**Jurnal Representamen** Vol. 12 No. 2 Oktober 2026
Hal. 233-242
DOI:10.30996/representamen.v12i2.133964

# ARGUMENT QUALITY, SOURCE CREDIBILITY, AND FOCUSED IMMERSION IN WHATSAPP GROUP MESSAGES: EFFECTS ON RUNNING COMMUNITY MEMBERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD EVENT PARTICIPATION

**Shafa Nazara Eryes Putri[1], Meria Octavianti[2], Putri Trulline[3]**
[1,2,3] Department of Communication Management, Faculty of Communication Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran
[1]shafa22011@mail.unpad.ac.id

***Abstract***

*This study examines whether argument quality and source credibility in WhatsApp group messages are associated with members' attitudes toward running-event participation and whether focused immersion moderates those relationships. A quantitative explanatory survey was conducted among 90 members selected from 864 members of the Fakerunners Bandung WhatsApp group through simple random sampling. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation, multiple regression, and hierarchical Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA). In the full model, argument quality (B = .330, p < .001), source credibility (B = .351, p = .002), and focused immersion (B = .612, p = .006) had significant positive coefficients. The interaction between argument quality and focused immersion was not significant (B = .048, p = .176), nor was the interaction between source credibility and focused immersion (B = -.026, p = .466). Model 3 explained 67.6% of attitude variance (adjusted R2 = .656). The findings indicate that focused immersion operated as a direct attention-related condition rather than as a moderator in this setting. Conceptually, focused immersion should not be equated with involvement or personal relevance: focused immersion concerns the ability to maintain attention while reading, whereas involvement concerns motivation to process an issue. Because cognitive elaboration and route use were not measured directly, the significant coefficients do not by themselves establish central or peripheral processing.*

***Keywords:*** *argument quality; source credibility; focused immersion; WhatsApp group; running community*

**Abstrak**

Penelitian ini menguji hubungan kualitas argumen dan kredibilitas sumber pada pesan grup WhatsApp dengan sikap anggota dalam mengikuti event lari serta menguji focused immersion sebagai variabel moderasi. Survei kuantitatif eksplanatif dilakukan terhadap 90 anggota yang dipilih secara acak dari 864 anggota grup WhatsApp Fakerunners Bandung. Data dianalisis menggunakan korelasi Pearson, regresi berganda, dan Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) berjenjang. Pada model lengkap, kualitas argumen (B = 0,330; p < 0,001), kredibilitas sumber (B = 0,351; p = 0,002), dan focused immersion (B = 0,612; p = 0,006) memiliki koefisien positif yang signifikan. Interaksi kualitas argumen dengan focused immersion tidak signifikan (B = 0,048; p = 0,176), demikian pula interaksi kredibilitas sumber dengan focused immersion (B = -0,026; p = 0,466). Model 3 menjelaskan 67,6% variasi sikap (Adjusted R2 = 0,656). Temuan menunjukkan bahwa focused immersion pada konteks ini berperan sebagai kondisi perhatian yang berhubungan langsung dengan sikap, bukan sebagai moderator. Secara konseptual, focused immersion tidak sama dengan involvement atau relevansi personal: focused immersion berkaitan dengan kemampuan mempertahankan perhatian saat membaca, sedangkan involvement berkaitan dengan motivasi untuk memproses isu. Karena elaborasi kognitif dan penggunaan jalur pemrosesan tidak diukur secara langsung, koefisien yang signifikan tidak dengan sendirinya membuktikan pemrosesan sentral atau periferal.

**Kata kunci**: kualitas argumen; kredibilitas sumber; focused immersion; grup WhatsApp; komunitas lari

## INTRODUCTION

Persuasive communication shapes how individuals evaluate information, form attitudes, and decide whether to participate in an activity. In a community setting, persuasion may appear through routine information, reminders, recommendations, interpersonal invitations, and ongoing conversation rather than through formal advertising. Messages about running events can therefore influence members' thoughts, feelings, and behavioral intentions because event participation involves practical preparation, personal goals, health considerations, and social interaction.

