International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Green Marketing And Digital Engagement As Drivers Of Sustainable Tourism Destination Competitiveness In North Minahasa

Mirah Hellen Rogi[1], Indrie Debbie Palandeng[2], Reitty L Samadi[3]

[1,2,3]Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sam Ratulangi University (UNSRAT), Manado, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Mirah Hellen Rogi, mirahrogi@unsrat.ac.id
E-mail: indriedebbie76@unsrat.ac.id; rsamadi@unsrat.ac.id

Abstract

North Minahasa combines coastal, marine, cultural, and community-based tourism assets with the strategic visibility of Likupang, yet destination competitiveness increasingly depends on how visitors evaluate environmental credibility and digital interaction. This study examines green marketing and digital engagement as parallel predictors of perceived sustainable tourism destination competitiveness. We surveyed 250 tourists who had visited destinations in North Minahasa and had used digital media for tourism information or interaction. The instrument contained 41 items covering green marketing, digital engagement, and destination competitiveness. Multiple regression produced a significant model, $F(2, 247) = 109.676$, $p < .001$, explaining 47.0% of the variance in competitiveness. Green marketing showed a positive effect ($B = .383$, beta = .321, $p < .001$), while digital engagement produced a stronger relative effect ($B = .472$, beta = .446, $p < .001$). Robust standard errors and demographic controls preserved both relationships. The findings position environmental value and digital interaction as distinct but complementary market-facing capabilities. Destination managers should therefore align credible sustainability practices with responsive, evidence-based digital communication rather than treat environmental promotion and online engagement as separate campaigns.

Keywords: green marketing, digital engagement, destination competitiveness, sustainable tourism, North Minahasa

2023

IJEBIR, Volume 05 Issue 06, 2026

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

INTRODUCTION

Tourism destinations compete through more than scenery, accessibility, or promotional reach. Visitors compare the quality of the experience, the credibility of environmental practices, the ease of obtaining information, and the strength of the relationship that a destination builds before, during, and after a visit. Classic destination-competitiveness models place inherited resources, supporting conditions, destination management, and demand conditions at the center of competitive performance (Dwyer & Kim, 2003; Ritchie & Crouch, 2003; Crouch, 2011). Recent work pushes this debate further. Barbosa et al. (2024) connect competitiveness with social progress, while Chen et al. (2025) show that tourists do not evaluate competitive attributes as fixed. Their experience and changing preferences continually reorder what matters. Digital readiness and infrastructure now occupy a central place in that competitive architecture, especially when tourists search, compare, review, and share destinations online.

This shift creates a specific challenge for emerging destinations. North Minahasa possesses strong nature-based assets, including coastal landscapes and marine attractions, and the Likupang area has increased the region's national tourism visibility. Yet resource endowment alone does not produce durable advantage. The destination must convert environmental assets into credible visitor value and communicate that value through channels that tourists actually use. Lesmana et al. (2022) reach a similar conclusion for Indonesian sustainable destinations: competitive advantage depends on the intersection between supply-side capability and demand-side evaluation. On the other hand, Wu et al. (2023) show that sustainability changes the meaning of tourism efficiency itself because destinations that ignore environmental costs overstate their competitive performance. These arguments shift attention from promotion volume toward the quality and credibility of the destination proposition.

Green marketing addresses one part of this problem. Tourism research increasingly treats green marketing as a strategic process that links environmental practices, value communication, trust, image, and visitor response rather than as a narrow advertising tactic. Akram et al. (2024) find that green advertising and eco-labeling strengthen green image and trust in sustainable destinations. Gheorghe et al. (2023) connect green marketing with sustainable destination development, while Bilynets and Knezevic Cvelbar (2022) show that an environmentally friendly destination image relates to tourists' pro-environmental behavior. Recent research also exposes a boundary condition. Sustainability communication loses value when tourists perceive inconsistency or greenwashing. Papagiannakis et al. (2024) document commercial penalties for tourism and hospitality providers that greenwash, Font et al. (2025) show that excessive sustainability information can intensify greenwashing perceptions, and Abate et al. (2026) demonstrate that greenwashing weakens the effect of green social media marketing on

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

responsible travel. Green marketing therefore creates competitive value only when visible practices support the claim.

Digital engagement addresses a different competitive task. Social media, online reviews, destination websites, maps, short-video platforms, and user-generated content reduce information distance between destination actors and tourists. Yet exposure does not equal engagement. Brodie et al. (2011) conceptualize engagement as a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral process, and So et al. (2021) show why tourism research should separate engagement profiles from simple social media activity. Recent destination studies reinforce that distinction. Blanco-Moreno et al. (2024) find that sender type and visual content shape Instagram engagement, Qiu et al. (2024) show that short-video platform quality and influencer expertise shape destination attitudes and travel intention, and Yang et al. (2025) demonstrate that video characteristics influence viewer engagement with destination-marketing-organization content. These studies explain why digital engagement can become a strategic asset rather than a communication metric.

The literature, however, still fragments the two processes. Green marketing studies commonly end with green purchase intention, trust, satisfaction, image, or pro-environmental behavior. Digital engagement studies often end with electronic word of mouth, visit intention, loyalty, or platform response. That separation leaves a managerial question unresolved: when tourists evaluate whether a destination can compete sustainably, how much do environmental marketing and digital engagement contribute after the model considers both at the same time? The gap matters in North Minahasa because destination actors face two simultaneous demands. They must protect and substantiate the environmental value that underpins the product, and they must communicate and co-create that value within a highly digital visitor journey.

This study answers that question with a compact empirical model. It treats green marketing and digital engagement as parallel predictors of perceived sustainable tourism destination competitiveness. The model does not claim that digital engagement moderates green marketing. Instead, it tests whether each construct contributes independently to tourists' competitive evaluations. This distinction aligns the theory with the statistical design and avoids interpreting a significant joint model as evidence of interaction.

