

Protecting the information environment in the age of social platforms: New approaches to advertising interaction and digital communication



Oksana Kovalchuk^a  | Olha Melnychuk^a  | Mariia Rozhylo^b  | Oksana Terebus^b  | Maksym Yablonskyi^c 

^aDepartment of Foreign and Ukrainian Philology, Faculty of Digital, Educational and Social Technologies, Lutsk National Technical University, Lutsk, Ukraine.

^bDepartment of Social Communications, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine.

^cDepartment of Social Communications, Faculty of Philology and Journalism, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine.

Abstract Cultural transformation profoundly influences human consciousness, spirituality, philosophy, and traditions, shaping how individuals perceive themselves and society. This process manifests in the creation of a multilayered cultural identity that ensures freedom of expression while reflecting both continuity and fluctuation. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of evolving cultural trends — shifting from continuity to cultural fluidity — on personal identification. The study employed a cross-sectional comparative survey design combined with structural-conceptual analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation analysis, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance. The findings reveal that stages of cultural continuity, including primitive society, antiquity, and the Middle Ages, strongly shaped individual identification within collective frameworks. In contrast, cultural fluidity, which is characteristic of modernism, postmodernism, and the digital age, has fostered greater social independence and a search for new meanings through cultural interaction. Current trends such as digitalization, polycentricity, ethics, decolonization, and new cultural orientations reinforce the perception of culture as a sphere of direct human participation and engagement with history. The analysis revealed that respondents in Group 1 (younger generation) are more oriented toward cultural fluidity (73%), which facilitates the revision of established values and the embrace of change. Moreover, the respondents in Group 2 (older generation) preferred cultural continuity (68%), reflecting their inclination to preserve traditional norms. Importantly, 82% of the students in Group 1 reported a strengthened sense of belonging, expanding their worldview. Their adaptability was further confirmed through situational tasks, where they achieved the highest results in integrating into a European university setting ($S=0.83$; 4.7 points).

Keywords: cultural transformation, cultural continuity, cultural fluidity, individual values, intercultural cooperation, generational differences, digital culture

1. Introduction

Over the past ten years, social platforms have redefined the information environment. News and advertising messages aggressively compete and circulate within a space of digitally mediated communications working according to some algorithmically controlled logic. The information environment is more vulnerable to misinformation and disinformation—it is strategically construed as a narrative that increasingly blends digital advertising, personalization, and artificial intelligence tools—than in the very facticity of its spread. Most importantly, there can be no simplified regulatory or prohibitive approach applicable because what we are dealing with here involves extremely complex interactions between platform algorithms, the economic incentives of ad ecosystems, and user behavior (Malykowska et al., 2024).

Works that clarify terminology and basic conceptual frameworks rank among the most important in forming even a preliminary conceptual approach to research on information threats within the digital environment. Aïmeur et al. (2023) provide, through their systematic literature review, one of the few recent studies that clearly distinguishes social platforms' misinformation, disinformation, and fake news into analytical categories. They also highlight very explicitly how terminological inconsistency in earlier works has hampered result interpretation and aggravated analysis precision regarding any assessment of state information environments (Khomik et al., 2022). The current state should be viewed from an interdisciplinary scientific field lacking a unified theoretical framework. In their systematic review, Broda and Strömbäck (2024) reported that research on disinformation has developed very much in parallel across different disciplines with minimal conceptual integration. It is this lack of conceptual integration that they themselves point out as a coordinated approach inside science to develop approaches for protecting the information environment.

The directions and priorities of research activity allow for an analysis of understudied areas. Chaudhuri et al. (2024) provide a summary of the main topics researched regarding disinformation on social platforms and outline a promising



scientific program. They note that advertising mechanisms and the commercial logic of digital communications remain marginal in research compared with its political and psychological aspects. Management at the platform level as an information risk manager occupies a separate place in the current literature; Clemons et al. (2025) analyze management strategies for misinformation with a focus on rules algorithms and economic incentives applied by platforms. They report that any effective protection or safe guarding information environment should involve ad ecosystems plus logics behind digital interactions (Yatsyshyn et al., 2022).

The transformation of digital advertising focuses particularly on the ethical aspects that artificial intelligence brings to this field. Saura et al. (2024) discussed the privacy paradox in AI-driven digital marketing and concluded that advertising personalization and mass data collection offer new threats to information security and user trust. To obtain a balanced understanding of the issue at hand, it is important to realize not only potential risks but also possible positive effects carried out by social platforms. Altay et al. (2025) empirically proved that under certain conditions, the consumption of news via social networks increases knowledge and makes beliefs more accurate, thus emphasizing the need for nuanced differentiated approaches to the regulation of digital communications rather than exclusively restrictive strategies.

Evolutionary analysis of the scientific field allows us to identify long-term trends and structural gaps in research. Xu et al. (2025) used bibliometric analysis to trace key themes and trajectories in disinformation research between 2013 and 2023. The authors reported that issues of advertising, platform logic, and digital communication remain poorly integrated into the overall discourse, which justifies the relevance of further theoretical reviews in this direction.

Despite the significant volume of contemporary research, the scientific field of information environment protection in the context of the dominance of social platforms remains structurally fragmented and analytically imbalanced. A systematic examination of the literature reveals several interrelated gaps that limit the development of a coherent theoretical understanding of this field. Most works focus on the political, psychological, or media-ethical aspects of misinformation and disinformation, while the role of digital advertising, commercial incentives, and algorithmically driven personalization is considered episodically or in passing.

