Social Science Chronicle

OPEN ACCESS

Peer-Reviewed, International, Academic Research Journal

ISSN : 3048-6297

Citation
Marchand, É., Durand, T., & Dubois, M. (2025). Surveillance Capitalism, Consumer Subjectivity and Marketing in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 5, Issue - 1, pp. 1-18.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)
https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2025.001

Received - September 25, 2024
Accepted - February 21, 2025
Published - February 28, 2025

Web-Link
All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2025-001

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Surveillance Capitalism, Consumer Subjectivity and Marketing in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Élodie Marchand[1], Théo Durand[2] and Maëlle Dubois[3]*

[1] Université de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France.
[2] Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France.
[3] Université de Bordeaux, Nouvelle-Aquitaine, France.

** Corresponding Author*

Abstract
This paper interrogates the transformative implications of artificial intelligence (AI) on contemporary marketing, situating it within broader ethical, epistemic, civic, and socio-political frameworks. Departing from reductive accounts that celebrate efficiency and personalization, the paper adopts an interdisciplinary lens, drawing from philosophy, sociology, data science, political economy, and legal theory, to examine how AI reconfigures the ontology of consumer subjectivity, reshapes attention economies, and challenges foundational assumptions about autonomy, agency, and fairness. Central to this transformation is the rise of algorithmic persuasion, i.e., AI systems now operationalize behavioral engineering at scale, exploiting cognitive biases and affective cues to micro-target individuals with hyper-personalized content. This recalibration of influence is structurally embedded in the political economy of surveillance capitalism, wherein personal data is commodified, consent is obfuscated, and algorithmic logics remain opaque. The review highlights pressing concerns around algorithmic bias, the erosion of informed consent, attention commodification, the use of generative AI in brand construction, and the weaponization of marketing infrastructures for political microtargeting and misinformation. It also explores the evolving skillsets, ethical responsibilities, and pedagogical imperatives required of marketing professionals operating within this complex landscape. Rather than advocating for technological optimism or moral panic, the paper argues for a human-centric marketing paradigm rooted in algorithmic accountability, inclusive design, and critical AI literacy. In doing so, it calls for coordinated efforts across disciplines, institutions, and regulatory frameworks to ensure that marketing in the age of AI serves democratic values, protects individual autonomy, and nurtures epistemic justice. Ultimately, the review positions marketing not merely as a commercial enterprise but as a civic practice, i.e., one that must be governed with the same ethical rigor and public responsibility demanded of other powerful socio-technical systems.

Keywords
Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Persuasion, Surveillance Capitalism, Behavioral Engineering, Consumer Autonomy, Algorithmic Bias, Attention Economy, Marketing Ethics, Generative AI.

1. Introduction

In the age of artificial intelligence (AI), the practice of marketing is undergoing a profound transformation that transcends technological upgrades to raise fundamental ethical, social, and political questions. Traditional mass-media advertising, characterized by one-way, monologic messaging to broad demographics, has rapidly given way to hyper-personalized, algorithmically mediated strategies. Where once consumers were treated as passive recipients of homogenous campaigns calibrated to generalized profiles, contemporary marketing now leverages AI-driven analytics to target individuals in real time.

Powerful machine learning (ML) models parse continuous streams of behavioral data (click patterns, location traces, purchase histories, biometriccues) to dynamically tailor content and offers at the granular level. The result is an unprecedented *shift from mass-mediated broadcast models to "hyper-individualized algorithmic persuasion"*, as marketers deploy AI not only to *predict* consumer intent but to actively *shape preferences and decisions before they are consciously formed*.

This new paradigm of algorithmic persuasion is buttressed by generative AI technologies capable of autonomously producing marketing content at scale. State-of-the-art recommender systems and large language models (LLMs) can craft advertisements, personalized messages, and even synthetic influencers with minimal human input (Agu et al., 2024; Balaji, 2024; Chowdhury & Oredo, 2023; George et al., 2023). AI tools like OpenAI's GPT or image generators can churn out an infinite variety of promotional narratives, visuals, and chatbot interactions optimized for engagement metrics. Marketing communications thus increasingly emerge from *socio-technical infrastructures* rather than human creativity alone - pipelines in which *data extraction, algorithmic modeling, and content generation are tightly interwoven*. These AI-driven infrastructures are highly adaptive, continuously learning from feedback (click-through rates, conversion data, dwell time) to refine their persuasive efficacy. In essence, marketing is becoming a *computationally mediated process of behavioral modulation*, where algorithms orchestrate what each consumer sees and experiences in order to influence their choices.

Crucially, these developments blur once-stable boundaries between domains that were traditionally distinct: *communication and computation, creativity and automation, choice and compulsion*. AI-driven marketing challenges the very ontology of consumer autonomy and agency (Rahman et al., 2024; Rosário & Dias, 2023; Selesi-Aina et al., 2024; Zlateva et al., 2024). The *consumer*, long idealized in marketing theory as a rational decision-maker - is now increasingly reframed as *a subject of continuous algorithmic experimentation*. Every scroll, click, and "like" becomes fodder for machine-learning models that probe cognitive and affective patterns, testing what triggers will yield the desired response. Through micro-targeting and personalized content delivery, marketing systems leverage well-known cognitive biases and psychological heuristics, from confirmation bias to scarcity cues - in order to tune their appeals to our vulnerabilities. *Personalization thus becomes a conduit for manipulation:* AI can infer not only what a user is likely to want, but also *when* and *how* to present it to maximize the probability of compliance or purchase. What was once sold as the benign quest for relevance in advertising is now "haunted by the specter of coercion".

The implications of this transformation extend far beyond higher click-through rates or marketing ROI. As this review will explore, *marketing in the age of AI is entwined with pressing debates across multiple disciplines*. From an *ethical* perspective, the rise of algorithmic persuasion forces us to confront questions of manipulation, autonomy, and the erosion of informed consent. In the realm of *law and policy*, AI-driven advertising and customer analytics raise issues of privacy, consumer protection, and regulatory oversight, fueling new frameworks around data governance and algorithmic accountability (Hicham, 2023; Kumar, D., 2024; Hermann, 2022; Li, 2024). *Education* and professional training for marketers must evolve to include AI ethics and critical data literacy, ensuring practitioners can navigate these powerful tools responsibly. *Philosophers* and social theorists, meanwhile, interrogate how AI alters the very notion of the consumer, reconfiguring human subjectivity and decision-making in the marketplace. *Sociologists* observe shifts in cultural norms, identity formation, and social influence as personalized marketing blurs into social media and everyday life. *Political economists* analyze how today's marketing systems exemplify surveillance capitalism and data commodification on a global scale, concentrating power in tech platforms. And *data scientists* grapple with the technical challenges of building fair, transparent algorithms in systems optimized for persuasion.

This narrative review synthesizes these interdisciplinary perspectives to provide a comprehensive analysis of "marketing in the age of AI." Rather than a mere summary of extant literature, it offers critical commentary and fresh insights into current debates, from *algorithmic persuasion and personalization to surveillance capitalism, behavioral engineering, algorithmic justice, data commodification, and marketing ethics*. We examine how AI reconfigures the ontology of consumer subjectivity, reshapes attention economies, and disrupts traditional modes of brand creation and professional practice in marketing. Moreover, we consider AI-powered marketing technologies (recommender systems, generative models, chatbots, etc.) as *socio-technical infrastructures* that carry profound epistemic, civic, and political implications. Ultimately, the review argues that marketing's AI revolution demands not just technical innovation but also *critical socio-political interrogation*. As one scholar aptly asks, in reengineering marketing for predictive precision and persuasive automation, "at what cost to human autonomy, collective deliberation, and the fragile architecture of informed consent?". In the sections that follow, we dive into these questions, beginning with the advent of algorithmic persuasion and its ramifications.

2. Mass Marketing and Algorithmic Persuasion

AI has fundamentally upended the 20th-century marketing playbook. *Mass marketing*, which dominated the last century, operated on broadcast principles: a single message (a TV commercial, print ad, or billboard) was disseminated to millions, with minimal personalization. Audiences were segmented only coarsely (by broad demographics or media channels), and campaigns unfolded on fixed schedules (Saheb et al., 2022; Sedkaoui & Benaichouba, 2024; Thirumagal et al., 2024; Yadav, S. J., 2024). Feedback from consumers was delayed and limited, making it difficult to adjust messages in flight. In stark contrast, *algorithmic marketing* in the digital era is agile, continuous, and fine-grained. Machine learning algorithms ingest torrents of real-time data from online interactions and sensors, enabling what one might call a *"perpetual beta" marketing strategy* where content and targeting are constantly optimized. Platforms like Google, Facebook,

Amazon, and TikTok - which double as advertising intermediaries - have built vertically integrated AI ad ecosystems that surveil user behavior and instantaneously adjust which ads or products are shown. Marketing communications have thus become *iterative and reactive*, tuned on the fly to user responses (clicks, swipes, time spent) in a closed feedback loop of optimization.

At the core of this new paradigm is the idea of *personalized persuasion at scale*. AI enables marketers to craft messages that match not only an individual's demographics or purchase history, but their inferred personality traits, emotions, and momentary needs. Recent empirical research demonstrates the power of this approach. In a 2024 study published in *Scientific Reports*, Matz et al. showed that *personalized messages generated by ChatGPT (an LLM) were significantly more persuasive than non-personalized messages*, across domains ranging from consumer product marketing to political appeals. By prompting the AI to tailor content to a target's psychological profile (e.g. their Big Five personality traits or moral values), the researchers achieved higher influence on attitudes and intentions than generic messaging. Critically, this was accomplished with very limited input about recipients, demonstrating how generative AI can automate and *mass-produce bespoke persuasion* that humans previously had to craft laboriously. Personalized persuasion, long considered one of the most effective messaging strategies in theory, is now operational at global scale thanks to AI's capacity to process "digital footprints" and generate tailored content in seconds.

The implications are double-edged. On one hand, advocates note that personalization can improve consumer *relevance and satisfaction*, showing people products or content they truly care about, and even encouraging beneficial behaviors. Indeed, AI-driven personalization is being deployed in prosocial campaigns (for health, financial literacy, environmental action) to boost engagement by matching messages to people's values. On the other hand, scholars and policymakers are increasingly wary of the *"pernicious" effects* of scalable personalized persuasion. *Matching the message to the mind makes it easier to manipulate*. The same techniques that can promote a healthy lifestyle or civic engagement can just as readily be used to spread disinformation, *manipulate political preferences*, or nudge consumers toward harmful choices. For example, an AI that knows a user's fears and biases could craft a highly convincing fake news story or an exploitative advertisement for a predatory financial product.

The *efficiency and potency of AI-driven targeting* thus raise alarm: as one analysis warned, AI-enabled personalized persuasion may represent an "inflection point" where the influence industry gains unprecedented power, unless checked by new regulations. In short, *the ability to personalize at scale, to micro-target every individual with a customized, psychology-based appeal, is revolutionizing marketing*. But this revolution, while it promises greater marketing effectiveness, also *intensifies concerns about consumer manipulation and societal harm*. We next examine the political-economic underpinnings of this new marketing order, often described as *surveillance capitalism*, and how data has become the lifeblood of AI-driven persuasion.

