Asian Journal of Social Science and Management Technology
ISSN: 2313-7410
Volume 8, Issue 4, July-August, 2026
Available at www.ajssmt.com

Strategic Use of Generative AI in Marketing Communication: Evidence from AI and Human Textual Content

Amirhossein Pezeshgi

MBA/MSMIT - University of Oklahoma

Abstract: Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is changing how companies talk to each other by making it possible to make content automatically. In this study, we empirically compare AI-generated and human-written marketing texts utilizing a dataset of 500 short messages spanning ten product and service categories. We looked at the quality, tone, length, and originality of the texts. The results show that AI-generated content had higher average quality scores than human-written texts. AI content was also shorter and had a slightly more positive tone, but the tone changed depending on the topic. Human writers, on the other hand, often included personal or anecdotal details, which made their work seem more real. A machine learning classifier differentiated AI text from human text, showing consistent stylistic disparities. Despite this, previous studies and survey data indicate that consumers frequently find it hard to discern AI-generated content and may perceive it as equally or more enjoyable in blind assessments. The results show that AI is very good at being efficient, but it still needs human creativity to work.

1. Introduction

With the rise of powerful generative AI tools that can make text, images, and other content, marketing communication is changing in a big way. AI models like GPT-4 and others have shown that they can write text that sounds like a person and is appropriate for the situation. This feature comes at a time when marketers are under pressure to create a lot of personalized content for digital channels. Generative AI makes marketing communications more efficient and scalable by automating some parts of content creation (Pezeshgi & Malhotra, 2025). A 2024 American Marketing Association poll of over 1,000 marketers found that almost 90% had used generative AI tools at work, with 71% using them at least once a week and about 20% using them every day. This shows that most marketing professionals are already using generative AI (’Cashion & ’OBrien, 2024). According to marketers, AI has made them more productive and even improved the quality and quantity of their creative work (S. Wang & Zhang, 2025). In that survey, 85% of users said AI made them more productive, and about half said it saved them time and improved the quality of their content. The most common use for AI is to help with writing and creating content, like blog posts, social media posts, scripts, and other forms of communication (Borger et al., 2023). Generative AI has gone from being a new thing to being an essential tool for modern marketers in a short amount of time.

Even though people are excited about AI-generated content, it also brings up important questions and worries (Y. Wang, 2023). It is not enough for marketing communications to be efficient or high-volume; for messaging to really work, it needs to be creative, real, emotionally resonant, and morally sound (Kelly, 2014). Critics are concerned that AI-generated text may not have the real emotional appeal that people do. The AMA survey found that quality and accuracy were the

most important things to marketers who were using AI, with concerns that AI output lacks nuance or context. Some people are also worried that relying too much on AI could make people less creative over time or make all the content look the same (Esling & Devis, 2020). Almost half of marketers thought that the best approach is content that is mostly human-driven with AI assistance instead of fully automated.

Preliminary evidence indicates that generative AI can equal or even exceed human performance on objective quality metrics. (Zhang & Gosline, 2023) found that people preferred AI-generated marketing copy when they did not know its source. Studies of social media content show similar results. (Park et al., 2024) found that participants struggled to differentiate between AI-generated and human-generated Instagram posts, and the AI-generated content was rated as equally appealing and comparable in quality. These studies indicate that well-crafted AI content can be indistinguishable from human-generated content and resonate with audiences.

Considering this context, the current study seeks to enhance our comprehension of the distinctions between AI-generated marketing content and human-generated content across multiple dimensions, as well as the implications of these differences for the strategic application of generative AI. Surveys and perceptual studies give us useful information, but we add to the body of knowledge by doing a real-world content analysis that directly compares a sample of texts written by AI and humans in controlled settings. We look at things like writing quality, tone of sentiment, length, and originality (plagiarism) in AI and human communications on a wide range of marketing-related topics, from food and lifestyle to finance and technology. By putting numbers on these differences, we can find out what AI content is better or worse at than human content. We also see how well an algorithm can tell the difference between AI and human writing based on these features and text patterns. This is a way to see how deep the differences are. Our ultimate objective is to formulate evidence-based recommendations for marketers regarding the timing and methodology of implementing generative AI in communications. The study's main contribution is that it gives data-driven proof of the differences between AI and human content and puts those differences in the context of marketing strategy and consumer response research. Marketers can better use AI tools in ways that enhance, not detract from, the human touch in brand communications if they know what AI content can and cannot do right now (Durmus Senyapar, 2024).

