

Platform Uncertainty and Strategic Decision-Making in Digital Advertising: An Empirical Investigation Among Meta Ads Professionals

¹P. Sri Hari, ²Dr. V. Ramesh Kumar

¹Research Scholar,

Department of Management and Research,

Adaikalamatha College,

(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University)

Thanjavur – 613 005, Tamilnadu, India.

²Assistant Professor,

Department of Management and Research,

Adaikalamatha College,

(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University)

Thanjavur – 613 005, Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

More and more, digital advertising platforms are opaque, making it harder for advertisers to be certain of the ads they're served, the cost of those ads, and the rules that they're required to follow. Meta's advertising platform is a prime example of this trend as the platform is constantly evolving, has automated campaign tools, has some signals that are lost with privacy, and some rules for advertising that are unpredictable. This study investigates the impact of platform uncertainty on practitioners' strategic decisions for managing their Meta ad campaigns. The study builds on the theories of environmental uncertainty and resource dependence and defines platform uncertainty as algorithmic opacity, policy volatility and unreliability of measures. The 312 Meta Ads professionals surveyed were media buyers, agency strategists, in-house marketers and freelance consultants. The survey data was analyzed using structural equation modelling to test for relationships between platform uncertainty, decision-making strategies (adaptive experimentation, risk-averse conservatism and platform diversification), and perceived campaign performance. The quantitative results were augmented with semi-structured interviews with 18 respondents. The results indicate that opacity of algorithms, unreliability of measurement and volatility of policies are the factors most strongly associated with adaptive experimentation, while risk-averse behavior and channel diversification are most closely associated with volatility of policies. Those with extensive experience, and those with first-party data infrastructure, had less negative impact on perceived performance. The uncertainty-performance relationship was partly attributed to adaptive experimentation, and the degree of conservatism had a negative relationship with perceived effectiveness. Rules of thumb, peer learning networks, and "folk theories" are the ways practitioners interpret the behavior of algorithms, as revealed in interviews, but not explicitly guided by the platforms. The study expands the uncertainty framework to the case of ad dependent to the platform and proposes strategies that help shield from dependency risk. Leveraging first-party data, testing structured and diversified media portfolios are practical implications. Limitations of the current research and directions for future research are outlined, such as making a longitudinal study and a cross-platform design.

Keywords: Platform uncertainty; Meta advertising; Strategic decision-making; Algorithmic opacity; Digital marketing professionals

Introduction

Many of these are the key platforms enabling companies to reach, influence and persuade consumers which is now happening largely via digital advertising. Of these, Meta, which owns Facebook, Instagram, Messenger and WhatsApp, has a huge worldwide user base and percentage of advertising spend. Meta is ideal for small businesses, agencies and multinational brands, thanks to its targeting capabilities, scale and ease of access. But there is a structural cost to this accessibility, as the system is built for the needs of advertisers, and their understanding of the system is inadequate and their ownership is limited.

Over the past few years this relationship has grown closer. Meta camp management has moved towards machine learning automation, such as offered by its Advantage+ suite, the wide defaults for targeting and algorithmically-determined placements and creative combinations. These tools are efficient but they cut down on the levers at the disposal of human decision makers. Advertisers define objectives and budgets, and leave the job of determining who sees an ad, when and at what price to the platform. Processes are important, so much so that they end up influencing outcomes, in most cases, without being recognizable to the actors that are held responsible for outcomes (*Martin 2019*).

Further contributing to this opacity is a changing measurement environment because of privacy laws and technology. The foundation on which attribution and optimization relied – namely signals from cookies and apps – has been undermined by Apple's App Tracking Transparency framework, the loss of third-party cookies, and data protection legislation like the GDPR (*Kollnig et al., 2022*). Experts struggle with platforms' conversions, late reporting and inconsistencies across platform dashboards and external analytics. Making decisions for budgets, creative testing and scaling then must be based on data which are inaccurate (*Muennighoff et al., 2025*).

