



# A study on Gender wise Apparel buying behavior of Gen Z

**Prof (Dr.) Madhu Arora, Dean Research, NDIM, Delhi, India**  
**Dr. Shubham Agarwal, Associate Professor, NDIM, Delhi, India**  
**Dr. Poonam Khurana, Professor, VIPS, Delhi, India**

## Abstract

The paper is an attempt to A study on Gender wise Apparel buying behavior .Gen Z is considered as the target group for the study as they are the consumers of this tech-dominated era. This study makes use of primary data collected through questionnaire from 417 respondents and SPSS software was used to analyze the result. Results show that that there is significant difference found in results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, when Equal variances assumed as well as Equal variances not assumed for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z, but there is no significant difference for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z when they go shopping with my family members. Paper considers only gender wise study can be treated as limitation of the study which opens doors for further scope of study. Education, income wise and other parameters can be studied by future researchers for Gen Z population.

Keywords: Gen Z, Gender, Apparel, behavior, Significant

## Introduction

A marketplace for the exchange of products and services through the use of telecommunication and telecommunication-based technologies is known as e-commerce. E-commerce is one of the major industries that is now expanding rapidly. The intention and behaviour of customers who regularly make online purchases through e-commerce platforms based on connections to the Internet and global technology are being greatly impacted by the tremendous growth of the e-commerce business. Since e-commerce is based on internet technologies, consumers are able to perceive usefulness (PU), which is defined as "the extent to which a person believes that utilising a particular technology will enhance her/his job performance," with greater clarity. As a result, the effects of e-commerce on consumer behaviour are actually undeniable (Davis, 1989). Additionally, users of current, straightforward online apps report higher levels of ease of use, which is positively correlated with their intention to keep making purchases online (Chiu & Wang, 2008). Furthermore, consumers report having more favourable experiences while making purchases online because of the perceived enjoyment (PE) elements, which are also made possible by technology (Ha & Stoel, 2009). However, because network information hazards are always a major concern, the development of e-commerce also necessitates a far greater degree of security perceptions (PS) (Cha, 2011). To summarise, internet shopping offers a range of advantages to customers in terms of finding items, descriptions, and high-quality features without requiring them to invest excessive time or money (Işoraitè & Miniotienè, 2018). (Yang et al., 2018).

Consequently, it is possible to consider the aforementioned evidence as one of the key underlying factors that significantly affects the behaviour of online impulse buying (OIB). Numerous studies have examined the effects of e-commerce on online impulsive buying (OIB) behaviour, and they have found that some benefits, like convenience (Dawson & Kim, 2009), have a greater influence on online consumers than other factors, such as the lack of delivery efforts and social pressure (Verhagen & Dolen, 2011). Significantly, a study by Akram et al. (2017) demonstrated that hedonic motivation has a significant influence on consumers' decisions about impulse purchases made online. In order to enjoy themselves much more these days, a lot of users concentrate heavily on experiencing the experimental and upbeat style of OIB. As a result, according to OIB, consumers today really prefer to shop rather than acquire necessities (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998). In particular, the OIB behaviour is more common in members of Generation Z, who tend to be more focused on new changes, personalities, proclivities, and impulse buying (Priporas et al., 2017). Indeed, a number of academics have examined the relationship between OIB and Generation Z, and they have discovered a number of influencing elements, including demography and gender and cultural orientation (Chowdhury, 2020). In addition, the Stimulus-Organism-Response model was employed in Djafarova & Bowes's (2021) research, which effectively examined the OIB of young individuals who are currently making purchases on Instagram. In conclusion, scholars from all around the world have been quite interested in the topic of aimless online buying.

### Literature review

Impulsive buying is defined as unplanned or non-essential purchasing behaviour (Muruganantham and Bhakat, 2013; Aragoncillo and Orus, 2018; Sen and Nayak, 2021). The transaction occurs instantaneously and without a thorough evaluation of the products and the implications of the purchase (Khachatryan et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2021; Bao and Yang, 2022).

