



Review Article

From AI-Assisted to AI-Generated: A Systematic Review of AI Involvement Disclosure and Consumer Responses in Advertising

Ruth R. Sealmoy **Author Information:**

Marketing Management Department,
College of Business Education and
Accountancy, Bulacan State University, City
of Malolos, Bulacan, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

Ruth R. Sealmoy
Email: ruth.sealmoy@bulsu.edu.ph

Article History:

Date received: September 4, 2026
Date revised: October 9, 2026
Date accepted: October 21, 2026

Recommended citation:

Sealmoy, R. (2026). From AI-assisted to AI-generated: A systematic review of AI involvement disclosure and consumer responses in advertising. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 4(11), 199-210. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.453>

Abstract. The increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in advertising has intensified the need to understand how disclosure of AI involvement influences consumer responses. This systematic literature review synthesizes empirical evidence on AI involvement disclosure in advertising, focusing on disclosure forms, consumer responses, psychological mechanisms, and contextual conditions. Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, Scopus-indexed, English-language, peer-reviewed empirical studies published from 2022 to 2026 were considered for inclusion. After applying the predefined eligibility and journal-level selection criteria, 20 studies published from 2024 to 2026 constituted the final corpus. Methodological quality was considered using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), separately from the Journal Impact Factor used as a journal-level delimitation criterion. Seventeen of the 20 studies employed primary quantitative approaches, demonstrating the predominance of experimental, survey, and related quantitative designs. The synthesis indicates that consumer responses to AI disclosure are conditional rather than uniformly positive or negative. Disclosure was associated with variations in authenticity, credibility, trust, perceived effort, attitudes, engagement, and behavioral intentions, with these relationships shaped by psychological mechanisms and contextual factors such as perceived human involvement, disclosure format, advertising appeal, privacy concerns, and AI competency. The review contributes a mechanism-based understanding of AI disclosure by emphasizing a disclosure–interpretation–response process in which consumers interpret the role of AI and human involvement before forming advertising evaluations and behavioral responses. The findings highlight the importance of communicating not merely the presence of AI but also its specific role in advertising production and identify directions for more transparent and context-sensitive AI disclosure practices.

Keywords: *AI disclosure; Artificial intelligence; Authenticity; Consumer responses; Systematic literature review.*

Artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed advertising by enabling organizations to automate copywriting, generate images and virtual endorsers, personalize promotional messages, and manage consumer interactions. These capabilities can reduce production costs, improve efficiency, and scale advertising campaigns. However, the increasing use of AI has also raised concerns about transparency, authenticity, accountability, and possible consumer deception. Consumers may respond differently when they learn that an



advertisement was created entirely by AI rather than produced by a person with AI assistance (Brüns & Meißner, 2024; Bui et al., 2024; Wang & Qiu, 2024; Xia et al., 2025).

A central tension in AI advertising disclosure is that although disclosure is intended to promote transparency by informing consumers about the use of artificial intelligence, making AI involvement explicit does not necessarily produce more favorable consumer responses. Generic labels such as “AI-generated” have been associated with lower perceived authenticity, credibility, trust, and advertiser effort in some contexts, particularly when consumers perceive that technology has replaced human creativity. These perceptions may subsequently influence advertising attitudes, engagement, purchase intention, positive word of mouth, and brand loyalty (Kirk & Givi, 2025; Bui, 2026; Patil & Rice, 2026; Zhao et al., 2026). Kim (2026) similarly found that AI models in fashion advertising could increase skepticism, while Brüns and Meißner (2024) showed that generative AI use diminished brand authenticity when AI appeared to replace rather than assist human content creators.

Nevertheless, disclosure effects are not universally negative. Consumer responses may depend on how disclosure is presented, AI's specific role, and the surrounding advertising context. Detailed disclosures explaining whether AI acted as a creator, assistant, editor, model, or personalization tool may preserve credibility more effectively than generic labels (Le et al., 2026; Wang & Qiu, 2024). Disclosure effects may also vary according to AI competency, privacy concerns, source type, advertising appeal, service intangibility, visual cues, and influencer well-being (Ahn et al., 2026; Balaban & Phua, 2026; Grigsby et al., 2025; Gu et al., 2026; Kim & Cho, 2026; Qadri et al., 2026; Qadri & Moustafa, 2026). These contrasting findings suggest that consumer responses depend not simply on whether AI use is disclosed but also on how consumers interpret the disclosed role of AI within the advertising process.

Despite growing research attention, a key mechanism-specification gap remains. Existing studies have examined AI disclosure through different disclosure formats, advertising contexts, psychological mechanisms, and consumer outcomes, but these findings have not been sufficiently integrated to explain why and under what conditions disclosure produces different responses. Studies have separately identified mechanisms involving authenticity, credibility, trust, perceived effort, curiosity, moral disgust, and perceptions of human involvement, while other findings demonstrate conditional effects involving source type, advertising appeal, privacy concerns, AI competency, service characteristics, and the degree of human involvement. Consequently, a systematic synthesis is needed to connect disclosure design and the role of AI with the psychological mechanisms and contextual conditions that shape consumer responses. Methodological and geographical limitations, including the predominance of quantitative research and the limited representation of several regions and real-world behavioral contexts, further indicate areas in which the evidence base remains incomplete (Guo et al., 2026; Xia et al., 2025).

