

# CAN AI-SIMULATED PROFILES REPLICATE HUMAN PERCEPTIONS? A STUDY ON ANTHROPOMORPHISM IN DIGITAL CONTENT

**Octavian Dumitru HERA**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9382-4299>  
West University of Timisoara, Timișoara, Romania  
Email: octavian.hera78@e-uvt.ro

DOI: 10.52846/MNMK.23.1.05

## **Abstract:**

*This study explores the assessment of anthropomorphic perceptions in synthetic digital content using AI-simulated profiles. Anthropomorphism, the tendency to attribute human traits to artificial entities, plays a crucial role in how consumers engage with AI-generated content. The research compares reactions from human subjects with responses generated by AI-simulated profiles to determine if AI can effectively replicate human assessments. A sample of 120 human participants evaluated AI-generated digital content, while AI-simulated profiles, mirroring the participants' demographic characteristics, completed the same assessment. The results showed that AI-simulated profiles can serve as a reliable alternative for measuring anthropomorphic reactions. These findings suggest that AI could be effectively used in marketing research to assess consumer perceptions of AI-generated content, potentially increasing efficiency and reducing costs.*

*Keywords: anthropomorphism, synthetic digital content, AI-simulated profiles, digital content marketing*

## **1. Introduction**

This paper will compare the assessment of anthropomorphic perceptions of synthetic digital content by human subjects and simulated profiles through artificial intelligence (AI). This method of evaluating content through simulated profiles by AI can bring a significant increase in productivity in marketing practice to the extent that the results generated are close to the results obtained from actual testing with human subjects.

The adoption and use of artificial intelligence in marketing processes has the potential to induce transformations in multiple areas of marketing such as marketing strategy, customer experience management and content marketing (Davenport et al., 2020; Hermann and Puntoni, 2024). Content marketing can benefit from the advances in AI both by reinterpreting existing ideas and by exploring new ideas that have not been previously experienced. By using generative AI in digital content marketing, new content elements can be created in various formats (text, images, video or other media formats). The adoption and use of generative AI in content marketing leads to a reaction from consumers as a result of interacting with content

that is difficult to distinguish from that generated by human authors. This anthropomorphic reaction (attributing human motivations, emotions and/or intentions to artificial entities) could be negative in the first phase, but could be beneficial in the long term when the interaction is built gradually and transparently (Epley, Waytz et al., 2007; Feng, Chen et al., 2023).

The study of digital content created by generative AI (which we will call “synthetic digital content”) is recent, being possible once the technological level has allowed the creation of content that approaches the level of content created by humans. Previous research has focused on analyzing consumers' trust and prejudices towards AI-generated content (Longoni and Cian, 2022), the ability to distinguish between synthetic digital content and human content (Ragot, Martin et al., 2020), and the influence of the content creator on consumer perceptions of content (Elgammal et al., 2017; Agudo et al., 2022). Some of these perceptions are caused by the phenomenon of anthropomorphism, which is the tendency to attribute human motivations, emotions, and/or behavioral intentions to artificial entities (Epley, Waytz et al., 2007).

Hermann and Puntoni (2024) note that AI has recently become a central topic in marketing research from multiple perspectives (strategy, ethics, consumer behavior, anthropomorphism, etc.), and Ford et al. (2023) signal the need to revise the theoretical framework and current marketing practice based on the results of studies on algorithmic creativity and the generation of advertising objects through AI.

## 2. Literature Review

The topic of this paper lies at the intersection between the study of the application of AI in marketing and the study of digital content marketing.

