JAPSI (Journal of Agriprecision and Social Impact)
Volume 3 Issue 3 November 2026
e-ISSN: 3032-7849; p-ISSN: 3046-5397, Page 451-467
DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.62793/japsi.v3i3.131
Available online at: https://journal.kdp.co.id/index.php/japsi

The Impact of Nano Influencer Promotional Language Styles on Perceived Credibility and Purchase Intention: An Experimental Study of Dufamec Pour on Anthelmintic on TikTok

Sangidil Kudri
Veterinary Agribusiness, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Airlangga University

Sunaryo Hadi Warsito
Department of Animal Husbandry, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Airlangga University

Emy Koestanti Sabdoningrum
Department of Animal Husbandry, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Airlangga University

Sri Hidanah
Department of Animal Husbandry, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Airlangga University

Tri Siwi Agustina
Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Airlangga University

Ardianto
Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Airlangga University

Address: Jl. Dr. Ir. H. Soekarno, Kampus C Mulyorejo, Surabaya 60115, East Java, Indonesia
Corresponding author: sanikudri47@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study examines the effect of promotional language styles (soft selling versus hard selling) on purchase intention for Dufamec Pour On Anthelmintic, a credence good, and the mediating role of perceived credibility on TikTok. A between-subjects experiment involved 360 livestock farmers exposed to promotional videos from Peternak Waras (less than 10,000 followers). Data were collected using 5-point Likert scale questionnaires and analyzed with Jamovi version 2.7 using Welch's Independent Samples T-Test and non-parametric bootstrapping regression with 10,000 resamples. Promotional styles do not significantly affect perceived credibility (Estimate = 0.04149, SE = 0.06596, p = 0.529; Welch's t = 0.622, p = 0.534), with audience trust already high (mean = 4.62 out of 5.00). However, credibility positively influences purchase intention (Estimate = 0.99375, SE = 0.00101, p < 0.001). Controlling for credibility, promotional style has a small but significant direct effect favoring soft selling (Estimate = 0.00628, SE = 0.00092, 95% CI [0.00446, 0.00808], p < 0.001). Nevertheless, purchase intention does not differ significantly between soft selling (mean = 4.65) and hard selling (mean = 4.60, p = 0.473), while the indirect effect is also insignificant (Estimate = 0.04123, SE = 0.06560, 95% CI [-0.08973, 0.16976], p = 0.530). These findings suggest that high pre-existing trust and urgent livestock health needs may enable promotional cues to stimulate purchase intention directly. A Problem-Solution Execution strategy emphasizing field demonstrations, verifiable product efficacy, and clear purchase instructions is recommended. Findings are limited by the measurement of self-reported rather than actual purchasing behavior.*

Keywords: *Soft selling, Hard selling, Perceived credibility, Purchase intention, Credence goods, Nano influencer, Bootstrapping regression*

Received: September 26, 2026 ; Accepted: October 29, 2026 ; Published: November 18, 2026
*Corresponding author, e-mail address sanikudri47@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms have transformed fundamentally into primary communication channels for agricultural knowledge sharing, driving an evolution toward social commerce across the livestock sector. In Indonesia, the short form video platform TikTok has established dominance in online engagement. Based on national search index records from Google Trends covering the 2021–2026 period (Google, 2026), the platform consistently led national web search volume with an average relative interest score of 71 out of 100 which surpassing Instagram at 39 and Facebook at 37, and reached 157.6 million active Indonesian users in 2024 following its social commerce integration (Permata, 2026). This massive digital ecosystem creates new avenues for specialized content creators and nano influencers (operationally defined in marketing literature as digital content creators with fewer than 10,000 followers who maintain high audience engagement within a specific niche; Brewster & Lyu, 2020; Campbell & Farrell, 2020) to shape farmer purchase intentions. Educational nano influencers, such as the Peternak Waras account on TikTok, are widely perceived as highly authentic, accessible, and deeply rooted in everyday farming experiences. This strong perception of authenticity is supported by Brewster and Lyu (2020), who found that recommendations from nano influencers feel more authentic because they closely resemble personal advice from a friend. Additionally, their reliance on educational communication strategies is crucial for effectively building and maintaining positive trust among their followers (Silva et al., 2023).

