Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

Social Media-Based Tourism Management: Instagram Strategies as a Digital Marketing Tool for Central Park Zoo Using the SOSTAC Approach

Budi Prayogi[0009-0006-6265-890X], Fizra Kartika[0009-0009-9036-074X], and Dewi Yanti[0000-0001-7390-3479]

Politeknik Pariwisata Medan, Medan, Indonesia
budiprayogi88@gmail.com, fizrakartika@gmail.com,
Dewiyanti@poltekparmedan.ac.id

Abstract. This study examines Instagram marketing management at Central Park Zoo in Deli Serdang, focusing on the relationship between content planning, publication, and evaluation. A qualitative case study draws on one semi-structured interview with the content creator, conducted on June 11, 2026, and researchers' records of feed posts and Reels published in March 2026. Interview material was analyzed thematically and subsequently interpreted through Situation, Objectives, Strategy, Tactics, Action, and Control (SOSTAC). The observation record contains 15 posts published on 11 dates: 12 Reels, two graphic-design posts, and one post of unidentified format. Twelve posts appeared between March 15 and 28. The informant reported monthly mood boards, a preference for Reels, and monitoring through comments and the Instagram Dashboard. The predominance of Reels is consistent with the reported format preference, but the interview does not establish the reasons for individual March decisions. Audience segmentation, time-bound objectives and key performance indicators, planning and approval records, budgets, and evaluation-led changes were not sufficiently documented in the available materials. An evidence-traceability matrix distinguishes reported practices, recorded publications, and unsupported connections across SOSTAC stages. The findings describe one practitioner's account alongside a bounded monthly publication record, not a verified organization-wide strategy or a representative assessment of year-round activity. The study identifies limits in tracing planning, publication, performance evaluation, and subsequent decisions; it does not establish marketing effectiveness or effects on sales and visitor arrivals.

Keywords: Digital Marketing, Instagram, SOSTAC.

1 Introduction

Tourism destination marketing increasingly depends on the ability of managers to connect on-site experiences with the information prospective visitors encounter before their trip. Social media provides a platform to showcase attractions, address information needs, and shape perceptions of a destination [1], [2]. However, the influence of social media on a destination's image is not determined solely by the existence of an account.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

A review by Tran and Rudolf [3] of 114 articles shows that studies on destination branding on social media cover branding strategies, user-generated content, and the dimensions of tourists' knowledge, emotions, and behavior. This diversity demonstrates that destination posts are part of a broader communication process than simply the dissemination of promotional material.

The use of social media in destination marketing is not merely about the ability to create and publish content. Behind every post lies a series of decisions regarding the target audience, the information to be conveyed, the timing of publication, production resources, and how to evaluate the response after the content is posted [4], [5]. Therefore, research on marketing via Instagram must go beyond simply observing the appearance of an account and the number of interactions. Attention must also be given to the process of managing an Instagram account, which enables promotional activities to proceed sustainably [6].

This issue is relevant for tourist destinations that use Instagram as one of their digital promotional channels to reach potential visitors. Information about activities, attractions, facilities, and operational conditions can be published quickly through a destination's Instagram account [7]. Instagram also functions as a co-creation space in which destination images are shaped jointly by destination accounts and users' own posts [8]. However, regularly publishing content does not necessarily indicate that marketing objectives have been clearly defined. Conversely, variations in posting frequency from one week to the next do not automatically indicate poor management [9]. Evidence from regional destination management organizations likewise shows that post characteristics, including visual content, post length, posting frequency, and publication time, are associated with different levels of user engagement [10]. The rhythm of publication must be understood within the context of the destination's activities, the planning process, and the capacity of those managing it.

The need to examine internal processes becomes increasingly clear in the analysis by Pahor Zvanut and Zabukovec Baruca [11]. They found a gap between the conceptual discussion of social media marketing strategies in the tourism sector and their implementation within organizations. Earlier evidence from the national tourism organizations of the most-visited countries similarly found that social media use was still largely experimental and that strategies varied considerably [12]. The issues highlighted include strategy documentation, the alignment of social media activities with organizational goals, and the measurement of results. These findings do not imply that all destinations must follow complex procedures. Rather, research at the destination level needs to explain how formal planning and spontaneous adjustments intersect in day-to-day operations.

In the zoo context, an evaluation of how zoological collections use social media found that posts were heavily weighted toward mammals, whereas overtly conservation- or education-based posts were limited in number [13]. A closer examination of the Central Park Zoo's Instagram content was conducted by Kartika et al. [14]. Their study analyzed digital copywriting using the AIDA model and identified parts of the message that needed optimization to make the content more persuasive. Its contribution lies in the analysis and refinement of how messages are written. This study takes a different starting point: rather than scoring the quality of captions or testing copywriting

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

designs, it examines the managerial decisions that led to the creation of this content. Thus, while the AIDA model may serve as a context for previous research, it is not the primary analytical framework of this article.