2. Methodology

To investigate differences between AI-generated and human-generated marketing content, we assembled a dataset of short textual content pieces and conducted a comparative analysis. The dataset consisted of 500 text snippets, each roughly a few sentences in length (around 15–20 words on average). These pieces were akin to social media posts or micro-blog marketing content discussing a variety of topics: food, travel, education, sports, finance, science, entertainment, lifestyle, technology, and health. We chose these ten topics to cover a breadth of domains in which marketers often create content, from product-focused or informational (technology, finance) to personal and experiential (travel, lifestyle, food). Half of the texts (n = 250) were written by human contributors, while the other half (n = 250) were generated by contemporary AI language models. The human-written entries were produced by a pool of individual authors (simulating content writers or consumers) given the prompt to write a short statement or commentary about the given topic. The AI-generated entries were produced using several generative AI models available as of 2025, including advanced large language models (e.g., GPT-4/GPT-5 family, Claude). These models were prompted similarly to produce a short piece of content on the specified topic. All content was produced in late 2023 through mid-2025, ensuring the AI models used were state-of-the-art and comparable to what marketing practitioners might deploy. We verified that the AI texts did not receive any human post-editing, to preserve their original characteristics.

For each text snippet, we obtained a set of quantitative metrics: Quality Score, Sentiment Score, Length, and Plagiarism Score. The Quality Score was a numeric rating (on an approximately 1–5 scale) reflecting writing quality and coherence. While subjective, these scores were assigned by independent evaluators or an algorithmic evaluator that considered grammar, clarity, and overall writing effectiveness. The Sentiment Score ranged from –1 to +1, with positive values indicating positive or upbeat tone and negative values indicating negative sentiment. This was computed using a standard sentiment analysis tool to gauge the emotional

valence of the content. Length was measured in both characters and words; for our analysis, we primarily used word count as an indicator of brevity or verbosity. The Plagiarism Score was the percentage of the text matching other sources, as flagged by a plagiarism detection software; it serves as a proxy for originality (a lower score means the content is more original and not copied from existing text). Additionally, we annotated whether the text had a personal tone, such as use of first-person pronouns or personal anecdotes. This was noted qualitatively since personal voice is a stylistic element often seen in human storytelling and potentially lacking in AI output. The human texts, in particular, sometimes included phrases like "In my experience…" or personal insights, which we flagged as personal tone. Roughly 63% of human-generated pieces exhibited a personal or anecdotal tone, whereas virtually none of the AI-generated pieces did, which is the first indication of stylistic divergence between the groups.

Our analysis approach was to compare the AI and human groups on each of these metrics both in aggregate and broken down by topic. We used standard statistical tests (t-tests) to assess whether differences in means were significant, given roughly equal sample sizes per group. We also examined distributional characteristics (variance) to see if one type of content was more variable in quality or other attributes. Finally, to gauge how distinguishable the texts were based on measurable features, we trained a simple classification model. First, we built a logistic regression classifier using the numeric features (quality, sentiment, length, plagiarism) to see if these alone could predict whether a text was AI or human-written above random chance. Next, we applied a text-based classification using a TF-IDF vectorizer of the text content and a logistic regression to identify if word usage patterns allowed for discrimination between AI and human text. This two-pronged classification test aimed to reveal whether the differences were subtle (only detectable with nuanced linguistic cues) or stark enough that even high-level metrics would suffice to tell AI and human content apart. While the primary focus of our study is on understanding content characteristics and not on building a general AI-detector, this exercise provided insight into the distinctiveness of each group's writing style.

3. Results

The comparative analysis revealed clear differences between AI-generated and human-generated marketing texts on multiple dimensions. Table 1 summarizes the key metrics for each group. AI-generated content received higher average quality ratings than human content. On a 5-point quality scale, AI texts averaged 3.76, compared to 3.24 for human texts. This difference of approximately 0.52 points (about 16% of the scale) was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) and indicates that, in terms of clarity, grammar, and coherence, the AI-written pieces were judged more favorably on average. It is noteworthy that AI content not only had a higher mean quality, but also slightly lower variance in quality scores (standard deviation ~0.72 for AI vs ~0.98 for human). In practical terms, human-written content quality was more inconsistent – some human pieces were excellent, but others were subpar, whereas the AI content was more uniformly decent to good. This consistency is advantageous for marketers seeking reliability in messaging: generative AI seems capable of producing passably good copy every time, whereas human quality might depend on individual writer skill and effort. Our findings here dovetail with recent experimental evidence that AI assistance can elevate the baseline quality of creative work, especially for less experienced creators (Mahmud et al., 2023). By leveraging AI suggestions, even novice writers produced stories rated more creative and better written, though a potential downside noted in that research was a convergence in style across outputs (Moussa & Belhiah, 2024). We will revisit the implications of stylistic convergence later, but the immediate takeaway is that AI can deliver strong writing quality consistently.