However, applying promotional strategies to veterinary pharmaceuticals introduces complex challenges because these veterinary medical supplies represent credence goods whose quality, chemical safety, and true biological efficacy remain difficult for consumers to evaluate independently prior to or even after use without specialized veterinary knowledge (Park et al., 2022). An ongoing academic and practical debate persists regarding whether indirect, educational communication (soft selling) or directive, urgent commercial calls to action (hard selling) are more effective in digital marketing. Previous studies examining influencer credibility and promotional language styles have focused primarily on conventional consumer search and experience goods, such as footwear (Hudhi & Windasari, 2023), cosmetics (Zhu et al., 2021), traditional batik clothing (Hidayat & Curatman, 2026), skincare products (Simamora & Suryani, 2025),

and general retail campaigns (Pramartha et al., 2026), where consumers can visually inspect product attributes and face low financial risk. While aggressive hard selling promotions on experience or search goods often stimulate immediate purchase intentions (Hudhi & Windasari, 2023; Simamora & Suryani, 2025), applying hard selling tactics to high risk veterinary credence goods like parasite medication risks triggering consumer skepticism, psychological reactance, and mistrust (Xu et al., 2022). As emphasized by Park et al. (2022), consumers of health related credence goods demand high expertise and trustworthiness from communicators, making an educational and informative soft selling approach potentially more appropriate than commercial coercion. Conversely, while soft selling builds relational rapport, it may lack the immediate transactional urgency required when livestock face acute parasitic health threats that endanger farm income (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020). Furthermore, empirical literature leaves an unresolved theoretical gap regarding whether promotional language directly motivates purchase intention in high risk agricultural markets or operates sequentially through the psychological mediation of communicator credibility.

Dufamec Pour On was selected as the experimental product for three primary reasons. First, it represents a typical veterinary credence good whose biological efficacy against internal and external parasites cannot be visually verified by farmers prior to use. Second, pour-on formulations are relatively new in many Indonesian smallholder systems compared with conventional oral or injectable anthelmintics, thereby creating a realistic information asymmetry that makes source credibility particularly salient. Third, the product is actively distributed through veterinary supply channels in Indonesia, allowing the experimental stimuli to maintain ecological validity while remaining ethically suitable for non commercial educational research. These characteristics make the product an appropriate test case for examining how promotional language styles influence purchase intention for high risk animal health inputs. To advance existing knowledge beyond conventional consumer goods into veterinary agribusiness, this experimental study investigates the causal impact of soft selling versus hard selling promotional language styles by a nano influencer on perceived credibility and purchase intention regarding Dufamec Pour On Anthelmintic on TikTok.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The conceptual foundation of this study integrates the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989) and extended by Venkatesh and Bala (2008), the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) by Ajzen (1991), and Source Credibility Theory by Hovland et al. (1953) and Ohanian (1990). To clarify the specific contribution of each theoretical perspective, TAM is positioned as a macro level contextual foundation explaining platform adoption specifically why the TikTok social commerce ecosystem functions as an accessible medium for disseminating veterinary agribusiness information, whereas Source Credibility Theory and TPB provide the micro level psychological constructs directly measured and tested within our structural hypotheses. Within this digital environment, TikTok satisfies TAM's perceived ease of use through its intuitive vertical short video interface accessible via simple screen scrolling, and fulfills perceived usefulness through its algorithmic distribution of practical livestock health solutions directly to farmers seeking remedies for animal diseases (Davis, 1989; Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). Although perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are not operationalized as separate latent variables in the regression model, they establish the technological boundary conditions that facilitate farmers' exposure to video marketing stimuli and map directly onto TPB's cognitive evaluations.

Specifically, while TAM explains platform receptivity, TPB (Ajzen, 1991) provides the psychological framework connecting message evaluations (attitudes toward a behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control) to individual purchase intentions. In agricultural decision making, when farmers perceive that an anthelmintic treatment video provides useful clinical solutions that will improve livestock productivity, they form positive behavioral attitudes; recommendations from respected digital educators shape communal subjective norms; and easy to use TikTok Shop ordering mechanisms reinforce perceived behavioral control, collectively driving transactional, referential, preferential, and explorative purchase intentions (Veloutsou & Panigyrakis, 2004; Ferdinand, 2014; Kotler & Keller, 2016). Furthermore, because veterinary pharmaceuticals represent credence goods whose chemical safety and biological efficacy cannot be visually evaluated prior to use, TPB is integrated with Source Credibility Theory (Hovland et al., 1953; Ohanian, 1990). This theory posits that persuasive communication depends on audience assessments of communicator expertise,

trustworthiness, and attractiveness, which function as vital risk relievers that mitigate consumer skepticism when evaluating high risk animal health assets (Ohanian, 1990; Park et al., 2022).

