as many of the options that the consumer would like to; and (3) the conceived ability to exhaust the consumer’s reference group. If the consumer’s conceived ability to exhaust their option is low relative to their reference group, the consumer will create perceptions of what they are missing. These conceived perceptions create the phenomenon of FoMO. Simply put, FoMO is based on the fear of missing out on whatever things because the consumer has some form of barrier preventing them from pursuing it.

Przybylski et al. (2013) addressed FoMO psychologically by developing the FoMO scale (FoMOS), which accurately measures the intensity of the fear of missing out construct. A theoretical resource for the development of the FoMOS uses SDT by Deci and Ryan (1985), which addresses the relationship of the satisfaction of basic needs with individual wellness. SDT differentiates between self-determined and non-self-determined forms of motivation. The former, also called autonomous motivation, comprises of personally satisfying relevant goals via intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. By contrast, the latter, also called controlled motivation, consists of external regulation that cogitates engaging in a behavior because of getting a reward or avoiding punishment. Due to social pressures from a larger reference group, mainly due to social media, SDT becomes relevant in the study of FoMO.

There has also been research that uses FoMO as a factor in consumer behavior. Riordan et al. (2015) showed that individuals with high FoMO were highly likely to exhibit various behaviors when alcohol is consumed. In their study, they showed that there was a significant relationship between FoMO and an increased incidence of negative alcohol-related consequences. In addition, a significant relationship between FoMO and drinking quantity per session was discovered where those higher in FoMO drank 1.5 times more in each drinking session than those who are lower in FoMO. Their research showed that FoMO affects the consumption behavior of consumers.

Furthermore, FoMO has been linked to increased TV viewing habits. Conlin et al. (2016) showed how FoMO predicted the speed at which people choose to watch TV, social media, and TV, and whether there is a possibility to watch one-time TV programs. Viewers engaged in the behavior is a likely result of FoMO because of its social aspects where they can talk about the shows with their friends, and they become a part of a cultural conversation.

To date, many literatures have used the SDT framework to explain FoMO as a mediator that links deficits in psychological need to negative social media use (Przybylski et al., 2013) and academic motivational styles (Alt, 2015). These studies have shown FoMO to cause behaviors like unhealthy use of social networking sites. However, none has shown FoMO affecting the consumption behavior of consumers. Thus, the current study has the following hypotheses:

H1: FoMO has a positive effect on the motivation of Generation Z consumers to purchase masstige apparel.

H2: FoMO has a negative effect on the attitude of Generation Z consumers regarding the outcome of the behavior.

H3: FoMO has a positive effect on the subjective norms of Generation Z consumers.
H4: FoMO has a negative effect on the perceived behavioral control of Generation Z consumers.

H5: FoMO has a positive effect on the intention of Generation Z consumers to purchase masstige products.

H6: FoMO has a positive effect on the behavior of Generation Z consumers, which is the consumption of masstige products.

H7: Motivation has a positive effect on attitudes.

H8: Motivation has a positive effect on subjective norms.

H9: Motivation has a positive effect on perceived behavioral control.

H10: Attitude has a positive effect on the intention of the consumer to purchase masstige products.

H11: Subjective norms have a positive effect on the intention of the consumer to purchase masstige products.

H12: Perceived behavioral controls have a positive effect on the intention of the consumer to purchase masstige products.

H13: Intentions have a positive effect on the behavior of the consumer.

H14: Perceived behavioral controls have a positive effect on the behavior of the consumer.

This paper has created its own conceptual model to take into consideration the role of FoMO in the behavior of the consumer in purchasing masstige brand apparel. This research adopts an integrated theoretical model by Hagger et al. (2012), which includes the constructs from the TPB and SDT. However, in this study, the SDT variables were encapsulated into one variable of motivation. FoMO was added as an independent factor in order to investigate its effect on consumer behavior using partial least squares - structural equation modeling. The conceptual framework of the study is shown in Figure 1.

**Methods**

The purpose of the study is to determine whether FoMO affects the masstige apparel consumption behavior of Generation Z consumers. To test the proposed model, we employed a survey method, and the path analysis model was estimated using the SmartPLS system. Partial least squares - structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was used to enable us to assess the model by measuring the contribution of each variable in explaining the variance, which is not possible in regression analysis.

