

When Ads Become Profiles: Large-Scale Audit of Algorithmic Biases and LLM Profiling Risks

Baiyu Chen
University of New South Wales
Sydney, NSW, Australia
breeze.chen@unsw.edu.au

Benjamin Tag
University of New South Wales
Sydney, NSW, Australia
benjamin.tag@unsw.edu.au

Hao Xue
University of New South Wales
Sydney, NSW, Australia
hao.xue1@unsw.edu.au

Daniel Angus
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, QLD, Australia
daniel.angus@qut.edu.au

Flora Salim
University of New South Wales
Sydney, NSW, Australia
flora.salim@unsw.edu.au

Abstract

Automated ad targeting on social media is opaque, creating risks of exploitation and invisibility to external scrutiny. Users may be steered toward harmful content while independent auditing of these processes remains blocked. Large Language Models (LLMs) raise a new concern: the potential to reverse-engineer sensitive user attributes from exposure alone. We introduce a multi-stage auditing framework to investigate these risks. First, a large-scale audit of over 435,000 ad impressions delivered to 891 Australian Facebook users reveals algorithmic biases, including disproportionate Gambling and Politics ads shown to socioeconomically vulnerable and politically aligned groups. Second, a multimodal LLM can reconstruct users' demographic profiles from ad streams, outperforming census-based baselines and matching or exceeding human performance. Our results provide the first empirical evidence that ad streams constitute rich digital footprints for public AI inference, highlighting urgent privacy risks and the need for content-level auditing and governance.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **Empirical studies in collaborative and social computing**; • **Information systems** → **Online advertising**; • **Security and privacy** → **Social aspects of security and privacy**.

Keywords

Targeted Advertising, Large Language Models, Generative AI, Human-AI Interaction, Bias, Privacy, Computational Social Science

1 Introduction

Automated advertising systems are central within the contemporary digital media ecosystem. Platforms such as Facebook and Google deploy complex, dynamic, and opaque algorithms for ad targeting based on inferred profiles and behaviours [56]. While personalisation can enhance user experience, it also creates a privacy-personalization dilemma [57], challenges for auditing, accountability [9], and understanding their societal impact [14]. This opacity enables measurable biases in ad delivery, with demographic skews emerging from platform optimisation, even with neutral targeting [7]. Moreover, advertisers can circumvent platform policies by using seemingly innocuous “proxy” interests to target protected

groups [63], leading to tangible harms, such as discriminatory exclusion from opportunities in housing and employment [37], and exposing vulnerable populations to potentially harmful content [5, 6]. These systems can inflict a “slow violence” on users through psychological distress, loss of autonomy, and algorithmic marginalization [70]. Unsurprisingly, users perceive such practices as “creepy” and express significant concern upon realising the extent of tracking and inference [21, 61, 75].

Platform transparency tools, such as “Why am I seeing this ad?” explanation, are often incomplete and misleading [8, 15], while associated privacy controls are frequently hidden and lack actionability [36]. Existing auditing approaches are also limited, often relying on inaccessible platform data or uncertain inferred demographics [39]. Few methods directly examine the semantic and sequential nature of advertisements themselves, which is a critical gap that obscures how platforms dynamically profile users. The sequence of ads delivered to a user offers a unique, content-level proxy for the platform’s evolving perception and categorisation of individuals.

This research gap becomes particularly critical in light of the rapid democratisation of powerful generative AI like Large Language Models (LLMs). Such technologies demonstrate remarkable abilities to understand and generate nuanced, human-like content [34, 55], reason about complex contexts [29, 40], adapt to user-specific preferences [54, 78], and even integrate multimodal information [11, 19, 34, 55], bringing immense convenience but also raising new privacy concerns in domains like online advertising [31]. As these models become increasingly accessible and capable [56], not only through APIs or open-source implementations but also via free, public-facing web interfaces to some of the most advanced proprietary models [11, 19, 29, 34, 55], which dramatically lower the barrier for conducting sophisticated analyses at scale, including those with potentially harmful intent. Today, even individuals with only basic technical skills can leverage these models to perform such inferences, making the threat of misuse both more probable and more accessible, this trend exemplified by the rise of no-code platforms for creating custom LLM applications [47]. While it is well-established that a user’s digital footprint can reveal sensitive demographic attributes [33, 49], the widespread accessibility of LLMs raises an urgent concern: can these powerful tools be used by malicious actors to infer sensitive user information from seemingly innocuous digital footprints [46]? Answering this




Figure 1: Conceptual overview of our study. A user’s exposure to a stream of advertisements on a social media platform (left) can be processed by a Large Language Model (LLM) to reconstruct a detailed and sensitive demographic profile of that user, creating a significant and previously undemonstrated privacy risk (right).

question is critical for understanding the next frontier of digital privacy risks.

Our investigation centers on the Facebook advertising ecosystem, whose global dominance and opaque targeting algorithms have produced societal impacts like algorithmic discrimination [7], even as its transparency tools remain insufficient [8, 15]. Consequently, it has become central for auditing research [9, 37], making it an essential case for understanding emergent, AI-driven privacy threats. In this work, we directly tackle this emerging challenge by investigating whether multimodal ad streams presented to a user can be reverse-engineered by multimodal LLMs to reconstruct user demographics. This leads to our research questions:

- **RQ1: Algorithmic Biases in Ad Targeting.** What biases are systematically embedded in Facebook’s ad targeting system?
- **RQ2: Feasibility of LLM-based Profile Reconstruction.** Can a multimodal LLM effectively reconstruct a user’s demographic profile solely from the sequence of advertisements they are shown?
- **RQ3: Characterizing Reconstruction Risks.** How does the LLM’s reconstruction performance compare to human capabilities, and what are the tangible privacy risks posed by its current level of performance?

To answer these questions, we propose a novel auditing framework leveraging the zero-shot capabilities (i.e., the ability to correctly perform a task without having been explicitly trained on examples of that specific task) of multimodal LLMs to reconstruct user profiles from ad sequences collected from 891 Australian Facebook users. We benchmark LLM performance against census-based prior and human evaluators. Our filtered dataset spans over 435,000 individual ads across more than 63,000 sessions, each comprising multimodal content (images, text) processed through a multimodal understanding pipeline to produce structured semantic features. We first conduct a statistical audit to quantify demographic skews in ad delivery for sensitive categories, revealing significant inappropriate

targeting in gambling and political ads toward socioeconomically vulnerable groups. We then evaluate the ability of state-of-the-art multimodal LLMs to reconstruct six demographic attributes from ad streams at both the session and user levels. Our results show that LLMs consistently outperform strong census-based priors and often rival or exceed human inference capabilities, frequently making “directionally correct” predictions into adjacent brackets. Longer chronological sequences further boosts accuracy, indicating that the temporal ad evolution provides an exploitable signal. These findings provide the first empirical demonstration that multimodal LLMs can reverse-engineer user profiles from ads alone, highlighting the scale of privacy risks and the urgent need for safeguards in the era of accessible, high-capacity generative AI.

