Impulse Buys: Emotions, Influencers, and Privacy in Modern Marketing

Grisha Doshi

I.   Introduction

Strategies are changing fast in the current modern world. Companies now rely heavily on approaches like influencer marketing, user-generated content (UGC), and data-driven campaigns to connect with audiences. These tools make it possible to run highly personalized ads, build stronger brand engagement, and influence how and when people buy things. They work by tapping into emotional triggers, current trends, and shared community ideas. Social media platforms and their algorithms make this even more powerful by constantly pushing content that can shape how people think and what they choose to purchase, sometimes without them realizing it.

Although these methods have clearly improved marketing efficiency and consumer interaction, they bring along important ethical questions. Issues such as data privacy, transparency in how influencers work with brands, and the risk of manipulating people's emotions are now at the center of debates about responsible marketing.

This paper looks at how influencer marketing and UGC affect impulse buying, with a focus on the role of emotion compared to rational decision-making. It also considers how micro-influencers, viral campaigns, and the idea of *authenticity* in content shape both quick purchase decisions and longer-term consumer behavior. Finally, the paper raises questions about privacy and transparency, aiming to give marketers and policymakers a better understanding of how to create effective campaigns without crossing ethical lines, while also helping consumers see the systems influencing their online choices.

Influencer Marketing & Emotional Manipulation –

Influencer marketing has emerged as a powerful strategy in digital advertising, leveraging trusted social figures to guide consumer behavior. Influencers are individuals with the power to affect purchasing decisions due to their perceived social authority, knowledge, or relatability. They are positioned as credible alternatives to traditional advertising, especially because they appeal to pathos. Unlike conventional celebrity endorsements, influencer marketing weaves brand promotion into seemingly authentic personal content, bypassing rational skepticism through emotional bonds between followers and influencers. These relationships increase campaign effectiveness, especially when influencers appear authentic and well-matched to the product. Social media platforms create parasocial relationships–one-sided emotional connections–where consumers emulate influencers' behavior, lifestyle, and choices. Schouten et al. confirm that parasocial interactions mediate the connection between influencer credibility and purchase intention, especially when the product aligns closely with the influencer.

Consumers are often unaware of this emotional manipulation because it is subtle, embedded in language and aesthetics, and presented as a reward every time they interact with content. What feels like a personal recommendation is a carefully orchestrated tactic. Liu et al. found that influencers significantly contribute to impulsive buying, especially among consumers who value perceived authenticity over expertise. Their findings show that authenticity had a statistically significant impact on impulsive purchases ($\beta = 0.136$, $p = 0.019$), whereas expertise had no meaningful effect ($p = 0.091$).

The influencer ecosystem is segmented by follower count into four levels, each manipulating behavior differently. Nano-influencers (1k–10k followers) offer intimacy and grassroots trust, while micro-influencers (10k–100k) specialize in niche content, appearing more credible than macro (100k–1M) or mega influencers (1M+). Macro and mega influencers provide greater reach but often less authenticity, as rising popularity reduces perceived intimacy and personalization. Nano and micro influencers rely on trust and emotional resonance, whereas macro and mega influencers generate aspirational desires. Both approaches use emotional triggers–trust, admiration, and relatability–that can lead to impulse buying, especially when content feels unscripted and personal. The Need for Uniqueness (NFU) also plays a role, as consumers attempt to both belong and differentiate themselves. Research shows that while brand similarity increases perceived uniqueness, high-NFU consumers eventually lose interest in products others commonly use as seen in the rise and subsequent saturation of PopMart's Labubu keychains.

Curated online personas further blur the lines between real life and promotion. Influencers manage their identities to appear both aspirational and attainable, constructing lifestyles that feel intimate yet ideal. Many present lavish lifestyles and promote PR-list products as transformative solutions or ideal experiences. Forbes reported on the Stanley Cup phenomenon: *"You're not really buying into a Stanley–you're buying into the community of all the other girls who have one."* This highlights brand congruency, where consumers are more satisfied with brands aligning with their self-concept. Influencers sell the emotional *access key* to belonging, making emotional loyalty more powerful than traditional advertising: *"brands are stewarded by the company, but are co-created by the people"*.