The study contributes in three ways. First, it shifts green marketing and digital engagement toward a destination-level strategic outcome by testing both against perceived competitiveness. Second, it treats digital engagement as a multidimensional relationship construct rather than a proxy for social media use. Third, it provides evidence from an emerging Indonesian destination system that combines a nationally visible tourism growth pole with smaller coastal and community destinations. The setting creates

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

a demanding test because increased visibility raises both market opportunity and scrutiny over environmental credibility, access, service quality, and local participation.

Accordingly, the study addresses two research questions: (1) Does perceived green marketing positively predict sustainable tourism destination competitiveness in North Minahasa? (2) Does digital engagement positively predict sustainable tourism destination competitiveness after the model accounts for green marketing? The next section develops the theoretical logic and hypotheses.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Destination Competitiveness as a Sustainable and Market-Facing Outcome

Destination competitiveness refers to a destination's capacity to deploy resources and capabilities in ways that create superior tourism value while sustaining the conditions that support future performance. Dwyer and Kim (2003) connect competitiveness with endowed resources, supporting factors, destination management, situational conditions, and demand. Ritchie and Crouch (2003) similarly argue that competitive success rests on both comparative resources and the strategic deployment of those resources. Crouch (2011) later shows that destination attributes differ in their relative importance, which warns managers against treating competitiveness as a single promotional outcome.

Recent research challenges static interpretations. González-Rodríguez et al. (2023) show that managerial capability explains important differences in destination efficiency, while Barbosa et al. (2024) argue that competitiveness should serve social progress rather than become an end in itself. Chen et al. (2025) use tourist-generated data to show that the attributes driving competitiveness change over time. Wu et al. (2023) add an environmental constraint: when analysts incorporate undesirable environmental outputs, conventional tourism-efficiency measures overstate performance. Sustainable competitiveness therefore requires destinations to connect economic attractiveness, visitor value, environmental stewardship, and social legitimacy.

This study adopts the tourist side of that logic. Tourists do not directly observe every governance process or environmental indicator, but they do form judgments about attraction, service quality, accessibility, differentiation, image, and sustainability. Those judgments matter because destinations compete in markets where information travels quickly and comparison costs continue to fall. The dependent variable therefore captures perceived sustainable tourism destination competitiveness rather than a national index or purely economic measure. Recent evidence published in IJEBIR reinforces this destination-level emphasis. Poa (2025) identifies weak integration of nature-based tourism themes as a constraint on destination competitiveness, while Syatria et al. (2025) show that destination attributes shape tourist loyalty through service-quality experience.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Green Marketing and Destination Competitiveness

Green marketing in tourism integrates environmental responsibility into product design, pricing logic, distribution, communication, and the broader destination value proposition. The concept matters because tourists increasingly encounter environmental claims alongside evidence about waste, conservation, local sourcing, congestion, and community participation. Han et al. (2024) frame green marketing as a central research agenda for sustainable tourism and hospitality, while Akram et al. (2024) show that green marketing tools strengthen green image and trust. Gheorghe et al. (2023) similarly link green marketing with sustainable destination development. In an Indonesian consumption setting, Hendrika et al. (2026) also report a positive role for green marketing in sustainable purchase intention, supporting the wider market relevance of credible environmental value propositions.

The competitive mechanism runs through differentiation and credibility. A destination that protects natural assets, communicates concrete environmental practices, and links local economic participation to the visitor experience creates a value proposition that rivals cannot reproduce through generic promotion. Barney's (1991) resource-based logic clarifies this point. Natural assets represent resources, but market advantage requires organizational routines that protect, package, and communicate those resources. Lesmana et al. (2022) translate this logic into the Indonesian tourism context by showing that sustainable competitive advantage emerges from aligned supply-side and demand-side conditions.

Sustainability communication also shapes reputation and behavior. Cuić Tanković and Mušanović (2022) find that sustainability communication contributes to destination reputation, especially through satisfaction. Marchi et al. (2023) show that destinations vary in the depth and balance of sustainability information on official websites. Frías-Jamilena et al. (2024) add a co-creation perspective: online value co-creation strengthens slow-destination image and pro-environmental behavior. Kapoor (2026) shows that positively framed destination sustainability communication increases social media engagement and visit intention. Taken together, these studies position environmental communication inside a wider relationship between operational practice, perception, and market response. Adelia et al. (2026) likewise show that sustainable tourism intention depends on behavioral conditions that support responsible tourism, reinforcing the need to connect environmental communication with credible visitor-facing practices.

Nevertheless, communication alone cannot create defensible advantage. Papagiannakis et al. (2024) show that tourism and hospitality firms that engage in greenwashing experience sales penalties. Font et al. (2025) find that sustainability information overload can increase greenwashing perceptions. Aktan et al. (2024) similarly identify greenwashing perceptions as a constraint on tourists' readiness for net-zero

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

tourism. Abate et al. (2026) extend that warning into social media by showing that perceived greenwashing weakens responsible-travel responses to green content. The evidence creates a clear theoretical boundary: green marketing strengthens competitiveness when visitors read the message as credible evidence of environmental value, not as symbolic overclaiming.

For North Minahasa, that mechanism has direct relevance. Coastal cleanliness, marine protection, waste management, local products, community participation, and responsible visitor guidance form part of the tourism product itself. When tourists perceive these practices and the associated communication positively, green marketing should strengthen attraction, differentiation, image, and the perceived sustainability of the destination.

H1: Perceived green marketing positively predicts perceived sustainable tourism destination competitiveness.