Accordingly, this systematic review examines empirical research on AI involvement disclosure in advertising. Studies published from 2022 to 2026 were eligible for inclusion. Following the predefined screening and selection criteria, the final corpus comprised 20 English-language, peer-reviewed empirical studies published from 2024 to 2026. Specifically, the review seeks to classify the forms and roles of AI involvement disclosure; synthesize their relationships with consumer perceptions, attitudes, and behavioral responses; identify the psychological mechanisms and contextual conditions that help explain these relationships; and determine methodological and geographical gaps in the existing literature. Through this synthesis, the review seeks to provide a more integrated understanding of how, why, and under what conditions AI disclosure shapes consumer responses and to inform transparent and responsible AI advertising practices.

Accordingly, the review addresses the following research questions: How has AI involvement disclosure been conceptualized and operationalized in advertising research? What consumer perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioral responses are associated with AI involvement disclosure? What psychological mechanisms and contextual conditions explain or modify consumer responses to AI involvement disclosure? What methodological and geographical gaps characterize the existing empirical literature?

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a systematic literature review (SLR) to examine existing empirical research on the disclosure of artificial intelligence involvement in advertising and its effects on consumer perceptions and behavioral

responses. An SLR was considered appropriate because it provides an organized and transparent method for identifying, selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing evidence related to a clearly defined research problem (Shaheen et al., 2023). The study selected an SLR over less structured review approaches because it sought to systematically identify, evaluate, and integrate empirical evidence on AI involvement disclosure across advertising contexts, disclosure formats, psychological mechanisms, and consumer outcomes, using explicit and reproducible selection criteria.

The review process was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework to document the identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and final inclusion of studies (Page et al., 2021). The review protocol was not prospectively registered in a systematic review registry or open repository.

We retrieved relevant articles from Scopus using a predefined Boolean search strategy covering artificial intelligence, disclosure, advertising, marketing, and branding. The search was limited to English-language empirical journal articles published from 2022 to 2026. Titles and abstracts were initially screened against the established inclusion and exclusion criteria. Candidate articles were then evaluated for relevance to AI disclosure in advertising, examination of consumer responses, empirical research design, and availability of a verifiable Journal Impact Factor.

Search Strategy and Boolean Logic

To ensure that the search captured studies directly examining AI disclosure in advertising and marketing, the search terms were organized into three keyword groups:

Primary Keywords:

("artificial intelligence" OR AI OR "generative artificial intelligence" OR "generative AI" OR GenAI OR "AI-generated" OR "AI assisted" OR "AI-assisted")

Disclosure Keywords:

W/5 (disclos* OR label* OR transparen* OR authorship OR involvement)

Contextual Keywords:

AND (advertis* OR ads OR marketing OR brand*)

The W/5 proximity operator required the AI-related and disclosure-related terms to appear within five words of each other. The search was limited to English-language journal articles published from 2022 to 2026. It was conducted in Scopus on August 7, 2026, and initially retrieved 220 records.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Following a clearly defined protocol, the review was limited to studies that met the following four criteria:

Journal-Level Selection Criterion. Only English-language articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals with a verifiable 2025 Journal Impact Factor (JIF) of at least 1.5 were considered. The JIF threshold of 1.5 was established as an author-defined delimitation criterion to narrow the eligible literature to studies published in established scholarly journals while maintaining a sufficient pool of thematically relevant empirical research. The threshold was not interpreted as a universal benchmark of journal or study quality.

Following thematic and methodological eligibility screening, 43 studies remained eligible. To establish a focused and manageable evidence corpus, the eligible studies were ranked according to their verified 2025 JIF, and the 20 studies published in the highest-impact journals were retained for the final synthesis. The JIF-based criterion was used as a journal-level delimitation strategy and was not treated as an indicator of the methodological quality of individual studies. Study-level methodological quality was considered separately using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). The use of JIF and the Top-20 restriction is acknowledged as a review delimitation that may have excluded relevant evidence published in journals with lower or unavailable impact factors.

Although the MMAT was used to guide the methodological appraisal of the included studies, item-level appraisal results were not retained for separate reporting. Consequently, the review does not provide a study-by-study numerical summary of MMAT criteria, which limits the reproducibility of the quality-appraisal component.

Empirical Evidence. The review focused exclusively on original empirical studies employing quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method research designs. Literature reviews, systematic reviews, bibliometric studies, conceptual papers, conference proceedings, book chapters, editorials, commentaries, and other nonempirical publications were excluded.

Thematic Relevance. Only studies examining the disclosure of artificial intelligence involvement in advertising, marketing communication, branding, social-media advertising, or influencer marketing were selected. Eligible studies were required to investigate AI disclosure, labeling, transparency, authorship, or communicated AI involvement and measure consumer perceptual, attitudinal, emotional, or behavioral responses. Studies were excluded when they examined AI applications without an explicit disclosure component, focused on contexts outside advertising or marketing communication, or did not measure consumer responses.

Temporal Scope. To reflect the rapid development of generative artificial intelligence and its increasing application in advertising, only studies published from 2022 to 2026 were considered.