Within social media marketing, nano influencers (defined as content creators with fewer than 10,000 followers who maintain high engagement and close parasocial relationships within a specific niche; Brewster & Lyu, 2020; Campbell & Farrell, 2020) rely on promotional language styles as their primary communication strategy. Promotional language styles are divided into two contrasting message appeals: soft selling, which emphasizes narrative storytelling, educational tips, empathy toward farming challenges, and subtle calls to action; and hard selling, which utilizes explicit, urgent, and instructive commercial directives highlighting price, stock scarcity, and immediate checkout commands (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018; Hudhi & Windasari, 2023). In relation to Hypothesis 1 (path a), the framing of these promotional messages is theorized to influence how audiences evaluate the communicator's integrity and competence, as congruence between message appeal and influencer type shapes perceived authenticity and credibility (Zhu et al., 2021; Silva et al., 2023). In relation to Hypothesis 2 (path b), Source Credibility Theory and TPB posit that once communicator credibility is established, it serves as a foundational determinant of purchase intention in credence goods markets, where farmers depend on expert validation to overcome information asymmetry and perceived medical risk (Ohanian, 1990; Park et al., 2022).

In relation to Hypothesis 3 (direct path c'), beyond shaping credibility perceptions, promotional language styles under TPB can also operate as direct situational stimuli (cues to action) for farmers confronting urgent livestock health issues, awakening immediate problem recognition and motivating purchase intention without requiring prolonged cognitive re evaluation (Zhu et al., 2021; Hudhi & Windasari, 2023; Simamora & Suryani, 2025; Hidayat & Curatman, 2026). Conversely, in relation to Hypothesis 4 (indirect path a × b), classical consumer behavior literature suggests a sequential mediation process in which message appeals must first build source credibility, enhance brand awareness, or reduce psychological reactance before translating into purchase intention (Brewster & Lyu, 2020; Xu et al., 2022; Hayes, 2022; Pramartha et al., 2026). To empirically distinguish the effect of promotional language style on perceived credibility, its direct effect on purchase intention, and its indirect effect mediated through perceived credibility

(Zhao et al., 2010; Örs Özdil & Kutlu, 2019; Alfons et al., 2021), four main hypotheses are: H1: Promotional language style significantly affects the perceived credibility of the nano influencer; H2: Perceived credibility significantly and positively affects purchase intention for veterinary health products; H3: Promotional language style directly and significantly affects purchase intention; and H4: Perceived credibility mediates the indirect effect of promotional language style on purchase intention.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative between subjects experimental research design conducted between July and August 2026. The target population comprised active Indonesian livestock farmers who regularly use TikTok. Participants were recruited through digital ruminant farming communities and social media channels using a purposive sampling strategy based on three strict eligibility criteria: (1) working full time as an active livestock farmer in Indonesia, (2) actively accessing the TikTok platform at least three times per week, and (3) completing the stimulus exposure and post test instrument in full. Eligible participants were allocated to one of two experimental conditions via automated random link assignment. After excluding incomplete responses and participants who failed the initial screening criteria prior to analysis, the procedure yielded 360 valid farmer respondents (surpassing the minimum multivariate sample size requirements of Hair et al., 2019) divided into a hard selling treatment group (Group 0, n = 194) and a soft selling treatment group (Group 1, n = 166). (Note: Group sample sizes reflect the exact coding in the statistical output where Group 0 = 194 and Group 1 = 166, totaling N = 360).