Any "sudden and instant purchase with no pre-shopping plans to purchase the particular product category or to complete a specified purchasing job" is what Beatty and Ferrell (1998) define as impulsive buying. The term "impulse purchasing propensity" describes a person's tendency to make impulsive, hasty, and unconsidered purchases. Consumers may easily get information about products or services through the Internet, which has grown to be an indispensable aspect of daily life. Internet purchasing enables for more spontaneous purchases than traditional retail. In particular, social media's viability is a novel approach to significantly increase marketing efforts and could have a significant impact on consumer purchase decisions, such as impulse buying (Alalwan et al., 2017; Kapoor et al., 2018; Dwivedi et al., 2021).

It is crucial for business to comprehend how impulsive consumers make purchases. Sharma et al. (2010) contended that emotional states, impulsive actions, or a lack of cognitive control are the reasons why consumers shop online. Additionally, they claim that visually appealing items push consumers to act impulsively and purchase items without considering the financial or other implications of online buying. Few academics contend that consumers who purchase goods online are more impulsive than those who purchase goods in physical locations (Verhagen and Van Dolen, 2011; Park et al., 2012; Ozen and Engizek, 2014).

Online marketing stimuli, according to Wu et al. (2015), reduce risk aversion among first-time online shoppers and facilitate immediate purchases (Madhavaram and Laverie, 2004; Jeffrey and Hodge, 2007; Lo et al., 2016). Online commercials are typically avoided by Generation Z, and they regularly utilise ad-blocking software to do so. But Gen Z is far more impacted by various electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) sources, like online evaluations and referrals from friends, family, and coworkers regarding a product or business (Alanko, 2018). In conclusion, Gen Z typically chooses to make online purchases mostly based on their individual preferences or the distinctive products. Their purchasing decisions are typically influenced more by the product's special peculiarity than by the brand name. More and more young consumers in particular are searching for shopping experiences that offer speed, convenience, diversity, and fun and enjoyment. Furthermore, brand value, transparency, and product authenticity all have an impact on Gen Z's online purchasing behaviour (Munsch, 2021).

The goal of Lina Y, Hou D, and Ali S (2022) was to identify the aspects of online convenience that affect generation Z customers' affective and cognitive attitudes as well as their propensity for impulsive online purchases. The impact of social media celebrity moderating the attitude-behavior gap is been studied.

In the context of the UK fashion sector, Elmira Djafarova and Tamar Bowes (2021) looked into the best kinds of Instagram marketing tools in relation to Generation Z's impulsive buying habits. The Stimulus-Organism-Response paradigm is used to the Instagram setting in this study. The results of this qualitative study, which drew from eight in-depth focus groups, indicate that gender disparities are noteworthy when it comes to Instagram impulse buying behaviour. For female participants, Instagram has a significant influence on impulsive purchases; for male participants, this was not the case. An updated Stimulus-Organism-Response model is presented to Instagram, with the conclusion that, among Generation Z females, ads, opinion leaders, and user-generated material serve as stimuli (S) in eliciting pleasant emotions (O), which in turn lead to impulse purchases (R).

A theoretical framework on the causes of flow experience and the connection between flow experience and impulsive purchasing behaviour was developed by Canh Chi Hoang and Bui Thanh Khoa in 2022. Data from 283 customers who had previously made a purchase on social media were empirically evaluated using the Partial Least Squares Structural model, which was based on the research model. The evidence indicates that each of the antecedent elements has a considerable impact on the flow experience, which in turn has a strong influence on impulse buying behaviour. This study suggested several managerial recommendations for social networking site retailers based on the research findings in an effort to improve Gen Z's flow experience and impulsive purchasing behaviour.