For younger consumers, particularly Gen Z, influencers have become key figures in identity development. Algorithms on platforms like Instagram and TikTok provide dopamine-driven feedback loops, rewarding engagement. For example, TikTok's skincare trend has popularized products like Drunk Elephant and The Ordinary, which were intended for mature skin, resulting in lowered self-esteem and potential harm among younger users. Emotional manipulation is not coercive but embedded in social norms–owning certain products becomes a marker of social acceptance. This aligns with Social Exchange Theory, which suggests that consumers tolerate emotional advertising when they perceive value in return. However, this raises ethical concerns, as the line between persuasion and manipulation is increasingly blurred by widespread media access. This ecosystem of influencers is only one part of the equation – ordinary consumers now play an equally powerful role through user-generated content, where they become both the audience and the marketers.

User-Generated Content –

User-generated content (UGC) has become one of the biggest game changers in marketing, shifting consumer influence from traditional word-of-mouth to challenges, reviews, and tutorials that live online. Users, knowingly or unknowingly, do the marketing for brands, saving companies from spending large budgets on traditional ads. This culture drives mechanisms of social belonging and identity construction in the digital world: posting trend-aligned content provides a sense of participation and turns consumption into a performative act of social validation. Carefully constructed content fuels a feedback loop–likes, comments, and shares amplify engagement, increase virality, and insert the content into more users' feeds, triggering imitation behavior.

The virality of UGC is closely linked to emotional valence: high-arousal emotions like awe, excitement, and anger are shared more quickly, while low-arousal emotions like sadness hinder sharing. Berger and Milkman (2012) empirically confirmed that emotionally charged peer content is favored both by algorithms and users for its sentimental value. Toubia and Stephen (2013) found that self-presentation and image utility are strong drivers for UGC creation. Influencers and micro-creators generate image-focused content to help consumers visualize themselves experiencing what is being promoted–by seemingly *authentic* people who are paid collaborators rather than unattainable celebrities. This fuels impulse buying, as consumers craft online personas to seek validation and align purchases with their aspirational digital self-image.

Chen et al. (2011) showed that peer-generated product reviews often outweigh expert recommendations. This reflects a psychological shift in trust: many consumers feel disillusioned with professionals who may have overpromised, misled, or offered overly standardized advice. For instance, dermatologists may provide generic skincare suggestions that ignore personal nuance, while dentists might advise against cosmetic treatments out of caution. Users may ignore such advice in favor of peer recommendations that prioritize aesthetics or desired results. Social media's accessibility reinforces this dynamic, making peers seem more relatable than experts. According to Social Identity Theory, individuals favor opinions from those they view as members of their *in-group*. Experts, by contrast, are often seen as outsiders. Social credibility theory further argues that trustworthiness and similarity weigh as heavily as expertise in perceived credibility.

This dynamic works best in communities where consumption becomes a form of belonging. The Stanley Cup case study illustrates this–partnerships with creators reframed products as culturally relevant tokens of community membership, challenging one-way marketing by putting emotional community at the core of brand value. However, this emotional dependence can create neural pathways that tie identity to consumption.

Empirical data highlights the saturation of UGC and influencer ecosystems: over 77% of social media users follow influencers, and content reaches roughly 94.3% of both followers and non-followers. This makes avoiding exposure nearly impossible, reducing consumer autonomy and increasing emotional fatigue. It also fuels *doom scrolling*, where users stay hooked to devices seeking emotional arousal. Instagram browsing behavior, for instance, correlates positively with impulse buying (B = 0.230, p < 0.05), and higher browsing intensity magnifies the effect. Repeated exposure to emotional stimuli lowers consumer resistance to unplanned purchases, encouraging them to buy to maintain emotional highs. Hashem (2021) further highlights gender nuances: women are more likely to trust influencers perceived as authentic, prioritizing their personal experiences over product features.

These phenomena align with Social Exchange Theory, where perceived rewards–like social validation and community membership–outweigh costs. However, this transactional nature conceals the ethical challenges

behind UGC, exploiting human needs for acceptance and identity. Many users remain unaware that their behavior is being manipulated. Together, influencer marketing and UGC create a feedback loop of emotional triggers and peer validation, making the digital environment highly optimized for impulsive behavior.

