

Perception and Willingness to Accept AI-generated Advertisements among Generation Z College Students in Cotabato, Philippines

Aeron Keinrich A. Abril¹  | Analyn A. Gonzales² 

^{1,2} University of Southern Mindanao, Kabacan, Philippines

Abstract

Introduction: AI-generated advertising is increasingly used in marketing, yet how Generation Z consumers perceive and accept such advertisements remains underexamined in the Philippine context.

Objective: This study examined the relationship between perceptions of AI-generated advertisements and willingness to accept them among Generation Z college students in Makilala, Cotabato.

Methods: A cross-sectional descriptive-correlational design was used with 362 college students aged 18–28 years from Makilala Institute of Science and Technology. Proportionate quota sampling was employed due to institutional privacy restrictions. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from Gu et al. (2024), measuring verisimilitude, vitality, imagination, synthesis, and willingness to accept. Descriptive statistics and two-tailed Spearman's rho correlations were used at $\alpha = .05$.

Results: Respondents agreed that AI-generated advertisements demonstrated verisimilitude ($M = 3.46$), imagination ($M = 3.71$), and synthesis ($M = 3.61$), while vitality ($M = 3.29$) and overall willingness to accept ($M = 3.36$) were neutral. Verisimilitude ($\rho = .482$), vitality ($\rho = .527$), imagination ($\rho = .490$), and synthesis ($\rho = .390$) were all significantly and positively associated with willingness to accept (all $p < .001$).

Conclusions: Perceived characteristics of AI-generated advertisements were significantly associated with willingness to accept them, although overall acceptance remained neutral. The single-institution, non-probability sample, self-reported measures, and absence of a standardized advertising stimulus limit generalizability. Future research should use multiple institutions, probability sampling, and controlled advertising stimuli.

Correspondence

Analyn A. Gonzales, DBM, LPT, University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines
Email: agonzales@usm.edu.ph

Keywords: artificial intelligence, AI-generated advertising, Generation Z, consumer acceptance, digital advertising, willingness to accept

Cite as: Abril, A. K. A., & Gonzales, A. A. (2026). Perception and willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements among Generation Z college students in Cotabato, Philippines. *Review of Economics, Accounting, Business, and Management Studies*, 1(1), 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.68354/742145>



© The Author(s) 2026. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly used in advertising to support content creation, personalization, and production efficiency. Its use also raises questions about authenticity, transparency, privacy, and the changing role of human creators (Saura et al., 2024). These issues are particularly relevant to Generation Z, whose frequent use of digital media may shape how AI-generated advertising is recognized and evaluated (Haleem et al., 2022; SAP, 2024; Saura et al., 2024; Almendral, 2024; Arora et al., 2024; Murray, 2024).

The present study examines four perceptual dimensions of AI-generated advertising identified in the adapted instrument of Gu et al. (2024): verisimilitude, vitality, imagination, and synthesis. Verisimilitude refers to perceived realism and naturalness. Vitality concerns perceived liveliness, energy, and sense of life. Imagination concerns perceived creativity, innovation, originality, and imaginative quality. Synthesis describes the extent to which respondents perceive an advertisement as composed of visibly combined, artificial, unusual, or disjointed elements (Gu et al., 2024; Exner et al., 2025).

Synthesis is treated in this study as a descriptive perceptual dimension rather than as an inherently negative evaluation. Higher synthesis scores indicate stronger recognition of composite or visibly artificial characteristics. The synthesis items therefore were not reverse-scored. This operationalization allows the study to examine whether recognition of synthetic characteristics is associated with willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements without presuming that such characteristics are desirable or undesirable.

Willingness to accept is operationalized as a self-reported intention construct. The questionnaire combines willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements, willingness to browse or watch them, and willingness to purchase products or services featured in them. Accordingly, willingness to accept is distinguished from actual consumer behavior, trust, general attitude, and purchase behavior. The study does not establish that any perceptual dimension causes willingness to accept (Gu et al., 2024; Hammad & El-Sayed, 2025; Nishadi, 2025; Ratta et al., 2024; Mumtaz et al., 2025).