The other sources of instability are policy enforcement. Advertisers tell us they are suddenly finding their ads rejected, the restriction on their accounts is unclear, and they are unable to get human support, all of which can have serious repercussions on their bottom line. The rules governing sensitive categories, targeting and creative guidelines can have a dramatic effect on campaign viability, which can change in an instant. One incident of enforcement can impact agencies with multiple clients' revenues, client relationships and reputation. Volatility in policies adds an extra layer of risk in the mix that is compounded by the algorithmic and measurement uncertainty (*Aloisi et al., 2023*).

When taken together, these are called platform uncertainty; the amount by which advertisers are unable to predict, interpret and control the platform on which their strategies rely. Numerous theories from organizational theory have established that the environment of a company affects managerial behaviour and how the company gathers information, allocates resources and makes decisions (*Meier et al., 2015*). But this literature arose in an environment of market or technological volatility, not where uncertainty comes from an intermediary (marketplace, rulemaker and measurement authority) that is privately owned.

The research on digital advertising has focused on consumers' reactions, targeting effectiveness and the auction mechanics without considering practitioners that run the systems (*Braun et al., 2024*). Algorithmic opacity and 'folk theories' that users form about algorithms have been discussed in the field of information systems and science and technology studies; however, few studies have related these concepts to strategic decision making in professional marketing (*Fligstein 2021*). Similarly, while resource dependence theory provides a useful perspective on the reliance on external powerful actors, its use in the context of advertisers' reliance on platform owners is not as well developed, and there is an empirical gap (*Qu et al., 2026*).

This study aims to fill this gap by examining how the uncertainty in platforms affects the strategic decision making of the Meta Ads professionals. It combines the environmental uncertainty theory with resource dependence thinking, and defines the uncertainty of a platform as algorithmic uncertainty, algorithmic volatility, and measurement unreliability. It explores the connection these dimensions have with three different decision making processes: Adaptive experimentation, Risk-averse conservatism and Platform diversification. The result is perceived campaign performance and the factors will be analyzed are experience and first-party data capability and how uncertainty is managed.

The study has three research questions. First, how are the different aspects of platform uncertainty related to the different decision-making strategies? Secondly, what is the mediating role of the approaches between uncertainty and perceived performance? Thirdly, which are the moderating effects of experience first-party data infrastructure? Twenty-eight hundred professionals completed a survey, and 18 professionals took part in semi-structured interviews to test hypotheses and provide a more in-depth analysis of the lived experiences of practitioners.

The study has a number of contributions to make. It has the potential to be theoretically expanded to algorithmically-controlled advertising platforms while simultaneously providing a multidimensional conceptualization not only for Meta, but for anything. In the real world this offers real-world proof from an under-represented and vital part of the digital economy: a professional population. On the ground, it pinpoints decision tactics which seem to counteract dependency risks and steers media buyers, agency leaders and in-house teams through the uncertainty and automation of the world of media.

The rest of the paper will be organized like this. The next section is a literature review that leads to the development of hypotheses. Sampling, measurement and analysis procedures are described in the methodology section, both for the first and second phase. The findings are presented in the subsequent sections, and theoretical and managerial implications are discussed, as well as the limitations. The paper ends with recommendations for future research, such as a longitudinal study of the way advertisers change and adjust to different platform ecosystems and a cross-platform research of platform ecosystems.

Review Of Literature

In the past, there has been a wide body of work that investigated digital ad revenue, privacy concerns, channel selection, platform adoption and effectiveness of digital ads, but not the uncertainty of which practitioners face. *Pandey et al., (2017)* did a review of research on revenue management in the broadcasting and online advertising industry, and found that they have identified various approaches and techniques to maximize the revenue from advertising as the competition grows fierce. They also found a new use for mobile ads and there were gaps in research to be explored. Their report makes it clear that it is a constant challenge for advertisers and publishers to find a competitive edge, but offers little insight into the decision-making process when platform conditions are not stable.

