

Strategic Management of Digital Tourism Marketing for Destination Management Organization Governance in Indonesia

Arus Reka Prasetya

Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia

Correspondent: reka.prasetya@widyatama.ac.id

Received : February 6, 2026

Accepted : March 16, 2026

Published : May 30, 2026

Citation: Prasetya, A. R. (2026). Strategic Management of Digital Tourism Marketing for Destination Management Organization Governance in Indonesia. *Mercatura : Journal of Marketing*, 2(1), 33-51.

<https://doi.org/10.61978/mercatura.v2i1.1386>

ABSTRACT: Digital platforms have turned destination marketing into a governance challenge rather than a content-production task, especially in Indonesia's dispersed and multi-level tourism system, where autonomous actors collectively shape a shared destination promise across fragmented digital touchpoints. This article develops an integrative capability framework for destination-level digital tourism marketing by showing how DMO or DMO-like governance can orchestrate four interdependent domains: channel portfolio and destination narrative governance; engagement, electronic word of mouth, and user-generated content governance; digital service integration and destination experience design; and data-driven governance and performance management. Drawing on a qualitative systematic literature review of studies published from 2015 to 2025, reported with PRISMA-informed procedures and synthesised through thematic analysis, the study contextualises global evidence through structured document analysis of Indonesian tourism policy and official destination communication to refine governance priorities. The contribution lies in specifying governance mechanisms such as channel-role rules, response protocols, shared service standards, and dashboard routines that enact sensing, seizing, and transforming under volatile platform conditions. The framework suggests a minimum viable governance package that may strengthen destination competitiveness and resilience by supporting standardised information quality, coordinated response practices, feasible service integration across the visitor journey, and shared learning routines, particularly where coordination capacity and data-sharing arrangements can be established.

Keywords: Destination Management Organizations, Digital Tourism Marketing, Dynamic Capabilities, Indonesia.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

The digitalisation of tourism has shifted destination marketing from the production of promotional content toward the governance of distributed digital touchpoints. Tourists now search, compare, validate, and share destination experiences through connected platforms that reward timely responses, credible information, and seamless interactions across the visitor journey

(Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019; Labanauskaitė et al., 2020). In destination settings, however, these expectations are not managed by a single firm. They emerge from a multi-actor system in which attractions, accommodation providers, transport services, public agencies, and local communities contribute to a shared destination promise. As a result, destination-level digital marketing effectiveness depends less on channel adoption alone and more on how stakeholders are coordinated across communication, engagement, and service delivery.

This coordination problem is increasingly recognised in DMO and smart destination research, yet the governance dimension remains under-specified. DMOs are expected to align stakeholders with market and policy priorities, but social media and platform adoption often remain promotional rather than relational, service-oriented, or learning-oriented (Sorokina et al., 2022; Uşaklı et al., 2017). Its importance becomes even more visible during disruption, when DMOs must revise messaging, priorities, and stakeholder support under uncertainty (Fedyk et al., 2022). Smart tourism destination scholarship similarly links digital transformation to collaboration, stewardship, and sustainability, while recent reviews still report implementation and governance gaps despite growing digital ambition (El Archi et al., 2023). For this reason, digital tourism marketing in multi-actor destinations must be analysed as a governance challenge shaped by platform volatility, reputational interdependence, and uneven organisational capacities.

In this study, governance mechanisms refer to the rules, routines, roles, service standards, and indicator practices through which DMO or DMO-like bodies align autonomous stakeholders across digital channels. This definition is important because destination performance does not depend only on promotional outputs, but also on whether destinations can organise channel-role clarity, response protocols, shared service expectations, and collective learning routines. To explain how these mechanisms become adaptive under change, the article adopts the dynamic capabilities perspective. Dynamic capabilities concern the ability to sense opportunities and threats, seize them through coordinated choices, and transform routines and resource configurations over time (Teece, 2007). In tourism settings, this logic is especially relevant because destination value creation depends on distributed resources, interorganisational relationships, and orchestration capability rather than hierarchical control (Idisondjaja et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2023).

The governance gap is particularly salient in Indonesia. Tourism value creation is dispersed across an archipelagic geography, heterogeneous destination typologies, and multi-level institutions, while digital promotion can remain fragmented when shared narratives, engagement governance, and performance learning are weak. Indonesian evidence shows that digital media can broaden destination communication reach, yet destination credibility still depends on coherent communication architectures that align identity claims with stakeholder practices across channels (Prasetia, 2015; Sudarmawan & Prasetia, 2019). These conditions make Indonesia an analytically important setting for examining how destination-level digital tourism marketing capability can be built through governance rather than through isolated campaigns.

Accordingly, this study asks: how can DMO governance orchestrate destination-level digital tourism marketing to build digital marketing capability in Indonesia?

To answer this question, the article develops an integrative governance framework that operationalises dynamic capabilities under platform volatility. The study uses a qualitative systematic literature review of publications from 2015 to 2025, reported with PRISMA-informed procedures and synthesised through thematic analysis, and it contextualises the synthesis through structured document analysis of Indonesian tourism policy and official destination communication to refine governance priorities. The article contributes by identifying four interdependent governance domains: channel portfolio and destination narrative governance; engagement, electronic word of mouth, and user-generated content governance; digital service integration and destination experience design; and data-driven governance and performance management. Taken together, these domains specify how governance routines can support collective sensing, seizing, and transforming, while also providing a staged roadmap for DMO-like bodies in Indonesia. The remainder of the paper presents the Method, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative systematic literature review with an integrative aim to develop a governance-based framework for destination digital tourism marketing in Indonesia. The review was reported using the PRISMA 2020 logic to document identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion decisions transparently (Page et al., 2021). To strengthen contextual relevance, the synthesis was complemented by structured document analysis of Indonesian tourism policy and official destination communication materials, which supported interpretive translation from global evidence to Indonesia's multi-level destination governance context (Dalglish et al., 2020). The overall design followed established guidance for integrative and systematic review-oriented scholarship that consolidates fragmented evidence to produce conceptual frameworks and researchable propositions (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2016).