Both experimental groups viewed specifically manipulated short form vertical (9:16 aspect ratio) TikTok promotional videos from the educational nano influencer account Peternak Waras (<10,000 followers) promoting Dufamec Pour On, a broad spectrum antiparasitic pour on solution containing 5 mg/ml active Ivermectin (500 ml bottle, manufactured by Dutch Farm International B.V., Netherlands, and imported by PT Gema Satwa Medika) indicated for gastrointestinal roundworms, lungworms, mites, lice, and ticks in ruminants at a topical dose of 1 ml per 10 kg body weight. To isolate the effect of promotional language style while accommodating natural narrative variations, core production features were held constant across both treatments, including the presenter

identity (Sangidil Kudri), visual display of the 500 ml twin neck dosing bottle, and technical dosage accuracy. The soft selling video (coded as 1) had a duration of approximately 17.47 seconds, was filmed inside a livestock barn, and employed an empathetic narrative demonstrating stress free topical application along the backline of sheep while explaining clinical parasite prevention benefits. Conversely, the hard selling video (coded as 0) had a duration of approximately 41 seconds and employed an explicit, urgent, and directive commercial script featuring close up product shots, bold on screen urgency text ("Yuk Amankan Stok" / Secure Your Stock Now), stock scarcity cues, and an immediate command to purchase via the checkout link.

Following video exposure, respondents completed a mandatory stimulus verification check confirming full video viewing and rated a 5 point Likert language comprehension check item ("The language used in the Dufamec Pour On promotional video by Peternak Waras that I just watched was very clear and easy to understand"), which confirmed high message reception across respondents (mean = 4.64, SD = 0.617). Research variables were operationalized and measured using a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"). Promotional language style (X) was coded dichotomously (0 = Hard Selling, 1 = Soft Selling). Perceived credibility (M) was operationalized as a unidimensional composite construct capturing the interconnected dimensions of source attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness/community standing adapted from Ohanian (1990), Brewster and Lyu (2020), and Silva et al. (2023) across seven items: engaging delivery (Cred 1), familiar farming language (Cred 2), convincing benefit explanation (Cred 3), technical livestock health knowledge (Cred 4), honest and truthful product information (Cred 5), exemplary farmer role model status (Cred 6), and positive reputation in the farming community (Cred 7).

Although attractiveness, familiarity, role model status, and community reputation represent nuanced facets, they converge into a single overarching evaluation of niche educator credibility in parasocial digital environments (Brewster & Lyu, 2020). Purchase intention (Y) was operationalized using established four dimensional behavioral intention scales from Veloutsou and Panigyrakis (2004), Ferdinand (2014), and Kotler and Keller (2016), capturing transactional intent (Intention 1: intention to buy when livestock face worm infections), referential intent (Intention 2: willingness to recommend to peers),

preferential intent (Intention 3: primary brand choice over competing anthelmintics), and explorative intent (Intention 4: proactive seeking of purchasing information).Data processing was conducted in Jamovi version 2.7 built on the R statistical environment. Because classical assumption testing revealed violations of normality (Shapiro Wilk $W = 0.618$, $p < 0.001$ for perceived credibility; $W = 0.617$, $p < 0.001$ for purchase intention) due to a strong ceiling effect and non homogeneous variances across treatment groups (Levene's Test $F(1, 358) = 7.29$, $p = 0.007$ for perceived credibility; $F(1, 358) = 8.70$, $p = 0.003$ for purchase intention), unadjusted comparative hypothesis testing was executed using Welch's Independent Samples T Test. Structural path analysis and mediation testing ($X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$) were conducted via ordinary least squares regression with non parametric percentile bootstrapping using 10,000 resamples at a 95% confidence interval (Örs Özdil & Kutlu, 2019; Alfons et al., 2021; Hayes, 2022). Regarding research ethics and disclosures, this non invasive online survey involved adult farmers without direct animal experimentation and qualified for institutional ethical exemption; all participants provided voluntary digital informed consent prior to participation under guaranteed anonymity. Formal written authorization to feature Dufamec Pour On for educational research was granted by PT Gema Satwa Medika. The authors transparently disclose that the Peternak Waras account is managed by the lead researcher; however, no commercial funding was received from the product distributor.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile and Scale Quality

Demographic analysis confirmed that all 360 respondents (100%) were full time livestock farmers, with 66.7% (n = 240) identifying as male and 33.3% (n = 120) as female. The sample was dominated by young and middle aged adults, with 51.9% (n = 187) aged 25–34, 32.5% (n = 117) aged 17–24, 10.8% (n = 39) aged 35–44, and 4.7% (n = 17) aged over 45, while 61.9% held high school diplomas, 33.1% held university degrees, and 5.0% held vocational diplomas. Most farmers managed livestock populations exceeding 10 animals (67.0%), which specifically comprised respondents owning more than 20 animals (34.2%) and those managing between 11 and 20 animals (32.8%), primarily raising mixed cattle, goat, and sheep herds (68.1%), with 70.8% having over five years of farming experience and 64.5% earning monthly incomes above

IDR 3,000,000. Significantly, 71.9% (n = 259) of respondents reported experiencing parasitic worm infections in their livestock within the past six months, confirming high situational urgency.