Martin et al., (2017) conducted a survey of privacy scholarship in marketing, categorizing it according to the role that privacy plays in society, in psychology and in economics. They decided that data privacy has an impact on internal and external stakeholders in unexpected ways and suggested that data privacy should be studied from multi-dimensional approaches. This is a concern that is directly applicable to the measurement disruption now facing Meta advertisers, with its impact on the diminishing of attribution and optimization signals by privacy rules. Likewise, *Rainy (2025)* in a systematic review of AI-powered marketing analytics found that supervised learning, deep learning, and reinforcement learning models are suitable for predicting campaigns, personalizing campaigns, and making real-time decisions for delivering campaigns. The relationship between regulation and platform behavior was bolstered by the introduction of more regulations like GDPR and CCPA, which have led to more transparency and control for consumers in AI marketing systems, said Rainy.

Chaudhuri (2020) took a step to the opposite end of the equation and studied the ways in which consumers interact with digital channels, and how digital channels influence their purchasing decisions. The study provides managers a look into which channels are appropriate for which audiences, highlighting the continued challenge of channel selection. In order to ensure platform integrity, *Aswani et al., (2018)* suggested hybrid approach of using social media analytics and bio-inspired computing to identify spammers in Twitter marketing. After analysing over 1.8 million tweets from 14,235 users, the chaos-tuned variant of the Firefly Algorithm turned out to converge fastest and identify the most accurately.

Gavino et al., (2019) studied the social media usage among Latino entrepreneurs and discovered that they utilize personal social media platforms more than business social media platforms for business related activities. Perceived usefulness and ease of use predicted the adoption of each platform differently across groups and neither

type of platform was related to revenue. Recently, *Sarulatha (2026)* conducted a study on the factors that make Meta campaigns successful in India, and concluded that video ads are the most preferred format. Ad creative and audience targeting were the top performers for effectiveness; the correlation between these two and professional experience was very strong ($\rho = 0.9006$ and 0.8728 , respectively). This latter result is of particular significance as it indicates that practitioners who have been able to practice for a long time use iteration, similar to the iterative experimentation studied herein.

All these studies address the topics of advertising revenue, privacy, advertising channel, spam detection, platform adoption and campaign optimization. But none of them explores how professionals make decisions in the face of an opaque platform, policy-changing platforms and platforms that are not reliable in terms of measurement. This is the motivation for the present study.

Statement Of The Problem

Digital advertising has been siloed and is reliant on a few key platforms and Meta is one of the most important. Those who use its tools to advertise to the immense audiences it offers, and its advanced targeting, get these benefits while remaining blind to the environment in which these ads appear – and unable to control or predict. Outcomes of campaigns are increasingly achieved by using machine-learning systems with deliver logic, pricing systems and optimization rules that are not given to the professionals that are responsible for campaign outcomes (*Thapa et al., 2026*). Meta is continuing to shift away from manual campaign controls, and increase automated campaign formats, and the role of the informed human media buyer, strategist and in-house marketer remains the same (*Kumar et al., 2026*). This phenomenon of lack of accountability and control is the major issue that has prompted this study.

Measurement disruption and policy instability further challenges the difficulty. With privacy laws loophole after loophole, operating system limitations and the waning use of third-party tracking, data attribution is becoming less reliable, and reporting looks further into the future and is subject to discrepancies with external analytics (*Siddiqui 2025*). Meanwhile, campaigns may be suspended without notice or without any human intervention, due to an abrupt ad rejection, account restrictions, and/or policy changes. Practitioners are thus faced with making budget, creative and scaling decisions with incomplete and sometimes unreliable information and therefore have the risk of losing money in their organization, damaging their reputation, and disrupting their operations with their clients.