Research Type

The study used a qualitative systematic literature review design. This approach was appropriate because the research objective was to consolidate mechanisms and governance logics across three streams that are often treated separately, namely destination digital tourism marketing, destination governance and the DMO function, and capability oriented strategic management. PRISMA 2020 was applied as a reporting scaffold, while thematic synthesis was used to derive analytical themes from heterogeneous sources through transparent coding and theme development procedures (Kiger & Varpio, 2020; Nowell et al., 2017).

Population and Sample/Informants (Studies and Documents)

The population comprised peer-reviewed publications examining destination-level digital tourism marketing, DMO governance and destination governance, stakeholder coordination and orchestration, and strategic management perspectives relevant to capability building. The main

inclusion window was 2015 to 2025, with limited use of seminal sources only when required to anchor foundational constructs. The sample prioritised journal articles, while conference proceedings were included only when they were peer-reviewed, methodologically explicit, and substantively relevant. Studies written in English or Indonesian were eligible provided that bibliographic information was complete and full texts were accessible. Exclusion criteria removed non-peer-reviewed materials, sources without stable bibliographic data, papers focused solely on tourism technology without substantive marketing or governance implications, and studies lacking sufficient conceptual or methodological detail for extraction and synthesis.

For contextual documents, the sample focused on publicly accessible organisational materials, prioritising official policy documents and formal communication outputs from Indonesian government institutions, tourism authorities, and DMO-like bodies, while also allowing credible industry reports when they offered relevant governance or digital communication insights. Documents were included only when they were attributable to identifiable organisations and did not contain personal or confidential data.

Research Location

The study was positioned at the national level in Indonesia. The synthesis integrated international evidence and interpreted it for Indonesia's archipelagic, multi-destination, and multi-level governance setting. The document analysis component was used to reflect Indonesia's institutional context and to refine governance priorities for DMO-like coordination in destination digital marketing, rather than to generate site-specific empirical claims.

Instrumentation or Tools

A structured extraction matrix and a codebook were used as the primary instruments for managing the review corpus. Extraction fields captured bibliographic metadata, study design, unit of analysis, destination context, digital marketing mechanisms, governance and orchestration features, strategic management lenses, and reported outcomes. A coding framework was iteratively refined to support consistency and traceability from source material to themes, consistent with qualitative thematic analysis guidance for evidence synthesis (Nowell et al., 2017; Kiger & Varpio, 2020). Reference management tools were used to organise records and support systematic de duplication.

To strengthen transparency and dependability, the extraction matrix and codebook were refined iteratively through an initial pilot pass on a subset of records before full coding proceeded. Category labels, inclusion boundaries, and note taking conventions were revised during this stage so that governance mechanisms, coordination routines, enabling conditions, and capability implications were captured consistently across heterogeneous sources. Because the review was conducted by a single author, no formal inter-coder reliability statistic was calculated; instead, consistency was supported through repeated checking of earlier coded records, analytic memoing, and an audit trail linking source extracts to descriptive categories and final themes.

Data Collection Procedures

Searches were conducted in Scopus and Web of Science and were complemented by selected publisher platforms and Google Scholar to strengthen coverage and reduce omission risk (Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2020; Haddaway et al., 2015). The final search update across all sources was completed on 30 September 2025. Search development combined four concept clusters, namely digital tourism marketing and related platform terms, destination governance and DMO terms, stakeholder orchestration and coordination terms, and capability oriented strategic management terms. A representative Boolean structure guided the review, and equivalent cross-platform search logic and supplementary retrieval procedures were applied consistently across sources.

Records were exported to reference management tools and de-duplicated using structured matching of key bibliographic fields to prevent double counting, consistent with recommended systematic review workflows (Bramer et al., 2016). Screening proceeded in two stages, namely title and abstract screening followed by full-text eligibility assessment, using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria across sources. Backward reference checking and forward citation tracking were applied to key articles identified during screening and full-text review. Google Scholar was used as a supplementary retrieval layer, screened in relevance order, and stopped when additional results no longer yielded new eligible studies. To minimise perceived selection bias, the review did not rely on targeted searching of a single author.

Data Analysis

Thematic synthesis was conducted through iterative coding and theme development. In the first analytic cycle, extracted segments were coded for governance mechanisms, enabling conditions, coordination routines, strategic roles, and reported outcomes rather than for descriptive background alone. In the second cycle, codes were grouped into descriptive categories and compared across methodological designs and destination contexts. In the third cycle, categories were consolidated into analytical themes explaining how DMO governance can orchestrate destination-level digital tourism marketing and how such orchestration may support destination-level digital marketing capability development. Analytic decisions were documented through memoing and an audit trail to strengthen dependability and confirmability (Korstjens & Moser, 2018).

The Indonesian document analysis was integrated after the literature themes had been stabilised and was used for contextual calibration rather than independent validation. More specifically, it was used to interpret transferability, refine governance priorities, and assess how internationally derived governance routines might be staged within Indonesia's multi-level destination setting (Dalglish et al., 2020). Quality appraisal supported evidence weighting rather than automatic exclusion. Empirical studies were appraised using MMAT 2018, and included systematic reviews were appraised using AMSTAR 2. Appraisal outcomes informed claim calibration by giving greater interpretive weight to methodologically transparent studies and by preventing weaker sources from carrying the central explanatory burden of the synthesis (Hong et al., 2018; Shea et al., 2017). Final

inclusion counts, full-text exclusion categories, and the PRISMA flow summary are reported in the Results section.

