

ETHICAL CONCERNS IN PERSONALIZED DIGITAL ADVERTISING

Dr. Aditi Malhotra

Assistant Professor

Department of Marketing and Digital Commerce

School of Management Studies

Institute of Business and Technology

New Delhi, India

Abstract

Personalized digital advertising has become a central feature of contemporary online commerce. Advertising systems now combine browsing behaviour, search activity, purchase history, device signals, location indicators, inferred interests, and engagement data to decide which message, offer, image, or product recommendation should be displayed to a particular individual. These practices may help people discover relevant services and may allow smaller businesses to reach interested audiences. At the same time, personalization can create ethical problems when individuals do not understand how their data are collected, when choices are shaped through hidden profiling, or when vulnerable groups receive different opportunities, prices, or persuasive appeals because of automated predictions.

This study uses a qualitative, literature-based approach to examine the ethical concerns connected with personalized digital advertising. It considers privacy, informed choice, autonomy, manipulation, discrimination, opacity, data minimization, sensitive inference, children's rights, platform accountability, and the role of advertisers, intermediaries, and data brokers. The analysis follows the lifecycle of a personalized advertising campaign: data collection, identity linkage, profiling, audience creation, ad delivery, measurement, optimization, retention, and complaint handling. It also examines how responsibility is shared where advertisers depend on advertising platforms, analytics firms, customer-data vendors, agencies, and automated decision systems.

The study finds that ethical evaluation cannot be limited to whether an advertisement is factually accurate or whether an individual clicked on it. A campaign may be technically effective while still relying on excessive data collection, dark patterns, unfair segmentation, misleading consent, or psychological pressure. Ethical practice requires a clear and limited purpose, meaningful notice, a valid basis for data processing, restrictions on sensitive targeting, accessible user controls, independent testing for discriminatory outcomes, transparent sponsorship and targeting explanations, secure data governance, and realistic mechanisms for review and remedy. Personalized advertising should therefore be treated as a high-impact socio-technical practice that affects consumer freedom, equality, and trust in digital markets.

Keywords: Personalized Advertising, Consumer Privacy, Digital Marketing, Data Profiling, Algorithmic Fairness, Online Manipulation, Transparency, Consent, Consumer Protection, Ethical Governance

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital advertising has shifted from broad audience communication toward individualized prediction and delivery. Rather than presenting the same message to every visitor, many advertising systems estimate what a person may want, what they may be willing to pay, when they may be receptive, and which creative format may influence their next action. This process can rely on first-party data supplied directly to a business, data observed through websites and applications, data obtained from partners, and data inferred

from patterns of behaviour. Personalization is therefore not simply a design choice. It is a system of data collection, classification, prediction, experimentation, and commercial decision-making that can affect the information and offers available to different people [1, 2].

Supporters of personalized advertising argue that relevance reduces advertising clutter, supports free or lower-cost digital services, and improves the efficiency of marketing expenditure. In limited and transparent settings, a person may reasonably expect a

retailer to remember a product category they explored or to provide recommendations based on a clearly stated preference. The ethical difficulty arises when the scale and intensity of profiling exceed what a person can understand or reasonably anticipate. Individuals may be tracked across websites, devices, applications, and offline settings; they may be grouped into opaque audience segments; and they may receive different messages without knowing that other users are being treated differently [3, 4].

Personalized advertising differs from ordinary advertising because it can combine persuasive communication with asymmetrical knowledge. The advertiser or platform may know a person's browsing habits, likely income range, life event, emotional state, health-related interests, or susceptibility to a particular appeal, while the individual knows very little about the data sources, predictive models, or auction processes behind the message. This imbalance can weaken meaningful choice. A person may be able to see an advertisement, but may not be able to identify why it was shown, what profile category was used, whether a sensitive inference influenced delivery, or how to challenge an error [5, 6].