3. Surveillance Capitalism and Data Commodification

The rise of AI marketing is inseparable from the rise of what Shoshana Zuboff calls *surveillance capitalism*, an economic logic built on the extraction and monetization of personal data. In Zuboff's formulation, private human experience is unilaterally claimed as "free raw material" for translation into behavioral data, which are then analyzed and packaged as *prediction products* sold in *behavioral futures markets*. In simpler terms: the clicks, searches, GPS locations, and social media posts of everyday life are captured (often without users' clear consent or awareness) and turned into probabilistic guesses about what we will do, want, or buy next (Akter et al., 2022; Bashang & Puttanna, 2023; Gao et al., 2023). These predictions are then sold to the highest bidder, typically advertisers, who seek to influence our future behavior. The tech giants at the forefront of AI marketing perfected this model. Google, for instance, learned early on that the "data exhaust" from users (search queries, browsing habits) contained surplus insights beyond what was needed to run its services. By harvesting this surplus data and analyzing it to predict user clicks and interests, Google could target ads with uncanny accuracy, inaugurating a new era of *data-driven advertising* where *user attention and intent are the commodities*.

This surveillance capitalist model has since *spread across virtually every sector and platform*, making it nearly impossible to "opt out" of data collection in modern society. Social media networks, e-commerce sites, smartphone apps, smart devices in our homes and cities, all are equipped with sensors and trackers siphoning up behavioral data that feed into marketing algorithms. Financial analysts now describe personal data as "more valuable than oil" in the digital economy, precisely because it fuels these powerful influence mechanisms. A defining feature of this system is its *opacity and asymmetry*: data are collected largely behind the scenes, aggregated and analyzed in proprietary AI models to which the public has no access. Users are typically unaware of the full extent of tracking (the "one-way mirror" problem), and they cannot see or contest the algorithmic inferences made about them. *Every online action becomes a measurable input*, and those inputs are leveraged to not only predict behavior but increasingly to shape it, steering users toward outcomes that benefit the platforms' and advertisers' objectives. As Zuboff and others have argued, this constitutes a new form of power, an *"instrumentarian" power that works through persuasion and modification of behavior, rather than outright coercion*.

From a *political economy* perspective, AI-driven marketing is a central pillar of surveillance capitalism, exemplifying how personal data are turned into profits. The *commodification of data* is now embedded in the business models of companies like Meta (Facebook), Alphabet (Google/YouTube), Amazon, and ByteDance (TikTok). These corporations have constructed sprawling advertising ecosystems where they gather enormous volumes of user data within their walled gardens and employ AI to monetize it via targeted ads. Notably, the control of such data confers competitive advantage and market power, leading to concerns about monopoly or oligopoly in the attention markets. A handful of companies act as *arbiters of the algorithmic logics* that determine who sees what, when.

They operate largely without transparent oversight, guided by profit motives that favor engagement and ad revenue. This concentration of data and AI capability raises the stakes of ethical lapses: biases or manipulative practices in one of these dominant platforms can affect billions of people. It also complicates regulation, since traditional market checks (like competition) are weak in the face of network effects and data moats.

The *ethical issues* inherent in this data regime are manifold. *Privacy* is an obvious concern: surveillance marketing often entails extensive profiling that can intrude on intimate aspects of life (health status, political leanings, sexual orientation) without individuals' meaningful consent. Even when consent is nominally obtained (via long privacy policies), it can hardly be considered "informed" given the complexity of AI systems - hence the "fragile architecture of informed consent" problem. Furthermore, *consumers lose agency over how they are represented* in data (Rawas, 2024; Rezaei et al., 2024; Samara et al., 2024). The algorithmic profiles and segments that AI systems create (e.g., "likely expecting mother," "sports enthusiast prone to impulse buys") are reductive and serve the marketer's interest, not necessarily the individual's self-image or welfare. This asymmetry can be exploitative: companies wield superior knowledge about individuals, which can be used to sway their behavior in ways those individuals might not endorse if they were fully aware (for example, enticing a vulnerable consumer to spend more when they're emotionally down). In Zuboff's words, the process "undermines autonomy" and even *erodes democracy* if unchecked, because it subverts the basic premise of individuals freely making choices.

It is important to note that regulators and civil society have not been entirely passive in response to surveillance capitalism. Data protection laws like the EU's *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)* and California's *Consumer Privacy Act* seek to give users more control over personal data and impose duties on companies regarding data usage. Yet, these laws have inherent limitations when faced with the subtlety of AI-driven inference, much of the persuasive targeting occurs not through outright sale of personal data, but through allowing algorithms to act on data internally to deliver ads (Ikulabo, 2024; Islam, 2024; Gonçalves, 2023). New regulatory proposals attempt to go further. For instance, in the United States, an *"Algorithmic Justice and Online Platform Transparency Act"* was introduced in 2023 to mandate audits of high-risk automated decision systems used in advertising and marketing.

In the EU, a landmark *Digital Services Act (DSA)* now requires large platforms to be transparent about their recommender systems and allows users to opt out of personalized recommendation feeds. Furthermore, a 2024 EU regulation on the *transparency and targeting of political advertising* will enforce strict disclosure of microtargeting criteria and limit the use of sensitive personal data in political ads. These steps signal a growing recognition that *unfettered surveillance-based marketing poses risks to society* and must be reined in through law and accountability mechanisms. Nevertheless, the enforcement of such regulations and their ability to keep up with fast-evolving AI techniques remain open questions. In the meantime, AI-driven marketing engines continue to hum in the background of our daily digital interactions, raising urgent ethical considerations about how they influence human behavior - the topic to which we now turn.

4. Personalization, Behavioral Engineering, and Consumer Autonomy

One of the most disconcerting aspects of AI-mediated marketing is how it can cross the line from persuasion into *behavioral engineering*. By leveraging insights from psychology at an immense scale, AI systems can be designed to systematically *nudge, coax, and condition consumer behavior*, often without the consumer's conscious realization. This capability forces us to revisit longstanding ethical questions in marketing: at what point does *persuasion become manipulation*, and how do we safeguard consumer autonomy under conditions of pervasive algorithmic influence? AI-driven personalization by its very nature blurs the boundary between merely "giving people what they want" and *shaping people to want what they get*. Classic marketing was already familiar with techniques of influence (scarcity appeals, social proof, targeted emotional appeals), but AI turbocharges these by personalizing them and timing them optimally. As discussed, personalization in an AI context means delivering precisely tailored content (an ad, a recommendation, a notification) at the moment it is predicted to have maximal effect on an individual's behavior. Internally, industry practitioners may frame this as enhancing user experience or satisfaction.

Yet from an external ethical perspective, it represents a potential *assault on individual agency*. Consumers, once seen as deliberative agents, are now treated as *"sites of algorithmic experimentation"* where personalization is explicitly used as a tool *"for maximal behavioral compliance."* Rather than engaging consumers as sovereign choosers, the system *tests and exploits their cognitive biases*, like showing a time-limited discount to trigger a fear-of-missing-out (scarcity bias) or using social comparison info ("X friends bought this") to trigger conformity (Samara et al., 2024; Sharma et al., 2023; Varsha, 2023). The end-goal is not empowering consumer choice, but *orchestrating choices* in the marketer's favor.

From a philosophical standpoint, such practices raise red flags. Immanuel Kant's moral philosophy, for instance, would object to treating humans as mere means to an end. When AI platforms "reduce persons to objects of optimization" for ad clicks or sales, they arguably *transgress Kantian imperatives* that insist on respecting individuals as ends in themselves. The language of "behavioral compliance" is telling, it implies the consumer's role is to comply with prompts set by the system, a clear diminution of autonomy. Even less deontologically strict frameworks like liberalism value the capacity of individuals to reflect and decide according to their own values; that capacity is undermined if choices are largely being pre-structured by algorithms exploiting subconscious levers. Defenders might argue that all advertising aims to influence behavior, and that consumers still ultimately have a choice to say "no." But what distinguishes AI-driven behavioral engineering is its *granularity, personalization, and persistence.* It

operates by *colonizing the decision environment* of each person, their feeds, their notifications, their search results, in a way that can be continuous and largely invisible. Psychological research shows that if you can control the choice architecture around someone, you can significantly direct their decisions without removing their feeling of control. AI marketing perfects this kind of choice architecture manipulation. Systems engage in what one scholar calls *"anticipatory governance" of consumer preferences*: instead of waiting for you to express a want, the AI anticipates and influences your wants. The individual may feel they are acting on their own desires, but those desires have been carefully stage-managed (Adeniran et al., 2024; Al-kfairy et al., 2024; Badmus et al., 2024). In effect, *the ideal of relevance in marketing becomes haunted by coercion*, because the helpful matching of products to interests is inseparable from the subtle coercion of shaping interests to match products.

Empirical evidence of this creeping manipulation is emerging. A striking example is the deployment of *emotionally intelligent chatbots and ad algorithms that exploit moments of vulnerability*. Imagine a scenario: an AI system notices a user scrolling late at night, lingering on content related to loneliness or heartbreak. A human marketer might show empathy; an AI sees an opportunity. It could swiftly serve a personalized advertisement for, say, a premium dating app or a "mood boosting" e-commerce deal, calibrated to resonate with the user's emotional state. Such tactics have already been observed. AI models can detect affective states from behavior, and there are documented cases of systems targeting ads for expensive luxury goods or addictive services at moments when users are sad or anxious - times when their impulse control might be lower. Researchers note that *predictive algorithms can weaponize affective states (loneliness, fear, anxiety) as "vectors for commercial conversion."* For instance, an *emotionally responsive chatbot* used in a shopping app could detect a tone of frustration and respond with a limited-time offer, knowing the user is more likely to make an impulsive purchase while seeking a mood lift. By *collapsing the boundary between persuasion and coercion* in these ways, AI systems pose ethical challenges that go beyond those of traditional marketing. The very notion of a freely sovereign consumer choice starts to erode when persuasion is individually and opaquely optimized to hit us at our weakest spots.

Psychologists and ethicists sometimes describe this as the problem of *"illusory autonomy"*. From the user's subjective standpoint, they feel they are choosing freely ("I decided to buy this product"). But unbeknownst to them, their choice was heavily orchestrated: the product was surfaced at exactly the right moment, in exactly the right framing, after a series of prior micro-influences. The user is free to choose, but *the choice was framed so meticulously that it is a guided freedom - a simulated freedom*. AI marketing often preserves only *"the illusion of free will" for the consumer*. This presents a profound moral tension. Under a utilitarian lens, one might argue that if the consumer ends up satisfied (they enjoy the product, and the transaction efficiency was improved), perhaps the means are justified. However, the counterargument is that such satisfaction can be hollow or ephemeral if achieved by bypassing rational deliberation. Moreover, even if outcomes are "pleasant" in the short term, the practice of conditioning consumer behavior at scale threatens the longer-term capacity of individuals to act as autonomous citizens, not just consumers.