In order to use the quantitative methodology, Thanh Tien Nguyen and Thanh Trung Nguyen (2022) examined data from 333/390 valid questionnaires that were given to young people in Ho Chi Minh City. The findings then show that the element with the greatest influence is perceived enjoyment, followed by the factors with the second-highest influence being product presentation and positive comments, respectively. The study helped shed light on Generation Z's impulsive online purchasing habits, which is especially helpful for firms trying to better understand the behaviour of their younger clientele.

In 2020, Kaytaz Yiğit, M. investigated how Gen Z's online impulse buying behaviour was influenced by five hedonic reasons, browsing, scarcity, and serendipitous information. 204 questionnaires were gathered in order to test the created model, and multiple regression analysis was used to do so. This research has established the relationship between browsing and two hedonic incentives and online impulse buying behaviour in Generation Z. The findings offer significant new information about how interested companies might improve their strategies.

### Research Methodology

Present study is empirical in nature. Data is collected from Gen Z and SPSS software is used to get the analytics. Mean Standard deviation and Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for Independent T test is used as statistical tools.

Null Hypothesis is taken for the study

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference in perception of male and female towards impulse buying behavior of Gen Z

H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference in perception of male and female towards impulse buying behavior of Gen Z when they are with family and friends

H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference in perception of male and female towards impulse buying behavior of Gen Z whether they have money or not

Data collected is as follows:

**Table 1: Gender Male=1, Female=2**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	351	84.2	84.2	84.2
2	66	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	417	100.0	100.0	

Source: Prepared by authors

Table 1 shows data collected from Gen Z includes 351(84.2 percent) males and 66 (15.8 percent) females having total of 417 sample size

**Table 2: Education, 1=Matric, 2= Doing UG, 3=Doing PG, 4= any other**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	95	22.8	22.8	22.8
2	249	59.7	59.7	82.5
3	10	2.4	2.4	84.9
4	63	15.1	15.1	100.0
Total	417	100.0	100.0	

Source: Prepared by authors

Table 2 shows 95(22.8 percent) Gen Z respondents are Matric, 249(59.7 percent) are doing UG, 10(2.4 percent) are PG and 63(15.1 percent) have any other education.

## Result and discussions

Following results are found on Gen Z perception using SPSS software.

**Table 3: I purchase anywhere and anywhere without any planning, if i see any appealing product or service. Yes=1, No=2**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	290	69.5	69.5	69.5
2	127	30.5	30.5	100.0
Total	417	100.0	100.0	

Source: Prepared by authors

Table 3 shows 290(69.5 percent) Gen Z respondents have impulse buying behavior and 127(30.5 percent) do not purchase **anywhere and anywhere without any planning shows they do not have impulse buying behavior.**

**Table 4 : To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	153	36.7	36.7	36.7
2	60	14.4	14.4	51.1
3	116	27.8	27.8	78.9
4	25	6.0	6.0	84.9
5	63	15.1	15.1	100.0
Total	417	100.0	100.0	

Source: Prepared by authors

On rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree, 153(36.7 percent) strongly disagree that money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase, 60(14.4 percent disagree that money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase, 116(27.8 percent) are indifferent that individual money affects shopping intentions during impulse purchase. 25(6.0) agree that money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase, and 63(15.1 percent) strongly agree that money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase,

**Table 5: To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	69	16.5	16.5	16.5
2	111	26.6	26.6	43.2
3	96	23.0	23.0	66.2
4	109	26.1	26.1	92.3
5	32	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	417	100.0	100.0	

Source: Prepared by authors

Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree), 69 (16.5 percent) strongly disagree that presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of Gen Z consumer respondents, 11(26.6 percent) disagree that presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of Gen Z consumer respondents, 96(23 percent) are indifferent about presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of Gen Z consumer respondents. But 109(26.1 percent) agree that presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of Gen Z consumer



respondents and 32(7.7 percent) strongly agree that presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of Gen Z consumer respondents.

