JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES

ISSN Print: 2984-8288, ISSN Online: 2984-8385
Vol. 3 No. 8, 709-716, August 2025

Can AI Persuade? A Study on AI-Generated Advertising Acceptance at an Allied Health School

Aubrey Shame A. Todlas*, Joseph H. Felongco, Monsour A. Pelmin
Graduate Studies Department, Mindanao State University-General Santos,
General Santos City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: aubreyshame.todlas@gmail.com

Date received: May 22, 2025
Date revised: June 29, 2025
Date accepted: July 18, 2025

Originality: 90%
Grammarly Score: 99%
Similarity: 10%

Recommended citation:
Todlas, A.S., Felongco, J., & Pelmin, M. (2025). Can AI persuade? A study on AI-generated advertising acceptance at an allied health school. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *3*(8), 709-716.
https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.440

Abstract. This study explored how students, faculty, and staff perceive AI-generated advertising in an allied health school in General Santos City and how these perceptions affect their willingness to accept and purchase. A quantitative, descriptive-correlational design was employed with 240 randomly selected participants across various roles and genders. Results from this study showed that perceived value positively influenced willingness to accept and purchase, while perceived eeriness negatively impacted acceptance. Perceived intelligence, however, had no significant effect on willingness to purchase or accept. These findings provide valuable insights for digital marketers and academic institutions on tailoring AI-driven campaigns to foster trust and receptivity among digitally literate consumers.

Keywords: AI-generated advertisements; Eeriness; Intelligence; Value.

1.0 Introduction

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized business operations today, including marketing (Rashid & Kausik, 2024). AI-generated advertisements are an emerging trend that utilizes automated and personalized promotional content. Specifically, generative AI transforms marketing and advertising by enabling personalized consumer engagement through advanced AI models such as Midjourney, ChatGPT, and DALL-E (Patil, 2024). By employing artificial intelligence applications, individuals, organizations, and business groups can now participate in multifaceted advertising, communication, and social interactions—whether for commercial or non-commercial purposes—that transcend traditional constraints such as geographical limitations, cultures, and beliefs. The application of AI tools to business and marketing has dramatically altered the production, dissemination, and reception of advertisements, influencing how marketing communications are perceived and accepted today (Eromosele, 2024).

Several companies in 2025, like Coca-Cola and Toys R' Us, released fully AI-generated advertisements in video and image formats with minimal human involvement (Di Placido, 2024). However, these bold moves by major companies resulted in mixed reactions, marked mainly by hostile consumer reception and criticism. Customers expressed disappointment in the lack of authenticity, emotional nuance, and sincerity. This backlash drew attention to how general consumers assess AI-generated content in terms of usefulness, emotional resonance, and perceived trustworthiness (Burlacu, 2023; Ratta et al., 2024).

To understand how consumers perceive AI-generated advertisements, we can apply Mehrabian and Russell's

(1974) proposed stimulus-organism-response (SOR) paradigm to examine how environmental stimuli influence individual reactions. The model consists of three components: "stimulus," which refers to external triggers that elicit emotional or psychological responses; "organism," which refers to internal psychological conditions such as attitudes and perceptions; and "response," which denotes the behaviors or decisions that result from those internal processes (Robert & John, 1982). Within this framework, AI-generated advertisements function as stimuli, while perceptions such as eeriness, intelligence, and value represent the internal organismic reactions that influence a consumer's behavioral response (Thi Nguyen et al., 2024).

Although AI-generated content in advertising is a rising trend, only a few related studies have been conducted to test consumer acceptance of AI technologies. For example, Gu et al. (2024), in their study Exploring Consumer Acceptance of AI-Generated Advertisements: From the Perspectives of Perceived Eeriness and Perceived Intelligence, examined how these two factors influence consumer perceptions. However, their study did not explore willingness to purchase or changes in brand attitude. Therefore, the extent of consumer trust and acceptance of AI remains underexplored, especially among Gen Z and Millennials, who are known for their technological adaptability and sensitivity to authenticity in digital brand communications (Wandhe, 2024).