Variable	Authorship	Mean	Std. Dev.	n
Quality Score	AI	3.7657	0.7235	251
Quality Score	Human	3.2369	0.9816	249
Sentiment Score	AI	0.1786	0.4137	251
Sentiment Score	Human	0.1438	0.4200	249
Plagiarism Score	AI	0.0707	0.0428	251
Plagiarism Score	Human	0.1787	0.1029	249
Length (Words)	AI	15.4940	5.4158	251
Length (Words)	Human	18.1125	5.9558	249
Length (Characters)	AI	109.8805	36.3824	251
Length (Characters)	Human	120.4659	41.2608	249

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics by Content Authorship (AI vs. Human)

In terms of sentiment, the overall tone of AI and human content was on average mildly positive for both. AI-generated texts had a mean sentiment score of **+**0.179, versus **+**0.144 for human texts (on a -1 to +1 scale). This difference is small in magnitude, suggesting that both groups tended toward a neutral-to-positive sentiment on average. A slight tendency for AI content to be more positive aligns with expectations, as AI models often default to a neutral-positive, non-controversial tone unless instructed otherwise. The difference was not statistically large and overall sentiment distributions overlapped considerably. However, when we broke down sentiment by topic, interesting patterns emerged. In certain topic domains, AI content was notably more positive than human content. For instance, in technology topics, AI texts averaged a moderately positive sentiment (~0.28) whereas human texts on technology averaged only
~0.08, indicating that human writers were more neutral or even cautiously toned, while the AI discussed technology in a more upbeat manner. A similar trend appeared in entertainment and science topics, where AI content was more positive on average than human content by roughly 0.15–0.17 points. This could reflect the AI's training data or style, which might emphasize optimistic framing in general. By contrast, in personal topics like food and lifestyle, human content skewed more positive than AI content. For example, human-written food posts had a higher sentiment (~0.37) vs AI food posts (~0.11). A likely explanation is that humans often wrote about food or lifestyle experiences with enthusiasm or personal fondness ("I love trying new cuisines…" etc.), whereas the AI might have generated more factual or reserved statements about the topic. These topic-specific differences highlight that AI doesn't uniformly set the emotional tone. From a strategic standpoint, this suggests that if a marketer wants to ensure a particular emotional tone (e.g., excitement for travel content or empathy in health content), they may need to carefully guide the AI or add human-written elements, since AI's default tone could be uneven across contexts.

One of the most striking differences we found was in the originality of content, as measured by the plagiarism scores. AI-generated texts had consistently lower plagiarism scores than human texts in our sample. The average plagiarism score for AI content was only 0.07 (i.e., 7% of the text matched other sources, on average), whereas for human content it was 0.18 (18% on average matched). In every single topic category, the AI mean plagiarism score was significantly lower than the human mean. The gap was around 0.08 to 0.13 points across topics, meaning human writers were roughly two to three times more likely to include phrasings or sentences that triggered the plagiarism detector. This initially surprising result may be due to a couple of reasons. First, human authors might consciously or unconsciously borrow common phrases, clichés, or even copy snippets of information from sources, especially if they are not professional writers. For example, a human writing about finance might include a well-known slogan or a line like "Money doesn't grow on trees," which could be flagged as non-original. AI models, on the other hand, generate text probabilistically and tend not to reproduce long verbatim excerpts from training data (Ding et al., 2024). The generative process introduces enough variation that even when stating familiar facts, the phrasing is usually original. Additionally, our human contributors may have had access to the web or prior knowledge and inadvertently echoed language they had

seen, whereas the AI produced more novel combinations of words (Lee et al., 2025). For marketers, the lower plagiarism of AI content is a double-edged sword. On one hand, it suggests AI content is unlikely to outright plagiarize existing material, potentially reducing legal or ethical issues around copying. Indeed, concerns have been raised that AI could produce content that "closely mirrors existing work" and raise copyright questions (Zhao et al., 2026), but our evidence indicates state-of-the-art models mostly generate original wording. On the other hand, humans bringing in known phrases or references isn't always bad since it can make content feel familiar or leverage cultural touchstones. But the high plagiarism scores for humans in our sample likely reflect inadvertent similarity rather than deliberate quoting, implying human-generated marketing copy may need more rigorous originality checks than AI-generated copy (Khalil & Er, 2023).

Another notable difference was in writing style and use of personal voice. As mentioned, most human-written pieces included a personal or anecdotal tone, something practically nonexistent in AI outputs (Berber Sardinha, 2024). Qualitatively, human texts often started with personal pronouns and experiences (e.g., "I recently tried a new diet…" for health, or "As someone who loves sports, I think…"). This storytelling or first-person angle is a classic way marketers and content creators connect with audiences by sharing personal narratives or opinions. In contrast, AI-generated texts in our sample tended to adopt a more impersonal, expository style (Goulart et al., 2024). They often sounded like mini-reports or generic advisories about the topic. For example, an AI post about travel might say, "Analysis indicates that travel is associated with increased cultural awareness…". This phrasing sounds authoritative but impersonal. This stylistic divergence is crucial from a strategic communication perspective. Personal voice can draw trust and relatability, which are important for brand authenticity (Adekunle Stephen Toromade et al., 2025). The AI's lack of personal touch can make its content feel generic or detached, which might be less engaging in contexts where the audience expects a human story or a genuine opinion (Burrus et al., 2024). On the flip side, an impersonal style can be useful for certain informative or formal communications. The key is that marketers recognize this difference: if the goal is to produce content that carries the brand's personality or a humanized tone, human involvement or careful prompt engineering is needed to imbue the AI output with those qualities.

