

Marketing Science Institute Working Paper Series 2026

Report No. 26-122

Beyond the Algorithm: Consumer Trust, Transparency, and the Governance of AI-Driven Marketing in Digital Ecosystems

Priya Gupta, Harshita Sharma and Yogesh Sharma

"WBeyond the Algorithm: Consumer Trust, Transparency, and the Governance of AI-Driven Marketing in Digital Ecosystems" © 2026

Priya Gupta, Harshita Sharma and Yogesh Sharma

MSI Working Papers are Distributed for the benefit of MSI corporate and academic members and the general public. Reports are not to be reproduced or published in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, without written permission.

Beyond the Algorithm: Consumer Trust, Transparency, and the Governance of AI-Driven Marketing in Digital Ecosystems

Priya Gupta[1], Harshita Sharma[2], Dr. Yogesh Sharma[3]

[1, 2]Atal Bihari Vajpayee School of Management and Entrepreneurship, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

[3]Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, New Delhi, India

[1]pgupta1902@gmail.com, [2] harshitasharma262002@gmail.com

and [3]yogesh.ysharma93@gmail.com

Date of submission - 21 May, 2026

Acknowledgement

We, the authors, would like to extend our heartfelt gratitude towards Atal Bihari Vajpayee School of Management and Entrepreneurship, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, which provided us with the academic and research infrastructure without which this study would have been impossible to conduct. Our special thanks also go to the Delhi Technological University (DTU), Delhi, which helped us gain access to the required research facilities.

1. Introduction

Reflect upon a scenario that many people go through on a daily basis. A person is looking to buy a healthcare product online in the evening. Soon enough, the very same product is recommended to the

user in a sponsored ad on their social networking profile, followed by a targeted advertisement on a news website, before finally receiving an exclusive offer via email. The consumer is oblivious to how this happened, the data behind this phenomenon, the players involved in making the decision, and whether the sense of urgency was justified or not.

This is no longer just a theoretical dilemma. This is a very real dilemma that many consumers have had to grapple with across the globe in digital marketplaces, and it is one of the most pressing dilemmas for marketers in this day and age. In an age when AI plays the key role in business-consumer interaction on every conceivable platform, who takes ownership of the process? Who shoulders the responsibility for the outcome? How do organizations deal with the massive weight of AI-driven personalization in an increasingly transparent world?

There has been an increase in the adoption of artificial intelligence for marketing purposes. As highlighted in the State of AI Report by McKinsey & Company (2024), over 72% of firms across the globe have incorporated AI in one way or another within their processes, ranging from marketing to sales, which is ranked as the highest in terms of applications. The operations conducted by artificial intelligence range from things that were solely done by human beings: customer segmentation, content creation, dynamic pricing, customer churn, and customer message optimization.

Nonetheless, the governance of these emerging technologies has not kept pace with their adoption. In its 2024 Edelman Trust Barometer report, for instance, consumer confidence in AI-enabled brand encounters has fallen for the second consecutive year, with more than 63 percent of consumers worried about the use of artificial intelligence by companies to reach them.

Regulatory bodies are finally reacting with a sense of urgency. For example, the EU's AI Act – finalized in 2024 – considers particular AI-driven marketing activities as high-risk, which implies

mandatory human supervision, requirements for transparency, and conformity assessment. India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, introduces significant obligations for data fiduciaries, who are mostly digital marketing platforms and providers of technology services to them. In the U.S., the Federal Trade Commission has issued specific guidelines against manipulative algorithmic practices. All three major consumer economies simultaneously experience increasing regulation, while firms find it increasingly difficult to cope with such developments.

In spite of the rapid technological progress in marketing, there seems to be a disconnect between marketing practice and marketing theory when it comes to governance issues related to algorithmic marketing systems. Academics have achieved significant progress in understanding how AI can help companies personalize customer journeys, optimize marketing processes, and increase ROI on marketing efforts. Yet the negative outcomes of poorly governed marketing systems seem to receive significantly less scholarly attention. This has significant relevance to business as well. As per the PwC Consumer Intelligence Series on Trust in AI (2023), customers who do not have confidence in how the business uses AI technology are generally found to be those who easily switch to other businesses and do not readily share their personal data with any businesses, making it difficult for businesses to utilize AI in marketing campaigns in the future. Given this context, the research questions that arise here include: What governance framework would be required for the AI-driven marketing activities to maintain consumer trust while still being feasible and regulation compliant in heterogeneous environments? In an attempt to fill in this gap, the present research will conduct a thematic synthesis of different sources including the relevant regulatory frameworks, literature on consumer trust, and best practices from India, the European Union, and the USA.

To fill in this governance gap, the paper will seek to address this problem directly. Through a thematic review of 35 high-quality qualitative research sources, including regulatory documents, reports,

and literature on consumer trust from the top international organisations, the present research will propose the Responsible AI Marketing Framework that includes four important pillars. This framework can serve as a science-backed approach for restoring consumer trust while still keeping personalization potential for CMOs, Chief Data Officers, platform governance officers, and marketing data analytics experts.

Three countries are selected in this study: India, the European Union, and the US. Each of these three markets embodies various regulatory approaches, different levels of maturity regarding governance in terms of AI, and consumer trust at different levels. Not only will the research be valuable from the theoretical standpoint, but it will also provide a great deal of information for managers fighting for positions on the international market where some standards must be achieved.