There is a growing chorus of concern that theseAI-enabled marketing tactics amount to a form of systematic behavioral *control*, even if non-coercive on the surface. Scholars have likened aspects of personalized advertising to "digital nudging" on steroids - whereas classic nudges (à la Thaler and Sunstein) aimed to gently steer choices for the person's own good (e.g., placing healthy food at eye level), here the nudging is done by corporate algorithms aiming to maximize profit, not necessarily the individual's welfare. More bluntly, some critics use the term *"behavioral engineering"*. The AI-driven marketing is no longer a neutral facilitator of consumer choice but rather *"a potent instrument of behavioral engineering" with sweeping implications for individual autonomy and civic life.* From an *ethical standpoint*, addressing this challenge requires revitalizing concepts like informed consent and autonomy for the digital age. How can consumers be truly "informed" when facing adaptive AI systems? Some argue for greater *transparency* - e.g., requiring that AI-mediated ads carry labels indicating when an AI has personalized or micro-targeted the content, so users are at least aware of the influence attempt (Ray, 2023; Schweitzer, 2024; Stahl et al., 2023; Umamaheswari, 2024).

Others suggest giving users more direct *agency over algorithms*, such as the ability to adjust or opt-out of certain types of personalization (the way one might adjust privacy settings). More radically, a few ethicists propose treating certain manipulative practices as unacceptable outright - for instance, it could be deemed unethical (or illegal) to knowingly target a person's addiction or psychological vulnerability (as with gambling ads targeted to known gambling addicts, or payday loan ads flood-targeted to those in financial distress). There is also a push to incorporate ethical guardrails into design: AI systems could be trained with constraints that prioritize user well-being metrics over pure engagement or conversion metrics. This ties into the broader movement of "*ethical AI*" in industry.

Finally, it's worth noting that *respect for autonomy is not just a high-minded principle; it has practical ramifications for trust and long-term brand relationships*. Consumers are increasingly aware of manipulative design (terms like "dark patterns" and "algorithmic manipulation" have entered public discourse). Brands that are perceived to exploit their customers' weaknesses risk backlash and reputational damage. Thus, even from a business perspective, it may be wise to avoid the most egregious forms of behavioral engineering and instead champion more transparent, consumer-centric personalization. Achieving that, however, likely requires a combination of enlightened corporate ethos, pressure from watchdogs, and possibly regulation - a theme we will revisit. In summary, AI-powered personalization has proven remarkably effective at influencing consumer behavior - so effective that it challenges our frameworks for consent and autonomy. Marketing strategies are veering into territory that starts to resemble a controlled experiment on the public, leveraging psychology and data in ways that test the boundaries of manipulation. Ensuring that

marketing remains within ethical bounds will necessitate conscious efforts to design and deploy AI with respect for the individual's ability to self-determine. Next, we examine another facet of this ethical landscape: the issue of *algorithmic bias and justice*, which asks whether AI-driven marketing treats all consumers fairly or perpetuates societal inequalities.

5. Algorithmic Bias and Justice in Marketing

AI systems are only as fair as the data and objectives we build into them. In the context of marketing, this means that the algorithms deciding who sees which advertisement or gets which offer can inadvertently (or sometimes deliberately) reflect and reinforce social biases. Concerns about *algorithmic bias* and calls for *algorithmic justice* have thus come to the fore as marketing operations become more automated. We define algorithmic bias, broadly, as systematic error or skew in an AI system's outcomes that produces unfair or discriminatory results - for example, excluding or adversely impacting certain groups (often historically disadvantaged groups) in a way that is not justifiable. In marketing, biases can creep in at multiple stages: in the training data (e.g., biased customer data), in the model design and optimization choices, and in the deployment context. Research shows that these biases are not hypothetical - they are *already manifesting in digital marketing platforms*, with real consequences. For instance, a well-documented case involved Facebook's advertising platform (now Meta): investigative journalists and researchers found that Facebook's algorithm for ad delivery was skewing the distribution of job and housing ads along gender and racial lines, even when advertisers did not intend to target by those attributes (Kopalle, 2022; Kumar, V., 2024; Khan, 2024; Kumar, R., 2024).

Ads for high-paying jobs in tech were shown far more to men than women; housing ads in certain neighborhoods were shown preferentially to white users over minority users. This occurred because the platform's machine learning system learned from prior engagement patterns that mirrored societal biases (perhaps more men clicked on tech job ads historically, etc.), and optimizing for engagement led to a self-fulfilling prophecy of biased delivery. The result was a kind of *"digital redlining"* - a recurrence of discrimination in a new, algorithmic form. This prompted legal and regulatory scrutiny (including a charge by U.S. civil rights agencies), and Facebook had to adjust its algorithms and allow advertisers to opt out of algorithmic optimization for housing, employment, and credit ads to settle claims of discrimination. The fact that *bias could "escape public awareness and regulatory response" for years, hidden behind the complexity of algorithms, underscores the challenge*: bias in AI marketing is often invisible until someone intentionally audits or experiences its harms.

The sources of algorithmic bias in marketing AI are multifaceted. At the data level, marketing algorithms learn from "digital traces of everyday life" that reflect existing social hierarchies and inequalities. For example, if minority communities have less purchasing power due to systemic inequality, a machine learning model might "learn" to allocate premium offers away from those communities (deeming them not worth targeting), thereby reinforcing a cycle of exclusion. Data can encode subtle biases too: images used in training a fashion AI might underrepresent certain body types or skin tones, leading to a recommender system that less frequently shows products to people who don't fit the 'ideal' customer profile the data implies. Bias also arises in feature selection and model objectives: if a marketing algorithm is optimized purely for engagement or conversion, it might exploit whatever correlations exist in data, including those that coincide with sensitive attributes (Mbah, 2024; Mutashar, 2024; Oguntibeju, 2024; Qwaider et al., 2024). For instance, maybe it finds that users in certain zip codes (a proxy for ethnicity or income) are more profitable, so it allocates resources accordingly - effectively disfavoring other zip codes and amplifying geographic inequality. These design choices, often made without ethical oversight, end up *"embedding normative assumptions"* about whose attention is valuable and whose is not. As researchers have noted, the values of profitability, speed, and personalization tend to be prioritized by default, while fairness or inclusivity are not built into the objective functions unless explicitly added.

Then there is *contextual bias* at deployment: how an algorithm interacts with the complex real-world environment can create new skew. An ad recommendation system might, for example, learn to *favor majority tastes and suppress niche or minority content*, simply because the majority generates more data and feedback loops reinforce their preferences. This can lead to what some call a *"homogenization of consumer experience,"* where minority cultures or smaller brands get algorithmically eclipsed, reducing diversity in marketplaces. If, say, a music streaming service's algorithm recommends popular artists more often than equally good but lesser-known artists, it might crowd out the latter - a bias in favor of incumbency and popularity. Such biases can have a self-perpetuating effect (popular items get more exposure, thus more popular, etc.), which raises barriers for new entrants or marginal voices. In the social sphere, this can translate to underrepresentation of, for instance, businesses owned by marginalized groups in search results or ad slots, unless corrected.

The key point is that *algorithms are not neutral* arbiters of demand; they are active participants in shaping markets and culture. They operate within "ideological regimes," reflecting the blind spots and biases of their creators and the data they consume. This falsifies the common myth that because AI involves math and code, it must be objective. Algorithms are *"socio-cultural artifacts"* - products of human design decisions and historical data - and thus carry all the baggage that entails. Recognizing this is the first step toward what many call *algorithmic justice*, which seeks to ensure automated systems treat people fairly, avoid discrimination, and promote equity. So, how can we pursue algorithmic justice in marketing? One avenue is technical: improving the *fairness of AI models*. There is a burgeoning field of research on algorithmic fairness that has developed techniques to detect and mitigate bias - for example, re-weighting training data to be more representative, adding fairness constraints to optimization (so the model doesn't sacrifice fairness for a tiny gain in accuracy), or post-processing outputs to equalize impacts across groups. In marketing, some academics have proposed "fair targeting"

algorithms or bias-aware recommendation systems (Allil, 2024; Boppiniti, 2023; Ford et al., 2023; Akter et al., 2023). For example, a fair ad allocation might ensure that a job ad is shown to a demographically diverse audience, not just the group the algorithm thinks most likely to click, in order to broaden opportunity (this dovetails with legal requirements in many jurisdictions).

True algorithmic justice often demands *ethical and institutional interventions*, not just code tweaks. This means *bringing human oversight and values into the loop*. Companies need to conduct regular bias audits of their marketing algorithms - essentially, testing how their AI's outputs differ by gender, race, age, etc., and whether those differences are justified or indicate a problem. Notably, some jurisdictions are moving toward requiring such audits for high-impact algorithms (New York City, for instance, now mandates bias audits for AI used in hiring, which is analogous to targeted recruitment ads). Another crucial element is *diversity in the teams* developing and managing these AI systems. A homogeneous group of engineers might not foresee how an algorithm could disadvantage a group they don't belong to, whereas a diverse team or consultation with affected stakeholders could catch issues early. We also see collaboration emerging between firms and outside experts (or advocacy groups) to identify biases - for example, Twitter (prior to the Musk takeover) had a "algorithmic bias bounty" inviting researchers to find biases in their image-cropping algorithm. Marketing platforms could similarly open up some of their systems for external scrutiny, although competitive and privacy concerns often limit transparency.

Regulation is increasingly being marshaled to enforce fairness. Anti-discrimination laws (e.g., in credit, employment, housing advertising) now explicitly encompass algorithmic targeting, making it illegal to use AI to do what a human is not allowed to do (exclude protected groups). The U.S. Federal Trade Commission has warned it will prosecute companies whose algorithms result in "outcomes that violate fair lending or equal opportunity laws," even if unintentional. The EU's *AI Act*, expected to be implemented in the coming years, will classify certain AI applications (including some personalized recommendation systems) as high-risk if they have significant effects on people's rights, requiring strict transparency and risk mitigation. Such regulations push towards algorithmic justice by imposing penalties for biased outcomes and requiring evidence that companies have attempted to address known biases. Beyond avoiding harm, there is also the aspirational aspect of algorithmic justice: *Can AI in marketing be used to advance equity?* Some suggest it can - for instance, algorithms could be designed to proactively target underserved communities with beneficial offers (like better financial services or educational products), effectively using personalization to close gaps rather than widen them. There are examples of brands aligning their algorithmic strategies with social responsibility missions, ensuring that their data-driven campaigns are inclusive.