Study Screening and Data Coding. Study screening, eligibility assessment, and data coding were conducted by the sole author using the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Titles and abstracts were initially screened for empirical design, thematic relevance, advertising or marketing context, AI-disclosure focus, consumer-response measures, and publication period. Full-text assessment was subsequently conducted for potentially eligible studies. For the final corpus, we systematically extracted and categorized relevant information by data type, data source, geographical setting, sample characteristics, analytical techniques, AI-disclosure variables, consumer-response variables, and mediating and moderating factors. Because screening and coding were conducted by a single reviewer, inter-rater reliability and reviewer-disagreement procedures were not applicable. This single-reviewer process is acknowledged as a methodological limitation.

PRISMA Flow Diagram

Identification. A total of 220 records were identified through the Scopus database search conducted on August 7, 2026. The exact search string used was:

TITLE-ABS-KEY(("artificial intelligence" OR AI OR "generative artificial intelligence" OR "generative AI" OR GenAI OR "AI-generated" OR "AI assisted" OR "AI-assisted") W/5 (disclos* OR label* OR transparen* OR authorship OR involvement)) AND (advertis* OR ads OR marketing OR brand*) AND PUBYEAR > 2021 AND PUBYEAR < 2027 AND DOCTYPE(ar) AND LANGUAGE(english)

Screening. The titles and abstracts of the 220 records were screened according to the predefined empirical, thematic, and temporal criteria. A total of 154 records were excluded because they were nonempirical publications, were outside the 2022–2026 publication period, did not examine AI disclosure, were unrelated to advertising or marketing communication, or did not measure consumer responses. This process left 65 candidate articles for eligibility and journal-quality assessment.

Eligibility. The 65 full-text articles were evaluated against the predefined eligibility criteria: (1) provision of original empirical evidence; (2) explicit examination of AI disclosure, labeling, transparency, authorship, or communicated AI involvement; (3) application within advertising, marketing, branding, social-media marketing, or influencer-marketing contexts; (4) measurement of consumer perceptual, attitudinal, emotional, or behavioral responses; and (5) publication in a peer-reviewed journal with a verifiable Journal Impact Factor (JIF) of at least 1.5. Methodological quality was further assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018). Reasons for exclusion included failure to meet the empirical, thematic, or consumer-response requirements (n = 16), publication in a journal with a JIF below 1.5 (n = 2), and absence of a verifiable JIF (n = 4). Consequently, 22 articles were excluded, leaving 43 articles that met the eligibility criteria. These eligible articles were then ranked by their verified 2025 JIF.

Inclusion. A final corpus of 20 articles was retained for systematic synthesis following the predefined empirical, thematic, temporal, and journal-level selection criteria. These studies were synthesized to examine geographical

settings, methodological characteristics, AI-disclosure variables, consumer-response variables, mediating and moderating mechanisms, and statistical treatments. Methodological characteristics of the included studies were considered using the MMAT framework separately from the journal-level JIF selection criterion.

Data Synthesis and Categorization

The extracted findings were synthesized thematically to identify recurring patterns across the included studies, following the principles of thematic synthesis described by Thomas and Harden (2008). The study presents a systematic review of the selected literature, focusing on data types and sources, geographical settings, sample characteristics, research designs, and statistical treatments. The review also identifies variables directly related to AI involvement disclosure, including disclosure presence, disclosure wording, AI-generated versus AI-assisted content, perceived human involvement, and disclosure timing or prominence. Consumer-response variables such as perceived authenticity, credibility, transparency, trust, engagement, advertising attitude, brand attitude, word-of-mouth intention, and purchase intention were also examined. In addition, the review considers mediating and moderating factors associated with these relationships, including perceived eeriness, persuasion knowledge, brand familiarity, product type, consumer AI literacy, and the perceived humanness of AI-generated content. Through this structured categorization, the study evaluates the development of AI-disclosure research from its initial examination of consumer reactions to AI-generated advertising to its current focus on strategic disclosure practices, ethical transparency, and effective human-AI communication in contemporary advertising and marketing.

Ethical Considerations

This systematic literature review relied exclusively on data from previously published studies and did not involve direct interaction with human participants or the collection of primary personal data. Accordingly, no new informed consent procedures were required for this review. Ethical research practices were observed through accurate citation, transparent reporting of the study selection and synthesis procedures, and appropriate acknowledgment of the original sources.

Results and Discussion

Type of Data

The reviewed literature is dominated by primary data collection, particularly controlled consumer experiments examining how AI disclosure affects consumer perceptions, attitudes, and behavioral intentions. Seventeen of the 20 studies (85%) used primary quantitative data, while one study (5%) employed primary mixed methods, one (5%) used a mixed empirical design combining platform data and consumer experiments, and one (5%) relied entirely on secondary or archival data. This distribution demonstrates a strongly empirical and experimental orientation of current AI-disclosure research.

Primary quantitative studies commonly exposed participants to advertisements with varying disclosure conditions, such as AI-generated, AI-assisted, human-generated, or undisclosed content. For example, Kim (2026) conducted a factorial consumer experiment involving 875 U.S. respondents, while Kim and Cho (2026) performed two online consumer experiments with a combined sample of 423 participants. Similarly, Balaban and Phua (2026) conducted two advertising experiments involving 596 respondents, and Qadri and Moustafa (2026) combined an experiment and consumer survey with a total sample of 650. These primary studies provided direct evidence regarding consumer trust, authenticity, credibility, advertising attitudes, engagement, and purchase intentions.