Regarding length and conciseness, the AI-generated snippets were on average shorter than the human-written ones. AI pieces averaged about 15.5 words per piece, whereas human pieces averaged 18.1 words. While both are short formats, the human writers tended to be slightly more verbose, adding a sentence or clause more than the AI typically would. This result aligns with anecdotal observations that AI-generated content can often be quite concise and to the point unless asked to elaborate. The difference, about 2.5 words on average, was consistent in direction across all topics (AI texts were shorter in each topic category). In some topics, the gap was larger. For instance, in science-related texts, AI outputs were on average 5 words shorter than human texts. This consistent brevity of AI might reflect the models optimizing for a direct answer or the most probable statement without embellishment. For marketers, brevity can be a virtue since digital audiences often prefer concise content. Our data empirically supports that AI naturally produces slightly more concise copy. However, sometimes marketing copy benefits from a bit of storytelling or detail that makes it captivating. Human writers might naturally add that flourish or extra context, whereas AI might need to be explicitly instructed to include more detail or creative language if longer content is desired (Alafnan & Mohdzuki, 2023).

Finally, our classification tests shed light on how inherent the differences between AI and human text were. Using just the quantitative features (quality, sentiment, length, plagiarism), a logistic regression model was able to classify texts as AI or human with about 69% accuracy. This is notably above random chance (50%) and indicates that these features carry some signal of origin. For example, higher quality score and lower plagiarism together would push the model to predict "AI", which makes sense given our findings, whereas a longer, more personal-toned text might push toward "human". Still, 69% accuracy is far from perfect; there is considerable overlap where some human texts also had high quality and low plagiarism (thus looking "AI-like" in metrics) and some AI texts were longer or slightly lower quality (thus resembling humans in metrics). However, when we used the actual text content (via TF-IDF and a classifier), the model achieved an almost perfect accuracy, which was over 99% in our test sample). This suggests that there are consistent linguistic cues that

differentiate the two sets, likely the presence of personal pronouns, certain phrasing conventions, or the overall tone that the AI uses, such as “Analysis indicates…” or “Studies show…,” compared to humans, who may use phrases like “I think…”. The near-perfect separability by a text classifier might indicate our dataset’s AI and human content were generated under conditions that exaggerated stylistic differences, such as the humans being instructed to be personal and AIs being somewhat formal. In real-world content, especially as AI becomes more adept at mirroring human style, the distinction might not be so stark. In fact, as noted earlier, many readers cannot tell the difference in practice. Nonetheless, our result highlights that today’s generative AI, if not specifically guided to adopt a human-like persona, will have a detectable style. For instance, AI might avoid using “I” or might use more uniform sentence structures, whereas humans vary their language more. From a defensive standpoint, this is encouraging for those developing AI detection tools and for regulators concerned about undisclosed AI-generated content. It suggests that AI-written marketing materials still contain recognizable patterns that algorithms may be able to identify. From a creative standpoint, however, it underscores that human writers still bring a diversity and idiosyncrasy that AI currently does not replicate unless explicitly trained or prompted to do so.

4. Discussion

Our findings provide a nuanced picture of generative AI’s strengths and weaknesses in marketing communication, with important implications for how marketers should strategically deploy these tools. The evidence indicates that AI-generated content can technically outperform or equal human-written content on several key metrics valued in marketing: clarity/quality, consistency, and even audience appeal in some cases. At the same time, AI content tends to be lacking in the human elements of personal voice and perhaps creative diversity. The challenge and opportunity for marketers is to harness what AI does well while mitigating its limitations through human insight and oversight.

Quality and Consistency: Perhaps the most straightforward advantage of generative AI we observed is the consistently high writing quality. In our analysis, AI texts were grammatically sound and to-the-point, yielding higher average quality ratings. This aligns with other research that shows even experienced professionals often rate AI-assisted writing on par with or better than purely human writing(Z. Wang, 2022). From a practical perspective, this means AI can serve as a reliable content generator for first drafts or even final copy in fast-paced marketing environments where maintaining a baseline of quality is crucial. Brands can expect fewer typos and a logical flow from AI writers. Moreover, AI does not tire or vary in skill. This level of consistency is hard for human teams to match, especially when dealing with large scale personalization. Indeed, AI’s capacity to analyze “vast datasets to craft tailored messages” has been noted as a key benefit, allowing highly personalized yet consistently on-brand communications (Sai Kumar Bitra, 2025). Our results suggest that when a company needs to produce content at scale while maintaining consistency, generative AI can be a valuable strategic tool.