Our work makes the following contributions:

- **A novel auditing framework combining statistical analysis and LLM-based inference.** We introduce a multi-stage framework that first quantifies algorithmic biases in ad targeting (RQ1) and then evaluates the feasibility and nature of user profile reconstruction by LLMs (RQ2 & RQ3).
- **Empirical evidence of harmful algorithmic biases in a real-world ad ecosystem.** We provide a large-scale, user-level statistical audit of Facebook’s ad delivery, revealing significant inappropriate targeting (RQ1).
- **Systematic evaluation and risk characterisation of LLM-based profile reconstruction from ad content.** We present the first large-scale evaluation of a multimodal LLM’s ability to infer user demographics from real-world ad sequences from 891 users, benchmarking its performance against strong baselines and human annotators (RQ2). Through in-depth comparative analysis, we further characterise the model’s inferential capabilities and delineate the specific privacy risks these capabilities entail (RQ3).

2 Related Works

In this section, we review two complementary fields. Prior work in ad auditing confirms that ad streams contain systemic demographic signals. Meanwhile, advances in LLM-based user profiling demonstrate the power to decode such signals into nuanced profiles.

2.1 Content-Level Ad Analysis and Bias Auditing Techniques

Researchers have developed sophisticated auditing methodologies beyond platform-provided data. A significant body of this work focuses on analysing the ad creatives, the text and images themselves. This content-level analysis is crucial, as creative elements heavily influence ad delivery, independent of the advertiser’s explicit targeting choices [7]. Large-scale measurement studies have utilised web crawlers and browser extensions to collect real-world ad data from users’ perspectives [9, 10, 76, 77], characterising the prevalence of different ad types, including problematic political ads [76], misinformation during geopolitical events [17, 63, 74], and harmful content such as influencer-marketed VPNs on YouTube [4]. These efforts often involve creating taxonomies to classify “bad” or problematic ads based on user perceptions, identifying categories like clickbait or deceptive content [75]. A key challenge in observational audits is disentangling advertiser intent from platform-driven bias, this bias is particularly pernicious because it can emerge not merely as a reflection of user engagement, but as a direct result of both the platform’s own optimization mechanisms and the pre-existing structural biases within its underlying data [7, 41]. Different methodologies have been developed to audit for discrimination by controlling for confounding variables, such as by comparing ads for similar jobs with different de facto demographic distributions [38]. Some platforms like Twitter, provide user-level ad data, enabling studies of targeting and user perceptions without crawlers [68]. These auditing efforts highlight the necessity of robust, independent data collection and analysis. The creation of public ad archives [22] was a step forward, but their limitations require complementary methods. The data collected from these diverse sources, from mobile app usage [49] to web tracking logs [20], confirms that digital footprints are rich sources for inferring a wide array of sensitive user attributes [33]. This established link between digital behaviour and demographic inference forms the technical foundation for our investigation into whether ad sequences can be similarly decoded.

Prior work has firmly established that a wide range of user attributes can be inferred from digital footprints, long before the advent of modern LLMs. A systematic review of the field confirms that demographic attributes are highly predictable from various online traces [33], for example, Facebook Likes can infer sensitive traits including sexual orientation and political views [44], researchers had to develop complex cross-domain transfer models to bridge disparate data sources like Facebook Likes and search logs [13]. Furthermore, extensive web tracking allows third parties to profile users through browsing histories [20]. Critically, users often misunderstand how online behavioral advertising ecosystem functions, creating a significant gap between the technical reality of data collection and users’ perception of risk [73]. This landscape has been fundamentally altered by the advent of powerful, publicly accessible LLMs, unlike traditional methods requiring extensive

feature engineering, large labeled datasets for training, and complex, bespoke models for cross-domain tasks [13], modern LLMs possess strong zero-shot and multimodal reasoning capabilities out of the box. This shift raises urgent, human-centered privacy questions [46], motivating our review of LLM-based user profiling and its risk.

2.2 LLM-Based User Profiling

The rise of LLMs has catalysed new approaches in recommender systems and user modelling, where a key trend is the move from opaque, vector-based user representations to transparent, language-based profiles. Balog et al. [12] first propose scrutible user models, suggesting that a user’s preferences could be summarised with human-readable tags or statements. This template-based approach aimed to make recommendations (e.g., for movies or products) explainable. Radlinski et al. [59] extend this to free-form natural language user profiles that a user can read and even edit. The motivation is that explaining what the system believes a user’s interests to be, using natural language improves transparency and trust, as opposed to dealing with inscrutable embedding vectors. The advent of large-scale LLMs has accelerated this trend. Ramos et al. [60] demonstrated that LLMs can summarise a user’s activity history into a coherent textual profile. In their framework, interactions (e.g., movies watched, articles read) are fed to a prompt, generating a paragraph describing the user’s tastes. This profile can drive a recommendations with accuracy comparable to traditional collaborative filtering while being more interpretable. Zhou et al. [79] similarly showed that language-based profiles, when derived by LLM fine-tuning or using an encoder-decoder model, can match the accuracy of conventional user representations on recommendation tasks, while providing human-understandable rationale.