Using mixed data strengthened the field by combining controlled experimentation with contextual or exploratory evidence. Wang and Qiu (2024), for instance, combined social-platform data with consumer experiments across five studies, allowing observed online behavior to be examined together with controlled psychological responses. Guo et al. (2026) employed primary mixed methods by integrating qualitative exploration with quantitative consumer research.

In contrast, Xia et al. (2025) used secondary or archival data from 9,665 Instagram virtual-influencer endorsement posts. Machine-learning analysis enabled the researchers to examine disclosure and engagement patterns at a scale that would be difficult to achieve through laboratory experiments. Collectively, these data sources provide both individual-level explanations of consumer responses and broader evidence of how AI disclosure operates in actual digital-advertising environments.

Source of Data

The primary data sources relied heavily on controlled consumer experiments, online panels, surveys, behavioral laboratories, and field studies. Researchers exposed participants to advertisements that varied according to AI involvement, disclosure wording, source type, message appeal, or degree of human participation. Kim (2026) conducted a factorial experiment with 875 U.S. respondents, while Kim and Cho (2026) used an online consumer panel for two experiments. Bui (2026) recruited respondents through Prolific, whereas Balaban and Phua (2026) and Yang et al. (2026) used Instagram-based advertising experiments. Qadri et al. (2026) combined a scenario-based experiment with a time-lagged field survey in China. Patil and Rice (2026) gathered evidence from online platforms, behavioral laboratories, and field settings, while Ahn et al. (2026) combined a survey with between-subjects and within-subject disclosure experiments. These sources allowed the researchers to measure authenticity, credibility, trust, engagement, advertising attitudes, and purchase intentions directly.

Table 1. *Summary of Included Articles*

	Title	Year	Author(s)	Data Type	Source of Data	Sample Size
1.	AI vs. Human Models in Fashion Brand Advertising: A Schema Theoretical Perspective on Consumer Responses	2026	Kim, S.	Primary quantitative	Consumer experiment with U.S. respondents, including qualitative responses	875
2.	How AI Involvement Affects Curiosity and Content Engagement in AI-Generated Advertisements	2026	Kim, S., & Cho, E.	Primary quantitative	Online consumer panel involving two experiments	Study 1: 200; Study 2: 223; Total: 423
3.	When and How AI Personalization Drives Sustainable Purchases: The Roles of Relevance, Privacy, and Transparency in Eco-Friendly Advertising	2026	Qadri, U. A., Moustafa, A. M. A., & Waqas, M.	Primary quantitative	Scenario-based experiment and time-lagged field survey in China	Not explicitly stated
4.	Decoding Virtual Influencer Endorsement Using Machine Learning: The Role of Virtual Influencer, Posting, and Disclosure Characteristics	2025	Xia, H., Zhang, L., Chen, J., & Wang, X.	Secondary/archival	Instagram virtual-influencer endorsement posts	9,665 posts
5.	Service Ads in the Era of Generative AI: Disclosures, Trust, and Intangibility	2025	Grigsby, J. L., Michelsen, M., & Zamudio, C.	Primary quantitative	Three consumer experiments	Not explicitly stated
6.	Do You Create Your Content Yourself? Using Generative Artificial Intelligence for Social Media Content Creation Diminishes Perceived Brand Authenticity	2024	Brüns, J. D., & Meißner, M.	Primary quantitative	Three experiments involving social-media brand content	Not explicitly stated
7.	The Positive Effect of Artificial Intelligence Technology Transparency on Digital Endorsers: Based on the Theory of Mind Perception	2024	Wang, X., & Qiu, X.	Mixed empirical	Social-platform data and consumer experiments across five studies	Not explicitly stated
8.	Is This Real or Fake? Examining the Effects of Disclosure of AI-Generated Content and Source Type in Instagram-Based Travel Destination Advertising	2026	Balaban, D. C., & Phua, J.	Primary quantitative	Two Instagram advertising experiments	Study 1: 395; Study 2: 201; Total: 596
9.	Automated Interactions, Authentic Bonds? AI Disclosure, Consumer Perceptions, and Loyalty Dynamics on Social Media Platforms	2026	Zhao, L., Chen, Z., & Wang, Y.	Primary quantitative	Three consumer experiments	700 total
10.	Examining the Effect of AI Advertising Involvement Disclosure on Advertising	2026	Bui, H. T.	Primary quantitative	Online consumer experiment conducted through Prolific	358