The use of AI in marketing is relatively recent and raises acceptance issues from marketing practitioners and consumers. Stevens and Stetson (2023) formulated the Theory of Trust and Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence Technology (TrAAIT) which introduces the concept of trust into the theoretical model of technology acceptance and the model of information systems success. TrAAIT identifies as the main factors influencing trust and acceptance of AI: (1) trust in the artificial entity with which it interacts; (2) attitude towards the objects/experiences generated by this technology; and (3) the quality of these objects/experiences. While quality is a linear construct that can be relatively easily assessed and improved incrementally, trust and attitude are non-linear constructs which refers to artificial entities that resemble and produce effects very close to those of human entities. Those generates anthropomorphic reactions that starts as a positive perception that evolves to a maximum point beyond which reactions can turn unfavorable if the similarities with humans become too profound (Hollebeek et al., 2024). Current evolution of generative AI ends up producing the type of results and effects that can no longer be easily distinguished from those achieved by humans (Hermann and Puntoni, 2024).

Digital content marketing emerged as a term at the beginning of this century (Hollebeek and Rowley, 2019) and designates the marketing process responsible for identifying, anticipating and satisfying customer needs profitably for the company through content distributed through digital channels (Rowley, 2008). Digital content marketing is part of the broader area of digital marketing that uses the Internet and other digital technologies to promote the company's products and services (Li et al., 2022). It has become an increasingly important marketing tool (Taiminen and

Ranaweera, 2018) placed at the center of most modern digital marketing actions (Buhphapant and Brandão, 2023) for cultivating relationships with consumers and continuous communication with them (Li et al., 2022) in order to maintain a long-term social connection (Fan, Wang et al., 2024).

## **2.1 Generative AI**

Generative AI is the technology by which synthetic digital content can be generated.

Generative AI uses generative models through which new content is generated based on learning how to filter the characteristic data of some objects (Kshetri, 2024). Among the learning models used by generative AI are Generative Pre-trained Transformers (GPT), which are autoregressive models that simultaneously process sequential data from human natural language in order to determine the most likely continuation of an idea according to large-capacity natural language processing models ("LLMs - Large Language Models") based on billions of learning parameters for interpreting tasks without specific prior training (Binz and Schulz, 2023) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) which involve the simultaneous training of two models: (1) the generative model whose objective is to create realistic digital objects, such as images, text, etc.; (2) the discriminator model that aims to distinguish authentic objects created by humans from synthetic objects created by AI in order to improve the generative capacity in such a way as to achieve a balance with the discriminator, i.e. the generation of synthetic digital objects that can no longer be distinguished from authentic ones (Ragot, Martin et al., 2020; Elgammal et al., 2017). The quality of synthetic digital content can be refined by using semantic segmentation, which consists of the simultaneous segmentation of objects in an image, the detection and ordering of objects in a certain context (Anantrisirichai and Bull, 2021) and diffusion models that successively generate images of increasing quality by eliminating anomalies from the previous generative sequence until obtaining images with a high degree of realism (Dhariwal and Nichol, 2021).

## **2.2 Synthetic Digital Content**

The emergence of AI in marketing has accelerated the trend of migrating from content created through analog and digital means to synthetic digital content (Campbell et al., 2019) made possible through generative AI applications that can create content in the form of images, text, audio and video using generative models trained on extensive data sets (Prasad Agrawal, 2023).

Synthetic digital content represents a new stage in the evolution of digital content marketing, with significant transformational potential, and the current level of AI programs allows the generation of creative content (Chui, Roberts et al., 2023) at a high level of visual realism (Ford et al., 2023) that can no longer be easily distinguished from authentic content created by humans (Anantrisirichai and Bull, 2021).

The way AI generates digital content would be equivalent to discovering ideas or solutions (Runco, 2023), and by refining generative methods, it could reach a higher level of quality and creativity as a result of exposure to a level of collective superintelligence (Ameen et al., 2022). The generation process is based on a set of instructions (called "prompts") that allow the generation of digital content of several categories: "text-to-image" for creating detailed images based on simple requirements expressed in the form of a text (Towes, 2022); "text-to-video" and "text-to-3D" for creating video sequences, respectively 3D objects based on requirements

expressed in natural language (White, 2023); and “text-to-music” to generate new songs, for example through the Suno.ai platform. Generative “text-to-x” solutions have emerged as very useful working tools for obtaining visual digital content quickly and at low cost (Singh, 2023) and signal the trend of migration from content created through analog and digital means to synthetic content created through AI (Campbell et al., 2019).

