

WHAT MAKES SUSTAINABILITY BELIEVABLE ONLINE? MESSAGES, COMMUNITY CUES, GREEN TRUST, AND VISIT INTENTION

Hayani¹, Tri Rusilawati Kasisariah², Wiwik Rachmarwi³, Diajeng Reztrianti⁴, Andi Juanna⁵

Universitas Serelo Lahat, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia¹

Universitas Serelo Lahat, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia²

Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia³

Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia⁴

Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia⁵

Email: hayani1010@unsela.ac.id

Abstract: *This study examines how sustainability messages and visible community involvement in digital destination content relate to tourists' green trust and visit intention. Focusing on a community-based destination in Pesawaran Regency, Lampung Province, the study distinguishes sustainability communication from community-based sustainability cues as two perceptually distinct attributes of the same digital content. An online survey yielded 200 usable responses from domestic tourists and prospective tourists after they viewed the same destination content. PLS-SEM tested an indirect pathway through green trust while estimating the direct associations of sustainability communication and community-based sustainability cues with visit intention. Both digital attributes were positively associated with green trust and visit intention, and green trust was also positively associated with visit intention. Significant indirect paths through green trust linked sustainability communication and community-based sustainability cues to visit intention. However, the direct associations of both attributes with visit intention remained significant after green trust entered the model, indicating that trust represents an important but not exclusive pathway connecting digital sustainability content with tourists' behavioral intentions. The study therefore conceptualizes believable sustainability communication as more than persuasive messaging: credibility also depends on visible community cues that socially ground sustainability claims and connects what destinations communicate with how local participation is represented online.*

Keywords: *Community-Based Sustainability Cues; Community-Based Tourism; Green Trust; Sustainability Communication; Visit Intention.*

Abstrak: Studi ini menguji bagaimana pesan keberlanjutan dan keterlibatan komunitas yang terlihat dalam konten destinasi berkaitan dengan green trust dan visit intention wisatawan. Berfokus pada destinasi berbasis komunitas di Kabupaten Pesawaran, Provinsi Lampung, studi ini membedakan sustainability communication dari community-based sustainability cues sebagai dua atribut perseptual yang berbeda dalam konten digital yang sama. Survei daring menghasilkan 200 respons yang dapat dianalisis dari wisatawan domestik dan calon wisatawan setelah mereka melihat konten destinasi yang sama. PLS-SEM menguji jalur tidak langsung melalui green trust sekaligus mengestimasi hubungan langsung sustainability communication dan community-based sustainability cues dengan visit intention. Kedua atribut digital tersebut berhubungan positif dengan green trust dan visit intention, sedangkan green trust juga berhubungan positif dengan visit intention. Jalur tidak langsung yang signifikan melalui green trust menghubungkan sustainability communication dan community-based sustainability cues dengan visit intention. Namun, hubungan langsung kedua atribut dengan visit intention tetap signifikan setelah green trust dimasukkan ke dalam model, yang menunjukkan bahwa kepercayaan merupakan jalur penting tetapi bukan satu-satunya mekanisme yang menghubungkan konten keberlanjutan digital dengan kecenderungan perilaku wisatawan. Studi ini karena itu memosisikan komunikasi keberlanjutan yang dapat dipercaya sebagai sesuatu yang lebih dari sekadar pesan persuasif: kredibilitas juga bergantung pada cue keterlibatan komunitas yang terlihat, yang memberi landasan sosial pada klaim keberlanjutan dan menghubungkan apa yang dikomunikasikan destinasi dengan bagaimana partisipasi masyarakat lokal direpresentasikan secara daring.

Kata Kunci: *Community-Based Sustainability Cues; Community-Based Tourism; Green Trust; Sustainability Communication; Visit Intention.*

INTRODUCTION

Digital content has become an important source through which prospective tourists recognize and evaluate destinations before visiting them. Contemporary digital marketing integrates content, social media, and audience engagement across interconnected communication channels (Reztrianti, 2024). Social media and other digital channels present attractions while providing information that shapes perceptions of destination value, credibility, identity, and management characteristics. Source credibility, content quality, and electronic word of mouth in digital tourism communication are associated with tourists' psychological responses and visit intentions (Widaningsih & Putranto, 2025). Research applying the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S-O-R) framework to digital tourism environments also links online information attributes with trust and travel intention (Anubha et al., 2025). Sustainability communication therefore forms part of the information tourists use when evaluating destinations before a visit.