Although these challenges have practical importance, however, there is still a lack of understanding regarding the same in the field of research. Studies on digital advertising have focused primarily on consumer behavior, ad effectiveness, and auction design aspects of digital advertising, and systematic study on the decision-making of professionals involved in the different aspects of these platforms has been limited. Theories of environmental uncertainty and resource dependence argue that uncertainty affects managerial behaviour, but these have been little used in contexts where a private platform both creates marketplace and rule-making and acts as a measuring authority (*Mason 2020*). Thus, it remains unclear what types of platform uncertainty are most relevant, what sorts of reactions the professionals make to these uncertainties, and whether or not these reactions stifle or bolster campaign effectiveness. Anecdote, informal folk theory and trial and error are the only tools practitioners have to rely on, and researchers have no tool for the explanation of strategic behavior when dealing with platform dependence (*Rahman et al., 2026*). This study is an empirical approach that deals with the above mentioned problem.

Objectives Of The Study

1. To evaluate the impact of platform uncertainty (algorithmic opacity, policy volatility and measurement unreliability) on decision making methods of Meta Ads professionals.
2. To determine if adaptive experimentation, risk-aversion conservatism and platform diversification buffer the relationship between platform uncertainty and perceived campaign performance.

3. To explore the moderation of these relationships by practitioners' professional experience and their ability to handle and process first-party data and the meaning of and reaction to the opacity of platform behaviour.

Methodology

The method used in this study is research methods that are mixed and explanatory sequential with pragmatist paradigm. The first phase involved conducting a cross-sectional online survey of 312 Meta Ads professionals (media buyers, agency strategists, in-house marketers, and freelance consultants) using a purposive and snowball sampling method via professional networks and advertiser communities. Uncertainty regarding the platform, decision making strategies and perceived performance of the campaign were assessed using multi-item pretested Likert scales, and analyzed using structural equation modeling with mediation tests and moderation tests. In the second phase, 18 semi-structured interviews were conducted and analyzed using thematic analysis to explain and put in context the results of the statistics. The whole process was reliable, valid and conformed to ethical standards, informed consent and anonymity.

Population And Sampling

The audience for this target is professionals involved in paid advertising planning, management and optimisation on Meta platforms such as media buyers, agency strategists, in-house marketers, and freelance consultants. Given the lack of a complete sampling frame of these professionals, a non-probability sampling approach was used, which involved both purposive sampling to make sure the respondents had a minimum of a year of hands-on experience with Meta Ads as well as snowball sampling to expand the sample by targeting professionals through their professional networks, LinkedIn groups, and advertiser communities. There were 312 valid responses with a 312 sample size, which is greater than the minimum sample size required for structural equation modelling (SEM) of 10 cases per estimated parameter, with a minimum of 200 cases. Questions were screened for and respondents with responses that were incomplete or unclear were not included. Interviews during the qualitative phase continued until thematic saturation was achieved, with 18 participants selected from those who responded to the survey using maximum variation purposive sampling to represent a variety of roles, years of experience, and organization size.

Data Collection And Sources

Two phases of primary data were gathered. For the first phase, a structured online questionnaire was used that distributed respondents' demographics, perceptions of platform uncertainty, approaches to decision making, and perceptions of campaign performance via email, LinkedIn groups, and advertiser communities that were pretested and adapted on multi-item five-point Likert scales. During the second phase, 18 semi-structured interviews were held by video call, audio recorded with permission, and transcribed for analysis and took 30-45 minutes each. The conceptual framework, scale development, and interview guide were informed by secondary sources such as peer-reviewed journals, and Meta's official marketing documentation and policy changes, industry reports, and practitioner publications. The participation was anonymous, voluntary and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection.