In closing this section, it's clear that *the ethical design and governance of marketing AI is not an optional add-on, but a necessity.* The ethical implications of AI marketing are *"central to its logic," not ancillary.* A failure to address algorithmic bias can lead to what the authors call *"contested visions of the good society"* being inadvertently embedded in our algorithms - essentially, we codify and scale up one vision (often the biased status quo) at the expense of others. Conversely, a commitment to algorithmic justice would mean continually questioning and reshaping these systems so that they serve broad societal interests, not just the interests of the most privileged or profitable segments. Striving for fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI-driven marketing is thus both an ethical imperative and, increasingly, a regulatory expectation. Having examined how AI can manipulate individual behavior and echo societal biases, we turn now to the broader *socio-cultural ramifications* of AI marketing - specifically, its effects on consumer attention and subjectivity, and the fabric of the public sphere.

6. Attention Economy and the Reconfiguration of Consumer Subjectivity

Modern marketing does not merely sell products; it sells experiences, narratives, and identities - and it competes for the finite resource of human *attention*. In the digital arena, attention has been famously likened to the new currency or "oil," as noted earlier, and AI is the refinery that processes raw attention into monetizable engagements. We live in an *attention economy* where countless apps, ads, and content streams vie for our eyes and ears. AI plays the role of an attention broker, deciding which stimuli to present to which user at any given moment for maximal engagement. This has profound implications for *consumer subjectivity* - that is, how consumers perceive themselves, their desires, and their choices in a world of ubiquitous personalized media. Firstly, consider how AI-curated feeds (be it a social media timeline, a YouTube recommendation list, or a personalized shopping homepage) shape one's perception of reality.

Each person increasingly lives in their own *algorithmically constructed information bubble*, where the news, products, and ideas they encounter are tailored to their profile. In marketing terms, this means your view of available products and services is heavily filtered. If the algorithms think you're a budget-conscious college student, you might never see the luxury car ads; if they peg you as a fashionista, you might be continuously served the latest couture and never realize there's a whole market of practical durable clothing out there. *Consumers no longer all share the same advertisements or brand stories; each sees a custom version of the brand world.* This personalization can be convenient and engaging, but it also *narrows one's horizons*. There's a risk of *"epistemic closure,"* where the set of options and ideas the consumer is exposed to becomes self-reinforcing and closed off. The algorithm learns your current preferences and keeps feeding you more of the same, which reinforces those preferences, in a loop. Over time, this can ossify tastes and reduce serendipitous discovery of new perspectives or products.

This dynamic is closely tied to how AI maximizes attention. Recommender systems often prioritize content that is similar to what engaged you before (homophily) or that

provokes strong emotional reactions (since that keeps people hooked). In social media and content platforms, this has led to filter bubbles and sometimes radicalization spirals (where content gets more extreme to keep attention). In the consumer realm, it might mean one's identity as "a Nike person" or "an Apple person" or any brand affinity is continually reinforced because the algorithm keeps showing you that brand's content disproportionately, knowing you'll click it (McAlister et al., 2024; Potwora et al., 2024; Obinna & Kess-Momoh, 2024). *Subjectivity - the sense of self - may thus partly be shaped by the patterns in what the AI shows you.* You come to believe "these are the things I like" without realizing how much of that liking was shaped by what was curated for you in the first place.

Another aspect is how *attention itself is commodified and manipulated* by marketing AI. Techniques like infinite scroll, autoplay videos, or gamified notifications are deliberately engineered (often with A/B tested AI optimization) to capture as much user attention as possible. This can *induce addictive usage patterns* - think of how some people lose hours to TikTok or Instagram's algorithmic feed. In the context of marketing, capturing attention is half the battle: a more engaged user is exposed to more ads and more opportunities to buy. But this raises ethical issues about mental health and autonomy. If an AI knows exactly how to keep you swiping - perhaps by intermixing content you love with occasional ads in a perfectly measured rhythm - your attentional faculties are being commandeered. Users may experience a loss of agency over their time and focus, emerging from an internet binge not entirely sure why they engaged so long. The notion of *"choice and compulsion" merging that we saw earlier* applies here as well: one chooses to keep watching or shopping, yet one is compelled by design.

The *quality of attention* is also at stake. Constant, AI-curated stimulation can fragment attention spans and encourage more impulsive, less reflective decision-making. For marketers aiming for quick conversions, a fragmented, hyper-stimulated consumer might be ideal (they'll respond to flash sales and catchy headlines). But from a societal and individual perspective, this could erode the capacity for the kind of sustained attention needed for critical thinking or long-term planning. Philosophers like Matthew Crawford have argued that the commercialization of attention is an affront to human dignity, as it aggressively seizes our mental space. AI, by making that seizure more precise and personalized, intensifies the assault. Now, consider *consumer subjectivity*: in marketing theory, consumers aren't just buyers of products, they derive meaning and identity through consumption (the clothes one wears, the car one drives, etc., contribute to one's self-concept).

AI-mediated marketing actively participates in that identity formation. If a teenager's social media (curated by AI) is filled with certain beauty ideals and branded lifestyles, those will inevitably inform her sense of self and aspirations as a consumer. We already see how Instagram's algorithmic content can influence body image and fashion choices, creating powerful peer-driven cycles. With AI, these cycles can be even more fine-tuned to each user - for example, an algorithm might detect someone's interest in sustainability and then show them a stream of content about eco-friendly living, thus encouraging them to adopt a "green consumer" identity (and of course suggesting products to buy that fit that identity). While this might have positive aspects (promoting sustainable choices), it could also be co-opted as just another marketing angle, giving people the feeling of individual expression while subtly channeling them into consumption patterns profitable to companies positioning themselves as eco-conscious.

Sociologically, one can argue that *AI creates a new kind of consumer "habitus" (to borrow Bourdieu's term)* - a set of dispositions and perceptions shaped by personalized digital environments. In the past, mass culture via mass advertising created broad trends and collective experiences (like everyone seeing the same Super Bowl ads and talking about them). Now, experiences are more atomized; your Instagram feed is not my Instagram feed. This raises a question: what happens to the notion of a *shared consumer culture or public sphere*? Some worry that when everyone is targeted individually, we lose common reference points and the solidarity that can come from that. This fragmentation is analogous to what's happening in news consumption (where personalized news feeds polarize public opinion). In the consumer realm, it might not polarize politically, but it could lead to a world where public discourse even around brands or products is splintered - fewer unifying cultural moments, more niche microcultures. However, others point out that humans are social and will share what they see with friends, so there is still a social dynamic at play - it's just mediated differently. Perhaps AI will facilitate new forms of community, as people find others with similar algorithmic tastes. We see phenomena like "TikTok made me buy it," where a product goes viral because many individuals happened to be shown it and then collectively discuss it. In such cases, the AI's attention allocation actually generates a mass trend (serendipitously or by design).

From the standpoint of *epistemic implications*, there is concern that algorithmic feeds can create *echo chambers of belief and desire.* If an AI thinks you prefer a certain narrative about a product or the world, it will feed you that, potentially making your beliefs more extreme or entrenched (Huh, 2023; Kunz, 2024). In terms of marketing, this could manifest as hardcore brand loyalists who see only positive content about their favored brand and only negative content about competitors, reinforcing tribal consumer identities (the classic example would be Apple vs. Android fan bases, which in online forums sometimes resemble ideological camps). AI could deepen such divides by showing each camp what resonates with them. The larger civic worry is that such segmentation of attention contributes to polarization and undermines a shared basis of facts - a worry much discussed regarding political content algorithms.

While buying preferences are not as consequential as political preferences, they intersect (e.g., ideologically tinted consumption like boycotts or buying "woke" vs "conservative" brands). We increasingly see marketing taking stances on social issues (for authenticity or value alignment with customers); AI might then segment consumers by those values,

which could either be empowering (people find brands aligning with their values) or further siloing (people never encounter perspectives outside their own value bubble, even in commercials).

On the *attention economy's civic impact*, one must mention the risk of misinformation and manipulation that goes beyond individual purchase decisions. The lines between commercial persuasion and political or ideological persuasion blur in the attention economy. The same algorithms that optimize product ads can also optimize political ads or propaganda. If a malicious actor wanted to influence public opinion or sow chaos, they could use marketing tools (like microtargeted ads on Facebook) to capture attention and spread tailored disinformation. This happened infamously with Cambridge Analytica and the 2016 U.S. elections, where voter data was used to microtarget political propaganda to susceptible individuals. *AI makes such operations more potent* - generative AI can create convincing fake personas (e.g., "synthetic influencers" with particular political slants) or deepfake imagery that grabs attention, and it can test thousands of ad variations to find the most divisive or engaging one for each subgroup. Scholars have flagged that generative AI could flood the information space with misleading content, undermining the shared reality democracy relies on. This isn't traditional marketing, but it uses the same infrastructure of attention capture and targeting. Thus, *the attention economy engineered by AI marketing becomes a national security and democracy concern*: an adversary or unscrupulous firm can weaponize attention manipulation at scale.

Bringing it back to marketing proper: in an attention-scarce environment, ethical marketing would seek not to exploit attention relentlessly but to earn it through trust and value. Some suggest we need a paradigm of "attention sovereignty" where users have more control - for instance, tools that help users manage how much time they spend or what they see (digital well-being features, algorithmic choice options). There are also calls for platform design that respect "attentional rights," maybe even the idea that excessive manipulation of attention should be seen as a consumer protection issue (akin to regulating gambling or other potentially addictive services). For example, *the concept of dark patterns (UI tricks to keep users engaged or to get them to click "yes") is being scrutinized by regulators* - the EU's DSA bans certain dark patterns on platforms. One could envisage regulations or guidelines specifically addressing the use of AI in maximizing attention, to ensure it doesn't cross into harmful coercion.

AI-driven marketing deeply influences the attention and consciousness of consumers, shaping what they see, believe, and desire. It brings efficiency and personalization, but at the cost of fragmenting the collective experience and potentially narrowing personal horizons (Owolabi et al., 2024; Osasona et al., 2024; Oladoyinbo et al., 2024; Noranee & bin Othman, 2023). Consumers' very subjectivities - their sense of identity and will - are increasingly entangled with algorithmic feedback loops. The challenge moving forward is finding a balance where attention can be monetized (funding free services, etc.) *without degrading the quality of human choice and awareness.* This will likely require both better design (ethical, human-centric tech) and better-informed consumers. Education in digital/media literacy becomes critical, so individuals understand how their attention is being pulled and can resist undue influence. We now move from individuals to brands and marketers themselves - examining how AI is transforming the construction of brand narratives and the marketing profession.

7. AI and the Reinvention of Brand Construction

Brands have always been social constructs - a mix of image, reputation, and consumer perception carefully cultivated through storytelling. In the AI era, the very way brands are constructed and communicated is changing. On one side, brands now have *powerful new tools:* generative AI that can create content (text, images, videos) on demand, and AI personas (like chatbots or virtual influencers) that can represent the brand interactively. On the other side, brands face *new challenges*: maintaining authenticity and trust in a world of AI-generated, potentially deepfake content; ensuring consistency of brand identity when hyper-personalization means every consumer might experience a different facet of the brand; and managing reputational risk when algorithms, not humans, are engaging with customers. One noticeable trend is the rise of *synthetic or virtual influencers* and brand avatars. These are AI-created characters that function much like human influencers or spokespeople - they have names, personalities, and social media presence - but they are entirely digital.