The distinction in these research questions is important because engaging content does not always stem from a workflow that is easy to maintain. Content managers may have ideas, follow video trends, and be able to produce posts that garner significant attention, but they still face challenges in prioritizing their audience, allocating production time, maintaining a consistent publishing schedule, and regularly analyzing results. Conversely, the existence of a plan does not automatically prove that content is published on schedule or evaluated after it goes live. Therefore, research on strategy needs to compare what was planned, what was actually implemented, and what evidence was used to inform subsequent decisions.

To examine these decisions, this study employs the SOSTAC framework. This framework consists of six elements: Situation, Objectives, Strategy, Tactics, Action, and Control. These six elements provide an analytical structure for understanding the circumstances faced by managers, the objectives to be achieved, the direction of marketing choices, the types of activities employed, their implementation, and how results are monitored. In this study, SOSTAC is not treated as a standardized measure that assumes every organization has formally implemented all six stages. Instead, the framework is used to identify relationships and gaps between the observed practices [15], [16].

The use of this framework must be distinguished from data analysis methods. Thematic analysis was used to interpret the informant's statements, whereas SOSTAC subsequently organized the resulting themes and evidence gaps. Because the interview guide was not developed around all six dimensions, the framework does not establish equal evidence coverage across them. The analysis examines whether the available material supports connections between stages, rather than assuming that every category can be populated or that reported monitoring necessarily influenced later decisions [17].

The interview with Irfan Wardhana, Central Park Zoo's content creator, provides a practitioner-level account of Instagram management. He reported handling most social media work independently, with staff and animal keepers occasionally appearing as on-camera participants. He also described a monthly mood board, a preference for Reels, and checks of the Instagram Dashboard. These statements identify reported planning, production, and monitoring activities. They do not independently establish organization-wide decision authority, management approval, budget allocation, or coordination with marketing, ticketing, customer service, and animal-care functions.

The researchers' record of Instagram publications from March 2026 provides a separate, bounded account of posting dates, identifiable formats, and brief themes. It does not directly reveal the reasons for individual decisions or the full range of account activity. The June interview and March record therefore serve different purposes: the former describes reported work practices at the time of the interview, while the latter describes the publications recorded for an earlier month. Agreement between them is treated as descriptive consistency, not as proof that the June account explains specific March decisions.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

The research question is: What do the content creator's account and the March 2026 publication record reveal about how Central Park Zoo Deli Serdang plans, implements, and evaluates Instagram marketing, and which relationships between these activities can be substantiated? The study aims to describe the reported management practices using SOSTAC, examine the recorded publication pattern within one month, and assess the evidential basis for linking monitoring to subsequent content decisions. Its contribution lies in distinguishing supported observations from unverified connections in the management process, rather than claiming a comprehensive organizational strategy or presenting Instagram as a new promotional channel for the destination.

2 Research Methodology

This study uses a qualitative case study design to examine Instagram marketing management at Central Park Zoo in Deli Serdang. A case study approach is suited to an in-depth, contextualized examination of a bounded phenomenon in its real-life setting [18]. Its empirical scope is limited to the content creator's account of work practices and the researchers' record of March 2026 publications. The units of analysis are reported planning decisions, recorded publication practices, and statements concerning monitoring and the use of results. The design does not measure the effect of Instagram marketing on visitor behavior or reconstruct the complete organization-wide marketing-management system.

The sole interview informant was Irfan Wardhana, S.Kom., Central Park Zoo's content creator. The semi-structured interview took place on June 11, 2026, at the Central Park Zoo reception desk. According to his account, he had held the role for approximately two years and managed Instagram and TikTok; only material relevant to Instagram is analyzed here. His direct involvement supports an account of his own content-production and publishing practices, but does not make his perspective representative of all organizational stakeholders. No additional interview accounts from management, marketing, ticketing, customer service, or animal keepers were available for this analysis. Consequently, approval authority, budgeting, interdepartmental coordination, and organizational evaluation procedures could not be triangulated across informants [19].

The second source consists of the researchers' records of feed posts and Reels published from March 1 to 31, 2026. Each recorded publication was treated as one observation, including separate entries for multiple posts on the same date. The record includes upload dates, identifiable formats, and brief thematic descriptions. The researchers reported checking dates not listed and finding no feed posts or Reels on those dates. March is treated as the available one-month observation window, not as a statistically or seasonally representative sample of the destination's broader Instagram activity. The materials do not provide a comparative basis for establishing that the month reflects routine activity across other periods.

The observation record excludes Stories, private messages, paid-advertising records, and other undocumented account activities. Individual post links, screenshots, complete captions, and an Instagram Insights export were not available in the analyzed materials. The numerical summaries therefore describe the researchers' record rather than an

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

independently reproducible account archive. One holiday-greeting post dated March 21 was recorded as distinct from the other posts that day, but its format remains unidentified. The materials do not document an archive recheck that resolved this entry or explain why verification was not completed. Its format is retained as unknown rather than inferred from its theme; it remains in the total post count but supports no format-specific conclusion. No independent recoding or intercoder-agreement assessment is documented, so classification reliability and post-level reproducibility remain limitations rather than established properties of the dataset [20].