### 2.3 Anthropomorphism

The generation of objects by AI that resemble those made by humans is a problem of social acceptance (Ragot, Martin et al., 2020). This social response is implicitly manifested in people who interact with objects that possess sufficient characteristics to be associated with social values (Nass and Moon, 2000) in the context in which the increasingly rapid advances in technology make it increasingly difficult to distinguish AI from the level of human intelligence.

These reactions, called “anthropomorphic reactions”, were divided by Coeckelbergh (2022) into two categories: (1) “naive instrumentalism”, which expresses a dualist-exclusive perspective in which artificial entities are viewed as simple objects, regardless of their mode of appearance and capacity for manifestation; and (2) “unconditional post-humanism”, which expresses an inclusive-evolutionary perspective in which artificial entities can be assimilated to persons who complete and enrich the world of humans. A high level of anthropomorphism can provoke negative reactions among consumers who would perceive this level of progress as a threat (Millet et al., 2023) and could negatively influence the consumer experience (Rizomyliotis et al., 2022). This negative reaction to the high level achieved by AI is called “algorithmic aversion” and characterizes the consumer perception of AI as inauthentic, immoral, maximizing performance to the point of absurdity (Hermann and Puntoni, 2024). The negative anthropomorphic reaction is less in objective domains, but is more acute in subjective domains, including the domain of creativity where the evaluation criteria are much vaguer (Chu and Liu, 2023).

## 3. Research objectives

The purpose of this research is to evaluate whether AI-simulated profiles can reliably assess anthropomorphic perceptions of synthetic digital content, offering a viable alternative to human-based studies. Therefore, the following research question has been formulated:

*Are there significant differences between the results obtained by simulating profiles using AI compared to the results obtained by actually collecting data from human subjects.*

### 3.1 Methodology of research

In order to explore the research question, a questionnaire has been drawn to measure the anthropomorphic reactions of the subjects. We have used a scale based on Moriuchi (2020) with following items to measure the construct of anthropomorphism:

- The presentation seemed to me to be made by a human.
- The presentation seemed to me to reflect a human touch.
- The presentation seemed to me to be cordial.
- I perceived a touch of sensitivity in the presentation.

Each item was assessed using a 5-points Likert scale, where 1 means strong disagreement and 5 means strong agreement.

The object of evaluation was a product presentation made entirely with AI tools: ChatGPT, version 4-o, was used to produce the written product presentation, while Midjourney application, version 6, was used to generate the visual product presentation.

The research comprises of two combined studies: (1) an online scenario where human subjects were asked to fill in the above questionnaire after viewing the synthetic digital content and (2) an AI scenario where simulated profiles generated their responses to the same questionnaire.

Participants in the online scenario have been selected through snowball method using WhatsApp. In total, 120 human subjects from Romania participated in the study. Through the registration form we collected the following data about the participants: (1) the email address used later in communication and for sending the access link to the individualized page; (2) age category and gender category; (3) occupation; and (4) leisure preferences. These data were later used to determine anthropomorphic reactions of the AI-simulated profiles.

**Table 1. Sample structure (based on human subjects characteristics)**

|                 |                               |     |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| by gender       | Female                        | 56  |
|                 | Male                          | 64  |
|                 | total (N)                     | 120 |
| by age category | Young (under 34 years-old)    | 30  |
|                 | Middle Aged (35-49 years-old) | 55  |
|                 | Mature & Seniors (50+)        | 35  |
|                 | total (N)                     | 120 |

The AI-simulated profiles mirrored characteristics of human subjects. Besides gender and age category, additional individual attributes have been used: occupation and preferences to spend free time. Those data were also mirrored with human subjects' data based on their declaration at registration for the study.