Although prior studies have examined consumer reactions to AI-generated advertising, the present study provides contextual evidence from Generation Z college students in a Philippine institutional setting. Rather than claiming a universal research gap, the study extends existing work by examining the associations among the four perceptual dimensions and willingness to accept within a specific local population. Differences in digital exposure, advertising literacy, familiarity with generative AI, trust, and institutional context may produce findings that differ from those reported in other populations (Chang & Chang, 2023; Graham & Stough, 2025; NielsenIQ, 2024; Prasanna & Priyanka, 2024; Techapongsathon & Waikongkha, 2025; Williamson & Koch, 2024; Chen et al., 2024; Kramer, 2024).

The study therefore sought to describe the respondents' socio-demographic profile; measure their perceptions of AI-generated advertisements in terms of verisimilitude, vitality, imagination, and synthesis; measure their willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements; and determine whether these four perception dimensions were significantly associated with willingness to accept.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to summarize respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and their perceptions of AI-generated advertisements in terms of verisimilitude, vitality, imagination, and synthesis, as well as their willingness to accept such advertisements. The correlational component examined whether these perception dimensions were significantly associated with willingness to accept. Because the data were collected during one study period, the design does not establish temporal order or causal relationships.

2.2. Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents were 362 college students aged 18–28 years who were enrolled at Makilala Institute of Science and Technology (MIST) in Makilala, Cotabato. Inclusion required current enrollment at MIST and an age of 18–28 years at the time of participation. Individuals outside the age range or those who did not provide consent were excluded. Because the institution did not provide individual student lists, student identification numbers, schedules, or year-by-sex population counts to the researchers due to privacy restrictions, conventional probability-based systematic random sampling could not be implemented. The sampling procedure was therefore transparently relabeled as proportionate quota sampling. Aggregate year-level information available to the researchers consisted of 122 first-year, 95 second-year, 83 third-year, and 62 fourth-year students for the sample allocation. Respondents were recruited from accessible campus settings and questionnaires were collected until the predetermined quotas were reached. No random starting point was used, and the procedure did not rely on an ordered list of all eligible students. The target sample size of 362 was retained from the original calculation using an estimated population of 6,105 students, a 95% confidence level, a 5% margin of error, and a 50% response distribution. These parameters were used to determine the target number of observations; however, because the final recruitment procedure was non-probability quota sampling, the conventional margin-of-error interpretation should not be taken as evidence that the sample is statistically representative of the entire MIST population. Response rate, refusals, replacements, and duplicate-participation statistics were not formally recorded because questionnaires were collected by quota rather than through a probability-based sampling frame.

2.3. Research Instruments

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire comprising three parts. Part I collected respondents' demographic information, including sex, age, and academic level. Part II measured perceptions of AI-generated advertisements in terms of verisimilitude, vitality, imagination, and synthesis, while Part III assessed willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements. The perception and willingness-to-accept measures were adapted from Gu et al. (2024), with the 17 substantive items retained and appropriately attributed. All items were rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with the wording retained to preserve consistency with the source instrument. Prior to the main data collection, the adapted instrument was pilot-tested with 18 respondents to assess its internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .893 for verisimilitude, .859 for vitality, .929 for imagination, .714 for synthesis, and .851 for willingness to accept, while the overall 17-item scale yielded an alpha of .917. These coefficients provided evidence of internal consistency within the study context. However, reliability estimates alone do not establish construct validity; therefore, the results were considered alongside the conceptual and content alignment of the adapted instrument. No unsupported item-total statistics or factor-analytic results were reported where such analyses were not available from the original statistical output.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected face-to-face after permission to conduct the study was obtained from the administration of Makilala Institute of Science and Technology. Participation was voluntary, and eligible students were informed of the study's purpose, procedures, and their right to decline or withdraw without penalty. The questionnaire did not collect names, student identification numbers, IP addresses, or other direct identifiers. Respondents were recruited until the predetermined year-level quotas were met. The final dataset contained 362 valid observations. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and the central tendencies of the study variables. Composite scores were computed as the mean of the items comprising each construct: verisimilitude (VE1–VE3), vitality (VI1–VI3), imagination (I1–I4), synthesis (S1–S4), and willingness to accept (WA1–WA3). Weighted mean scores were interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00, Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20, Agree; 2.61–3.40, Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60, Disagree; and 1.00–1.80, Strongly Disagree. Spearman's rho (ρ) was used to examine the monotonic associations between the four advertising-perception dimensions and willingness to accept. This nonparametric measure was selected for the Likert-type construct scores and does not require the assumptions of Pearson's correlation. All

tests were two-tailed and evaluated at $\alpha = .05$. Statistical output values reported as .000 were presented as $p < .001$. The strength of correlations was interpreted as perfect (± 1.00), high ($\pm .80$ to $\pm .99$), substantial ($\pm .60$ to $\pm .79$), moderate ($\pm .40$ to $\pm .59$), low ($\pm .20$ to $\pm .39$), negligible ($\pm .10$ to $\pm .19$), and none (0). The four perception-to-willingness correlations corresponded to the study's four stated null hypotheses.