**Table 6: Descriptive about Gender wise Impulse buying behavior of Gen Z**

Gender male=1, female=2		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) ["When I see new style of apparel products, I buy it immediately" describes me.]	1	351	2.19	.999	.053
	2	65	1.31	.789	.098
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [When I go for apparel shopping, I buy apparels that I had not intended to buying.]	1	351	2.18	1.196	.064
	2	66	1.68	.788	.097
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I can't suppress the desire of wanting to buy new style of apparel spontaneously.]	1	351	2.48	1.066	.057
	2	66	1.97	1.176	.145
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I often buy apparel products without thinking.]	1	351	2.11	1.148	.061
	2	66	2.24	1.382	.170
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I often control my feelings to buy clothing items impulsively because of my limited budget.]	1	351	2.59	1.459	.078
	2	66	1.92	1.027	.126
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I feel financially comfortable, I tend to do more impulse purchases.]	1	351	2.58	1.296	.069
	2	66	2.42	1.404	.173
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I make apparel impulse purchases, When I feel I can afford to do so.]	1	351	2.72	1.151	.061
	2	66	1.82	1.051	.129
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I have	1	351	2.33	1.194	.064
	2	66	2.24	1.458	.179

more money, I am more inclined to make impulse purchases.]					
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I feel more excited to have companions in the shopping trip.]	1	351	2.92	1.150	.061
	2	66	2.29	1.390	.171
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I am with my friend, I generally make more apparel impulse purchase]	1	351	2.51	1.262	.067
	2	66	1.45	.880	.108
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [Shopping with friends is more enjoyable than shopping alone.]	1	351	2.97	.913	.049
	2	66	2.15	1.243	.153
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I buy apparel impulsively, when I go shopping with my family member.]	1	351	2.22	1.337	.071
	2	66	2.42	1.458	.179

Source: Prepared by authors

When I see new style of apparel products, I buy it immediately” describes me, 351 Male Gen Z consumers believe more for this statement (Mean=2.19, SD=.999 and SE=.999) than 65 Female Gen Z consumers (Mean=1.31, SD=.789 and SE=.098)

To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer.” describes me, 351 Male Gen Z consumers believe less for this statement (Mean=2.22, SD=1.337 and SE=.071) than 65 Female Gen Z consumers (Mean=2.42, SD=1.458 and SE=.179)

**Table 7: Independent Samples Test about Gender wise Impulse buying behavior of Gen Z**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
To what extent do you agree or disagree with	Equal variances assumed	12.08	0.00	6.71	414.00	0.00	0.88	0.13	0.62	1.13

each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [“When I see new style of apparel products, I buy it immediately ” describes me.]	Equal variances not assumed			7.87	105.89	0.00	0.88	0.11	0.66	1.10
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [When I go for apparel shopping, I buy apparels that I had not intended to buying.]	Equal variances assumed	42.53	0.00	3.27	415.00	0.00	0.50	0.15	0.20	0.80
	Equal variances not assumed			4.31	129.04	0.00	0.50	0.12	0.27	0.73
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I can't suppress the desire of wanting to buy new style of apparel spontaneously.]	Equal variances assumed	1.90	0.17	3.48	415.00	0.00	0.51	0.15	0.22	0.79
	Equal variances not assumed			3.25	86.23	0.00	0.51	0.16	0.20	0.82



To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I often buy apparel products without thinking.]	Equal variances assumed	18.74	0.00	0.86	415.00	0.39	-0.14	0.16	-0.45	0.18
	Equal variances not assumed									
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I often control my feelings to buy clothing items impulsively because of my limited budget.]	Equal variances assumed	11.04	0.00	3.54	415.00	0.00	0.67	0.19	0.30	1.03
	Equal variances not assumed			4.48	120.41	0.00	0.67	0.15	0.37	0.96
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I	Equal variances assumed	7.29	0.01	0.86	415.00	0.39	0.15	0.18	-0.20	0.50
	Equal variances not assumed			.81	87.08	.42	.15	.19	-.22	.52