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) explains persuasion through a continuum of elaboration determined by motivation and ability (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Under higher elaboration, recipients examine issue-relevant information more carefully; under lower elaboration, they rely more on simple cues surrounding the message. However, ELM does not require message and source variables to operate as permanently separate routes. A variable may function as an argument, a cue, or a factor that changes the extent or direction of processing. Consequently, a significant coefficient for argument quality or source credibility cannot by itself prove that respondents used a central or peripheral route. Route-specific claims require direct evidence of cognitive elaboration, attitude strength, persistence, or resistance, none of which was measured in this study.

Mobile messaging platforms provide an important setting for examining this issue. WhatsApp groups and Communities enable administrators to distribute updates, organize topic-based subgroups, and maintain collective interaction (Meta, 2022). Studies included in the thesis also show that WhatsApp supports continuing persuasive communication through interpersonal features, reminders, and simple language (Wahyuti & Sudarmanti, 2025; Yuliati, 2026). Meanwhile, Sussman and Siegal (2003) apply an information-adoption perspective to organizational email, the closest messaging environment among the ELM-related studies used here. Together, these works establish the relevance of messaging media, but they do not explain how perceived message quality, source evaluation, and an attention-related receiver condition operate together in a WhatsApp community within an ELM framework.

Fakerunners Bandung is a relevant case because WhatsApp functions as its principal internal communication channel. The community was established on January 22, 2017 and uses the FRBdg group and several subgroups to share routine schedules, training programs, event information, participation lists, and event-specific coordination. Instagram and TikTok are used more for external publication. The FRBdg group contained 864 members as of May 30, 2026, making it a substantial communication space in which members repeatedly encounter running-event information.

Argument quality in this study refers to the perceived persuasive strength of information embedded in running-event messages. This operationalization follows information-adoption research, in which argument quality can be understood as information quality in computer-mediated communication (Sussman & Siegal, 2003;

Cheung et al., 2008). It is measured through accuracy, timeliness, relevance, and comprehensiveness. Thus, the construct does not represent an experimental manipulation of strong versus weak arguments; it represents members' evaluation of whether event information is correct, timely, useful, and sufficiently complete for consideration and decision making. This clarification is important because the indicators are conceptually close to perceived information quality.

Source credibility concerns members' evaluation of the sender of event information. Following Ohanian (1990), the construct includes expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. Expertise reflects knowledge and experience, while trustworthiness reflects reliability, honesty, consistency, and accuracy. Attractiveness was adapted to the social context of a community rather than restricted to physical appearance. It was represented by similarity, familiarity, and likability, including shared interest in running events, recognition of the sender, perceived closeness, preferred communication style, and friendliness.

Focused immersion refers to a state of deep attention in which competing demands are temporarily set aside (Agarwal & Karahanna, 2000). Zha et al. (2018) position focused immersion as an ability-related condition in ELM because it can help recipients concentrate on and understand information. It must therefore be distinguished from involvement or personal relevance. Involvement concerns motivation: how important or personally consequential an issue is to the recipient. Focused immersion concerns an attentive condition or ability while processing a message. The present study did not measure involvement as a separate variable, so this distinction is conceptual rather than an empirical comparison between two measured constructs.

Prior studies show that argument quality and source credibility matter in organizational email, online reviews, health messages, and social-media information processing (Sussman & Siegal, 2003; Cheung et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2017; Zha et al., 2018). Oh and Sundar (2015) further show that cognitive absorption and elaboration are relevant to attitudes in interactive digital media. Nevertheless, the studies differ in outcome and communication structure. Zha et al. (2018), the closest model, found that focused immersion moderated the influence of information quality on informational fit-to-task in social media. The present research instead examines attitudes toward event participation inside an ongoing WhatsApp community relationship.