It is essential to understand how consumer behavior is influenced by perceived eeriness, intelligence, and value in the context of AI-generated advertisements. According to the Consumer Trust Model and Perceived Risk Theory, the adoption of new technologies depends on perceived dependability, emotional comfort, and familiarity with outcomes (Tingchi Liu et al., 2013). In the context of allied health academic settings, where accuracy and scientific validation are crucial, individuals may hold unique perspectives on AI-generated advertising. Faculty, students, and staff in this field are accustomed to making decisions based on evidence and verifiable information, which can influence their level of trust in AI-generated content (Vieriu & Petrea, 2025). This study aims to bridge the gap in understanding how digitally literate consumers—particularly those in academic healthcare institutions—perceive and accept AI-generated advertisements. The results of this study will provide practical insights to marketers, institutions, and advertisers working within or targeting the medical and allied health sectors. Additionally, the findings contribute to ongoing discussions around AI ethics, consumer trust, and digital marketing practices.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study used a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design to capture a snapshot of the perceptions held by students, faculty, and staff at an allied health school. The study also sought to investigate the correlations between perceived eeriness, intelligence, and value in terms of willingness to accept and purchase. The descriptive component will clearly describe the respondents, while the correlational component will enable the analysis of relationships between variables without requiring an experimental design (Bedeian, 2015). A descriptive-correlational research design is suitable for educational contexts, where it is often challenging to achieve experimental control (Mekonnen, 2020). Correlational research can inform future practices by showing significant connections between meaningful datasets.

2.2 Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants are the students, faculty members, and non-teaching staff from an allied health institution. To qualify, participants needed 1) to currently be affiliated with the institution and 2) to be willing to participate. The researchers used a simple random sample to minimize bias. A total of 240 participants were selected from the population of approximately 2,000 using a sample size calculation with a 90% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. Given the target group's small population and limited resources, a 90% confidence level is considered appropriate by the researchers for exploratory studies (Statsig, 2025).

2.3 Research Instrument

The researchers initially based the questionnaire on established instruments from Gu et al. (2024), Jayasingh et al. (2025), and Akdim and Casaló (2023). Several items were modified to better align with the study's objectives. The researchers conducted a pilot test of the instrument to ensure consistency and clarity. The questionnaire included video and image samples of AI-generated advertisements, and participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale, with one denoting "strongly disagree" and five denoting "strongly agree". The researchers used Cronbach's alpha to evaluate the instrument's internal reliability, obtaining a value of 0.76, a value generally regarded as satisfactory in social science research.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

After receiving approval, the researchers disseminated the survey both online and in person, adhering to the predetermined selection criteria. The web platform used is Google Forms. For simplicity and accessibility, the researchers distributed the survey link through Facebook and Messenger to reach participants. The researchers distributed printed surveys to individuals who were physically present during the survey process. The researchers provided all participants with informed consent before completing the study, which explained the survey's intent, that participants would remain anonymous, and the data collection process. No personal identification was present on the survey form itself. The data collection lasted two weeks, which was enough time for participants to respond. The researchers made efforts to actively involve students, faculty, and staff to ensure the sample reflected the institution's diverse academic community.

2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

To protect participants' confidentiality, the researchers intentionally excluded personal information such as names and email addresses from the collected data. This measure ensured both anonymity and compliance with data privacy. After collection, all responses were exported from Google Forms, reviewed for completeness and consistency in Microsoft Excel, and subsequently imported into IBM SPSS for formal statistical analysis.

Data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential techniques. The demographic characteristics of respondents, including gender, age, role in the institution, and frequency of social media use, were outlined using frequency analysis. To assess how participants perceived AI-generated advertisements, the study also included measures of central tendency and variability, such as means and standard deviations, which helped highlight general response patterns.

The study examined how different perceptions influenced behavioral responses by employing multiple regression analysis. This method enabled the assessment of how three factors—perceived eeriness, intelligence, and value—relate to participants' willingness to accept and purchase products featured in AI-generated advertisements. The regression model identified the factors that had the most significant influence on consumer acceptance and purchase intent. The researcher applied a statistical test using a significance level of $p < .05$ and reviewed the standard assumptions for multiple regression to ensure the validity of the results.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

For ethical considerations, the researchers provided the respondents with a detailed briefing and key information about the study's purpose. Through informed consent signed by the institution, respondents can willingly decide to participate in the study. To ensure anonymity, secrecy, and the avoidance of potential harm, all information is handled with utmost confidentiality, including the non-disclosure of the names and identities of research participants, by the Data Privacy Act.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 displays the gender distribution of responses. The studied population is comprised of 37% males, 59% females, and 4% who prefer not to reveal their gender. This result is consistent with the demographics of a medical institution in the Philippines, where females are the majority. This gender distribution may also have implications in this study, as previous studies in technology use suggest that gender can influence attitudes towards technologies (Cai et al., 2017).