First, a conceptual gap can be identified, reflected in the absence of integrative theoretical frameworks capable of linking disinformation research with digital advertising and platform governance. Existing studies tend to examine these domains in isolation, which prevents the formation of a unified understanding of the information environment as a complex socio-technical system.

Second, a structural gap is evident in the limited attention to advertising ecosystems as systemic drivers of information flows. Although advertising mechanisms are occasionally mentioned, they are rarely conceptualized as embedded elements of platform architectures that shape the production, amplification, and monetization of information, including harmful content.

Theoretical models explaining how advertising ecosystems and mechanisms of interaction between platforms, brands, and users amplify or transform information threats remain underdeveloped. Third, a methodological gap is observed in the scarcity of integrative and interdisciplinary review studies that combine approaches from communication studies, digital marketing, artificial intelligence ethics, and platform governance into a single analytical framework. As a result, the field lacks studies capable of capturing the multidimensional nature of platform-based information environments.

Taken together, these limitations indicate that current research does not sufficiently explain how informational, economic, and algorithmic logics interact within social platforms to produce and manage information risks. This creates the need for a systematic and conceptually integrated analysis of the field.

This article aims to provide a systematic and conceptually oriented review of the scientific literature on protecting the information environment under conditions of social platform dominance, with a focus on identifying its structural configuration, revealing the role of digital advertising and communication as cross-cutting mechanisms, and addressing the identified conceptual, structural, and methodological gaps through the development of an integrative analytical framework.

2. Materials and Methods

This study was carried out as a systematic literature review with elements of qualitative meta-synthesis in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines. The research design is interpretive-analytical and aims not only to aggregate findings but to develop a conceptual framework explaining the role of digital advertising and communication within the structure of the platform-based information environment. This ensured transparency of the procedure, clearly structured the stages of source selection, and provided a fully reproducible methodological design.

The object of the study is the scientific literature on the information environment of social platforms, while the subject is the conceptualization of digital advertising and communication as structural elements within this environment, particularly in relation to misinformation, user behavior, and platform governance.

The data sources were the international scientometric databases Scopus and Web of Science Core Collection, which provide access to peer-reviewed and interdisciplinary relevant scientific publications. The main search was conducted in January 2025. The time frame of the search covered the period from 2015 to 2025 (inclusive), which made it possible to capture

the current stage of development of research related to social platforms, disinformation, and digital advertising and communication practices.

The search strategy was formulated explicitly using Boolean operators and the TITLE-ABS-KEY (Scopus) and TS (Web of Science) fields. The basic logical query was as follows: ("information environment" AND "social media platforms") AND (misinformation OR disinformation OR "fake news") AND ("digital advertising" OR "digital communication" OR "platform governance"). Substantively identical queries were used in both databases, taking into account the technical features of their interfaces.

The source selection procedure was carried out in three consecutive phases in accordance with PRISMA. At the identification stage, 312 records were identified. After removing duplicates and initial screening of titles and abstracts, 104 publications were selected for further analysis. At the inclusion stage, after full-text review and application of the selection criteria, a final analytical corpus of 40 scientific publications was formed.

The inclusion criteria were peer-reviewed scientific articles and review studies; English language publications; thematic relevance to the information environment of social platforms, disinformation, digital advertising, or digital communication; and compliance with the established time limits. The exclusion criteria were duplicates; nonscientific publications; conference materials; editorial texts; policy papers; and sources focused exclusively on legal or regulatory analysis without a theoretical focus. Preprints and non-peer-reviewed materials (e.g., arXiv) were excluded from the final corpus unless they were explicitly used in the literature solely for contextual comparison and not included in the analytical sample, thereby ensuring the consistency and reliability of the evidence base.

To enhance methodological transparency, the study applied a structured qualitative coding procedure. Each publication included in the final corpus was subjected to open coding, during which key analytical categories were identified inductively based on recurring themes in the literature. Examples of primary codes included: "misinformation/disinformation," "user trust," "algorithmic personalization," "digital advertising," "platform governance," and "information risk."

At the second stage, axial coding was conducted to group these primary codes into higher-order conceptual categories. For instance, the codes "misinformation," "fake news," and "content manipulation" were aggregated into the broader category "information threats," while "digital advertising," "targeting," and "personalization" were grouped under "advertising and communication mechanisms."

At the final stage, selective coding enabled the formation of three core analytical clusters that structure the field: (1) terminological and conceptual approaches to misinformation; (2) behavioral and communication dynamics; and (3) risk management and platform governance. The aggregation of 40 publications into these clusters was based on the dominant analytical focus of each study, with cross-cutting themes recorded as secondary attributes.

The coding procedure was conducted manually using Microsoft Excel 365, which was employed as a tool for data organization, categorization, and matrix-based comparison. Specifically, Excel was used to construct a coding matrix where rows corresponded to individual publications and columns represented analytical categories and codes, enabling systematic comparison and clustering.

The choice of qualitative thematic synthesis as the main analytical method is justified by the exploratory and integrative nature of the study. Unlike quantitative meta-analysis, which focuses on effect sizes, thematic synthesis allows for the identification of conceptual patterns, structural relationships, and theoretical gaps within a heterogeneous body of literature.

The methodological procedure can be reproduced through the following sequence of stages: (1) database search using defined Boolean queries; (2) PRISMA-based screening and selection; (3) application of inclusion/exclusion criteria; (4) open coding of selected publications; (5) axial grouping into conceptual categories; (6) formation of analytical clusters; and (7) interpretive synthesis of results.