Table 1. Retrospective SOSTAC Analytical Matrix and Evidence Coverage

Component	Retrospective analytical focus	Available material	Unanswered issues / evidence limits
Situation	Basis for understanding context and audiences	Interview statements about other accounts, trends, and high and low seasons; recorded March themes.	Audience profiles, visitor data, and documented competitor analysis were unavailable.
Objectives	Distinguishing aspirations from measurable objectives	Interview statements about followers, verification, sales, and attracting visitors.	No documented SMART targets, deadlines, baselines, or objective-specific KPIs.
Strategy	Content direction and basis for targeting	Reported preferences for Reels, hooks, education, and destination experiences; recorded format and themes.	Content themes do not establish selected audience segments or positioning.
Tactics	Planning reference, formats, language, and CTAs	Reported monthly mood board, example content composition, and “Sobat Zoo” greeting; recorded post formats.	The actual March mood board, complete captions, and dated revisions were unavailable.
Action	Reported responsibilities and recorded publication	Interview account of content-creator and on-camera roles; March publication dates.	Approval, budgeting, coordination, and planned-versus-published records were unavailable.
Control	Monitoring and its connection to later decisions	Reported Dashboard, comment, like, video, CTA, and hook checks.	No Insights exports, post-level performance, conversion records, or documented follow-up decisions.

Source: Authors’ retrospective mapping of the available research materials, 2026.

The original research instruments were a semi-structured interview guide and an observation sheet. The guide addressed content planning, digital copywriting, visuals, and

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

evaluation; it was not designed to elicit complete evidence for all six SOSTAC dimensions. Table 1 is therefore a retrospective analytical matrix, not a claim that every question shown was asked during the interview or that every listed document was collected. It separates available material from unanswered issues, particularly audience segmentation, measurable objectives, approval mechanisms, budgets, and documented evaluation-led decisions.

Analysis proceeded in four stages: reading the interview material for statements about content selection, objectives, planning, task distribution, adaptation, and evaluation; coding relevant statements according to their meaning; grouping codes into themes such as trend monitoring, flexible planning, concentrated content-production responsibilities, and reported monitoring; and interpreting these themes through SOSTAC [21]. In this retrospective interpretation, an explicit informant statement supports a reported practice, a recorded publication supports an observation, and a connection between stages is accepted only to the extent supported by the available sources. Unaddressed categories remain evidence gaps. Content themes are not substituted for target-audience data, aspirations are not treated as measurable objectives, and dashboard use is not treated as proof of evaluation-led planning. This distinction limits framework-driven inference without claiming that the original interview achieved complete SOSTAC coverage.

Observation notes were summarized by number of posts, recorded format, theme, and publication dates. Recorded categories were retained without assigning the unresolved post to a known format. Interview and observation material were compared only on directly comparable features: for example, the recorded predominance of Reels is consistent with the informant's stated preference for that format. This comparison offers limited cross-source corroboration of format preference, not triangulation of the entire management process. Publication gaps do not establish workload constraints, and thematic repetition does not establish either a target segment or the reason for choosing a publication date.

The interview and publication record are separated by approximately three months. No contemporaneous March mood board, decision log, approval record, or performance archive was available to establish that the general practices described in June governed particular March publications. Retrospective recall and the possibility that work practices changed between March and June therefore limit temporal attribution. Supplementary explanations reproduced in the research materials concern mood-board flexibility, competing work, and attention to trends, but their dates and communication media are not documented. They are identified as undated contextual remarks from the same informant, not as additional independent interviews, chronological verification, or evidence of the causes of specific March decisions. Table 3 traces the available sources and missing links; it does not supply the missing documentation.

3 Results and Discussion

According to Irfan's interview account, he handles content planning, visual production, caption writing, and publishing for the destination's social media accounts, while staff

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

members and animal keepers occasionally appear in the content. This describes concentration of the operational tasks he reported. It does not establish that he is the organization's sole marketing decision-maker or that other stakeholders have no role in approvals, budgets, ticket information, customer responses, or evaluation. Those organizational relationships were not independently documented.

The reported concentration of production work provides a basis for discussing dependence on one content creator's availability, but not for diagnosing staffing adequacy or explaining publication gaps. The study did not measure workload or verify staffing arrangements. Undated supplementary remarks that other work sometimes delayed posting are retained only as contextual statements; they cannot establish that workload caused any particular gap in March.

The March observation record contains 15 publications on 11 dates. No feed posts or Reels were recorded on the other 20 calendar days. These counts describe the publication units included in the record, not complete account activity: Stories, private-message interactions, and other excluded activities may not be inferred from the presence or absence of recorded posts. Table 2 summarizes this bounded publication pattern.