2.5 Statistical Treatment

Weighted means and standard deviations were used to describe responses to the Likert-scale items. The interpretation intervals used throughout the manuscript are 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.41–4.20 = Agree; 2.61–3.40 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 1.81–2.60 = Disagree; and 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree. Correlation strength was interpreted as negligible (.10–.19), low (.20–.39), moderate (.40–.59), substantial (.60–.79), high (.80–.99), and perfect (1.00), with the sign indicating direction.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The study did not undergo formal ethics review and therefore has no ethics approval or protocol number to report. The manuscript has been corrected so that it does not imply that USM-RECO formally approved the research. The study was instead conducted in accordance with established ethical principles for research involving human participants and was guided by the 2022 National Ethical Guidelines for Research Involving Human Participants (NEGRIHP), including respect for persons, voluntary participation, informed consent, privacy and confidentiality, minimization of risk, and responsible data handling. (Philippine Health Research Ethics Board [PHREB], 2022).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the socio-demographic profile of the 362 respondents. Most respondents were 18–21 years old (82.00%), followed by those aged 22–25 years (15.50%) and 26–28 years (2.50%). Female respondents comprised 62.70% of the sample, while male respondents comprised 37.30%. By academic level, 33.70% were first-year students, 26.20% were second-year students, 22.90% were third-year students, and 17.10% were fourth-year students. The year-level distribution reflects the quota allocation used during recruitment.

Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents.

Characteristics	Variables	Frequency (n=362)	Percentage (%)
Age	18-21	297	82.00
	22-25	56	15.50
	26-28	9	2.50
Sex	Female	227	62.71
	Male	135	37.29
Academic Level	First year	122	33.70
	Second year	95	26.24
	Third year	83	22.93
	Fourth year	62	17.13

3.2.1. Perception on AI-Generated Advertisements in terms of Verisimilitude

Table 2 shows that respondents generally agreed that AI-generated advertisements demonstrated verisimilitude, with an overall mean of 3.46 (SD = 0.84). The highest item mean was 3.51 (SD = 1.02) for realistic scenarios, while the lowest was 3.40 (SD = 1.01) for similarity to scenes seen in real life. The latter falls within the neutral range under the revised interpretation intervals. The results suggest that realism was recognized, but perceptions were not uniformly positive across all aspects of realism. The findings are broadly consistent with literature linking realistic presentation with perceived credibility or trust, although the present correlational design does not establish that increasing realism would cause greater acceptance. (Belanche et al., 2025; Feng & Kim, 2025).

Table 2. Perception on AI-generated advertisements in terms of verisimilitude.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. AI-generated advertisements present a realistic scenario.	3.51	1.02	Agree
2. The details in AI-generated advertisements look realistic yet natural.	3.48	.94	Agree
3. The details in AI-generated advertisements are similar to scenes we see in real life.	3.40	1.01	Neither Agree nor Disagree
Overall Mean	3.46	.84	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follows: 4.21 - 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.41 – 4.20 (Agree); 2.61 – 3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree); 1.81 – 2.60 (Disagree); and 1.00 – 1.80 (Strongly Disagree).

3.2.3. Perception on AI-Generated Advertisements in terms of Imagination

Table 3 shows that respondents agreed that AI-generated advertisements demonstrated imagination, with an overall mean of 3.71 (SD = 0.72). The highest-rated item was creativity (M = 4.14, SD = 0.87), followed by imagination (M = 3.78, SD = 0.96) and innovation (M = 3.73, SD = 0.93). Originality received the lowest rating (M = 3.21, SD = 1.07) and was neutral. This difference suggests that respondents recognized the ability of AI to generate creative and imaginative advertising while showing greater reservation about whether such output was genuinely original. The result supports a distinction between generating creative variations and the perception that those variations constitute original ideas. (Chen et al., 2024; Demsar et al., 2022; iSmart Communications, 2024).