To evaluate measurement quality transparently, Table 1 presents the item means, standard deviations, corrected item rest correlations, single factor loadings, and internal consistency coefficients. Following Hair et al. (2019), individual indicators were classified as Valid if corrected item rest correlations exceeded 0.30 and standardized factor loadings exceeded 0.70 (with Average Variance Extracted AVE > 0.50), while scales were classified as Highly Reliable if Cronbach's Alpha (α) and McDonald's Omega (ω) exceeded 0.80.

Table 1. Summary of Scale Reliability Analysis

Variable	**Question Indicator**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Item rest Correlation**	**Remarks (r>0.30)**	**Cronbach's Alpha (α)**	**McDonald's Omega (ω)**	**Reliability Status (ω,ω>0.80)**
Credibility Perception (AVE = 0.967)	Cred 1 (Attractive)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid	0,994	0,996	Highly Reliable
	Cred 2 (Familiar)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			
	Cred 3 (Convincing)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			
	Cred 4 (Knowledgeable)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			
	Cred 5 (Honest and Truthful)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			
	Cred 6 (Role Model)	4.57	0.743	0,96	Valid			
	Cred 7 (Good Reputation)	4.57	0.743	0,96	Valid			
Purchase Intention (AVE = 0.965)	Intention 1 (Intention to Buy)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid	0,989	0,992	Highly Reliable
	Intention 2 (Recommend)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			
	Intention 3 (Primary Choice)	4.57	0.743	0,939	Valid			
	Intention 4 (Seek Further Info)	4.64	0.617	0,991	Valid			

Scale reliability testing yielded exceptional internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha (α) reaching 0.994 for perceived credibility and 0.989 for purchase intention, supported by McDonald's Omega (ω) values of 0.996 and 0.992, and AVE values of 0.967 and 0.965, respectively. However, as noted in psychometric literature (Hair et al., 2019), reliability coefficients approaching 1.00 alongside identical item means (4.64 ± 0.617 across Cred 1–5 and Intention 1, 2, 4) indicate substantial item redundancy and response overlap. Inspection of the dataset confirms that this near unity consistency stems from a pronounced ceiling effect: because respondents were active livestock farmers facing recent parasite issues (71.9%) who valued the practical veterinary solution, the vast majority assigned uniformly high scores of 4 or 5 across nearly all items (overall credibility mean = 4.62, median = 5.00; overall purchase intention mean = 4.63, median = 5.00). Slightly lower means (4.57 ± 0.743) occurred only on role model status (Cred 6), community reputation (Cred 7), and primary brand choice over existing anthelmintics (Intention 3).

Hypothesis Testing and Path Estimates

The inferential structural paths were evaluated using 10,000 bootstrap resamples to establish precise 95% confidence intervals and standard errors, as presented in Table 2 alongside the unadjusted total effect and Welch's t test comparisons.

Table 2. Path Estimates and Hypothesis Decisions (10,000 Bootstrap Resamples, N = 360)

Hypothesis	Path	Estimate	Bootstrap SE	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Z score	p	Remarks
H1 (Path a)	Promotional Language Style > Credibility Perception	0.041	0.06596	0.09051	0.17048	0.629	0.529	Not Significant
H2 (Path b)	Credibility Perception > Purchase Intention	0.993	0.00101	0.99157	0.99562	983.044	<0.001	Significant
H3(Direct Path c')	Promotional Language Style > Purchase Intention	0.006	0.00092	0.00446	0.00808	6.856	<0.001	Significant
H4 (Indirect Effect a x b)	Promotional Language Style > Credibility Perception > Purchase Intention	0.041	0.06560	0.08973	0.16976	0.629	0.530	Not Significant
Total Effect (c = c' + a x b)	Promotional Language Style → Purchase Intention (Unadjusted Total Effect)	0.04751	0.06550	0.08297	0.17548	0.726	0.468	Not Significant (Matches Welch's t)

Notes: Promotional Language Style is coded as 0 = Hard Selling and 1 = Soft Selling.