Table 2. Distribution of Recorded Instagram Posts in March 2026

Period	Number of posts	Days with posts	Days without posts	Overview of themes
1–7 March	1	1	6	Announcement that Central Park Zoo remained open during Ramadan
8–14 March	2	2	5	*War takjil* (the rush to buy food for breaking the fast) and a fire-truck water activity
15–21 March	7	4	3	*War takjil*, Nyepi (Day of Silence), THR (*Eid holiday allowance*) giveaways, and holiday greetings
22–28 March	5	4	3	Pool cleaning, THR giveaways, and a fire-truck water activity
29–31 March	0	0	3	No posts identified
Total	**15**	**11**	**20**	The format of one post remains unidentified

Source: Researchers' March 2026 publication record.

The recorded publications were unevenly distributed: 12 of the 15 posts appeared between March 15 and 28. March 20 contained two posts, March 21 three posts, and March 22 two posts. No posts were recorded for March 29–31. Each seven-day interval shown for March 1–28 includes at least one recorded post, while the final interval covers only three days. These intervals describe calendar distribution; they are not measures of adherence to a publication plan or evidence of weak execution.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

The record classifies 12 publications as Reels and two as graphic-design posts. One holiday-greeting post on March 21 remains of unidentified format. Recorded themes include operational information, visitor activities, celebratory messages, THR (Eid holiday allowance) giveaways, and behind-the-scenes activity such as pool cleaning. THR giveaways appear on several dates; war takjil and fire-truck water activities also recur. These summaries preserve the recorded themes without treating them as verified campaign objectives or evidence of a defined target audience.

Evidence coverage differs across the SOSTAC dimensions. Table 3 is an evidence-traceability matrix: I denotes the June 11 interview; O denotes the researchers' March publication record summarized in Table 2; and U denotes the undated supplementary remarks described in the methodology. These labels identify the available source types, not additional data or independently archived transcript and post identifiers. The matrix links each dimension to specific reported or recorded material, identifies the documentation required for stronger verification, and states the permissible inference. It cannot replace the missing post links, screenshots, internal documents, or performance exports.

Table 3. SOSTAC Evidence-Traceability Matrix: Available Support, Missing Evidence, and Permissible Inference

Component	Specific available evidence	Missing verification	Permissible inference and limits
Situation	I: reviews of Bali Safari Zoo and Taman Safari accounts, trends, and seasonal content constraints. O: operational, activity, celebration, and promotion themes.	Audience demographics, geography, behavior, visitor profiles, March visitor figures, and documented competitor analysis.	Informal context monitoring is reported. A systematic situation analysis or audience basis for March decisions is not verified.
Objectives	I: aspirations for millions of followers, account verification, higher sales, and attracting visitors. O: no recorded post-specific objectives.	Approved SMART objectives, baselines, deadlines, KPIs, conversion targets, and attribution records.	Platform growth, account status, communication, conversion, and business outcomes must remain distinct. No target attainment can be assessed.
Strategy	I: preference for Reels, opening hooks, education, curiosity, and destination experiences. O: 12 of 15 recorded posts are Reels.	Target-segment evidence, positioning rationale, and dated links between audience knowledge, objectives, and content choices.	Recorded format predominance is consistent with reported preference. Themes and "Sobat Zoo" do not establish a coherent target-audience strategy.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

Tactics	I: a monthly mood board and example composition of two photos, two designs, and two Reels. O: 12 Reels, two designs, and one unknown format. U: planning flexibility.	Actual March mood board, publication schedule, dated revisions, complete captions, and approval records.	A planning reference is reported. Plan adherence, intentional changes, and the unresolved post format cannot be verified.
Action	I: content-creator responsibility for production and uploads; staff and keepers as on-camera participants. O: 15 posts on 11 dates; 12 posts on March 15–28. U: competing work.	Production and approval logs, budgets, departmental accounts, planned-versus-published comparison, and dated reasons for gaps.	The publication pattern and reported operational roles can be described. Scheduling intent, workload causes, and organizational decision authority are not established.
Control	I: Dashboard, comment, like, video, and CTA review; hook revision; claimed 6.7 million views. O: no performance dataset. U: limited performance attention and trend-following.	Insights exports, post identifiers and metrics, CTA clicks, advertising conversions, evaluation reports, and dated subsequent decisions.	Monitoring and adjustment are self-reported, not independently verified. No evaluation-to-decision chain is demonstrated; 6.7 million views remains an unverified claim.

Source: Authors' analysis of the June 11 interview (I), March publication record (O), and undated contextual remarks (U).

3.1 Situation: Assessing the Context and Audience

For Situation, Irfan reported reviewing the Bali Safari Zoo and Taman Safari accounts, including follower counts, video views, and video trends. This supports a reported practice of informal environmental monitoring. The available material does not establish a documented competitor analysis, a systematic comparison procedure, or the use of these observations in particular March decisions.