Table 1. *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of gender*

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	142	59.17
Male	88	36.67
Prefer not to say	10	4.17
Total	**240**	**100.0**

Table 2 presents the age distribution of the respondents. Most respondents are from the 18-24 age range, comprising 62.5% (150 out of 240) of the total sample population. These were followed by the respondents aged 25-34 at 20%, and those younger than 18 at 7.5%. Fewer responses were collected from individuals aged 34-44 (5.4%), 45– 54 (2.9%), and those older than 54 (1.6%). This age distribution reflects the demographics of a medical

institution in the Philippines. The dominance of Gen Z and late Millennials in the sample population is significant in this study, as they are recognized as digital natives (Wandhe, 2024). The presence of older groups also provides a comparative perspective on generational attitudes towards AI.

Table 2. *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of age*

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Younger than 18 years old	18	7.50
18 years old – 24 years old	150	62.50
25 years old – 34 years old	48	20.00
35 years old – 44 years old	13	5.42
45 years old – 54 years old	7	2.92
Older than 54 years old	4	1.67
Total	**240**	**100.0**

Table 3 shows the respondents' roles within the organization. Students made up 70.8% of the responses, followed by faculty (17.5%) and staff (11.7%). This distribution reflects the natural environment of a medical academic institution, where students form the largest group. Their strong presence is essential in gauging perceptions of AI-generated advertising, while insights from faculty and staff add depth to the analysis across various age groups and professional experiences.

Table 3. *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of role*

Role	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty	142	17.50
Staff	88	11.67
Student	10	70.83
Total	**240**	**100.0**

Table 4 presents that an overwhelming majority of respondents (94.6%) reported using social media daily, while only a small portion accessed it weekly (3.8%) or rarely (1.6%). None of the respondents reported never using social media. The data indicates that the target population is highly active online, making them ideal subjects for examining the reception and acceptance of AI-generated advertisements delivered through digital platforms.

Table 4. *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of social media usage*

Usage of social media	Frequency	Percentage
Daily	227	94.58
Weekly	9	3.75
Rarely	4	1.67
Never	0	0.00
Total	**240**	**100.0**

Table 5 presents the survey results when respondents were asked how often they encounter advertisements generated by AI. Fifty-one percent of respondents answered 'frequently', 35.8% said 'occasionally', 12.9% responded 'rarely', and none reported 'never' encountering AI-generated advertisements.

Table 5. *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of exposure to AI-generated advertisement*

Exposure to AI-generated advertisements	Frequency	Percentage
Frequently	123	51.25
Occasionally	86	35.83
Rarely	31	12.92
Total	**240**	**100.0**

3.2 Factors Influencing AI-Generated Advertisement

In terms of Perceived Eeriness

The results in Table 6 indicate a moderate level of eeriness among respondents toward AI-generated advertisements. Predominantly, respondents expressed some level of discomfort. 69% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with item number 3, with a mean score of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.9. Respondents characterized AI-generated ads as bizarre, creepy, and weird, with a mean score of 3.38, 3.29, and 3.23, respectively.

Table 6. *Factors Influencing AI-generated advertisements in terms of Perceived Eeriness*

Items	Frequency (Percentage)					Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1. I think the advertisements created by AI are creepy.	11 (5.00)	43 (18.00)	81 (34.00)	75 (31.00)	30 (13.00)	3.29	1.0
2. I think AI-generated advertisements are weird.	14 (6.00)	58 (24.00)	62 (26.00)	70 (29.00)	36 (15.00)	3.23	1.1
3. I think AI-generated advertisements are unnatural.	4 (2.00)	21 (9.00)	51 (21.00)	112 (47.00)	52 (22.00)	3.78	0.9
4. I think AI-generated advertisements are bizarre.	10 (4.00)	32 (13.00)	87 (36.00)	80 (33.00)	31 (13.00)	3.38	1.0