Recent works further demonstrate the versatility of LLM-based profiling beyond dense interaction histories. Wongso et al. [69] propose GenUP, which constructs natural language user profiles from sparse Point of Interest (POI) (i.e. a specific location such as a restaurant, gas station that people may find useful) check-ins and uses them as prompts for LLM-based POI recommendations. By replacing long historical trajectories with concise, interpretable profiles grounded in behavioural theory and personality traits, their approach performs well in low-data regimes with reduced computational cost. Ren et al. [62] introduce RLMRec, aligning LLM-generated textual context with traditional ID-based embeddings to learn more robust user profiles by bridging language and collaborative signals. Moving from alignment to augmentation, Xi et al. [71] further use LLMs to generate and integrate external knowledge, enabling open-world recommendation where long-tail or emerging user interests can be inferred even without direct interaction history. Beyond recommendation, Tan and Jiang [66] survey boarder applications of LLM-based user modeling, from conversational agents (where the system maintains a profile of the user’s preferences) to education and content moderation, highlighting how LLMs inject external knowledge and reasoning, e.g., inferring that a user who likes two seemingly unrelated niche hobbies might have a broader interest in creativity. Our work extends this line of research by using LLMs to build user profiles from an entirely new type of signal: advertisement sequences. Unlike prior profiling

inputs such as user interactions, POI check-ins, or explicit preferences, ad streams are externally curated by opaque targeting algorithms and arrive as multimodal, temporally ordered content. This introduces unique challenges in modelling noisy, heterogeneous inputs while preserving sequential dependencies. We address these challenges by proposing and evaluating a specialised multi-stage pipeline. Our study assesses the feasibility of such LLM-based profiling from ads while also quantifying its privacy risks by systematically evaluating how accurately sensitive demographic attributes can be reconstructed. We compare this to human annotators and strong baselines derived from national census data. In a complementary direction, Meguellati et al. [51] investigate *How Good are LLMs in Generating Personalized Advertisements?*, evaluating the ability of LLMs to produce tailored ad content. While their work focuses on using LLMs for ad personalisation, our study takes the inverse perspective, examining how LLMs can exploit delivered ads to reconstruct user profiles, together highlighting the bidirectional interplay between LLMs and advertising systems.

3 Methodology

Our multi-stage research procedure is illustrated in Figure 2.

3.1 Multimodal Ad Understanding

To prepare the ad content for both the user profile reconstruction and the bias audit, we employ an LLM-driven process to transform raw, multimodal ad data into a structured feature set. For each advertisement in our dataset, which consists of visual images and all associated textual information (e.g., title, body, call-to-action), we provide this multimodal input to Gemini 2.0 Flash [28]. The model is prompted to act as an expert advertisement analyst and extract four types of structured, textual features. We selected Gemini 2.0 Flash for this large-scale task for its balance of multimodal understanding, performance, speed, and cost, which was essential for feasibly processing over 435,000 ad impressions. Using more powerful but costly models for this would have been prohibitively expensive, while less capable models might not have adequately captured the semantic richness of the ad content. The full prompt used for this process is detailed in Figure 10, and the full parameter settings for all models are provided in Appendix C.

As illustrated in Figure 3, this process extracts four types of structured textual features: a Caption summarising the ad, Descriptive Categories for its tone, style and communication strategy, IAB Categories from a controlled vocabulary of 45 options via multi-label zero-shot classification (one or more results) [35], and Key Entities like brands or products. This structured feature set forms the basis for all subsequent analyses. To ensure that these model-generated features were of sufficient quality to support downstream reconstruction and auditing tasks, we conducted a Gemini quality evaluation, the details of which are provided in Appendix D. We also include in Appendix E an illustrative example of Human–Gemini disagreement, which highlights where the model’s interpretations may diverge from human judgment while remaining adequate for downstream use.

3.2 Algorithmic Biases and Risks Auditing

To investigate algorithmic biases and risks in ad targeting (RQ1), we developed a two-stage auditing framework.

Firstly, we conduct a descriptive analysis of ad-delivery disparities across two constructs: *Opportunity Exclusion*, refers to cases where certain demographic groups are systematically less exposed to beneficial, life-altering advertisements, in our study, we proxy this construct using the **Education and Careers** ad category, as access to education and employment are foundational life opportunities. The second construct, *Inappropriate Targeting*: the disproportionate exposure of vulnerable populations to potentially harmful or exploitative ad content. We proxy this by auditing ad delivery for **Gambling, Alcohol, and Politics**, categories widely recognised in public policy and prior research as carrying risks of addiction and public health harms [5, 6], or undue political persuasion [63, 76]. We operationalise ad exposure for each target category (e.g., Gambling) using two metrics: **Coverage**, measures the breadth of exposure and is defined as the proportion of active users within a given demographic group (e.g., age 18-24) who were shown at least one ad from the target category; and **Average Intensity**, measures the frequency of exposure and is defined as the mean number of ads from the target category shown per active user in that same demographic group. An active user is defined as an individual shown at least three ads of any category within a 7-day window. Since our observation period spans two years, it comprises approximately 100 non-overlapping 7-day windows per user. This initial descriptive analysis allows us to identify directly observable differences in ad exposure across demographic groups. These initial findings set the stage for our subsequent regression models, which then statistically control for interrelated factors.

Secondly, to isolate the independent contribution of each demographic factor while controlling for others, we conduct Negative Binomial Regressions (NBR) [16, 32, 52] at the user-week level. We specify two model formulations. Our primary model estimates the main effect of each demographic attribute while controlling for all others. The conditional mean for this model is expressed as:

$$\log(\mathbb{E}[Y_{it} \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \text{exposure}_{it}]) = \log(\text{exposure}_{it}) + \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^6 \mathbf{X}_i^{(j)} \boldsymbol{\beta}_j \quad (1)$$

where Y_{it} is the count of target ads for user i in time window t , and exposure_{it} is the total ad count for that user-week, which serves as an offset. $\mathbf{X}_i^{(j)}$ is a vector of dummy variables representing the j -th demographic attribute (gender, age, income, education, employment, political party) for user i , which are time-invariant in our dataset. $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ is the corresponding vector of coefficients. We chose the Negative Binomial Regression model because it is well-suited for count data, such as the number of ads a user sees. Unlike the simpler Poisson model, which assumes the mean and variance of the counts are equal, the NBR model includes an additional parameter (α) to handle cases where the variance is greater than the mean, a common characteristic of real-world behavioral data. We adopt the negative binomial parameterization, where the variance is a quadratic function of the mean: $\text{Var}(Y_{it} \mid \cdot) = \mu_{it} + \alpha \mu_{it}^2$, with $\mu_{it} = \mathbb{E}[Y_{it} \mid \cdot]$.




Figure 2: Overall Study Procedure. Begins with data collection from 2000+ Australian Facebook users, then data preprocessing from the data sources. A multimodal LLM generates sequential structured outputs for user profile reconstruction and potential harm analysis.




Figure 3: The multimodal ad understanding stage. For each of the 435K+ ads, multimodal inputs (images and text) are processed via an LLM prompt to generate a structured textual feature set.