Irfan also described fewer visitor-related content opportunities outside the high season and mentioned parody content as one response. This is his account of a production condition, not a verified description of March visitor flows. Without visitor records or dated production notes, the study cannot attribute a March publication gap to low-season conditions.

Audience knowledge is insufficiently documented. No demographic, geographic, behavioral, or visitor-profile dataset was available to establish a selected target

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

segment. “Sobat Zoo” is a reported form of address, not evidence that a defined audience segment exists. Likewise, the appearance of students, teachers, visitors, and educational activities indicates depicted subjects and content themes, not the composition of the account’s actual or intended audience. Situation therefore remains only partly supported, particularly regarding the audience basis for later strategic choices.

3.2 Objectives: Marketing Objectives

The informant’s aspirations require separation by their intended outcome. Reaching millions of followers is a platform-growth aspiration, whereas obtaining a verification badge concerns account status. Increasing sales and visitor arrivals concerns business outcomes. His statement that the account had fewer than 100,000 followers at the interview is also an informant-reported figure, not a verified baseline. These statements should not be combined into a single objective or interpreted as evidence that measurable organizational targets had been approved.

Communication objectives, such as informing audiences or encouraging interest in destination experiences, are distinguishable from platform growth and business outcomes, but no explicit measurable communication target was documented. Conversion objectives would require an identified action connecting Instagram exposure to a response, such as a ticket-information click or an attributable transaction; the materials contain no documented conversion target or tracking record. The informant’s account of advertising during peak seasons or New Year indicates a reported intention to attract visitors, but advertising budgets, campaign periods, CTA clicks, attributable transactions, and visitor-source records were not available to verify its implementation or results.

Across these categories, the available statements do not establish a set of objectives that is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) [16]. “Millions of followers” does not specify an exact target or deadline; verification is a desired status without a documented schedule; and higher sales or visitor arrivals lacks a stated baseline, required increase, measurement period, and attribution method. No documented key performance indicators (KPIs) connect these aspirations to the monthly content plan. This is a finding about insufficiently documented objectives in the research materials, not proof that the organization has no internal targets.

The themes recorded in March cannot fill this gap. Operational announcements, educational material, and THR-related promotions suggest different possible communication functions, but those functions are analytical interpretations unless confirmed in a dated plan or a post-specific account. The study therefore does not assign verified objectives to individual posts or evaluate target attainment. Distinguishing communication, platform-growth, account-status, conversion, and business-outcome categories clarifies why views alone cannot substantiate all of the informant’s aspirations.

3.3 Strategy: Reported Content Direction and the Unverified Audience Basis

Irfan reported prioritizing Reels over photographs because he believed Reels could reach a wider audience. He emphasized opening hooks, especially the first three seconds, and regarded captions mainly as supplementary information. The recorded

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

predominance of Reels is consistent with this stated content direction. It does not independently demonstrate superior reach, confirm the intended audience, or establish the organization's positioning and targeting strategy. Research on short-form travel videos likewise identifies this format as a prominent medium through which travel experiences are produced and shared, which helps explain its appeal without establishing its effectiveness in this case [22].

As an example of curiosity-led content, Irfan discussed a video about cleaning a large swimming pool and reported 6.7 million views. The figure remains an unverified informant claim: no corresponding Insights record, post-level performance evidence, or verified post identifier was available. It is not treated as a confirmed count of unique viewers, as verified reach, or as evidence of visits or sales. Although the observation record includes a pool-cleaning Reel dated March 22, the available materials do not establish that it is the same video. The interview example therefore illustrates the informant's stated rationale for a theme, not verified March performance.

Irfan also described animal care, bathing, vaccinations, giveaways, new games, and fire-truck water activities as content intended to attract interest or offer educational value. These descriptions identify thematic priorities and his interpretation of audience interest. They do not establish which demographic, geographic, behavioral, or visitor segment was selected, nor whether the themes were derived from audience research. The educational and visitor-experience orientation is consequently described as content direction rather than a verified target-audience strategy.

The informant's interest in trends provides context for content selection, but the March record does not identify the specific trends, audiovisual references, or post-level decisions involved. Event-related and celebratory themes cannot, by themselves, prove that a post was a response to a viral trend. The study therefore does not infer platform-algorithm effects or a systematic trend-selection strategy from those themes.

Strategy is only partly traceable. The available material supports a stated preference for short videos, opening hooks, curiosity, education, and destination experiences. It does not demonstrate a coherent segmentation, targeting, and positioning process or a verified connection between those choices and measurable marketing objectives. This distinction avoids both overstating a complete audience strategy and claiming that no strategic thinking exists.

3.4 Tactics: Planning and Content Formats

Irfan reported preparing a mood board approximately monthly, selecting topics himself, and using "two photos, two designs, and two Reels" as an example of content composition. This is a reported planning reference, not an inspected March plan or a verified monthly quota. The actual March mood board was unavailable, so its objectives, target audiences, production requirements, dates, approval status, and revisions could not be examined.