Sustainability communication extends destination communication beyond the presentation of attractions by conveying information about environmental initiatives, socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and responsible management practices. Message design shapes how consumers evaluate environmental performance and potential greenwashing (Bernard et al., 2024). Evidence from another digital communication context also indicates that coherent and credible digital narratives can strengthen perceived trust and reputation (Reztrianti et al., 2025b). In destination contexts, sustainability framing is also associated with social media engagement and visit intention (Kapoor, 2026). García de los Salmones et al. (2025) apply S-O-R to sustainability communication on destination social media by positioning content as a stimulus associated with internal states and subsequent user responses. These findings indicate that the evaluative relevance of sustainability communication depends on how tourists interpret the information available to them.

Community-based destinations add a social dimension to sustainability communication. Digital content may make community involvement visible through environmental stewardship, local economic benefits, cultural preservation, and participation in destination management. Community participation occupies an important position in sustainable tourism marketing because it connects local interests with conservation and destination management (Lawelai et al., 2024). Evidence from cultural tourism further identifies local community engagement as an important element of sustainable destination experiences and tourists' revisit intentions (Reztrianti et al., 2025a). When such involvement becomes visible in digital content, tourists gain cues about who undertakes sustainability practices, who benefits from them, and how local communities participate in destination management. Community-Based Sustainability Cues (CBSC) capture tourists' perceptions of these visible forms of community involvement.

Previous research has examined sustainability communication, community participation, trust, and behavioral intention through different research streams. Fandos-Herrera et al. (2026), for example, link perceived sustainability and authenticity with destination evaluation and visit intention in rural tourism. Research closer to the community-based tourism (CBT) context identifies perceived sustainability communication as a sustainability signal that acquires relevance through tourists' psychological evaluations (Boonnual & Boonnual, 2026). Existing research provides less clarity on whether tourists distinguish explicitly communicated sustainability information from visible community involvement within the same digital content and how these two attributes relate to trust and visit intention.

Sustainability Communication (SC) and CBSC represent distinct objects of evaluation. SC captures how tourists interpret information about environmental practices, socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and message clarity. CBSC captures how tourists interpret visible representations of community involvement. Although both attributes originate from the same digital material, they convey different forms of information. SC provides an informational layer concerning the sustainability practices communicated by the destination, whereas CBSC provides a social layer concerning the community actors visibly involved in those practices. This distinction provides the conceptual basis for a two-layer sustainability communication logic in CBT, in which tourists evaluate digital sustainability communication through message content and the accompanying community-based social cues.

The empirical model examines the relationships of SC and CBSC with Green Trust (GT) and Visit Intention (VI). Specifically, the analysis aims to: (1) examine the relationships of SC and CBSC with GT; (2) assess the relationships of SC, CBSC, and GT with VI; and (3) test the indirect effects of SC and CBSC on VI through GT. This focus moves the analysis of digital sustainability

communication beyond content as a general stimulus toward specific stimulus attributes interpreted as sustainability messages and community-based sustainability cues.

The S-O-R framework provides the theoretical basis for these relationships. Mehrabian & Russell (1974) explain how environmental stimuli shape individuals' internal states and subsequent behavioral responses. Applications of S-O-R in hospitality and tourism commonly position environmental, informational, and experiential attributes as stimuli, cognitive or affective states as the organism, and intentions or behaviors as responses (Asyraff et al., 2023). In digital tourism settings, the framework has been used to explain relationships between online information stimuli and trust, destination image, travel intention, and responses to sustainability communication (Anubha et al., 2025; Salmones et al., 2025).

Within this structure, SC and CBSC represent two perceived stimulus attributes. SC reflects tourists' evaluations of sustainability messages conveyed through digital content, whereas CBSC reflects their evaluations of visible community involvement. GT occupies the organism position by capturing confidence in destination management, the credibility of sustainability claims, and commitment to sustainability. VI represents the response as a prospective tendency to visit the destination.