Ethical Approval

Formal ethics review was not sought because the study used only published literature and publicly accessible organisational documents and did not involve human participants, personal data, or confidential materials. The analysis excluded personally identifying information, reported organisational content only at an aggregated or illustrative level necessary for contextual interpretation, and treated official documents as public records rather than as evidence of private institutional conduct. Source attribution and citation were maintained throughout, and no copyrighted material was reproduced beyond standard scholarly quotation and referencing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Study Selection and Evidence Base

Study identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion were documented using the PRISMA 2020 flow structure, with the final search completed on 30 September 2025. In total, 1,270 records were retrieved from database and supplementary searches. After removal of 300 duplicates, 970 unique records were screened by title and abstract, leading to 830 exclusions. Of 140 reports taken to retrieval, 10 could not be obtained, 130 full texts were assessed, and 45 studies were retained for qualitative thematic synthesis. The remaining 85 full texts were excluded for recorded reasons, which are summarised in Table 1. In addition, 5 publicly accessible Indonesian governance and official tourism communication documents were included for contextual calibration of destination-level digital tourism marketing governance.

Table 1. Recorded Reasons for Full-Text Exclusion (N = 85)

Full-Text Exclusion Category	Count	%
Not focused on destination-level tourism marketing or destination governance	29	34.1%
Focused on tourism technology or digital tools without substantive marketing or governance relevance	17	20.0%
Did not contain substantive DMO, governance, orchestration, or coordination content	15	17.6%
Insufficient conceptual or methodological detail for extraction and synthesis	11	12.9%
Non peer-reviewed source or unstable bibliographic information identified at full-text stage	7	8.2%
Other scope mismatch identified after full-text assessment	6	7.1%
Total	85	100.0%

Note: Percentages are rounded to one decimal place; therefore, totals may not sum exactly to 100.0.

Corpus Profiling

A descriptive evidence mapping matrix was compiled to profile the included corpus by publication year, outlet type, methodological design, geographic coverage, unit of analysis, and conceptual focus. The evidence base was dominated by peer-reviewed journal articles, while peer-reviewed conference proceedings were retained selectively when they demonstrated methodological transparency and strong relevance to destination-level governance and digital tourism marketing. Methodologically, the corpus was heterogeneous, encompassing qualitative case-based studies, quantitative analyses of digital communication and platform indicators, mixed-methods designs, and conceptual or framework-oriented contributions. Conceptually, the reviewed works converged around three interrelated streams: destination digital tourism marketing as a platform-mediated and multi-touchpoint system, destination governance and DMO roles as stakeholder coordination and orchestration, and strategic management perspectives concerned with adaptation and capability development under change.

Thematic Findings

The thematic synthesis yielded four interdependent governance domains through which DMO-like bodies can orchestrate destination-level digital tourism marketing as a coordinated capability in multi-actor settings. The first domain concerns channel portfolio and destination narrative governance and is visible in practices such as channel-role allocation, narrative standards, and information integrity routines. The second concerns engagement, electronic word of mouth, and user-generated content governance and centres on listening systems, response playbooks, and stewardship of participatory communication. The third concerns digital service integration and destination experience design and focuses on journey-supporting service layers, interoperability priorities, and coordinated visitor support. The fourth concerns data-driven governance and performance management and includes dashboard routines, indicator architectures, and shared review cycles. Together, these domains specify the governance architecture through which destinations can organise collective sensing, seizing, and transforming. Table 2 summarises the dynamic capabilities mapping and indicative outputs associated with each domain.

Table 2. Mapping Governance Domains to Dynamic Capabilities and Indicative Outputs

Governance Domain	Indicative Mechanisms and Routines	Dynamic Capability Contribution	Indicative Outputs or Indicators
Channel portfolio and destination narrative governance	Channel role matrix, editorial standards, information update protocols, shared narrative templates, asset governance routines	Supports sensing through platform and audience scanning, seizing through channel allocation and narrative prioritisation, and transforming through revision of shared standards and role allocations	Documented channel matrix, narrative guideline, information accuracy, update timeliness, reduced message inconsistency
Engagement, electronic word of mouth, and user-generated content governance	Social listening routines, response playbooks, escalation and service recovery protocols, ethical participation guidelines for UGC	Supports sensing through issue detection and sentiment monitoring, seizing through coordinated response and recovery, and transforming through learning-led revision of engagement protocols	Response standards, sentiment review routines, complaint resolution tracking, UGC stewardship guideline, engagement quality monitoring
Digital service integration and destination experience design	Digital journey mapping, integrated official information layers, referral or interoperability priorities, coordinated visitor support routines	Supports sensing through identification of journey friction points, seizing through service layer integration choices, and transforming through redesign of cross-stakeholder support routines	Integrated visitor information, service referral pathways, journey support features, service adoption metrics, reduced visitor uncertainty

Strategic Management of Digital Tourism Marketing for Destination Management Organization Governance in Indonesia

Prasetia

Governance Domain	Indicative Mechanisms and Routines	Dynamic Capability Contribution	Indicative Outputs or Indicators
Data-driven governance and performance management	Shared KPI set, dashboard routines, data-sharing arrangements, periodic review cycles, coordinated information practices	Supports sensing through analytics and monitoring, seizing through evidence-based coordination decisions, and transforming through iterative adjustment and institutional learning	Dashboard use, review meeting cadence, KPI reports, documented corrective actions, shared learning routines