This paper examines personalized advertising through an ethical governance perspective. It reviews relevant literature and regulatory principles, identifies the main risks connected with data-driven marketing, and develops a practical framework for assessing whether a campaign is necessary, fair, transparent, and accountable. The aim is not to reject all data-informed advertising. Rather, it is to clarify the safeguards required when commercial systems use personal data and behavioral predictions to shape consumer choices at scale.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on digital advertising has expanded alongside advances in web analytics, mobile applications, real-time bidding, customer relationship management, machine learning, and social-media platforms. Technical work often focuses on click-through rates, conversion prediction, audience matching, attribution, frequency optimization, and return on advertising expenditure. These measures may reveal whether a campaign performs efficiently for a business, but they do not independently establish whether the method of

targeting is ethically acceptable. A high conversion rate can be associated with a useful recommendation, but it can also be associated with intrusive surveillance, exploitative timing, or manipulative interface design [7, 8]. Ethical and legal scholarship has broadened the analysis beyond performance metrics. Researchers have emphasized that personal data can become a source of power when it is used to predict, classify, and influence people without adequate transparency or meaningful control. The relevant concerns include informational privacy, consumer autonomy, equality of opportunity, deception, unfair commercial practices, and the normalization of continuous monitoring. The ethical question is therefore not only whether an advertisement is accurate, but whether the data practices and targeting logic respect people as informed participants rather than as objects of behavioral extraction [9, 10].

Recent governance literature treats personalized advertising as a socio-technical system rather than a single marketing tool. Its effects depend on the quality and legality of data sources, identity resolution methods, inferred attributes, segmentation rules, audience exclusions, bid strategies, creative content, delivery algorithms, interface design, performance reporting, and complaint procedures. Harm may result from any stage in the chain. A governance approach must consequently assess the full pathway from data capture to the commercial action that follows an advertisement [11, 12].

2.1 PERSONALIZED ADVERTISING ENVIRONMENTS

- Personalization may be delivered through search engines, social-media platforms, e-commerce sites, mobile applications, connected television, email campaigns, loyalty programmes, online marketplaces, and location-based services.
- Advertising systems may use declared information, observed behaviour, inferred interests, look-alike audiences, contextual signals, and third-party data. These sources involve different levels of reliability and different ethical risks.
- Real-time bidding can make targeting decisions within milliseconds, while longer-term customer-data platforms may

retain profiles and connect activity across multiple channels.

- Digital environments often involve people who have not directly negotiated the conditions of profiling and who may not understand the commercial relationships among platforms, advertisers, agencies, and data intermediaries.

2.2 ETHICAL RISKS OF PERSONALIZED ADVERTISING

- Privacy and dignity are affected when personal behaviour is converted into profiles or predictions without a clear explanation of the purpose, sources, retention period, and recipients of the data.
- Manipulative targeting can exploit urgency, scarcity, insecurity, financial stress, health anxiety, or other vulnerabilities by selecting a message at a moment of reduced deliberation.
- Discriminatory delivery can occur when models exclude or under-deliver opportunities, housing, employment, credit, education, or public-interest information to particular groups.
- Opaque targeting can prevent users from knowing why they receive an advertisement, what characteristics are inferred about them, and whether another person is being offered a different price, product, or opportunity.
- Children and adolescents may face heightened risks because they can be less able to recognize persuasive intent, distinguish marketing from content, or understand the consequences of long-term data collection.

2.3 GOVERNANCE AND REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

- Data-protection and consumer-protection approaches require a clear purpose, lawful processing, data minimization, fairness, transparency, security, accountability, and accessible routes for challenge or correction.
- Rules on online advertising increasingly distinguish simple contextual advertising

3.1 ADVERTISING CONTEXTS AND ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS

S.No.	Advertising Environment	Typical Personalization Practice	Main Ethical Concern	Essential Safeguard
1	E-commerce platforms	Product recommendations,	Price steering, excessive profiling,	Clear data notice, opt-out controls,

from practices that rely on cross-context tracking, sensitive data, hidden profiling, or automated decisions with significant effects [3, 11].