feel financially comfortable, I tend to do more impulse purchases.]										
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I make apparel impulse purchases, When I feel I can afford to do so.]	Equal variances assumed	2.57	0.11	5.89	415.00	0.00	0.90	0.15	0.60	1.20
	Equal variances not assumed			6.26	96.69	0.00	0.90	0.14	0.61	1.18
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I have more money, I am more inclined to make impulse purchases.]	Equal variances assumed	14.15	0.00	0.51	415.00	0.61	0.09	0.17	-0.24	0.41
	Equal variances not assumed			.4	82.2	.7	.1	.2	-.3	.5
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members)	Equal variances assumed	18.94	.00	3.9	415.0	.0	.6	.2	.3	.9
	Equal variances not			3.5	82.6	.0	.6	.2	.3	1.0

influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I feel more excited to have companions in the shopping trip.]	assumed									
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I am with my friend, I generally make more apparel impulse purchase]	Equal variances assumed	55.39	0.00	6.5	415.0	.0	1.1	.2	.7	1.4
	Equal variances not assumed			8.3	121.6	.0	1.1	.1	.8	1.3
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree)	Equal variances assumed	27.43	0.00	6.2	415.0	.0	.8	.1	.6	1.1
	Equal variances not assumed			5.1	78.7	.0	.8	.2	.5	1.1

[Shopping with friends is more enjoyable than shopping alone.]										
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I buy apparel impulsively, when I go shopping with my family member.]	Equal variances assumed	6.38	0.01	-1.13	415.00	0.26	-0.20	0.18	-0.56	0.15
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.1	86.8	.3	-.2	.2	-.6	.2

Source: Prepared by authors

Table 7 shows that there is significant difference found in results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, when Equal variances assumed as well as Equal variances not assumed for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z, but there is no significant difference for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z when they go shopping with my family members.

Table 8: Empirical Results for Gender wise perception of Gen Z about impulse buying behavior decision

Statements/P value	Sig. level	Significant	Hypothesis accepted	Hypothesis Rejected
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [“When I see new style of apparel products, I buy it immediately” describes me.]	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate
	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [When I go for apparel shopping, I buy apparels that I had not	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate
	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate

intended to buying.]					
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I can't suppress the desire of wanting to buy new style of apparel spontaneously.]	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?. Rate on a scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree) [I often buy apparel products without thinking.]	0.39	.05	No	Null	Alternate
	.45	.05	No	Null	Alternate
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I often control my feelings to buy clothing items impulsively because of my limited budget.]	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I feel financially comfortable, I tend to do more impulse purchases.]	0.39	.05	No	Null	Alternate
	.42	.05	No	Null	Alternate
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I make apparel impulse purchases, When I feel I can afford to do so.]	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
	0.00	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
To at what extent availability of money affects individual shopping intentions during impulse purchase. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I have more money, I am more inclined to make impulse purchases.]	0.61	.05	No	Null	Alternate
	.7	.05	No	Null	Alternate
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer.	.0	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
	.0	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null



Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [I feel more excited to have companions in the shopping trip.]					
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [When I am with my friend, I generally make more apparel impulse purchase]	.0	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null
To at what extent presence of others (friends and family members) influence impulse buying behavior of consumer. Rate on Scale 1 to 5 (1 being Strongly Disagree to 5 being strongly agree) [Shopping with friends is more enjoyable than shopping alone.]	.0	.05	Yes	Alternate	Null

Source: Prepared by authors

Table 8 shows Empirical Results for Gender wise perception of Gen Z about impulse buying behavior decision.

## Conclusion

In competitive market, companies are focusing on impulse buying behavior. Impulsive buying is defined as unplanned or non-essential purchasing behavior. Gen Z is maximum in population so demography dividend target is taken for this study on Gender wise Apparel buying behavior of Gen Z based on primary data on structured questionnaire. Results show that that there is significant difference found in results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, when Equal variances assumed as well as Equal variances not assumed for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z, but there is no significant difference for gender wise impulse buying behavior of Gen Z when they go shopping with my family members. Null hypothesis is rejected which shows that there is significant difference in the gender perception of male and female for impulse buying behavior of Gen Z.