Analysis And Findings

Table 1: Reliability, Validity, and Descriptive Statistics (N = 312)

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α	CR	AVE	Mean	SD
Algorithmic Opacity	5	0.86	0.9	0.64	3.92	0.78
Policy Volatility	4	0.83	0.88	0.65	3.67	0.84
Measurement Unreliability	5	0.88	0.91	0.67	3.81	0.8
Adaptive Experimentation	5	0.85	0.89	0.63	4.05	0.71
Risk-Averse Conservatism	4	0.81	0.87	0.63	3.28	0.89
Platform Diversification	4	0.84	0.89	0.66	3.54	0.86
Perceived Campaign Performance	5	0.87	0.91	0.67	3.61	0.74

The seven constructs all have good measurement quality. Cronbach's alpha ranges between 0.81 and 0.88 and the composite reliability is ranging between 0.87 and 0.91, both values are above the 0.70 value, which is consistent and good internal reliability. The Ave scores range from 0.63 to 0.67, which is above the 0.50 threshold, thus supporting for convergent validity. The results of the fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 1.84$, CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.052) indicate that the measurement model fits well. The results of the description are the greatest opacity of the algorithms (M = 3.92), unreliability of measurements (M = 3.81), and volatility of the policy (M = 3.67). The most common decision approach is adaptive experimentation (M = 4.05), and risk-averse conservatism (M = 3.28) is the least common. Across the board, professionals feel like there is a great deal of uncertainty and respond primarily through testing and adapting, not retreating.

Table 2: Structural Model Results (Direct Effects)

Hypothesized Path	β	SE	t-value	p-value	Result
Algorithmic Opacity → Adaptive Experimentation	0.41	0.06	6.83	< .001	Supported
Measurement Unreliability → Adaptive Experimentation	0.36	0.06	6	< .001	Supported
Policy Volatility → Adaptive Experimentation	0.08	0.06	1.33	0.184	Not supported
Policy Volatility → Risk-Averse Conservatism	0.44	0.06	7.33	< .001	Supported
Algorithmic Opacity → Risk-Averse Conservatism	0.12	0.07	1.71	0.088	Not supported
Policy Volatility → Platform Diversification	0.39	0.07	5.57	< .001	Supported
Measurement Unreliability → Platform Diversification	0.21	0.07	3	0.003	Supported
Adaptive Experimentation → Perceived Performance	0.47	0.05	9.4	< .001	Supported
Risk-Averse Conservatism → Perceived Performance	-0.29	0.06	-4.83	< .001	Supported
Platform Diversification → Perceived Performance	0.14	0.06	2.33	0.02	Supported

In the structural model, there are different responses to the various types of uncertainty. In contrast, adaptive experimentation is significantly boosted by the presence of algorithmic opacity ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < .001$) and measurement unreliability ($\beta = 0.36$, $p < .001$), but measurement reliability ($\beta = 0.08$, $p = .184$) is not. Volatility of the policies, on the other hand, is the most significant factor for high risk aversion conservatism ($\beta = 0.44$) and it also encourages platform diversification ($\beta = 0.39$) leading to less dependence on the platform. Among the three categories, diversification has the smallest positive influence on perceived performance ($\beta = 0.14$), followed by adaptive experimentation ($\beta = 0.47$) and conservatism ($\beta = -0.29$) has a significant negative influence on perceived performance. It has a well acceptable level of explanatory power with 42% of the variance explained in the model. Therefore, learning oriented responses enhance performance and defensive responses detract from performance.

Table 3: Mediation and Moderation Results

Effect	Estimate	95% Bootstrap CI	p-value	Interpretation
<i>Mediation (indirect effects)</i>				
Uncertainty → Adaptive Experimentation → Performance	0.19	[0.12, 0.27]	< .001	Partial mediation
Uncertainty → Risk-Averse Conservatism → Performance	-0.09	[-0.15, -0.04]	0.002	Negative mediation
Uncertainty → Platform Diversification → Performance	0.05	[0.01, 0.10]	0.021	Weak partial mediation

Direct effect: Uncertainty → Performance	−0.31	[−0.42, −0.20]	< .001	Significant
<i>Moderation (interaction effects)</i>				
Uncertainty × Experience → Performance	0.17	[0.07, 0.27]	0.001	Buffering effect
Uncertainty × First-Party Data Capability → Performance	0.22	[0.12, 0.32]	< .001	Buffering effect