There are four interconnected conclusions from the thematic analysis: the gap in transparency in AI marketing systems, the cycle of trust erosion due to insufficiently managed consent practices, regulatory divergence among the three studied jurisdictions, and emerging best practices in the industry that signify converging governance norms. These four findings are what underpin the framework of Responsible AI Marketing consisting of four elements, which are Transparency by Design, Consent Architecture, Algorithmic Accountability, and Consumer Empowerment.

Here is the structure of the paper. Section 2 contains the literature review. Section 3 describes the methodology used. Findings will be in Section 4 under four headings. In Section 5, the Responsible AI Marketing framework will be discussed. In Section 6, there will be a discussion on managerial issues, and in Section 7, a conclusion is given.

2. Literature Review

The body of literature in the intersection of AI and marketing has significantly expanded over the last decade, shifting from its initial focus on the exploration of AI-driven recommendation engines to a more integrative perspective in which the strategic and behavioral implications of AI adoption are considered. Here, we discuss three distinct areas of literature pertinent to the topic at hand.

2.1 AI in Marketing Analytics and Personalisation

The key strength of artificial intelligence (AI) for marketing comes from the ability to analyze huge amounts of information about customers and derive actionable insights that allow scaling up personalization. According to Davenport, Guha, Grewal, and Bressgott (2020), AI is revolutionizing marketing in five key areas: consumer insights, content generation, consumer experience, advertisement, and price optimization. Based on a series of illustrative examples, the authors argue that the greatest practical value of AI is derived from the possibility of personalized engagement with consumers, as no human-led marketing team can match the accuracy of real-time matching of offers, messages, and communication channels to specific consumer situations.

In their article, Kumar, Rajan, Venkatesan, and Lecinski (2019) further elaborate on the potential of AI by looking into its use for personalized engagement marketing. The researchers conclude that the paradigmatic change implied in shifting from personalized marketing within segments of consumers to personalized marketing at the level of individual customers is an important trend for the future. Furthermore, Wedel and Kannan (2016) offer an important typology for marketing analytics, where they claim that the move to data-intensive environments means that firms need to re-think their understanding of targeting, personalization, and consumer reaction measurement – an area which becomes especially important with AI-based decision-making. Huang & Rust (2021) provide another perspective on the use of AI in marketing, which is based on the differentiation of three types of capabilities in artificial

intelligence: mechanical, thinking, and feeling. According to this perspective, the commercial potential of AI is greatest when it engages customers using its feeling abilities through empathic personalization.

Shankar et al. (2022) explore the use of AI technology in digital marketing communication and explain how personalization changes consumer behavior in this case. It is relevant to the current research since it demonstrates how personalization caused by AI alters marketing communication in such a way that traditional attribution techniques fail to measure the impact.

2.2 Consumer Trust and the Transparency Challenge

Another related body of work considers the impact of AI marketing techniques on consumer trust. According to Martin & Murphy (2017), data privacy concerns represent a central component of marketing practice because a willingness by consumers to provide personal information is inherently conditional upon consumer trust in the fair and transparent handling of their data. Even though this theory was formed before the development of the current literature on governance, it is the core logic behind this issue, since the utilization of AI marketing systems through consumer data that the consumer does not understand or agree upon constitutes an inherently damaging process for the relationship between the parties involved.

From a wider perspective, Taddeo & Floridi (2018) note that AI may be regarded as beneficial for society in light of the principles of transparency, accountability, and human autonomy. Regarding empirical evidence, according to Mikalef & Gupta (2021), there is a connection between organizational AI ability and such aspects as efficiency, innovativeness, and vulnerability to AI governance issues.

Discussing their feeling economy model, Rust and Huang (2021) highlight that, in light of AI assuming cognitive and analytical tasks, the role of human virtues such as trustworthiness, empathy, and

authenticity become increasingly crucial in the context of consumer-brand relations. It is an important point when addressing the problem under consideration, since the more often AI mediates consumer experiences, the greater the importance of transparency becomes.

Together, these findings suggest that trust in AI-mediated marketing does not represent a stable predisposition, but rather a contingent and precarious result of transparency, data management practices, and the extent to which consumers maintain control over the use of their data. Importantly, it must be noted that in the vast majority of research efforts conducted on the topic to date, trust is conceptualized as a dependent variable that needs to be explained, rather than as a result of specific governance arrangements that either foster or inhibit it. This is a critical difference: it highlights the existence of a notable gap in the extant literature, which is addressed by this study.

2.3 Governance and the Emerging Regulatory Literature

Third, literature related to AI governance issues forms another relevant stream. This research stream is less developed compared to the other two streams because the issue of AI governance is relatively new. As stated by Chaffey and Ellis-Chadwick (2022), digital marketing is a highly regulated sphere; however, the gap between regulation and reality remains large in many countries. As per the OECD Digital Economy Outlook (2024), whereas most leading economies have created their respective AI principles and frameworks, the actual implementation and enforcement vary.

In terms of regulation, there are three different approaches to governance in major digital economies. In the EU, for instance, a risk-based and rights-based approach has been taken under the AI Act (2024) that makes it obligatory for high-risk AI systems to be transparent and accountable. India, on the other hand, has adopted a consent-and-fiduciary approach under the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023), which is based on data sovereignty. Meanwhile, NITI Aayog has taken an approach focused

on ethics in its Responsible AI framework (2020). Unlike India, the US does not have specific AI legislation. These different approaches result in what has been termed a compliance asymmetry by scholars researching regulatory theory, where multinational companies are required to adhere to incompatible governance requirements at the same time (OECD, 2024).