To probe intersectional effects where main effects are most pronounced, we augment this specification with screened two-way interactions (e.g., gender \times income). The results are reported as Incidence Rate Ratios (IRR), $\exp(\beta)$, where β is the coefficient from a log link on the *expected* count (rate) for the target group relative to a specified reference group; 95% confidence intervals are computed as $\exp(\hat{\beta} \pm 1.96 \text{ SE})$. With the log link and the exposure offset, the IRR represents the multiplicative change in the expected *ad rate* per unit exposure when moving from the reference group to the target

group, holding all other variables constant. For example, an IRR of 2.0 for men (compared to women as the reference group) means that men are expected to have twice the *rate* of target-category ads as women; conversely, an IRR of 0.5 means half the rate. An IRR of 1.0 indicates no difference between the groups. We use robust standard errors clustered at the user level to account for intra-person correlation over time.

3.3 Session-Level User Profile Reconstruction

Our reconstruction process begins at the most granular level: the user session. A session is defined as a chronologically ordered sequence of advertisements a user is exposed to during a continuous period of platform usage; the detailed definition is in Section 4.2. For each session, we compile the structured textual features, comprising the generated caption, descriptive categories, IAB categories, and key entities, which are extracted from every ad as described in Section 3.1. These feature sets are concatenated in the same temporal order as the ads appeared, forming a rich, text-based representation of the session’s ad stream. This text-based approach is a deliberate methodological choice. Directly inputting all raw ad images from a session presents practical challenges: token costs for multiple high-resolution images are prohibitive, sessions contain a variable number of ads (3-50), and presenting a collage of disparate images could confuse the model. To avoid that, we begin by processing each ad with the multimodal LLM through our multimodal understanding pipeline, which distills and amplifies its core semantic information. The resulting structured text provides a more coherent and token-efficient input for the subsequent reconstruction task.

For each session, we provide this time-ordered textual representation to the LLM and prompt it to perform a zero-shot classification for each of the six demographic attributes (gender, age, income, education, employment, political party). In addition to predicting a category for each attribute, the model is also instructed to generate a concise summary of its reasoning for its predictions for that session. This summary encapsulates the key signals the LLM identified within the session’s ad content that led to its demographic inferences.

3.4 User-Level User Profile Reconstruction

While session-level analysis provides insights into short-term ad content, a user’s full ad exposure history offers a much richer and more stable signal for profile reconstruction. To leverage this, we construct a user-level profile by aggregating the outputs from the session-level analysis. Specifically, for each of the users in our dataset, we collect all the session summaries generated in the previous step. These summaries are then concatenated in chronological order, creating a longitudinal narrative of the LLM’s evolving perception of the user over their entire two-year observation period. This complete, time-ordered text, which represents a condensed history of the key demographic signals identified by the LLM over time, is then provided to the model in a final step. The LLM is tasked with performing a holistic, user-level classification for each demographic attribute based on this comprehensive narrative. This methodology allows the model to base its final user-level prediction on a synthesis of cumulative evidence (i.e., the aggregate semantic signals from all ads seen over time) and temporal patterns (i.e., shifts or trends in the types of ads shown), while remaining computationally tractable.

4 Results

4.1 Dataset

For this study, we utilise a large-scale, longitudinal dataset from a data donation project. The project recruits volunteer participants

from the Australian public to donate data about the advertisements they encounter on Facebook. This data is collected via a custom-built, privacy-preserving browser plugin that participants install, which automatically captures sponsored posts from their News Feeds. Participants in the original study joined by installing the browser plugin and completing a demographic questionnaire. Once installed, the plugin automatically detects and collects sponsored posts from the participant’s Facebook News Feed as they browse the platform on a desktop or laptop computer. The collected data for each ad includes the ad creative (image and text), associated meta-data, and a link to the de-identified demographic profile of the participant who observed it. This methodology provides a unique, user-centric view of the ad ecosystem, capturing the personalised ads that are otherwise inaccessible to public scrutiny. The full dataset made available to us comprises over 700,000 ad observations collected between 2021 and 2023 from over 2,000 Australian Facebook users who provided demographic information. This extensive, real-world dataset allows us to conduct a robust, large-scale audit of both the ad targeting systems and the potential for user profile reconstruction by LLMs.

4.2 Preprocessing

Since our data captures a continuous stream of ad exposures from desktop browsing, we must first segment it into meaningful user sessions. We use a data-driven, principled way to define what counts as a “session” in our dataset, instead of arbitrarily choosing a cutoff. Users’ ad exposures arrive as a continuous, non-uniform timeline of events over days and weeks. To segment each user’s ad viewing history into coherent sessions, we identify a robust threshold for the maximum time interval that can elapse between consecutive ads such that they still belong to the same session.

Given a user with a sequence of ad timestamps $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$, we compute the inter-ad time intervals:

$$\Delta t_i = t_{i+1} - t_i, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad (2)$$

Since these intervals are often highly skewed, with short gaps reflecting within-session activity and long gaps reflecting offline periods, we apply a logarithmic transformation to better capture the underlying multimodal structure:

$$\delta_i = \log(\Delta t_i) \quad (3)$$

We then fit a kernel density estimator (KDE) over the set $\{\delta_i\}$ to obtain a smooth estimate of the gap distribution. The KDE curve typically reveals two prominent modes: (1) the first local maximum δ_{\max} , corresponding to frequent short gaps within sessions, and (2) the first local minimum δ_{\min} , marking the transition to between-session gaps. We define a session threshold θ as the midpoint between these extrema in log-space, exponentiated back to the time domain:

$$\theta = \exp\left(\frac{\delta_{\max} + \delta_{\min}}{2}\right) \quad (4)$$

We compute a session threshold θ by averaging the per-user KDE-derived midpoints, resulting in a global threshold of $\theta = 389$ seconds. Thus, two consecutive ads t_i, t_{i+1} are considered to belong to different sessions if $t_{i+1} - t_i > \theta$.

This data-driven approach allows us to transform the continuous variable of time gaps into a principled categorical distinction (same session vs. new session) based on real user behavioral patterns observed in the data.

Following temporal segmentation, we apply additional filtering steps to ensure data quality and modelling tractability:

- **Source filtering:** We retain only ad impressions sourced from Facebook, excluding other platforms and modalities such as video-only content.
- **Session length bounds:** We discard sessions with fewer than 3 or more than 50 ads to eliminate sparse sessions and abnormally long sequences.
- **User filtering:** We exclude users who contributed fewer than 3 ad session impressions, as such short histories are insufficient for meaningful profiling.