No statistical inference or causal generalization was performed, as the study is limited to conceptual and structural analysis of the literature. This section contains no interpretation of substantive findings and serves exclusively to describe the methodological procedure.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Structural configuration of research into the information environment of social platforms

As a result of this systematic review, a final analytical corpus of 40 scientific publications indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science Core Collection databases and published between 2015 and 2025 was formed. In terms of document type, the corpus consists of research articles and review publications, reflecting a combination of empirically oriented and conceptual-generalizing approaches to the study of the information environment of social platforms. These parameters are recorded as the empirical result of the selection procedure, which characterizes the current state and boundaries of the scientific field, rather than as an element of methodological design.

Structural analysis of the corpus revealed a clear cluster organization of research along three interrelated dimensions. First, systematic reviews and narrative reviews dominate in terms of review and analytical designs, supplemented by individual survey studies and bibliometric/scientometric analyses, whereas multivocal or gray-oriented reviews have a marginal presence.

Second, in terms of central thematic focus, publications concentrate on the issues of misinformation/disinformation/fake news; research on trust; user perception and behavior; and risks, cybersecurity, and platform management. Third, in terms of the level of analysis, works focused on the micro level of the user (behavior, emotions, content distribution), the meso level of the platform (governance, policies, algorithmic practices), and the macro level of the market or public sphere (business environment, public crises, electoral processes) stand out. The generalized structural configuration of the scientific field is presented in Table 1, where the distributions are presented in terms of absolute values (n) and relative shares (%), which allows the results to be interpreted not as a description of general trends but as a record of the cluster structure of the literature corpus.

Table 1 Structural configuration of research on the information environment of social platforms.

Classification criterion	Category	n	%
Type of review design	Systematic review	14	35
	Narrative review	11	27
	Survey/state-of-the-art	7	17.5
	Bibliometric/scientometric	6	15
	Multivocal/gray-oriented	2	5
Central thematic focus	Misinformation/disinformation/fake news	16	40
	Trust and user behavior	9	22
	Risk, cybersecurity, privacy	8	20
	Governance and platform management	5	12
	Marketing, advertising, digital communication	2	5
Level of analysis	User	15	37.5
	Platform	14	35
	Market/public sphere	11	27.5

Note: The indicators are given for the final corpus of 40 publications.

The resulting structure of the analyzed corpus indicates that the field is organized around three analytical cores. The first, conceptual and terminological, includes studies focused on definitions and typologies of misinformation, disinformation, and fake news, forming a common conceptual foundation for research. The second, behavioral and communicational, comprises studies examining mechanisms of perception, trust, and dissemination of information by users of social platforms. The third, risk and management, covers studies addressing cybersecurity, privacy, and platform governance, considering the information environment as an object of management and protection. This three-core configuration is consistent with findings reported in interdisciplinary reviews, which note both the fragmentation and partial conceptual structuring of the research space (Aïmeur et al., 2023; Broda & Strömbäck, 2024; Chaudhuri et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025a, 2025b; Zainudin et al., 2024).

Moreover, the results of the analysis show that digital advertising and communication are not represented as an autonomous dominant cluster within the corpus but are distributed across the identified analytical cores. Within the analyzed studies, they appear mainly as elements of the behavioral-communication and risk-management domains. In particular, advertising is described either as an infrastructure channel for the dissemination of problematic content or as part of platform-based mechanisms related to information risk management (Clemons et al., 2025; Diaz Ruiz, 2023). This distribution suggests that advertising and communication are treated in the literature as cross-cutting elements rather than independent analytical categories.

The analyzed sources also demonstrate that the risk-management dimension constitutes a substantial part of the corpus, including studies focused on cybersecurity, privacy, and platform governance. Research on cyber resilience in digital marketing indicates that advertising and communication practices are increasingly examined in relation to information risk and system stability (Gündüzyeli, 2025). Similarly, systematic reviews of countering manipulative information, particularly in climate communication contexts, emphasize institutional and regulatory approaches, which correspond to the dominance of risk-based analytical frameworks within the sample (Herasimenka et al., 2025).

At the micro level, studies devoted to privacy concerns and social media usage identify advertising and algorithmic practices as contributing factors in the formation of user-level information risks, although these factors are not isolated as a separate research direction (Lumare et al., 2024). At the meso and macro levels, general reviews of cyber threats conceptualize the information environment as a system of interaction between technological vulnerabilities, user behavior, and platform governance (Orłowska, 2022). In addition, studies on cyberbullying extend the risk-management domain to include social and psychological threats, indicating that security issues encompass broader aspects of digital communication practices (Ray et al., 2024).

Finally, state-of-the-art reviews of social network security challenges confirm the central position of the risk-management dimension within the literature, while also noting the limited integration of advertising-related mechanisms into

this domain (Singh et al., 2025). Taken together, these findings indicate that the analyzed corpus exhibits a structurally differentiated but partially integrated configuration, in which risk-management approaches dominate, whereas advertising and communication remain distributed across multiple analytical domains.

Summarizing the results of the section, the scientific field of research on the information environment of social platforms (2015–2025) can be characterized by a cluster-based structure with three dominant analytical cores—terminological, behavioral-communicational, and risk-management. The corpus of 40 publications indexed in Scopus and Web of Science demonstrates a concentration of research within these domains, which determine the logic of problem formulation, levels of analysis, and research designs. Within this structure, digital advertising and communication function as cross-analytical elements connecting user behavior, platform mechanisms, and information risk management rather than forming an independent research cluster. This pattern is consistent with existing literature and indicates a partial integration of research domains alongside persistent thematic fragmentation.