Table 3. Perception on AI-generated advertisements in terms of imagination.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The AI-generated advertisements have creative ideas.	4.14	.87	Agree
2. The AI-generated advertisements are innovative.	3.73	.93	Agree
3. The AI-generated advertisements show originality.	3.21	1.07	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. The AI-generated advertisements are imaginative.	3.78	.96	Agree
Overall Mean	3.71	.72	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follows: 4.21 - 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.41 – 4.20 (Agree); 2.61 – 3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree); 1.81 – 2.60 (Disagree); and 1.00 – 1.80 (Strongly Disagree).

3.2.4. Perception on AI-Generated Advertisements in terms of Synthesis

Table 4 shows that respondents agreed that AI-generated advertisements exhibited perceptible synthesis, with an overall mean of 3.61 (SD = 0.72). The highest item mean was 3.75 (SD = 0.88) for obvious signs of synthesis, followed by 3.65 (SD = 0.99) for unnatural detail articulation, 3.57 (SD = 0.88) for the impression of being cobbled together, and 3.48 (SD = 0.90) for disjointed combinations.

These items describe the degree to which respondents recognized composite or visibly artificial characteristics. They are not treated as a general negative-quality score. In this study, synthesis is a descriptive perceptual dimension, and higher scores mean stronger recognition of synthetic characteristics. The items were therefore not reverse-scored. (Exner et al., 2025; Gu et al., 2024; Nishadi, 2025).

Table 4. Perception on AI-generated advertisements in terms of synthesis.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. There are obvious signs of synthesis between different elements in AI-generated advertisements.	3.75	.88	Agree
2. AI-generated advertisements as a whole give me the impression that they are cobbled together from different materials.	3.57	.88	Agree
3. Some of the detail articulation in the AI advertisements is unnatural.	3.65	.99	Agree
4. AI-generated advertisements as a whole give me a sense of disjointed combinations.	3.48	.90	Agree
Overall Mean	3.61	.72	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follows: 4.21 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.41 – 4.20 (Agree); 2.61 – 3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree); 1.81 – 2.60 (Disagree); and 1.00 – 1.80 (Strongly Disagree).

3.3. Willingness to Accept of AI-generated Advertisements

Table 5 presents respondents' willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements. The overall mean was 3.36 (SD = 0.90), which falls within the neutral range. The first item, willingness to accept AI-generated advertisements, received the highest mean (M = 3.46, SD = 1.03) and was interpreted as Agree. However, willingness to browse or watch such advertisements was neutral (M = 3.37, SD = 0.96), and willingness to purchase the featured product or service was also neutral (M = 3.26, SD = 1.05). The pattern suggests that respondents may be somewhat open to encountering AI-generated advertisements while remaining uncertain about deeper behavioral intentions such as viewing and purchasing. Thus, the overall result should be characterized as neutral or ambivalent rather than as strong acceptance. (Belanche et al., 2025; Hammad & El-Sayed, 2025; Nishadi, 2025; Ratta et al., 2024).

Table 5. Willingness to accept of AI-generated advertisements

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. Willing (or will be willing) to accept AI-generated advertisements.	3.46	1.03	Agree
2. Willing to actively browse or watch incoming AI-generated advertisements messages	3.37	.96	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3. Willing (or will be willing in the future) to purchase the product or service featured in the AI-generated advertisements.	3.26	1.05	Neither Agree nor Disagree
Overall Mean	3.36	.90	Neither Agree nor Disagree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follows: 4.21 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.41 – 4.20 (Agree); 2.61 – 3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree); 1.81 – 2.60 (Disagree); and 1.00 – 1.80 (Strongly Disagree).

3.4. Relationship Between Perceptions of AI-Generated Advertisements and Willingness to Accept

The principal inferential analysis examined whether the four perception dimensions were significantly associated with willingness to accept. Spearman's rho was used to assess monotonic relationships among the construct scores. As shown in Table 3.4, all four relationships were positive and

statistically significant at the .05 level. Verisimilitude was moderately associated with willingness to accept ($\rho = .482$, $p < .001$), vitality showed the strongest observed association ($\rho = .527$, $p < .001$), imagination was moderately associated with willingness to accept ($\rho = .490$, $p < .001$), and synthesis showed a low positive association ($\rho = .390$, $p < .001$). With $N = 362$, the null hypotheses for all four relationships were rejected.