Micro influencers vs. Celebrities –

Micro-influencers are *ordinary internet users who built up a large following by posting content such as their personal lifestyles*. They have become powerful marketing tools because their smaller followings allow them to build emotional proximity, relatability, and niche community engagement. Their perceived authenticity fosters parasocial bonds, making recommendations feel like genuine lifestyle sharing rather than persuasion. These influencers engage directly with followers, replying to comments and maintaining a casual tone, which creates intimacy at scale. This transforms consumption from being purely about product utility to being tied to social identity and belonging. De Veirman et al. (2017) confirm that micro-influencers, despite having smaller audiences, often achieve higher engagement rates and stronger trust-based relationships, particularly in niche markets where sincerity and passion matter more than celebrity status.

Celebrities, in contrast, generate aspiration, while micro-influencers generate identification. Consumers may want to be celebrities but feel they *are* micro-influencers, which affects how they interpret and act on celebrity messages. Emotional connection, trust, and the desire for self-improvement drive their impulsive purchases. Liu et al. (2023) found that an influencer's authenticity and charisma both contribute to impulsive buying. Micro-influencer campaigns are also cost-effective compared to celebrity endorsements, which require higher fees and extensive preparation. Micro-influencers often accept free products, tickets, or PR packages in place of full payments, producing relatable content like hauls, *open my PR package* videos, and skincare routines that emotionally resonate with audiences. This strategy is effective consumers are 82% more likely to purchase products recommended by a micro-influencer than by a celebrity.

Trust also shapes consumer browsing behavior: it affects both browsing frequency ($\beta = 0.198$, $p < 0.05$) and browsing intensity ($\beta = 0.266$, $p < 0.05$). Consumers are more likely to engage with content when they perceive the messenger as genuine and emotionally sincere.

Celebrity endorsements still play a role, but their impact has steadily declined over the past decade. Boerman et al. (2017) argue that celebrity ads are often seen as transactional and commercial, leading to dismissiveness. Micro-influencers avoid this problem by blending promotional content into daily life, giving consumers a sense of intimacy, stability, and control. These shifts in influence also lay the groundwork for understanding how broader cultural forces – trends, social proof, and algorithmic amplification – shape collective consumer decisions.

The Psychology of Trends & Social Proof –

Trends are emotionally contagious cycles driven by social conformity, peer validation, and identity construction, operating in digital spaces as aesthetic phenomena. At the center is the theory of social proof–a psychological shortcut where people assume behavior is correct by observing others. Social proof is visualized on platforms like TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube through likes, shares, and comments, which act as trust cues and accelerate product desirability. When enough people exhibit a behavior, it signals its acceptability and desirability, reducing the perceived risk of following suit. This overlaps with the bandwagon effect, where consumers join trends not out of necessity but to align with collective behavior.

FOMO (fear of missing out) is a key emotional consequence: seeing others engage with trends creates urgency to buy or participate before being *left behind.* Although trends are often fleeting, they feel magnified in real time because of social pressure. Trends on social media can create a sense of urgency and FOMO, driving consumers to adopt behaviors and purchase products to align with perceived social norms. Algorithms intensify this, amplifying micro-trends into cultural waves. Even passive viewers become emotionally influenced by public visibility and social currency, as products become status symbols or markers of insider access.

The Apple vs. IBM subliminal study further highlights emotional depth in trend association: participants exposed to Apple logos performed better on creative tasks, reflecting Apple's *creative and cool* brand identity. This demonstrates how brands evolve into emotional signifiers of self-expression. When I make choices about brands… someone is going to form an impression about what I'm about. Once emotional association forms, it deepens consumers defend their chosen brands like family, where an attack on the brand is an attack on themselves. Neuroscience research by Michael et al. shows iPhone users display familial empathy responses to Apple-related news, while Samsung users showed no brain reactivity except negative responses toward Apple. This aligns with Need for Uniqueness (NFU) theory, where consumers differentiate themselves by rejecting mainstream brands. Together, these findings reinforce Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, where people mimic peers or aspirational figures. Sloman (2010) similarly notes that *trend adoption is often driven by a desire for social inclusion and status signaling.* The Stanley case study illustrates this power: their revenue grew from $74 million in 2019 to $750 million in 2023 through scarcity-driven drops and clever micro-influencer marketing.