3.2. Topics of research on digital advertising and communication on social platforms

The analysis of the final corpus (N = 40) shows that digital advertising and communication are not represented as independent analytical objects in the majority of publications. Instead, they are included within broader thematic areas such as misinformation and disinformation, trust formation, user behavior, and AI-driven marketing (Alhitmi et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2021).

Within the analyzed studies, digital advertising is most frequently identified as a secondary analytical variable associated with content distribution and the formation of information flows. In particular, advertising mechanisms are described as channels through which information, including disinformation, is disseminated, expanded, or reinforced. The coding of the corpus identified three recurrent functional roles of digital advertising across the publications: (1) as a channel of information dissemination; (2) as a factor influencing user perception and behavioral responses; and (3) as a component of platform ecosystems combining commercial, algorithmic, and communicative processes. The distribution of publications shows that advertising-related elements are most frequently associated with the behavioral-communication and risk-management clusters rather than forming a separate analytical category.

The corpus also includes studies focused on the effectiveness of advertising strategies, ethical aspects of data use, and user perception of advertising messages (Dwivedi et al., 2021; Saura et al., 2024). However, these studies do not systematically integrate advertising mechanisms into broader models of information risk or information environment protection. Bibliometric and review studies further indicate that dominant research themes in digital advertising include innovation, data analytics, and marketing strategies, while the integration of advertising practices into information security or risk management frameworks remains limited (Pahari et al., 2024). In addition, several studies in the corpus examine the relationship between advertising-related mechanisms and user behavior, including affective responses to information and motivations for content sharing (Adeeb & Mirhoseini, 2023; Cai et al., 2025). These studies are classified within the behavioral-communication cluster based on their primary analytical focus.

Other publications address issues of data security, privacy, and algorithmic governance in the context of digital advertising and communication (Alhitmi et al., 2024; Cheng & Guo, 2025). These studies are categorized within the risk-management cluster.

Overall, the results indicate that digital advertising and communication are distributed across multiple analytical domains within the corpus and are not represented as an independent research cluster. The obtained results are consistent with prior interdisciplinary studies that emphasize the fragmentation of research on digital communication and disinformation (Aïmeur et al., 2023; Broda & Strömbäck, 2024). In particular, the absence of digital advertising as an autonomous analytical cluster confirms earlier findings that marketing-related mechanisms remain conceptually under-integrated within the broader discourse on information environment protection.

Compared to leading studies in digital marketing and platform governance, the present findings suggest that advertising is predominantly treated as an auxiliary rather than a systemic component of information ecosystems (Dwivedi et al., 2021; Clemons et al., 2025). This reinforces the argument that existing theoretical models insufficiently capture the interaction between commercial incentives and information risk formation.

From a comparative perspective, similar patterns of analytical fragmentation can be observed in post-conflict and transitional economies, where information environments are shaped by overlapping institutional, economic, and technological factors. For example, studies of post-conflict societies indicate that information systems often develop under conditions of institutional instability, where communication infrastructures simultaneously serve informational, political, and economic functions.

However, the Ukrainian case demonstrates a more pronounced integration of advertising, information flows, and risk dynamics due to the combined effects of digitalization, external information influence, and wartime conditions. Unlike more stable post-conflict contexts, where institutional recovery gradually separates communication, economic, and governance functions, the Ukrainian information environment exhibits a persistent overlap of these domains.

This allows us to distinguish between universal and context-specific patterns. Universally, digital advertising functions as a mechanism of amplification and behavioral influence across different information environments. At the same time, context-specific features – such as heightened information vulnerability, external influence, and regulatory asymmetry – intensify the role of advertising in shaping information risks in Ukraine. The findings also indicate that the lack of integration between advertising studies and information risk research limits the explanatory capacity of existing theoretical frameworks. As a result, digital advertising remains analytically fragmented, which prevents the development of comprehensive models of the information environment.

3.3. The issue of information risk and the managerial dimension of information environment protection

Analysis of the final body of literature shows that the risk management segment is more structured than the other thematic segments of the sample within the systematic literature review. As an empirically recorded result of the review, in sample N = 40, a significant number of the publications use risk-based analysis logic, focusing on issues of cybersecurity, privacy, governance, and resilience. Unlike the advertising and communications block, which is characterized by thematic fragmentation, studies in this area demonstrate a higher degree of conceptual consistency in the final analytical corpus, which can be traced through the repetitiveness of analytical frameworks and the stability of the categorical apparatus (Cremer et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2025).

The structural goal of this section is to fix the concentration of research around several relatively stable analytical subgroups: (a) the cybersecurity of social networks and platform infrastructures; (b) personal data protection and privacy issues; (c) the management of disinformation risks through platform and state mechanisms; and (d) increasing the resilience of the information environment in crisis contexts. Within the final corpus, these areas form the core of the corpus and are quantitatively represented by a relatively large share of publications, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Structural distribution of information risk studies and management approaches in the final corpus (N = 40).

Analytical focus	n	%
Cybersecurity of social platforms	14	35
Privacy and personal data protection	9	22
Governance and risk management	10	25
Resilience and crisis contexts	7	17

Note: Quantitative indicators reflect the frequency of thematic representation of publications within inductively formed analytical groups and are not statistically significant in nature.