For example, "Lil Miquela" is a famous virtual influencer on Instagram with millions of followers, who has worked with fashion brands. Brands like Prada, KFC, and others have experimented with AI-generated brand ambassadors. The appeal for marketers is clear: a virtual influencer can be perfectly on-brand, never age, never get embroiled in a scandal, and can interact with fans 24/7. They are *wholly controllable brand messengers*. AI enables not only the creation of the avatar's visuals but also its dialogue (via natural language generation) and behavior, potentially giving each user a slightly tailored interaction (Rivas & Zhao, 2023; Sharma et al., 2023; Yadav, 2024). For instance, a cosmetics brand's virtual beauty advisor might chat with thousands of customers at once through an AI chatbot, each conversation adjusted to the customer's tone and preferences, all while staying in a carefully defined brand persona.

However, research and experience are revealing *pitfalls* of this approach. A key issue is *authenticity and trust.* Consumers are adept at sensing authenticity, and they often form stronger emotional connections with real human narratives. A virtual influencer, if not transparently identified as such, might mislead people or simply fail to resonate on a deeper level. Even when users know an AI character isn't real, the relationship is complicated - some may engage out of novelty, but others may be skeptical or feel the brand is trying to fool them. Even beyond virtual influencers, generative AI is widely used in content creation for branding. AI can generate social media posts, design logos variations, write product descriptions, even compose music for jingles. This aids marketers by dramatically scaling content production. But it also creates a risk of *brand dilution or inconsistency*. If each piece of AI-

generated content is optimized in isolation (perhaps for engagement), the sum total might become incoherent. For example, an AI might generate different tones of voice for different micro-audiences - snarky humor for one segment, earnest sincerity for another - and while each performs well locally, the global brand voice loses integrity. Industry observers have warned that *"too much variation can dilute brand identity"* when using AI personalization. The essence of a brand is to stand for certain values, aesthetics, and emotions consistently. AI has to be carefully guided (through prompt engineering and governance policies) to stay within those guardrails. As the *Sales & Marketing* article put it, brands should define which core elements (logo, color scheme, key messaging pillars) *"should never change"* and ensure the AI respects those even as it personalizes content. It becomes necessary to establish strict brand guidelines and possibly use human oversight to review AI outputs for on-brand alignment.

Transparency is another important facet. As AI generates more brand content, companies have to decide whether to disclose this to their audience. *Does it matter to consumers if a catchy slogan or a blog post was written by AI instead of a copywriter?* Perhaps not, if the content is good. But if consumers begin to feel that all interactions are automated, they might lose the sense of human connection that often underpins brand loyalty. Some brands are addressing this by a *"hybrid" approach* - using AI to assist and speed up creative work, but keeping humans in the loop so that the final output has a human touch or at least human approval. For instance, an AI might generate 50 variations of an ad copy, and a human creative director picks and polishes the best one. This not only preserves authenticity, it can also prevent gaffes; AI sometimes generates content that is tone-deaf or carries unintended biases (e.g., early versions of AI like GPT-3 sometimes produced sexist or culturally insensitive lines if not carefully guided). A human in the loop can catch those before they go public - a crucial quality control.

Beyond content, AI also changes *brand experience* through personalization. Increasingly, brands aim to create a personalized journey for each customer - from website landing pages that rearrange content based on your profile, to email marketing where product images are tailored to your preferences (e.g., showing the same shirt in blue vs red depending on your past color choices). AI handles these micro-decisions. While this can make marketing feel more relevant, it also means no two people get quite the same brand story. The challenge for brand managers is ensuring that despite this variability, the underlying brand narrative and values remain clear and consistent. One emerging solution is to use *AI-driven template systems* - the brand defines templates that allow certain sections to vary (product recommendations, images) while others remain fixed (the core message, the logo placement, the brand tone). Regular audits of personalized outputs can help ensure the AI isn't drifting off-message.

Brand trust in the AI age also intersects with issues of data ethics. Consumers are aware that personalization comes from data tracking. If a brand oversteps - say, using AI to send an email that references a consumer's recent location or purchase that the consumer didn't explicitly share - it may trigger a privacy backlash ("how did they know that?!"). Thus, maintaining brand trust requires prudent data governance. Brands should be transparent about what data they collect and how it's used for personalization (another aspect of authenticity). Some companies have turned this into a selling point, marketing themselves as privacy-respecting alternatives who will personalize only with consent and within limits. In addition, we see brands taking *ethical stands on AI usage* as part of their identity. For example, some might pledge not to use deepfake technology to impersonate people or not to automate customer service completely with bots because they value human touch. Others might embrace AI boldly and make it part of their edgy, innovative image. Either way, how a brand uses AI is becoming part of the brand's identity in consumers' minds. Consider the difference: an artisanal craft goods brand might boast that none of its marketing is algorithmic - it's all human and organic - to appeal to those tired of the digital saturation. A tech-forward brand, conversely, might deploy an AI mascot and highlight their use of AI in ads to signal cutting-edge sophistication.

Finally, it's worth noting *reputational risks* associated with AI that brands must manage. If an AI chatbot representing a brand says something inappropriate or gives erroneous advice (as happened when a medical advice bot gave unsafe recommendations), the brand faces the fallout. This happened famously with Microsoft's "Tay" chatbot which in non-brand context became racist after trolling on Twitter - a PR fiasco. In customer service, AI chatbots sometimes misunderstand and frustrate customers, affecting the brand's reputation for care. Therefore, many brands proceed with caution, limiting AI autonomy in customer-facing roles or providing easy escalation to humans. A concept gaining traction is *"corporate digital responsibility,"* which extends corporate social responsibility to the digital realm: companies should ensure their AI use is ethical, transparent, and aligned with user expectations. For branding, showing that you use AI responsibly can itself be a brand value. AI offers brands unparalleled capabilities to amplify and personalize their narratives, but it also tests the fundamental tenets of branding - consistency, authenticity, trust (Naveeenkumar et al., 2024; McKay et al., 2022; More & Unnikrishnan, 2024; Pattanayak, 2022).

The brands that thrive will likely be those that strike a balance: leveraging AI's creativity and scale, while keeping a strong human-centric vision and ethical compass at the heart of their brand strategy. As the marketing guru David Ogilvy once said, "The consumer is not a moron; she is your wife." In updated terms, the consumer is not just a data point; she is a person who will sense insincerity and cherish genuine engagement. AI must be wielded in service of genuine value and relationship-building, not as a cold replacement for it. Having examined how AI is reshaping brand communications, we now turn to how it is reshaping the practitioners behind those brands - the marketers themselves - and what skills and ethical frameworks the *marketing profession* needs in this new era.

8. Skills, Education, and Ethics in Marketing Profession

The advent of AI in marketing is not only changing how we market, but also *who is doing the marketing and what skills they need*. The marketing profession is undergoing a significant shift. Tasks that were once the domain of human marketers - media buying, creative content writing, customer segmentation - are increasingly being automated or augmented by AI systems. This naturally raises the question: *Are marketers automating themselves out of a job?* The reality appears more nuanced. Rather than wholesale replacement, AI is catalyzing a *role evolution*: certain jobs and skill sets diminish in importance, while new ones emerge. Marketers must adapt by developing new competencies (often more technical or analytical) and by focusing more on the strategic, creative, and ethical dimensions that AI cannot (yet) handle well. One observable trend is that the *"quant" side of marketing - data analysis, programmatic ad placement, A/B testing - has become highly automated*.

AI can optimize Google Ads bids in real-time better than any human, determine which of 50 email subject lines yields the best open rate, or dynamically personalize a website layout. This means the traditional role of a media planner or email campaign manager is shifting from manually configuring campaigns to *overseeing AI-driven platforms*. Today's digital marketers often act as *orchestrators of AI* tools: they set objectives, provide creative inputs or constraints, and then let the system execute and learn. For example, a marketer might specify the target audience and branding guidelines, and the AI will generate and test dozens of ad variations. In such a setup, *the marketer's value-add is in guiding the AI - setting the right parameters and making judgment calls - rather than doing all tasks by hand*. This has given rise to the skill of "prompt engineering" for creatives: knowing how to talk to a generative AI to get useful results (e.g., writing a good prompt for an AI to produce a Facebook ad image consistent with brand style). Roles like "marketing data scientist" or "marketing AI specialist" are becoming common, blending traditional marketing knowledge with data science and AI fluency.

At the same time, *demand is growing for skills that AI lacks, especially around strategy, empathy, and high-level creative direction*. AI can churn out content, but deciding the overarching brand narrative or campaign big idea still typically requires human insight. Marketers are focusing more on *strategy formulation*: interpreting market trends (with AI's help), understanding human motivations on a deep level, and devising creative concepts that resonate emotionally. They then use AI to execute or amplify those concepts. In essence, AI takes over some of the execution load, freeing humans to concentrate on strategic and conceptual work - the hope is a *"centaur" model* where human + AI together outperform either alone. However, this ideal synergy requires that marketers have enough understanding of AI to leverage it properly. Training programs and companies are emphasizing upskilling in AI literacy: not every marketer needs to code a neural network, but they should understand capabilities and limitations of tools (what kind of bias might an algorithm introduce? How to interpret analytics from an AI system?).

Crucially, *ethics and responsibility* are becoming core parts of the marketing role. In the past, marketers certainly dealt with ethical issues (truth in advertising, targeting vulnerable consumers, etc.), but AI brings these issues to a new level of complexity and scale. Marketers find themselves grappling with questions like: "Should we use this consumer data in our algorithm? Are we creeping people out?" or "Our AI tool is recommending a campaign that segments users by inferred ethnicity - is that acceptable?" or "This personalized pricing algorithm could charge higher prices to less tech-savvy customers; is that fair?" As such, modern marketers (and their legal/compliance partners) must infuse ethical considerations into tech-driven campaigns. Some companies have formed internal "AI ethics committees" or protocols that marketers must follow when deploying algorithms (for example, prohibiting certain sensitive attributes from being used in targeting even if the AI could).

Forward-thinking professionals see *ethical marketing* not as a constraint, but as part of brand value and risk management - a way to differentiate and build long-term trust. The transformation of the profession is also spurring changes in *marketing education*. University programs and business schools are racing to update curricula that traditionally focused on creative, consumer psychology, and classic 4Ps marketing. Now, courses on digital marketing analytics, AI in marketing, and data privacy are essential. However, many educational institutions have been slow to integrate these topics deeply. There is concern of a "curricular lag" where students graduate with outdated skill sets. The chapter argues that *AI ethics and algorithmic accountability should be a core pillar in marketing education*, not an elective add-on. This means training future marketers to think critically about the tools they'll use: not just how to use them, but when *not* to use them, how to question their outputs, and how to align them with societal values. The authors call for *interdisciplinary learning* - for instance, a marketing student should learn basics of data science, but also fundamentals of law (privacy regulations) and philosophy (ethics of persuasion). Only by synthesizing these domains can a marketer truly navigate the AI age responsibly.