Peer influence and tie strength are particularly pronounced among Gen Z and Millennials, who are digital natives conditioned by emotional cues. Descriptive norms–what others do–become stronger motivators than explicit social approval, creating a feedback loop where repeated exposure reshapes consumer schemas.

However, not all social triggers lead to action. Lie et al. (2023) found that emotional and influencer-driven content (authenticity, relatability) led to impulse buying, but social value alone–seeking approval–did not. Their study, using the elaboration likelihood model, showed that product value activates the rational (central) route, while influencer traits and emotional storytelling activate the peripheral route, making emotional cues more effective at driving quick, impulsive actions. Instagram data supports this: trust in the platform increases browsing behavior ($\beta = 0.198$, $p < 0.05$) and browsing intensity ($\beta = 0.266$, $p < 0.05$). Crucially, intensity–not browsing alone–correlates with impulse buying ($\beta = 0.230$, $p < 0.05$).

Trends may appear grassroots, yet are often emotionally orchestrated cycles of belonging, aesthetic alignment, and scarcity. Emotional mimicry is frequently subconscious: many consumers don't realize they're subconsciously choosing brands because those brands have some kind of expressive values. Even when they believe they are making rational choices, they are buying into a self-concept and emotional experience, which brands deliberately exploit. These mechanisms demonstrate that trend adoption is rarely a rational process – it is fueled by emotional resonance, a theme that becomes even clearer when we contrast emotional and rational appeals in marketing.

Emotional vs. Rational Appeals –

Research consistently finds that emotional appeals significantly outperform rational messaging in driving consumer behavior, particularly in impulse buying. Emotional appeals work through storytelling that taps into subconscious desires and identity constructs, creating engagement by evoking feelings like joy, nostalgia, or belonging. Influencers often frame products in personal, relatable narratives – *This product changed my life!* – bypassing analytical thinking and activating affective primacy–the principle that emotions arise faster and with less cognitive effort than thoughts. This makes consumers *feel* their way into a purchase rather than think through it.

Such narratives create an emotional halo effect, where the intimacy and excitement-built para-socially with an influencer transfer subconsciously to the product–even when its actual features remain vague or unexamined. The affect-as-information hypothesis supports this: people rely on immediate emotions as heuristic cues, especially in low-involvement or information-overload contexts like social media. Enthusiastic influencer recommendations bias consumers' evaluation by embedding emotional responses into memory, bypassing rational scrutiny. This is not because consumers are irrational, but because platforms prioritize speed, resonance, and aesthetics over deliberation. Over time, parasocial bonds mimic real-world trust, causing consumers to attribute credibility and value to promoted products simply because they are framed in emotionally engaging contexts.

Rational appeals–emphasizing features like durability, specs, or cost efficiency–struggle to gain traction in this fast-paced, distraction-filled environment. The Elaboration Likelihood Model shows that rational, central-route processing only works when consumers are motivated and able to think deeply. Social media browsing is typically passive and fragmented, so users default to peripheral processing, relying on surface cues such as influencer charisma or video aesthetics. As a result, rational appeals often fade into the background while emotional content dominates attention.

This dominance has trade-offs: emotional content is more memorable and viral but can lead to shallow, impulsive decisions driven by transient feelings rather than reflective need. Hashem (2021) critiques this as a form of hasty decision-making, where consumers are emotionally *pushed* into purchases without processing implications–making emotional storytelling potentially manipulative.

That said, emotional and rational appeals can work together. Liu et al. (2023) found that both emotional value ($\beta = 0.120$, $p = 0.049$) and functional value ($\beta = 0.136$, $p = 0.012$) predict impulse buying, while social value ($\beta = 0.014$, $p = 0.759$) does not. Emotional appeals are most effective when grounded in real value–product aesthetics, usability, or genuine experience. Overreliance on hype without tangible benefits risks short-term sales at the cost of long-term brand credibility.