With such perceptions, many find this kind of advertisement unusual or unsettling, reinforcing unnaturalness. In the context of the consumer trust model, this lack of authenticity may hinder trust, as emotional authenticity is a crucial aspect of marketing and advertising. Furthermore, the creepiness, weirdness, and bizarreness of these advertisements may act as a barrier to acceptance, despite their ability to convey information effectively. This finding supports Wu and Wen (2021), who emphasized that eeriness or lack of emotional authenticity significantly reduces consumer trust in AI-generated content. Similarly, Gu et al. (2024) identified eeriness as a primary inhibitor of acceptance, which is consistent with the observed discomfort among respondents in this study, suggesting that the majority of people in the allied health education institution still hold a negative view of AI.

In terms of Perceived Intelligence

Customer perceptions of AI-generated advertisements in terms of perceived intelligence are shown in Table 7. A general tendency toward optimistic yet cautious impulses is shown by mean scores that range from 3.34 to 3.93. 73% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, with a mean score of 3.93, that advertisements created by AI demonstrate a high level of technology. Item no. 1 also received a positive rating at a mean of 3.61, although it was lower. However, the slightly lower confidence level in the functional superiority of the products, at a mean of 3.34, suggests doubt as to whether a stunning AI-created advertisement accurately reflects the actual value of the product being advertised.

Table 7. *Factors Influencing AI-generated advertisements in terms of Perceived Intelligence*

Items	Frequency (Percentage)					Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1. AI-generated advertisements are of great quality.	5 (2.00)	30 (13.00)	61 (25.00)	101 (42.00)	43 (18.00)	3.61	1.0
2. I believe the products in AI-generated advertisements are functionally excellent.	16 (7.00)	36 (15.00)	65 (27.00)	97 (40.00)	26 (11.00)	3.34	1.1
3. I think AI-generated advertisements demonstrate a high level of technology.	1 (0.40)	19 (8.00)	44 (18.00)	109 (45.00)	67 (28.00)	3.93	0.9

Respondents provided affirmative answers, despite differing views, with standard deviations ranging from 0.9 to 1.1, indicating moderate diversity. According to these results, even though AI is used for technical quality, its ability to be trusted for the products it sells may still be hampered. While Gu et al. (2024) found perceived intelligence to be a positive influence on AI ad acceptance, this study contradicts that view when it comes to willingness to purchase and trust. In our sample, intelligence had no significant effect on willingness to purchase or accept, suggesting that intelligence alone may not be enough to foster trust in a healthcare academic setting.

In terms of Perceived Value

Table 8 presents the respondents' perceived value of AI-generated advertisements. Overall, respondents expressed neutral to slightly favorable opinions, particularly regarding the belief that AI-generated advertisements are beneficial. The highest-rated item is number 3, with a mean of 3.27 and a standard deviation of 1.1; 48% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This indicates that a moderate percentage of people in the allied health academic institution understand the purpose and valuable benefits of AI-generated advertisements. However, items 1, 2, and 4 show considerably lower perceptions, with agreement levels ranging from 38% to 42%, suggesting that respondents are still not entirely convinced of their overall value and worth.

Table 8. *Factors Influencing AI-generated advertisements in terms of Perceived Value*

Items	Frequency (Percentage)					Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1. I believe that AI-generated advertisements are valuable.	15 (6.00)	43 (18.00)	89 (37.00)	77 (32.00)	16 (7.00)	3.15	1.0
2. I believe that AI-generated advertisements are worthwhile.	18 (8.00)	48 (20.00)	83 (35.00)	76 (32.00)	15 (6.00)	3.09	1.0
3. I believe that AI-generated advertisements are beneficial.	19 (8.00)	34 (14.00)	71 (30.00)	96 (40.00)	20 (8.00)	3.27	1.1
4. Overall, AI-generated advertisements deliver high value.	18 (8.00)	41 (17.00)	81 (34.00)	77 (32.00)	23 (10.00)	3.19	1.1

These findings suggest that, while there is an emerging interest in AI-generated advertising, especially among digitally literate users, the perceived usefulness or value of such content remains underwhelming. This moderately positive yet hesitant stance reflects what Sohn and Kwon (2020) found—that the acceptance of innovative AI-based tools is more strongly influenced by consumer interest in technology than by perceptions of practical or utilitarian value.