The analysis of the final corpus shows that platforms and state institutions are most frequently identified as primary actors involved in information risk management, while users are described as elements within information processes or as affected actors (Cremer et al., 2022; Herath et al., 2022; Nawaz et al., 2023). The reviewed studies demonstrate that a significant proportion of publications within this segment apply systemic, regulatory, and managerial analytical frameworks. These studies focus on cybersecurity threats, detection mechanisms, platform governance, and institutional responses (Nguyen et al., 2025).

The corpus also includes review-based studies that address disinformation risk management using multivocal or interdisciplinary perspectives, where platform-level governance and regulatory mechanisms are identified as key components of analysis (Noronha et al., 2026; Clemons et al., 2025). In addition, the analyzed publications apply risk management approaches across different contextual domains. These include studies examining disinformation in the health sector, natural disaster communication, and political processes, where information flows and platform dynamics are treated as objects of risk-related analysis (Denniss & Lindberg, 2025; Hilberts et al., 2025; Subekti et al., 2025). The corpus further includes studies focused on misinformation in global contexts such as pandemics and climate communication, which are analyzed within the framework of long-term information environment management (Surjatmodjo et al., 2024; Tomassi et al., 2025).

Overall, the results indicate that the risk management dimension constitutes a structurally consistent segment within the corpus, characterized by the use of institutional, regulatory, and systemic analytical approaches. The identified dominance of institutional and regulatory approaches in the analyzed corpus is consistent with prior research emphasizing the central role of platform governance in managing information risks (Cremer et al., 2022; Clemons et al., 2025). Unlike behavioral or communication-focused studies, the risk-management domain demonstrates a higher level of conceptual consistency, which confirms its relative theoretical maturity within the broader research field.

At the same time, the results indicate that users are predominantly conceptualized as passive elements within risk frameworks, which aligns with findings in cybersecurity and platform governance literature (Herath et al., 2022; Nawaz et al., 2023). This suggests a limited integration of user agency into risk management models, which remains an underdeveloped area in current research. From a comparative perspective, similar patterns can be observed in post-conflict and transitional economies, where information environments are shaped by strong institutional intervention and regulatory control. In such

contexts, including cases in Eastern Europe and post-crisis regions, risk management frameworks tend to prioritize system stability and institutional coordination over market-driven or user-centered approaches.

However, the Ukrainian context demonstrates a more intensive convergence of institutional, informational, and technological factors. Under conditions of ongoing conflict, information risks are amplified by external influence, infrastructural vulnerabilities, and high dependence on coordinated state and platform responses. In contrast to post-conflict economies with gradual institutional stabilization, Ukraine exhibits a persistent high-risk environment in which regulatory mechanisms play a dominant role in maintaining information system stability. This allows for the identification of both universal and context-specific patterns. Universally, risk management approaches in digital environments rely on institutional frameworks, cybersecurity mechanisms, and governance models. At the same time, context-specific features – such as geopolitical instability, external information pressure, and accelerated digitalization – intensify the role of these mechanisms in shaping the information environment in Ukraine.

Furthermore, the results reveal a persistent separation between risk-management research and studies of digital advertising and communication. While risk-oriented studies focus on institutional and regulatory mechanisms, marketing and communication research address user behavior and content dynamics without systematic integration into risk frameworks. This separation limits the explanatory capacity of existing models and highlights the need for integrative approaches that connect advertising interaction with information risk management.

3.4. Structural characteristics of the financial sector of Ukraine under wartime conditions

The financial sector of Ukraine under wartime conditions exhibits a structurally specific configuration characterized by a high degree of concentration, a pronounced dominance of the banking segment, and an the role has been strengthened of the state as a stabilizing institutional actor. While the Ukrainian financial system had already demonstrated a bank-centric structure prior to 2022, the full-scale war significantly intensified this pattern due to the contraction of non-banking financial activities and the strengthening of regulatory intervention.

At the core of the system, commercial banks perform the overwhelming majority of financial intermediation functions, including credit allocation, liquidity provision, and payment system operations. In contrast, the non-banking financial sector – including insurance companies, credit unions, and financial intermediaries – has experienced a substantial decline in activity. This contraction is driven by reduced household solvency, increased uncertainty, and limited access to long-term funding sources. As a result, the financial system has evolved toward a structurally imbalanced configuration in which banks effectively assume the role of a universal financial infrastructure for the economy.

A defining feature of the wartime financial architecture is the significant presence of state-owned banks. These institutions play a ключова роль in maintaining systemic stability by ensuring the continuity of payments, supporting public finance operations, and implementing targeted credit programs under conditions of elevated risk. However, this structure simultaneously generates concentration risks, as financial stability becomes increasingly dependent on the fiscal capacity of the state and the effectiveness of governance within state-controlled institutions.

The regulatory framework of the financial sector has undergone substantial transformation in response to wartime challenges. The National Bank of Ukraine has implemented a complex of emergency monetary and macroprudential measures aimed at preserving financial stability. These include strict currency controls, such as the temporary fixation of the exchange rate during the initial phase of the war, capital flow restrictions, and limitations on cross-border financial transactions. In parallel, the central bank introduced liquidity support mechanisms, including refinancing operations, regulatory forbearance, and temporary adjustments to capital adequacy requirements.

These interventions allowed the financial system to avoid systemic collapse and ensured the continuity of critical financial functions despite a sharp contraction in economic activity and heightened uncertainty. At the same time, they have significantly altered the operating environment of financial institutions, reducing market flexibility while increasing dependence on regulatory decisions.