The March record contains more Reels than graphic-design posts, which is consistent with the stated preference for Reels. It cannot establish whether the reported example of content composition was followed, departed from, or intended to apply in March. Without the relevant plan, neither the difference in recorded formats nor the

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

concentration of posting dates demonstrates weak planning, successful adaptation, or noncompliance with a schedule.

Regarding production, Irfan described attention to camera angles and caution when photographing visitors, particularly children in swimming areas. He also reported asking teachers for permission when photographing student activities involving animal education. These are statements about his reported practices, not independent evidence of an organization-wide consent or content-approval policy. The study did not examine documented permission procedures or management approval records.

Irfan identified “Sobat Zoo” as a form of address and gave “Come on, Sobat Zoo, we’re waiting for you!” as an example of an invitation. He also reported rarely using links in the bio. These statements describe a communication style and reported CTA practice; they do not establish segmentation or a measured path to ticket information and purchases. Because complete captions and click records were unavailable, the study does not generalize the example to every March publication or assess CTA effectiveness.

3.5 Action: Reported Responsibilities and Recorded Publication

For Action, the interview describes Irfan’s involvement in topic selection, production, captions, and uploads, with staff and animal keepers appearing as on-camera participants when needed. This supports a practitioner-level description of operational responsibilities. The participation of these colleagues does not substitute for their own accounts of coordination, and the available materials do not establish the wider planning, approval, budgeting, ticketing, or customer-service workflow.

The concentration of 12 posts between March 15 and 28 coincides in the record with THR giveaways, holiday greetings, and destination activities. Deliberate event-based scheduling, adaptive changes, workload constraints, and normal variation in available activities are possible explanations, but none is established by the publication record alone. The March mood board, planned-versus-published comparison, and dated reasons for scheduling changes were unavailable. The observed pattern therefore remains descriptive and cannot be diagnosed as weak execution or confirmed as deliberate scheduling.

Irfan reported occasional advertising during peak seasons or New Year and promotion through Medan Talk. These are interview statements rather than verified March campaign records. The observation dataset does not distinguish organic from paid distribution, identify third-party promotion dates, or contain advertising budgets and targets. It therefore cannot support conclusions about spending decisions, campaign coordination, or paid-advertising effectiveness.

A practical implication is to distinguish the availability of content ideas from the operational record of producing, approving, and publishing them. A simple record of theme, objective, required material, responsible person, production status, planned date, actual date, and reasons for change could make this relationship more traceable. This is a proposed management improvement, not a workflow verified by the study or evidence that the observed posting pattern was inadequate.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

3.6 Control: Evaluation and Use of Feedback

For Control, Irfan reported checking the Instagram Dashboard, monthly likes, comments, and video performance. He said comments received more attention than likes and mentioned revising a hook he considered less effective. These statements support reported monitoring and an example of self-reported adjustment. Without an identified post, date, original objective, before-and-after evidence, or documented follow-up decision, they do not verify that monitoring informed March decisions or a subsequent planning cycle.

Monitoring, evaluation, and strategic feedback are treated as distinct evidential steps. Monitoring concerns examining responses; evaluation requires relating them to an objective; feedback requires tracing how that assessment informs a later decision. The analyzed materials do not document this sequence. For example, clarifying operational information after repeated audience questions is a possible management application, not an observed sequence established in the March record.

The informant described reviewing performance through the Instagram Dashboard and said CTAs were evaluated, but did not provide click counts, documented response categories, or subsequent actions. Undated supplementary remarks referred to limited attention to performance and a tendency to follow trends. These contextual remarks neither independently verify nor resolve the scope of monitoring described in the dated interview. No Insights exports, post-level performance dataset, CTA-click records, advertising conversions, or documented evaluation reports were available. Accordingly, the study cannot determine whether monitoring systematically influenced later strategic decisions. The reported 6.7 million views remains unverified throughout and is not used as an effectiveness indicator.

3.7 SOSTAC Integration, Implications, and Study Limitations

The SOSTAC mapping identifies reported activities across the six dimensions, but not a fully verified management cycle. Informal monitoring of other accounts is reported under Situation; platform-growth, account-status, and business aspirations under Objectives; content-format and thematic preferences under Strategy; a monthly mood board and communication choices under Tactics; operational responsibilities under Action; and dashboard and comment checks under Control. These categories organize the informant's account. They do not demonstrate complete organizational coverage, equivalent evidential support, or causal connections between stages.

The strongest cross-source consistency concerns format preference: the interview prioritizes Reels, and the March record predominantly contains Reels. The remaining chain—planning → publication → performance evaluation → subsequent content decisions—cannot be demonstrated end to end. The missing March mood board prevents a planned-versus-published comparison; missing post-level performance and evaluation records prevent tracing publication to assessment; and missing dated decision records prevent tracing assessment to later content. Table 3 makes these boundaries explicit rather than inferring the links from the coexistence of reported activities.