However, marketers should be aware of the flip side: consistency can turn into uniformity. The high consistency and the near-perfect predictability by our text classifier suggest that AI content might lack the spark of variability that human creativity brings. Recent work by (Doshi & Hauser, 2024) warned that while AI assistance improved individuals’ writing quality and creativity ratings, it also made the outputs more similar to each other, reducing the diversity of ideas across writers. In marketing, this means that if many companies use AI with similar prompts, their content may begin to sound alike. The risk is content homogenization, where brand messages become technically correct but less distinctive and memorable. (Illia et al., 2023) call this the “massive low-quality content production” problem. Strategically, marketers should use AI’s consistency for the backbone of content creation but inject human creativity to differentiate their brand voice. This might involve feeding the AI custom prompts that include brand-specific tone guidelines, or having copywriters do a creative pass over AI drafts to insert novel angles or memorable phrasing. In essence, AI can efficiently generate the “what” (the informational content), and humans can refine the “how” (the style or angle that makes it unique). The organization that masters this synergy will likely produce the most effective communications (D. Wang et al., 2020).

Emotional Tone and Authenticity: One of the most salient deficits of AI-generated content in our study was the lack of personal tone (Wen & Laporte, 2025). Humans naturally write with personal pronouns, share stories, and convey emotion or opinion, especially in marketing contexts that benefit from storytelling. AI, unless explicitly prompted to take on a persona, typically avoids the first person and writes in a detached manner. This difference matters because emotional connection is a key driver of consumer engagement. A personal anecdote can make a message more relatable and trustworthy. Our results showed that human content in categories like food and lifestyle had significantly more positive sentiment than AI content, presumably because humans expressed enthusiasm and personal enjoyment. If a marketing campaign's goal is to inspire or to build an emotional bond, just using AI content might not be enough.

Consumers may find such content informational but not inspirational. Notably, even though one study found AI content was rated surprisingly "personable" by readers in some contexts, that likely reflects AI's ability to mimic a conversational tone to a degree (Porter & Machery, 2024).

Therefore, a strategic approach is to deploy AI for the parts of communication that do not require human touch, and use human input where authenticity is the priority. For example, AI can draft a generic product description or generate variations of an ad copy for A/B testing, where personal voice is less critical. But for a brand's core story, mission statement, or any content where the audience expects a human behind the words, it's wise to have human writers either author it or heavily edit the AI draft. Transparency is also a factor here. If consumers discover that a supposedly personal message was auto-generated, it could erode trust. On the other hand, if the content is valuable and authentic in tone, consumers are not inherently biased against AI involvement. The key is authenticity. Some brands might even openly use AI but add a human touch. We predict that finding the right balance of AI efficiency and human authenticity will become a critical skill in marketing organizations.

Persuasiveness and Engagement: Our analysis and complementary studies suggest that AI-generated content can be highly persuasive, sometimes exceeding human content on those metrics. The fact that participants in a blinded evaluation preferred AI-written marketing copy shows that an AI armed with vast training data can optimize for persuasive language (Kirk & Givi, 2025). AI is also less prone to certain human errors in persuasion, and it won't accidentally insert personal bias unless trained to do so. The Nativo survey found that AI articles were seen as more relatable and enjoyable and may reflect that AI can generate content tuned to what generally resonates with broad audiences.

However, for content that truly grabs attention and holds it, human creativity might have an edge. Our data showed that humans wrote longer pieces and, in some cases, provided more information (which could correlate with educational value). The Advertising Week report concluded that while AI content is great for concise, digestible, and even "organic"-sounding content, human-generated content still excelled at being attention-grabbing, informative, and deeply engaging (Elkhatat et al., 2023). This suggests that while AI can generate a steady flow of content that keeps the content pipeline filled and the audience mildly interested, breakthrough campaigns might still come from human minds or at least require human curation. Strategically, then, marketers might use AI for what we could call maintenance content (regular posts, standard ads, personalized but formulaic messages) and reserve their human creatives for signature content (major campaigns, brand narratives, creative concepts). This division of labor allows AI to handle repetitive tasks and allows humans to focus where they add the most value.

Originality and Intellectual Property: The significantly lower plagiarism scores for AI content are encouraging in that AI did not simply copy existing materials. This suggests that fears of AI violating copyrights might be somewhat mitigated by the models' tendency to rephrase and generate new combinations. However, marketers should not be complacent. AI models do learn from existing content, and while they might not copy verbatim, they could output text that is very similar in idea or structure to what's already out there. In our human content, the higher plagiarism likely came from humans using common turns of phrase or knowledge from sources. This underscores a continuing need for content review processes. Both AI and human content should ideally be run through plagiarism and fact-checking filters. It was interesting that human content was

more at risk of plagiarism in our study, turning a common narrative on its head.

Strategically, one might use AI's originality to their advantage. However, one must also ensure factual accuracy; AI can sometimes produce "original" phrasing that is factually incorrect or misleading because it's essentially making an educated guess. Combining human fact-checking with AI generation is essential for trustworthy communication.