In fact, professional bodies and accreditation organizations are beginning to heed this call. The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), one of the top business school accreditors, has been encouraged to include AI ethics components in their standards. Likewise, industry certifications (like those offered by the Digital Marketing Institute) now include modules on AI and ethics. Companies, on their end, are investing in continuous learning for their marketing teams - sending them to workshops on the latest AI marketing platforms, but also seminars on data ethics and emerging regulations. Another shift is the *collaboration between marketers and data scientists/engineers.* Marketing departments are hiring more technical talent, or closely collaborating with in-house data science teams. The age of the "full-stack marketer" who can conceive a campaign and also SQL query a database or fine-tune a machine learning model is dawning. While not everyone will be that hybrid, teams increasingly are - a creative director working alongside a machine learning engineer and a privacy lawyer, for example, to launch a big campaign. This requires marketers to become conversant in new languages (both the language of code and the language of interdisciplinary teamwork).

From a labor market perspective, some traditional marketing roles are diminishing. We see fewer roles purely for things like "social media content moderator" or "email campaign scheduler" - those have been automated or consolidated. But new roles are growing: "marketing AI strategist", "personalization specialist", "voice AI brand designer" (for Alexa-like brand voices), "customer journey architect", etc. The net effect on jobs is debated, but most studies forecast a restructuring rather than massive unemployment. Those who reskill are likely to find their work enriched (if sometimes more challenging), whereas those who don't may find their previous tasks taken over by software. One promising development is the idea of *using AI to augment human creativity rather than replace it.* Many marketers report that AI tools, like copy generation assistants or analytics dashboards, save them time on drudge work (compiling reports, drafting variant copies), enabling them to focus on bigger creative ideas or spend more time on personal interactions with clients. For example, an account manager might have AI summarize a campaign's performance and even suggest optimization tweaks, but the manager then uses that information to craft a nuanced strategy update to the client, combining data with human insight. In this way, the job becomes more about interpretation and relationship management - arguably a more human and meaningful focus.

Finally, with great power comes great responsibility. *The profession is implicitly being tasked with self-regulation to prevent abuse of AI in marketing.* If marketers push the boundaries too far (with creepy targeting, deepfake ads, manipulation), they risk regulatory crackdowns and public backlash that could constrain the whole field. Thus, enlightened self-interest should lead marketers to establish *codes of conduct for AI use.* Already, the American Marketing Association (AMA) has principles around data privacy and transparency; these are being extended to AI (e.g., "marketers should disclose when AI is used in communication if not obvious," or "marketers should not use AI to intentionally target vulnerable populations with harmful products"). Such principles align with the idea of *Corporate Digital Responsibility* or CDR, which posits that companies have a duty to deploy digital tech in ways that are socially responsible and sustainable. Marketers, being the interface between companies and consumers, will often be where the rubber meets the road for CDR initiatives regarding AI.

In summary, the marketing professional of the AI era is envisioned as a *tech-savvy, analytics-informed strategist with a strong ethical compass and cross-disciplinary fluency*. This is a tall order - but also an exciting evolution of the field. Marketing has always sat at the crossroads of art and science; AI tilts it more towards science, but arguably frees up more room for the art and human connection if handled right. Education and ongoing training are critical to prepare current and future marketers for this new reality. There is a need for a comprehensive reconfiguration of marketing curricula and professional development to ensure that practitioners are not just technically equipped but also philosophically and ethically grounded. Marketers must become, in a sense, *stewards of algorithmic influence* - accountable for how these powerful tools are directed in the marketplace. With the roles and responsibilities of marketers transforming, we must also look outward to the larger society in which marketing operates. In our final analytical section, we connect the dots between AI marketing practices and their *epistemic, civic, and political implications* for society at large, before concluding with thoughts on how we might navigate the road ahead.

9. Socio-Technical Infrastructures and Their Civic/Political Implications

The infrastructures of AI-driven marketing - the algorithms, data pipelines, and platforms - have become *key mediators of public life*, not just commerce. They form a kind of invisible layer that influences how information flows, how opinions are shaped, and who gets to participate in economic and civic opportunities. In this sense, marketing algorithms have graduated into *societal infrastructures*, much like roads or utilities, but for information and attention. With that status comes serious *epistemic, civic, and political implications*. One major area of concern is the impact of micro-targeted advertising on the *democratic process* and public discourse. As discussed earlier, the same techniques used to sell shoes or streaming subscriptions can be (and have been) used to "sell" political candidates or ideas. The Cambridge Analytica scandal was a wake-up call that *political campaigns now readily exploit commercial marketing data and AI tools* to segment voters and send tailored messages that may skirt the truth or play on fears. In the years since, the techniques have only grown more sophisticated.

We now see the emergence of *AI-generated political content*: messages, videos, even synthetic personas pushing campaign talking points. In the run-up to elections, there is a legitimate worry that electorate segments will be bombarded with misleading, hyper-personalized propaganda that is nearly impossible for outsiders (or fact-checkers) to monitor, since each person's feed is unique. As Zhu and Isaacs (2024) argue, *"campaign microtargeting and AI can jeopardize democracy"* by undermining transparency and accountability in political messaging. If every voter gets a different promise from a candidate (A/B tested to what they want to hear), how can we hold that candidate accountable? There is also the risk of increased polarization: *when algorithms selectively expose people to messages they are likely to agree with, it reinforces their existing beliefs and can drive political tribes further apart*. The LSE researchers noted that microtargeting primarily has been used to rally the base rather than persuade undecideds, meaning it often serves to harden echo chambers instead of fostering debate.Generative AI amplifies these issues by introducing the threat of mass-produced *deepfakes and synthetic media.* One can imagine a fraudulent "leaked" video of a candidate created entirely by AI, circulated via targeted ads to just the voters who would be most credulous or most enraged by it. Such a video could be distributed in a decentralized manner (private groups, ephemeral ads) leaving little trace for authorities to rebut in time.

This ability to flood the zone with tailored mis/disinformation could lead to a scenario described by Kreps and Kriner (2023) where the information environment becomes so polluted that citizens adopt a stance of nihilistic disbelief - *"a reasonable cognitive prophylactic…would be to believe nothing"*, a mindset corrosive to democracy. They warn that generative

AI threatens core pillars of democratic governance: representation (by faking constituent voices or misreading public opinion), accountability (by obfuscating reality and record), and trust (by making it impossible to distinguish truth from fake). These concerns have prompted calls for *guardrails*. Policy responses include requiring clear labeling of AI-generated political content, mandates for archives of online political ads for public scrutiny, and even outright bans on microtargeting voters based on sensitive attributes. The EU's new rules on political advertising, as of 2024, for instance, will force disclosure of targeting parameters and limit microtargeting beyond certain broad criteria. This is an attempt to restore some common ground in political communication and avoid the "different pledges to different demographics" problem. Additionally, researchers are working on AI tools to detect deepfakes and coordinated bot-driven campaigns, although it's an arms race between detection and generation.

Beyond electoral politics, the *civic implications* of AI marketing touch on areas like consumer rights and societal equity. For example, if AI-driven marketing in the financial sector targets certain high-risk loans or products at specific vulnerable communities (say high-interest payday loans primarily at low-income zip codes, detected via algorithmic profiling), it can entrench economic inequalities and exploit those already disadvantaged. There is a social justice issue when, say, an insurance company's marketing algorithm decides not to market health plans to a neighborhood because data suggests lower profit there - effectively that population might be less informed of their options, widening gaps. *Algorithmic redlining* can occur in subtle ways through marketing. Civil rights advocates thus argue that *algorithmic decision-making that affects opportunities (jobs, housing, credit, education)* should be subject to public scrutiny even when it happens as part of marketing or advertising. The lines blur between a "marketing decision" and a "provision of service" decision when AI is involved; denying someone exposure to an opportunity can be as harmful as denying them the opportunity outright.

Another civic dimension is *culture and free expression*. Marketing algorithms, especially content recommenders on platforms like YouTube, TikTok, Spotify, etc., play a role in shaping what culture gets visibility. These algorithms often prioritize engagement (clicks, views), which tends to favor sensational or mainstream content. As a result, some worry about a *"homogenization of culture"* where diverse or minority expressions get algorithmically sidelined. This can diminish the pluralism of voices in the cultural sphere. On the flip side, algorithms have also enabled niche communities to find each other across geography (a boon for subcultures). The net effect on cultural diversity is complex, but it's clear that the values encoded in these systems (what gets deemed "relevant" or "high quality") have broad societal impact. There are growing discussions about whether platforms have a duty to support certain public interest content - for instance, surfacing local news or educational content even if it doesn't maximize engagement.

Epistemically, we're dealing with a new kind of knowledge problem: the algorithms know a lot about us (as individuals and groups), but we know very little about them (they are often proprietary black boxes). This asymmetry can undermine the epistemic agency of citizens. For example, if a person doesn't understand that their social media feed is tailored by an algorithm for engagement, they might take the content they see as a neutral reflection of reality ("everyone is talking about X!" when in fact the algorithm is just showing them X a lot). This can distort collective understanding of what issues are important. It can also be exploited to distract or divert attention from critical issues - essentially "agenda-setting" via algorithm. Scholars have pointed out that *AI platforms now exercise a form of agenda-setting power historically associated with media editors* or governments, but without the same accountability. This has led to calls for algorithmic transparency - not just for fairness, but so the public can be aware of how our shared informational environment is being constructed.

The notion of treating major algorithms as *public infrastructure* is gaining traction. If YouTube or Facebook are where a large fraction of the population gets information, perhaps their algorithmic choices should be subject to public-interest obligations (analogous to broadcast regulations or utilities oversight). Indeed, the EU's Digital Services Act takes a step in this direction by requiring systemic platforms to allow audits and to assess and mitigate societal risks of their algorithms (like risks to electoral processes or public health through misinformation). There is also discussion of providing more *user control*: imagine if you could easily choose the criteria your feed optimizes for, or switch to a non-personalized chronological feed if you want to escape the filter bubble. The DSA actually enshrines something like this - users of very large platforms must have the option to use a feed "not based on profiling." Whether many will use it is another question. From a civic standpoint, *digital literacy and education* emerge as crucial solutions (alongside regulation). People need to understand when they are being marketed to or manipulated by AI content. Just as previous generations were taught to critically evaluate television or print advertising, today's youth (and everyone, really) need to learn how algorithms shape what they see. This includes recognizing tactics like clickbait, sponsored content masquerading as user posts, deepfakes, and so on.

Encouragingly, there are initiatives in some countries to include "algorithm awareness" in school curricula, and NGOs working on public awareness campaigns. Essentially, in a society saturated with AI-driven marketing and media, *critical thinking and skepticism are vital civic virtues* to cultivate, so that citizens can navigate the infosphere without losing their agency or falling prey to manipulation.