- Consent is not ethically meaningful when it is obtained through confusing language, preselected options, repeated prompts, or designs that make refusal substantially harder than acceptance.
- Independent review, documentation, audience-impact testing, clear human responsibility, and public reporting are essential where targeting can influence consumer welfare, equal treatment, or access to important opportunities.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines personalized digital advertising as a high-impact data-driven marketing environment. The object of study is not a single company, platform, or campaign. Instead, it considers the ethical requirements that arise whenever an organization collects, obtains, infers, or analyzes personal information to decide which commercial message should be delivered to a particular person or group. The analysis focuses on the relationship between technical targeting practices and their consequences for consumer autonomy, privacy, equality, and trust.

The theoretical basis of the study is grounded in the principle that commercial communication should respect people as capable decision-makers. This requires more than a privacy notice or a statement that data are used to provide relevant ads. A legitimate practice should be supported by a clear purpose, proportionate data use, understandable information, meaningful user choice, safeguards against unfair treatment, careful human and organizational oversight, and a realistic route for correction and remedy. The study consequently treats personalized advertising as an interconnected system of data, algorithms, creative content, platforms, business incentives, and public accountability.

		retargeting, dynamic offers	pressure to purchase	price fairness review
2	Social-media services	Interest-based audiences, look-alike groups, engagement optimization	Hidden profiling, political or social vulnerability, discrimination	Targeting explanations, sensitive-category restrictions, independent audit
3	Search and content services	Keyword, contextual, and behavioral advertising	Confusion between paid and organic information; covert preference shaping	Prominent sponsorship labels, contextual limits, ad-library transparency
4	Mobile applications and location services	Device identifiers, geofencing, in-app behavioral targeting	Persistent tracking, location sensitivity, limited user awareness	Data minimization, explicit controls, short retention, security safeguards
5	Financial, health, and education-related advertising	Risk or life-event targeting based on inferred needs	Exploitation of vulnerable users; unequal access to opportunities	High-risk restrictions, human review, non-discrimination testing, remedy

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the ethical implications of personalized digital advertising and consumer data profiling.
- To identify the privacy, autonomy, fairness, transparency, and consumer-protection risks associated with data-driven targeting.
- To compare ethical requirements across e-commerce, social media, search, mobile, and high-impact advertising environments.
- To evaluate the importance of purpose limitation, data minimization, meaningful consent, non-discrimination, human oversight, and remedy.
- To develop a practical governance framework for responsible evaluation of personalized advertising systems.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative and literature-based research methodology. It synthesizes peer-reviewed scholarship, data-protection guidance, consumer-protection materials, regulatory documents, technology-policy reports, and ethical frameworks relevant to behavioral advertising and automated profiling. This approach is appropriate because

the research question concerns the relationship between commercial persuasion, personal data, and institutional decision-making rather than the measurement of a single marketing outcome. The analysis uses a comparative framework to examine how ethical requirements differ according to data sensitivity, population vulnerability, targeting purpose, intervention intensity, and accountability arrangements.

The methodological framework follows the lifecycle of a personalized advertising campaign. It considers the definition of the marketing objective, selection of data sources, identity linkage, profile construction, audience creation, advertising delivery, automated optimization, measurement, retention, sharing, audit, and complaint handling. The study also examines how contractual arrangements and platform policies influence accountability when advertisers rely on agencies, ad-tech intermediaries, data brokers, analytics providers, and automated delivery systems.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN (QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH)

- The study follows a qualitative and comparative design based on ethical, legal,

technical, and policy literature on targeted advertising and consumer data governance.

- The analysis compares advertising settings according to the type of data used, the extent of tracking, the degree of individualization, the vulnerability of the audience, and the consequences of targeting errors.
- The study uses a lifecycle perspective that connects data and model design decisions with consumer outcomes, market fairness, and public accountability.
- Findings are interpreted through ethical governance principles rather than through an experimental campaign or a consumer survey.