From an institutional risk perspective, the Ukrainian financial sector is characterized by a set of interconnected vulnerabilities that distinguish it from more stable financial systems. First, currency risk remains structurally elevated due to exchange rate pressures and external imbalances. Second, the system demonstrates a high degree of dependence on external financial assistance, including international aid and credit support from global institutions, which directly affects liquidity and fiscal sustainability. Third, credit activity remains constrained due to increased default risks, weakened borrower capacity, and heightened uncertainty, limiting the sector's ability to support economic recovery.

In addition, geopolitical uncertainty and physical risks associated with military actions create a non-standard risk environment that cannot be adequately captured by conventional financial risk models. Unlike cyclical financial instability observed in developed markets, these risks are structural and persistent, reflecting the ongoing conditions of conflict and institutional transformation.

In comparative terms, while European financial systems demonstrate relatively stable adaptive mechanisms to external shocks, the Ukrainian financial sector operates under conditions of continuous systemic stress, where stability is achieved primarily through regulatory intervention rather than market-based adjustments. This distinction underscores the need to

analyze the Ukrainian case not as a variation of general financial dynamics but as a structurally unique model shaped by wartime constraints, institutional factors, and external dependencies.

4. Future Perspectives

The results of the present study provide several promising directions for the further development of research on the protection of the information environment in the context of social platform dominance. This systematic review demonstrated that contemporary scientific literature is characterized by fragmentation between research on misinformation, digital marketing, platform governance, and cybersecurity. Moreover, the intersection between digital advertising, communication practices, and information risk management remains insufficiently conceptualized. Consequently, future research should focus on expanding the analytical scope of this field and developing integrative theoretical approaches capable of linking these domains into a coherent framework.

5. Expansion of the Research

One of the most important directions for further research lies in expanding the empirical and theoretical coverage of the relationship between digital advertising ecosystems and the dynamics of the information environment. The present review has shown that advertising practices are most often analyzed as auxiliary mechanisms within broader studies of misinformation or user behavior rather than as an independent analytical dimension. Future studies may therefore focus on the structural role of advertising infrastructures in shaping information flows, algorithmic amplification, and the economic incentives that influence the circulation of digital content. Comparative cross-platform research could also provide a deeper understanding of how different platform architectures affect the interaction between advertising strategies and information risk.

Another promising direction involves expanding the analytical corpus to include interdisciplinary perspectives. While communication studies, marketing research, and information security literature address related issues, they often operate with different conceptual frameworks. Integrating these perspectives may contribute to the development of a unified theoretical model of the digital information environment in which advertising interaction, algorithmic governance, and information risk management are analyzed as interdependent components. The findings of the study also have potential practical implications for platform governance and the regulation of digital communication ecosystems. A better understanding of the role of advertising mechanisms in the dissemination of information can contribute to the development of more transparent advertising policies and accountability mechanisms for digital platforms. In particular, the integration of advertising transparency standards, clearer labeling of sponsored content, and improved monitoring of algorithmic amplification may help reduce the risks associated with manipulative or misleading information.

From a managerial perspective, organizations and communication professionals may also benefit from incorporating information risk considerations into digital advertising strategies. Responsible data practices, the ethical use of algorithmic targeting, and increased transparency in advertising communication may strengthen user trust and contribute to a more resilient information environment. Despite the growing attention given to the protection of the digital information environment, several challenges remain. One of the key obstacles lies in the rapid technological evolution of social platforms and advertising technologies, which often outpace the development of regulatory frameworks and academic research. As advertising ecosystems increasingly rely on algorithmic personalization and large-scale data processing, assessing their impact on information security becomes methodologically complex.

Another limitation concerns the availability and transparency of platform data. Researchers frequently face restricted access to platform algorithms, advertising targeting mechanisms, and large-scale behavioral datasets, which complicates the empirical analysis of information flows. Addressing these limitations will require closer cooperation between academic institutions, technology companies, and regulatory bodies. Future research may benefit from the application of new methodological approaches that combine qualitative and quantitative analytical techniques. For instance, computational social science methods, including network analysis, large-scale content analysis, and machine learning-based detection of information patterns, may allow researchers to identify the mechanisms through which advertising and algorithmic amplification influence information dissemination.

Moreover, mixed-method research designs that combine systematic literature reviews, experimental studies, and platform data analysis could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships between advertising interaction, user behavior, and information risk dynamics. Such methodological diversification may significantly enhance the analytical robustness of future studies. Rapid developments in artificial intelligence, algorithmic governance, and data analytics are likely to reshape the research agenda in this field. AI-driven advertising technologies increasingly rely on predictive models of user behavior and automated content optimization, which may intensify both the efficiency of digital communication and the risks associated with misinformation amplification. In parallel, advances in digital transparency tools, algorithmic auditing, and data governance frameworks may create new opportunities for monitoring and regulating advertising ecosystems. These technological developments will likely play an important role in shaping future strategies for protecting the information environment of social platforms.

Finally, addressing the complexity of the digital information environment requires stronger interdisciplinary collaboration between several scientific domains. Communication studies, digital marketing research, information security, data science, and public policy analysis each contribute essential perspectives for understanding the mechanisms that shape digital communication ecosystems. Interdisciplinary research initiatives may therefore facilitate the development of comprehensive analytical frameworks capable of integrating the technological, economic, behavioral, and governance dimensions of the information environment. Such collaboration may also support the design of more effective strategies for balancing innovation in digital communication with the need to ensure information integrity and societal trust in the digital public sphere.