SC can support GT when information about environmental practices, socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and destination management is clear and comprehensible. Well-designed sustainability communication helps consumers evaluate environmental performance and reduces uncertainty surrounding the substance of sustainability claims, whereas claim-evidence gaps can increase perceptions of greenwashing (Bernard et al., 2024). Trust becomes particularly relevant when prospective tourists lack direct experience through which they can verify destination practices. Chamoli et al. (2025) link green trust with behavioral intention in response to sustainability-related stimuli, while digital tourism research also identifies trust as an internal state associated with travel intention (Anubha et al., 2025). These relationships support a positive association between SC and GT.

Sustainability information may also relate directly to VI because it provides a basis for evaluating destination attractiveness and fit. Kapoor (2026) reports that positive sustainability framing in destination communication is associated with social media engagement and visit intention. Widaningsih & Putranto (2025) likewise connect digital communication characteristics with tourist responses through direct and psychological pathways. In CBT, Boonnual & Boonnual (2026) show that sustainability communication acquires behavioral relevance through symbolic interpretation and destination evaluation. Together, these findings support a direct relationship between SC and VI alongside psychologically mediated pathways.

CBSC provides a different evaluative basis through socially visible information. Representations of local communities engaging in environmental conservation, receiving economic benefits, preserving culture, or participating in management contextualize sustainability narratives. Lawelai et al. (2024) emphasize the relevance of community involvement in sustainable tourism marketing, while CBT places local communities within the creation and distribution of sustainability value. In digital content, such representations can function as social-evidentiary cues that help tourists connect sustainability commitments with visible community involvement. This reasoning supports a positive association between CBSC and GT.

Visible community involvement can also provide information about the social, cultural, and managerial characteristics of a destination that matter for pre-visit evaluation. In CBT, sustainability and authenticity are associated with destination evaluation and tourists' behavioral intentions (Fandos-Herrera et al., 2026). Representations of local benefits, cultural preservation, and community participation can enrich destination evaluations beyond generic promotional information. CBSC is therefore expected to relate positively to VI.

GT provides an evaluative pathway between the two stimulus attributes and VI. Within S-O-R, the organism captures internal states associated with how individuals respond to perceived stimuli. Trust is especially relevant in digital tourism decisions because tourists often form evaluations before gaining direct experience of a destination. Anubha et al. (2025) show that online travel review attributes are associated with travel intention through tourist trust, while Chamoli et al. (2025) identify green trust as a psychological mechanism linking sustainability-related stimuli with behavioral intention in organic tourism contexts. These findings support a positive relationship between GT and VI and provide a basis for indirect effects from SC and CBSC to VI through GT.

Based on this conceptual development, seven hypotheses are proposed:

- H1. *Sustainability Communication* is positively associated with *Green Trust*.
- H2. *Community-Based Sustainability Cues* are positively associated with *Green Trust*.
- H3. *Sustainability Communication* is positively associated with *Visit Intention*.
- H4. *Community-Based Sustainability Cues* are positively associated with *Visit Intention*.
- H5. *Green Trust* is positively associated with *Visit Intention*.
- H6. *Sustainability Communication* has a positive indirect effect on *Visit Intention* through *Green Trust*.
- H7. *Community-Based Sustainability Cues* have a positive indirect effect on *Visit Intention* through *Green Trust*.




Figure 1 Conceptual Framework
Source: Developed based on the S-O-R framework, 2026

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

An explanatory quantitative survey with a cross-sectional design was used to examine relationships among the constructs within the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S–O–R) framework. The empirical setting comprised community-based destinations managed or promoted by tourism awareness groups (Kelompok Sadar Wisata, Pokdarwis) in Pesawaran Regency, Lampung Province. All respondents evaluated the same destination and the same digital material.

The population comprised domestic tourists and prospective tourists aged at least 17 years who used social media as a source of travel information and were willing to evaluate destination-related digital content. Purposive sampling was applied based on these criteria. The screening process yielded 200 responses that met the analytical requirements, with individual tourists or prospective tourists serving as the unit of analysis.