4.2 ETHICAL GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

- Necessity and proportionality are used to assess whether personalized targeting is genuinely required for a stated commercial purpose and whether less intrusive alternatives such as contextual advertising can achieve the same objective.
- Privacy and data protection are assessed through lawful processing, purpose limitation, data minimization, security, retention limits, third-party controls, and restrictions on secondary use.
- Fairness is assessed through audience inclusion and exclusion rules, differential delivery patterns, proxy discrimination, pricing variation, sensitive inference, and safeguards against unfair impact.
- Accountability is assessed through clearly assigned responsibility, vendor obligations, documentation, audit logs, advertising libraries, independent review, and meaningful consumer remedy.
- Autonomy is assessed through the clarity of disclosure, quality of user controls, avoidance of dark patterns, separation of service access from unnecessary tracking, and restrictions on exploitative persuasion.

4.3 DIGITAL MARKET AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

- The study considers e-commerce stores, social-media platforms, search services, mobile applications, streaming services, email programmes, and data-sharing ecosystems where ads are selected through personal or inferred information.

- Personalization is treated as a process involving identifiers, browsing signals, purchase events, inferred attributes, audience segments, bids, creatives, delivery models, conversion events, and retention policies.
- Commercial outcomes are evaluated in relation to consumer welfare, fair competition, privacy, equality, transparency, trust, and the integrity of informed choice.
- Institutional capacity is considered through governance policies, contractual controls, technical expertise, privacy review, consumer-support systems, staff training, internal audit, and external oversight.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

The following ethical and governance parameters are evaluated:

- Clarity of purpose, evidence of necessity, and availability of less intrusive advertising alternatives
- Scope of data collection, identity linkage, sensitivity of inferred attributes, retention period, and sharing arrangements
- Audience construction, delivery outcomes, discriminatory effects, price or opportunity differences, and vulnerability risks
- Transparency, sponsorship labeling, targeting explanations, consent quality, user controls, and contestability
- Human responsibility, auditability, data security, contract governance, complaint handling, and available remedies

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review scholarship, regulations, standards, policy materials, and consumer-protection guidance relating to personalized advertising, profiling, and online choice architecture.
- Identify recurring ethical concerns involving privacy, consent, manipulation, discrimination, dark patterns, opacity, and children's rights.
- Compare representative advertising environments and the forms of harm that may arise from different sources of data, targeting logics, and delivery mechanisms.
- Map ethical requirements to governance practices involving data, models, audiences, creative content, platforms,

contracts, and consumer-support processes.

- Interpret the combined findings to formulate a consumer-respecting governance framework.
- Develop practical recommendations for organizations considering or operating data-driven advertising campaigns.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative comparison of ethical risks and safeguards across different advertising environments and operational models.
- Interpretation of how data collection, profiling, creative design, platform delivery, and business incentives combine to shape consumer outcomes.
- Assessment of the relationship between advertising design, informed choice, consumer trust, market fairness, and legal legitimacy.
- Identification of governance practices that can be applied by advertisers, platforms, agencies, data providers, regulators, and consumer-protection bodies.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis indicates that personalized advertising cannot be assessed solely by asking whether a campaign reached the intended audience or increased sales. Its ethical significance depends on what data were collected, whether those data were reasonably expected, how profiles were constructed, what characteristics were inferred, how audiences were included or excluded, and what options were available to the individual. A campaign may generate useful recommendations while still relying on invasive tracking, unclear consent, or targeting logic that a consumer could not realistically understand or contest.

The comparative assessment shows that context is central. A person who voluntarily signs up for a retailer's loyalty programme may expect a degree of product communication connected with that relationship, especially where preferences and controls are explained clearly. A person who is tracked across unrelated websites and applications, by contrast, may not know that information is being combined to create an advertising profile. This difference affects the strength of notice, the legitimacy of reliance on consent, the need for data minimization, and the responsibility of the organization to

explain the commercial purpose of profiling [3, 11].

Data quality is also ethically important. Profiles may be inaccurate, outdated, incomplete, or based on weak proxies. An individual may be placed in a category suggesting financial vulnerability, health concerns, political interest, family status, or purchasing capacity without ever having provided that information. Inaccurate classification can distort the advertisements, prices, or opportunities offered to a person. Even where a model has acceptable average performance, it can impose harmful outcomes when sensitive inferences are used without robust review, when audience exclusions are not tested, or when delivery patterns are hidden from public scrutiny [6, 13].