Finally, we should consider *the economy and labor* more broadly: AI marketing contributes to broader trends of automation that affect jobs (as discussed) and potentially consumer welfare. There's a political economy angle concerning data ownership: some argue that individuals should have property or at least dividend rights to the data that companies collect from them - if our data is fueling these AI marketing profits, perhaps we should see a cut (this is a radical idea but it's been floated under concepts like "data dignity" or Jaron Lanier's proposals). While not mainstream policy yet, it reflects the sense that the value distribution in surveillance

capitalism is lopsided. In summation, AI-driven marketing infrastructures have *consequences that spill into every corner of society*.

They influence what we know, how we socialize, how we form opinions, and who gets ahead. They can bolster democratic participation (through better outreach and engagement techniques) or they can undermine it (through manipulation and fragmentation). They can make markets more efficient and convenient, or they can exacerbate inequality and exclusion. Recognizing these technologies as *socio-technical systems* - not just business tools - is the first step to addressing their impacts. This requires interdisciplinary insight: we need ethicists, sociologists, political scientists, economists, legal scholars, and technologists working together (and with marketers and platform designers) to ensure these systems develop in a way that aligns with societal values like justice, transparency, and human flourishing. The next and final section will conclude the review, highlighting key insights and proposing ways forward to align marketing in the age of AI with the public good.

10. Conclusion

AI's integration into marketing represents a watershed moment - *a paradigm shift* in how consumers and businesses interact, how preferences are shaped, and how value is created in the marketplace. Throughout this review, we have illuminated both the extraordinary capabilities and the formidable challenges that come with this shift. AI has endowed marketers with tools of persuasion and personalization once confined to the realm of science fiction: recommender systems that know us better than we know ourselves, generative models that can simulate human creativity at scale, algorithms that can autonomously test and learn from millions of micro-experiments in consumer influence. These technologies, functioning as opaque yet powerful socio-technical infrastructures, are reconstituting the very fabric of marketing - transforming it from a predominantly human-driven craft to a data-driven, automated process operating at the speed and scale of computation.

Yet, as we have argued, to view this transformation as merely a story of improved efficiency or commercial optimization would be dangerously myopic. *Marketing in the age of AI is not a value-neutral evolution; it is rife with normative and societal implications***.** The *central lens* of our analysis - "Marketing in the Age of AI" - required that we look beyond the confines of business strategy and consider ethics, law, philosophy, sociology, political economy, and technology in concert. This interdisciplinary inquiry reveals a picture that is both exciting and unsettling. On one hand, AI-driven marketing can enhance consumer experiences through relevance and convenience, help firms allocate resources more effectively, and even contribute positively (e.g., personalized interventions for public health campaigns or financial well-being). On the other hand, it can be a vehicle for *unprecedented surveillance and manipulation*, reinforcing power imbalances between corporations and individuals, and between those who control data/algorithms and those who are subject to them.

A recurring theme is the tension between *personalization and autonomy*. Hyper-individualized targeting, while superficially appealing as "getting exactly what you want," often conceals a manipulation of the user's will - raising deep ethical concerns about the erosion of consent and self-determination. We saw that the line between persuasion and coercion blurs when AI can leverage cognitive biases at scale. The review highlighted calls from the literature for frameworks that treat certain manipulative practices as unacceptable and for empowering users with greater transparency and control. Upholding *human autonomy* in a landscape of intelligent persuasion engines will likely require a combination of stronger regulatory protections (e.g., laws against deceptive design and overly intrusive data use) and innovations in system design that prioritize user agency (like interfaces that explain why you are seeing a given ad or content item, and allow you to adjust the algorithm's assumptions).

Another dominant theme is *justice and fairness*. AI systems inherit and can amplify societal biases, risking discrimination in who gets what opportunities or how groups are portrayed in marketing content. Ensuring *algorithmic justice* in marketing means actively working to identify and mitigate biases - technically, through fair AI design, and organizationally, through policies and oversight that align AI outcomes with civil rights and inclusion goals. This is not a trivial endeavor; it challenges the marketing profession to expand its notion of responsibility. Marketers, traditionally focused on creative messaging and sales metrics, must now also think like *stewards of societal impact*, monitoring how their algorithms might adversely affect vulnerable populations or social cohesion. The review noted that this ethical awakening is underway, but far from complete. Importantly, it also noted that technical fixes have limits, implying that genuine progress will require a values-based approach embedded in company culture and perhaps enforced by external accountability (regulatory audits, independent ethics boards, etc.).

The intersection *of marketing AI with civic life* raised perhaps the most urgent alarms. In the realm of politics and public discourse, we argued that *algorithmic marketing techniques can undermine democratic processes* by fragmenting the public sphere and enabling new forms of propaganda and misinformation. However, we also discussed nascent solutions: stricter transparency requirements for political ads, efforts to educate the public, and the role of journalists and activists in shining light on dark algorithmic practices. Democracy has always weathered advances in communication technology (from radio to television to social media), often after initial upheavals, by adapting norms and regulations - there is hope that a similar adaptation can occur for AI, but it will require vigilance and proactive policy. As one report concluded, *"what is urgently required is not passive admiration of technical prowess, but critical interrogation of the socio-political costs embedded in algorithmic optimization."*. We fully echo that sentiment. On the question of the *marketing profession and education*, the review found a gap between the speed of AI adoption in industry and the preparedness of educational institutions to produce professionals equipped for this environment.

Encouragingly, we see thought leaders pushing for a *reimagining of marketing education* - one that integrates data science fundamentals, interdisciplinary ethics, and practical AI tool fluency. The "marketer of the future" must be conversant in algorithms and comfortable collaborating with AI, but also strongly grounded in human insight, creativity, and ethical reasoning. The complexity of AI-driven markets actually heightens the need for clear, principled thinking - a purely machine-led market approach could maximize short-term metrics at the expense of trust and brand equity, a mistake only a broader human perspective can catch. In reinforcing this point, this paper advocates making *AI ethics a core pillar of marketing curricula and professional training*, effectively building an "ethical infrastructure" in parallel with the technical infrastructure. This review supports that recommendation: without an ethical infrastructure, the dazzling efficiencies of AI marketing may crumble under backlash or regulatory bans spurred by ethical failures.

Looking forward, what does a *human-centric marketing future* in the age of AI look like? It would be one where *AI serves human ends, not undermines them*. Imagine AI systems designed with *privacy enhancement* techniques (like federated learning or differential privacy) so that we reap personalization benefits without excessive personal data intrusion. Imagine algorithms whose objectives are multi-dimensional - not only optimizing for click or purchase, but constrained by fairness, diversity of content, and long-term customer well-being metrics. One could envision a sort of *"Hippocratic Oath" for marketing AI*: first, do no harm (do not deceive or unfairly discriminate), then pursue the mutually beneficial outcome (connect consumers with products and services they truly value). In practical terms, this might mean greater use of *value-based design* approaches, where stakeholders (including consumer representatives, ethicists, regulators) are involved in setting the design criteria of marketing AI systems from the outset.

It could also mean more *algorithmic transparency tools* offered to consumers, like dashboards revealing why certain recommendations are made, or the ability to correct an algorithm's assumptions about one's preferences (thereby keeping the consumer in the loop and in control). From the regulatory side, ongoing developments like the EU's AI Act and similar efforts globally will likely impose baseline standards - for example, requiring risk assessments for AI systems that influence people's decisions or rights, and possibly certifying systems for fairness. The effectiveness of such regulation will depend on technical and bureaucratic details, but the trajectory suggests *greater accountability for the developers and users of marketing AI*. Companies that proactively embrace ethical best practices now will be ahead of the curve and better positioned when compliance becomes mandatory.

In closing, *marketing in the age of AI stands at a crossroads*. Down one path, we have a future of hyper-efficient, personalized commerce, but also one of pervasive surveillance, manipulation, and societal discord - a future in which the marketplace becomes an "architecture of coercion" and individuals are reduced to predictable behaviorist responses. Down another path, we see the possibility of AI-augmented marketing that genuinely empowers consumers - making markets more transparent, matches more fitting, and interactions more meaningful, all while respecting individual rights and community values. The choices we (as marketers, consumers, policymakers, and citizens) make now and in the coming years will determine which vision prevails. This narrative review has argued that *interdisciplinary insight and collaboration are key* to steering us toward the more human-centric path. Ethical and legal scholars must continue to critically examine algorithmic marketing practices and inform policy; technologists and data scientists should work hand in hand with social scientists and humanists to design systems mindful of context and consequence; educators should prepare the next generation with not just technical know-how but the wisdom of multiple disciplines; and consumers should be seen not as targets to be captured, but as stakeholders to engage with transparency and respect.

Only through such a holistic approach can we ensure that AI's undoubted prowess is harnessed for the *genuine benefit of both businesses and society*, avoiding what one might call the "Frankenstein's monster" scenario of uncontrolled algorithmic influence. In sum, *marketing in the age of AI must become as much a civic project as a commercial one*, integrating ethics and accountability at its core. The cost of failing to do so would be measured not just in brand trust or customer loyalty, but in nothing less than the autonomy and agency of the consumer-citizen and the health of the public sphere. It is our hope that through continued scholarship, dialogue, and conscientious action, we can collectively navigate this inflection point. Marketing has always been a mirror of the society and technology of its time; let it now reflect our highest values as we enter deeper into the AI-driven future. In the final analysis, *human judgment, empathy, and ethics must guide the algorithms* - not the other way around - to ensure that the promise of AI elevates marketing practice rather than diminishing the very humanity it ultimately exists to serve.

Declaration of Interest:
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding Information:
This research did not receive any specific funding from any public, commercial, or non-profit agency.

Disclosure Statement:
No material or relevant stake relating to this research was disclosed by the author(s).

Competing Interest:
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement:
Data sharing is not applicable to this research article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Declaration of Helsinki Compliance:
All research procedures involving human participants were carried out in accordance with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and its subsequent amendments.