Data were collected through a self-administered questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. All respondents followed the same sequence of references. Before completing the main measures, respondents identified whether they had previously visited the destination with the aid of a visual reference. They then viewed one item of destination-related digital content that incorporated documentation from various national news reports. The material presented information on environmental initiatives, local socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and community involvement in destination management. All construct evaluations referred to the same destination and digital material.

Four constructs were operationalized reflectively. Sustainability Communication (SC) was measured using four indicators covering environmental messages, local socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and message clarity. The SC indicators were adapted and contextualized from Bernard et al. (2024), Kapoor (2026), and Fandos-Herrera et al. (2026). Community-Based Sustainability Cues (CBSC) was measured using four indicators covering community involvement in environmental protection, tourism benefits for local residents, the community's role in cultural

and environmental preservation, and sustainable management involving the community. The CBSC indicators were adapted from Lawelai et al. (2024) and Fandos-Herrera et al. (2026).

SC and CBSC reflect two attributes interpreted from the same digital material. SC focuses on the sustainability information communicated through the content, whereas CBSC focuses on visible community involvement. CBSC captures respondents' perceptions of how community participation is represented, while variation in SC and CBSC scores reflects differences in how respondents interpret the same material.

Green Trust (GT), adapted from Chamoli et al. (2025), was measured using three indicators covering confidence in destination management, the credibility of sustainability claims, and commitment to sustainability. Visit Intention (VI), adapted from Fandos-Herrera et al. (2026), was measured using three indicators covering the likelihood, willingness, and intention to visit in the future. Previous visitation was recorded as a respondent characteristic. VI captures future visitation tendency, either as first-visit intention among respondents who had not previously visited the destination or as revisit intention among those with prior experience.

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was used to estimate direct relationships and indirect effects and to explain variation in GT and VI within the S-O-R model (Hair et al., 2022). All analyses were conducted using SmartPLS 3 (Ringle et al., 2015). The measurement model was evaluated using outer loadings, Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, average variance extracted (AVE), and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT). Structural model evaluation included the inner variance inflation factor (VIF), adjusted R², f², path coefficients, and specific indirect effects (Hair et al., 2022; Henseler et al., 2015).

The significance of direct relationships and indirect effects was assessed through complete bootstrapping with 10,000 subsamples, two-tailed testing, and a 5% significance level. Hypothesis evaluation considered path coefficients, t-statistics, p-values, and 95% bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) confidence intervals. Coefficients in the hypothesized direction with statistical support at the specified significance level were used to determine hypothesis support. Because the data were collected cross-sectionally, the structural estimates represent empirical relationships observed during the data collection period.

RESULTS

A total of 200 responses met the criteria for analysis. Respondents aged 25–34 years formed the largest group (34%), followed by those aged 18–24 years (29%) and 35–44 years (21.5%). Most respondents (88.5%) had taken a recreational trip within the previous 12 months. Social media use as a source of travel information was also relatively high, with 45.5% reporting frequent use and 22.0% reporting very frequent use. Most respondents (69%) had never visited the destination shown in the digital material, while 31% reported previous visitation. As a contextual recognition check, 87% identified the content as.

Table 1 Respondent Profile

Characteristics	Category	n	%
Age	17 years	16	8
	18–24 years	58	29
	25–34 years	68	34
	35–44 years	43	21,5
	≥45 years	15	7,5
Education	Below senior high school	15	7,5
	Senior high school/vocational school or equivalent	96	48
	Bachelor's degree/Diploma	81	40,5
	Postgraduate degree	8	4
Recreational travel in the past 12 months	Yes	177	88,5
	No	23	11,5
Previous visit to the destination	Yes	62	31
	No	138	69

Source: Primary Data, 2026

All indicators had outer loadings above 0.708, ranging from 0.818 to 0.898. Cronbach's alpha and rho_A exceeded 0.70 for all constructs, while AVE values were above 0.50. These values support adequate internal consistency reliability and convergent validity (Hair et al., 2022).