The theoretical gap is therefore not merely that the platform and community are different. The unresolved question is whether focused immersion consistently changes the strength of message- and source-related relationships, or whether it can instead contribute directly to attitude formation. By testing both its direct coefficient and its interactions with argument quality and source credibility, this study evaluates whether the moderation pattern reported by Zha et al. (2018) extends to a continuing WhatsApp community and an attitudinal outcome. The study also clarifies that significant message and source coefficients are consistent with ELM but do not independently identify the processing route used by respondents.

Five hypotheses were tested: argument quality significantly predicts members' attitudes (H1); source credibility significantly predicts members' attitudes (H2); focused immersion

significantly predicts members' attitudes directly (H3); focused immersion moderates the relationship between argument quality and attitude (H4); and focused immersion moderates the relationship between source credibility and attitude (H5).

## METHODS

This study used a quantitative explanatory survey to examine statistical relationships among argument quality (X1), source credibility (X2), focused immersion (M), and members' attitudes toward running-event participation (Y). The research site was the Fakerunners Bandung community, particularly the FRBdg WhatsApp group. Respondents were registered members who received event-related information through this internal communication channel.

The population consisted of 864 members registered in the FRBdg WhatsApp group as of May 30, 2026, including the researcher. The sampling frame was compiled by extracting the WhatsApp numbers listed in the group. The Taro Yamane formula with a 10% margin of error produced a required sample of 89.62, rounded to 90 respondents. Simple random sampling was conducted using the Data Analysis feature in Microsoft Excel, which generated 90 member numbers at random. The questionnaire link was then distributed through WhatsApp to the selected members.

Data were collected through a closed-ended Google Forms questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Argument quality was measured using 17 items covering accuracy, timeliness, relevance, and comprehensiveness. Source credibility was measured using 14 items covering expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. Attitude was initially measured using 19 items representing cognitive, affective, and conative components; four invalid items were removed, leaving 15 items for analysis. Focused immersion was measured using five items covering psychological absorption, cognitive focus, sustained attention, active involvement in understanding, and the ability to set aside distractions.

The six attractiveness items were mapped in the operational matrix to similarity, familiarity, and likability in the social relationship between message senders and community members. The documented assessment of this adaptation consisted of theory-based item mapping and the subsequent pilot item-total validity and reliability tests. A separate numerical expert-panel content-validity index was not part of the documented analysis and is therefore not claimed in this article.

Before the main survey, the instrument was tested on 30 respondents with similar characteristics who were not included in the main sample. All 17 argument-quality items were valid, with item-total correlations of .661-.945, and Cronbach's alpha was .972. All 14 source-credibility items were valid, with correlations of .445-.944, and alpha was .956. Fifteen retained attitude items produced alpha = .936. All five focused-immersion items were valid, with correlations of .744-.806, and alpha was .836.

Descriptive categories were calculated from the theoretical score range. The maximum score equaled the highest Likert score multiplied by the

number of items, the minimum score equaled the lowest score multiplied by the number of items, and the range was divided into three classes. The resulting low, medium, and high intervals were 17-39, 40-62, and 63-85 for X1; 14-32, 33-51, and 52-70 for X2; 15-34, 35-54, and 55-75 for Y; and 5-11, 12-18, and 19-25 for M. These categories were used only for descriptive presentation. Moderation was assessed with continuous scores and interaction terms, not by comparing categorical groups.

Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation, multiple regression, and hierarchical MRA in SPSS 31. Model 1 included X1 and X2, and Model 2 added M. Before the interaction terms were calculated, the X1, X2, and M scores were mean-centered by subtracting each variable's sample mean. The interaction terms were then formed as X1 x M = (X1 - mean X1) x (M - mean M) and X2 x M = (X2 - mean X2) x (M - mean M). Model 3 entered the main effects and the two centered interaction products. The models were: Model 1, $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + e$; Model 2, $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3M + e$; and Model 3, $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3M + b4(X1 \times M) + b5(X2 \times M) + e$. H4 and H5 were supported only if the respective interaction coefficient was significant at $p < .05$.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The sample comprised 90 members with varied demographic and participation backgrounds. Men represented 63.33% of respondents, the largest age group was 26-40 years (63.33%), and private-sector or state-owned-enterprise employees formed the largest occupational category (42.22%). Half of the respondents held a bachelor's degree. In addition, 56.67% had joined running events more than four times during the previous year, and all respondents reported receiving event information through the community WhatsApp group. Table 1 presents the complete distribution of the principal respondent characteristics rather than only the dominant category.

**Table 1.** Complete distribution of respondent characteristics

| Variable | Category | f | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 57 | 63.33 |
| Gender | Female | 33 | 36.67 |
| Age | 18-25 years | 10 | 11.11 |
| Age | 26-40 years | 57 | 63.33 |
| Age | 41-60 years | 22 | 24.44 |
| Age | > 60 years | 1 | 1.11 |
| Occupation | Student | 8 | 8.89 |
| Occupation | Civil service /police/military | 11 | 12.22 |
| Occupation | Private-sector/ state-owned enterprise employee | 38 | 42.22 |
| Occupation | Entrepreneur | 20 | 22.22 |
| Occupation | Homemaker | 6 | 6.67 |
| Occupation | Other | 7 | 7.78 |
| Education | Junior secondary or equivalent | 1 | 1.11 |
| Education | Senior secondary or equivalent | 26 | 28.89 |
| Education | Diploma | 10 | 11.11 |
| Education | Bachelor degree | 45 | 50.00 |
| Education | Master degree | 7 | 7.78 |
| Education | Doctoral degree | 1 | 1.11 |
| Monthly expenditure | < IDR 1,000,000 | 7 | 7.78 |
| Monthly expenditure | IDR 1,000,000-<2,500,000 | 15 | 16.67 |
| Monthly expenditure | IDR 2,500,000-<5,000,000 | 32 | 35.56 |

| Variable | Category | f | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Monthly expenditure | IDR 5,000,000-<7,500,000 | 22 | 24.44 |
| Monthly expenditure | IDR 7,500,000-10,000,000 | 6 | 6.67 |
| Monthly expenditure | > IDR 10,000,000 | 8 | 8.89 |
| Length of membership | < 1 year | 21 | 23.33 |
| Length of membership | 1-2 years | 31 | 34.44 |
| Length of membership | 3-4 years | 24 | 26.67 |
| Length of membership | 5-6 years | 8 | 8.89 |
| Length of membership | > 7 years | 6 | 6.67 |
| Event frequency, last year | Never | 2 | 2.22 |
| Event frequency, last year | Once | 8 | 8.89 |
| Event frequency, last year | Twice | 15 | 16.67 |
| Event frequency, last year | Three times | 14 | 15.56 |
| Event frequency, last year | More than four times | 51 | 56.67 |

The descriptive scores were concentrated at the upper end for argument quality and attitude. Argument quality was high for 94.44% of respondents, source credibility was high for 71.11%, and attitude was high for 81.11%. Focused immersion differed: 66.67% of respondents were in the medium category and 32.22% were in the high category. These categories summarize response patterns only and were not used to infer moderation.

**Table 2.** Descriptive categorization of research variables

| Variable | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Argument quality (X1) | 85 (94.44%) | 5 (5.56%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Source credibility (X2) | 64 (71.11%) | 26 (28.89%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Members' attitude (Y) | 73 (81.11%) | 17 (18.89%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Focused immersion (M) | 29 (32.22%) | 60 (66.67%) | 1 (1.11%) |

Pearson correlations were positive and significant. Argument quality correlated with attitude at r = .722, source credibility at r = .754, and focused immersion at r = .601 (all p < .001). X1 and X2 were also strongly correlated (r = .783, p < .001), so their unique coefficients were examined in the regression models.