Demographic	Count	%
Gender		
Male	554	62.18
Female	318	35.69
Prefer not to say	13	1.46
Other	6	0.67
Age Range		
18-24	113	12.68
25-34	184	20.65
35-44	112	12.57
45-54	112	12.57
55-64	152	17.06
65-74	158	17.73
75 and over	52	5.84
Prefer not to say	8	0.90
Income Bracket		
\$1-\$15,599	59	6.62
\$15,600-\$20,799	47	5.27
\$20,800-\$25,999	58	6.51
\$26,000-\$33,799	55	6.17
\$33,800-\$41,599	59	6.62
\$41,600-\$51,999	55	6.17
\$52,000-\$64,999	67	7.52
\$65,000-\$77,999	56	6.29
\$78,000-\$90,999	72	8.08
\$91,000-\$103,999	49	5.50
\$104,000-\$155,999	129	14.48
\$156,000 or more	77	8.64
Prefer not to say	108	12.12
Education Level		
Postgraduate degree level	315	35.35
Bachelor degree level	366	41.08
Year 12 or equivalent	145	16.27
Less than year 12 or equivalent	45	5.05
Prefer not to say	20	2.24
Employment Status		
Employed full time	359	40.29
Employed part time	199	22.33
Unemployed and looking for work	34	3.82
Unemployed and not looking for work	41	4.60
Retired	224	25.14
Prefer not to say	34	3.82
Party Preference		
Labor	331	37.15
Liberal (National Coalition)	28	3.14
Greens	315	35.35
None	166	18.63
Other	51	5.72

Table 1: Filtered Users’ demographics.




Figure 4: Category Distribution from the filtered dataset.

After filtering, the dataset contains: 891 unique users, 63,864 total ad sessions and 435,314 total ad impressions. To further prepare the ad text for subsequent processing, we remove all HTML elements and markup, resulting in clean plain-text representations free from formatting artifacts. The demographic composition of the final filtered user cohort is detailed in Table 1. This table provides the operational definitions for all demographic categories, such as age ranges (older or younger), income brackets and education levels (higher or lower), used throughout our subsequent analyses. All monetary values, including income brackets, are reported in Australian Dollars (AUD). The distribution of ad content across IAB categories, which forms a core feature for our subsequent analyses, is visualised in Figure 4. These distributions provide the foundational context for both our algorithmic bias audit and the user profile reconstruction experiments.

4.3 Empirical Evidence of Algorithmic Biases and Risks in Ad Targeting

Our analysis of ad-delivery disparities begins with a descriptive overview, with detailed visualizations for all demographic dimensions appearing in Appendix B. These preliminary findings reveal pronounced and systematic differences across our categories of interest. For **Gambling**, we observe strong signals of targeting towards socioeconomically vulnerable groups, i.e., users with lower educational attainment or unemployed status exhibit substantially higher coverage and intensity; male users also experience markedly higher exposure than female users, a pattern similarly observed for **Alcohol**. **Politics** ads show distinct concentration among older age groups, retired individuals, and users with declared party preferences. For **Education and Careers**, patterns align with expectations: coverage and intensity are broadly consistent across demographic strata, with no evidence of systematic opportunity exclusion in ad delivery.

While these descriptive results suggest that content is not distributed uniformly, they cannot differentiate correlated attributes. To address this limitation, we employ Negative Binomial Regression models, which quantify these disparities more rigorously. The following sections present the statistically significant findings ($p < 0.05$) for each construct.

4.3.1 *Opportunity Exclusion.* In this section, we focus our analysis of *opportunity exclusion* on the **Education and Careers** category, as

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	<i>p</i> value
Age	18–24	25–34	1.88	1.45	2.45	0.000
Education	Postgraduate degree	Bachelor degree	1.35	1.16	1.56	0.000
Income	\$52,000–\$64,999	\$156,000 or more	0.72	0.56	0.91	0.007
Employment	Employed part time	Employed full time	1.29	1.06	1.56	0.011
Age	65–74	25–34	0.74	0.56	0.97	0.030
Employment	Retired	Employed full time	0.77	0.59	0.99	0.042
Income	\$26,000–\$33,799	\$156,000 or more	1.49	1.00	2.21	0.048
Income	\$78,000–\$90,999	\$156,000 or more	1.36	1.00	1.84	0.049
Employment	Unemployed & looking	Employed full time	1.49	1.00	2.23	0.049

Table 2: Education & Careers (NBR) (Main Effects Only): Significant effects ($p < 0.05$), sort by p value.

it represents the most explicit form of career and training-related advertising. This category directly reflects the availability of economic and educational opportunities, making it a natural lens to examine whether ad delivery systematically excludes certain groups.

Table 2 presents the statistically significant main effects from our Negative Binomial Regression model. Consistent with the descriptive results, the model does not reveal evidence of systematic opportunity exclusion. Exposure patterns are broadly aligned with plausible variation in career- and education-related ad delivery. For example, younger users (18-24) exhibit higher exposure relative to the 25-34 reference group, which is expected given their increased likelihood of engaging with educational opportunities. Similarly, part-time employees show moderately higher exposure than full-time employees, potentially reflecting increased availability for training or upskilling. At the other end of the spectrum, retired users and older age groups receive fewer such ads, which is consistent with a lower market relevance of career-focused content for these demographics. Income effects are mixed but remain within a plausible range: for example, lower-middle-income groups such as \$26,000–\$33,799 show somewhat higher exposure relative to the highest income bracket, whereas some upper-middle-income brackets have slightly lower exposure.

Descriptive coverage and intensity plots (Figure 5) reinforce these patterns: across gender, education, and income strata, differences are modest, and high-coverage groups (e.g., unemployed and looking for work) correspond to demographics where targeting is intuitively relevant. Taken together, both univariate and multivariate evidence suggest that ad delivery in Education and Careers follows patterns consistent with its intended audience, without indications of systematic exclusion from opportunities.

4.3.2 Inappropriate Targeting. We focus our *inappropriate targeting* analysis on **Gambling**, **Alcohol**, and **Politics** for three reasons. First, these categories are widely designated as sensitive in industry policies and regulatory guidance, given their potential to exacerbate addiction and financial harm (gambling), public-health risks (alcohol), and unequal persuasive reach or civic manipulation (politics). Second, they represent distinct mechanisms of harm, from encouragement of risky behaviours to targeted political persuasion, allowing us to probe different modes within a single framework. Third, in our data, they occur with sufficient base rates across demographic levels and weeks to support well-powered user-week Negative Binomial Regression models and screened interaction terms; other sensitive categories were too sparse for reliable estimation.

Gambling advertisements show evidence of heightened targeting toward socioeconomically vulnerable populations.