**Data Collection**

This present study employed random sampling wherein the respondents were selected randomly, and the questionnaires were given to them personally. In the case of this study, a total of 307 respondents were garnered.

Of the 307 respondents, 52% were female with an average age of 20. On average, they have a monthly allowance of less than PhP10,000, and they have bought masstige brand apparel for at least once in two months.

![Figure 1. Conceptual Model (adopted from Hagger et al., 2012)](image-url)
**Measurement**

Measures of motivations were developed using Guay et al.’s (2000) the Situational Motivation Scales as a template with questions to measure introjected regulation coming from Ryan and Connell’s (1989) Perceived Locus of Causality Scale. The types of motivation were intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. Four items were utilized for each motivation type for a total of 16 items. The items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree to 7: Strongly agree).

To measure attitudes, the research will be using four seven-point semantic differential scales with the bipolar adjectives in reaction to the common stem: “Overall, I think that purchasing products from premium brands is...”. There are two instrumental items (whether the behavior achieves something) using the harmful-beneficial, and worth it-not worth it bipolar adjectives. One item measured the affective aspect of attitude by using the pleasant-unpleasant adjective pair. The good-bad scale was also added to capture the overall evaluation of attitude. The items are arranged so that the ends of the scales are a mix of positive and negative endpoints. Items that have negative endpoints on the right are recoded during data analysis.

To measure subjective norms, there are three items using a 7-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree to 7: Strongly agree). The first question is negatively worded and hence recoded during data analysis.

There are three items to measure perceived behavioral control (PBC), which are measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree to 7: Strongly agree).

FoMO was measured using Przybylski et al.’s (2013) FoMO scale. The scale consists of 10 statements, and responses were made on five-point scales ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 5 (extremely true of me).

The measure of intentions includes four questions rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree to 7: Strongly agree). The measure of behavior includes four questions rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1: Strongly disagree to 7: Strongly agree).

**Results**

The assessment of reliability of the model is presented in Table 1. To test the quality of the measurement model, its reliability and validity are evaluated by testing its indicator reliability, internal consistency via the composite reliability, Cronbach’s alpha, average variance extracted (AVE), and the Fornell-Larcker criterion which compares the square root of each construct’s average variance extracted with its correlations with all other constructs in the model.

The results revealed that the construct measures are reliable and valid with the removal of 11 indicators because they have loadings below 0.708 and attaining AVE values of 0.50 or higher, which means that, on average, the constructs explain more than half of the variance of its indicators. In terms of its internal consistency reliability, Cronbach’s alphas are considered satisfactory because they fall above 0.70, except for perceived behavioral control. However, due to its limitations in terms of its underestimation of internal consistency reliability caused by its sensitivity to the number of items in the scale, it is more appropriate to use composite reliability as the measure for internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2016). The composite reliability values are considered satisfactory because they fall between 0.70 and 0.90 (Nunally & Bernstein, 1994).

Evaluation of the constructs’ discriminant validity is shown in Table 2. Fornell-Larcker criterion was used to analyze the constructs’ discriminant validity, which compares the square root of the AVE values with the latent variable correlations. The result showed that the square root of each construct’s AVE is greater than its highest correlation with any other construct. This shows that the constructs are truly distinct from other constructs by empirical standards.

Coefficients for the path model are presented in Table 3 and were used to assess the hypothesized direct effects in the model. There were significant effects for FoMO on intrinsic motivation, introjected regulation, external regulation, subjective norms, and intention, as predicted. A significant effect was found for FoMO on identified regulation but in a different direction as hypothesized. There were, however, no significant effects on attitudes, perceived behavioral control, and behavior.

There are no direct effect on intrinsic motivation on the TPB variables, except for subjective norms, which is in contrast to the hypothesis. As predicted, identified regulation, an autonomous form of motivation, had a significant effect on attitudes and PBC. The results also showed that introjected regulation has a significant effect on subjective norms. The results supported
Table 1
Indicator Loadings, Average Variance Extracted, and Reliability Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Indicator Reliability</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FoMO</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>ER2</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER4</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID2</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID4</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM1</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM2</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM3</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM4</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR1</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR3</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR4</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you “in” or are you “out”?