	Value and Purchase Intentions					
11.	The Infinite Monkey Theorem in AIGC Advertising: Matching Effects Between AI Disclosure and Advertising Appeals on Consumer Advertising Avoidance Intention	2026	Gu, C., Li, X., & Xiang, Q.	Primary quantitative	Three experiments using AI-generated advertisements	Not explicitly stated
12.	How to Help Small Human Influencers Face GenAI Challenges: The Role of Non-AI Disclosure	2026	Guo, R., Wang, Y., Song, M., & Duan, Y.	Primary mixed methods	Exploratory qualitative and quantitative consumer research	Not explicitly stated
13.	Is That Your Best Effort? How AI-Use Disclosure in Digital Advertising Affects Perceived Effort and Engagement	2026	Patil, R. K., & Rice, D. H.	Primary quantitative	Online platform, behavioral laboratory, and field studies	Not explicitly stated
14.	The AI-Authorship Effect: Understanding Authenticity, Moral Disgust, and Consumer Responses to AI-Generated Marketing Communications	2025	Kirk, C. P., & Givi, J.	Primary quantitative	Seven preregistered consumer experiments	Not explicitly stated
15.	Virtual Perfection: Visual Cues, Disclosure, and Adolescent Responses to Virtual Influencers	2026	Ahn, R. J., Cho, S. Y., & Zhao, X.	Primary quantitative	Adolescent survey and AI-disclosure experiments	Not explicitly stated
16.	When AI Meets Advertising Creative: Attitudinal Effects of AI-Generation Disclosures for Copy and Visuals	2026	Yang, Q., Johnson, B. K., Zuo, X., & Jin, Y.	Primary quantitative	Instagram advertising experiments	Not explicitly stated
17.	Disclaimer! This Content Is AI-Generated: How AI-Disclosures Influence Trust in Advertisements and Organizations	2025	Koning, B., & Voorveld, H. A. M.	Primary quantitative	Consumer advertising experiment	304
18.	More Than Saying "It's AI": How Role Disclosure Transparency in AI-Generated Ads Influences Persuasion	2026	Le, K. B. Q., Khan, H., Li, F., & Kunz, W. H.	Primary quantitative	Four empirical consumer studies	Not explicitly stated
19.	They Made It Just for Me! How AI Transparency and Influencer Well-Being Shape Consumer Responses to AI-Driven Content	2026	Qadri, U. A., & Moustafa, A. M. A.	Primary quantitative	Factorial experiment and recall-based consumer survey	Study 1: 280; Study 2: 370; Total: 650
20.	AI-Thenticity: Exploring the Effect of Perceived Authenticity of AI-Generated Visual Content on Tourist Patronage Intentions	2024	Bui, H. T., Filimonau, V., & Sezerel, H.	Primary quantitative	Experimental evaluation of AI- and human-generated destination images	Not explicitly stated

Secondary and observational data sources were used less frequently. Xia et al. (2025) analyzed 9,665 Instagram virtual-influencer endorsement posts using machine-learning techniques, providing large-scale evidence of how disclosure and posting characteristics influenced consumer engagement. Wang and Qiu (2024) combined existing social-platform data with consumer experiments, allowing actual online patterns to be examined alongside controlled psychological responses. Guo et al. (2026) also integrated exploratory qualitative evidence with quantitative consumer research. These secondary, observational, and mixed sources complemented experimental findings by demonstrating how AI disclosure operates within actual digital-advertising and social-media environments.

Sample Sizes

Sample sizes varied substantially by research design and data source. Among studies with explicitly reported sample sizes, experimental samples ranged from 304 participants in Koning and Voorveld (2025) to 875 respondents in Kim (2026). Other multi-study investigations used relatively large combined samples, including Zhao et al. (2026) with 700 participants, Qadri and Moustafa (2026) with 650, Balaban and Phua (2026) with 596, and Kim and Cho (2026) with 423. Bui (2026) used 358 respondents. In contrast, Xia et al. (2025) analyzed 9,665 Instagram endorsement posts. This figure represents archival social-media observations rather than individual respondents and should therefore not be directly compared with experimental sample sizes. Overall, moderate-to-large samples and multiple experiments strengthened the statistical power and robustness of the evidence on consumer responses to AI disclosure.

Table 2. *Distribution of Geographical Settings of Selected Studies*

Geographic Setting	Number of Studies	Percentage
Asia	8	40%
US	7	35%
Europe	5	25%

The geographical distribution was relatively balanced across three major regions. Asia accounted for the largest proportion, with eight studies (40%), followed closely by North America with seven studies (35%) and Europe with five studies (25%). The Asian studies were primarily conducted in China, with one study conducted in India, while all North American studies were conducted in the United States. European studies included research conducted in the United Kingdom and other European settings. Because the difference between Asia and North America was only five percentage points, the literature should not be characterized as heavily Asia-dominated. Nevertheless, the absence of studies from Africa, Latin America, and other developing regions indicates a geographic gap in the research. Future research should examine AI disclosure across more diverse cultural and regulatory settings to determine whether perceptions of authenticity, trust, advertising value, and purchase intentions differ among consumer populations.

The statistical methodologies employed in the reviewed studies were predominantly quantitative and mechanism-oriented. Mediation or indirect-effect analysis was the most prevalent technique, appearing in 16 studies (80%), followed by moderation or conditional-effect analysis in 11 studies (55%). This pattern demonstrates that researchers focused on explaining both the psychological mechanisms through which AI disclosure influences consumer responses and the conditions under which these effects vary. Frequently examined mechanisms and conditions included authenticity, credibility, trust, curiosity, moral disgust, AI competency, privacy concerns, source type, and advertising appeal. Less frequently used methods included qualitative response analysis in two studies (10%) and MANCOVA/ANCOVA, correlation analysis, machine-learning analysis, and single-paper meta-analysis in one study each (5%). Overall, the findings show that the field relies heavily on mediation and moderation techniques, while qualitative, archival, machine-learning, and research-synthesis methods remain comparatively limited.

Variable Usage in AI Disclosure Research

The classification of AI involvement disclosure varies according to whether a study examines its direct effects or the conditions under which it becomes effective. In most studies, AI disclosure functions as an independent variable, commonly operationalized by comparing disclosed and undisclosed AI involvement or AI-generated and human-generated advertising. Brüns and Meißner (2024), Bui (2026), Kirk and Givi (2025), and Koning and Voorveld (2025) used AI disclosure or authorship to predict changes in authenticity, credibility, trust, and behavioral responses. Similarly, Kim (2026), Patil and Rice (2026), and Yang et al. (2026) examined how disclosed AI involvement affected advertising skepticism, perceived advertiser effort, and attitudes toward AI-generated advertising creatives.