6. Conclusions

In accordance with the stated aim of the study – to identify the structural configuration of the scientific field and to analyze the role of digital advertising and communication within the information environment of social platforms – the results provide several clearly defined findings. Within the framework of this study, the scientific corpus of publications devoted to the protection of the information environment of social platforms in the context of digital communication and advertising interaction was systematized and conceptually generalized. The analysis of the final corpus (N = 40, 2015–2025) demonstrates that the field is structured into three stable analytical cores: (1) terminological and conceptual approaches to misinformation and disinformation; (2) behavioral and communication-focused studies addressing user perception, trust, and information dissemination; and (3) risk-management approaches focusing on cybersecurity, privacy, and platform governance.

The first key finding is that these analytical cores are not equally integrated. The risk-management segment demonstrates a higher level of conceptual consistency and methodological convergence, whereas the behavioral-communication and advertising-related segments remain fragmented and less systematically connected.

The key scientific result of the study is the confirmation that digital advertising and communication do not function as independent theoretical clusters in the literature. The second key finding specifies that digital advertising is consistently positioned as a cross-cutting mechanism distributed across the identified analytical cores, rather than as a distinct research domain. It is operationalized in the literature in three recurring roles: (1) as a channel of information dissemination, (2) as a behavioral-influence mechanism shaping user perception and trust, and (3) as a structural component of platform ecosystems linking commercial incentives with algorithmic processes.

The third key finding is the identification of a conceptual gap between research on information risk and studies of digital marketing and communication. While risk-oriented studies emphasize institutional and regulatory mechanisms, advertising and communication research remains focused on user behavior and marketing effectiveness, with limited integration into models of information environment protection.

Taken together, these results indicate that the current scientific discourse lacks an integrative analytical framework capable of explaining the interaction between informational, economic, and algorithmic logics within social platforms.

The results are of theoretical importance since they permit the conceptualization of the field, not as separate issues (disinformation, cyber threats, advertising ethics) but as an integrated system comprising communication practices, economic incentives, and management mechanisms. Thus, the study contributes to the development of an interdisciplinary perspective by explicitly linking digital marketing and communication research with information risk and platform governance approaches.

Moreover, there are certain limitations to this study. First, the analysis considered only peer-reviewed literature indexed in Scopus and Web of Science. Second, no formalized source quality assessment was applied in the review because a broader conceptualization was needed on the basis of the assumptions of the different models. Third, thematic synthesis does not allow for causal generalizations. Fourth, the study relies on qualitative synthesis, which limits the ability to quantify the strength of relationships between identified analytical dimensions.

Future research should focus on the empirical operationalization of the identified analytical framework, particularly through the analysis of interactions between digital advertising infrastructures, user behavior, and information risk dynamics across different platform environments. In addition, comparative studies involving post-conflict and transitional economies may allow for the identification of universal and context-specific patterns in the development of information environments. Such an approach would enable the development of a unified theoretical model integrating digital advertising, communication practices, and information risk management, thereby addressing the key gaps identified in this study.

7. Declarations

7.1. Ethical considerations

Not applicable.

7.2. Use of artificial intelligence (AI)

The authors declare that no generative artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation, analysis, or writing of this manuscript.