The contribution of this case is therefore a bounded description of practitioner-reported management alongside a monthly publication record, with an explicit account

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

of what remains unverified. Compared with a focus on message-writing techniques, it draws attention to the evidential links needed to examine management across planning, production, publication, and feedback. More detailed descriptions of content production than of segmentation or evaluation reflect unequal coverage in the available material; they should not be interpreted as proof that undocumented organizational practices are absent.

The findings support proportionate recommendations rather than claims of demonstrated improvement. First, retain a flexible mood board while recording the intended audience, objective, format, planned date, actual publication date, and reasons for changes. Second, organize production around available capacity and prepare content options that do not depend entirely on visitor activity. Third, document a small set of evaluations by linking each selected post's initial objective to the available response evidence and one subsequent content decision. These proposals have not been implemented or tested within this study.

Recommended evaluation should distinguish communication responses, platform growth, account status, conversions, and business outcomes rather than apply views to every objective [23]. A documented post-level objective is necessary before a response can be interpreted as success or failure. In this study, neither the recorded themes nor the informant's view claim establishes conversion, sales growth, or additional visits. The recommendations concern making decisions traceable; they do not establish the effectiveness of a particular metric or content format.

3.8 Limitations and Scope of Interpretation

This study does not claim thematic saturation, comprehensive organizational coverage, or representativeness across seasons. A single employee's account cannot verify other stakeholders' responsibilities, and the publication record provides only limited cross-source corroboration. The missing individual post links and screenshots prevent independent post-level checking, while the unresolved format and lack of documented independent recoding limit classification reliability. Counts should therefore be read as summaries of the available record rather than a certified complete archive of all account activity.

Temporal and evidential limitations also constrain interpretation. General processes reported in June cannot retrospectively authenticate the rationale for March publications, and undated supplementary remarks do not remove the risk of recall bias. Missing audience, planning, approval, budget, performance, and decision records prevent assessment of the full SOSTAC chain. These are limits of the study's evidence, not findings that such organizational records or practices do not exist. Stronger organizational or effectiveness claims would require additional evidence beyond the present dataset.

4 Conclusion

The content creator's account describes Instagram management at Central Park Zoo Deli Serdang through trend monitoring, monthly mood boards, a preference for Reels,

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

destination-related themes, and checks of the Instagram Dashboard and comments. He reported handling the main production and publishing tasks, with staff and animal keepers occasionally appearing in content. The March 2026 observation record contains 15 posts on 11 dates: 12 Reels, two graphic-design posts, and one post of unidentified format. Twelve publications appeared between March 15 and 28. These findings distinguish reported practices from recorded outputs rather than verify an organization-wide marketing strategy.

Through SOSTAC, format preference shows descriptive consistency across the interview and observation record, while audience segmentation, measurable objectives, planning approval, budgeting, and the use of evaluation in subsequent decisions remain insufficiently documented. The central finding is not that Central Park Zoo lacks a strategy or that uneven publication demonstrates weak execution. It is that the available materials do not substantiate a complete relationship between planning, publication, performance evaluation, and later decisions. The three-month separation between sources, single-informant perspective, one-month coverage, missing post-level archive, unresolved format, and absence of performance records limit both verification and generalization.

Practical recommendations are to document content objectives and scheduling changes, align production records with available capacity, and connect selected evaluations to explicit follow-up decisions. Further research would require additional organizational informants, contemporaneous mood boards and approval and budgeting records, verifiable post archives across a broader period, and Insights and evaluation records. These are requirements for stronger future verification, not data collected in this study. No conclusion is drawn about increased sales or visitor arrivals, representative year-round practice, or the accuracy of the unverified claim of 6.7 million views.

DECLARATIONS

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, B.P. and D.Y.; methodology, B.P.; investigation and data curation, F.K.; writing—original draft preparation, B.P.; writing—review and editing, F.K. and D.Y.; supervision, D.Y. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

The authors received no specific funding for this research.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Data Availability Statement

The interview material and the March 2026 Instagram publication record analyzed in this study are not publicly available because they contain information from an identified informant. They are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business
Vol 5, Issue 1, January 2027, Page 1150-1166
ISSN: 2985-5810 (Media Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58905/apollo.v5i1.820

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Disclosure
The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

Research Ethics
Ethical review and approval were not required for this study because [brief justification].

Informed Consent Statement
Informed consent was obtained from the informant involved in the study, including consent to be identified by name in this article.

Acknowledgments
The authors would like to thank Central Park Zoo Deli Serdang and its content creator, Irfan Wardhana, for participating in this study.

References

[1] D. Yanti, Liyushiana, F. I. Dalimunthe, B. Prayogi, and W. N. A. Tun Ismail, "The Effectiveness of Digital Media Management by Local Governments in Tourism Marketing," *Planning Malaysia*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1–16, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.21837/pm.v21i30.1382.

[2] D. Leung, R. Law, H. van Hoof, and D. Buhalis, "Social Media in Tourism and Hospitality: A Literature Review," *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, vol. 30, no. 1-2, pp. 3–22, 2013, doi: 10.1080/10548408.2013.750919.