Table 2 Hasil Model Pengukuran

Construct	Outer loading	Cronbach's α	rho_A	AVE
SC1	0,866	0,904	0,907	0,775
SC2	0,884			
SC3	0,888			
SC4	0,884			
CBSC1	0,876	0,896	0,905	0,762
CBSC2	0,892			
CBSC3	0,898			
CBSC4	0,824			
GT1	0,853	0,808	0,812	0,722
GT2	0,827			
GT3	0,868			
VI1	0,818	0,778	0,779	0,692
VI2	0,834			
VI3	0,844			

Source: Authors' calculations using SmartPLS 3, 2026

HTMT values were below 0.90 for five of the six construct pairs. The GT-VI pair produced an HTMT value of 1.010, with a 95% BCa confidence interval of 0.953–1.063. Discriminant validity between GT and VI was therefore not established. This measurement limitation constrains interpretation of the GT → VI path and the indirect effects through GT as relationships between empirically distinct constructs (Henseler et al., 2015).

Table 3 Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

Konstruk	CBSC	GT	SC	VI
CBSC	–			
GT	0,664	–		
SC	0,069	0,721	–	
VI	0,691	1,010	0,714	–

Source: Authors' calculations using SmartPLS 3, 2026

Inner VIF values ranged from 1.000 to 3.488 and remained below 5. Based on adjusted R², SC and CBSC explained 71.0% of the variance in GT, while SC, CBSC, and GT explained 73.2% of the variance in VI. Effect-size estimates were large for SC → GT ($f^2 = 1.360$) and CBSC → GT ($f^2 = 1.141$), moderate for CBSC → VI ($f^2 = 0.279$) and SC → VI ($f^2 = 0.251$), and relatively small for GT → VI ($f^2 = 0.120$).

Bootstrapping with 10,000 subsamples, two-tailed testing, and $\alpha = 5\%$ assessed the significance of the structural paths. All direct relationships produced positive and statistically significant coefficients. SC → GT had the largest coefficient among the predictors of GT ($\beta = 0.624$), followed by CBSC → GT ($\beta = 0.572$). The direct relationships of SC → VI ($\beta = 0.396$) and CBSC → VI ($\beta = 0.397$) were nearly identical in magnitude, while GT → VI produced a coefficient of 0.332. Both indirect effects through GT were also positive and significant, with coefficients of 0.207 for SC → GT → VI and 0.190 for CBSC → GT → VI. H1–H7 therefore received statistical support at the structural-model level. Interpretation of H5–H7 remains qualified by the limited discriminant validity between GT and VI.

Table 4 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Relationship	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	STDEV	t-statistic	p-value	Result
H1	SC → GT	0,624	0,625	0,037	16,951	<0,001	Supported
H2	CBSC → GT	0,572	0,572	0,037	15,472	<0,001	Supported

H3	SC → VI	0,396	0,396	0,053	7,440	<0,001	Supported
H4	CBSC → VI	0,397	0,398	0,049	8,148	<0,001	Supported
H5	GT → VI	0,332	0,331	0,062	5,325	<0,001	Supported
H6	SC → GT → VI	0,207	0,207	0,041	5,004	<0,001	Supported
H7	CBSC → GT → VI	0,190	0,189	0,037	5,125	<0,001	Supported

Source: Authors' calculations using SmartPLS 3, 2026




Figure 2 PLS-SEM Structural Model Results

Source: Authors' calculations using SmartPLS 3, 2026

DISCUSSION

Sustainability Communication (SC) was positively associated with Green Trust (GT) and Visit Intention (VI), supporting H1 and H3. The SC → GT path produced the largest coefficient among the predictors of GT, indicating a strong relationship between information about environmental initiatives, socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and message clarity and tourists' confidence in the destination's sustainability commitment. Bernard et al. (2024) show that sustainability communication design shapes consumers' evaluations of environmental performance and potential greenwashing. Such information is particularly relevant in digital destination marketing because prospective tourists often form judgments before gaining direct experience of a destination. The positive relationship between SC and VI also aligns with Widaningsih & Putranto (2025), who link digital communication characteristics with visit intention through both direct relationships and tourists' psychological processes.