**Table 3.** Pearson correlations among principal variables

| Relationship | r | p | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| X1 - Y | .722 | < .001 | Strong positive |
| X2 - Y | .754 | < .001 | Strong positive |
| M - Y | .601 | < .001 | Strong positive |
| X1 - X2 | .783 | < .001 | Strong positive |

The exact diagnostic statistics are reported in Table 4. Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics were D = .079, .054, and .051 for Models 1-3; the corresponding asymptotic probabilities were .200 for all models and the Monte Carlo probabilities were .181, .740, and .823. Exact tolerance/VIF values were: Model 1, X1 = .387/2.585 and X2 = .387/2.585; Model 2, X1 = .386/2.588, X2 = .323/3.093, and M = .690/1.450; Model 3, X1 = .385/2.598, X2 = .318/3.143, M = .582/1.719, X1 x M = .195/5.121, and X2 x M = .193/5.169. These values met the study's criteria of tolerance > .10 and VIF < 10. Scatterplots showed no systematic residual pattern, so the three models were treated as free from heteroskedasticity under the graphical criterion used in the study.

**Table 4.** Exact classical-assumption diagnostics

| Model | K-S D | Asymp. p | Monte Carlo p | Tolerance (exact) | VIF (exact) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .079 | .200 | .181 | X1=.387 X2=.387 | X1=2.585 X2=2.585 |
| 2 | .054 | .200 | .740 | X1=.386 X2=.323 M=.690 | X1=2.588 X2=3.093 M=1.450 |
| 3 | .051 | .200 | .823 | X1=.385 X2=.318 M=.582 X1xM=.195 X2xM=.193 | X1=2.598 X2=3.143 M=1.719 X1xM=5.121 X2xM=5.169 |

All three hierarchical models were significant. Model 1 explained 61.4% of attitude variance. Adding focused immersion increased R2 by .051 to .665. Adding the two mean-centered interaction products increased R2 by a further .011 to .676; adjusted R2 for the full model was .656. The Delta R2 values in Table 5 are arithmetic differences between the R2 values reported for consecutive models; the original analysis did not report a separate significance test for R2 change.

**Table 5.** Hierarchical model summaries

| Model | Predictors | R | R2 | Adjusted R2 | Delta R2 | Overall F (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | X1, X2 | .783 | .614 | .605 | - | 69.079 (< .001) |
| 2 | X1, X2, M | .815 | .665 | .653 | .051 | 56.825 (< .001) |
| 3 | X1, X2, M, X1xM, X2xM | .822 | .676 | .656 | .011 | 34.972 (< .001) |

Model 3 was used for the final hypothesis decisions because it contained all main effects and both interactions. Argument quality had a significant positive coefficient (B = .330, p < .001), source credibility had a significant positive coefficient (B = .351, p = .002), and focused immersion had a significant positive direct coefficient (B = .612, p = .006). H1, H2, and H3 were therefore supported. The X1 x M coefficient was not significant (B = .048, p = .176), and the X2 x M coefficient was also not significant (B = -.026, p = .466); therefore, H4 and H5 were not supported.