What is lacking in the existing research on this topic is a comprehensive approach that blends regulatory knowledge with theories on consumer trust and management practices, which will assist marketers in adopting artificial intelligence ethically.

What is currently lacking in the literature on this form of governance is an integrated framework that brings together regulatory requirements, organizational practices, and consumer trust dynamics into one coherent framework.

2.4 Theoretical Anchoring: Trust and Institutional Pressures

This study is rooted in three interrelated theoretical frameworks. The notion of trust serves as a foundation for the analysis of the consumer's side of the relationship, thus implying that consumers participating in the application of AI-driven marketing approaches are vulnerable because they cannot get any information regarding how their data is collected, processed, analyzed, and targeted. It follows that trust is predicated upon the establishment of visible signals reducing consumer uncertainty, such as information disclosure, opt-ins, privacy dashboards, and accountability (Mayer, Davis and Schoorman, 1995). Such a statement is consistent with signaling theory, which recognizes the existence of informational asymmetry in marketing with the help of AI.

The institutional theory is applied to explain the organizational and regulatory dimensions of the problem. Corporate governance practices are adopted by organizations not only due to economic incentives, but also out of necessity to ensure organizational legitimacy in the context of coercive (AI

Act, DPDP Act, and FTC guidelines), normative (ethical behavior of the industry), and mimetic (competitor capabilities to handle AI-related risks) pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott, 2008). Collectively, these three theoretical perspectives set out the logic of analysis for this study, forming the basis for interpretation of the results and construction of the governance model. That is, responsible AI marketing governance arises from the conversion of external institutional pressure into internal consumer trust signals. The concept is thoroughly articulated in the four elements of the Responsible AI Marketing Model, wherein Transparency by Design and Consent Architecture are trust signals, while Algorithmic Accountability and Consumer Empowerment constitute institutional governance models.

3. Methodology

Qualitative content analysis and thematic synthesis were used as methodologies in this paper. These methods are relevant to the purpose of the study since this paper seeks to formulate a theoretical framework based on an extensive array of literature sources. Qualitative synthesis is a widely used method in management and marketing literature for formulating theories through various bodies of knowledge. This method is suitable for answering emerging questions regarding governance that can only be addressed using knowledge sources from regulatory texts, industry practices, and consumer behavior studies.

3.1 Search Strategy and Source Selection

The 35-source corpus was developed through a structured search and screening process. Academic sources were searched using Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, Emerald Insight, IEEE Xplore, and publisher databases relevant to marketing, management, information systems, and AI governance. Policy and regulatory materials were identified through official websites of the European Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Government of India, NITI Aayog, OECD, and UNESCO.

Industry and consumer-trust reports were searched through the official repositories of Accenture, Deloitte, McKinsey, PwC, BCG, Gartner, Edelman, Nielsen, and Statista.

The search used combinations of the following keywords: artificial intelligence marketing, AI-driven marketing, algorithmic marketing, personalized advertising, consumer trust, AI transparency, algorithmic accountability, data privacy, consent architecture, responsible AI, AI governance, digital platforms, institutional pressures, regulatory governance, AI ethics, and consumer empowerment. Boolean combinations included terms such as AI AND marketing AND trust, algorithmic transparency AND consumer trust, responsible AI AND marketing governance, institutional pressure AND AI governance, and personalization AND data privacy.

The inclusion criteria were: sources published between 2016 and 2024, but not including foundational theory sources used as a theoretical basis for the argument; sources that directly relate to AI-enabled marketing, consumer trust, data privacy, transparency, algorithmic accountability, or digital-platform governance; sources published in peer-reviewed journals, books, regulatory papers, or respected industry/consulting reports; sources that have a methodological foundation, empirical support, regulatory significance, or conceptual importance; and sources that are related to one of the three jurisdictions studied in the paper: India, the EU, and the US.

The exclusion criteria were: sources concerned with AI without marketing, consumer, governance, or platform implications; opinion pieces, blog entries, and commentary sources without an identifiable empirical base or source of institutional authority; duplicate sources and superseded sources from prior publications; sources without enough methodological clarity; and sources published before 2016, excluding foundational theory sources like trust theory, signaling theory, and institutional theory.

3.2 Data Corpus

The database employed in this research comprises 35 sources of high quality, which can be classified into four categories. The first category is comprised of policy and regulation measures such as the EU AI Act (2024), the Digital Personal Data Protection Act of India (2023), Commercial Surveillance Rulemaking by the FTC (2022), NITI Aayog Responsible AI for All (2020), and AI governance documents by OECD & UNESCO.

The second group is represented by consulting and industry reports prepared by such companies as McKinsey, Deloitte, PwC, Nielsen, Accenture, Boston Consulting Group, and Gartner. This type of document includes relevant information regarding the practice, trends, and actions taken to regulate marketing activities. This particular group is selected based on the research methodology, the survey's scope, and its effect on the decision-making process of the manager in marketing. The third group comprises the results of trust surveys carried out by Edelman, KPMG, Eurobarometer, Internet and Mobile Association of India, and Statista. They offer a systematic account of consumer behavior with respect to AI-enabled marketing techniques within several locations.

The fourth group is made up of journal articles and books that support the theoretical framework for analysis. They come mainly from the best of the journals, such as Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Retailing, California Management Review, Information & Management, and Science.

3.3 Analytical Procedure

This analysis was carried out in three distinct phases. Phase one entailed reading all the documents in their entirety and coding the major arguments presented in them, the evidence offered, and their connection to AI-enabled marketing governance. Open coding was conducted in order to determine initial themes without having any preconceived notion of what they might be.