3.3 Consumer Acceptance of AI-Generated Advertisement

In terms of Willingness to Purchase

Table 9 shows consumer willingness to purchase products through AI-generated ads. The mean scores range from 2.87 to 3.00, indicating that respondents exhibited neutral to slightly positive attitudes toward making purchases based on AI-generated advertising. These scores indicate a tentative openness, rather than strong enthusiasm or resistance. Item number 1 showed that 33% agreed, 30% were neutral, and only 8% strongly disagreed, reinforcing a trend of tentative openness rather than firm endorsement. Standard deviations around 1.0 to 1.1 reflect moderate variability, suggesting that while individual opinions differed, responses tended to stay within a narrow, moderate range.

Table 9. *Consumer Acceptance of AI-generated advertisements in terms of willingness to purchase*

Items	Frequency (Percentage)					Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1. I will buy products promoted through AI-generated advertisements in the near future.	20 (8.00)	71 (30.00)	78 (33.00)	62 (26.00)	9 (4.00)	2.87	1.0
2. I intend to purchase products promoted through AI-generated advertisements in the near future.	24 (10.00)	60 (25.00)	84 (35.00)	65 (27.00)	7 (3.00)	2.88	1.0
3. It is likely that I will purchase products promoted through AI-generated advertisements in the near future.	23 (10.00)	61 (25.00)	80 (33.00)	65 (27.00)	11 (5.00)	2.92	1.0
4. I expect to purchase products promoted through AI-generated advertisements in the near future.	26 (11.00)	52 (22.00)	78 (33.00)	63 (26.00)	21 (9.00)	3.00	1.1

The results suggest that consumers are not opposed to purchasing products promoted by artificial intelligence (AI), but their intention to buy those products remains uncertain. Marketers may consider strategies such as enhancing perceived value to encourage hesitant consumers to have strong purchase intent (Wu & Huang, 2023).

In terms of Willingness to Accept

Table 10 presents that consumers hold a neutral to slightly positive attitude toward AI-generated advertisements. While the mean score for general willingness to accept was 3.18, 35% of respondents agreed, and 33% remained neutral, showing a measured openness. A similar pattern emerged in item number 2, with a mean score of 3.11, where 41% agreed and 25% were neutral, suggesting that interest was tempered by uncertainty. The lowest mean of 3.0 was seen at item number 3, with 37% agreeing but a combined 36% expressing disagreement, reflecting more divided views. A standard deviation of 1.0 and 1.1 across all items indicates moderate variability, pointing to differences in familiarity, trust, or perceived relevance. Most neutral answers on all items reflected a variable mindset rather than strong support or opposition.

Table 10. *Consumer Acceptance of AI-generated advertisements in terms of willingness to accept*

Items	Frequency (Percentage)					Mean	Standard Deviation
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1. I am willing (or will be willing) to accept AI-generated advertisements.	18 (8.00)	40 (17.00)	80 (33.00)	84 (35.00)	18 (8.00)	3.18	1.0
2. I am willing to actively browse or watch incoming AI-generated advertisement messages.	24 (10.00)	46 (19.00)	60 (25.00)	99 (41.00)	11 (5.00)	3.11	1.1
3. I am willing (or will be willing in the future) to purchase the product or service featured in the AI-generated advertisements.	30 (13.00)	55 (23.00)	54 (23.00)	88 (37.00)	13 (5.00)	3.00	1.1

The findings revealed that, while AI-generated advertisements are not frequently rejected, full acceptance has yet to be recognized. Marketers should stress personalization, openness, and empathy. The study by Yoon and Lee (2021) demonstrates that personalization and perceived empathy increase the willingness to accept. This way, it may lead to more confident acceptance from cautious consumers.