The analysis further demonstrates that fairness is not limited to the absence of explicit discriminatory language. A targeting system can produce unequal outcomes through proxies such as postal area, device type, browsing patterns, inferred income, language, social network, or past purchasing behavior. For example, an employment, housing, credit, education, or insurance advertisement may be delivered unevenly even if the advertiser did not intentionally instruct the system to discriminate. Ethical governance must therefore examine both the inputs used to construct an audience and the actual distribution of advertisements across relevant groups. It should include pre-deployment assessment, representative testing, delivery monitoring, public reporting, and corrective action where unequal effects are identified [14, 15].

Transparency is another decisive factor. A visible label indicating that content is sponsored does not by itself explain how or why a person was selected. Meaningful transparency should tell users that personalization is occurring, identify the advertiser, explain the main targeting criteria in understandable terms, disclose whether sensitive data or inferences are involved, and provide practical controls. In addition, public ad libraries and campaign-level reporting can help researchers, journalists, regulators, and affected communities examine patterns that are invisible to a single user. Without these mechanisms, people may see only their own

individualized message and may be unable to identify differential treatment or misleading segmentation.

Finally, the analysis shows that governance and accountability determine whether safeguards work in practice. Policies that merely state that a company respects privacy cannot prevent misuse. Effective systems require a named accountable authority, documented data flows, approved audience criteria, limits on sensitive targeting, vendor obligations, audit logs, retention schedules, staff training, and complaint pathways that can lead to correction, deletion, compensation, or other remedy. Organizations should also maintain a record of high-risk campaigns, the rationale for personalization, the data categories used, the expected consumer impact, and the outcome of periodic review.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that personalized advertising is a governance challenge as much as a marketing technique. It can create value when a person receives relevant information under conditions they understand and can control. Yet its capacity to profile, predict, and influence at scale changes the nature of commercial communication. Traditional advertising presents a message to a broad audience. Personalized advertising can adapt the message, timing, price, and appeal to an individual or small group using information that the recipient may never see. This creates a heightened ethical burden because the same system can be used to assist consumer choice or to exploit informational and psychological asymmetries.

A central lesson is that formal consent alone is not enough. People may encounter lengthy privacy notices, repeated pop-ups, confusing cookie banners, or account settings designed in ways that make refusal difficult. Consent does not become meaningful merely because a user clicks "accept" during an attempt to access a service. Where digital participation is necessary for work, education, communication, or everyday commerce, organizations should not rely on a procedural claim of agreement while maintaining opaque and excessive data practices. The ethical baseline should include purpose limitation, privacy-protective defaults, clear alternatives,

and a refusal option that does not impose unreasonable disadvantage.

The strongest governance approach is layered. It combines a defined marketing purpose, a defensible necessity assessment, strict limits on data collection, transparent profile and audience practices, controls on sensitive inference, non-discrimination testing, understandable disclosures, accessible user controls, secure data management, independent review, audit, and remedy. It must also regulate commercial relationships. Advertisers should not be able to claim ignorance of harmful targeting merely because a platform or agency operated the delivery system. Contracts should allocate responsibilities for data provenance, lawful processing, campaign review, security, retention, advertising transparency, incident response, and cooperation with complaints or regulatory investigations.

Consumer trust depends on whether institutions treat people as rights holders rather than as raw material for behavioral prediction. Consultation with consumer organizations, privacy specialists, technical experts, and affected communities can reveal harms that are hidden by narrow performance metrics. In high-risk contexts involving children, financial distress, health-related interests, housing, employment, education, credit, or other essential opportunities, a presumption against intrusive personalization is ethically justified unless a specific, evidence-based, and independently reviewed need can be demonstrated. Contextual advertising or broad, non-sensitive audience communication may often provide a less intrusive alternative.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined the ethical concerns associated with personalized digital advertising. It showed that the central issues extend beyond commercial relevance and campaign efficiency to include privacy, autonomy, fairness, transparency, manipulation, data governance, consumer protection, and accountability. Personalized systems can expose individuals to persistent data collection and opaque prediction, and their impact is shaped by the complete operational chain of data capture, identity linkage, profiling, segmentation, delivery, measurement, retention, and oversight.