Phase two involved grouping the various themes into clusters and identifying trends among the various sources of the information. It was during this phase that the four main themes emerged. They include: lack of transparency, escalating erosion of trust, regulatory disparity, and emerging best practices.

The final stage in this process entailed the creation of the Responsible AI Marketing Framework, based on the extraction of the main themes and their connection to the various pillars of the Responsible AI Marketing Framework. In this research, the creation of the framework entailed a process known as Thematic Synthesis, which is where themes from qualitative analysis were used to create constructs.

3.4 Quality and Rigour

The strength of the analysis relies on the variety of sources that have been used, the process involved in coding, and the connection between each element of the model and the sources used. In the selection of the sources used, emphasis was placed on the regulatory jurisdiction, methodology, scope of the empirical base, and the recency of the source. All sources used were written after 2016, with the vast majority of them published between 2021 and 2024.

4. Findings and Analysis

There were four primary themes identified via the qualitative analysis conducted on the 35-source corpus. The following are the four themes identified, along with evidence to back up each theme.

4.1 Theme One: The Transparency Deficit

The most prominent finding throughout the literature review was the existence of an extensive transparency gap between the workings of AI systems in marketing and the knowledge consumers

possess regarding them. The average consumer in any major market is unlikely to understand how AI decides which content to deliver, when to deliver it, at what price, and how urgent it needs to be. These results are not trivial. Edelman's trust findings suggest persistent consumer skepticism regarding the transparency of how companies use AI and personal data in marketing practices (Edelman, 2023) Similarly, the global survey by KPMG (2023) revealed that more than half of the surveyed population in every country would like to have more details on how these recommendations and offers are generated.

The transparency gap exists on various levels. Technically speaking, many of the AI algorithms used in marketing cannot be easily interpreted, even by the software engineer designing the algorithm. At an organisational level, there can be significant distances between the marketing department and the AI system carrying out the campaign. Moreover, from a regulatory perspective, current disclosure standards in most jurisdictions fail to provide adequate insight into the ways in which AI may impact consumer decisions.

Although many organizations acknowledge the importance of transparency in AI deployment, the implementation of formal transparency procedures in marketing systems remains uneven across firms. In this respect, the discrepancy between aspirations and action with regard to transparency can be compared to the difference between consumer expectations and organizational behavior.

In response to the aforementioned deficiency, the EU AI Act (2024) provides for specific transparency measures that must be taken in relation to the operation of AI systems that involve consumers, such as the obligation to provide information concerning AI's involvement in a transaction even where consumers are not dealing with human personnel, as well as providing for detailed documentation of the data used and the decision making logic in high risk AI applications.

The Indian DPDP Act (2023), in a similar vein, requires data fiduciaries to inform data principals about the reasons for processing their data, such as personalization and targeting systems. According to the FTC (2022), AI-fueled marketing strategies that lead consumers into believing something that isn't true, such as creating a sense of urgency, using social proof, or charging personalized prices without informing consumers, are actionable.

4.2 Theme Two: The Trust Erosion Spiral

Theme two concerns what will be referred to throughout the paper as the trust erosion spiral, in which opaque marketing practices in AI marketing result in low trust from the consumer, which leads to little voluntary data sharing, which means poor data for the AI model, resulting in poor consumer experiences, which again leads to low trust. Such a spiral can be observed across several sources within the literature and constitutes one of the key commercial rationales for improved governance in AI marketing.

The PwC's Consumer Intelligence Series on Trust in AI (2023) offers the most thorough quantifiable evidence in this regard, showing that customers who do not trust the AI practices used by a company are much more likely to cut ties with the company, much less willing to share personal data with the company, and more likely to use privacy-enhancing technologies that hinder the firm's tracking abilities. The Deloitte's Digital Consumer Trends report (2023a) shows that younger people, who comprise the biggest growing market segment in digital commerce, are especially sensitive to the perceived manipulation of AI and seek out transparent companies.

It is Edelman's Trust Barometer (2024), however, which provides some of the clearest evidence for the generational aspect of the trust erosion spiral. While in the overall sample of consumers, those between the ages of 18 and 35 trust AI-powered brand interactions the least, it is this same cohort that has

suffered the greatest decline in trust among those surveyed; it is also, importantly, the one that offers the greatest opportunities from a business perspective and that is most likely to change its buying behavior based on trust considerations.

The trust erosion spiral is then further accentuated by media and regulatory interventions, both of which help spread awareness of AI marketing among consumers, thus increasing their focus on transparency as an important attribute of a brand. According to KPMG's trust studies (2023), consumers who know about investigations of AI marketing practices of a certain company are much less likely to trust this company's use of AI technology than those who do not know about it, regardless of whether the firm has actually committed any breaches of regulation.

According to the Gartner Strategic Technology Trends Report of 2023, AI Trust, Risk, and Security Management is one of the ten strategic technology trends that will dominate the next decade, signifying that there is an emerging understanding by technology leaders that the business viability of the implementation of AI requires developing trust architectures that will stand up to scrutiny by consumers and regulators.

4.3 Theme Three: Regulatory Divergence and Its Marketing Consequences

The third theme is related to the notable difference in regulations regarding the use of artificial intelligence in marketing across three countries analyzed above and its impact on multinationals operating in all three countries at once. Such a difference is particularly noticeable when comparing India, EU, and the USA, as there is a considerable difference in how marketing with the help of artificial intelligence is regulated.

