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Abstract
In the perpetually shifting and dynamic realm of retail, the pivotal elements of differentiation and ensnaring customer trustworthiness stand as paramount imperatives. The crucial strategy for retailers in steadfast customer retention and captivating is to understand the complex factors behind impulse buying behavior. Henceforth, this study explores the influential factors guiding impulse buying and their dominancy in securing customer loyalty. Our primary goal was to differentiate influential factors of impulse buying behavior and then discover their adeptness potential for customer acquisition. More importantly, our focus gravitated towards dissecting the shopping environment encasing Hyperstar, Karachi, to extract empirical data through a meticulously targeted survey mechanism. A quantitative approach was implemented, surveying 382 respondents within the boundaries of Hyperstar. Employing a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire, the scrutinization leveraged a conventional tool, ensuring an unwavering reliability quotient exceeding 0.7 thresholds for each differentiated factor. The survey questionnaire was borrowed from antecedent researchers to seamlessly align with the context while ensuring robustness. The research culminated in the discernment of distinct factors; sensation cues, promotional approaches, and window displays. Exhibiting a positive correlation with impulse buying bents for retail commodities. Most notably, sensation cues appeared as the foremost catalyst, exerting a strangely profound influence on impulse buying behavior. The research steadfastly emphasizes the pivotal role played by sensory stimuli in direction-finding impulse purchases. By purposefully managing sensation cues line-up promotional strategies and window displays, retailers can efficiently attribute impulse buying behaviors to adoptive customer engagement and customer loyalty, to fortify the market standing in the dynamic retail domain.

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, the quest for unparalleled shopping experiences has evolved through a transformation in consumer buying behavior (Singh et al. 2023). These experiences are being gauged by customers based on their pleasure and enjoyment, which can easily derived from their interactions with products (Shafiq et al. 2023).
However, the offerings have been emphasized by adding value which results in redefining the marketing strategies for the prompted retailers (Deborah, Oesman, and Yudha 2022).

The attention of marketers has increasingly turned to understanding the intricate landscape of consumer buying behavior, delving into the when, why, how, and where behind purchase decisions (Chaudhari 2023). The phenomenon of impulse buying, particularly prevalent in larger retail establishments like Hyperstar and Supermarts, garners substantial attention from marketers due to its sudden and unplanned nature, stirring specific feelings and fulfilling unforeseen needs (Han 2023). Impulse buying, closely linked to consumer buying decisions, is influenced by a spectrum of internal and external factors. Internal factors encompass individual traits and mental states, while external factors encapsulate store characteristics, in-store displays, and promotional approaches (Abdelkhair et al. 2023; Prasetio and Muchnita 2022). Henceforth, our primary research objective is to discern the pivotal factors influencing impulse buying behavior.

Despite being a swift decision in shopping, impulse buying is a complex process deeply intertwined with the shopping experience and often influenced by cultural and emotional forces (Goel et al. 2022). It can arise from a desire to address negative emotional states or from hedonic consumption seeking pleasure and joy. Layouts, displays, and packaging intricately influence sales, while emotions, cognitive states, and online behaviors interconnect significantly with impulse buying tendencies (Azizah and Nur 2022; Raza, Asif, and Akram 2023). Furthermore, the retail environment’s quality is found to exert a profound effect on impulse buying behavior, aligning with the factors we aim to explore in our study.

As per (Cavazos-Arroyo and Máynez-Guaderrama 2022; Pratiwy and Siregar 2022; Zhu et al. 2023) impulse buying behavior, characterized as an unforeseen and urgent cognitive purchasing pattern, involves making swift decisions without engaging in deliberate reflection on alternative options. This spontaneous behavior, often devoid of an analysis of alternatives, reflects an individual’s inclination towards unplanned purchases (Tesfaye 2022). The inception of this buying impulse, traced back to customers’ exposure to motivating factors within the store environment, encourages unplanned purchases (Patrikha et al. 2023). The impulse buying process typically begins without a predetermined shopping agenda, leading customers to experience an intense desire for certain products, prompting them to make purchasing decisions without evaluating other options (Edirisinghe and Munson 2023; Li et al. 2022). Post-purchase, customers often reflect on the positive or negative consequences of their buying behavior, highlighting the cognitive assessment that follows these impulsive decisions (Lee, Gan, and Liew 2022).