In other studies, transparency moderated the strength of relationships between advertising characteristics and consumer outcomes. Qadri et al. (2026) examined transparency alongside relevance and privacy in personalized advertising, while Qadri and Moustafa (2026) investigated how AI transparency and influencer well-being conditioned the effect of personalization on purchase intention. Xia et al. (2025) treated disclosure characteristics as predictor variables in determining engagement with virtual-influencer posts. Overall, AI disclosure was generally positioned as an explanatory or conditional variable rather than an outcome. Because several studies

employed multiple analytical techniques within the same investigation, the frequencies represent occurrences of statistical techniques rather than mutually exclusive classifications of studies.

Table 3. *Statistical Treatment of Sampled Articles*

Statistical/Analytical Technique	No. of Studies	Percentage
Mediation/indirect-effect analysis	16	80%
Moderation/conditional-effect analysis	11	55%
Qualitative response analysis	2	10%
MANCOVA/ANCOVA	1	5%
Correlation analysis	1	5%
Machine-learning analysis	1	5%
Single-paper meta-analysis	1	5%

Note. Percentages do not sum to 100% because individual studies may employ more than one statistical technique. Each technique was counted separately when reported in a study.

Variables Related to AI Disclosure

The variables associated with AI disclosure can be broadly classified into perceptual, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral outcomes. Perceptual variables include authenticity, credibility, trust, perceived effort, relational investment, mind perception, and perceived transparency. Brüns and Meißner (2024) and Kirk and Givi (2025) emphasized perceived authenticity, while Bui (2026) and Le et al. (2026) examined advertising and creation-process credibility. Koning and Voorveld (2025) related disclosure to conceptual AI knowledge, persuasion knowledge, and trust, whereas Zhao et al. (2026) examined its relationship with perceived relational investment and consumer loyalty. Emotional and cognitive mechanisms included curiosity, skepticism, moral disgust, perceived relevance, and privacy concerns (Kim, 2026; Kim & Cho, 2026; Kirk & Givi, 2025; Qadri et al., 2026).

Behavioral outcomes included content engagement, purchase intention, positive word of mouth, brand loyalty, advertising avoidance, and tourist patronage intention (Gu et al., 2026; Patil & Rice, 2026; Qadri & Moustafa, 2026; Wang & Qiu, 2024). Collectively, the studies demonstrate that AI disclosure is not merely a binary label but a multidimensional advertising signal that shapes consumers' interpretations of human involvement, authenticity, credibility, and responsibility before influencing their behavioral responses.

The synthesized evidence should not be interpreted as indicating that AI disclosure produces uniformly significant or negative consumer responses across all contexts. The reviewed studies varied in disclosure format, advertising context, outcome measures, and moderating conditions, and the direction and strength of reported relationships were not consistent across the evidence base. Accordingly, the findings are interpreted as conditional patterns rather than universal effects of AI disclosure. Because the present synthesis primarily categorized the reported relationships and mechanisms across studies rather than systematically coding every null or non-significant statistical result, the relative prevalence of significant and non-significant effects cannot be determined from this review.

Analysis

The synthesis indicates that consumer responses to AI involvement disclosure are better understood as conditional psychological processes rather than a uniform positive or negative effect. Across the reviewed studies, disclosure functions as informational input that shapes how consumers interpret the origin, authorship, and production process of advertising content. Its influence therefore appears to depend not only on whether AI involvement is disclosed but also on what the disclosure communicates about the respective roles of AI and human creators.

A recurring mechanism concerns perceptions of authenticity, credibility, trust, and human effort. When disclosure leads consumers to perceive less human contribution or effort in creating advertising content, evaluations may become less favorable. However, these responses are not consistent across all contexts. The evidence suggests that consumers interpret AI involvement differently depending on the nature of the advertisement, how AI participation is described, and the extent to which human involvement remains visible or implied. This helps explain why transparency alone does not necessarily produce either favorable or unfavorable consumer responses.

Table 4. *Parameters Used in Measuring AI Involvement Disclosure and Consumer Responses*