In the main effects specification (Table 3a), people without upper-secondary qualifications are exposed at substantially higher rates than those with bachelor’s degrees (IRR = 2.48), and those out of work receive markedly more gambling ads than full-time workers (IRR = 2.89 and IRR = 2.02). Men also receive more such ads than women (IRR = 2.25). Several middle and lower income ranges show higher exposure than the highest-income reference, consistent with greater delivery to people with fewer economic resources (e.g., IRR = 2.02 for \$20,800–\$25,999).

To probe this more nuanced, intersectional question, we introduce screened two-way interactions between gender and income (Table 3a). In this parameterisation, the reported interaction entries are ratios of the male–female effect at each income level relative to the top-income bracket. The conditional gender effect at \$156,000+ is large (IRR = 16.87). The interaction ratios show that this gap is considerably smaller at most other income levels. For example, among people earning roughly \$41,600–\$51,999, the ratio is 0.22, implying a male–female IRR of $0.22 \times 16.87 \approx 3.71$ for that income band. Taken together, the gender disparity is strongest among the highest-income users and attenuates across most lower and middle-income ranges. Nevertheless, it often remains directionally present, i.e., men are still ahead of women, not the other way around.

The descriptive plots (Figure 6) reinforce these regression findings. Men are more likely than women to encounter at least one gambling ad and receive more such ads on average (coverage $\approx 23\%$ vs. $\approx 13\%$; intensity ≈ 0.58 vs. ≈ 0.30 ads per active user-week). People who left school before completing upper-secondary education experience notably higher reach and intensity than those with postgraduate qualifications (coverage $\approx 34\%$ vs. $\approx 15\%$; intensity ≈ 1.38 vs. ≈ 0.29). Individuals actively seeking work stand out with both high coverage and the highest average intensity among employment categories (coverage $\approx 37\%$, intensity ≈ 1.40), substantially exceeding full-time workers (coverage $\approx 18\%$, intensity ≈ 0.38). Several lower and lower-middle income ranges also show elevated intensity relative to the highest-income group.

Overall, both the univariate and multivariate evidence indicate that gambling ads are disproportionately delivered to people with fewer educational credentials and to those outside full-time employment, with a persistent (though income-dependent) male advantage in exposure. These patterns align with well-documented risk factors for gambling-related harm, underscoring the need for stronger safeguards around the delivery of this content.

(a) Gambling (Main effects)

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	p value
Gender	Male	Female	2.25	1.63	3.10	0.000
Education	< year 12 or equivalent	Bachelor degree	2.48	1.28	4.80	0.007
Employment	Unemployed & looking	Employed full time	2.89	1.32	6.33	0.008
Income	\$104,000–\$155,999	\$156,000+	2.19	1.20	4.02	0.011
Income	\$91,000–\$103,999	\$156,000+	1.95	1.09	3.47	0.024
Income	\$65,000–\$77,999	\$156,000+	1.97	1.08	3.58	0.026
Income	\$20,800–\$25,999	\$156,000+	2.02	1.03	3.94	0.040
Income	\$26,000–\$33,799	\$156,000+	1.98	1.03	3.80	0.041
Employment	Unemployed & not looking	Employed full time	2.02	1.02	3.97	0.043

(b) Gambling (With Gender × Income Interaction Effects)

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	p value
<i>Conditional Main Effects (Significant in this model)</i>						
Gender (at \$156,000+)	Male	Female	16.87	6.37	44.65	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$104,000–\$155,999	\$156,000+	26.52	9.42	74.67	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$20,800–\$25,999	\$156,000+	21.15	6.77	66.02	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$33,799–\$41,599	\$156,000+	18.04	5.34	60.93	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$65,000–\$77,999	\$156,000+	12.76	4.35	37.42	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$52,000–\$65,000	\$156,000+	12.20	3.80	39.16	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$25,999–\$33,799	\$156,000+	11.95	4.15	34.40	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$1–\$15,999	\$156,000+	11.03	3.44	35.33	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$41,599–\$52,000	\$156,000+	10.22	3.04	34.30	0.000
Income (for Females)	\$91,000–\$104,000	\$156,000+	6.54	2.07	20.66	0.001
Education	< year 12 or equivalent	Bachelor degree	2.55	1.32	4.90	0.005
Income (for Females)	\$15,999–\$20,800	\$156,000+	4.42	1.49	13.08	0.007
Employment	Unemployed & looking	Employed full time	2.87	1.27	6.50	0.011
Age	18–24	25–34	1.78	1.10	2.87	0.018
<i>Two-way interaction (Ratio of Gender Effects across Income levels)</i>						
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$104,000–\$155,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.07	0.02	0.22	0.000
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$20,800–\$25,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.06	0.02	0.22	0.000
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$1–\$15,599	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.09	0.02	0.34	0.000
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$52,000–\$64,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.11	0.03	0.37	0.000
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$33,800–\$41,599	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.08	0.02	0.34	0.001
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$65,000–\$77,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.16	0.04	0.56	0.004
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$26,000–\$33,799	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.17	0.05	0.59	0.005
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$41,600–\$51,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	0.22	0.05	0.98	0.048

Table 3: Gambling (NBR): Significant effects ($p < 0.05$), sort by p value.

Political advertising concentrates among older audiences and politically engaged users, with a persistent male tilt. According to the main-effects model (Table 4a), men receive more political ads than women (IRR = 1.63). People with postgraduate degrees see more such ads than those with bachelor’s degrees (IRR = 1.43), consistent with higher political engagement among highly educated users. Exposure also rises for several mid-income bands relative to the highest-income reference. Older adults show higher delivery than those in their late twenties and early thirties (IRR = 1.54 for people in their late fifties to early sixties; IRR = 1.44 for those in their mid-sixties to early seventies). Those actively seeking work also receive more political ads than full-time workers (IRR = 1.84). Finally, users who report a party preference, particularly supporters of the Labor or Greens parties, see more political ads than those reporting no affiliation (IRR = 1.51 and 1.49, respectively).

To probe the intersectional structure, we also add screened gender-by-income interactions (Table 4b). The interaction entries are ratios of the male-female effect at each income level relative to the top-income bracket. We observe such amplification around upper-middle incomes and in the lower-middle band. While the exact

implied male-female IRR by income requires the baseline gender effect from this interaction model, these ratios clearly indicate that the gender disparity in political ad delivery is larger in those bands than among the highest-income users.