The factors, whether internal or external, significantly impact customers’ disposition towards impulse buying (Lavuri 2021). Whereas external factors involve strategic situation of advertising signs and promotional exertions within the store, appealing customers’ eye towards impulsive purchases (Redine et al. 2023). In addition, the store’s physical appearances, including in-store exhibitions, ambiance, and several stimuli such as scent, sound, and staff conduct, significantly influence unintended purchasing behaviors (Wang et al. 2022). Surprising price variations or discounts also play a crucial role in prompting consumer’s spending habits, upsetting their perception of product value and
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afterward impacting impulsive buying decisions (Rahman and Hossain 2022). Internally, emotional states, individual traits, and norms regarding purchasing promises directly subsidize to impulsive leanings, prompting consumers’ responses to the provocations met during their shopping experiences (Lin et al. 2022; Pereira et al. 2022; Sen and Nayak 2022). In conclusion, the dynamics of impulse buying behavior integrate a multitude of both factors (external and internal) twisted with the shopping environment, influencing spontaneous purchasing behaviors among consumers.

• To investigate correlations; Exploring and understanding the complex correlations among independent variables and their impact on impulse buying behavior.
• To evaluate sensation cues; Analyzing the specific intensities that significantly influence impulse buying behavior.
• To assess promotional approaches; Investigating the effectiveness of mixed promotional strategies in causing impulsive purchasing decisions.
• To analyze window display impact; Examining the nuanced elements of window displays on inspiring impulse buying behavior.
• To explore consumer preferences; Understanding the factors contributing to consumers’ preferences towards impulse buying behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The enigmatic realm of impulse buying behavior unfurls a tapestry interwoven with the abrupt and imperative thrust into purchasing precipices, oftentimes shunning the deliberate cogitation and contemplation of alternate avenues (LE et al. 2022; Redine et al. 2023; Tran 2022) (Anon n.d.; Tran 2022). A multitude of inquiries, guided by scholarly compasses, have endeavored to decipher the external forces casting their influence upon this impulsive tableau, unraveling the omnipotence of window displays, promotional choreography, and the tantalizing symphony of sensory cues, each carving their indelible mark upon the impulsive purchase trajectory (Chauhan, Banerjee, and Dagar 2023). A nuanced dichotomy emerges, segregating the ordinary course of purchase from the impulsive ardor, wherein the latter spurns the customary information quest, embarking instead upon a journey initiated by the in-store product siren song, culminating in instantaneous acquisitions spurred by untamed desire (Anon 2022).

Distinguishing between regular and impulse buying processes, the latter bounces the information search stage and often starts with in-store product awareness, leading to immediate purchase decisions driven by desire (Gao and Yee 2022). This impulsive saga unfolds further, culminating in a post-purchase reckoning, wherein customers reckon with the ramifications, whether favorable or unfavorable, borne of their impromptu procurement (Borromeo, Cai, and Antonio E. Etrata 2022). A cavalcade of influences, myriad in nature, besieges the bastions of impulse buying conduct, stemming from an intricate interplay of internal and external machinations. Beyond the precincts, external influences encompass the heralds of advertising signals and seductive promotional incentives, eliciting impromptu shopping sojourns (Um, Chung, and Stienmetz 2023). The edifice of store characteristics and their displays, cocooned within the embrace of the in-store shopping milieu, exerts a momentous sway upon consumer predilections and their purchasing parabolas (Chen, Ha, and Vu 2023). Internally, the individual’s emotional tapestry, the tenor of their mood, and the idiosyncrasies of personality traits bear an indelible imprint upon the impulsive buying inclinations. Scholars espouse the notion of
these personality attributes as veritable signposts, heralding a person’s proclivity towards impulsive purchases (Zhang, Cheng, and Huang 2023; Zhang, Zhang, and Wang 2022). Moreover, the use of credit cards has emerged as a facilitator of impulse buying behavior due to their ease of use and deferred payment nature and this widespread use of credit cards affects consumer spending habits, potentially increasing their expenditure beyond budgetary constraints (Azizah and Nur 2022; Lee et al. 2022). Understanding the intricate interplay of these diverse factors is essential in comprehending and predicting impulse buying behavior, thereby offering valuable insights into consumer behavior and purchasing patterns (Madhu, Soundararajan, and Parayitam 2023).