Digital Engagement and Destination Competitiveness

Digital engagement captures the cognitive attention, emotional connection, and behavioral interaction that tourists direct toward destination-related digital content and platforms. Brodie et al. (2011) define customer engagement as an interactive psychological state embedded in service relationships. Tourism research extends this logic across destination brands, social media, and travel experiences. Harrigan et al. (2017) show that tourism social media brands can generate meaningful customer engagement, while So et al. (2021) identify distinct engagement profiles and caution against reducing engagement to visible platform activity.

Digital engagement affects competitiveness because it changes how tourists acquire and validate destination value. Sharmin et al. (2021) connect smartphone-based social media with sustainable destination marketing ecosystems. Ai et al. (2022) show that destination sensory experience can translate into digital engagement, while Abbasi et al. (2023) demonstrate that engagement transmits the value of social media imagery into electronic word of mouth. Armutcu et al. (2023) find that online tourism content, satisfaction, and digital interaction shape behavioral intentions. These mechanisms reduce information friction and give destinations more opportunities to reinforce image, accessibility knowledge, and service expectations. Within IJEBIR, Oktavia and Syaefulloh (2026) similarly find that viral marketing and electronic word of mouth significantly influence tourism visit decisions, illustrating how digital interaction converts online information into market response.

Platform design and content characteristics also matter. Pachucki et al. (2022) show that destination communication styles alter social media engagement. Qiu et al. (2024) identify expertise, usefulness, and enjoyment as important drivers in short-video

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

contexts. Yu et al. (2024) find that visual semiotics such as emojis carry different engagement effects depending on destination content. Blanco-Moreno et al. (2024) show that posts about points of interest and posts created by tourists attract more Instagram engagement than some service-oriented alternatives. Yang et al. (2025) use video analytics to demonstrate that aesthetic, structural, and content features influence engagement with destination videos. These findings reject a simplistic content-volume strategy. Engagement depends on relevance, credibility, interaction quality, and the fit between content and the visitor decision process.

Digital engagement also links directly to sustainable positioning. Rodrigues et al. (2023) show that digital marketing can influence rural destination image, visit intention, and destination sustainability. Firman et al. (2023) connect social media with sustainable tourism development in Indonesia, while Thong et al. (2022) demonstrate the relevance of social media marketing in protected-area ecotourism. Recent evidence on green social media reinforces the connection. Abate et al. (2026) find that user-generated green content produces stronger responsible-travel responses than firm-generated content, with destination green trust acting as a key mechanism. Digital engagement therefore does not merely distribute a sustainability message. It allows tourists to verify, contest, reinterpret, and redistribute the message.

The competitive implication follows directly. Destinations with stronger digital engagement should gain better information reach, greater relational continuity, more user validation, and stronger differentiation in crowded tourism markets. Those advantages should persist even after the model accounts for green marketing because digital engagement addresses interaction quality rather than the environmental substance of the offer.

H2: Digital engagement positively predicts perceived sustainable tourism destination competitiveness after accounting for green marketing.

Integrated Research Model

The model treats green marketing and digital engagement as two distinct market-facing capabilities. Green marketing supplies environmental substance and differentiation. Digital engagement supplies interaction, verification, participation, and circulation. The two capabilities complement each other in management practice, but the statistical model estimates additive effects rather than moderation. This specification keeps the empirical test aligned with the data and avoids claiming an interaction that the model does not estimate.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Figure 1. Proposed Research Model

Green Marketing (H1)	→	**Sustainable Tourism Destination Competitiveness**
Digital Engagement (H2)	→	**Sustainable Tourism Destination Competitiveness**

Source: Authors' conceptualization based on the reviewed literature.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design, Context, and Respondents

This study used an explanatory cross-sectional survey to test the two proposed relationships. The research focused on tourists with direct experience of tourism destinations in North Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. We used purposive sampling because the research questions require respondents who can evaluate both the destination experience and its digital communication. We applied two screening criteria: respondents had visited at least one tourism destination in North Minahasa, and they had used digital media in connection with tourism information or interaction. The final dataset contained 250 complete responses, and every case met both screening criteria.

The respondent profile captured local and regional tourism demand rather than only resident opinion. Women represented 54.4% of respondents and men 45.6%. The largest age group was 21 to 30 years at 39.6%, followed by 31 to 40 years at 20.8% and 41 to 50 years at 20.0%. Manado residents formed 32.8% of the sample, respondents from other North Sulawesi districts or cities formed 24.8%, and North Minahasa residents formed 20.4%. Respondents from other Indonesian provinces and outside Indonesia completed the remaining share.

Visit experience also varied. First-time visitors formed 45.6% of the sample, while 36.0% had visited two to three times. Respondents reported Paal Beach, Likupang, and Pulisan most frequently among the focal destinations. Digital media use was intensive. A combined 67.2% used social media often or very often for tourism-related purposes. Instagram and TikTok represented 56.0% of the primary platforms, followed by Google or Google Maps, YouTube, Facebook, travel platforms, WhatsApp, and destination websites. This profile gives the digital-engagement test substantive relevance because the sample does not consist of occasional or purely offline information users.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 1. Respondent Profile (N = 250)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	136	54.4
	Male	114	45.6
Age	17-20	23	9.2
	21-30	99	39.6
	31-40	52	20.8
	41-50	50	20.0
	>50	26	10.4
Residence	North Minahasa Regency	51	20.4
	Manado City	82	32.8
	Other district/city in North Sulawesi	62	24.8
	Other Indonesian province	50	20.0
	Outside Indonesia	5	2.0
Visit frequency	1 visit	114	45.6
	2-3 visits	90	36.0
	4-5 visits	31	12.4
	>5 visits	15	6.0
Social media use	Very rarely	7	2.8
	Rarely	17	6.8
	Quite often	58	23.2
	Often	101	40.4
	Very often	67	26.8
Primary platform	Instagram	77	30.8

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Characteristic	Category	n	%
	TikTok	63	25.2
	Google/Google Maps	31	12.4
	YouTube	29	11.6
	Facebook	19	7.6
	Travel platform/OTA	13	5.2
	WhatsApp	10	4.0
	Destination/tourism website	8	3.2

Source: Primary data, 2026.