The application used in the AI scenario was ChatGPT, version 4-turbo. The following prompt was used:

*"We will do a simulation. Let's assume that we have 120 subjects who are subject to a questionnaire. The 120 subjects have the characteristics listed in the spreadsheet: age, field of activity, free time preferences, gender category. These subjects visualize the presentation of a product – product-presentation.pdf.*

*After that, they must answer the following questions:*

- 1. It seemed to me that the presentation was made by a human.*
- 2. The presentation seemed to me to reflect a human contact.*
- 3. The presentation seemed cordial to me.*
- 4. I perceived a note of sensitivity in the presentation.*

*The simulation consists of filling in the answers for each subject in the spreadsheet, starting from the characteristics of each profile (age, field of activity, free time preferences, gender category). The answers will be given by scores from 1 to 5 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) where 1 means total disagreement and 5 means total agreement.*

*Analyze the content, analyze the profile of each subject and formulate answers to fill in the table and return the answers."*

#### 4. Results and discussion

Collected data for both scenarios has been analysed using SPSS, version 21.

In the first stage of the analysis, we tested the scale reliability. Thus the Cronbach-Alpha coefficient of the 4 items of the anthropomorphism measurement scale revealed that none of them negatively affects the value of the Cronbach-Alpha coefficient.

**Table 2. Reliability analysis of the anthropomorphism measurement scale**

| Item                                                   | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |                       |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                                        | Human subjects                   | AI-simulated profiles |
| The presentation seemed to me to be made by a human    | .900                             | .804                  |
| The presentation seemed to me to reflect a human touch | .872                             | .810                  |
| The presentation seemed to me to be cordial            | .911                             | .836                  |
| I perceived a touch of sensitivity in the presentation | .891                             | .861                  |
|                                                        | <b>.918</b>                      | <b>.866</b>           |

The value of the Cronbach-Alpha coefficient calculated for the 4 items of the AI content anthropomorphism construct is 0.918 for human subjects, respectively 0.866 for AI-simulated profiles, thus revealing that the scale is reliable for both samples.

Overall, the anthropomorphism level recorded was 3.1104 (SD: 1.0476) for human subjects, respectively 3.2771 (SD: 0.5008) for AI-simulated profiles. The result of independent samples t-test was  $t(238) = -1.572$ ,  $p = 0.117$ , showing that there is no significant difference between Human and AI regarding the analyzed variable, as the p-value is greater than 0.05. This finding validates the hypothesis that AI-simulated profiles could be effectively used to measure anthropomorphic reactions instead of human subjects with a given set of characteristics.

Furthermore, depth analysis of the results obtained by human subjects and the profiles simulated by AI found that there are no significant differences in the subgroups formed by gender categories: female ( $\text{Human}_{\text{gender}=F} = 3.1161$ , SD 1.1078;  $\text{AI}_{\text{gender}=F} = 3.2857$ , SD 0.4825;  $t(110) = -1.051$ ,  $p = 0.296$ ), male ( $\text{Human}_{\text{gender}=M} = 3.1055$ , SD 1.1001;  $\text{AI}_{\text{gender}=M} = 3.2695$ , SD 0.5200;  $t(126) = -1.164$ ,  $p = 0.247$ ).

On the other hand, the responses generated by the profiles simulated by AI recorded significant differences in the subgroups formed by age categories regarding the segment of middle-aged people ( $\text{Human}_{\text{age}=mid} = 3.3909$ , SD 1.1019;  $\text{AI}_{\text{age}=mid} = 2.9818$ , SD 0.2144;  $t(108) = 2.913$ ,  $p = 0.046$ ) and especially of mature and senior people ( $\text{Human}_{\text{age}=senior} = 2.9214$ , SD 0.9602;  $\text{AI}_{\text{age}=senior} = 3.9786$ , SD 0.2453;  $t(68) = -6.311$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Regarding the segment of young people, no significant differences were recorded between the responses of human subjects and those of the profiles simulated by AI ( $\text{Human}_{\text{age}=young} = 2.8167$ , SD 1.098;  $\text{AI}_{\text{age}=young} = 3.000$ , SD 0.1857;  $t(58) = -0.901$ ,  $p = 0.371$ ).