**Sensation cues**

The enthralling saga of consumer purchasing behavior orbits around the mesmerizing allure of sensation cues entrenched within the labyrinthine folds of the shopping sphere (Chen and Yue 2023). An intricate tapestry of stimuli, comprising the ambient orchestration of shop environs replete with a melange of graphics, resonant audio waves, redolent aromas, and the ethereal embrace of lighting, assumes a pivotal mantle in the symphony orchestrating consumer buying behavior (Aires 2022). Scholars, with their scholarly lanterns ablaze, cast an illuminating gaze upon the profound impact bestowed by these sensorial realms, where the allure of an enchanting shop milieu bedecks the patron’s state of readiness for purchase. Moreover, the multifaceted mechanisms adorning the shop canvas, whether the vivid palette of colors or the nuanced interplay of lighting spectrums, emerge as veritable maestros in the grand symphony of retailing strategies. (Li, Zhu, and Yu 2023). Besides, Music has been identified as a trigger for behavioral responses in consumers, particularly impacting their emotional states (Khan, Qayyum, and Hanif 2022).

**Window displays**

The captivating visage of window displays and the astute choreography of product placements nestled within store confines are veritable linchpins in the intricate dance of capturing coveted customer gaze and stoking the fires of impulsive procurement (Jaini et al. 2022; Moes et al. 2021). The symphonic interplay of shopping realms suffused with an aura of delight, where the warm palette of colors converges with the redolence of fragrances and the melodic cadence of soundscapes, emerges as a beckoning beacon fostering the whims of impulsive buying fervor (Herdiany et al. 2022).

**Promotional approaches**

The dynamic tapestry of promotional methodologies, wielding the potent arsenal of coupons, price truncations, and the allure of sales promotions, stands as a seismic force sculpting the contours of consumer conduct with indelible impact (Daulay 2022; Mandolfo et al. 2022). Of these, the siren call of price reductions, etching an indelible mark upon the emotional tapestry of customers, emerges as a catalyst spurring their propensity to dive headlong into the maelstrom of impulsive acquisitions (Gardi and Darmawan 2022; Lutfiatin and Rahardjo 2023).

**Effect of Sensation Cues on Impulse Buying Behavior**

The symphony of Sensation Cues: A mesmerizing ballet orchestrated within the hallowed halls of stores, wherein the store ambiance, the mellifluous cadence of audio, and the
intricate tapestry of store design wield an omnipotent scepter, guiding the trajectory of unplanned needs and the siren song of impulse buying (Goel et al. 2023). The benign embrace of a shopping haven, bedecked with the harmonious convergence of music, hues painting the canvas, and fragrant whispers, acts as a nurturing cradle fostering the impetus for impulsive purchases (Chen and Yue 2023). It’s within the sanctum of these store environs that the humdrum routines of purchases metamorphose into exhilarating escapades, pulsating with the thrill of spontaneity and excitement (Sarwar et al. 2023). Furthermore, the external echo of sales promotions and the irresistible allure of discounted prices stand as beckoning sirens goading consumer impulses towards impromptu acquisitions (Lou et al. 2022).

Promotional Approaches to Impulse Buying Behavior

A tapestry woven with myriad threads, where the guises of coupons, discounts, and the magnetic allure of gift offers cast a spell, eliciting emotional crescendos in consumers, their impulse-fueled proclivities jostling to the forefront (Daulay 2022). The unexpected delight and emotional resonance harnessed by vouchers and price truncations etch indelible imprints upon purchasing paradigms, igniting the flames of impulsive buying in select contexts (Liang and Lin 2023; Petersson and Brink 2022).

Window display’s role in Impulse Buying Behavior

The orchestration of window displays and the deft arrangement of products within store confines emerge as behemoths in the impulsive realm, captivating customer gazes and coaxing forth spontaneous purchases with beguiling allure (Kumar et al. 2023; Tesfaye 2022).

Factors Affecting Impulse Buying Behavior at the shopping mall

Within the labyrinthine expanse of shopping malls, the characteristics of stores, the tender ministrations of customer services, the strategic deployment of pricing stratagems, and the elaborate choreography of promotional ballets loom large, wielding a seismic sway upon consumer impulses, sculpting the contours of impulsive buying behaviors (Redine et al. 2023). It’s amidst the bliss of enjoyable shopping sojourns and the tantalizing accessibility to financial means that the seeds of heightened impulse buying tendencies find fertile ground within the hearts of shoppers (Coelho et al. 2023).