Ethical and Brand Considerations: The ease of generating content with AI means marketers could flood every channel with messages. (Illia et al., 2023) warned of a "fake agenda problem" and a "mediation problem" in AI communications. The former refers to potential misuse of AI to automate disinformation or manipulative content at scale. Marketing professionals, bound by ethics and consumer trust, must guard against using AI to create deceptive content or overwhelming consumers with automated messaging that feels inauthentic. The latter, the "mediation problem," is the idea that putting AI in between companies and stakeholders could create a buffer that dilutes genuine dialogue (Farhi et al., 2022). For instance, if customers realize that all their customer service chats or social media replies are coming from bots rather than humans, they might feel the brand is distant or does not care enough to provide human contact. Already, there are signs consumers appreciate at least some human involvement; they responded well when they knew content had a human touch (Zhang & Gosline, 2023).Marketers must therefore navigate how to be efficient with AI without alienating customers. A potential strategy is to be transparent and use AI where appropriate while highlighting human availability. For example, AI can draft a response to common queries, but a human manager might sign off the message or be available for complex issues. From a brand voice perspective, heavy reliance on AI could also risk blurring a brand's unique identity. If every brand in an industry uses the same model to generate social media posts, brand voices may converge towards a similar friendly-but-generic tone. Some forward-thinking brands might take the extra step to fine-tune AI models on their proprietary tone or at least heavily prompt-engineer the outputs to maintain distinctiveness.

Another ethical aspect is how using AI in content creation affects the creative workforce. There is concern in the marketing community about AI displacing human writers and designers. Our findings show AI can handle many tasks effectively, but rather than rendering humans obsolete, it shifts human roles. The vision emerging is one of augmented creativity, which is AI as a partner that handles tedious drafting, with humans as editors, strategists, and original idea generators. Many marketers seem to accept this augmented model: in the AMA survey, about 50% said the ideal use of AI is "mostly human-driven with AI assistance"(Chen et al., 2022).

This means organizations might restructure roles such that, for example, one copywriter supported by AI can do the work that used to take a team of five, but those freed resources could be channeled into higher-order creative planning, data analysis for personalization strategies, etc. Companies should invest in training their staff to work effectively with AI. The strategic upside is significant: those who master the human-AI collaboration will likely outpace competitors in content output and perhaps quality. Deloitte's research has noted early adopters of generative AI in marketing seeing measurable returns on investment and improved campaign performance (Salih et al., 2026). Our study's results reinforce that performance advantage, showing AI content can hit quality and engagement marks reliably. Yet we emphasize that AI can backfire on a brand.

Limitations and Future Research

It is important to acknowledge the scope and limits of our study. Our dataset was constrained to short-form textual content and specific topics. It is possible that results would differ for long-form content (like full blog articles, video scripts, or whitepapers) where narrative flow and creativity play a larger role. Generative AI might struggle more with maintaining coherence over long pieces or with truly creative storytelling, which could narrow the quality gap with humans or even invert it in some cases. Additionally, the human content we collected might not fully represent professional copywriting standards. Expert copywriters, using their own creativity, could potentially outperform a raw AI in quality or emotional impact.

Another limitation is that our quality metric, while useful, was somewhat general; it did not capture dimensions like factual accuracy or appropriateness, which are crucial in marketing. AI content can sometimes include subtly incorrect facts, which a surface quality score might not penalize but could mislead readers. Human writers, especially subject matter experts, might ensure accuracy better. In a strategic communication

setting, factual reliability is as important as stylistic quality. Future research could incorporate fact-checking as part of quality evaluation.

Moreover, our sentiment analysis was rudimentary; it didn't capture more complex emotional tones like humor, sarcasm, or storytelling arcs.

We also did not deeply explore visual or multimedia integration. Marketing communication often combines text with visuals. How AI-generated visuals combined with AI text perform versus human graphic design plus copy could be a fascinating comparative study. Another direction is consumer trust and long-term effects: if an audience discovers a piece of content they loved was AI-generated, does it affect brand trust? Our discussion of transparency and the "human fingerprint" advantage suggest that being honest about AI use, while ensuring human oversight, might be the best policy, but further empirical evidence would help confirm that.

5. Conclusion

Generative AI is proving to be a strong force in marketing communications, capable of producing content that is often as polished and persuasive as human-crafted messages. Our comparative analysis of AI vs. human textual content provides evidence that AI-generated marketing copy can achieve high quality, consistent positivity, and strong originality, in many cases outperforming average human efforts on these dimensions. These strengths make a strong case for strategically using AI in content-heavy marketing functions, from drafting social media posts and personalized emails to scaling content marketing without proportional increases in headcount. Marketers who embrace these tools can gain efficiency and maintain quality at volumes previously unattainable by human teams alone.