First of all, in the EU, there is a more comprehensive approach to regulation in the form of the AI Act (2024). The act includes risk-based categorization of artificial intelligence systems. Moreover, the document describes the obligations for high-risk AI systems, which include transparency, liability, and conformity assessment. It should be noted that a number of instances of using artificial intelligence in marketing can be considered either as high-risk AI systems under the act or close to them. They are, first of all, the use of personalized pricing due to the use of consumer profiling algorithms, emotion recognition tools for marketing, and the dissemination of content via AI. The critical aspect about the document is that its scope covers any companies that have AI systems that affect EU consumers regardless of their geographical location.

It focuses on five key elements – safety, equity, inclusivity, privacy, transparency, and accountability. Nevertheless, while the DPDP Act has already been enacted, its enforcement by the Data Protection Board is still nascent, meaning that firms cannot yet draw from the board's experience with the law's requirements. The United States' regulatory landscape is highly fragmented due to the lack of a cohesive federal regulation or AI/data protection law. Instead, the governance framework for AI-based marketing consists of sectoral regulations, FTC guidelines, and recent state-level AI regulations such as the California Consumer Privacy Act. The FTC has taken an enforcement-oriented stance by addressing any instances of deception or manipulation of consumers via the use of AI in marketing without necessarily creating a regulatory framework for AI marketing beforehand. This poses challenges for companies trying to establish governance mechanisms for AI marketing because there is uncertainty regarding what the requirements are.

The practical implication of such a difference between the regulatory approaches is that the establishment of AI marketing governance mechanisms that comply with the requirements of the EU AI Act will result in governance mechanisms that surpass or meet the minimum requirements of the DPDP

Act and the guidelines by the FTC, in most cases. Therefore, the framework provided by the EU becomes a de facto standard for marketing governance mechanisms for AI. Companies having significant business activities in the EU are becoming de facto standard-setters for their businesses globally. This phenomenon is documented in the OECD Digital Economy Outlook (2024), which notes that the expanding reach of AI governance frameworks, particularly those emerging from the European Union, is influencing firms across jurisdictions to align their AI governance practices with EU-oriented standards.

4.4 Theme Four: Emerging Best Practices

A fourth theme that comes out of the corpus is a collection of best practices employed by top companies and described in industry literature. The uniqueness of such practices is that they show the feasibility of responsible AI marketing governance, rather than its mere possibility.

Synthesising across the corpus, four practices emerge as characteristic of firms that have succeeded in maintaining consumer trust within AI marketing environments. These are:

- Proactive transparency, whereby companies make clear what the impact of AI on the consumer is through communication, without being forced into disclosure by regulation;
- Meaningful consent, whereby companies design informed consents in such a way as to be truly informative and not merely procedural in nature;
- Algorithmic accountability arrangements, where certain individuals or groups of people are made responsible for monitoring and auditing the behavior of the AI marketing system; and,
- Consumer empowerment mechanisms, where consumers gain the capacity to learn about and control the AI systems that impact them.

Firms that are rated highly in terms of AI transparency by consumers perform better in business performance measures such as retention rates, net promoter scores, and wallet share (Deloitte, 2023b). In addition, according to Balis, Bakopoulos and Wiener (2025), firms with advanced AI marketing governance practices derive greater value from their AI marketing investments through reduced churn due to trust issues, lower risks of regulatory interventions, and better quality first-party data collected voluntarily by consumers.

The McKinsey survey titled State of AI (2024) extends its perspective to organisations, concluding that companies employing specialist AI governance roles, independent or embedded within the current risk/compliance framework, have significantly greater confidence regarding the management of AI risks and significantly greater levels of AI success stories for their marketing and sales activities.

5. The Responsible AI Marketing Framework

As can be seen, these four topics combined show that responsible AI marketing governance can never be achieved through some isolated interventions. While transparency can help to restore trust, as long as the mechanisms of consent remain coercive, it will not be possible. Moreover, compliance with regulations alone does not necessarily mean that the organization is held accountable. As such, responsible governance requires a holistic approach that would address the issues of transparency, consent, accountability, and consumer agency at the same time. That is why the proposed framework of Responsible AI Marketing Governance is expected to help achieve these goals.

First of all, the topic of transparency gap leads to the formulation of the problem statement: AI marketing systems do not have sufficient transparency needed both by consumers and regulators. Secondly, the topic of the trust erosion cycle allows highlighting the importance of the problem in the

context of the company's operations, demonstrating that failure to develop adequate AI marketing governance is indeed a problem. Thirdly, the topic of regulatory divergence helps to highlight competitive advantages that the companies can gain while building their governance architecture. Finally, the best practices analysis shows that the framework in question is indeed feasible enough.

Four pillars that constitute the Responsible AI Marketing Framework are: Transparency by Design, Consent Architecture, Algorithmic Accountability, and Consumer Empowerment. This can be seen in Table 1

Table 1: The Responsible AI Marketing Framework

PILLAR 1	PILLAR 2	PILLAR 3	PILLAR 4
Transparency by Design Build AI systems with explainability as a core requirement. Document decision logic. Communicate AI use to consumers proactively.	**Consent Architecture** Design consent processes that genuinely inform. Ensure equal accessibility of refusal. Enable ongoing consent management.	**Algorithmic Accountability** Assign clear governance ownership. Conduct regular AI audits. Establish incident response and board-level reporting.	**Consumer Empowerment** Provide preference management tools. Enable why-did-I-see-this explanations. Offer a meaningful opt-out. Act on consumer feedback.