Mayya & Subhash also show that Instagram browsing alone does not create impulse buying. Emotional drivers like intimacy, trust, and authenticity are required for passive exposure to convert into action. Trust is a catalyst–it removes psychological resistance and encourages faster, riskier decisions:

- **H₃:** Browsing behavior alone does not lead to impulse buying (B = .064, β = .056, t = 1.191, $p > 0.05$).
- **H₅:** Impulse buying tendency strongly predicts Instagram purchasing (B = .293, β = 2.81, t = 4.211, $p < 0.05$).
- **H₆:** Trust significantly increases Instagram impulse buying (B = .179, β = .137, t = 2.922, $p < 0.05$).

Together, these findings suggest that emotional appeals outperform rational ones not because logic is irrelevant, but because digital environments suppress the space for deep cognitive evaluation. The most effective messaging combines emotional resonance with clear functional value, earning trust through both storytelling and tangible

truth. Marketing that neglects this balance risks consumer burnout, skepticism, or backlash–ultimately commodifying emotion itself. The interplay of emotion and reason underscores why generational, gender, and cultural differences matter: emotional susceptibility is not uniform across demographics, making segmentation critical for marketers.

Consumer Behavior Across Demographics –
Digital marketing cannot operate as a one-size-fits-all mechanism; it is perceived differently across generational, gender, and cultural lines, shaping consumer behavior through emotional, psychological, and socio-cultural pathways.

Generational Cohorts:
Generation Z and younger Millennials are the most emotionally responsive demographic. Liu et al. (2023) found that dominant impulsive buyers are aged 21–30, a group with deep social media exposure and platform familiarity. Their buying culture is shaped by platform integration into identity formation, allowing seamless transitions from scrolling to purchasing and creating an impulse-buy loop fueled by constant emotional stimulation. This digital fluency is a double-edged sword: while it enables convenience, it also increases vulnerability, as Gen Z values authenticity and social alignment. Brands must reflect social justice, sustainability, and empowerment to earn their trust, which amplifies affective resonance and strengthens the *halo effect* surrounding promoted products.

In contrast, older consumers engage differently. Yoon et al. (2009) found that they still respond to emotional content but prefer cues grounded in security, familiarity, and reliability. Gen Z tends to chase novelty and social belonging, while older consumers rely on cognitive frameworks shaped by decades of brand relationships and experiences. With age, attentional systems shift toward affective simplicity, favoring ads that evoke warmth and reassurance over sensory stimulation. Moschis (2003) also observed that older consumers prioritize dependability, service quality, and utility over trends or aesthetics, reflecting a risk-averse, loyalty-driven purchasing style rather than impulsivity. While both groups consume emotionally charged content, their emotional orientations lead to diverging behaviors.

Gender Dynamics:
Research shows women generally exhibit stronger responses to emotional appeals, particularly in categories such as beauty, fashion, and lifestyle. Hashem's study in KSA found women–60.4% of participants, mostly housewives aged 40–50–displayed higher emotional responsiveness and were more likely to engage in impulsive buying within influencer contexts. They responded not just to products but to the emotional framing, where stories of transformation and belonging were embedded in the influencer's persona.

However, these triggers are not universal. Emotional susceptibility is category-specific and culturally mediated. Women are more influenced when the influencer represents relatable aspirations or socioeconomic similarity, as the influencer becomes a proxy for success, beauty, or self-worth. This emotional resonance can bypass rational evaluation and create an illusion of trust mistaken for product credibility. However, ethical questions arise where tapping into gendered emotional labor and domestic roles on platforms to create higher engagement and conversation rates may be reinforcing historically feminized consumption patterns,

Men, meanwhile, show different response tendencies. Williams & Drolet (2005) note that male consumers are more persuaded by direct, fact-based messaging, emphasizing functionality and performance. Putrevu (2001) similarly found that men engage more with objective claims than affective narratives. Yet this binary strategy risks reinforcing outdated stereotypes–casting women as emotional and impulsive, men as rational and analytical– and limiting creative and ethical marketing possibilities.