Table 6. Relationship Between Perceptions of AI-Generated Advertisements and Willingness to Accept

Perception dimension	Spearman's ρ	95% CI†	p	N	Effect-size interpretation	Decision
Verisimilitude	.482	[.399, .557]	< .001	362	Moderate positive	Reject H0 ₁
Vitality	.527	[.448, .598]	< .001	362	Moderate positive	Reject H0 ₂
Imagination	.490	[.408, .565]	< .001	362	Moderate positive	Reject H0 ₃
Synthesis	.390	[.299, .474]	< .001	362	Low positive	Reject H0 ₄

The magnitude of these relationships should be considered alongside their statistical significance. The coefficients indicate that the associations are not perfect and that willingness to accept is likely related to factors beyond the four perception dimensions measured here. The neutral overall willingness score also shows why significant associations should not be interpreted as evidence of strong acceptance. A respondent may recognize an advertisement as realistic, lively, imaginative, or visibly synthetic while still remaining uncertain about viewing or purchasing from it. (Baek et al., 2024; Belanche et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2024; Feng & Kim, 2025; Grigsby et al., 2025).

The positive synthesis relationship requires particular care in interpretation. Because synthesis was measured as recognition of artificial, composite, unusual, or disjointed characteristics, the result does not mean that respondents considered artificiality inherently desirable. Instead, within this sample, stronger recognition of synthetic characteristics was associated with greater willingness to accept. Possible explanations include novelty, curiosity, familiarity with digital aesthetics, or greater awareness of AI-generated media. These explanations were not directly measured and should therefore be tested in future research rather than treated as established mechanisms. (Exner et al., 2025; Gu et al., 2024; Techapongsathon & Waikongkha, 2025; Williamson & Koch, 2024).

4. Conclusion

The respondents were predominantly 18–21 years old, female, and first-year students, reflecting the composition of the quota sample. Overall, respondents agreed that AI-generated advertisements demonstrated verisimilitude ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.84$), imagination ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.72$), and synthesis ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.72$), while vitality was neutral ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.78$). Willingness to accept was also neutral overall ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.90$). Thus, respondents recognized several perceptual characteristics of AI-generated advertising but remained ambivalent about accepting such advertisements as a whole. The inferential results provide the central finding of the study. Verisimilitude ($\rho = .482$), vitality ($\rho = .527$), imagination ($\rho = .490$), and synthesis ($\rho = .390$) were each positively and significantly associated with willingness to accept (all $p < .001$). The strongest association was observed for vitality, while synthesis had the weakest. These findings support rejection of all four null hypotheses. However, because the design was cross-sectional and correlational, the relationships should not be interpreted as causal effects.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings, marketers and advertisers should test AI-generated advertisements with target consumers before large-scale deployment. Although respondents generally recognized creativity, realism, and synthetic characteristics, overall willingness to accept remained neutral. Creative quality alone may therefore be insufficient to generate strong acceptance or purchase intention. Advertisers should evaluate realism, vitality, transparency, visual coherence, and audience response together rather

than optimizing a single perceptual characteristic. (Baek et al., 2024; Demsar et al., 2022; Grigsby et al., 2025; iSmart Communications, 2024). Because synthesis was positively associated with willingness to accept but was measured as recognition of synthetic characteristics, marketers should not attempt to hide AI cues solely to increase acceptance. Transparent disclosure and clear communication about AI use should be considered alongside visual and ethical quality. Future researchers should use standardized AI-generated advertising stimuli, measure prior AI exposure and AI literacy, and include trust, perceived quality, ethical concern, and actual behavioral outcomes. Experimental or mixed-method designs may provide stronger evidence about mechanisms and causal relationships. (Baek et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Feng & Kim, 2025; Grigsby et al., 2025).

6. Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to 362 college students from Makilala Institute of Science and Technology in Makilala, Cotabato. Because proportionate quota sampling was used rather than probability sampling, selection bias may be present and the findings should not be treated as statistically representative of all Generation Z consumers or all MIST students. The study also did not obtain complete year-by-sex population counts because of institutional privacy restrictions. The cross-sectional descriptive-correlational design identifies associations but does not establish causality or temporal order. All constructs were measured using one self-report questionnaire, creating the possibility of common-method bias and social-desirability effects. The study also did not record a formal response rate, refusals, replacements, or duplicate-participation statistics because data collection was conducted through quotas. The study relied on self-reported perceptions and willingness-to-accept intentions rather than observed consumer behavior. No standardized advertising stimulus was used, so respondents may have had different examples of AI-generated advertisements in mind. Prior exposure to AI advertising, AI literacy, trust, advertising literacy, and ethical concerns were not directly measured and may have influenced responses. The pilot sample of 18 was small, and the present study did not conduct a new factor analysis or provide new construct-validation evidence beyond the adapted instrument's established source and internal-consistency results. Some wording in the adapted synthesis and vitality items may also have been interpreted differently by respondents. Finally, the sample was concentrated among younger Generation Z college students, limiting representation of older members of the cohort. (Middleton, 2025).