Measurement

The questionnaire contained 41 statements and used a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The instrument measured green marketing with 12 items across green product, green price, green place, and green promotion. It measured digital engagement with 14 items across cognitive, emotional, and behavioral or interactive engagement. The destination-competitiveness construct used 15 items covering attraction, tourism experience and service quality, accessibility and infrastructure, differentiation and destination image, and sustainability. The multidimensional structure allows the constructs to capture broader destination evaluations instead of reducing them to single promotional behaviors.

We retained the construct architecture contained in the study instrument and calculated composite scores by summing the items within each construct for the regression analysis. We also calculated one-to-five construct means for descriptive interpretation. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .656 to .808 for green marketing, .650 to .802 for digital engagement, and .662 to .789 for destination competitiveness. Cronbach's alpha reached .946, .948, and .949, respectively. These values indicate very strong internal consistency. We did not delete items because every item contributed acceptably to its intended scale and the complete instrument preserved the conceptual coverage of each construct.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 2. Measurement Structure and Reliability

Construct	Dimensions	Items	Mean	SD	α
Green marketing	Green product; green price; green place; green promotion	12	3.347	0.702	0.946
Digital engagement	Cognitive; emotional; behavioral and interactive	14	3.316	0.678	0.948
Destination competitiveness	Attraction; experience and service; accessibility and infrastructure; differentiation and image; sustainability	15	3.393	0.670	0.949

Note: Means and standard deviations use the 1-5 response metric. Source: Primary data, 2026.

Data Analysis and Diagnostic Strategy

We first examined descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, corrected item-total correlations, and Cronbach's alpha. We then estimated an ordinary least squares multiple regression with destination competitiveness as the dependent variable and green marketing and digital engagement as predictors. We reported unstandardized coefficients, standardized beta coefficients, 95% confidence intervals, variance inflation factors, and predictor-level effect sizes. Cohen's (1988) f^2 provided an interpretable estimate of each predictor's incremental contribution.

We evaluated regression diagnostics before interpreting the model. The residual distribution satisfied the Kolmogorov-Smirnov criterion ($p = .200$), and the Durbin-Watson statistic reached 1.985. Both predictors recorded VIF values of 1.528, which indicate low collinearity. A Breusch-Pagan test returned $p = .136$, so the residual variance did not show a systematic heteroskedastic pattern. We also estimated HC3 heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors to test whether conventional standard-error assumptions drove the significance results.

The research design collected predictors and outcome through the same questionnaire, so common-method variance required attention. Podsakoff et al. (2003) warn that common method processes can inflate or suppress observed relationships, while Fuller et al. (2016) show that researchers should interpret single-factor diagnostics cautiously rather than treat them as definitive tests. We therefore used the first unrotated component only as a diagnostic, not as proof that common-method bias was absent. The

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

first component accounted for 44.6% of total item variance. We then re-estimated the model with gender, age, visit frequency, and social media use frequency as controls. The combination of diagnostics and robustness checks tests coefficient stability while acknowledging the limits of a single-wave, self-report design.

RESULT

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

The three constructs produced moderate-to-positive mean evaluations on the five-point scale. Destination competitiveness recorded the highest mean (M = 3.393), followed by green marketing (M = 3.347) and digital engagement (M = 3.316). The means indicate favorable but not saturated evaluations, leaving meaningful variance for the explanatory model.

All bivariate correlations were positive and statistically significant. Green marketing correlated with destination competitiveness at r = .583, while digital engagement correlated with destination competitiveness at r = .635. Green marketing and digital engagement correlated at r = .588. The predictor correlation shows conceptual proximity without suggesting redundancy, a conclusion that the VIF statistics also support.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Construct	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. Green marketing	3.347	0.702	1.000		
2. Digital engagement	3.316	0.678	0.588***	1.000	
3. Destination competitiveness	3.393	0.670	0.583***	0.635***	1.000

*Note: *** p < .001. Source: Primary data, 2026.*

Multiple Regression and Hypothesis Tests

The regression model produced $F(2, 247) = 109.676$, $p < .001$, with $R^2 = .470$ and adjusted $R^2 = .466$. Green marketing and digital engagement therefore explained 47.0% of the variance in perceived destination competitiveness. The result indicates substantial explanatory relevance for a compact two-predictor model, although more than half of the variance remains associated with other destination conditions.

Green marketing produced a positive coefficient of B = .383 (SE = .068, t = 5.607, p < .001, 95% CI [.248, .517]). Its standardized coefficient reached beta = .321, and its predictor-level f^2 equaled .127. H1 therefore received empirical support. Digital engagement produced B = .472 (SE = .061, t = 7.794, p < .001, 95% CI [.353, .592]) with

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

beta = .446 and f² = .246. H2 also received empirical support. Digital engagement contributed more strongly than green marketing on a standardized basis within this sample.

The significant overall F test confirms that the two predictors jointly improve prediction of destination competitiveness relative to an intercept-only model. It does not establish an interaction effect. The results therefore support an additive model in which both predictors retain independent explanatory value.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Predicting Destination Competitiveness

Predictor	B	SE	Beta	t	p	95% CI	f²
Constant	13.594	2.565	-	5.300	< .001	[8.542, 18.646]	-
Green marketing	0.383	0.068	0.321	5.607	< .001	[0.248, 0.517]	0.127
Digital engagement	0.472	0.061	0.446	7.794	< .001	[0.353, 0.592]	0.246

Model statistics: R^2 = .470; adjusted R^2 = .466; $F(2, 247) = 109.676$, $p < .001$; Durbin-Watson = 1.985; VIF = 1.528 for both predictors. Source: Primary data, 2026.