Title	Author(s)	Role of AI-Related Variable	Variable(s) Being Related To
AI vs. Human Models in Fashion Brand Advertising	Kim (2026)	Independent variable	Advertising skepticism, brand evaluation, and behavioral intentions
How AI Involvement Affects Curiosity and Content Engagement	Kim and Cho (2026)	Independent variable	Curiosity and content engagement
When and How AI Personalization Drives Sustainable Purchases	Qadri et al. (2026)	Independent and moderating variables	Perceived relevance, privacy concerns, and sustainable purchase intention
Decoding Virtual Influencer Endorsement Using Machine Learning	Xia et al. (2025)	Predictor variable	Social-media engagement
Service Ads in the Era of Generative AI	Grigsby et al. (2025)	Independent variable	Consumer trust and perceived service intangibility
Do You Create Your Content Yourself?	Brüns and Meißner (2024)	Independent variable	Perceived brand authenticity, brand attitude, and engagement
The Positive Effect of AI Technology Transparency on Digital Endorsers	Wang and Qiu (2024)	Independent variable	Mind perception, engagement, and purchase intention
Is This Real or Fake?	Balaban and Phua (2026)	Independent variable	Advertising attitudes and behavioral intentions
Automated Interactions, Authentic Bonds?	Zhao et al. (2026)	Independent variable	Relational investment, consumer perceptions, and loyalty
Examining the Effect of AI Advertising Involvement Disclosure	Bui (2026)	Independent variable	Advertising credibility, advertising value, and purchase intention
The Infinite Monkey Theorem in AIGC Advertising	Gu et al. (2026)	Independent and moderating variables	Advertising avoidance intention
How to Help Small Human Influencers Face GenAI Challenges	Guo et al. (2026)	Independent variable	Influencer authenticity, differentiation, and consumer responses
Is That Your Best Effort?	Patil and Rice (2026)	Independent variable	Perceived advertiser effort and consumer engagement
The AI-Authorship Effect	Kirk and Givi (2025)	Independent variable	Perceived authenticity, moral disgust, word of mouth, and loyalty
Virtual Perfection	Ahn et al. (2026)	Independent variable	Adolescents' cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral responses
When AI Meets Advertising Creative	Yang et al. (2026)	Independent variable	Attitudes toward advertisements and advertising creatives
Disclaimer! This Content Is AI-Generated	Koning and Voorveld (2025)	Independent variable	AI knowledge, persuasion knowledge, and trust
More Than Saying "It's AI"	Le et al. (2026)	Independent variable	Ad-creation credibility and attitude toward the advertisement
They Made It Just for Me!	Qadri and Moustafa (2026)	Moderating variable	Perceived authenticity and purchase intention
AI-Thenticity	Bui et al. (2024)	Independent variable	Perceived authenticity and tourist patronage intention

The reviewed evidence also demonstrates the importance of mediating psychological mechanisms. Variables such as authenticity, credibility, trust, perceived effort, curiosity, moral disgust, and mind perception help explain how information about AI involvement is translated into consumer judgments and behavioral responses. These mechanisms suggest that disclosure itself may not directly determine consumer reactions; instead, it influences the meanings consumers assign to the advertising process, which then shape attitudes, engagement, and behavioral intentions.

Contextual and individual factors further qualify these relationships. The effects of AI disclosure vary by factors such as disclosure format, source type, advertising appeal, privacy concerns, AI competency, service characteristics, and the degree of human involvement. These moderating conditions reinforce the view that AI disclosure should not be treated as a standardized intervention with a single predictable outcome. Instead, its effectiveness depends on interactions among disclosure design, advertising context, consumer characteristics, and the perceived role of AI.

Taken together, the reviewed studies point to a mechanism-based interpretation of AI disclosure in advertising:

disclosure communicates the presence and role of AI; consumers interpret this information through perceptions of authenticity, credibility, trust, effort, and related psychological mechanisms; and these interpretations contribute to attitudinal and behavioral responses under different contextual conditions. This synthesis therefore shifts attention from whether AI disclosure is inherently beneficial or detrimental to understanding how, why, and under what conditions disclosure shapes consumer responses.

Conclusion

This systematic review demonstrates that the effects of AI involvement disclosure in advertising are conditional rather than uniformly positive or negative. Across the reviewed studies, consumer responses depended not only on whether AI involvement was disclosed but also on how the role of AI was presented, the perceived degree of human involvement, and the psychological meanings consumers attached to the disclosure. Authenticity, credibility, trust, perceived effort, curiosity, moral disgust, and mind perception emerged as key mechanisms linked to consumer attitudes and behavioral responses, while disclosure format, source type, advertising appeal, privacy concerns, AI competency, service characteristics, and degree of human involvement further shaped these relationships. The review therefore contributes to the emerging literature by advancing a mechanism-based understanding of AI disclosure as a disclosure–interpretation–response process. Rather than treating disclosure as a simple binary condition, this perspective suggests that information about AI involvement shapes consumers' interpretations of authorship, human contribution, and the advertising production process, which in turn influence psychological evaluations and consumer responses. The findings consequently shift attention from whether AI disclosure is inherently beneficial or detrimental toward understanding how, why, and under what conditions it shapes consumer responses.

For advertisers and marketers, the findings suggest that transparency should involve more than simply attaching a generic AI label to advertising content. Disclosure strategies should communicate AI's specific role and, where relevant, the extent of human participation in the creative process. Distinguishing whether AI assisted human creators or played a more independent generative role may provide consumers with more meaningful information about how advertising content was produced. Advertisers should also consider message, source, product or service, platform, and target audience when designing disclosure strategies because consumer interpretations may vary across contexts and individual characteristics. Thus, a standardized disclosure approach should not be assumed to generate identical responses across advertising situations. Instead, transparent AI communication should balance clarity about AI involvement with sufficient information about its role in content creation.

Several limitations define the boundaries of these conclusions. The review was restricted to Scopus-indexed, English-language, peer-reviewed journal articles and further applied a minimum Journal Impact Factor and Top-20 selection criterion, potentially excluding relevant evidence from other databases, languages, and publication outlets. Screening and coding were conducted by a single reviewer, the protocol was not prospectively registered, item-level MMAT appraisal results were not retained for separate study-by-study reporting, and null or non-significant findings were not systematically coded as a distinct category. These limitations limit the review's comprehensiveness and reproducibility and should be considered when interpreting its findings. Future research should therefore examine AI disclosure across broader geographical and cultural settings, employ longitudinal, field-based, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches, and directly compare AI-assisted, human–AI collaborative, and predominantly AI-generated advertising. Future reviews should also broaden database coverage, use independent reviewers, prospectively register review protocols, and systematically document study-level quality appraisal and null findings to strengthen the evidence base for transparent and responsible AI advertising practices.