References

- Adeniran, I. A., Efunniyi, C. P., Osundare, O. S., & Abhulimen, A. O. (2024). Transforming marketing strategies with data analytics: A study on customer behavior and personalization. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, *6*(8), 41-51.
- Agu, E. E., Abhulimen, A. O., Obiki-Osafiele, A. N., Osundare, O. S., Adeniran, I. A., & Efunniyi, C. P. (2024). Discussing ethical considerations and solutions for ensuring fairness in AI-driven financial services. *International Journal of Frontier Research in Science*, *3*(2), 001-009.
- Akter, S., Dwivedi, Y. K., Sajib, S., Biswas, K., Bandara, R. J., & Michael, K. (2022). Algorithmic bias in machine learning-based marketing models. *Journal of Business Research*, *144*, 201-216.
- Akter, S., Sultana, S., Mariani, M., Wamba, S. F., Spanaki, K., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Advancing algorithmic bias management capabilities in AI-driven marketing analytics research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *114*, 243-261.
- Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., Insiew, M., & Alfandi, O. (2024, September). Ethical challenges and solutions of generative AI: An interdisciplinary perspective. In *Informatics* (Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 58). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Allil, K. (2024). Integrating AI-driven marketing analytics techniques into the classroom: pedagogical strategies for enhancing student engagement and future business success. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, *12*(2), 142-168.
- Badmus, O., Rajput, S. A., Arogundade, J. B., & Williams, M. (2024). AI-driven business analytics and decision making. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *24*(1), 616-633.
- Balaji, K. (2024). Harnessing AI for Financial Innovations: Pioneering the Future of Financial Services. In *Modern Management Science Practices in the Age of AI* (pp. 91-122). IGI Global.
- Bashang, S., & Puttanna, K. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence in digital marketing: a review. *International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies IRJEMS*, *2*(3).
- Boppiniti, S. T. (2023). Data ethics in ai: Addressing challenges in machine learning and data governance for responsible data science. *International Scientific Journal for Research*, *5*(5), 1-29.
- Chowdhury, T., & Oredo, J. (2023). AI ethical biases: normative and information systems development conceptual framework. *Journal of Decision Systems*, *32*(3), 617-633.
- Ford, J., Jain, V., Wadhwani, K., & Gupta, D. G. (2023). AI advertising: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *166*, 114124.
- Gao, B., Wang, Y., Xie, H., Hu, Y., & Hu, Y. (2023). Artificial intelligence in advertising: advancements, challenges, and ethical considerations in targeting, personalization, content creation, and ad optimization. *Sage Open*, *13*(4), 21582440231210759.
- George, A. S., George, A. H., & Baskar, T. (2023). Exploring the potential of prompt engineering in India: a study on the future of AI-driven job market and the role of higher education. *Partners Universal Innovative Research Publication*, *1*(2), 34-57.
- Gonçalves, A. R., Pinto, D. C., Rita, P., & Pires, T. (2023). Artificial intelligence and its ethical implications for marketing. *Emerging Science Journal*, *7*(2), 313-327.

- Hermann, E. (2022). Leveraging artificial intelligence in marketing for social good—An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *179*(1), 43-61.
- Hicham, N., Nassera, H., & Karim, S. (2023). Strategic framework for leveraging artificial intelligence in future marketing decision-making. *Journal of Intelligent Management Decision*, *2*(3), 139-150.
- Huh, J., Nelson, M. R., & Russell, C. A. (2023). ChatGPT, AI advertising, and advertising research and education. *Journal of Advertising*, *52*(4), 477-482.
- Ikudabo, A. O., & Kumar, P. (2024). AI-driven risk assessment and management in banking: balancing innovation and security. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *5*(10), 3573-88.
- Islam, M. A., Fakir, S. I., Masud, S. B., Hossen, M. D., Islam, M. T., & Siddiky, M. R. (2024). Artificial intelligence in digital marketing automation: Enhancing personalization, predictive analytics, and ethical integration. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, *8*(6), 6498-6516.
- Iyelolu, T. V., Agu, E. E., Idemudia, C., & Ijomah, T. I. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for personalized marketing campaigns to improve conversion rates. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development*, *20*(8), 253-270.
- Khan, M. S., & Umer, H. (2024). ChatGPT in finance: Applications, challenges, and solutions. *Heliyon*, *10*(2).
- Kopalle, P. K., Gangwar, M., Kaplan, A., Ramachandran, D., Reinartz, W., & Rindfleisch, A. (2022). Examining artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in marketing via a global lens: Current trends and future research opportunities. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *39*(2), 522-540.
- Kumar, D., & Suthar, N. (2024). Ethical and legal challenges of AI in marketing: an exploration of solutions. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, *22*(1), 124-144.
- Kumar, R., Joshi, A., Sharan, H. O., Peng, S. L., & Dudhagara, C. R. (Eds.). (2024). *The ethical frontier of AI and data analysis*. IGI Global.
- Kumar, V., Ashraf, A. R., & Nadeem, W. (2024). AI-powered marketing: What, where, and how?. *International Journal of Information Management*, *77*, 102783.
- Kunz, W. H., & Wirtz, J. (2024). Corporate digital responsibility (CDR) in the age of AI: implications for interactive marketing. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, *18*(1), 31-37.
- Li, Z. (2024). Ethical frontiers in artificial intelligence: navigating the complexities of bias, privacy, and accountability. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, *14*(3), 109-116.
- Mbah, G. O. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Shaping Future Intellectual Property Law and Policy: Regulatory Challenges and Ethical Considerations. *Journal homepage: www. ijrpr. com ISSN*, *2582*, 7421.
- McAlister, A. R., Alhabash, S., & Yang, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence and ChatGPT: Exploring Current and potential future roles in marketing education. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *30*(2), 166-187.
- McKay, F., Williams, B. J., Prestwich, G., Bansal, D., Hallowell, N., & Treanor, D. (2022). The ethical challenges of artificial intelligence-driven digital pathology. *The Journal of Pathology: Clinical Research*, *8*(3), 209-216.
- More, A., & Unnikrishnan, R. (2024). AI-Powered Analytics in Product Marketing Optimizing Customer Experience and Market Segmentation. *Journal Of Multidisciplinary*, *4*(11), 12-19.
- Mutashar, M. K. (2024). Navigating ethics in AI-driven translation for a human-centric future. *Academia Open*, *9*(2), 10-21070.
- Naveeenkumar, N., Rallapalli, S., Sasikala, K., Priya, P. V., Husain, J., & Boopathi, S. (2024). Enhancing Consumer Behavior and Experience Through AI-Driven Insights Optimization. In *AI impacts in digital consumer behavior* (pp. 1-35). IGI Global.
- Noranee, S., & bin Othman, A. K. (2023). Understanding consumer sentiments: Exploring the role of artificial intelligence in marketing. *JMM17: Jurnal Ilmu ekonomi dan manajemen*, *10*(1), 15-23.
- Obinna, A. J., & Kess-Momoh, A. J. (2024). Comparative technical analysis of legal and ethical frameworks in AI-enhanced procurement processes. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *22*(1), 1415-1430.
- Oguntibeju, O. O. (2024). Mitigating artificial intelligence bias in financial systems: A comparative analysis of debiasing techniques. *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, *17*(12), 165-178.
- Oladoyinbo, T. O., Olabanji, S. O., Olaniyi, O. O., Adebiyi, O. O., Okunleye, O. J., & Ismaila Alao, A. (2024). Exploring the challenges of artificial intelligence in data integrity and its influence on social dynamics. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, *18*(2), 1-23.
- Osasona, F., Amoo, O. O., Atadoga, A., Abrahams, T. O., Farayola, O. A., & Ayinla, B. S. (2024). Reviewing the ethical implications of AI in decision making processes. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, *6*(2), 322-335.
- Owolabi, O. S., Uche, P. C., Adeniken, N. T., Ihejirika, C., Islam, R. B., Chhetri, B. J. T., & Jung, B. (2024). Ethical implication of artificial intelligence (AI) adoption in financial decision making. *Comput. Inf. Sci*, *17*, 49-56.
- Pattanayak, S. K. (2022). Generative AI for Market Analysis in Business Consulting: Revolutionizing Data Insights and Competitive Intelligence. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications*, *11*, 74-86.
- Potwora, M., Vdovichena, O., Semchuk, D., Lipych, L., & Saienko, V. (2024). The use of artificial intelligence in marketing strategies: Automation, personalization and forecasting. *Journal of Management World*, *2*, 41-49.

- Qwaider, S. R., Abu-Saqer, M. M., Albatish, I., Alsaqqa, A. H., Abunasser, B. S., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2024). Harnessing artificial intelligence for effective leadership: Opportunities and challenges.
- Rahman, M. M., Al Mahi, A., & Hossian, M. A. Z. (2024). Application of AI in Halal Marketing: Navigating the Ethical Crossroads. *West Science Interdisciplinary Studies*, *2*(04), 920-926.
- Rawas, S. (2024). AI: the future of humanity. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *4*(1), 25.
- Ray, P. P. (2023). ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*, *3*, 121-154.
- Rezaei, M., Pironti, M., & Quaglia, R. (2024). AI in knowledge sharing, which ethical challenges are raised in decision-making processes for organisations?. *Management Decision*.
- Rivas, P., & Zhao, L. (2023). Marketing with chatgpt: Navigating the ethical terrain of gpt-based chatbot technology. *AI*, *4*(2), 375-384.
- Rosário, A. T., & Dias, J. C. (2023). How has data-driven marketing evolved: Challenges and opportunities with emerging technologies. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, *3*(2), 100203.
- Saheb, T., Jamthe, S., & Saheb, T. (2022). Developing a conceptual framework for identifying the ethical repercussions of artificial intelligence: A mixed method analysis. *Journal of AI, Robotics & Workplace Automation*, *1*(4), 371-398.
- Samara, F. Y. A., Taha, A. H. A., Massa, N. M., Jamie, T. N. A., Harara, F. E., Abu-Nasser, B. S., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2024). The Role of AI in Enhancing Business Decision-Making: Innovations and Implications.
- Schweitzer, B. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) ethics in accounting. *Journal of Accounting, Ethics & Public Policy, JAEPP*, *25*(1), 67-67.
- Sedkaoui, S., & Benaichouba, R. (2024). Generative AI as a transformative force for innovation: a review of opportunities, applications and challenges. *European Journal of Innovation Management*.
- Selesi-Aina, O., Obot, N. E., Olisa, A. O., Gbadebo, M. O., Olateju, O., & Olaniyi, O. O. (2024). The future of work: A human-centric approach to AI, robotics, and cloud computing. *Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*, *26*(11), 10-9734.
- Sharma, K. K., Tomar, M., & Tadimarri, A. (2023). Unlocking sales potential: How AI revolutionizes marketing strategies. *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology ISSN: 2959-6386 (online)*, *2*(2), 231-250.
- Stahl, B. C., Schroeder, D., & Rodrigues, R. (2023). *Ethics of artificial intelligence: Case studies and options for addressing ethical challenges* (p. 116). Springer Nature.
- Thirumagal, P. G., Bhattacharjee, K., Dorbala, R., Palav, M. R., & Mahajan, V. (2024, April). Application of Machine Learning Algorithms in Personalized Marketing. In *2024 5th International Conference on Recent Trends in Computer Science and Technology (ICRTCST)* (pp. 165-170). IEEE.
- Umamaheswari, D. D. (2024). Role of Artificial Intelligence in Marketing Strategies and Performance. *Migration Letters*, *21*(S4), 1589-1599.
- Varsha, P. S. (2023). How can we manage biases in artificial intelligence systems - A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, *3*(1), 100165.
- Yadav, B. R. (2024). The Ethics of Understanding: Exploring Moral Implications of Explainable AI. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, *13*(6), 1-7.
- Yadav, S. J. (2024). AI Bias and Fairness: Ethical Considerations in Service Marketing Strategies. In *Integrating AI-Driven Technologies Into Service Marketing* (pp. 49-64). IGI Global.
- Zlateva, P., Steshina, L., Petukhov, I., & Velev, D. (2024). A conceptual framework for solving ethical issues in generative artificial intelligence. In *Electronics, Communications and Networks* (pp. 110-119). IOS Press.