Community-Based Sustainability Cues (CBSC) were also positively associated with GT and VI, supporting H2 and H4. Digital representations of local communities protecting the environment, receiving economic benefits, preserving culture, or participating in destination management provide tourists with cues about who carries out sustainability practices and who benefits from them. Lawelai et al. (2024) identify community involvement as an important element of sustainable tourism marketing that connects local economic interests with conservation. In digital environments, these representations can function as evidentiary cues that situate sustainability narratives within a visible social context and enrich tourists' evaluations of the destination.

GT was positively associated with VI, while the indirect effects of SC → GT → VI and CBSC → GT → VI were also positive and significant. At the structural-estimation level, the direct and indirect effects operating in the same direction are consistent with complementary mediation. Chamoli et al. (2025) position green trust as an internal psychological state associated with behavioral

responses to sustainability-related stimuli. Within the S-O-R framework, the observed pattern links perceived digital stimulus attributes with trust in destination sustainability and subsequent visit intention. The cross-sectional design captures these relationships within a single period of data collection and does not establish the temporal sequence of perception, trust, and visit intention.

Interpretation of the pathways through GT remains constrained by the discriminant validity between GT and VI. The HTMT value of 1.010 indicates insufficient empirical separation between the response patterns of the two constructs. Conceptually, GT captures confidence in destination management, the credibility of sustainability claims, and commitment to sustainability, whereas VI reflects a prospective tendency to visit the destination. This measurement limitation means that the GT → VI coefficient and the indirect effects through GT cannot yet be treated as fully distinct evidence of a trust-to-intention mechanism.

Digital sustainability communication in community-based destinations reveals two distinct stimulus attributes. SC conveys sustainability information communicated by the destination, while CBSC conveys social cues concerning visible community involvement. This distinction supports a two-layer sustainability communication logic in which tourists evaluate sustainability through message content and the social context surrounding that message. In community-based tourism, visible community involvement enriches narratives about environmental practices, socioeconomic benefits, and cultural preservation by linking those narratives with the actors engaged in the practices being communicated. This pattern extends the application of S-O-R from digital content as a broad stimulus category toward specific stimulus attributes interpreted as sustainability messages and community-based sustainability cues.

CONCLUSION

Sustainability Communication (SC) and Community-Based Sustainability Cues (CBSC) were positively associated with Green Trust (GT) and Visit Intention (VI) in the digital communication of community-based destinations. GT was also positively associated with VI, while both indirect effects through GT received statistical support and operated in the same direction as the direct relationships of SC and CBSC with VI. These patterns indicate that tourists' sustainability evaluations of digital content draw on both communicated information and visible social cues concerning community involvement in destination management.

For tourism awareness groups (Kelompok Sadar Wisata, Pokdarwis) and destination managers, sustainability messages should be connected with practices that prospective tourists can recognize. Digital content can communicate environmental initiatives, socioeconomic benefits, cultural preservation, and management commitments in specific terms while making community involvement visible through environmental stewardship, local benefits, cultural preservation, and participation in destination management. Combining clear sustainability messages with relevant community-based sustainability cues can provide a more concrete basis for communication credibility and connect destination narratives with practices visible in the content.

The theoretical contribution lies in distinguishing two stimulus attributes within the application of S-O-R to the digital communication of community-based destinations. SC represents the informational layer of communicated sustainability, whereas CBSC represents the social layer through which community involvement becomes visible. This distinction refines the treatment of digital stimuli in S-O-R by separating informational and social attributes that are independently associated with tourists' internal evaluations and visit intentions. The two-layer sustainability communication logic captures this relationship by positioning sustainability messages and visible community involvement as parallel elements of destination communication.

Several limitations affect the interpretation of the findings. The cross-sectional design, purposive sampling, and focus on a single destination context limit generalizability and do not establish temporal causal order. All constructs were derived from the same respondents' perceptions of the same digital material, leaving the possibility that common method variance influenced covariance among the constructs. Previous visitation also characterized 31% of the sample, meaning that VI reflects revisit intention for some respondents and first-visit intention for others. The GT–VI HTMT value of 1.010 further indicates insufficient empirical separation between the two constructs, which limits interpretation of the GT → VI relationship and the indirect effects through GT.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future research can test the model across multiple community-based destinations and more diverse tourist populations to assess the consistency of the observed relationships. Longitudinal designs could examine the temporal sequence linking communication exposure, trust formation, and visit intention. Experimental designs could vary sustainability messages, the intensity of community-based sustainability cues, or source information to compare the contribution of each attribute more directly.