Theme 1: Channel Portfolio and Destination Narrative Governance

Across the reviewed studies, the digital environment was consistently described as a fragmented information space in which destination visibility and credibility depend on coordinated narratives and information assets across multiple platforms and touchpoints. A recurrent pattern was that destinations often expand channel presence without clearly differentiated channel roles, which increases inconsistent messaging across stakeholders and reduces the strategic value of digital communication. Evidence on DMO social media practice indicates that interactive capabilities are frequently underutilised, as many destinations employ social platforms primarily for one-way promotion rather than sustained engagement and service-oriented interaction (Uşaklı et al., 2017). The literature also linked channel governance to platform-mediated discovery and evaluation, indicating that tourists' selection processes are shaped by platform logics and digital representations, which elevates the importance of coherent narrative structures and managed information assets (Cooper et al., 2021). From a stakeholder perspective, destinations were reported to strengthen social media-based image formation when stakeholder roles in content generation are defined and coordinated in ways that reduce duplication and contradiction (de las Heras-Pedrosa et al., 2020). In addition, digital destination branding frameworks suggest that destination branding in digital environments involves the joint configuration of social network presence, content governance, and the linkage between communication and useful digital services that reduce visitor uncertainty (Confetto et al., 2023). Complementary evidence on tourism e-marketing tools similarly indicates that effectiveness depends on deliberate tool selection and communication management routines rather than channel adoption alone (Labanauskaitė et al., 2020), while real-time co-creation scholarship underscores that value creation increasingly relies on continuous digital interaction that requires consistency and learning-oriented coordination across stakeholders (Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019).

Theme 2: Engagement, Electronic Word of Mouth, and User-Generated Content Governance

Engagement dynamics were consistently positioned as a core driver of destination meaning-making, particularly through electronic word of mouth (e-WOM) and user-generated content (UGC) circulating via social media, review platforms, and visual-first channels. Evidence indicates that tourists' co-created online experiences influence destination image evaluations and satisfaction, which positions UGC as both an informational signal and an experiential layer shaping expectations and interpretations of destination performance (Lam et al., 2020). Research focusing on destination brand outcomes likewise reported that destination brand equity and engagement are shaped by the interaction between controlled communication produced by destination organisations and uncontrolled communication generated by tourists, implying that engagement governance extends beyond publishing strategies and includes managing the broader communicative ecosystem in which visitors participate (Huerta-Álvarez et al., 2020). A recurrent pattern was that e-WOM and UGC operate as social validation mechanisms in which perceived authenticity and social proof amplify reputational sensitivity to conversational trends and

sentiment shifts. This aligns with real-time co-creation perspectives that view responsiveness and interaction quality as part of how visitors evaluate destinations across the journey (Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019). The synthesis also highlighted the relevance of coordinated response capability: post-disruption evidence indicates that social media e-WOM can influence behavioural outcomes such as revisit intention (Azhar et al., 2022), while resilience-oriented work conceptualises real-time response as a systems approach that relies on timely information sharing and coordinated action when disruptions, misinformation, or reputational shocks spread rapidly across platforms (Bethune et al., 2022). Across contexts, Theme 2 consolidated three recurring governance elements: social listening and issue identification, response protocols and service recovery coordination, and UGC enablement and ethical amplification practices that support positive co-creation without manipulative control.

Theme 3: Digital Service Integration and Destination Experience Design

Theme 3 linked destination digital tourism marketing effectiveness to a destination's capacity to complement communication with an integrated digital service layer that supports the visitor journey from pre-visit planning to on-site navigation and post-visit feedback. The reviewed studies positioned digital services as functional components of destination value creation because they reduce informational uncertainty and operational friction, thereby translating destination meaning into usable visitor support. Evidence on destination management systems suggests that stakeholders value functionalities beyond basic promotion, including service information, transactional support, and relationship-oriented features, although perceived relevance varies with organisational resources and strategic vision (Estêvão et al., 2022). A consistent strand treated digital service integration as an ecosystem issue requiring interoperability and coordinated participation across stakeholders; smart destination research adopting a DMO perspective emphasised that destination-wide digital initiatives often depend on shared infrastructures and alignment mechanisms that connect marketing systems with place management priorities (Sorokina et al., 2022). In parallel, research on stakeholder engagement practices in the digital era described how regional DMOs leverage websites and digital platforms as coordination hubs for distributing consistent destination information and facilitating coordinated destination-level actions (Trunfio & Della Lucia, 2019). Related work also indicated that transforming conventional websites into enhanced platforms can strengthen collaboration in marketing coordination, networking, and knowledge sharing, although sustained collaboration depends on governance conditions such as leadership and accepted participation rules (Zainal-Abidin et al., 2023). The experiential consequences of destination digital services were also emphasised: empirical studies reported that perceived usefulness and ease of use shape online experience quality and contribute to cognitive and affective destination image formation (Xia et al., 2018), while smart tourism application attributes were shown to influence perceived destination image and behavioural intention in several contexts (Tavitiyaman et al., 2021).

Theme 4: Data-driven Governance and Performance Management

Theme 4 highlighted that destination-level digital tourism marketing is repeatedly associated with measurement routines and governance mechanisms that translate platform signals into

coordinated learning and performance improvement. The evidence base described a recurring gap between adopting e-marketing tools and establishing systematic evaluation practices, which can limit the refinement of communication management and engagement strategies based on evidence (Labanauskaitė et al., 2020). A consistent stream of findings focused on structured assessment frameworks that link social media strategy choices to performance indicators, enabling comparative evaluation across platforms and content types (Pino et al., 2019).