Figure 1.
Research framework
The framework laboring in this study revolves around key variables; Sensation Cues, Promotional Approaches, and Window Displays as independent variables whereas Impulse Buying Behavior as dependent variable. These variables were purposefully
chosen to investigate their interrelatedness, specifically to examine the impact of independent variables (Sensation Cues, Promotional Approaches, and Window Displays) on dependent variable (Impulse Buying Behavior). By executing this agenda, the study aims to uncover the nuanced influences between marketing strategies, sensory stimuli, visual displays, and consumers' impulsive purchasing tendencies. Through a particular examination of these variables, the research activities to unveil the complex dynamics that shape consumers' impulsive actions within retail sceneries, shedding light on influential factors that drive purchasing decisions in the ever-growing marketplace.

**METHODOLOGY**

The foundational architecture underpinning this scholarly endeavor adheres to a meticulously crafted causal, quantitative blueprint, ingeniously fusing the reservoirs of both primary and secondary founts of data. The linchpin of this data acquisition nexus stands embodied within the contours of a meticulously structured questionnaire, the paragon instrument employed for this veritable data odyssey. This questionnaire, wielded as the harbinger of insight, embarked on its sojourn through the expansive and bustling expanse of Karachi, a metropolis teeming with denizens, its estimated populace dancing to the tune of 17,236,230 as meticulously documented by the World Population Review of 2023.

Imbued with the sanctity of statistical rigor, the deliberate and painstaking curation of a sample size comprising 382 individuals ensued, a feat orchestrated with exacting precision to safeguard against a margin of error, meticulously anchored at a 5% threshold. This deliberate selection, a testament to methodological prowess, paved the path for an empirical pilgrimage brimming with a mosaic of insights awaiting decipherment. This research employs a convenient sampling technique to gather insights from both primary and secondary sources, utilizing a questionnaire modeled after the study conducted by Keyur (2014) on Factors Affecting Impulse Buying Behavior. The Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5, elucidates respondents' agreement levels (from strongly disagree to strongly agree), ensuring each factor's reliability surpasses the threshold of 0.7.

**HYPOTHESIS**

**H1:** There is a significant relationship between sensation cues and impulse buying.

**H0:** There is no significant relationship between sensation cues and impulse buying.

**H2:** There is a significant relationship between promotional approaches and impulse buying.

**H02:** There is no significant relationship between promotional approaches and impulse buying.

**H3:** There is a significant relationship between window display and impulse buying.

**H03:** There is no significant relationship between a window display and impulse buying.

**H4:** There is a respondent's preference towards impulse buying behavior.

**H04:** There is no respondent’s preference towards impulse buying behavior.

**H5:** There is an effect of sensation cues on impulse buying.

**H05:** There is no effect of sensation cues on impulse buying.
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H6: There is an effect of promotional approaches on impulse buying.
H06: There is no effect of promotional approaches on impulse buying.
H7: There is an effect of window display on impulse buying.
H07: There is no effect of window display on impulse buying.

Data Analysis

In-depth analysis and presentation of the questionnaire survey results obtained from the respondents are delineated. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 served as the analytical tool to dissect the data collected from respondents within Karachi, specifically at Hyperstar shopping mall. The statistical examination encapsulates descriptive analysis, encompassing respondents’ demographic profiles and general information. Additionally, the analysis comprises scale measurement through reliability tests and inferential examination conducted via Correlation and Regression analyses, elucidating the nuanced relationships and predictive factors associated with the variables under scrutiny.

RELIABILITY

Statistics and Analysis

The obtained results reveal a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .847, indicating a high level of consistency and reliability within the items utilized in the instrument. This robust coefficient surpasses the standard ratio of 0.60 typically required for reliability measures. The higher-than-expected value affirms the strong internal consistency among the questionnaire items, substantiating their reliability and reinforcing their suitability for accurate measurement and analysis within this research context.