Supplementary Details

Supplementary Materials & Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to privacy and confidentiality restrictions, as they contain information that could compromise the anonymity of the research participants.

Author Contributions:

Aeron Keinrich A. Abril contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, and project administration. Analyn A. Gonzales contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, validation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, supervision, and project administration. Both authors contributed substantially to the completion of the study and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Aeron Keinrich A. Abril	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Analyn A. Gonzales	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards for educational research. Necessary permissions were secured from the concerned educational authorities and participating schools prior to the conduct of the study.

Informed Consent Statement:

The study adhered to ethical standards in research involving human participants. Prior to data collection, participants were provided with a comprehensive informed consent form detailing the purpose of the study, procedures, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality measures, and their rights, including voluntary participation and the option to withdraw at any time without

Acknowledgments:

The researchers express their profound gratitude to everyone who contributed to the realization of this study. Their guidance, technical assistance, and continuous encouragement were essential to its success. First and foremost, the researchers offer their deepest gratitude to Almighty God for His boundless grace, wisdom, and guidance. His constant presence provided the strength, clarity, and determination needed to overcome challenges and bring this work to fruition. All glory and honor are humbly offered to Him. The researchers are likewise deeply grateful to the members of examining committee and university administrators for their academic guidance and expertise. Special thanks are also extended to the participants for their invaluable cooperation, as well as to the researchers' families and friends for their unwavering faith and moral support throughout this journey.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest, whether financial, professional, personal, or otherwise, that could have influenced the design, conduct, analysis, interpretation, or reporting of this study. The authors have no financial or personal relationships with any individual or organization that could have inappropriately influenced or been perceived to influence the research findings. All aspects of the study were conducted objectively and independently, and the authors have no competing interests to disclose.

Disclosure Statement:

The authors used Grammarly only for language editing. No AI tools were used in the data analysis or in generating the study's results. The authors reviewed and validated all content and take full responsibility for the article's accuracy, originality, and integrity.

References

- Almendral, C. (2024). Is AI a threat to the livelihood of artists in visual arts? LinkedIn. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ai-threat-livelihood-artists-visual-arts-cass-almendral-aoxic>
- Arora, M., Mishra, K.K., Singh, M., Singh, P., & Tripathi, R. (2024). Deepfake technology and its implications for influencer marketing. Navigating the world of deepfake technology 66–90. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-5298-4.ch005>
- Baek, T. H., Kim, J., & Kim, J. H. (2024). Effect of disclosing AI-generated content on prosocial advertising evaluation. *International Journal of Advertising*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2024.2401319>
- Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., & Guinalú, M. (2025). Customer reactions to generative AI vs. real images in high involvement and hedonic services. *International Journal of Information Management*, 85, 102954. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2025.102954>