Robustness Checks

The substantive results survived two robustness checks. HC3 robust standard errors retained strong significance for green marketing (B = .383, robust SE = .069, p < .001) and digital engagement (B = .472, robust SE = .063, p < .001). This result reduces concern that mild residual variance irregularities explain the main findings.

The control model also preserved both relationships after accounting for gender, age, visit frequency, and social media use frequency. In that specification, green marketing produced B = .364 (p < .001) and digital engagement produced B = .493 (p < .001), while R^2 increased to .499. The coefficient pattern therefore remains stable when the model incorporates selected respondent characteristics.

Table 5. Robustness Summary

Specification	Green marketing	Digital engagement	Controls	R^2
Baseline OLS	B = .383, p < .001	B = .472, p < .001	No	.470

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Specification	Green marketing	Digital engagement	Controls	R^2
HC3 robust SE	B = .383, SE = .069	B = .472, SE = .063	No	.470
Control model	B = .364, p < .001	B = .493, p < .001	Gender, age, visit frequency, social media use	.499

Source: Primary data, 2026.

DISCUSSION

Green Marketing as Competitive Substance, Not Promotional Decoration

The first result shows that tourists connect green marketing with destination competitiveness after the model accounts for digital engagement. The coefficient remains statistically strong under conventional and robust estimation, and the control model preserves the effect. This pattern extends green marketing research beyond green purchase intention, satisfaction, or image. Akram et al. (2024) show that green advertising and eco-labeling work through green image and trust, while Gheorghe et al. (2023) link green marketing with sustainable destination development. The present finding pushes the outcome one step further: tourists incorporate green marketing into a broader judgment of whether a destination can attract, differentiate, serve, and sustain its market position.

That extension matters because destination competitiveness contains operational content. North Minahasa depends heavily on coastal and nature-based tourism assets. Visitors therefore encounter environmental quality through beach cleanliness, waste handling, marine protection, crowd management, local products, landscape quality, and community interaction. Green marketing adds competitive value when it makes those practices visible and interpretable. It loses strategic value when it disconnects communication from the experience. Bilynets and Knezevic Cvelbar (2022) show that environmental destination image relates to pro-environmental tourist behavior, while Cuić Tanković and Mušanović (2022) connect sustainability communication with destination reputation. Both streams support a credibility-based reading of the present result.

The greenwashing literature sharpens the interpretation. Papagiannakis et al. (2024) reject the assumption that every sustainability claim constitutes greenwashing, yet they identify a clear market penalty for providers that do greenwash. Font et al. (2025) show that too much sustainability information can itself trigger suspicion, and Abate et al. (2026) find that greenwashing weakens the persuasive effect of green social media content. These findings create friction with a promotion-centered strategy. More green

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

messages do not automatically create more competitive value. Managers need verifiable environmental practices, restrained claims, and evidence that tourists can observe or confirm.

The resource-based interpretation also becomes more specific. Barney (1991) argues that valuable resources generate advantage only when organizations deploy them effectively. North Minahasa already possesses natural attractions. The scarce capability lies in coordinating stewardship, service, local participation, and market communication around those attractions. Lesmana et al. (2022) reach a similar conclusion from the Indonesian supply-demand perspective. The present study adds tourist evidence: visitors reward the market-facing expression of sustainability, but they do so inside a broader competitive evaluation.

Digital Engagement as the Stronger Relative Driver

Digital engagement produced the larger standardized coefficient, beta = .446 compared with beta = .321 for green marketing. The difference does not downgrade sustainability. It identifies the stronger relative association inside a sample where every respondent used digital media for tourism-related purposes and 67.2% reported frequent or very frequent social media use. Instagram and TikTok alone represented 56.0% of primary platform use. For these visitors, digital interaction sits inside the tourism decision process rather than outside it.

The result agrees with engagement theory but rejects a simple exposure explanation. Brodie et al. (2011) conceptualize engagement as cognitive, emotional, and behavioral participation. So et al. (2021) similarly show that tourists form distinct engagement profiles. Ai et al. (2022) connect destination experience with digital engagement, and Abbasi et al. (2023) show that engagement carries the value of tourism images into electronic word of mouth. The current instrument follows this richer logic through cognitive, emotional, and interactive dimensions. The stronger coefficient therefore reflects a relationship process, not a count of posts, likes, or platform visits.

Recent platform research explains why this process shapes competitive judgment. Blanco-Moreno et al. (2024) show that destination Instagram engagement changes with content and source. Qiu et al. (2024) find that short-video usefulness, enjoyment, and influencer expertise shape attitudes and travel intention. Yu et al. (2024) show that visual symbols alter engagement depending on destination context, while Yang et al. (2025) identify systematic effects of video aesthetics, structure, and content. These studies agree on one point: digital engagement depends on communication design and user interpretation. A destination therefore strengthens competitiveness when it helps tourists find, verify, discuss, and redistribute useful destination value.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

That said, the larger digital coefficient creates a managerial risk if destination actors interpret it as permission to prioritize content output over destination quality. Digital engagement amplifies the underlying experience. Armutcu et al. (2023) show that online content and digital interaction influence behavioral intentions, but their model also places satisfaction inside the process. Pachucki et al. (2022) demonstrate that communication style changes engagement, yet content effects remain context dependent. Digital reach therefore multiplies both credible value and visible failure. Weak access information, poor facilities, unmanaged waste, or inconsistent service can travel through the same networks that spread positive advocacy.