Contributions of Authors

The sole author is responsible for conceptualizing and writing the entire paper.

Funding

None

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

None

References

- Ahn, R.J., Cho, S.Y., & Zhao, X. (2026). Virtual perfection: Visual cues, disclosure, and adolescent responses to virtual influencers. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2026.2681492>
- Balaban, D.C., & Phua, J. (2026). Is this real or fake? Examining the effects of disclosure of AI-generated content and source type in Instagram-based travel destination advertising on consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 183, Article 109047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2026.109047>
- Brüns, J.D., & Meißner, M. (2024). Do you create your content yourself? Using generative artificial intelligence for social media content creation diminishes perceived brand authenticity. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 79, Article 103790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103790>
- Bui, H.T. (2026). Examining the effect of AI advertising involvement disclosure on advertising value and purchase intentions. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 20(5), 613–632. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-02-2025-0066>
- Bui, H.T., Filimonau, V., & Sezerel, H. (2024). AI-thenticity: Exploring the effect of perceived authenticity of AI-generated visual content on tourist patronage intentions. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 34, Article 100956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100956>
- Grigsby, J., Michelsen, M., & Zamudio, C. (2025). Service ads in the era of generative AI: Disclosures, trust, and intangibility. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 84, Article 104231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2025.104231>
- Gu, C., Li, X., & Xiang, Q. (2026). The infinite monkey theorem in AIGC advertising: Matching effects between AI disclosure and advertising appeals on consumer advertising avoidance intention. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 20(6), 886–905. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-05-2025-0265>
- Guo, R., Wang, Y., Song, M., & Duan, Y. (2026). How to help small human influencers face GenAI challenges: The role of non-AI disclosure. *Journal of Business Research*, 215, Article 116355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2026.116355>
- Hong, Q.N., Fabregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M.P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O’Cathain, A., Rousseau, M.C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for Information*, 34(4), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221>
- Kim, S. [Sanghee]. (2026). AI vs. human models in fashion brand advertising: A schema theoretical perspective on consumer responses. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 92, Article 104820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2026.104820>
- Kim, S. [Songmee], & Cho, E. (2026). How AI involvement affects curiosity and content engagement in AI-generated advertisements. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 92, Article 104756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2026.104756>
- Kirk, C., & Givi, J. (2025). The AI-authorship effect: Understanding authenticity, moral disgust, and consumer responses to AI-generated marketing communications. *Journal of Business Research*, 186, Article 114984. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114984>
- Koning, B., & Voorveld, H.A.M. (2025). Disclaimer! This content is AI-generated: How AI-disclosures influence trust in advertisements and organizations. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 25(3), 240–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2025.2554149>
- Le, K.B.Q., Khan, H., Li, F., & Kunz, W.H. (2026). More than saying “It’s AI”: How role disclosure transparency in AI-generated ads influences persuasion. *Psychology & Marketing*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.70175>
- Page, M., McKenzie, J., Bossuyt, P., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T., Mulrow, C., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J., Akl, E., Brennan, S., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M., Li, T., Loder, E., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L., Stewart, L., Thomas, J., Tricco, A., Welch, V., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Patil, R.K., & Rice, D.H. (2026). Is that your best effort? How AI-use disclosure in digital advertising affects perceived effort and engagement. *Journal of Business Research*, 215, Article 116354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2026.116354>
- Qadri, U.A., & Moustafa, A.M.A. (2026). They made it just for me! How AI transparency and influencer well-being shape consumer responses to AI-driven content. *Psychology & Marketing*, 43(3), 591–608. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.70075>
- Qadri, U.A., Moustafa, A.M.A., & Waqas, M. (2026). When and how AI personalization drives sustainable purchases: The roles of relevance, privacy, and transparency in eco-friendly advertising. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 89, Article 104592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2025.104592>
- Shaheen, N., Shaheen, A., Ramadan, A., Hefnawy, M.T., Ramadan, A., Ibrahim, I., Hassanein, M.E., Ashour, M., & Flouty, O. (2023). Appraising systematic reviews: A comprehensive guide to ensuring validity and reliability. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 8, Article 1268045. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2023.1268045>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, Article 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Wang, X., & Qiu, X. (2024). The positive effect of artificial intelligence technology transparency on digital endorsers: Based on the theory of mind perception. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 78, Article 103777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103777>
- Xia, H., Zhang, L., Chen, J., & Wang, X. (2025). Decoding virtual influencer endorsement using machine learning: The role of virtual influencer, posting, and disclosure characteristics. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 87, Article 104366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2025.104366>
- Yang, Q., Johnson, B., Zuo, X., & Jin, Y. (2026). When AI meets advertising creative: Attitudinal effects of AI-generation disclosures for copy and visuals. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2026.2665454>
- Zhao, L., Chen, Z., & Wang, Y. (2026). Automated interactions, authentic bonds? AI disclosure, consumer perceptions and loyalty dynamics on social media platforms. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 20(7), 1017–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-06-2025-0306>