**Table 2**

*Square Roots of AVE and Correlation Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavior</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FoMO</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentions</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivation</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PBC</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Subjective Norms</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**

*Path Coefficients for Path Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Expected Coefficient</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: FoMO -&gt; Motivation</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: FoMO -&gt; Attitude</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: FoMO -&gt; Subjective Norms</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: FoMO -&gt; Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: FoMO -&gt; Intentions</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: FoMO -&gt; Behavior</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Motivation -&gt; Attitude</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Motivation -&gt; Subjective Norms</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Motivation -&gt; Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Attitude -&gt; Intentions</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11: Subjective Norms -&gt; Intentions</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12: Perceived Behavioral Control -&gt; Intentions</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13: Intentions -&gt; Behavior</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14: Perceived Behavioral Control -&gt; Behavior</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value < 0.01

the hypothesis that introjected regulation has no effects on attitudes, but it has a significant effect on perceived behavioral control, which is in contrast to the present study’s hypothesis. External regulation had no significant effects on attitudes and PBC, as predicted. However, the results do not support the hypothesis that external regulation has a positive effect on subjective norms.

Attitudes and PBC significantly predicted intentions, just like in previous researches, although significant effects for subjective norms were not found. Finally, intentions and PBC had significant effects on behavior. Figure 2 shows a summary of the result of the analysis.

A blindfolding procedure was conducted to assess the predictive capability of the model given the parameters of PLS-SEM (Chin, 1998), as shown in Table 4. Cross-validated redundancy (Q^2) is critical in this study as it estimates latent construct. Q^2 higher than zero indicates that there is a predictive relevance in overall models (Fornell & Cha, 1994). Self-
determination theory variables were found to have little predictive relevance compared to the TPB variables having medium predictive relevance, exception for the behavior construct having a high predictive relevance. R-squared ($R^2$) values for most of the latent variables were found to be weak. However, it is important to note that R-squared values of 0.20 are considered high in disciplines such as consumer behavior (Hair et al., 2011; Henseler et al., 2009.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>R-Squared</th>
<th>Q-Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Summary of the Result of the Analysis

Discussion

The present study aimed to determine the effects of FoMO on psychosocial determinants of masstige apparel purchasing behavior among Generation Z consumers. The study adopted an explanatory design with FoMO and psychological variables from TPB and motivation proposed to be predictors of Generation Z consumers’ masstige brand apparel purchasing behavior. Path analytic models partially supported the hypotheses of the proposed model. FoMO was a significant predictor of motivation, attitude, subjective norm, intention, and behavior. The information gathered from this study implied motivation (with respect to purchasing masstige brand apparel), has the most influence in predicting intentions, and behavior in this sample of Generation Z consumers.

The conceptual model of the present study offers a reflective and deliberative explanation of consumer behavior with FoMO affecting the reflective process of purchasing masstige brand apparel. The results of the study showed that FoMO significantly affected the motivational constructs over the belief-based constructs. In this regard, it is unsurprising as FoMO is a psychological phenomenon that has social pressures as an integral part of its construct. According to the research of Przybylski et al. (2013), individuals who are low in basic psychological need satisfaction, namely satisfaction of the needs for autonomy, competency, and relatedness, are more likely to experience FoMO. Furthermore, the significantly stronger relationship of FoMO on intention, compared to behavior, indicates that FoMO is part of a deliberative process in purchasing masstige brand apparel.

In the present study, it shows that FoMO is effective in influencing the masstige brand apparel purchasing behavior of Generation Z consumers. The research contributes to the overall understanding of the effects of FoMO on consumers, particularly Generation Z consumers. The result showed that FoMO affects the
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deliberative process of consumer decisions. Based on the results of the present study, it can be concluded that the impact of FoMO on the purchasing behavior of Generation Z consumers for masstige brand apparel may not be underestimated.