**Table 6.** Complete coefficients for the three regression models

| Model | Predictor | B | SE | Beta | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Constant | 14.965 | 4.618 | - | 3.241 | .002 |
| 1 | Argument quality (X1) | .315 | .099 | .341 | 3.179 | .002 |
| 1 | Source credibility (X2) | .490 | .108 | .487 | 4.549 | < .001 |
| 2 | Constant | 9.585 | 4.575 | - | 2.095 | .039 |
| 2 | Argument quality (X1) | .327 | .093 | .353 | 3.515 | < .001 |
| 2 | Source credibility (X2) | .328 | .111 | .326 | 2.971 | .004 |
| 2 | Focused immersion (M) | .722 | .199 | .272 | 3.620 | < .001 |
| 3 | Constant | 9.848 | 4.588 | - | 2.147 | .035 |
| 3 | Argument quality (X1) | .330 | .093 | .357 | 3.565 | < .001 |
| 3 | Source credibility (X2) | .351 | .111 | .349 | 3.166 | .002 |
| 3 | Focused immersion (M) | .612 | .216 | .231 | 2.830 | .006 |
| 3 | X1 x M (centered product) | .048 | .035 | .192 | 1.365 | .176 |
| 3 | X2 x M (centered product) | -.026 | .035 | -.103 | -.732 | .466 |

The positive coefficient for argument quality indicates that respondents who evaluated event information as more accurate, timely, relevant, and comprehensive also tended to report more positive attitudes after the other predictors were controlled.

The finding is consistent with ELM's proposition that substantive message characteristics can contribute to attitude formation. However, the operationalization captures perceived information quality rather than an experimental contrast between strong and weak arguments, and the study did not directly measure cognitive elaboration. It should therefore not be interpreted as proof that respondents used the central route.

Source credibility also retained a positive coefficient in the full model. Members evaluated not only the information but also the knowledge, reliability, honesty, similarity, familiarity, and likability of the sender. In an ongoing community relationship, attractiveness is social rather than merely physical. The result is consistent with the role of source variables in ELM, but it does not establish exclusively peripheral processing. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) explain that source characteristics can operate as simple cues, affect the extent of processing, or become relevant information within a more elaborate judgment.

Focused immersion had a significant direct coefficient but did not moderate either relationship. This differs from Zha et al. (2018), who found that focused immersion moderated the relationship between information quality and informational fit-to-task. The difference may relate to the outcome and communication setting. Informational fit-to-task concerns whether information supports task performance, whereas the present outcome is an attitude toward joining a running event inside a continuing community relationship. The sample also showed substantial running-event experience and contextual relevance: 56.67% had participated more than four times in the previous year, and 74.44% joined the community partly to obtain event information. These characteristics suggest that prior knowledge, repeated exposure, and motivation may have enabled members to evaluate messages without the strength of the X1-Y or X2-Y relationship depending on momentary immersion. These explanations are derived from the study's theoretical discussion but were not tested as separate mediators or moderators.

The main theoretical contribution concerns the position of focused immersion. In this study, it was associated with attitude directly, but the interaction coefficients were not significant. Focused immersion is an ability- and attention-related state: it captures being absorbed, maintaining focus, understanding information, and setting aside distractions. Involvement or personal relevance is motivation-related: it concerns how important the issue is to the recipient. Treating them as interchangeable could lead to an incorrect expectation that every form of attention must strengthen message or source effects. The study did not measure involvement separately, so its contribution is to clarify their conceptual distinction and to show that focused immersion need not function as a moderator in every digital persuasion context.

The simultaneous significance of argument quality and source credibility should likewise be interpreted carefully. It shows that both message evaluation and source evaluation contribute unique variance within the regression model. It does not prove that respondents simultaneously followed two distinct routes, because route use, cognitive responses, attitude persistence, resistance to counter-persuasion, and behavioral prediction were

not directly measured. The findings are therefore consistent with ELM's flexible treatment of message and source variables without providing a direct route-classification test.

Practically, community administrators should ensure that event messages are accurate, timely, relevant, and sufficiently complete, and that information is delivered or confirmed by senders who are knowledgeable and reliable. Because focused immersion was directly associated with attitude, messages should also be easy to follow and should minimize avoidable ambiguity. These implications follow from the measured dimensions; the study does not establish that a particular formatting technique will cause participation.