Complementary evidence using platform analytics reported that content characteristics can be associated with measurable audience responses, indicating that destinations can evaluate message effectiveness through observable digital traces rather than relying on descriptive reporting alone (Molina et al., 2020). Beyond platform metrics, destination KPI frameworks emphasised that management performance can be assessed through coordinated indicator architectures that integrate marketing and experience measures with broader destination management pillars to support more comprehensive monitoring of destination outcomes (Crotts et al., 2022).

Related smart destination and smart DMO scholarship further described DMOs as increasingly involved in digitally enabled sensing and stewardship functions through the use of data and analytics in technology-mediated coordination environments (Gretzel, 2022). Resilience-oriented research also conceptualised real-time response capability as dependent on timely information sharing and coordinated action, implying an operational dimension to data governance under disruption (Bethune et al., 2022). Taken together, Theme 4 consolidated three recurrent elements: monitoring and analytics for situational awareness, structured assessment frameworks and indicator systems, and coordination-oriented information practices that support shared learning and timely action across stakeholders.

Overall, the Results indicate that destination-level digital tourism marketing is described in the recent literature as a coordinated governance capability organised around four domains: governed channel portfolios and destination narratives, engagement and UGC governance, integrated digital services supporting experience design, and data-driven performance management that connects digital traces to collective learning. These descriptive patterns provide the basis for the next section, which discusses how the themes align with theory and inform governance practice and contributions.

This study argues that destination-level digital tourism marketing in Indonesia is best understood as a governance problem in which governance routines operate as the practical bridge between dynamic capabilities and coordinated digital performance. Across the four domains identified in the synthesis, destinations do not build digital marketing capability simply by adding channels or digital tools. They build it by institutionalising routines that allocate channel roles, govern response practices, coordinate visitor-supporting service layers, and embed shared performance learning across stakeholders. Through these routines, sensing becomes an organised activity of listening, monitoring, and issue detection; seizing becomes a coordinated activity of prioritising narratives, responses, and service choices; and transforming becomes a cumulative activity of revising standards, protocols, and collaboration arrangements under platform volatility. The contribution of this Discussion is therefore not to restate the four themes descriptively, but to explain how

governance turns dispersed digital activity into an adaptive destination-level capability. The cross-domain logic summarised in Table 2 informs this mechanism-based interpretation.

Theme 1: Channel Portfolio and Destination Narrative Governance

Theme 1 indicates that strategic effectiveness depends on whether destinations manage digital touchpoints as a governed channel portfolio instead of fragmented accounts run independently by multiple stakeholders. Because destination meaning is assembled across search, social feeds, short-form video ecosystems, and review platforms, unclear channel roles and weak narrative standards increase the likelihood of inconsistent operational information, contradictory brand cues, and reduced trust. This interpretation is consistent with evidence that many DMOs still underutilise social media's relational potential and tend to treat platforms as one-way promotional channels (Uşaklı et al., 2017), and with stakeholder-based arguments that digital destination image formation is strengthened when content responsibilities and coordination are explicit. Platform logics further shape discovery and evaluation pathways, making coherent information assets and stable narrative structures central to competitiveness (Cooper et al., 2021). Digital destination branding research similarly frames channel configuration, content governance, and the linkage between branding and useful digital services as strategic choices (Confetto et al., 2023). In Indonesia, where tourism supply is often dominated by SMEs and community actors with uneven digital capacity, a minimum governance package can reduce inconsistency costs while preserving local distinctiveness, provided it follows selective standardisation rather than rigid control (Gretzel, 2022; Teece et al., 2016).

Theme 2: Engagement, e-WOM, and User-Generated Content Governance

Theme 2 highlights that destination credibility is continuously co-produced through engagement dynamics, e-WOM, and UGC, which shifts reputation from a communication outcome to a governance issue. UGC platforms influence destination image and satisfaction (Lam et al., 2020), while destination brand trajectories reflect the interaction between controlled organisational communication and uncontrolled tourist-generated communication (Huerta-Álvarez et al., 2020). In addition, value co-creation increasingly depends on real-time interaction quality and responsiveness (Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019), and post-disruption evidence shows that e-WOM can influence revisit intention (Azhar et al., 2022). These patterns imply that destinations require cross-stakeholder stewardship in the form of listening and sensemaking routines, coordinated response and service recovery protocols, and ethical UGC participation practices that protect authenticity and trust (Bethune et al., 2022; Teece, 2007). In Indonesia's dispersed and multilingual context, the operational emphasis should be accountable responsiveness with selective standardisation that protects information integrity without producing scripted interactions that undermine perceived authenticity.

Theme 3: Digital Service Integration and Destination Experience Design

Theme 3 indicates that digital tourism marketing becomes strategically meaningful when destination narratives are coupled with an integrated digital service layer that reduces visitor

friction along the journey. Stakeholders value destination management system functionalities beyond promotion, yet adoption and sustained use depend on resources and strategic clarity (Estêvão et al., 2022). Smart destination scholarship positions DMO leadership as an enabling mechanism for coordinating destination-wide digital initiatives and aligning marketing systems with place management objectives (Sorokina et al., 2022), while the smart DMO perspective emphasises digitally enabled stewardship in technology-mediated environments (Gretzel, 2022). At the visitor experience level, perceived usefulness and ease of use shape online experience quality and contribute to destination image through cognitive and affective pathways (Xia et al., 2018), and smart tourism application attributes can influence destination image and behavioural intention (Tavitiyaman et al., 2021).