5.1 Pillar One: Transparency by Design

The first pillar makes it clear that transparency should not be seen as a disclosure responsibility to be fulfilled after the development of AI marketing systems; instead, transparency should be considered a fundamental design principle that determines the way these systems are developed from the beginning. Transparency by Design implies the need to develop AI marketing systems as systems with the function of explainability built in from the very beginning. This implies that all the decisions made using AI marketing systems must be accompanied by an explainable rationale expressed in terms understandable to the marketing professionals behind these decisions, as well as, where applicable, to the end customers themselves. This pillar rests upon the transparency requirements provided for in the EU AI Act and on the transparency principle set out by NITI Aayog in its Responsible AI framework. From a practical perspective, Transparency by Design will involve businesses adopting AI solutions that are easy to understand, setting standards for documenting the processes of making decisions based on AI in marketing, training their marketing staff in understanding and explaining the AI solutions, and ensuring communication that promotes transparency among customers about the use of AI in personalizing their experiences.

5.2 Pillar Two: Consent Architecture

The Consent Architecture framework addresses the design of the process through which organizations obtain consumer consent for their data to be used by AI. The industry is characterized by compliance rather than informed consent, so consumers have consent forms that are difficult to understand, cannot be refused, and are not even close to being informed consent. In this case, the evidence obtained from the corpus is quite apparent. The issues related to the consent process used by organizations when trying to obtain the permission of consumers for utilizing their data in artificial

intelligence marketing systems today focus on technical compliance and not substantial consent by the consumers themselves. As such, consumers are offered consent forms that are technical, confusing, and hard to say no to.

Consent and notification regulations under the DPDP Act can be considered the backbone for this component of India's regulatory framework. The EU's AI Act and its demands to ensure that high-risk AI systems are subject to meaningful human oversight, at the very least, indicate that people who are subject to such systems are fully informed about how they work. The actions by the FTC to counter such manipulative mechanisms for seeking consent form the foundation for this principle within the US jurisdiction.

5.3 Pillar Three: Algorithmic Accountability

This third pillar deals with the problem of accountability structures within which AI marketing technologies operate. Algorithmic Accountability addresses the structural conditions under which AI marketing systems operate without sufficient oversight. When no individual or team is clearly responsible for AI marketing outcomes, discrimination in targeting, manipulative urgency notifications, and opaque pricing practices emerge without consequence. Algorithmic Accountability in this context refers to the requirement for accountability structures in which there is accountability for actions taken by AI marketing technologies.

Certain factors play a key role in successfully implementing Algorithmic Accountability. These are the selection of the AI marketing governance owners that could be the chief AI officer, the marketing ethics council, or an AI risk management team that would have adequate authority over the AI marketing system performances. It requires audit mechanisms to review AI marketing system results for any indication of bias, manipulation, regulation violation, or customer abuse. There must also be emergency

procedures for addressing scenarios where AI marketing systems yield negative or unexpected effects. Finally, there should be board-level reporting of AI marketing governance, which ensures that the people responsible for customer interactions at the organizational top level know how AI handles these interactions.

According to the Gartner report on the importance of AI Trust, Risk, and Security Management as a strategic technology trend (2023), the growing consciousness of business and technology leaders on the need for accountability frameworks such as this for sustainable AI technology usage is evident. The research conducted by Accenture (2024) has empirically shown that companies that possess such an accountability structure for AI marketing are able to solve any governance issues before affecting either customers or regulators.

5.4 Pillar Four: Consumer Empowerment

Although transparency, consent, and accountability are essential components, they are not enough by themselves to establish trust from consumers regarding AI marketing strategies. Consumers should have the capacity to understand and participate in controlling the use of these technologies. Consumer Empowerment, as articulated within this model, entails providing consumers with mechanisms that allow them to review decisions made using these AI technologies, to understand the reasons behind such decisions, and modify the way in which personalization takes place based on their own preferences.

The notion of Consumer Empowerment is informed by the findings from the trust studies mentioned in the corpus above. In particular, the Trust Barometer published by Edelman in 2024 and the trust survey conducted worldwide by KPMG in 2023 both show that there is a strong correlation between consumer empowerment (or rather lack thereof) and consumer trust. That is to say that consumers who

have the ability to control the use of AI in their dealings with brands tend to demonstrate significantly greater levels of trust than consumers who have no such power.

In reality, this would mean that preference management tools are user-friendly and work effectively. This would mean providing an easy-to-understand explanation of the algorithms used for personalisation purposes, namely, why-did-I-see-this functions that have become required by more and more regulations. This would mean offering genuine opt-outs without ruining the whole experience to such a degree that opting out becomes a punishment of sorts. And this would mean taking into account consumer opinion in terms of AI marketing activities, namely, providing an opportunity for consumers to notify the company about any suspicious AI marketing actions.

6. Managerial Implications

The Responsible AI Marketing Framework holds immediate and serious implications for the marketers and corporate governors responsible for managing the deployment of AI technology and its associated relationships with consumers. These implications are grouped by functional area in the following sections.

6.1 Implications for Chief Marketing Officers

The implications of this study for the Chief Marketing Officers of organisations are clear. Namely, the findings regarding the erosion of trust in the AI marketing ecosystem imply that the economic benefits from AI marketing investments depend directly on the quality of governance within the AI marketing systems themselves. CMOs who leave the AI marketing process entirely up to the technology function of their organisations are neglecting one of the key determinants of consumer perceptions of their brand identity *(McKinsey, 2024)*.