The descriptive evidence (Figure 7) mirrors these patterns. Men are more likely than women to encounter political ads and to receive them more frequently (coverage $\approx 57\%$ vs. $\approx 46\%$; intensity ≈ 2.89 vs. ≈ 1.80 ads per active user-week). Reach and frequency climb steadily with age, peaking among the oldest users (coverage $\approx 69\%$, intensity ≈ 4.47 for those in the oldest group). People reporting a party affiliation—across major parties—also show higher coverage and intensity than those reporting none. And outside the labour force, especially among those actively looking for work, delivery is notably higher (intensity ≈ 4.79 vs. ≈ 1.90 for full-time workers).

Taken together, both the univariate and multivariate results indicate that political messaging is not distributed uniformly: it skews toward men, older adults, users with strong partisan identities, and several mid-income segments, with gender gaps that widen at specific income levels. Notably, people currently out of work also receive elevated volumes of political advertising, a group likely to

(a) Politics (Main Effects Only)

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	<i>p</i> value
Gender	Male	Female	1.63	1.32	2.02	0.000
Education	Postgraduate degree	Bachelor degree	1.43	1.15	1.78	0.001
Income	\$91,000–\$103,999	\$156,000 or more	1.88	1.28	2.77	0.001
Party	Greens	None	1.49	1.15	1.92	0.002
Income	\$26,000–\$33,799	\$156,000 or more	1.92	1.25	2.95	0.003
Party	Labor	None	1.51	1.14	2.00	0.004
Age	55–64	25–34	1.54	1.12	2.12	0.008
Income	\$41,600–\$51,999	\$156,000 or more	2.01	1.19	3.41	0.009
Employment	Unemployed & looking	Employed full time	1.84	1.08	3.12	0.024
Party	Other	None	1.70	1.06	2.75	0.029
Income	\$20,800–\$25,999	\$156,000 or more	1.54	1.01	2.36	0.046
Age	65–74	25–34	1.44	1.00	2.06	0.049

(b) Politics (With Gender × Income Interaction Effects)

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	<i>p</i> value
<i>Conditional Main Effects (Significant in this model)</i>						
Education	Postgraduate degree level	Bachelor degree level	1.39	1.12	1.73	0.003
Party	Greens	None	1.45	1.13	1.86	0.003
Age	55–64	25–34	1.57	1.15	2.16	0.005
Party	Labor	None	1.47	1.12	1.93	0.005
Employment	Unemployed & looking for work	Employed full time	1.91	1.13	3.21	0.015
Income (for Females)	\$104,000–\$155,999	\$156,000+	0.50	0.28	0.90	0.020
Party	Other	None	1.57	1.01	2.46	0.046
<i>Two-way interaction (Ratio of Gender Effects across Income levels)</i>						
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$104,000–\$155,999	Gender effect in \$156,000+	2.13	1.10	4.13	0.025
Gender × Income	Gender effect in \$33,800–\$41,599	Gender effect in \$156,000+	2.37	1.03	5.46	0.042

Table 4: Politics (NBR): Significant effects ($p < 0.05$), sort by p value.

be especially sensitive to policy promises and trade-offs, raising additional concerns about disproportionate persuasive reach.

Alcohol advertising shows a clear male tilt and a midlife concentration. In the main-effects model (Table 5), men receive substantially more alcohol ads than women (IRR = 2.19). Delivery declines among older adults relative to those in their late twenties and early thirties, lower for people in their mid-sixties to early seventies (IRR = 0.41) and lowest for the oldest group (IRR = 0.22). No other attributes reach statistical significance, indicating that the most robust patterns are a persistent gender gap and late-life attenuation.

The descriptive evidence (Figure 8) aligns with these model results. Men are more likely than women to encounter at least one alcohol ad and to receive them more frequently (coverage \approx 31.9% vs. \approx 20.7%; intensity \approx 1.02 vs. \approx 0.47 ads per active user-week). By age, reach and frequency peak in midlife and taper at older ages (e.g., intensity \approx 1.21 for those in their mid-forties to early fifties, declining to \approx 0.69 at ages 65–74 and \approx 0.38 for the oldest group). Across education and party affiliation, coverage and frequency are broadly similar; income heterogeneity in the descriptive plots does not persist as statistically significant in the multivariate model. This means that, although income seemed to matter at first glance, it does not actually explain the differences once we controlled for other variables in a multivariate model. Meanwhile, education and party affiliation do not show any real disparities either.

Overall, the alcohol category in our data appears more preference-driven than exclusive. Delivery tracks a stable male tilt and life-stage

differences commonly associated with alcohol consumption, without the concentrated reach to socioeconomically vulnerable groups seen for gambling or the partisan/age amplifications observed for politics. After adjusting for covariates, only gender and late-life attenuation remain robust; other demographic contrasts are small and unstable. We therefore interpret these patterns as reflecting audience interest, rather than clear indications of inappropriate targeting, as the observed skews align with broad (Table 8), established consumption patterns rather than targeting legally or ethically defined vulnerable groups. While this distinction does not eliminate all potential harms, it differentiates alcohol ad delivery in our data from the patterns observed for gambling, where targeting aligns with known socioeconomic risk factors for addiction. We still emphasise the importance of routinely monitoring frequency and creative placement for sensitive subgroups.

In summary, the evidence indicates heterogeneous risk across sensitive categories: clear inequities for gambling, substantial demographic skews for politics, and comparatively limited concern for alcohol. These findings motivate category-specific safeguards and continuous fairness auditing of targeting and frequency, especially where harms or civic impacts are plausible.

4.4 User Profile Reconstruction

The preceding analysis demonstrates that ad-delivery systems on Facebook do not operate uniformly; instead, they generate ad streams with systematic and statistically significant skews along demographic lines. For sensitive categories like *Gambling*, *Alcohol*, and *Politics*, the sequence of ads a user sees is not random but

Attribute	Target Group	Reference Group	IRR	CI_low	CI_high	<i>p</i> value
Gender	Male	Female	2.19	1.64	2.92	0.000
Age	75 and over	25–34	0.22	0.09	0.52	0.001
Age	65–74	25–34	0.41	0.23	0.73	0.002

Table 5: Alcohol (NBR) (Main Effects Only): Significant effects ($p < 0.05$), sorted by p value.