Further instrument development should sharpen the conceptual and empirical distinction between GT and VI. GT indicators can focus more specifically on confidence in destination management, claim credibility, and the consistency of sustainability commitments, while VI remains centered on the likelihood, willingness, and intention to visit in the future. Subsequent analyses can also distinguish first-visit intention from revisit intention and examine other psychological mechanisms, including perceived authenticity, destination image, and place attachment, to extend explanations of how digital communication attributes relate to tourist responses.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia (Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, Kemendiktisaintek) for funding this research through the 2026 Penelitian Dosen Pemula (PDP) scheme under contract numbers 281/C3/DT.05.00/PL-BARU/2026 and 232/LL2/AL.04.03/PL-BARU/2026. The authors also acknowledge the participating tourism awareness groups (Kelompok Sadar Wisata, Pokdarwis) and all respondents who contributed to the completion of the study.

REFERENCES

- Anubha, A., Narang, D., & Jain, M. K. (2025). Online travel reviews and tourist trust: A SOR perspective. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 74(5–6), 1655–1676. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-04-2023-0145>
- Asyraff, M. A., Hanafiah, M. H., Aminuddin, N., & Mahdzar, M. (2023). Adoption of the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S-O-R) model in hospitality and tourism research: Systematic literature review and future research directions. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(1), 19–48.
- Bernard, S., Rahman, I., & Douglas, A. (2024). Sustainability communication in hotels: The role of cognitive linguistics. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 48(4), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480231158757>
- Boonnual, C., & Boonnual, T. (2026). Perceived sustainability communication and tourist behavioral intention in community-based tourism: The sequential mediating roles of destination personality and destination image. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 7(7), 210. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp7070210>
- Chamoli, A., Tariyal, A., & Rana, V. (2025). From green trust to green plates: How external stimuli shape Gen Z's local food purchases in organic tourism destinations. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 42, 101288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2025.101288>
- Fandos-Herrera, C., Labuena, A., & Orús, C. (2026). Analysis of sustainability and authenticity as key elements for rural tourism. *Spanish Journal of Marketing – ESIC*, 30(2), 192–213. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJME-04-2024-0098>
- García de los Salmones, M. D. M., Herrero, A., & Martínez García de Leaniz, P. (2025). The intention to share a sustainability communication about a tourism destination. *Spanish Journal of Marketing – ESIC*, 29(3), 371–398. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJME-01-2024-0003>
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>

- 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*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CBTH-03-2025-0062>
- Lawelai, H., Sadat, A., & Harakan, A. (2024). The level of local community involvement in sustainable tourism marketing of the World Coral Triangle in Wakatobi National Park, Indonesia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 19(12), 4831–4841. <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.191230>
- Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. MIT Press.
- Reztrianti, D. (2024). *Digital marketing unlocked: Strategi inovatif & praktis untuk penguasaan masa depan*. Pustaka Aksara.
- Reztrianti, D., Juanna, A., Haykal, A. P., & Wibowo, S. F. (2025a). Ethnic festivals and revisiting intentions: A study of cultural tourism at Bali's Ogoh-Ogoh festival. *Jambura Science of Management*, 7(2), 156–178. <https://doi.org/10.37479/jsm.v7i2.31410>
- Reztrianti, D., Suhud, U., & Wibowo, S. F. (2025b). What role does digital marketing play in nation branding during war? A conceptual model from Ukraine. *JISOSEPOL: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Ekonomi dan Politik*, 3(1), 298–317. <https://doi.org/10.61787/3eahh092>
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). *SmartPLS 3* [Computer software]. SmartPLS GmbH. <https://www.smartpls.com>
- Widaningsih, T. T., & Putranto, A. (2025). Digital tourism communication: Effects of influencer credibility, content quality, and e-WoM on emotions, FoMO, self-identification, and visit intentions of Gen Z travelers. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10, 1717937. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1717937>