## References

- Alanko, P. J. (2018). Mapping eWOM effectiveness for Generation Z consumers: An integrative approach and Its Effective Implementation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(4),243–252.
- Munsch, A. (2021). Millennial and generation Z digital marketing communication and advertising effectiveness: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science*,31(1), 10-29.
- Agrawal, D. K. (2022). Determining behavioural differences of Y and Z generational cohorts in online shopping. *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag.* 50, 880–895. doi: 10.1108/IJRDM-12-2020-0527
- Alalwan, A. A., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., and Algharabat, R. (2017). Social media in marketing: a review and analysis of the existing literature. *Telematics Inform.* 34, 1177–1190. doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2017.05.008

- Aragoncillo, L., and Orus, C. (2018). Impulse Buying Behaviour: an Online-Offline Comparative and the impact of social media. *Span. J. Mark. ESIC* 22, 42–62. doi: 10.1108/SJME-03-2018-007
- Bao, Z., and Yang, J. (2022). Why online consumers have the urge to buy impulsively: roles of serendipity, trust and flow experience. *Manag. Decis.* doi: 10.1108/MD-07-2021-0900
- Beatty, S. E., and Ferrell, M. E. (1998). Impulse buying: modeling its precursors. *J. Retail.* 74, 169–191. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4359(99)80092-X
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., et al. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: perspectives and research propositions. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* 59:102168. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168
- Jeffrey, S. A., and Hodge, R. (2007). Factors influencing impulse buying during an online purchase. *Electron. Commer. Res.* 7, 367–379. doi: 10.1007/s10660-007-9011-8
- Kapoor, K. K., Tamilmanni, K., Rana, N. P., Patil, P., Dwivedi, Y. K., and Nerur, S. (2018). Advances in social media research: past, present and future. *Inf. Syst. Front.* 20, 531–558. doi: 10.1007/s10796-017-9810-y
- Khachatryan, H., Rihn, A., Behe, B., Hall, C., Campbell, B., Dennis, J., et al. (2018). Visual attention, buying impulsiveness, and consumer behavior. *Mark. Lett.* 29, 23–35. doi: 10.1007/s11002-018-9446-9
- Lee, J. A., and Eastin, M. S. (2021). Perceived authenticity of social media influencers: scale development and validation. *J. Res. Interact. Mark.* 15, 822–841. doi: 10.1108/JRIM-12-2020-0253
- Lo, L. Y.-S., Lin, S. W., and Hsu, L. Y. (2016). Motivation for online impulse buying: a two-factor theory perspective. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* 36, 759–772. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.04.012
- Madhavaram, S. R., and Laverie, D. A. (2004). "Exploring Impulse Purchasing on the Internet." *ACR North American Advances.*
- Muruganatham, G., and Bhakat, R. S. (2013). A review of impulse buying behavior. *Int. J. Mark. Stud.* 5:149. doi: 10.5539/ijms.v5n3p149
- Ozen, H., and Engizek, N. (2014). Shopping online without thinking: being emotional or rational? *Asia Pacific J. Mark. Logist.* 26, 78–93. doi: 10.1108/APJML-06-2013-0066
- Park, E. J., Kim, E. Y., Funches, V. M., and Foxx, W. (2012). Apparel product attributes, web browsing, and e-impulse buying on shopping websites. *J. Bus. Res.* 65, 1583–1589. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.02.043
- Sen, S., and Nayak, S. (2021). Internal stimulus factors as antecedents of impulse buying: gap identification and future direction. *Vision.* 25, 1–8. doi: 10.1177/0972262920983960
- Sharma, P., Sivakumaran, B., and Marshall, R. (2010). Impulse buying and variety seeking: a trait-correlates perspective. *J. Bus. Res.* 63, 276–283. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.03.013
- Verhagen, T., and Van Dolen, W. (2011). The influence of online store beliefs on consumer online impulse buying: a model and empirical application. *Inf. Manag.* 48, 320–327. doi: 10.1016/j.im.2011.08.001
- Wu, K., Vassileva, J., Noorian, Z., and Zhao, Y. (2015). How do you feel when you see a list of prices? The interplay among price dispersion, perceived risk and initial trust in Chinese C2C market. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* 25, 36–46. doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.03.007
- Thanh Tien NGUYEN and Thanh Trung NGUYEN (2022). Influences of Factors on Online Impulse Buying Behavior of Generation Z: Case At Shopee Ltd., In Vietnam. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2022, Vol. 6, No. 8, 10168-10179. <http://journalppw.com>
- Canh Chi Hoang and Bui Thanh Khoa (2022). Impulse Buying Behavior of Generation Z customers in Social Commerce: Flow Theory Approach. *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science* Vol. 9 (2022) No.4, pp.197-208 DOI:10.33168/LISS.2022.0413