Because service features and experience design are distributed across actors, integration depends on coordination hubs, accepted participation rules, and sustained collaboration (Trunfio & Della Lucia, 2019; Zainal-Abidin et al., 2023). For Indonesia, the synthesis supports a staged approach that prioritises a minimum viable service layer (official information integrity and itinerary coherence) before pursuing more complex interoperability, while paying attention to participation costs that can exclude smaller operators (Teece, 2007).

Theme 4: Data-Driven Governance and Performance Management

Theme 4 positions monitoring, evaluation, and learning as governance routines that connect digital actions to coordinated improvement. Many tourism organisations adopt e-marketing tools faster than they develop systematic evaluation practices, limiting learning and weakening strategic renewal (Labanauskaitė et al., 2020). Methodological work suggests that evaluation frameworks for DMO social media strategy can support governance by linking communication choices to indicators and comparable benchmarks (Pino et al., 2019), while evidence also shows that content characteristics can be linked to measurable audience responses through observable digital traces (Molina et al., 2020). However, performance governance should not be reduced to reach and engagement metrics, because destination digital value also depends on whether services support the journey from inspiration to action. This aligns with smart DMO stewardship that emphasises sensing signals and coordinating responses, and with destination KPI perspectives that connect marketing metrics to broader destination management priorities. Through a dynamic capabilities lens, sensing is strengthened by shared monitoring and issue detection, seizing by timely evidence-based coordination decisions, and transforming by learning loops that update narrative standards, engagement protocols, and service integration priorities (Teece, 2007). In resilience terms, real-time response capacity becomes relevant when disruptions escalate across platforms (Bethune et al., 2022). For Indonesia, a layered architecture (minimum viable measurement, diagnostic learning, and destination-level performance coherence) is more feasible than complex indicator regimes, while boundary conditions such as platform dependence and data inequality reinforce the need to prioritise interpretability and accountability over metric proliferation (Crotts et al., 2022).

The transferability of the framework is conditioned by destination size, coordination capacity, resource availability, platform dependence, data inequality, and the administrative burden that governance can impose on smaller actors. For that reason, the framework should be read as staged rather than uniform. A minimum governance foundation is necessary in almost all destinations

and consists of channel-role clarity, minimum information quality standards, basic listening and response rules, coherent official visitor information, and a limited review rhythm based on interpretable indicators. More advanced maturity layers become relevant only when destinations possess stronger coordination capacity, more reliable cross-stakeholder participation, and workable data-sharing arrangements. These advanced layers include deeper service interoperability, more formalised escalation and recovery systems, richer dashboard integration, and broader performance governance across stakeholders. In Indonesia's heterogeneous destination system, capability building is therefore likely to be cumulative and uneven, which means that successful governance depends less on adopting the most sophisticated tools than on matching governance ambition to institutional capacity and stakeholder inclusion.

Theoretical Contributions

This study makes three interrelated theoretical contributions. First, it reframes destination digital tourism marketing as a collective strategic capability that is built through governance routines rather than through channel adoption alone, thereby extending dynamic capabilities logic to multi-actor destination systems where coordination, not hierarchy, is decisive. Second, it offers a mid-range integrative framework that operationalises smart destination and smart DMO arguments through four governance domains and their associated routines, clarifying how digitally enabled stewardship becomes actionable as destination-level marketing capability building. In doing so, it also complements digital destination branding scholarship by showing that brand credibility depends not only on narrative consistency but also on the alignment between communication claims, response governance, service-layer support, and learning routines across touchpoints. Third, it advances orchestration scholarship by positioning DMO or DMO-like coordination as the mechanism through which distributed actors convert sensing, seizing, and transforming into destination-level strategic coherence under platform volatility. As summarised in Table 2, the framework is analytically useful because it links specific governance mechanisms to dynamic capability functions and to observable outputs that can guide further empirical work.

Practical Implications

The findings suggest that Indonesian DMO-like bodies, including tourism offices, destination authorities, and public-private destination consortia, should treat digital tourism marketing as coordinated governance linking destination meaning, visitor support, and shared learning across stakeholders. In practical terms, the most urgent priority is not maximum digital sophistication but a minimum viable governance foundation. This foundation consists of clear channel-role allocation, minimum information accuracy and update standards, basic listening and response routines for engagement and e-WOM, a coherent official visitor information layer that reduces journey friction, and a limited set of interpretable indicators reviewed regularly enough to support coordinated adjustment. These elements are likely to matter most in destinations where fragmentation, uneven digital capacity, and multilingual communication complicate credibility and responsiveness.

A more advanced maturity layer becomes feasible when destinations possess stronger coordination capacity, more reliable participation by SMEs and community actors, and workable data-sharing arrangements. At that stage, DMO-like bodies can pursue deeper service interoperability, more formalised escalation and recovery systems, richer dashboard integration, and broader cross-stakeholder performance governance. The practical implication is therefore staged rather than universal: destinations should first secure governance routines that protect credibility, responsiveness, and inclusion, and only then expand toward more complex digital integration. This approach may support competitiveness and resilience more credibly than campaign-centric expansion, particularly in Indonesia's diverse and institutionally uneven destination system.

Limitations and Cautions

Several limitations should guide interpretation of the framework presented in this study. The paper relies on a qualitative systematic literature review complemented by structured document analysis, so its conclusions remain bounded by the scope, accessibility, and quality of available publications and official materials. Although the review followed PRISMA-informed procedures, relevant studies may still have been missed because of indexing delays, database coverage differences, keyword variability, and publication bias, especially for Indonesian contexts whose evidence is not always visible in internationally indexed outlets. In addition, the evidence base was methodologically heterogeneous, spanning conceptual works and empirical studies conducted across different destination types and governance environments. The appraisal and evidence-weighting procedures strengthened interpretive discipline, but they could not eliminate contextual incomparability, and the synthesis therefore identifies patterned governance logics rather than estimating effects or verifying causality.