7.3. Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

7.4. Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

References

- Adeeb, R. A., & Mirhoseini, M. (2023). The impact of affect on the perception of fake news on social media: A systematic review. *Social Sciences*, 12(12), 674. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12120674>
- Aïmeur, E., Amri, S., & Brassard, G. (2023). Fake news, disinformation and misinformation in social media: A review. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 13(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-023-01028-5>
- Alhitmi, H. K., Mardiah, A., Al-Sulaiti, K. I., & Abbas, J. (2024). Data security and privacy concerns of AI-driven marketing in the context of economics and business field: An exploration into possible solutions. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2393743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2393743>
- Altay, S., Hoes, E., & Wojcieszak, M. (2025). Following news on social media boosts knowledge, belief accuracy and trust. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 9, 1833–1842. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02205-6>
- Broda, E., & Strömbäck, J. (2024). Misinformation, disinformation, and fake news: Lessons from an interdisciplinary, systematic literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 48(2), 136–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2024.2323736>
- Cai, Y., Kamarudin, S., & Nujaimi, S. (2025). Willingness to share information on social media: A systematic literature review (2020–2024). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1567506. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1567506>
- Chaudhuri, N., Gupta, G., Bagherzadeh, M., Daim, T., & Yalcin, H. (2024). Misinformation on social platforms: A review and research agenda. *Technology in Society*, 78, 102654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102654>
- Cheng, L., & Guo, Y. (2025). Privacy protection on social media platforms: Overdisclosure of online behavioral data is labeling users. *International Journal of Digital Law and Governance*, 2(1), 107–133. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijdlg-2025-0001>
- Clemons, E. K., Schreieck, M., & Waran, R. V. (2025). Managing disinformation on social media platforms. *Electronic Markets*, 35, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-025-00796-6>
- Cremer, F., Sheehan, B., Fortmann, M., Kia, A. N., Mullins, M., Murphy, F., & Materne, S. (2022). Cyber risk and cybersecurity: A systematic review of data availability. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance – Issues and Practice*, 47(3), 698–736. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41288-022-00266-6>
- Denniss, E., & Lindberg, R. (2025). Social media and the spread of misinformation: Infectious and a threat to public health. *Health Promotion International*, 40(2), daaf023. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daaf023>
- Diaz Ruiz, C. (2023). Disinformation on digital media platforms: A market-shaping approach. *New Media & Society*, 27(4), 2188–2211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231207644>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., Jain, V., Karjaluoto, H., Kefi, H., Krishen, A. S., Kumar, V., Rahman, M. M., Raman, R., Rauschnabel, P. A., Rowley, J., Salo, J., Tran, G. A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168>
- Gündüzyeli, B. (2025). Cyber resilience in digital marketing within the framework of sustainable management. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 2080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052080>
- Herasimenka, A., Wang, X., & Schroeder, R. (2025). A systematic review of effective measures to resist manipulative information about climate change on social media. *Climate*, 13(2), 32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli13020032>
- Herath, T. B. G., Khanna, P., & Ahmed, M. (2022). Cybersecurity practices for social media users: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cybersecurity and Privacy*, 2(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcp2010001>
- Hilberts, S., Govers, M., Petelos, E., & Evers, S. (2025). The impact of misinformation on social media in the context of natural disasters: Narrative review. *JMIR Infodemiology*, 5, e70413. <https://doi.org/10.2196/70413>
- Khomik, M., Bielikova, N. O., Indyka, S. Y., & Kovalchuk, O. M. (2022). The use of Microsoft Teams platform to train students with disabilities. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 87(1), 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v87i1.4212>
- Lumare, N., Muradyan, L., & Jansberg, C. (2024). Behind the screen: The relationship between privacy concerns and social media usage. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2024.2424922>
- Malykowska, L., Sternichuk, V., Petruk, V., Honchar, K., Knysh, T., Panchenko, V., & Yanovets, A. (2024). Contemporary English media discourse: Linguistic, pragmatic, social and digital aspects. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 14(1), 151–156. <https://doi.org/10.33543/140139151156>
- Nawaz, N. A., Ishaq, K., Farooq, U., Khalil, A., Rasheed, S., Abid, A., & Rosdi, F. (2023). A comprehensive review of security threats and solutions for the online social networks industry. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 9, e1143. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1143>
- Nguyen, N. T., Shamout, M. D., Nguyen, T. M., Pham, Q. T., & Almazroi, A. A. (2025). A survey of social cybersecurity: Techniques for attack detection, evaluations, challenges, and future prospects. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 18, 100668. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2025.100668>
- Noronha, E., Varela da Costa, J., & Mira da Silva, M. (2026). A multivocal grey literature review on fake news and risk management. *Discover Computing*, 29, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09902-w>
- Orłowska, A. (2022). Cybersecurity and cyberthreats in social media. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 10(6), 45–48. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2022.1067>
- Pahari, S., Bandyopadhyay, A., Kumar, V. V. M., & Pingle, S. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of digital advertising in social media: The state of the art and future research agenda. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2383794. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2383794>
- Ray, G., McDermott, C. D., & Nicho, M. (2024). Cyberbullying on social media: Definitions, prevalence, and impact challenges. *Journal of Cybersecurity*, 10(1), tyae026. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cybsec/tyae026>



- Saura, J. R., Škare, V., & Ozretic Dosen, D. (2024). Is AI-based digital marketing ethical? Assessing a new data privacy paradox. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 9(4), 100597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100597>
- Singh, V. V., Gupta, B. K., Verma, S. B., Singh, V., & Singh, R. (2025). Social network security and cybersecurity: A state-of-the-art survey of challenges and emerging threats. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 11(24s), 3684–3694. <https://doi.org/10.64252/6mcmfh56>
- Subekti, D., Yusuf, M., Saadah, M., & Wahid, M. (2025). Social media and disinformation for candidates: The evidence in the 2024 Indonesian presidential election. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1625535. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1625535>
- Surjatmodjo, D., Unde, A. A., Cangara, H., & Sonni, A. F. (2024). Information pandemic: A critical review of disinformation spread on social media and its implications for state resilience. *Social Sciences*, 13(8), 418. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13080418>
- Tomassi, A., Falegnami, A., & Romano, E. (2025). Disinformation in the digital age: Climate change, media dynamics, and strategies for resilience. *Publications*, 13(2), 24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications13020024>
- Wang, J., Zhai, Y., & Shahzad, F. (2025a). Mapping the terrain of social media misinformation: A scientometric exploration of global research. *Acta Psychologica*, 252, 104691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104691>
- Wang, X., Xie, F., Gu, P., Shi, D., & Gu, K. (2025b). Evaluating privacy policy compliance through user perception: A case study of Chinese social media applications. *Data Science and Informetrics*, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsım.2025.05.003>
- Xu, G., Qian, M., & Meng, L. (2025). Misinformation dissemination on social media: Key research themes and evolutionary paths between 2013 and 2023. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1775. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06067-1>
- Yatsyshyn, M., Yatsyshyn, N., Koliada, E., Kondruk, A., Bondarchuk, O., Suprun, M., Semeniuk, A., & Melnychuk, O. (2022). The use of blended learning interactive technologies in the educational process in the context of European integration processes in Ukraine on the example of humanitarian specialties. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 12(2), 137–140.
- Zainudin, J., Mohamad Ali, N., Smeaton, A. F., & Ijab, M. T. (2024). Intervention strategies for misinformation sharing on social media: A bibliometric analysis. *arXiv Preprint*, arXiv:2409.17637. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.17637>