Recent research challenges this dichotomy. Gao, Wheeler & Shiv (2009) found both genders respond strongly to emotional appeals when aligned with their self-concept or identity goals. Meyers-Levy & Loken's (2020) meta-analysis argues gender differences in ad processing are shaped more by personality and culture than gender itself. Eisend (2019) also critiques the binary model, noting that modern consumers reject stereotypical gender portrayals and that brands failing to adapt risk alienating audiences. These findings suggest marketers should adopt nuanced psychographic approaches, targeting values, lifestyles, and motivations across gender lines rather than relying on fixed cognitive styles. However, as marketing becomes more tailored to these demographic and psychographic differences, it also relies more heavily on consumer data – raising questions about personalization, autonomy, and ethical boundaries.

Personalized Ads & Data Privacy –
Personalized ads are powerful tools for consumer engagement but come with significant ethical and privacy challenges. Data-driven targeting delivers relevant, emotionally charged ads that can increase impulse buying, but it also risks loss of consumer agency, privacy breaches, and invasive surveillance of digital behavior.

Martin & Murphy (2016) call this the *privacy paradox*–where consumers express privacy concerns but still disclose large amounts of personal data due to limited control or awareness. This reflects a psychological trade-off: immediate emotional and convenience benefits of personalization are weighed against abstract, distant risks that consumers rarely perceive directly. Yet these dynamic fuels surveillance capitalism, data commodification, and a shifting power imbalance between consumers and corporations.

Data Privacy Threats:

A major risk comes from unconsented data harvesting, where third-party trackers collect behavioral data without explicit permission–often through cookies, device fingerprinting, or intrusive app permissions. This creates difficulty for users to meaningfully opt out due to the necessity of accessing websites or services. Nissenbaum's (2010) theory of contextual integrity argues that privacy violations are not just about data collection but about data being repurposed beyond expected social norms, particularly when used for targeted advertising or predictive profiling. This process converts not only user activity but also their contextual norms into data points for algorithmic analysis.

Beyond data collection, breaches in data security heighten risks like identity theft, financial fraud, and reputational harm. Such breaches often result from weak cybersecurity or sale of data to insecure third parties, undermining public trust in a firm's ability to safeguard information.

Algorithmic Opacity and Discrimination:

Another pressing concern is algorithmic opacity. The logic, criteria, and scores used by targeting systems are hidden from consumers and regulators, leaving users unable to understand why they are seeing certain ads or what inferences have been drawn about them. Acquisti, Brandimarte & Loewenstein (2010) note that users often hold an illusion of control, believing they can manage their privacy settings while remaining largely unaware of platform mechanics.

Eubanks (2018) highlights a more serious consequence: algorithmic targeting can replicate or amplify social biases. Predictive analytics often disproportionately profile vulnerable populations based on race, socioeconomic status, or geography, excluding them from opportunities in housing, credit, and employment. Instead of democratizing access, data-driven advertising can entrench systemic inequality by using past disadvantages as a basis for future exclusion.

Transparency, Autonomy, and Behavioral Biases:

Attempts at transparency–cookie banners, opt-out links, or cryptic privacy settings–often fail to meaningfully empower users. Behavioral decision theory shows that these mechanisms rely on choice architecture that burdens users rather than granting true autonomy. Reactance theory suggests that perceived loss of control can trigger defensive behaviors and skepticism toward brands. However, optimism bias and illusions of control lead consumers to underestimate risks, continuing to share data despite concerns–deepening the privacy paradox.

Social exchange theory frames data sharing as a negotiation: consumers accept privacy risks when perceived benefits outweigh costs. Breaches of this implicit contract–through deceptive practices or poor security–represent ethical failures, provoke regulatory scrutiny, and risk long-term reputational damage for brands.

Regulatory Landscape:

Globally, privacy protections vary. The EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is a landmark framework emphasizing consumer rights, data minimization, and user control. While GDPR restricts some marketing tactics, its focus on fairness and autonomy sets a benchmark for ethical data usage. By contrast, the U.S. regulatory environment relies largely on industry self-regulation and notice-and-choice mechanisms, creating a fragmented system with loopholes that leave consumers vulnerable.

Personalized advertising therefore represents both the peak of marketing sophistication and its most urgent ethical dilemma. It ties together the paper's key themes: emotional targeting, influencer ecosystems, demographic susceptibility, and the risk of manipulation. As we move into the conclusion, the challenge becomes clear – how can marketers leverage these tools responsibly while protecting consumer autonomy and trust?