3.4 Relationship Between Perceived Factors and Consumer Acceptance

Table 11 presents the results of a multiple regression analysis examining both predictors of willingness to purchase and willingness to accept. Both were statistically significant. Perceived eeriness, perceived intelligence, and perceived value collectively explain approximately 41.6% of the variance in respondents' willingness to purchase ($F = 56.03$, $p < .001$, with an R^2 of .416 and an adjusted R^2 of .409). For the willingness to accept, the model explained slightly more variance, at 44.0% ($F = 61.83$, $p < .001$, with an R^2 of .440 and an adjusted R^2 of .433). Compared to the willingness to purchase, the willingness to accept explained a greater proportion of variance, indicating a higher predictive strength.

Table 11. *Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Dependent Variables*

	Willingness to Purchase				Willingness to Accept			
Model	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-statistic	Sig.	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	1.255	.330	3.800	.000	2.047	.337	6.083	.000
Perceived Eeriness	-.110	.058	-1.879	.062	-.293	.059	-4.929	.000
Perceived Intelligence	-.045	.069	-.650	.517	-.026	.070	-.372	.711
Perceived Value	.693	.067	10.385	.000	.617	.068	9.065	.000

Note. $N = 240$. For purchase model: $R^2 = .416$, adjusted $R^2 = .409$, $F(3, 236) = 56.03$, $p < .001$. For acceptance model: $R^2 = .440$, adjusted $R^2 = .433$, $F(3, 236) = 61.83$, $p < .001$.

Furthermore, perceived value emerged as the strongest and most consistent predictor of willingness to purchase ($B = 0.693$, $B = 0.629$, $p < .001$) and willingness to accept ($B = 0.617$, $B = 0.538$, $p < .001$). Consumers are more likely to purchase and accept products they perceive as highly valuable. These findings align with the study of Wu and Huang (2023), who emphasized the central role of value perception in consumer decision-making.

Intriguingly, perceived eeriness was negatively associated with both dependent variables, but the significance differed. For a willingness to purchase, it approached significance ($B = -0.110$, $p = .062$), suggesting a possible but inconclusive deterrent effect. Meanwhile, it was a significant negative predictor of willingness to accept ($B = -.293$, $p < .001$), indicating that feelings of eeriness significantly reduced participants' willingness to accept the product. This pattern aligns with insights from Yang et al. (2024), who suggest that affective discomfort plays a more significant role in acceptance, particularly when individuals have less agency. The higher impact of eeriness on acceptance might be explained by cognitive dissonance when the action conflicts with personal values.

In contrast, perceived intelligence did not significantly influence either purchasing ($p = .517$) or acceptance ($p = .711$). Prior studies by Alessandro et al. (2025) have proposed that intelligent features can foster trust or interest. The findings suggest that intelligence alone is insufficient; without perceived value, it may not contribute to meaningful decision-making. The results underscore that perceived value is the dominant factor, while affective responses, such as eeriness, become more critical in the context of forced or passive engagement. Designing for emotional comfort may be just as essential as technical performance, especially for products that require habitual use.

4.0 Conclusion

The respondents acknowledge that AI-driven advertisements are technically sophisticated, intelligent, and of high quality. Nevertheless, perceived intelligence has a minimal impact on willingness to accept or stimulate a

purchase. The most effective predictor of acceptance and purchase is the perceived value of the content. In other words, respondents are more likely to accept and act on the ads they find helpful, relevant, and beneficial.

The findings aligned with the SOR model, in which AI-generated advertisements act as external stimuli that influence consumers' internal cognitive and emotional state, which drives behavioral responses. Perceived value and eeriness are important stimuli that trigger internal reactions, influencing the acceptance of the advertisement and potential purchase. This connection solidifies the theoretical foundation while highlighting key psychological processes used in digital advertising. This result also supports the perceived risk and consumer trust model theory, which posits that trust is built on something dependable and beneficial. Eeriness in promotional materials, on the other hand, is a barrier to acceptance; although it does not stop people from buying, it reduces the effectiveness of the advertisement. This suggests that the discomfort the respondents get from an AI-generated advertisement may hinder the acceptance of a good product. To appeal to digitally literate audiences, especially in an allied health institution, it is recommended that advertisers and marketers using AI-generated advertisements focus on enhancing the perceived value of the content to influence internal reactions positively. Moreover, reducing the eeriness of the advertisement by providing a more natural theme and approach is also encouraged to minimize the barrier to acceptance and improve consumer response and engagement.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

Author 1: conceptualization, proposal writing, data gathering, data analysis.
Author 2: conceptualization, proposal writing, data gathering.
Author 3: advising, proofreading.