The Two Drivers Belong Together, but They Do Different Work

The joint model explains 47.0% of perceived destination competitiveness. That level gives the two predictors substantial relevance without implying that marketing alone determines competitive performance. Green marketing and digital engagement solve different strategic problems. Green marketing provides environmental substance and differentiation. Digital engagement reduces information distance, supports interaction, and circulates visitor interpretations. Management practice should connect the two, but the regression estimates independent effects rather than statistical synergy.

This distinction improves the conceptual contribution. Much green marketing research asks whether environmental claims influence trust, intention, satisfaction, or green behavior. Much digital engagement research asks whether social media interactions generate eWOM, loyalty, revisit intention, or platform response. The current model places both streams against the same strategic outcome. It therefore explains destination competitiveness through two market-facing capabilities instead of forcing one construct to mediate or moderate the other.

The recent literature increasingly supports that integrated direction. Rodrigues et al. (2023) connect digital marketing with rural destination image and sustainability. Firman et al. (2023) connect eco-innovation, tourism policy, and social media with sustainable tourism development in Indonesia. Frías-Jamilena et al. (2024) link online value co-creation with sustainable destination image and behavior. Kapoor (2026) shows that sustainability communication can generate social media engagement and visit intention, while Abate et al. (2026) show that green social media effectiveness depends on trust and perceived greenwashing. These studies bring sustainability and digital interaction closer together, but they also show that the mechanisms remain distinct. The present evidence fits that pattern.

On the other hand, the unexplained 53.0% places a clear boundary around the model. Destination competitiveness remains multidimensional. Dwyer and Kim (2003), Ritchie and Crouch (2003), and Crouch (2011) identify infrastructure, management,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

supporting conditions, and demand factors that lie outside this two-predictor specification. Chen et al. (2025) add that competitive attributes change with tourist experience. Wu et al. (2023) show that sustainability alters efficiency itself. Marketing capability therefore cannot substitute for transport access, service consistency, safety, governance, environmental carrying capacity, or price-value performance.

Theoretical Contributions

The study contributes to theory in four ways. First, it reframes destination competitiveness as an outcome that tourists construct through both environmental value and digital relationship quality. This view connects classic competitiveness theory with contemporary market-facing capabilities. It does not replace resource, infrastructure, or governance explanations. Instead, it explains how tourists translate selected capabilities into competitive judgments.

Second, the study moves green marketing beyond behavioral intention. The result supports a competitive-substance interpretation in which credible environmental practice contributes to attraction, differentiation, image, and perceived sustainability. This interpretation agrees with Akram et al. (2024) and Cuić Tanković and Mušanović (2022), but it also incorporates the greenwashing boundary emphasized by Papagiannakis et al. (2024), Font et al. (2025), Aktan et al. (2024), and Abate et al. (2026).

Third, the study retains the multidimensional character of digital engagement. The construct covers cognitive, emotional, and behavioral or interactive engagement. That design follows the customer-engagement tradition more closely than measures that equate engagement with exposure or social media frequency. The stronger digital coefficient therefore has theoretical meaning: relationship quality explains competitive judgment beyond the effect of environmental marketing.

Fourth, the study adds evidence from an emerging destination system in Indonesia. North Minahasa combines a nationally visible destination-development agenda with smaller coastal and community sites. The region therefore captures a real strategic tension between rapid visibility and the slower work of environmental stewardship, service improvement, access, and local value creation. The findings place that tension inside a quantified destination-competitiveness model.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Destination managers should build environmental evidence before they build environmental claims. Green marketing in North Minahasa should connect promotion with visible practices such as beach cleanliness, waste separation, marine protection, limits on damaging activities, local sourcing, community participation, and visitor guidance. Managers should document these practices with specific evidence rather than rely on

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

broad sustainability language. Marchi et al. (2023) show why communication depth and balance matter, while Font et al. (2025) demonstrate the reputational risk of excessive or poorly calibrated sustainability information.

Managers should also design digital strategy around engagement quality rather than follower counts. Instagram and TikTok deserve attention because they dominate the sample's platform use, but destination actors should connect discovery platforms with Google or Google Maps, travel platforms, and official destination information that support planning and verification. Content should combine accurate access information, environmental practices, local business stories, community experiences, current facilities, and visitor-generated material. Qiu et al. (2024), Blanco-Moreno et al. (2024), and Yang et al. (2025) show that content design shapes digital response. Oktavia and Syaefulloh (2026) provide recent Indonesian evidence that digitally transmitted recommendations influence tourism visit decisions.

Government and destination organizations should coordinate the two strategies through a shared scorecard. The scorecard should track environmental practice, content response time, engagement quality, review themes, visitor satisfaction, access complaints, local product participation, and repeat visitation. This coordination prevents marketing teams from maximizing visibility while operational teams carry unresolved environmental or service problems. It also gives local micro and small enterprises a defined role in the destination narrative rather than treating them as decorative content.

Policy makers should treat digital capability as part of destination infrastructure. Visitors now experience a destination through information systems before they arrive. Missing route data, inaccurate opening times, inconsistent pricing information, weak review response, and fragmented destination accounts all raise transaction costs. Strengthening digital governance therefore complements physical infrastructure. The destination gains more value when tourists can move smoothly from discovery to planning, visitation, feedback, and advocacy.

CONCLUSION

This study tested green marketing and digital engagement as parallel predictors of sustainable tourism destination competitiveness in North Minahasa. Both predictors produced positive and statistically strong relationships with competitiveness. Green marketing recorded B = .383 and beta = .321, while digital engagement recorded B = .472 and beta = .446. Together, the two predictors explained 47.0% of the variance in perceived destination competitiveness. HC3 robust standard errors and demographic controls preserved the findings.