This suggests that the CMOs should take an active role in the AI marketing governance decisions related to data collection, personalisation logic design, transparency communication practices, and processing of consumer feedback about AI marketing experiences. This would also entail integrating the AI transparency principle into the brand positioning strategy, especially when dealing with brands whose competitive edge hinges on consumer trust. Lastly, CMOs should support the organisational investments into explainable AI technologies required by the Transparency by Design framework, since the alternative path of relying on AI marketing systems whose operation remains mysterious to both consumers and regulators would prove economically unsustainable.

6.2 Implications for Chief Data Officers

As CDOs, the most relevant implication of this framework is that data governance and AI marketing governance should be combined. Specifically, the Consent Architecture needs to undergo some significant changes to align with the challenges posed by the increasing complexity of collecting, managing, and documenting consent for use of AI technology in marketing applications. Most companies now have consent architectures that are suitable for less complex types of data processing and are thus not adequate for the purposes of AI marketing. CDOs will therefore need to assess these architectures against the new legal standards defined by the DPDP Act, the EU AI Act, and the FTC to make sure that they work well (DPDP Act, 2023; Regulation EU 2024/1689, 2024) .

The issue of data quality on the trust erosion spiral will also have direct implications for CDOs. This is because the reluctance of consumers who are dissatisfied with AI marketing tactics to share data means that there will be no high-quality first-party data available to support such operations. Those CDOs who can show that consent collection frameworks in their organizations take consumer autonomy into account are more likely to succeed in retaining such data.

6.3 Implications for Platform Governance Teams

In the case of companies operating digital platforms, such as e-commerce marketplaces, social media platforms, and advertising technologies, the Algorithmic Accountability pillar carries important consequences. Governance teams of platforms play a critical role in facilitating the marketing relationship between brand advertisers and platform users through AI tools, and they have an important place within the AI marketing governance space. The regulations covered by this research require platforms to act as data fiduciaries and owners of AI systems affecting consumer welfare and rights.

The Responsible AI Marketing Framework can serve as a guiding principle for platforms when establishing guidelines for brand advertisers on their platforms and their own AI systems. Digital platforms creating a framework of governance for AI marketing activities and monitoring advertisers' adherence to it have a much lower risk of regulatory exposure in the jurisdictions where they operate (EU AI Act, 2024; DPDP Act, 2023).

6.4 Implications for Marketing Analytics Leaders

Marketing analytics leaders and data scientists need to understand that there is a significant shift in the design, evaluation, and reporting of AI marketing systems that results from adopting the framework. Transparency by Design mandates that explainability be considered as a prerequisite in the development of AI marketing systems, not as something added after the fact. This impacts decision-making regarding which types of models to use – interpretable models are preferred when explainability requirements are higher – as well as the supporting structure around the deployment of AI marketing systems.

This has important implications for measurement. Current marketing measurement approaches lack the capacity to measure all facets pertaining to governance within the realm of AI marketing performance. Marketing analytics practitioners must be able to build their measurement framework, which includes taking into account trust metrics along with commercial metrics, measuring consent rates, monitoring trends in data quality, and many more (Accenture, 2024; Gartner, 2023).

7. Conclusion

In this context, this research demonstrates that there are many issues in the governance of artificial intelligence-based marketing in the top three digital economies, such as transparency deficit, self-reinforcing trust deficit, and regulatory fragmentation, amongst others. These challenges require an integrated approach towards governance. In this study, the Responsible AI Marketing Framework is presented as a solution to this challenge based on regulatory standardization, consumer trust theory, and best practices in business.

Transparency by Design, Consent Architecture, Algorithmic Accountability, and Consumer Empowerment make up the four pillars of this framework. However, it is important to note that these four aspects are not separate and are interrelated components of an effective governance framework. Any framework must be transparent in order to create the basis for informed consent. Consent Architecture helps in gathering accurate data as well as encouraging consumer confidence in providing the required information.

The findings suggest that firms that embed these four pillars into their AI marketing operations are better positioned to convert governance investment into competitive advantage, specifically through higher

consent rates, stronger brand trust, and defensible regulatory compliance across the EU, US, and Indian contexts examined.

Theoretically, this study contributes an integrated governance framework that bridges consumer trust theory, signalling theory, and institutional theory within a single actionable architecture — addressing a gap identified across the existing literature on AI marketing governance. Practically, the framework provides CMOs, CDOs, platform governance teams, and marketing analytics leaders with a jurisdiction-sensitive roadmap for embedding transparency, consent, accountability, and consumer empowerment into AI marketing operations.

Many areas within this paper can be considered limitations, and these should be developed in future studies. First, the synthesis qualitative analysis method chosen by the author is suitable for the development of the theoretical framework, but does not offer any new empirical evidence on how consumers react to particular intervention measures. In the future, researchers should use more experimental and field study methods to validate the propositions offered in the paper. Second, the paper analyzes only three jurisdictions that do not include such regions as China, Brazil, and Southeast Asia. It would be interesting to conduct comparative research and expand the scope of analysis to these countries and their regulatory mechanisms. Third, the proposed framework is very generalized, and future research may consider applying this framework in various industries, such as finance, health care marketing, and fast-moving consumer goods.