In many studies about TPB, the research focuses mainly on the intention to purchase products. This study extended TPB to include motivational constructs and FoMO as an additional antecedent to intention to purchase masstige brand apparel. The present study shows that FoMO affects the consumer’s motivation to purchase masstige brand apparel, which then affects their intention to purchase masstige brand apparel through the mediation of the belief-based constructs of TPB. This signifies that FoMO is a predictor of the masstige brand apparel purchasing behavior of Generation Z consumers. The fact that this generation has access to an accumulating set of real-time information sourced from the Internet—through an ever-increasing range of platforms like laptops, tablet computers, and smartphones—implies that they are constantly connected with their social group.

For marketers of masstige brand apparel, this implies that if they want to improve the propensity of Generation Z consumers to purchase their products, developing interventions that target the construct of motivation while using FoMO marketing appeals is imperative.

Generation Z consumers are susceptible to and aware of FoMO. This means that they will be particularly receptive to communications and strategies that tap into FoMO. Masstige brands have numerous opportunities to calibrate communications, offers, contests, and other marketing strategies to tap into FoMO. These masstige brands can focus on using FoMO to affect motivation by fine-tuning strategies that manipulate the motivations to perform the behavior.

It can be manipulated by showing the outcome of the behavior in a way that promotes the personal relevance and importance of the outcome (Resnicow et al., 2008). FoMO marketing appeals should highlight the levels of satisfaction and personal gain that the Generation Z consumer may expect when they purchase apparel from masstige brands. For example, masstige brands can use user-generated content, which lets potential consumers vicariously share in the experience of putting on the apparel.

In addition, marketers could trigger FoMO through a sense of exclusivity. Getting an opportunity that very few people have promotes enhancements of one’s ego. For example, masstige brand apparel can create an exclusive limited-edition product while showing the number of stocks left in real-time. Alternatively, as Generation Z consumers form their opinions and feelings of a brand or product through the input of members from their social network, marketers can harness this and use these feelings to drive the purchase intentions. Marketers can incorporate the consumer’s desire to belong as a motivational tool to purchase masstige brand apparel.

Masstige brands can form messaging that escalates FoMO in order to motivate the desired behavior. Generation Z consumers tend to share openly and frequently checks social media to see what everyone else is up to. Masstige brands can promote this by providing cross-platform support that facilitates the sharing of their individual experiences.

The present conceptual model paves the way for the development of marketing appeals among Generation Z consumers via the mediation of motivation. Therefore, the topic is a worthy area of academic research. More research on the topic could add value to the concept of FoMO, especially about the behavioral outcome after the effect of FoMO. Furthermore, the research could be done into the relationship between individual constructs and the effectiveness of different intervention techniques. Consequently, demographic, psychographic, or personality-like variables could be explored. Improvement in the understanding of FoMO increases the probability of the construct being effective as a trigger for purchase behavior. Although the present study of FoMO shows that the construct affects the pre-purchase phase, there are more opportunities to rouse demand during the behavior and after the outcome of the behavior has been acquired.

A caveat for the results is that it is only limited to the respondents of the survey. It may not be representative of the target population as other respondents from a different university with different cultures and social norms may have different sentiments regarding masstige brand apparel.

Finally, it is interesting to note that in contrast to previous research that uses the TPB (Shah Alam & Mohamed Sayuti, 2011; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Kim & James, 2016), subjective norms in the present
study does not have a significant effect on intentions. In a study by Samodra and Mariani (2013), the authors stated that Generation Z “are more concerned with establishing ‘personal identity’ rather than complying with social norms” (p. 129). Furthermore, as observed by Euromonitor (2011), the lack of effect of subjective norms to intention may be caused by the Generation Z consumer’s highly individualistic and self-absorbed nature. Their belief in not living according to social norms resulted in the study’s results that contrasted previous researches using TPB.

Given our limited time and resources, the present study faced limitations. These limitations include the fact that the research was only conducted in the Philippines; hence, the results may be more generalizable to culturally similar English-speaking countries than to others. In addition, the sample was exclusively De La Salle University students. The age group matched the target age group of the study; however, it does not capture the general sentiments of the population as other respondents who are not from a private university may have different factors affecting their decision like culture and social group.

To strengthen the findings of the present study, replicating the research with a more representative sample would be beneficial. Furthermore, a cross-generational exploration of the effects of FoMO may also be warranted in order to compare the effects of FoMO between different generations.
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