Statistical testing revealed that promotional language style had no significant impact on perceived credibility (Estimate = 0.04149, SE = 0.06596, 95% CI [-0.09051, 0.17048], Z = 0.629, p = 0.529; Welch's t = -0.622, p = 0.534), leading to the rejection of H1. The non significant relationship between promotional language style and perceived credibility is attributed to a pronounced ceiling effect. This ceiling effect is primarily evidenced by the background of the Peternak Waras account, which is managed by a professional practitioner and academic with over five years of experience in agribusiness management who serves as a Practitioner Lecturer at Universitas Brawijaya and is a Master's candidate in Veterinary Agribusiness at Universitas Airlangga. Consistent with Source Credibility Theory (Ohanian, 1990) and Brewster and Lyu's (2020) findings on parasocial trust in niche nano influencers, because Peternak Waras had already established strong academic and practical authority within the livestock community,

farmers maintained uniformly high credibility ratings (overall mean = 4.62; soft selling mean = 4.64, SD = 0.541; hard selling mean = 4.60, SD = 0.721) regardless of whether the video used a soft selling narrative or hard selling commercial calls. Unlike Silva et al. (2023), who noted that overt commercialism can weaken nano influencer credibility, single video rhetoric modifications in this experiment were insufficient to alter deeply entrenched trust baselines. Conversely, perceived credibility exerted a powerful, highly significant positive influence on purchase intention (Estimate = 0.99375, SE = 0.00101, 95% CI [0.99157, 0.99562], Z = 983.044, $p < 0.001$), strongly supporting H2. Verification against the raw statistical output confirms that the exceptionally large Z-score (983.044) is an artifact of the near perfect linear alignment between composite perceived credibility (mean = 4.62, SD = 0.644) and composite purchase intention (mean = 4.63, SD = 0.640) induced by ceiling level scoring, which yielded a minute standard error of 0.00101 (Z = 0.99375 / 0.00101 = 983.044).

Theoretically, the confirmation of H2 highlights that high source credibility remains a critical prerequisite for promoting credence goods (Ohanian, 1990; Park et al., 2022). In veterinary markets, where misdiagnosis or ineffective treatments threaten valuable animal assets, strong communicator credibility mitigates perceived risk, reinforces positive behavioral attitudes under TPB (Ajzen, 1991), and fosters purchase readiness. However, the slightly lower score on Intention 3 (selecting Dufamec Pour On as the primary choice over other brands, mean = 4.57, SD = 0.743) reflects that experienced farmers (70.8% with >5 years of tenure) often have established habits of using conventional oral or injectable anthelmintics, requiring educators to emphasize the practical labor saving advantages of topical pour on administration. Regarding H3, an important methodological clarification is required to reconcile the statistically significant direct path in Table 2 (Estimate = 0.00628, SE = 0.00092, 95% CI [0.00446, 0.00808], Z = 6.856, $p < 0.001$) with the non significant difference between treatment groups in Welch's t-test (t = -0.718, p = 0.473) and the bootstrap Total Effect (Estimate = 0.04751, SE = 0.06550, p = 0.468). These two results refer to distinct statistical comparisons: Welch's t-test and the Total Effect (c) evaluate the unadjusted overall mean difference in purchase intention between soft selling (mean = 4.65, SD = 0.531) and hard selling (mean = 4.60, SD = 0.721), whereas H3 (Direct Path c') evaluates the covariate adjusted direct effect of promotional language style while holding perceived credibility constant.

Because perceived credibility accounts for nearly all variance in purchase intention (b = 0.99375), controlling for credibility drastically reduces the residual standard error from 0.06550 to 0.00092, rendering a tiny adjusted difference of 0.00628 scale points favoring soft selling statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