The trajectory of responsible AI governance is now clearly established across all three jurisdictions examined. Consumer demands are moving faster than organizations' responses. The era of largely unregulated AI marketing practices is drawing to a close. The costs of the breakdown of the trust cycles become increasingly clear. It is the companies and academics that take the lead on this issue in the

beginning and put in the most effort in governing AI marketing that will define the criteria for the rest of the industry.

References

- Accenture. (2024). Responsible AI: From Compliance to Confidence: Embracing a New Mindset to Advance Responsible AI Maturity. Accenture Research https://www.accenture.com/content/dam/accenture/final/accenture-com/document-3/Accenture-Responsible-AI-From-Compliance-To-Confidence-Report.pdf
- Balis, J., Bakopoulos, V. and Wiener, L. (2025). From campaigns to business value: how AI will transform marketing. Boston Consulting Group. Available at: https://www.bcg.com/publications/2025/transforming-marketing-with-ai
- Chaffey, D. and Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2022). Digital Marketing: Strategy, Implementation and Practice. 8th edition. Pearson Education.
- Davenport, T., Guha, A., Grewal, D., and Bressgott, T. (2020). How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *48*(1), 24-42.
- Deloitte. (2023a). *Digital consumer trends 2023: UK insights*. Deloitte LLP. https://www.deloitte.com/uk/en/Industries/tmt/research/digital-consumer-trends-2023.html
- Deloitte. (2023b). *Global marketing trends 2023: Resilient seeds for growth*. Deloitte Insights**. https://www.deloitte.com/be/en/services/consulting/research/global-marketing-trends-2023.html**

- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. (2023), Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. https://www.meity.gov.in/static/uploads/2024/06/2bf1f0e9f04e6fb4f8fef35e82c42aa5.pdf
- DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, *48*(2), 147-160.
- Edelman (2023) Edelman Trust Barometer: Navigating a polarized world. Edelman Trust Institute. https://www.edelman.com/trust/2023/trust-barometer
- Edelman. (2024). 2024 Edelman Trust Barometer: Innovation in Peril. Edelman Trust Institute. https://www.edelman.com/trust/2024/trust-barometer
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). (2024). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
- European Commission. (2025). *European citizens' knowledge and attitudes towards science and technology*. https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/3227
- Federal Trade Commission. (2022). *Trade regulation rule on commercial surveillance and data security (advance notice of proposed rulemaking)*. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/08/22/2022-17752/trade-regulation-rule-on-commercial-surveillance-and-data-security
- Gartner. (2023, October 16). *Gartner identifies the top 10 strategic technology trends for 2024*. https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2023-10-16-gartner-identifies-the-top-10-strategic-technology-trends-for-2024
- Huang, M. H., and Rust, R. T. (2021). A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *49*(1), 30-50.

- Internet and Mobile Association of India. (2023). *Internet in India 2023*. https://www.iamai.in/sites/default/files/research/INTERNET%20IN%20INDIA%202023.pdf
- KPMG (2023). Trust in Artificial Intelligence: A Global Study. KPMG International. Available at: https://kpmg.com/xx/en/our-insights/ai-and-technology/trust-in-artificial-intelligence.html
- Kumar, V., Rajan, B., Venkatesan, R., and Lecinski, J. (2019). Understanding the role of artificial intelligence in personalized engagement marketing. *California management review*, *61*(4), 135-155.
- Martin, K. D., and Murphy, P. E. (2017). The role of data privacy in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *45*(2), 135-155.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., and Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, *20*(3), 709-734.
- McKinsey and Company (2023). The State of AI in 2023: Generative AI's Breakout Year. McKinsey Global Institute. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai-in-2023-generative-ais-breakout-year
- McKinsey and Company (2024). The State of AI in early 2024: Gen AI Adoption spikes and starts to generate value. McKinsey Global Institute. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai-2024
- Mikalef, P. and Gupta, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence capability: Conceptualization, measurement calibration, and empirical study on its impact on organizational creativity and firm performance. Information and Management, 58(3), 103434.
- NITI Aayog. (2020). Working Document: *Towards responsible #AI for all: Draft for Discussion.* https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-11/Towards_Responsible_AIforAll_Part1.pdf

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *OECD digital economy outlook 2020*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-digital-economy-outlook-2020_bb167041-en.html
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2024). *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the technology frontier*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2023). *Global consumer insights pulse survey: February 2023*. PwC. https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/industries/consumer-markets/consumer-insights-survey-feb-2023.html
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC). (2024). *2024 AI business predictions*. https://www.pwc.com/id/en/services/risk-assurance-services/data-analytics/2024-ai-business-predictions--pwc.html
- Rust, R. T., and Huang, M. H. (2021). The feeling economy. In *The Feeling Economy: How Artificial Intelligence Is Creating the Era of Empathy* (pp. 41-61). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Scott, W.R. (2008). Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests. 3rd edition. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/unf_research/55/
- Shankar, V., Grewal, D., Sunder, S., Fossen, B., Peters, K., and Agarwal, A. (2022). Digital marketing communication in global marketplaces: A review of extant research, future directions, and potential approaches. *International Journal of research in Marketing*, *39*(2), 541-565.
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87(3), 355-374.
- Statista. (2024). *Consumers' trust in brands using artificial intelligence (AI) worldwide in 2023, by use case*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/1536451/consumers-trust-brands-using-ai/

- Taddeo, M., and Floridi, L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. *Science*, *361*(6404), 751-752.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence
- Wedel, M., and Kannan, P. K. (2016). Marketing analytics for data-rich environments. *Journal of marketing*, *80*(6), 97-121.