The analysis found that responsible practice requires a narrow and clearly explained purpose, a credible assessment of necessity, proportionate data use, meaningful user controls, strong restrictions on sensitive targeting, rigorous testing for discriminatory outcomes, understandable sponsorship and targeting explanations, secure deletion practices, independent oversight, and accessible remedy. Where these conditions

cannot be met, or where advertising practices create a substantial risk of manipulation, unfair exclusion, or intrusive surveillance, personalized targeting should not be used. Organizations should approach data-driven advertising as a continuing ethical responsibility that requires evidence, review, and accountability throughout the lifecycle of every campaign.

8. REFERENCES

1. Acquisti, A., Taylor, C., & Wagman, L. (2016). The economics of privacy. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 54(2), 442-492.
2. Goldfarb, A., & Tucker, C. (2011). Privacy regulation and online advertising. *Management Science*, 57(1), 57-71.
3. European Parliament and Council. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 119, 1-88.
4. European Parliament and Council. (2022). Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on a Single Market for Digital Services (Digital Services Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*.
5. Calo, R. (2014). Digital market manipulation. *George Washington Law Review*, 82, 995-1051.
6. Barocas, S. (2012). The price of precision: How behavioral advertising harms consumers and what can be done about it. *New York University Law Review Online*, 83, 1-31.
7. Lambrecht, A., & Tucker, C. (2013). When does retargeting work? Information specificity in online advertising. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50(5), 561-576.
8. Boerman, S. C., Kruikemeier, S., & Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2017). Online behavioral advertising: A literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Advertising*, 46(3), 363-376.
9. Nissenbaum, H. (2010). *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*. Stanford University Press.
10. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
11. European Data Protection Board. (2020). Guidelines 8/2020 on the targeting of social media users. European Data Protection Board.
12. Information Commissioner's Office. (2019). Update Report into Adtech and Real Time Bidding. Information Commissioner's Office.
13. Article 29 Working Party. (2018). Guidelines on Automated Individual Decision-Making and Profiling for the Purposes of Regulation 2016/679. European Commission.
14. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671-732.
15. Ali, M., Sapiezynski, P., Bogen, M., Korolova, A., Mislove, A., & Rieke, A. (2019). Discrimination through optimization: How Facebook's ad delivery can lead to skewed outcomes. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW), 1-30.
16. Mathur, A., Acar, G., Friedman, M. J., Lucherini, E., Mayer, J., Chetty, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). Dark patterns at scale: Findings from a crawl of 11K shopping websites. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW), 1-32.
17. Susser, D., Roessler, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (2019). Technology, autonomy, and manipulation. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(2), 1-22.
18. Turow, J. (2011). *The Daily You: How the New Advertising Industry Is Defining Your Identity and Your Worth*. Yale University Press.
19. Norwegian Consumer Council. (2018). *Deceived by Design: How Tech Companies Use Dark Patterns to Discourage Us from Exercising Our Rights to Privacy*. Norwegian Consumer Council.
20. Federal Trade Commission. (2022). *Commercial Surveillance and Data Security: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*. Federal Trade Commission.
21. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). *The OECD Privacy Framework*. OECD Publishing.

22. UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. UNESCO.
23. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People: An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines*, 28, 689-707.
24. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1, 389-399.
25. O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown.
26. Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press.
27. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Press.
28. CMA. (2022). *Online Choice Architecture: How Digital Design Can Harm Competition and Consumers*. Competition and Markets Authority.
29. Council of Europe. (2018). *Guidelines on the Protection of Individuals with Regard to the Processing of Personal Data in a World of Big Data*. Council of Europe.
30. Solove, D. J. (2021). *Understanding Privacy*. Harvard University Press.