The evidence supports a precise strategic interpretation. Environmental value and digital interaction perform different functions. Green marketing gives the destination a

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

credible sustainability proposition and a basis for differentiation. Digital engagement helps tourists encounter, interpret, verify, discuss, and redistribute destination value. Digital engagement produced the stronger relative coefficient in this sample, but digital reach cannot substitute for environmental practice, service quality, access, or governance. North Minahasa therefore needs an integrated management system that aligns what the destination promises, what visitors experience, and what they later communicate online.

The study also carries limitations. The cross-sectional design identifies predictive relationships rather than temporal causality. Purposive sampling constrains population-level generalization, and the digital-use screening criterion excludes tourists who rely mainly on offline information. One questionnaire measured all constructs, so common-method variance remains a design risk despite the diagnostic and robustness checks. The model also estimates additive effects rather than moderation. Future research should combine tourist surveys with objective destination indicators, platform analytics, and multi-wave data; compare Likupang with other North Minahasa destinations; test the role of green trust and perceived greenwashing; and examine whether digital engagement changes the effect of green marketing under different levels of environmental credibility, service quality, or destination maturity.

REFERENCES

Abate, Y. A., Niininen, O., Ukpabi, D., & Karjaluoto, H. (2026). Green social media marketing and responsible travel across generations: How content source, trust, and greenwashing shape environmental responsibility. Cleaner and Responsible Consumption, 22, 100455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clrc.2026.100455

Abbasi, A. Z., Tsiotsou, R. H., Hussain, K., Rather, R. A., & Ting, D. H. (2023). Investigating the impact of social media images' value, consumer engagement, and involvement on eWOM of a tourism destination: A transmittal mediation approach. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 71, 103231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103231

Adelia, C., Roslina, & Shofa, F. (2026). The influence of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on sustainable tourism intention. International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research, 5(04), 2890-2905. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijebir.v5i04.4892

Ai, J., Yan, L., Hu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2022). An investigation into the effects of destination sensory experiences at visitors' digital engagement: Empirical evidence from Sanya, China. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 942078. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.942078

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Akram, U., Lavuri, R., Bilal, M., Hameed, I., & Byun, J. (2024). Exploring the roles of green marketing tools and green motives on green purchase intention in sustainable tourism destinations: A cross-cultural study. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 41(4), 453-471. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2023.2293022

Aktan, M., Zaman, U., Raza, S. H., & Koc, E. (2024). Demystifying tourists' intentional readiness for net zero transformation through environmental knowledge, conspicuous altruism, and greenwashing perceptions. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 29(4), 495-514. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2024.2333497

Armutcu, B., Tan, A., Amponsah, M., Parida, S., & Ramkissoon, H. (2023). Tourist behaviour: The role of digital marketing and social media. Acta Psychologica, 240, 104025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2023.104025

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. (2026). Statistik Pariwisata Provinsi Sulawesi Utara 2025. BPS Provinsi Sulawesi Utara.

Barbosa, A. de P. A., Fischmann, A. A., & Costa, B. K. (2024). Tourism competitiveness and social progress: A systematic literature review. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 59, 309-323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2024.05.004

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Bilynets, I., & Knezevic Cvelbar, L. (2022). Tourist pro-environmental behaviour: The role of environmental image of destination and daily behaviour. Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights, 3(2), 100070. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annale.2022.100070

Blanco-Moreno, S., Gonzalez-Fernandez, A. M., Munoz-Gallego, P. A., & Casalo, L. V. (2024). Understanding engagement with Instagram posts about tourism destinations. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 34, 100948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100948

Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011). Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. Journal of Service Research, 14(3), 252-271. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511411703

Chen, J., Wu, J., Wang, D., & Stantic, B. (2025). Beyond static rankings: A tourist experience-driven approach to measure destination competitiveness. Tourism Management, 106, 105022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.105022

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Crouch, G. I. (2011). Destination competitiveness: An analysis of determinant attributes. Journal of Travel Research, 50(1), 27-45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510362776

Cuić Tanković, A., & Mušanović, J. (2022). Exploring direct and indirect effects of sustainability communication on destination reputation. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 25, 100729. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2022.100729

Dwyer, L., & Kim, C. (2003). Destination competitiveness: Determinants and indicators. Current Issues in Tourism, 6(5), 369-414. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500308667962

Firman, A., Moslehpour, M., Qiu, R., Lin, P.-K., Ismail, T., & Rahman, F. F. (2023). The impact of eco-innovation, ecotourism policy and social media on sustainable tourism development: Evidence from the tourism sector of Indonesia. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja, 36(2), 2143847. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2143847

Font, X., Andreu, L., Mattila, A. S., & Aldas-Manzano, J. (2025). Sustainability information overload: Its effect on customers' greenwashing perceptions, perceived value, and behavioral intentions. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 62, 196-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2025.01.013

Frías-Jamilena, D. M., Polo-Pena, A. I., Peco-Torres, F., & Sabiote-Ortiz, C. M. (2024). Can co-creating a slow destination image boost sustainability? Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 32, 100898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100898

Fuller, C. M., Simmering, M. J., Atinc, G., Atinc, Y., & Babin, B. J. (2016). Common methods variance detection in business research. Journal of Business Research, 69(8), 3192-3198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.12.008

Gheorghe, G., Tudorache, P., & Rosca, I. M. (2023). The contribution of green marketing in the development of a sustainable destination through advanced clustering methods. Sustainability, 15(18), 13691. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813691

Gonzalez-Rodriguez, M. R., Diaz-Fernandez, M. C., & Pulido-Pavon, N. (2023). Tourist destination competitiveness: An international approach through the travel and tourism competitiveness index. Tourism Management Perspectives, 47, 101127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101127

Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z., & Koo, C. (2015). Smart tourism: Foundations and developments. Electronic Markets, 25(3), 179-188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-015-0196-8

Han, H., Chua, B.-L., & Fakfare, P. (2024). Special issue: Green marketing: Consumption and development of sustainable tourism and hospitality. Journal of Travel &

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Tourism Marketing, 41(4), 451-452. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2024.2334569

Harrigan, P., Evers, U., Miles, M., & Daly, T. (2017). Customer engagement with tourism social media brands. Tourism Management, 59, 597-609. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.09.015

Hendrika, K. P., Aprilani, D., & Yandes, J. (2026). The influence of green marketing, environmental awareness, and perceived value on sustainable purchase intention: A study of customers at Cafe Energi Positif in Bandar Lampung. International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research, 5(04), 2479-2500. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijebir.v5i04.4657

Hussain, K., Alam, M. M. D., Malik, A., Tarhini, A., & Al Balushi, M. K. (2024). From likes to luggage: The role of social media content in attracting tourists. Heliyon, 10(19), e38914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38914

Kapoor, P. S. (2026). Destination sustainability communication: The role of hope and shame in social media engagement and visit intentions. Consumer Behavior in Tourism and Hospitality, 21(4), 624-641. https://doi.org/10.1108/CBTH-03-2025-0062

Lesmana, H., Sugiarto, S., Yosevina, C., & Widjojo, H. (2022). A competitive advantage model for Indonesia's sustainable tourism destinations from supply and demand side perspectives. Sustainability, 14(24), 16398. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416398

Malhana, M., & Dewani, P. P. (2023). Customer engagement on social networking sites: An experimental analysis in the tourism and hospitality sector. Current Issues in Tourism, 26(12), 1915-1940. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2022.2071685

Marchi, V., Marasco, A., & Apicerni, V. (2023). Sustainability communication of tourism cities: A text mining approach. Cities, 143, 104590. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104590

Ministry of Tourism, Republic of Indonesia. (n.d.). Likupang and its exotic coastal attractions. Indonesia Travel. https://www.indonesia.travel/

Oktavia, S., & Syaefulloh, S. (2026). Viral marketing and electronic word-of-mouth influencing visiting decisions for Pacu Jalur events in Kuantan Singingi. International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research, 5(05), 5457-5467. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijebir.v5i05.6698

Pachucki, C., Grohs, R., & Scholl-Grissemann, U. (2022). Is nothing like before? COVID-19-evoked changes to tourism destination social media communication. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 23, 100692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2022.100692

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Papagiannakis, G. E., Vlachos, P. A., Koritos, C. D., & Kassinis, G. I. (2024). Are publicly traded tourism and hospitality providers greenwashing? Tourism Management, 103, 104893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.104893

Pike, S., & Page, S. J. (2014). Destination marketing organizations and destination marketing: A narrative analysis of the literature. Tourism Management, 41, 202-227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.09.009

Poa, D. S. M. (2025). Enhancing destination competitiveness: A thematic approach to nature-based tourism in Sikka Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province. International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research, 4(02), 494-503. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijebir.v4i02.1621

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Qiu, L., Li, X., & Choi, S.-H. (2024). Exploring the influence of short video platforms on tourist attitudes and travel intention: A social-technical perspective. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 31, 100826. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2023.100826

Rasul, T., Santini, F. de O., Lim, W. M., Buhalis, D., Ramkissoon, H., Ladeira, W. J., Pinto, D. C., & Azhar, M. (2025). Tourist engagement: Toward an integrated framework using meta-analysis. Journal of Vacation Marketing, 31(4), 845-867. https://doi.org/10.1177/13567667241238456

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003). The competitive destination: A sustainable tourism perspective. CABI Publishing.

Rodrigues, S., Correia, R., Goncalves, R., Branco, F., & Martins, J. (2023). Digital marketing's impact on rural destinations' image, intention to visit, and destination sustainability. Sustainability, 15(3), 2683. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032683

Sharmin, F., Sultan, M. T., Badulescu, D., Badulescu, A., Borma, A., & Li, B. (2021). Sustainable destination marketing ecosystem through smartphone-based social media: The consumers' acceptance perspective. Sustainability, 13(4), 2308. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042308

So, K. K. F., Wei, W., & Martin, D. (2021). Understanding customer engagement and social media activities in tourism: A latent profile analysis and cross-validation. Journal of Business Research, 129, 474-483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.054

Syatria, R., Fihartini, Y., & Pandjaitan, D. R. H. (2025). The role of tourism destination attributes in enhancing tourist loyalty through service quality experience at Tanjung Setia Beach Tourism Area, Pesisir Barat Regency, Lampung.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research, 5(01), 304-314. https://doi.org/10.63922/ijebir.v5i01.2637

Thong, J. Z., Lo, M. C., Ramayah, T., & Mohamad, A. A. (2022). The role of social media marketing in ecotourism: Perspectives of tourists visiting totally protected areas in Sarawak, Malaysia. Studies of Applied Economics, 40(1). https://doi.org/10.25115/eea.v40i1.6601

Wu, D., Li, H., & Wang, Y. (2023). Measuring sustainability and competitiveness of tourism destinations with data envelopment analysis. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 31(6), 1315-1335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2042699

Yang, Y., Ma, S., & Kirilenko, A. (2025). What destination videos can better engage viewers? Video analytics of destination marketing organizations' social media posts. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 42(9), 1204-1219. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2025.2573426

Yu, J., Dickinger, A., & Egger, R. (2024). Leveraging emojis as visual semiotics for enhanced engagement in destination marketing. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 33, 100925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100925

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.