Frequency

Table1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

The gender distribution within the respondents showcases a ratio of 248 males, constituting 64.9% of the total sample, while 134 females represent 35.1% of the surveyed population.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation

Within the demographic occupation breakdown, the survey results indicate that students accounted for 170 respondents, comprising 44.5% of the total participants. Professionals constituted 149 respondents, representing 39.0% of the sample, while businesspersons and other categories accounted for 13 respondents each, equivalent to 13.1% and 3.4% of the surveyed population, respectively.
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessperson</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification: Within the demographic qualification segment, the data indicates that respondents holding an undergraduate qualification accounted for 132 individuals, constituting 34.6% of the total respondents. Those with a graduation qualification comprised the largest group, with 181 respondents, equivalent to 47.4%. Post-graduates accounted for 57 respondents, representing 14.9% of the surveyed population, while a smaller subset, categorized as 'other,' encompassed 12 individuals, making up 3.1% of the total sample.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

A breakdown of respondents by age group reveals that 197 individuals, making up 51.6% of the total sample, fell within the age range of 18-25 years. The 26-35 age bracket comprised 109 respondents, representing 28.5% of the surveyed population. Additionally, 49 respondents, equivalent to 12.8%, were within the 36-45 age group, while individuals aged over 45 accounted for 27 respondents, making up 7.1% of the total participants.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 25</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income per Anum

Within the demographic segmentation based on annual income, the data indicates that 133 respondents, accounting for 34.8% of the total participants, reported an income up to 50,000. In the bracket of 50,000 to 100,000, 160 respondents were represented, constituting 41.9% of the surveyed population. Additionally, 65 respondents fell within the 100,000 to 300,000 income range, making up 17.0% of the sample. Respondents with an income exceeding 300,000 amounted to 24 individuals, equivalent to 6.3% of the total respondents.
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Shopping

Within the demographic segmentation based on shopping frequency, the data reveals that 22 respondents, constituting 5.8% of the total participants, reported shopping daily. Weekly shoppers comprised 87 respondents, representing 22.8% of the surveyed population, while 115 respondents, equivalent to 30.1%, indicated shopping every month. The majority of respondents, totaling 126 individuals or 33.0%, reported shopping occasionally. Additionally, 32 respondents, making up 8.4% of the sample, were categorized as 'not decided' regarding their shopping frequency. Notably, the most prevalent shopping frequency among respondents was categorized as occasional.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product

In our frequency analysis of product categories, the data unveils a distinct preference among respondents. The majority, comprising 224 individuals or 58%, indicated a preference for clothes or retail product shopping. Electronics garnered preference from 44 respondents, representing 11.5% of the surveyed population. Moreover, 72 respondents, equivalent to 18.8%, expressed a preference for cosmetics, while accessories were favored by 18 individuals, making up 4.7% of the sample. An additional 24 respondents, constituting 6.3% of the total participants, indicated a preference for other product categories. Notably, clothes emerged as the most preferred category among the respondents in this analysis.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORRELATION

Analysis

The provided table depicts the correlation among Sensation Cues, promotional Approaches, Window Display, and Impulse Buying. The analysis reveals substantial and noteworthy correlations, denoted by the double asterisks (*), indicating a strong positive relationship. Specifically, the correlation coefficients stand at .548 for Sensation Cues and Impulse Buying, .404** for Promotional Approaches and Impulse Buying, and .456** for Window Display and Impulse Buying. These robust correlation values validate the
significance of the relationships between all independent variables and the dependent variable. Consequently, it confirms the fulfillment of hypotheses H1, H2, and H3, demonstrating the significant and positive correlations among Sensation Cues, Promotional Approaches, Window Display, and Impulse Buying in study.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Impulsive Buying</th>
<th>Sensation Cues</th>
<th>Promotional Approaches</th>
<th>Window Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive Buying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation Cues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.371**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Display</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis Testing

In Hypothesis 1, the analysis supports H1, revealing a significant relationship between sensation cues and impulse buying, thus confirming its acceptance. Conversely, the null hypothesis, H0, suggesting no significant relationship between these variables, is rejected based on the findings. Moving to Hypothesis 2, the results align with H1, demonstrating a significant relationship between promotional approaches and impulse buying. Hence, Hypothesis 2 is accepted, while the null hypothesis (H0) proposing no substantial relationship is dismissed. Similarly, Hypothesis 3 findings uphold H3, establishing a significant relationship between a window display and impulse buying, affirming its acceptance. Contrarily, the null hypothesis (H0), positing no significant relationship between these variables, is rejected based on the analysis outcomes.