Further caution is needed because the Indonesian contextualisation drew primarily on publicly accessible policy and official communication materials. Such sources are useful for interpreting formal priorities and institutional positioning, yet they may not fully capture informal coordination dynamics, political negotiation, platform dependence, or day-to-day implementation frictions. For that reason, the framework should be treated as a theory-informed and contextually calibrated proposition whose transferability depends on destination size, coordination capacity, resource availability, platform dependence, and data-sharing conditions. The study therefore cannot determine that the proposed governance architecture will produce uniform outcomes across settings. It is more defensible to conclude that the architecture may support stronger competitiveness, resilience, and shared learning where institutional capacity and stakeholder participation are sufficiently developed.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should test and refine the proposed framework through comparative empirical work across Indonesia's diverse destination typologies and institutional arrangements. Multi-site case studies can examine how different coordinating bodies enact the four governance domains under shared authority, how orchestration capability emerges in practice, and how role clarity, decision routines, and resource flows shape coordination quality. Complementing this, researchers

should develop and validate destination-level measures for narrative coherence, engagement governance maturity, service integration readiness, and performance governance so that governance propositions can be assessed consistently across settings and over time.

Further work is also needed to evaluate specific interventions and to examine the conditions that support inclusion and accountability. Longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs could assess the effects of information standardisation protocols, coordinated response playbooks, and destination digital hubs by linking pre and post digital trace data to sentiment dynamics and visitor behaviour proxies. Parallel inquiry should examine interoperability and data-sharing arrangements between DMO-like bodies, platform firms, and tourism SMEs, while also specifying the incentives, capacity-building practices, and lightweight standards that allow SMEs and community actors to participate without excessive transaction costs. Together, these lines of inquiry would help determine which combinations of governance mechanisms are both feasible and beneficial in Indonesia's uneven destination landscape.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that destination-level digital tourism marketing in Indonesia is best understood as a governance problem in multi-actor destinations rather than as a promotional problem solved by simply increasing platform presence. Because destination meaning, visitor support, and reputation are co-produced across autonomous actors, strategic effectiveness depends on whether DMO or DMO-like bodies can organise shared routines for coordination, responsiveness, and learning.

The article proposes four interdependent governance domains as a destination-level capability architecture: channel portfolio and destination narrative governance; engagement, electronic word of mouth, and user-generated content governance; digital service integration and destination experience design; and data-driven governance and performance management. Read through a dynamic capabilities lens, these domains specify how sensing, seizing, and transforming can be enacted collectively through governance routines rather than assumed as abstract strategic capacities. The framework therefore clarifies how coordination may become capability building under platform volatility.

For practice, the most feasible route for Indonesia is a staged governance roadmap. Destinations should begin with a minimum governance foundation that secures channel-role clarity, information integrity, accountable response routines, coherent official visitor support, and a limited performance review cycle, and then move toward more advanced interoperability and cross-stakeholder learning as coordination capacity, resource availability, and data-sharing conditions improve. Future research should now validate the framework across contrasting destination typologies and develop measurable governance maturity indicators that can be linked more carefully to destination outcomes.

REFERENCE

- Azhar, M., Ali, R., Hamid, S., Akhtar, M. J., & Rahman, M. N. (2022). Demystifying the Effect of Social Media eWOM on Revisit Intention Post-COVID-19: An Extension of Theory of Planned Behavior. *Future Business Journal*, 8(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-022-00161-5>
- Bethune, E., Buhalis, D., & Miles, L. (2022). Real Time Response (RTR): Conceptualizing a Smart Systems Approach to Destination Resilience. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 23, 100687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100687>
- Bramer, W. M., Giustini, D., de Jonge, G. B., Holland, L., & Bekhuis, T. (2016). De-Duplication of Database Search Results for Systematic Reviews in EndNote. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 104(3), 240–243. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.104.3.014>
- Buhalis, D., & Sinarta, Y. (2019). Real-Time Co-Creation and Nowness Service: Lessons from Tourism and Hospitality. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(5), 563–582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2019.1592059>
- Confetto, M. G., Conte, F., Palazzo, M., & Siano, A. (2023). Digital Destination Branding: A Framework to Define and Measure Choices Made by Tourism Players Such as DMOs. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 30, 100804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2023.100804>
- Cooper, M.-A., Camprubí, R., Koç, E., & Buckley, R. (2021). Digital Destination Matching: Practices, Priorities and Predictions. *Sustainability*, 13(19), 10540. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910540>
- Crotts, J. C., Magnini, V. P., & Calvert, E. (2022). Key Performance Indicators for Destination Management in Developed Economies: A Four Pillar Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights*, 3(2), 100053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annale.2022.100053>
- Dalglis, S. L., Khalid, H., & McMahon, S. A. (2020). Document Analysis in Health Policy Research: The READ Approach. *Health Policy and Planning*, 35(10), 1424–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa064>
- de las Heras-Pedrosa, C., Millan-Celis, E., Iglesias-Sánchez, P. P., & Jambrino-Maldonado, C. (2020). Importance of Social Media in the Image Formation of Tourist Destinations from the Stakeholders' Perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(10), 4092. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104092>
- El Archi, Y., Benbba, B., Nizamatinova, Z., Issakov, Y., Vargáné, G. I., & Dávid, L. D. (2023). Systematic Literature Review Analysing Smart Tourism Destinations in Context of Sustainable Development: Current Applications and Future Directions. *Sustainability*, 15(6), 5086. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065086>
- Estêvão, J., Teixeira, L., & Carneiro, M. J. (2022). The Relevance of Destination Management Systems' Functionalities: A Model Based on Stakeholders' View. *Journal of Organizational*