Several limitations qualify the findings. The study examined one running community, used a cross-sectional design, and measured perceived attitudes rather than actual event participation. All variables were collected through one self-report questionnaire. A separate common-method-bias test was not part of the documented analysis, so shared-method variance cannot be ruled out. A separate numerical expert-panel content-validity index was likewise not available for the adaptation of attractiveness. Finally, the study did not directly measure elaboration, motivation, involvement, attitude strength, or processing route. These limitations restrict causal and route-specific interpretation.

## CONCLUSION

Argument quality, source credibility, and focused immersion each had significant positive coefficients in the full regression model, while neither interaction term was significant. The findings therefore support the direct relationships proposed in H1-H3 but do not support the moderating relationships proposed in H4-H5. Model 3 explained 67.6% of attitude variance, with adjusted R2 = .656.

The results refine the application of ELM in a WhatsApp running-community context. Accuracy, timeliness, relevance, and comprehensiveness represent the perceived informational strength of the message, while expertise, trustworthiness, and socially adapted attractiveness represent evaluation of the sender. Their significant coefficients are consistent with ELM, but they do not by themselves identify central or peripheral route use. Focused immersion is more appropriately interpreted here as an attention- and ability-related condition with a direct association with attitude, not as an empirical substitute for involvement or personal relevance and not as a moderator of the two persuasive predictors.

Fakerunners Bandung should continue to provide verified and sufficiently detailed event information through credible senders. Future research should measure personal relevance or involvement separately from focused immersion, directly assess cognitive elaboration and attitude strength, use designs that permit stronger causal inference, test common method variance when all constructs are collected from one questionnaire, and examine actual event participation in addition to self-reported attitudes.

## REFERENCES

Agarwal, R., & Karahanna, E. (2000). Time flies when you're having fun: Cognitive absorption and beliefs about information technology usage. MIS Quarterly, 24(4), 665-694. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250951

Azwar, S. (2023). Sikap manusia: Teori dan pengukurannya (2nd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-1182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

Cheung, C. M. K., & Thadani, D. R. (2012). The impact of electronic word-of-mouth communication: A literature analysis and integrative model. Decision Support Systems, 54(1), 461-470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2012.06.008

Cheung, C. M. K., Lee, M. K. O., & Rabjohn, N. (2008). The impact of electronic word-of-mouth: The adoption of online opinions in online customer communities. Internet Research, 18(3), 229-247. https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240810883290

Cheung, C., Sia, C.-L., & Kuan, K. (2012). Is this review believable? A study of factors affecting the credibility of online consumer reviews from an ELM perspective. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 13(8), 618-635. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00305

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Lin, T., Hwang, L., & Lai, Y. (2017). Effects of argument quality, source credibility and self-reported diabetes knowledge on message attitudes: An experiment using diabetes related messages. Health Information & Libraries Journal, 34(3), 225-235. https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12181

Meta. (2022). Sharing our vision for Communities on WhatsApp. About Meta. https://about.fb.com/news/2022/04/our-vision-for-communities-on-whatsapp/

Oh, J., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. Journal of Communication, 65(2), 213-236. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12147

Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. Journal of Advertising, 19(3), 39-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673191

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change. Springer.

Sugiyono. (2023). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.

Sussman, S. W., & Siegal, W. S. (2003). Informational influence in organizations: An integrated approach to knowledge adoption. Information Systems Research, 14(1), 47-65. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.14.1.47.14767

Wahyuti, T., & Sudarmanti, R. (2025). The influence of WhatsApp usage on persuasive communication in romantic relationships: A study among Indonesian Generation Z. Jurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi, 249-258.

Yuliati, N. (2026). Komunikasi persuasif pengurus Pemberdayaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga (PKK) dalam meningkatkan partisipasi kegiatan program Desa Sugih Waras. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum, 2887-2901.

Zha, X., Yang, H., Yan, Y., Liu, K., & Huang, C. (2018). Exploring the effect of social media information quality, source credibility and reputation on informational fit-to-task: Moderating role of focused immersion. Computers in Human Behavior, 79, 227-237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.038