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Analysis

The presented table showcases the mean values for various factors: impulse buying stands at 2.1968, sensation cues at 2.3480, promotional approaches at 2.0016, and window display at 2.0191. These figures indicate that respondents' opinions predominantly sway between agreement (A) and neutrality (N) for most of the questions. The pattern suggests a general inclination towards agreement among respondents. Additionally, the standard deviation values, all below one, signify limited variance in responses, indicating less scattered data. On average, respondents exhibit a preference
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for impulse buying behavior, aligning with their perception that sensation cues, promotional approaches, and window displays act as stimuli for impulse buying. Thus, these findings substantiate the acceptance of Hypothesis 4, indicating a prevalent preference among respondents for impulse buying behavior. This preference is bolstered by their perception that sensation cues, promotional approaches, and window displays serve as influential factors stimulating impulse buying tendencies.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive Buying</td>
<td>2.1968</td>
<td>.53800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation Cues</td>
<td>2.3480</td>
<td>.75959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Approaches</td>
<td>2.0016</td>
<td>.70225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Display</td>
<td>2.0191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis H4 supports the presence of a respondent's preference towards impulse buying behavior, as indicated by the analysis outcomes. Hence, H4 is accepted, affirming the existence of a prevailing inclination among respondents for impulse buying behavior. Conversely, the null hypothesis (H0) suggesting the absence of such a preference is rejected based on the analysis findings.

Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Results</th>
<th>Akaike Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H04</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Analysis

Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.621a</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.42353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant)
Sensation Cues, Promotional Approaches, Window Display

MODEL SUMMARY

The model summary examining the impact of sensation cues, promotional approaches, and window display on impulse buying behavior indicates a lack of significance. In accordance with the standard criteria, the "Adjusted R Square" value is expected to be greater than or equal to 0.6 to signify a well-fitted model. However, our analysis reveals an "Adjusted R Square" value of .380, falling below the accepted threshold. This outcome suggests that the model constructed in this study does not adequately fit the data, indicating its inadequacy in explaining the variance in impulse buying behavior based on the variables of sensation cues, promotional approaches, and window display.

In the regression model for impulse buying, the coefficients suggest the following effects:
Sensation cues exhibit a substantial impact with a beta coefficient of 0.273 and a "t" value of 8.337. This indicates a significant influence on impulse buying behavior, surpassing the standard "t" value of 2, affirming its considerable effect.

Promotional approaches display an effect with a beta coefficient of 0.134 and a "t" value of 3.889. This suggests an impact on impulse buying, surpassing the standard "t" value, indicating a notable effect.

Window display, with a beta coefficient of 0.172 and a "t" value of 4.919, also showcases an effect on impulse buying. However, the "t" value falls slightly below the standard value of 2, implying a relatively lesser but still noteworthy influence.

These findings highlight the differential impacts of the variables on impulse buying behavior, emphasizing the predominant influence of sensation cues, followed by promotional approaches, and then window display, according to their respective coefficients and "t" values.

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

The analysis supports H5, signifying the presence of a significant effect of sensation cues on impulse buying behavior. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H0) proposing no such effect is rejected based on the findings. Similarly, Hypothesis 6 aligns demonstrating a significant effect of promotional approaches on impulse buying. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 is accepted, while the null hypothesis (H0) positing no substantial effect is dismissed. Likewise, Hypothesis 7's results revealing a significant effect of window display on impulse buying behavior. Thus, Hypothesis 7 is accepted, while the null hypothesis (H0) suggesting no significant effect is rejected based on the analysis outcomes.

**Table 13.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H05</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H06</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H07</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

The study’s findings are derived from a robust analysis of 382 respondents at Hyperstar, Karachi, unveiling crucial insights into impulse buying behavior. The research achieved a commendable reliability value of 0.847, surpassing the required threshold. Demographically, the participant distribution revealed a majority of females (64.1%) compared to males (35.9%), with a predominant presence of students (44.5%) and individuals holding a graduation degree (47.4%). Age-wise, the highest proportion of respondents fell within the 18-25 bracket (51.6%), while the most prevalent annual income bracket was within the range of 50,000-100,000 (41.9%). Regarding shopping habits, a significant number of respondents indicated occasional shopping behavior (30.0%). Product-wise, clothes emerged as the dominant category (58.6%). The analysis
underscored the positive relationship between all variables and impulse buying behavior. Specifically, sensation cues exhibited the strongest correlation (0.548**), followed by promotional approaches (0.404**), and window displays (0.456**). However, the regression model was deemed insufficiently fitting. Notably, sensation cues emerged as the most influential factor on impulse buying, supported by a significant "t" value of 8.337, while promotional approaches and window displays also showcased impact with "t" values of 3.889 and 4.919, respectively.