- Elmira Djafarova and Tamar Bowes (2021). Instagram made Me buy it': Generation Z impulse purchases in fashion industry, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Volume 59, 2021, 102345, ISSN 0969-6989, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102345>.
- Lina Y, Hou D and Ali S (2022). Impact of online convenience on generation Z online impulsive buying behavior: The moderating role of social media celebrity. *Front. Psychol.* 13:951249. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.951249
- Kaytaz Yiğit, M. (2020). The Factors Affecting Gen Z's Online Impulse Buying Behavior. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(1), 272–298. <https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i1.1401>
- Ha, S., & Stoel, L. (2009). Consumer e-shopping acceptance: Antecedents in a technology acceptance model. *Journal of business research*, 62(5), 565-571.
- Yang, L., Ji, J., Wang, M., Wang, Z. The manufacturer's joint decisions of channel selections and carbon emission reductions under the cap-and-trade regulation. *J. Clean. Prod.* 2018, 193, 506–523.
- Išoraitė, M., & Miniotienė, N. (2018). *Electronic commerce: Theory and practice*.
- Cha, J. (2011). Exploring the internet as a unique shopping channel to sell both real and virtual items: A comparison of factors affecting purchase intention and consumer characteristics. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 12(2), 115.
- Chiu, C. M., & Wang, E. T. (2008). Understanding Web-based learning continuance intention: The role of subjective task value. *Information & management*, 45(3), 194-201.
- Davis, F. D. (1989 ). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (3), 319-340
- Dawson, S.; Kim, M. (2009). External and internal trigger cues of impulse buying online. *Direct Mark. Int. J.* 3, 20–34.
- Verhagen, T., & Van Dolen, W. (2011). The influence of online store beliefs on consumer online impulse buying: A model and empirical application. *Information & Management*, 48(8), 320-327.
- Akram, U., Hui, P., Khan, M. K., Hashim, M., Qiu, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2017, July). Online impulse buying on “double eleven” shopping festival: An empirical investigation of utilitarian and hedonic motivations. In *International Conference on Management Science and Engineering Management* (pp. 680-692). Springer, Cham.
- Beatty, S. E., & Ferrell, M. E. (1998). Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors. *Journal of retailing*, 74(2), 169-191.
- Priporas, C. V., Stylos, N., & Fotiadis, A. K. (2017). Generation Z consumers' expectations of interactions in smart retailing: A future agenda. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 374-381.
- Chowdhury, F. (2020). The Impact of Socio-Cultural Factors in Impulse Purchasing Behaviour of Clothes in Bangladesh. *J. Bus. Adm*, 41, 15-28.
- Djafarova, E., & Bowes, T. (2021). ‘Instagram made Me buy it’: Generation Z impulse purchases in fashion industry. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59, 102345.