Thus, although no significant differences were recorded on the general sample and on the subgroups formed by gender groups, the use of this method must be

treated with caution when it is intended to analyze the results on subgroups formed based on age groups.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper has investigated the potential of AI-simulated profiles to assess anthropomorphic perceptions of synthetic digital content. By comparing responses from human participants with those generated by AI-based simulations, we aimed to determine whether AI can reliably replicate human reactions to AI-generated content. The results indicate that there is no significant difference between the responses of human subjects and AI-simulated profiles. Traditional models of digital content marketing assume human consumers as the primary evaluators of marketing materials. This study suggests that AI can function as a proxy for human feedback, potentially redefining how digital content is tested and optimised

From a managerial perspective, this finding suggests that AI-simulated profiles can be used as an effective and efficient alternative to human participants in evaluating anthropomorphic reactions to digital content. The ability to generate reliable insights through AI simulations presents opportunities for marketing research, reducing the costs and time associated with traditional consumer studies. Implications for businesses and marketing practitioners could include a faster way to enhance content personalization by understanding anthropomorphic perceptions of a given target group simulating the consumer reactions and thus optimizing the engagement strategies.

From a theoretical perspective, the paper findings support the idea of using AI as a research tool in marketing. The study highlights that AI-generated profiles can produce comparable responses to human subjects, reinforcing existing discussions on the evolving role of AI in consumer behavior research. This finding supports the argument that AI is not merely a tool but an active participant in shaping consumer experiences.

Moreover, as AI continues to evolve, its role in content creation and evaluation will likely expand. However, ethical considerations regarding transparency and consumer trust remain important, particularly as AI-generated content becomes increasingly indistinguishable from human-created material. Future research should further explore the long-term impact of AI-simulated evaluations and how they influence marketing strategies and consumer engagement.

This paper contributes to the growing body of literature on AI in digital marketing and highlight the potential for AI to enhance consumer research methodologies.

## REFERENCES

- Agudo, U., Arrese, M., Liberal, K.G. and Matute, H., 2022. Assessing Emotion and Sensitivity of AI Artwork. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 13, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.879088>
- Ameen, N., Sharma, G.D., Tarba, S., Rao, A. and Chopra, R., 2022. Toward advancing theory on creativity in marketing and artificial intelligence, *Psychology & Marketing*, 39, 1802–1825. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21699>

- Anantrasirichai, N. and Bull, D., 2022. Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55, 589–656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7>
- Binz, M. and Schulz, E., 2023. Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3. PNAS, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 120(6), 1–10.
- Bubphapant, J. and Brandão, A., 2024. Content marketing research: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 48(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12984>
- Campbell, C., Plangger, K., Sands, S. and Kietzmann, J., 2022. Preparing for an Era of Deepfakes and AI-Generated Ads: A Framework for Understanding Responses to Manipulated Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 51(1), 22–38.
- Chu, Y. and Liu, P. 2023. Public aversion against ChatGPT in creative fields?, *The Innovation*, 4(4), 1-2.
- Chui, M., Roberts, R. and Yee, L., 2022. Generative AI is here: How tools like ChatGPT could change your business. McKinsey, accessed 20 December 2022.
- Coeckelbergh, M., 2022. Three Responses to Anthropomorphism in Social Robotics: Towards a Critical, Relational, and Hermeneutic Approach. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14, 2049–2061. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-021-00770-0>
- Davenport, T.H., Guha, A., Grewal, D. and Bressgott, T., 2020. How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing, *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 48, 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0>
- Dhariwal, P. and Nichol, A., 2024. Diffusion models beat GANs on image synthesis”, NIPS’21: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 8780-8794.
- Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M. and Mazzone, M., 2017. CAN: Creative Adversarial Networks. Generating “Art” by Learning About Styles and Deviating from Style Norms. *8th International Conference on Computational Creativity (ICCC)*, Atlanta, 1-22.
- Epley, N., Waytz, A. and Cacioppo, J. T., 2007. On seeing human: A three-factor theory of anthropomorphism. *Psychological Review*, 114(4), 864–886. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.114.4.864>
- Fan, L., Wang, Y. and Mou, J., 2024. Enjoy to read and enjoy to shop: An investigation on the impact of product information presentation on purchase intention in digital content marketing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 76, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103594>
- Feng, Y., Chen, H. and Xie, Q. 2024. AI Influencers in Advertising: The Role of AI Influencer-Related Attributes in Shaping Consumer Attitudes, Consumer Trust, and Perceived Influencer–Product Fit. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2023.2284355>