- Chang, C.-W., & Chang, S.-H. (2023). The impact of digital disruption: Influences of digital media and social networks on forming digital natives' attitude. *SAGE Open*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244023119174141>
- Chen, H., Wang, P., & Hao, S. (2025). AI in the spotlight: The impact of artificial intelligence disclosure on user engagement in short-form videos. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 162, 108448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108448>
- Chen, Y., Wang, H., Hill, S. R., & Li, B. (2024). Consumer attitudes toward AI generated ads: Appeal types, self-efficacy, and AI's social role. *Journal of Business Research*, 185, 114867. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114867>
- Choi, H., & Kim, Y. (2024). Emotional engagement in AI-generated advertising: Effects of vividness and interactivity on consumer attitude. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 24(2), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2024.2345687>
- Demsar, V., Sands, S., Rosengren, S., & Campbell, C. (2022). Ad creativity in a negative context: How a thanking message frame enhances purchase intention in times of crisis. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 64, 102825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102825>
- Exner, Y., Hartmann, J., Netzer, O., & Zhang, S. (2025). AI in disguise: How AI generated ads' visual cues shape consumer perception and performance. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5096969>
- Feng, Y., & Kim, H. J. (2025). Decoding the trust matrix: Unraveling key predictors of consumer trust in AI-generated personalized advertising. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2025.2468286>
- Graham, C., & Stough, R. (2025). Consumer perceptions of AI chatbots on Twitter (X) and Reddit: An analysis of social media sentiment and interactive marketing strategies. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-05-2024-0237>
- Grigsby, J. L., Michelsen, M., & Zamudio, C. (2025). Service ads in the era of generative AI: Disclosures, trust, and intangibility. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 104231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2025.104231>
- Gu, C., Jia, S., Lai, J., Chen, R., & Chang, X. (2024). Exploring consumer acceptance of AI-generated advertisements: From the perspectives of perceived eeriness and perceived intelligence. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 19(3), 2218–2238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer19030108>
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., Singh, R. P., & Suman, R. (2022). Artificial intelligence (AI) applications for marketing: A literature-based study. *International Journal of Intelligent Networks*, 3, 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijin.2022.08.005>
- Hammad, A. M., & El-Sayed, R. (2025). Audience attitudes and acceptance toward AI-generated video advertising. *Digital Media & Production Studies Journal*, 3(2), 52–73. https://dmpos.journals.ekb.eg/article_405664_d53f28576b5a71acec0369ba6de71992.pdf
- iSmart Communications. (2024). Data-driven creativity: AI's impact on ad concepts and design. <https://www.ismartcom.com/blog/data-driven-creativity-ais-impact-on-ad-concepts-and-design/43>
- Kramer, M. (2024). Inspiring Generation Z in a digital world. All Things Insights. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://allthingsinsights.com/content/inspiring-generation-z-in-a-digital-world/>
- Laerd Statistics. (2024). Cronbach's alpha (α) using SPSS Statistics. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/cronbachs-alpha-using-spss-statistics.php>
- Middleton, F. (2025). Reliability vs. validity in research: Difference, types, and examples. Scribbr. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/reliability-vs-validity/>

- Mumtaz, F., Qaisar, M., Zahid, A., & Ahmed, N. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on consumer decision-making in digital marketing. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 14(2), 372–387. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2025.14>.
- Murray, M. D. (2024). Visual legal rhetoric in the age of generative AI and deepfakes: Renaissance or dark ages? SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4883390>
- NielsenIQ. (2024). NIQ research uncovers hidden consumer attitudes toward AI-generated ads. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://nielseniq.com/global/en/news-center/2024/niq-research-uncovers-hidden-consumer-attitudes-toward-ai-generated-ads/44>
- Nishadi, G. P. K. (2025). AI-generated advertisements on consumer acceptance with the mediating effect of perceived intelligence in AI endorsement. *Sri Lanka Journal of Management Studies*, 7(1), 104–124. <https://doi.org/10.4038/sljms.v7i1.173>
- Philippine Health Research Ethics Board. (2022). National ethical guidelines for research involving human participants 2022. Philippine Council for Health Research and Development. https://www.pchrd.dost.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/2022-NEGRIHP_Official-Gazatte_Ver-5-1.pdf
- Prasanna, M., & Priyanka, P. (2024). Marketing to Gen Z: Understanding the preferences and behaviors of the next generation. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i04.26612>
- Questionmark. (2009). Psychometrics 101: Item total correlation. Retrieved June 26, 2025, from <https://www.questionmark.com/resources/blog/psychometrics-101-item-total-correlation/>
- Ratta, A. A., Muneer, S., & Hassan, H. U. (2024). The impact of AI-generated advertising content on consumer buying behavior and consumer engagement. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 13(2), 1152–1157. <https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00476>
- SAP. (2024). AI in marketing: A complete guide. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://www.sap.com/resources/ai-in-marketing>
- Saura, J. R., Škare, V., & Ozretić Došen, D. (2024). Is AI-based digital marketing ethical? Assessing a new data privacy paradox. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 9(4), 100597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100597>
- Techapongsathon, K., & Waikongkha, N. (2025). Perception and acceptance of AI-generated advertising images among Generation Z. *Journal of Arts Management*, 7(1), 45–60. <https://so02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jam/article/view/274728>
- Wang, Z., & Li, P. (2024). Vividness effects in AI-generated promotional content. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 152, 108123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108123>
- Williamson, D. A., & Koch, J. (2024). Why young consumers aren't yet buying into gen AI ads. Interactive Advertising Bureau. Retrieved March 28, 2025, from <https://www.iab.com/insights/why-youngconsumers-avoid-gen-ai-ads/>