Practically, while soft selling yields a slight adjusted positive edge and significantly higher response consistency (smaller variance, Levene's $F = 8.70$, $p = 0.003$), both promotional styles generated similarly high overall purchase intention scores. Because 71.9% of farmers faced recent parasite threats in their herds, both educational soft selling demonstrations and directive hard selling prompts operated effectively as situational triggers (cues to action) motivating purchase intention (Zhu et al., 2021; Hudhi & Windasari, 2023). Finally, indirect mediation analysis showed that perceived credibility did not significantly mediate the relationship between promotional language style and purchase intention (indirect effect = 0.04123, SE = 0.06560, 95% CI [-0.08973, 0.16976], $p = 0.530$), leading to the rejection of H4. In accordance with Zhao et al. (2010) and Hayes (2022), the combination of a significant controlled direct path (c′) and a non significant indirect path reflects a direct only non mediation pattern within this sample. A plausible explanation is that in high trust niche social commerce environments involving urgent livestock health needs, communicator credibility and promotional message appeals may operate in parallel rather than strictly sequentially. When baseline trust in a specialist nano influencer is already established, farmers may respond directly to practical promotional cues without needing to re-evaluate communicator credibility from scratch during a single video exposure. This interpretation remains provisional, however, because the study measured self-reported purchase intention rather than actual purchasing behavior.

The non significant relationship between promotional language style and perceived credibility (H1 rejected) is primarily attributed to a pronounced ceiling effect. This pattern is consistent with the established background of the Peternak Waras account, which is managed by a professional practitioner and academic with substantial experience in agribusiness. Because the account had already built a high level of trust within the livestock community, farmers maintained similarly high credibility ratings (mean = 4.62) regardless of whether the video used a soft selling or hard selling approach. As a result,

single video variations in promotional language were insufficient to shift these already elevated trust baselines.

The confirmation of H2 indicates that perceived credibility plays an important role in supporting purchase intention for veterinary credence goods. In markets where treatment effectiveness is difficult to verify in advance, strong communicator credibility helps reduce perceived risk and supports more confident purchase decisions. Regarding H3, the combination of a small but statistically significant adjusted direct effect and the non significant unadjusted group difference ($p = 0.473$) suggests that both soft selling and hard selling styles functioned effectively as situational cues when farmers faced urgent parasite problems. In this context, farmers appeared to focus more on obtaining a practical solution than on carefully differentiating the promotional style used.

Finally, the rejection of H4 is consistent with a direct only non mediation pattern. When baseline trust in a specialist nano influencer is already high and livestock health needs are urgent, promotional cues may influence purchase intention without requiring a sequential re-evaluation of communicator credibility. This interpretation should be treated as provisional, however, because the study measured self-reported purchase intention rather than actual purchasing behavior.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that within the examined sample of Indonesian livestock farmers, promotional language styles soft selling versus hard selling did not significantly alter the perceived credibility of a specialized agricultural nano influencer ($p = 0.529$), likely because audience trust operated at a high pre existing baseline ceiling (mean = 4.62). High perceived credibility showed a strong positive association with purchase intention ($p < 0.001$), confirming its vital role in reducing perceived risk for veterinary credence goods. Furthermore, while controlling for perceived credibility revealed a statistically significant but small direct effect favoring soft selling ($p < 0.001$) alongside greater response homogeneity, unadjusted group comparisons did not detect a statistically significant difference in overall purchase intention between soft selling (mean = 4.65) and hard selling (mean = 4.60) approaches ($p = 0.473$). Consequently, perceived credibility did not significantly mediate the relationship between promotional language style and purchase intention (indirect effect = 0.04123, 95% CI [0.08973, 0.16976], $p = 0.530$).

Theoretically, rather than establishing definitive statistical equivalence between promotional styles or proving that buyers entirely bypass cognitive evaluation, these findings suggest a plausible boundary condition for hierarchy of effects models: when baseline trust in a niche educator is already high and farmers face urgent livestock parasite problems, promotional cues can stimulate purchase intention directly without requiring intermediate credibility re evaluation. Managerially, veterinary pharmaceutical marketers and digital educators are advised to adopt a Problem Solution Execution strategy that combines clear soft selling demonstrations of field symptoms and verifiable pour on product efficacy at the start of a video with an explicit hard selling call to action at the close.

Several study limitations must be acknowledged. First, the use of purposive sampling within farming communities familiar with the educator contributed to a strong ceiling effect and high inter item overlap (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.98$), which restricted score variance across treatment groups. Second, the experiment relied on a single nano influencer account Peternak Waras and a single veterinary product Dufamec Pour On, limiting generalizability to unfamiliar communicators or other agricultural inputs. Third, the study measured self reported purchase intention rather than actual purchasing behavior. Future research should examine multiple influencers with varying baseline familiarity, compare different categories of livestock health products, incorporate multi item manipulation checks and pre test control groups, and track actual purchasing transactions within social commerce checkout systems.