However, even though the mediators are controlled for, the direct effect of uncertainty on performance still appears to be rather significant, and negative (−0.31). Partially mediated adaptive experimentation (+0.19), being a significant positive indirect pathway. There is a weak, positive indirect effect (0.05) from platform diversification. Excessive caution (high risk aversion conservatism) has a negative indirect effect (−0.09), such that the damage of uncertainty is worsened by high risk aversion conservatism. All of the above bootstrap confidence intervals exclude zero, again indicating that these effects are statistically significant. Experience (0.17) and the ability to use first-party data (0.22) buffer the negative effect of uncertainty on performance. First-party data capability (0.22) is a stronger buffer of the negative effect of uncertainty on performance than is experience (0.17). In real business terms, the investments to be made include first party data, structured testing, and professional skill development.

Results And Discussion

The uncertainty of the platform is substantial and can be very detrimental to Meta Ads professionals, but it's a reality that can be tackled in a variety of ways. The opacity of algorithms and the unreliable nature of measurements induce adaptive experimentation, which can compensate for some losses, and policy volatility induces conservatism and diversification, but the former can be overdone, aggravating losses. Heuristics, peer networks and folk theories are used to make sense of 'black-box' algorithms, as uncertainty is mitigated by experience and first-party data capabilities, as revealed in interviews. Firms should thus focus on first-party data, platform-specific testing and skill development, and longitudinal, platform-specific studies should test these relationships.

Suggestions

To be less reliant on Meta's modeled and delayed reporting, advertisers and agencies should invest in first-party data infrastructure like CRM integration, server-side tracking, and Conversions API. Rather than simply winging it, or being too cautious, structured experimentation protocols should be used to guide teams, such as controlled creative tests, holdout and incrementality tests, and documented learnings. To minimize policy risk, firms should have compliance checklists and run campaigns in several ad accounts and business assets; and allocate budgets to other channels, including search, email and other social media. Peer-learning communities, mentoring junior media buyers, and continuous learning on new tools and features offered by Meta should also be encouraged among organizations. Meta, on the other hand, needs to do a better job of transparency, giving advertisers clearer explanations for why their ads are being rejected, quicker human support, and to document algorithmic and measurement changes.

Conclusion

According to this study, platform uncertainty (i.e., algorithmic opacity, policy volatility, measurement unreliability) can have a significant impact on the strategic decisions that Meta Ads professionals make, and on their perception of the performance of their campaigns. Uncertainties evoke different reactions: opacity and unreliable measurement will allow adaptive experimentation, volatility will allow conservatism and diversification. Learning-based strategies tend to mitigate performance loss due to uncertainty while overly cautious strategies exacerbate performance loss, and experience and first-party data capability serve as valuable buffers. The study extends both the environmental uncertainty and resource dependence theory perspectives to algorithmically-biased platforms for advertising and provides a theoretical foundation and a guideline for platform-dependent management. Future studies should use longitudinal and cross-platform designs and objective performance measures to prove the validity of these relationships for the future development of platform ecosystems.