II.   Conclusion

In the end, impulse buying today isn't random. It grows out of a system: influencers and UGC create a steady stream of feelings, trends and *everyone's doing it* moments; platforms boost that with algorithms; and brands package it as authenticity. Micro-influencers make it feel personal; celebrities make it feel aspirational, and trends turn both into habits. Most of this works because emotion gets our attention faster than facts, especially on feeds where we scroll quickly.

But people don't all respond the same way. Gen Z leans into novelty and identity; older consumers look for security and reliability. Women and men can both be moved by emotion, depending on the message and context. Because of that, the most effective marketing mixes feeling with function–story plus real value–so it earns trust instead of burning it.

The hard part is privacy. Personalization can make ads useful, but it also depends on data trails most users don't fully see or control. When targeting crosses lines–through opaque algorithms, repurposed data, or biased outcomes–it chips away at autonomy and fairness.

So, the takeaway is simple: use emotion, but back it with truth. Be clear about what data you collect and why. Give people real choices. And as consumers, slow down long enough to ask, *"Do I want this, or was I just nudged?"* If marketers, platforms, and audiences all do their part, we can keep the creative, human side of modern marketing without giving up trust and privacy.

References

[1]. Abosag, Ibrahim, et al. "Customers' Need for Uniqueness Theory versus Brand Congruence Theory: The Impact on Satisfaction with Social Network Sites." *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 117, Apr. 2019, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.03.016.

[2]. Acquisti, Alessandro, et al. "Privacy and Human Behavior in the Age of Information." *Science*, vol. 347, no. 6221, Jan. 2015, pp. 509–14, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1465.

[3]. Berger, Jonah, and Katherine L. Milkman. "What Makes Online Content Viral?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 49, no. 2, Apr. 2012, pp. 192–205, https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353.

[4]. Big Think. "How Apple and Nike Have Branded Your Brain | Your Brain on Money | Big Think." *YouTube*, 27 July 2021, www.youtube.com/watch?v=4eIDBV4Mpek.

[5]. Calo, M. Ryan. *The Boundaries of Privacy Harm*. July 2010, www.researchgate.net/publication/45251794_The_Boundaries_Of_Privacy_Harm.

[6]. Chen, Yubo, et al. "The Role of Marketing in Social Media: How Online Consumer Reviews Evolve." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2011, https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1710357.

[7]. De Veirman, Marijke, et al. "Marketing through Instagram Influencers: The Impact of Number of Followers and Product Divergence on Brand Attitude." 2017, www.researchgate.net/publication/318434044_Marketing_through_Instagram_influencers_the_impact_of_number_of_followers_and_product_divergence_on_brand_attitude.

[8]. Eisend, Martin. "Gender Roles." *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 48, no. 1, Mar. 2019, pp. 72–80, https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2019.1566103.

[9]. Forbes. "Why All Brands Should Study Stanley Cup CEO Terence Reilly's Marketing Masterclass." *YouTube*, 6 Mar. 2024, www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sb9IF7wBnus.

[10]. Freberg, Karen, et al. "Who Are the Social Media Influencers? ("Influencer Culture: How Online Personalities Are Shaping ... - Medium") A Study of Public Perceptions of Personality." 2011, www.researchgate.net/publication/251582746_Who_are_the_social_media_influencers_A_study_of_public_perceptions_of_personality.

[11]. Gao, Leilei, et al. "The 'Shaken Self': Product Choices as a Means of Restoring Self-View Confidence." *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 36, no. 1, June 2009, pp. 29–38, https://doi.org/10.1086/596028.

[12]. Habibi, Mohammad Reza, et al. "The Roles of Brand Community and Community Engagement in Building Brand Trust on Social Media." *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 37, Aug. 2014, pp. 152–61, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.016.

[13]. Hashem, Tareq. *Impact of Influencer Marketing – Three R's – on Impulsive Purchase Behavior: The Moderating Influence of Gender*. Dec. 2021, www.researchgate.net/publication/358510742_Impact_of_Influencer_Marketing_-Three_R_s_-On_Impulsive_Purchase_Behavior_The_Moderating_Influence_of_Gender.