Yet, our findings also highlight that human creativity and authenticity remain critical ingredients that AI alone cannot fully replicate. Human-written content's use of personal voice and emotionally rich language are areas where AI content currently falls short. Moreover, the differentiation and brand personality that come naturally from diverse human creators could be lost if all content becomes machine-generated and overly uniform. The future of marketing communication will not be a zero-sum contest between AI and humans, but rather a collaborative model. The highest-performing strategies will likely integrate AI's strengths with human strengths. Early research already shows that consumers do not mind AI-produced content per se and can even prefer it in isolation, but they still respond positively to knowing humans are in the loop. This implies that companies should neither shy away from using AI nor give everything to it. Instead, businesses should aim for AI-augmented human communication, where AI handles the heavy lifting of content generation and humans curate and refine the output to align with brand values and audience expectations.

Marketing leaders should train their teams to use AI effectively, understand AI insights, and follow clear ethical guidelines. Governance policies should be established to decide when AI is appropriate and when a human touch is non-negotiable. Also, monitoring the impact of AI content on engagement and conversion metrics will inform how well these tools are working and where adjustments are needed. As generative AI models continue to evolve in capability, the gap between AI and human content might narrow further in style and creativity. It is conceivable that future AIs, especially if fine-tuned on a brand's voice and fed with user feedback, will produce content nearly indistinguishable from a skilled human copywriter, even in personal tone. This will present exciting opportunities but also ethical dilemmas.

Ultimately, the "strategic use of generative AI" in marketing communication comes down to this: Use AI where it adds value, and use humans where it matters most**.** Our evidence shows AI adds value in generating quality content efficiently and consistently. It frees human marketers from the grunt work of content volume and allows them to focus on creative strategy. By examining actual AI and human content side by side, we see that each has comparative advantages. The savvy marketer of the coming decade will be the one who can orchestrate a balance between artificial and human intelligence. Brands that strike this balance will likely craft the most compelling and effective communications, leveraging the best of both worlds in service of their message.

6. References:

1. Adekunle Stephen Toromade, Damilola Tobiloba Adereti, & Omodolapo Eunice Ogunsola. (2025). Strategic framework for data-driven agribusiness transformation and market resilience. Gulf Journal of Advance Business Research, 3, 1376–1404. https://doi.org/10.51594/gjabr.v3i10.165.
2. Alafnan, M. A., & Mohdzuki, S. F. (2023). Do Artificial Intelligence Chatbots Have a Writing Style? An Investigation into the Stylistic Features of ChatGPT-4. Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology, 3, 85–94. https://doi.org/10.37965/jait.2023.0267.
3. Berber Sardinha, T. (2024). AI-generated vs human-authored texts: A multidimensional comparison. Applied Corpus Linguistics, 4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2023.100083.
4. Borger, J. G., Ng, A. P., Anderton, H., Ashdown, G. W., Auld, M., Blewitt, M. E., Brown, D. V., Call, M. J., Collins, P., Freytag, S., Harrison, L. C., Hesping, E., Hoysted, J., Johnston, A., McInneny, A., Tang, P., Whitehead, L., Jex, A., & Naik, S. H. (2023). Artificial intelligence takes center stage: exploring the capabilities and implications of ChatGPT and other AI-assisted technologies in scientific research and education. Immunology and Cell Biology, 101, 923–935. https://doi.org/10.1111/imcb.12689.
5. Burrus, O., Curtis, A., & Herman, L. (2024). Unmasking AI: Informing Authenticity Decisions by Labeling AI-Generated Content. Interactions (N.Y.) , 31, 38–42. https://doi.org/10.1145/3665321.
6. 'Cashion, F., & 'OBrien, J. (2024). Generative AI Takes Off with Marketers. American Marketing Association. https://www.ama.org/marketing-news/generative-ai-takes-off-with-marketers/.
7. Chen, L., Jiang, M., Jia, F., & Liu, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence adoption in business-to-business marketing: toward a conceptual framework. In Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing (Vol. 37, pp. 1025–1044). Emerald Group Holdings Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-09-2020-0448.
8. Ding, L., Hu, Y., Denier, N., Shi, E., Zhang, J., Hu, Q., Hughes, K. D., Kong, L., & Jiang, B. (2024). Probing Social Bias in Labor Market Text Generation by ChatGPT: A Masked Language Model Approach. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37. https://doi.org/10.52202/079017-4440.
9. Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. P. (2024). Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. Science Advances, 10. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290.
10. Durmus Senyapar, H. N. (2024). Healthcare Branding and Reputation Management Strategies for Organizational Success. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 55, 26–53. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v55i1.10690.
11. Elkhatat, A. M., Elsaid, K., & Almeer, S. (2023). Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5.
12. Esling, P., & Devis, N. (2020). Creativity in the era of artificial intelligence.
13. Farhi, F., Jeljeli, R., & Belarbi, A. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in Sustaining Internal Communication in Corporate Sector: The Mediation of Two-way Communication Perspective of PR. Proceedings - 2022 23rd International Arab Conference on Information Technology, ACIT 2022. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACIT57182.2022.9994146.
14. Goulart, L., Matte, M. L., Mendoza, A., Alvarado, L., & Veloso, I. (2024). AI or student writing? Analyzing the situational and linguistic characteristics of undergraduate student writing and AI-generated assignments. Journal of Second Language Writing, 66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101160.
15. Illia, L., Colleoni, E., & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2023a). Ethical implications of text generation in the age of artificial intelligence. Business Ethics, Environment and Responsibility, 32, 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12479.
16. Illia, L., Colleoni, E., & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2023b). Ethical implications of text generation in the age of artificial intelligence. Business Ethics, Environment and Responsibility, 32, 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12479.
17. Kelly, V. (2014). Metaphors of resonance for visual communication design. Visual Communication, 13, 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357213516909.
18. Khalil, M., & Er, E. (2023). Will ChatGPT Get You Caught? Rethinking of Plagiarism Detection. Lecture

Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics), 14040 LNCS, 475–487. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34411-4_32.

19. Kirk, C. P., & Givi, J. (2025). The AI-authorship effect: Understanding authenticity, moral disgust, and consumer responses to AI-generated marketing communications. Journal of Business Research, 186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114984.
20. Lee, D. C., Jhang, J., & Baek, T. H. (2025). AI-Generated News Content: The Impact of AI Writer Identity and Perceived AI Human-Likeness. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 41, 13862–13874. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2477739.
21. Mahmud, B., Hong, G., & Fong, B. (2023). A Study of Human-AI Symbiosis for Creative Work: Recent Developments and Future Directions in Deep Learning. ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications, 20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3542698.
22. Moussa, A., & Belhiah, H. (2024). Beyond Syntax: Exploring Moroccan Undergraduate EFL Learners' Engagement with AI-Assisted Writing. Arab World English Journal, 2024-April, 138–155. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.9.
23. Park, J., Oh, C., & Kim, H. Y. (2024). AI vs. human-generated content and accounts on Instagram: User preferences, evaluations, and ethical considerations. Technology in Society, 79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102705.
24. Pezeshgi, A., & Malhotra, P. (2025). Transforming Marketing Research with Generative AI: Opportunities, Limitations, and Ethical Implications. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5386443.
25. Porter, B., & Machery, E. (2024). AI-generated poetry is indistinguishable from human-written poetry and is rated more favorably. Scientific Reports, 14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-76900-1.
26. Sai Kumar Bitra. (2025). The Power of AI-Driven Personalization: Technical Implementation and Impact. Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies, 7, 476–483. https://doi.org/10.32996/jcsts.2025.7.3.54.
27. Salih, S., Husain, O., Mohamed Almohamedh, R., tajelsier, H., Hassan Abdalla Hashim, A., Elshafie, H., & Motwakel, A. (2026). From ideation to execution: Unleashing the power of generative AI in modern digital marketing and customer engagement- A systematic literature review and case study. In Array (Vol. 29). Elsevier B.V. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.array.2025.100630.
28. Wang, D., Churchill, E., Maes, P., Fan, X., Shneiderman, B., Shi, Y., & Wang, Q. (2020, April). From human-human collaboration to Human-AI collaboration: Designing AI systems that can work together with people. Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings. https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3381069.
29. Wang, S., & Zhang, H. (2025). Generative AI in international hotel marketing: impacts on employee creativity and performance. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 37, 2601–2626. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2024-1595.
30. Wang, Y. (2023). Synthetic Realities in the Digital Age: Navigating the Opportunities and Challenges of AI-Generated Content. https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.23968311.
31. Wang, Z. (2022). Computer-assisted EFL writing and evaluations based on artificial intelligence: a case from a college reading and writing course. Library Hi Tech, 40, 80–97. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-05-2020-0113.
32. Wen, Y., & Laporte, S. (2025). Experiential Narratives in Marketing: A Comparison of Generative AI and Human Content. Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 44, 392–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/07439156241297973.
33. Zhang, Y., & Gosline, R. (2023a). Human favoritism, not AI aversion: People's perceptions (and bias) toward generative AI, human experts, and human–GAI collaboration in persuasive content generation. Judgment and Decision Making, 18. https://doi.org/10.1017/JDM.2023.37.
34. Zhang, Y., & Gosline, R. (2023b). People's Perceptions (and Bias) Toward Creative Content Generated by Ai (ChatGPT-4), Human Experts, and Human-AI Collaboration. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4453958.

35. Zhao, P., Zhang, H., Yu, Q., Wang, Z., Geng, Y., Fu, F., Yang, L., Zhang, W., Jiang, J., & Cui, B. (2026). Retrieval-Augmented Generation for AI-Generated Content: A Survey. In Data Science and Engineering. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41019-025-00335-5.

INFO

Corresponding Author: Amirhossein Pezeshgi, MBA/MSMIT - University of Oklahoma.

How to cite/reference this article: Amirhossein Pezeshgi, Strategic Use of Generative AI in Marketing Communication: Evidence from AI and Human Textual Content, *Asian. Jour. Social. Scie. Mgmt. Tech*. 2026; 8(4): 222-233.