[3] N. L. Tran and W. Rudolf, "Social Media and Destination Branding in Tourism: A Systematic Review of the Literature," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 20, p. 13528, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su142013528.

[4] Rachmaniar and R. Anisa, "Strategi Visualisasi dan Narasi Digital dalam Promosi Wisata Edukasi di Indonesia: Analisis Konten Instagram Bertagar #wisataedukasi," *Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen Pariwisata dan Perhotelan*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 608–622, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.55606/jempper.v4i3.5114.

[5] R. Felix, P. A. Rauschnabel, and C. Hinsch, "Elements of strategic social media marketing: A holistic framework," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 70, pp. 118–126, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.05.001.

[6] N. Handayani and D. Syarifuddin, "Instagram sebagai Ruang Publik Virtual Pengaruhnya terhadap Minat Berkunjung ke Kiara Artha Park," *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1610–1617, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.38035/jmpis.v6i2.4220.

[7] W. Nugraha and N. Hardiyanto, "Pengaruh Kualitas Informasi Pada Instagram Terhadap Pembentukan Citra Destinasi Wisatawan: Akun Official Instagram Pantai Sayang Heulang," in *Prosiding Industrial Research Workshop and National Seminar (IRWNS)*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2022, pp. 1148–1155. doi: 10.35313/irwns.v13i01.4207.

[8] P. P. Iglesias-Sánchez, M. B. Correia, C. Jambrino-Maldonado, and C. de las Heras-Pedrosa, "Instagram as a Co-Creation Space for Tourist Destination Image-Building: Algarve and Costa del Sol Case Studies," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 7, p. 2793, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12072793.

[9] N. Hidayah, H. Suherlan, R. F. Widiarrachman, R. Rahmanda Putra, and F. A. Sujawoto, "Enhancing Tourism Destination Promotion through Strategic Instagram Engagement,"

Jurnal Kepariwisataan: Destinasi, Hospitalitas dan Perjalanan, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 288–302, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.34013/jk.v9i2.2171.

[10] M. M. Mariani, M. Di Felice, and M. Mura, "Facebook as a destination marketing tool: Evidence from Italian regional Destination Management Organizations," *Tourism Management*, vol. 54, pp. 321–343, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.008.

[11] A. Pahor Zvanut and P. Zabukovec Baruca, "Social Media Marketing Strategy in the Tourism Industry: A Systematic Literature Review," *Tourism Planning & Development*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 459–492, May 2026, doi: 10.1080/21568316.2025.2549069.

[12] S. Hays, S. Page, and D. Buhalis, "Social media as a destination marketing tool: its use by national tourism organisations," *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 211–239, 2013, doi: 10.1080/13683500.2012.662215.

[13] P. E. Rose, K. A. Hunt, and L. M. Riley, "Animals in an online world; an evaluation of how zoological collections use social media," *Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 57–62, 2018, doi: 10.19227/jzar.v6i2.324.

[14] F. Kartika, D. Yanti, and M. R. Lubis, "Optimalisasi Digital Copywriting Berbasis Model AIDA pada Media Sosial Central Park Zoo," *Jurnal Pariwisata Terapan*, vol. 10, no. 2, Sep. 2026, doi: 10.22146/jpt.124650.

[15] N. Hidayah et al., "Strategi Pemasaran Media Sosial Destinasi Pariwisata Menggunakan Pendekatan SOSTAC," *Jurnal Kepariwisataan: Destinasi, Hospitalitas dan Perjalanan*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 57–75, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.34013/jk.v5i2.408.

[16] D. Chaffey and P. R. Smith, *Digital Marketing Excellence: Planning, Optimizing and Integrating Online Marketing*, 5th ed. London: Routledge, 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315640341.

[17] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis," *Qualitative Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 3–26, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1037/qup0000196.

[18] S. Crowe, K. Cresswell, A. Robertson, G. Huby, A. Avery, and A. Sheikh, "The case study approach," *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 100, Jun. 2011, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-100.

[19] N. Carter, D. Bryant-Lukosius, A. DiCenso, J. Blythe, and A. J. Neville, "The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research," *Oncology Nursing Forum*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 545–547, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1188/14.ONF.545-547.

[20] L. S. Nowell, J. M. Norris, D. E. White, and N. J. Moules, "Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 1609406917733847, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1177/1609406917733847.

[21] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006, doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

[22] X. Du, T. Liechty, C. A. Santos, and J. Park, "'I want to record and share my wonderful journey': Chinese Millennials' production and sharing of short-form travel videos on TikTok or Douyin," *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. 25, no. 21, pp. 3412–3424, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1080/13683500.2020.1810212.

[23] K. Peters, Y. Chen, A. M. Kaplan, B. Ognibeni, and K. Pauwels, "Social Media Metrics — A Framework and Guidelines for Managing Social Media," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 281–298, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2013.09.007.