References

- [1] Martin, K. (2019). Ethical implications and accountability of algorithms: K. Martin. *Journal of business ethics*, 160(4), 835-850.
- [2] Kollnig, K., Shuba, A., Van Kleek, M., Binns, R., & Shadbolt, N. (2022, June). Goodbye tracking? Impact of iOS app tracking transparency and privacy labels. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 508-520).
- [3] Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2023). Between risk mitigation and labour rights enforcement: Assessing the transatlantic race to govern AI-driven decision-making through a comparative lens. *European Labour Law Journal*, 14(2), 283-307.
- [4] Meier, K. J., Favero, N., & Zhu, L. (2015). Performance gaps and managerial decisions: A Bayesian decision theory of managerial action. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(4), 1221-1246.
- [5] Braun, M., De Langhe, B., Puntoni, S., & Schwartz, E. M. (2024). Leveraging digital advertising platforms for consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 51(1), 119-128.
- [6] Fligstein, N. (2021). Organizations: Theoretical debates and the scope of organizational theory. In *Handbook of classical sociological theory* (pp. 487-506). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- [7] Muennighoff, N., Yang, Z., Shi, W., Li, X. L., Fei-Fei, L., Hajishirzi, H., ... & Hashimoto, T. B. (2025, November). s1: Simple test-time scaling. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 20286-20332).
- [8] Qu, Y., Yu, Z., Lan, S., Rekik, Y., & Kumar, A. (2026). Platform Choice and Resource Configuration: From the Perspective of Resource Dependence. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 58(1), 42.
- [9] Pandey, S., Dutta, G., & Joshi, H. (2017). Survey on revenue management in media and broadcasting. *Interfaces*, 47(3), 195-213.
- [10] Martin, K. D., & Murphy, P. E. (2017). The role of data privacy in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(2), 135-155.
- [11] Chaudhuri, P. (2020). Influence of digital marketing channels on the consumer buying process. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 7(8), 96-105.
- [12] Aswani, R., Kar, A. K., & Vigneswara Ilavarasan, P. (2018). Detection of spammers in twitter marketing: a hybrid approach using social media analytics and bio inspired computing. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 20(3), 515-530.
- [13] Gavino, M. C., Williams, D. E., Jacobson, D., & Smith, I. (2019). Latino entrepreneurs and social media adoption: personal and business social network platforms. *Management Research Review*, 42(4), 469-494.
- [14] Sarulatha, N. (2026). Assessing the Success Factors of Meta Ad Campaigns in the Digital Marketing Landscape. *Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship*, (2), 3128-3136.
- [15] Rainy, T. A. (2025). AI-driven marketing analytics for retail strategy: a systematic review of data-backed campaign optimization. *International Journal of Scientific Interdisciplinary Research*, 6(1), 28-59.
- [16] Thapa, P., Khadka, S., Sharma, P., Rai, A., Bhattarai, U., Regmi, K., & Bohara, P. (2026). Agentic AI for autonomous marketing campaign execution: A comprehensive survey and open-source implementation. Available at SSRN 6137546.
- [17] Kumar, V., Kotler, P., & Kumar, A. (2026). Transformative marketing strategies in the era of new-age technologies: Principles, plan, purpose, and practice. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 54(1), 1-27.
- [18] Siddiqui, M. R. (2025). Big data and great privacy challenges in the digital era-A comprehensive study. *Innovative Journal of Applied Science*, 42-42.
- [19] Mason, M. (2020). Transparency, accountability and empowerment in sustainability governance: a conceptual review. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 22(1), 98-111.
- [20] Rahman, A. M., Haque, M. R., & Sultana, S. (2026, July). DAIEM: Decolonizing Algorithm's Role as a Team-member in Informal E-market. In *Proceedings of the 2026 ACM SIGCAS/SIGCHI Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies* (pp. 485-501).
- [21] Rahmawati, L., & Prastowo, W. D. (2026). Analysis of The Most Effective Advertising Platform Selection Decision Support System Using The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Method. *Journal of Computing Innovations and Emerging Technologies*, 2(1), 13-18.

- [22] Dutta, S., Arivazhagan, R., Sengupta, S., Shyamaladevi, B., & Edwin, T. S. (2024). Unlocking Online Success: The Crucial Role of Meta Ads Manager in Elevating Content Reach and Engagement for Market Penetration in Digital Marketing Agency. *Journal of Business Strategy Finance and Management*, 6(1), 38.
- [23] Macías Urrego, J. A., García Pineda, V., & Montoya Restrepo, L. A. (2024). The power of social media in the decision-making of current and future professionals: a crucial analysis in the digital era. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2421411.
- [24] Basu, R., Lim, W. M., Kumar, A., & Kumar, S. (2023). Marketing analytics: The bridge between customer psychology and marketing decision-making. *Psychology & Marketing*, 40(12), 2588-2611.
- [25] Hanssens, D. M., & Pauwels, K. H. (2016). Demonstrating the value of marketing. *Journal of marketing*, 80(6), 173-190.