REFERENCES

Adi Pramartha, I. G. E. K., Ni Wayan Eka Mitariani, & Pande Ketut Ribek (2026). The role of brand awareness in mediating the effects of soft selling and hard selling approaches on purchase intention in TikTok campaigns. International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science, 5(3), 9270–9281. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijevss.v5i03.6054

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Alfons, A., Ateş, N. Y., & Groenen, P. J. F. (2022). A robust bootstrap test for mediation analysis. Organizational Research Methods, 25(3), 591–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428121999096

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Peternakan dalam angka 2020 [Livestock in figures 2020]. Badan Pusat Statistik. ISSN 2714-8416. https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2020/06/10/93c6d3265760176e2a87c8cf/livestock-in-figures-2020.html

Brewster, M. L., & Lyu, J. (2020). Exploring the parasocial impact of nano, micro and macro influencers. International Textile and Apparel Association Annual Conference Proceedings, 77(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.31274/itaa.12254

Campbell, C., & Farrell, J. R. (2020). More than meets the eye: The functional components underlying influencer marketing. Business Horizons, 63(4), 469–479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.03.003

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Ferdinand, A. (2014). Metode penelitian manajemen: Pedoman penelitian untuk penulisan skripsi, tesis, dan disertasi ilmu manajemen (Edisi 5). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. ISBN 979-704-254-5.

Google. (2026). Google Trends: Search interest for TikTok, Instagram, and Facebook in Indonesia, 2021–2026 [Data set]. Retrieved October 31, 2026, from https://trends.google.com/trends/explore?date=2021-01-01%202026-10-31&geo=ID&q=TikTok,Instagram,Facebook

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning EMEA. ISBN 978-1-4737-5654-0.

Hayes, A. F. (2022). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. ISBN 978-1-4625-4903-0.

Hidayat, T., & Curatman, A. (2026). Hard selling dan soft selling terhadap minat beli produk batik di platform TikTok. Journal of Management and Digital Business, 6(2), 861–878. https://doi.org/10.53088/jmdb.v6i2.3100

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change. Yale University Press.

Hudhi, T. M., & Windasari, N. A. (2023). The effect of micro and macro brand ambassador related to soft and hard selling language on purchase decision of Piero shoes in Jakarta, Indonesia. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 6(12), 8083–8114. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V6-i12-63

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2018). Principles of marketing (17th ed.). Pearson. ISBN 978-1-292-22017-8.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson. ISBN 978-1-292-09262-1.

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

Örs Özdil, S., & Kutlu, Ö. (2019). Investigation of the mediator variable effect using BK,

Sobel and bootstrap methods (mathematical literacy case). International Journal of Progressive Education, 15(2), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2019.189.3

Park, J., Chenghui, X., & Kim, R. B. (2022). The effect of brand credibility on search and credence goods: A cross-country analysis of Korea, China & France. Journal of International Studies, 15(2), 199–209. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2022/15-2/13

Permata. (2025, February 8). KOL.ID Insight: Data pengguna TikTok, jumlah konten & durasi screentime rata-rata pengguna TikTok. KOL.ID. https://kol.id/blog/kol-id-insight-data-pengguna-jumlah-konten-%26-durasi-screentime-rata-rata-pengguna-tiktok

Silva, M. J. de B., Silva, C. J., & Pinheiro, M. M. A. (2023). Be authentic! Analyzing the image management of digital nano influencers. ReMark: Revista Brasileira de Marketing, 22(3), 1127–1157. https://doi.org/10.5585/remark.v22i3.21653

Simamora, I. H., & Suryani, W. (2025). Pengaruh metode pemasaran hard selling dan soft selling di aplikasi TikTok terhadap minat beli produk skincare pada pengguna TikTok (studi kasus Kecamatan Medan Sunggal). RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business, 4(3), 4458–4464. https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i3.2655

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. Decision Sciences, 39(2), 273–315. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x

Xu, J., Li, Z., Wang, X., & Xia, C. (2022). Narrative information on secondhand products in e-commerce. Marketing Letters, 33(4), 625–644. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-022-09637-4

Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., Jr., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. Journal of Consumer Research, 37(2), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1086/651257

Zhu, H., Kim, M., & Choi, Y. K. (2022). Social media advertising endorsement: The role of endorser type, message appeal and brand familiarity. International Journal of Advertising, 41(5), 948–969. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2021.1966963