**DISCUSSION**

The discussion reflects a substantial alignment with prior research, affirming the positive relationships between sensation cues, promotional approaches, window display, and impulse buying behavior. Consistently, previous studies have similarly established these variables' significant and positive associations with impulse buying. Notably, your research reinforces the consensus that sensation cues play a primary role, exerting a greater influence on impulse buying compared to promotional approaches and window display. The collective impact of all three independent variables on impulse buying behavior is affirmed by your study, echoing the findings of previous research. Specifically, the heightened impact of sensation cues on impulse buying resonates with prior conclusions, underlining its predominant role in driving consumer impulsivity within retail settings.

**CONCLUSION**

This study aimed to dissect the drivers of impulse buying behavior within Hyperstar shopping mall. The research yielded crucial insights, affirming the reliability of the questionnaire with a robust ratio of .847. Eminently noteworthy, the discernment of conspicuous and affirmative interlinkages among the pantheon of sensation cues, promotional stratagems, window displays, and the impulsive acquisition of goods emerged as the lodestar of this scholarly expedition. Yet, ensconced within the model's ambit, a paucity in its encompassing capacity, adumbrated by the "adjusted R Square" metric resting at a modest 0.266, heralds the delineation of the inherent limitations in explicating the labyrinthine variance inherent within impulse buying proclivities. This clarion call resounds for a deeper foray, a profound plunge into the uncharted realms of a more expansive and comprehensive gamut of influences stitching the tapestry of impulsive purchases beyond the confines of this delineated scene.

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION**

The research signals an urgent call for exhaustive and expansive inquiries into the multifaceted determinants governing impulsive purchases. Venturing beyond the confined boundaries of studied parameters, a comprehensive examination beckons towards store attributes, pricing methodologies, and customer engagement realms hitherto unexplored. Moreover, a meticulous scrutiny delving into the dichotomous repercussions, both affirmative and adverse, emanating from these determinants stands pivotal in unraveling the labyrinthine tapestry of customer conduct. This profound plunge becomes imperative for retailers endeavoring to craft bespoke strategies resonating harmoniously with the kaleidoscopic array of consumer predilections and behaviors.
The trajectory of forthcoming inquiries should transcend the confines of the Hyperstar retail haven, traversing diverse commercial terrains encompassing alternative shopping arenas such as malls, mega-stores, and bustling markets. The adoption of longitudinal studies, incisive case analyses, and immersive focus group investigations looms large as vehicles poised to unravel richer and more textured insights into the subtle nuances characterizing the impacts of disparate variables on impulsive buying tendencies. This diversified and expansive trajectory holds the promise of weaving a more comprehensive and all-encompassing comprehension of the intricate impulsive buying dynamics manifesting across variegated retail landscapes. This, in turn, endows businesses with malleable and adaptable strategies, wielding the prowess to seamlessly captivate and sway consumer inclinations with consummate efficacy.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The study’s revelations yield a treasure trove of invaluable insights primed for dissemination among policymakers and stakeholders entrenched in the retail echelons, galvanized by the shared ambition of augmenting consumer sojourns while propelling the inexorable trajectory of commercial expansion. To harness the identified bedrock determinants; namely, the potent trifecta of sensory triggers, avant-garde promotional paradigms, and visually captivating window exhibitions. Retail policies must pivot towards nurturing and fostering immersive and transformative shopping milieus. The underpinning of directives that espouse and exalt the strategic orchestration of sensory stimuli deployment, the avant-garde deployment of promotional stratagems, and the bewitching panorama of window displays stands poised to wield a seismic influence on consumer conduct. The canvas extends further; the orchestration of symbiotic affiliations between retailers and the luminaries of sensory marketing portends a supercharged augmentation of the efficacy of these groundbreaking strategies. This envisioned collaboration constructs an incubatory domain, wherein retailers are bestowed with the agility and acumen to perpetually calibrate and innovate in concordance with the constantly evolving tapestry of consumer predilections. Policymakers, ensconced within their pivotal role, hold the mantle to orchestrate sweeping industry-wide symposiums or chart the course for dissemination of comprehensive directives, proffering an olive branch brimming with best practices. These initiatives, permeating through the retail fabric, stand as beacons steering the collective compass towards the adoption and assimilation of these transformative strategies across myriad retail platforms. The denouement, an empyrean panorama, heralds the cultivation of a fiercely competitive and consummately consumer-centric retail frontier.
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