6.0 Funding

There was no specific financial support from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to thank the families, friends, and the entire allied health school community for their support in allowing us to conduct this study—a huge thank you to all respondents who participated in the research paper.

9.0 References

Akdim, K., & Casaló, L. V. (2023). Perceived value of AI-based recommendations service: the case of voice assistants. Service Business, 17(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-023-00527-x

Alessandro, G., Dimitri, O., Cristina, B., & Anna, M. (2024). The emotional impact of generative AI: Negative emotions and perception of threat. Behaviour and Information Technology, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929x.2024.2333933

Bedeian, A. G. (2015). More than meets the eye: A guide to interpreting the descriptive statistics and correlation matrices reported in management research. Revista Ibero-Americana De Estratégia, 14(2), 08–22. https://doi.org/10.5585/ijsm.v14i2.2244

Burlacu, C. (2023). The impact of AI-powered content generation on customer experience (bachelor's thesis, University of Twente). https://purl.utwente.nl/essays/95515

Cai, Z., Fan, X., & Du, J. (2016). Gender and attitudes toward technology use: A meta-analysis. Computers & Education, 105, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.11.003

Di Placido, D. (2024). Coca-Cola's AI-generated ad controversy, explained. Forbes. https://tinyurl.com/2nxa83fr

Eromosele, R. C. (2024). Perception of the use of Artificial Intelligence in the creation of advertisement among academic staff of select tertiary institutions in Benin City. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30159.39844

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

Jayasingh, S., Sivakumar, A., & Vanathaiyan, A. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence influencers' credibility effect on consumer engagement and purchase intention. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 20(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20010017

Mekonnen, W. (2020). Review on correlation research. International Journal of English Literature and Culture, 8(4), 99–106. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/45j4wnzk

Patil, D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in marketing and advertising: Advancing personalization and optimizing consumer engagement strategies. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5057404

Rashid, A. B., & Kausik, M. a. K. (2024). AI revolutionizing industries worldwide: A comprehensive overview of its diverse applications. Hybrid Advances, 7, 100277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hybadv.2024.100277

Ratta, A. A., Muneer, S., & Hassan, H. U. (2024). The impact of AI-generated advertising content on consumer buying intention and consumer engagement. Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE), 13(2), 1152–1157. https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00476

Sohn, K., & Kwon, O. (2019). Technology acceptance theories and factors influencing artificial Intelligence-based intelligent products. Telematics and Informatics, 47, 101324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2019.101324

Statsig. (2025). 90% vs. 95% confidence interval: Which to use?. https://tinyurl.com/mrkdrdxt

Thi Nguyen, L. A., Nguyen, T. P., Vu, M. D., Nguyen, T. H., Tran, T. V. T., & Tran, T. H. (2024). The influence of AI-generated vs. Human-generated advertising on purchase intention: A study of Vietnamese consumers. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5052536

Tingchi Liu, M., Brock, J. L., Cheng Shi, G., Chu, R., & Tseng, T. H. (2013). Perceived benefits, perceived risk, and trust: Influences on consumers' group buying behaviour. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 25(2), 225–248. https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851311314031

Vieriu, A. M., & Petrea, G. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' academic development. Education Sciences, 15(3), 343. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343

Wandhe, P. (2024). The new generation: Understanding millennials and Gen Z. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4716585

Wu, L., & Wen, T. J. (2021). Understanding AI advertising from the consumer perspective. Journal of Advertising Research, 61(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.2501/jar-2021-004

Wu, Y., & Huang, H. (2023b). Influence of perceived value on consumers' continuous purchase intention in Live-Streaming E-Commerce—Mediated by consumer trust. Sustainability, 15(5), 4432. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054432

Yang, Y., Xu, J., Land, L. P. W., Yang, S., & Chesney, T. (2023). Exploring active and passive interactions in social networking services: a psychological needs perspective. Information Technology and People, 37(5), 1918–1949. https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-07-2022-0563

Yoon, N., & Lee, H. (2021). AI recommendation service acceptance: Assessing the effects of perceived empathy and need for cognition. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 16(5), 1912–1928. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer16050107