- Computing and Electronic Commerce*, 32(1), 21–44.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2022.2036568>
- Fedyk, W., Soltysik, M., Bagińska, J., Ziemia, M., Kolodziej, M., & Borzyszkowski, J. (2022). Changes in DMO's Orientation and Tools to Support Organizations in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(18), 11611. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811611>
- Gretzel, U. (2022). The Smart DMO: A New Step in the Digital Transformation of Destination Management Organizations. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 30, 3002. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v30i.2589>
- Gusenbauer, M., & Haddaway, N. R. (2020). Which Academic Search Systems Are Suitable for Systematic Reviews or Meta-Analyses? Evaluating Retrieval Qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 Other Resources. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 11(2), 181–217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378>
- Haddaway, N. R., Collins, A. M., Coughlin, D., & Kirk, S. (2015). The Role of Google Scholar in Evidence Reviews and Its Applicability to Grey Literature Searching. *Systematic Reviews*, 4, 138. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-015-0066-8>
- Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M. P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M. C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Version 2018 for Information Professionals and Researchers. *Education for Information*, 34(4), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221>
- Huerta-Álvarez, R., Cambra-Fierro, J. J., & Fuentes-Blasco, M. (2020). The Interplay between Social Media Communication, Brand Equity and Brand Engagement in Tourist Destinations: An Analysis in an Emerging Economy. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 16, 100413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100413>
- Idisondjaja, B. B., Wahyuni, S., & Turino, H. (2023). The Role of Resource Structuring, Marketing, and Networking Capabilities in Forming DMO Orchestration Capability toward Sustainable Value Creation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(3), 2288381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2288381>
- Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher*, 42(8), 846–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030>
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical Guidance to Qualitative Research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and Publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Labanauskaitė, D., Fiore, M., & Stašys, R. (2020). Use of E-Marketing Tools as Communication Management in the Tourism Industry. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 34, 100652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100652>
- Lam, J. M. S., Ismail, H., & Lee, S. (2020). From Desktop to Destination: User-Generated Content Platforms, Co-Created Online Experiences, Destination Image and Satisfaction. *Journal of*

- Destination Marketing & Management*, 18, 100490.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100490>
- Molina, A., Gómez, M., Lyon, A., Aranda, E., & Loibl, W. (2020). What Content to Post? Evaluating the Effectiveness of Facebook Communications in Destinations. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 18, 100498.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100498>
- Nguyen, H. T. T., Pham, H. S. T., & Freeman, S. (2023). Dynamic Capabilities in Tourism Businesses: Antecedents and Outcomes. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17, 1645–1680.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00567-z>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., & others. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 Statement: An Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Pino, G., Peluso, A. M., Del Vecchio, P., Ndou, V., Passiante, G., & Guido, G. (2019). A Methodological Framework to Assess Social Media Strategies of Event and Destination Management Organizations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(2), 189–216.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2018.1516590>
- Prasetia, A. R. (2015, May). Nation Branding: Komunikasi (Kenegaraan) atau Komunikasi Pemasaran? *Conference on Communication and New Media Studies: Peran dan Kontribusi Kajian Komunikasi dalam Era Komunitas ASEAN*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3692.2960>
- Shea, B. J., Reeves, B. C., Wells, G., Thuku, M., Hamel, C., Moran, J., Moher, D., Tugwell, P., Welch, V., Kristjansson, E., & Henry, D. A. (2017). AMSTAR 2: A Critical Appraisal Tool for Systematic Reviews That Include Randomised or Non-Randomised Studies of Healthcare Interventions, or Both. *BMJ*, 358, j4008. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sorokina, E., Wang, Y., Fyall, A., Lugosi, P., Torres, E., & Jung, T. (2022). Constructing a Smart Destination Framework: A Destination Marketing Organization Perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 23, 100688.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100688>
- Sudarmawan, N. W., & Prasetia, A. R. (2019). Pengenalan Objek Wisata Alam Kabupaten Lebak melalui Strategi Komunikasi Berbasis Media Digital. *Conference On Communication and News Media Studies*, 1, 346.
<https://proceeding.umn.ac.id/index.php/COMNEWS/article/view/1108>

- Tavitiyaman, P., Qu, H., Tsang, W. S. L., & Lam, C. W. R. (2021). The Influence of Smart Tourism Applications on Perceived Destination Image and Behavioral Intention: The Moderating Role of Information Search Behavior. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 476–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.02.003>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: The Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4), 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13>
- Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Using the Past and Present to Explore the Future. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15(4), 404–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606>
- Trunfio, M., & Della Lucia, M. (2019). Engaging Destination Stakeholders in the Digital Era: The Best Practice of Italian Regional DMOs. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(3), 349–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348018807293>
- Uşaklı, A., Koç, B., & Sönmez, S. (2017). How “Social” Are Destinations? Examining European DMO Social Media Usage. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(2), 136–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.02.001>
- Xia, M., Zhang, Y., & Zhang, C. (2018). A TAM-Based Approach to Explore the Effect of Online Experience on Destination Image: A Smartphone User’s Perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8, 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.05.002>
- Zainal-Abidin, H., Scarles, C., & Lundberg, C. (2023). The Antecedents of Digital Collaboration through an Enhanced Digital Platform for Destination Management: A Micro-DMO Perspective. *Tourism Management*, 96, 104691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104691>