- Ford, J., Jain, V., Wadhwani, K. and Gupta, D.G., 2023. AI advertising: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 166, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114124>
- Hermann, E. and Puntoni, S., 2024. Artificial intelligence and consumer behavior: From predictive to generative AI. *Journal of Business Research*, 180, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114720>
- Hollebeek, L. D. and Macky, K., 2019. Digital Content Marketing's Role in Fostering Consumer Engagement, Trust, and Value: Framework, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 45(1), 27-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2018.07.003>
- Hollebeek, L. D., Menidjel, C., Sarstedt, M., Jansson, J. and Urbonavicius, S. 2024., Engaging consumers through artificially intelligent technologies: Systematic review, conceptual model, and further research. *Psychology & Marketing*, 41, 880–898. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21957>
- Kshetri, N., Dwivedi, Y.K., Davenport, T.H. and Panteli, N., 2024. Generative artificial intelligence in marketing: Applications, opportunities, challenges, and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 75, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102716>
- Longoni, C. and Cian, L., 2022. Artificial Intelligence in Utilitarian vs. Hedonic Contexts: The “Word-of-Machine” Effect!. *Journal of Marketing*, 86(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920957347>
- Millet, K., Buehler, F., Du, G. and Kokkoris, M.D., 2023. Defending humankind: Anthropocentric bias in the appreciation of AI art. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 143, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107707>
- Moriuchi, E., 2021. An empirical study on anthropomorphism and engagement with disembodied AIs and consumers' re-use behavior”. *Psychology & Marketing*, 38, 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21407>
- Nass, C. and Moon, Y., 2000. Machines and Mindlessness: Social Responses to Computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(1), 81-103. <https://doi.org/10.111-1/0022-4537.00153>
- Prasad Agrawal, K., 2023. Towards Adoption of Generative AI in Organizational Settings. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 64(5), 636–651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2023.2240744>
- Ragot, M., Martin, N. and Cojean, S., 2020. AI-generated vs. Human Artworks. A Perception Bias Towards Artificial Intelligence?. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10.
- Rizomyliotis, I., Kastanakis, M.N., Giovanis, A., Konstantoulaki, K. and Kostopoulos, I., 2022. “How mAy I help you today?” The use of AI chatbots in small family businesses and the moderating role of customer affective commitment, *Journal of Business Research*, 153, 329-340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.08.035>

- Rowley, J., 2008. Understanding digital content marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(5-6), 517-540. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725708X325977>
- Runco, M.A., 2023. AI can only produce artificial creativity. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100063>
- Singh, A., 2023. A Survey of AI Text-to-Image and AI Text-to-Video Generators. 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Robotics and Control (AIRC .2023), 1-4.
- Stevens, A.F. and Stetson, P., 2023. Theory of trust and acceptance of artificial intelligence technology (TrAAIT): An instrument to assess clinician trust and acceptance of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 148, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2023.104550>
- Taiminen, K. and Ranaweera, C., 2019. Fostering brand engagement and value-laden trusted B2B relationships through digital content marketing: The role of brand's helpfulness. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(9), 1759-1781. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2017-0794>
- Towes, R., 2022. The Biggest Opportunity In Generative AI Is Language, Not Images. *Forbes*, accessed 6 November 2022.
- White, M., 2023. A Brief History of Generative AI, *Medium*, accessed 7 January 2023.