[14]. Liu, Huinan, et al. "A Study on How Social Media Influences on Impulsive Buying." *Expert Systems*, vol. 42, no. 1, Sept. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13448.

[15]. Marwick, A. E. *Status Update: Celebrity, Publicity, and Branding in the Social Media Age*. ("Status Update: Celebrity, Publicity, and Branding in the Social Media Age") 2013, www.researchgate.net/publication/281668405_Status_Update_Celebrity_Publicity_and_Branding_in_the_Social_Media_Age.

[16]. Martin, Kelly D., and Patrick E. Murphy. "The Role of Data Privacy in Marketing." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 45, no. 2, Sept. 2017, pp. 135–55, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-016-0495-4.

[17]. Mayya, Shrinivasa D., and Rashmi Subhash. "'Social Media Impact on Online Impulse Buying–an Instagram Perspective.'" *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, vol. 14, no. 12, Dec. 2022, pp. 376–91, https://doi.org/10.37896/JXAT14.12/316530.

[18]. Moschis, George P. "Marketing to Older Adults: An Updated Overview of Present Knowledge and Practice." ("PUBLICATIONS: REFEREED SCHOLARLY – George P. Moschis") *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, vol. 20, no. 6, Nov. 2003, pp. 516–25, https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310499093.

[19]. Nissenbaum, Helen. *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*. ("PRIVACY IN CONTEXT: TECHNOLOGY, POLICY AND THE INTEGRITY OF SOCIAL LIFE") 2010, crypto.stanford.edu/portia/papers/privacy_in_context.pdf.

[20]. Petty, Richard E., and John T. Cacioppo. "The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion." 20 July 1986, www.researchgate.net/publication/229068356_The_Elaboration_Likelihood_Model_of_Persuasion.

[21]. Pham, Michel Tuan. "Emotion and Rationality: A Critical Review and Interpretation of Empirical Evidence." *Review of General Psychology*, vol. 11, no. 2, June 2007, pp. 155–78, https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.11.2.155.

[22]. Putrevu, Sanjay. "Exploring the Origins and Information Processing Differences between Men and Women: Implications for Advertisers." ("Exploring the Origins and Information Processing - ProQuest") 2001, scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=AB10xYYAAAAJ&citation_for_view=AB10xYYAAAAJ:u-x6o8ySG0sC.

[23]. Schouten, Alexander, et al. "Celebrity vs. Influencer Endorsements in Advertising: The Role of Identification, Credibility, and Product-Endorser Fit." 2 July

2019, www.researchgate.net/publication/334184138_Celebrity_vs_Influencer_endorsements_in_advertising_the_role_of_identification_credibility_and_Product-Endorser_fit.

[24]. SendPulse. "What Is Influencer Marketing: Guide–Definition." 2024, sendpulse.com/support/glossary/influencer-marketing.

[25]. Tajfel, H., and J. C. Turner. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict." 1979, www.scirp.org/reference/ReferencesPapers?ReferenceID=757561.

[26]. Voigt, Paul, and Axel von dem Bussche. *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).* Springer International Publishing, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57959-7.

[27]. Williams, Patti, and Aimee Drolet. "Age-Related Differences in Responses to Emotional Advertisements." 1 Dec. 2005, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1946370.

[28]. Yoon, Carolyn, and Stephanie M. Carpenter. "Aging and Consumer Decision Making." *Aging and Decision Making*, 2015, pp. 351–70, https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-417148-0.00017-0.

[29]. Zajonc, Robert B. "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences." ("Measuring product category involvement: A multitrait-multimethod study ...") *American Psychologist*, vol. 35, no. 2, 1980, pp. 151–75, https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.2.151.

[30]. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

[31]. Toubia, O., & Stephen, A. T. (2013). *Intrinsic vs. Image-Related Utility in Social Media: Why Do People Contribute Content to Twitter?* Marketing Science, 32(3), 368–392.

[32]. Fitzsimons, G. J., Chartrand, T. L., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2008). *Automatic Effects of Brand Exposure on Motivated Behavior: How Apple Makes You "Think Different".* Journal of Consumer Research, 35(1), 21–35.

[33]. Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor.* St. Martin's Press.