Method		Gender	Age	Income	Education	Employment	Party
Random Guessing	Acc	50.00	14.29	8.33	25.00	20.00	20.00
	F1	50.00	14.29	8.33	25.00	20.00	20.00
Gemini 2.0 Flash	Acc	59.13	20.41	9.94	42.70	48.38	35.13
	F1	58.85	15.62	4.56	18.04	19.92	20.99

Table 6: Session-level performance (%) on 63,864 sessions.

is correlated with their gender, age, education, and employment status. This finding establishes a critical precondition for our second research question (RQ2): if an ad stream contains discernible demographic signals, can a powerful, general-purpose inference engine like a Large Language Model (LLM) detect and exploit these signals to reconstruct a user’s demographic profile? In this section, we empirically evaluate this possibility. We treat the sequence of multimodal advertisements delivered to a user as a rich, content-level digital footprint. Our objective is to determine whether a state-of-the-art multimodal LLM, given only this ad stream, can infer sensitive demographic attributes without any access to the platform’s underlying targeting data. To do so, we develop a novel **auditing framework** where the LLM performs zero-shot classification for each demographic attribute based on the ad content. We then benchmark the LLM’s reconstruction accuracy against both a prior distribution baseline and human evaluators to rigorously assess its effectiveness.

4.4.1 Session-Level Reconstruction. We first conduct our analysis at the most granular level: **the user session**. A user session is defined as the sequence of ads a user is exposed to within a single, continuous period of platform usage. This session-level analysis allows us to test the LLM’s inference capabilities on short, contextually coherent ad sequences. To ensure data quality and meaningful classification, we excluded responses where users selected “prefer not to say” for any given attribute. We also excluded the “other” category for gender due to its small sample size ($N=6$ users), which is insufficient for a reliable model evaluation. We then tasked Gemini 2.0 Flash, a state-of-the-art multimodal LLM, with performing zero-shot classification for six demographic attributes across the remaining 63,864 user sessions from our dataset. The full prompt used for session-level reconstruction is provided in Figure 11. The model’s performance, measured by accuracy and macro F1-score, is benchmarked against a random guessing baseline, with the results presented in Table 6. As shown in the table, this baseline varies for each attribute, as it is determined by the number of possible categories (i.e., 1 divided by the number of classes). For example, with seven age brackets, the random guessing accuracy for Age is 14.29% (1/7). The results demonstrate that the LLM consistently outperforms the random guessing baseline in terms of accuracy across all

demographic attributes. For instance, Gemini achieves an accuracy of 59.13% for *Gender* classification, a notable improvement over the 50% chance baseline. The most substantial gains are observed for *Education* and *Employment*, where the model’s accuracy reaches 42.70% and 48.38%, respectively, more than doubling the random guess performance. This indicates that ad sequences, even at the session level, contain sufficient demographic signals for the LLM to make inferences that are better than chance. However, a closer look at the macro F1-scores reveals a more nuanced picture. While accuracy measures the overall correctness of predictions, the F1-score provides a more robust evaluation, especially in the presence of class imbalance, by balancing precision and recall. For attributes with many categories, such as *Age* and *Income*, the F1-scores are considerably lower (15.62% and 4.56%, respectively) and show only marginal improvement over the baseline. This suggests that while the LLM can often correctly identify the majority class, its ability to reliably distinguish between the multiple fine-grained categories within these attributes is limited at the session level. For attributes with fewer classes, like *Employment* and *Party*, the F1-scores are closer to their corresponding accuracies, indicating a more balanced performance. In summary, our **session-level** analysis provides initial evidence that LLMs can indeed extract demographic signals from ad streams to reconstruct user profiles with better-than-random accuracy. Nevertheless, the low F1-scores for multi-class attributes highlight the challenge of making reliable, fine-grained inferences from the limited information contained within a single user session. This motivates our subsequent analysis at the user level, where aggregating information across multiple sessions may provide a richer and more stable signal for reconstruction.

4.4.2 User-Level Reconstruction. To create a more stable and comprehensive signal, we aggregate information across all sessions for each of the 891 users in our dataset. For each user, we first generate a textual summary of the LLM’s inference and reasoning for every individual session. We then concatenate these session summaries in chronological order, creating a longitudinal narrative of the LLM’s evolving perception of the user over time. This complete, time-ordered text is then provided to the LLM in a final step to perform a holistic, user-level classification for each demographic attribute. This method allows the model to leverage not only the

Method		Gender	Age	Income	Education	Employment	Party
Prior-Mode (Majority Class)	Acc	36.47	20.84	9.25	21.81	56.71	3.14
	F1	26.72	4.93	1.54	11.94	24.13	1.22
Prior-Sampling	Acc	49.89±1.68	14.85±1.22	8.26±1.01	26.63±1.24	46.90±1.79	19.85±1.25
	F1	49.03±1.68	14.01±1.18	7.68±0.96	24.20±1.38	32.77±1.77	16.20±1.13
Gemini 2.0 Flash	Acc	74.88	41.18	9.11	44.87	61.95	39.91
	F1	74.87	34.57	5.46	34.13	34.66	23.90
Gemini 2.0 Flash [†]	Acc	76.38	40.84	8.99	44.41	62.46	41.60
	F1	76.35	34.39	5.76	34.37	35.63	25.82

Table 7: Comparison of augmented (Australian context) and non-augmented Gemini 2.0 Flash against census prior on user-level performance (%). To ensure alignment with the census prior classes, we removed or merged a small subset of categories in our dataset that were either misaligned with or absent from the prior. † denotes the LLM augmented with an Australian-specific context prompt.

cumulative evidence but also any temporal patterns or shifts in the ad content a user is shown, preserving the temporal nature of a user’s ad exposure history. For this more rigorous user-level evaluation, we introduce two stronger baseline models derived from Australian census data, which reflect the prior demographic distribution of the population (Table 11). The Prior-Mode baseline always predicts the majority class for each attribute. The Prior-Sampling baseline provides a more robust chance-level comparison by making predictions through random sampling from the census distribution; we report the mean and standard deviation of its performance over 1,000 independent runs in Table 7. To ensure a fair comparison, we harmonised our dataset with the census data. For all attributes, we excluded responses where users selected “prefer not to say.” We excluded gender-diverse respondents from this analysis because the census prior reports only male and female categories. For education, we aligned with the higher education census distribution by merging all non-degree categories in our data into a single “No Degree” class. Census data for individual income, reported weekly, was annualised (i.e., multiplied by 52) and aligned perfectly with our income brackets. For employment, we merged our two “unemployed” categories to match the census, which does not distinguish between looking for work or not; we also excluded “retired” individuals from this specific attribute’s evaluation, as the census employment data pertains only to the labour force. Detailed statistics of the demographics of the Australian Census and Australian Federal Election Study are provided in Appendix 11. We evaluate two versions of LLM: the standard Gemini 2.0 flash model and an augmented version, Gemini[†], which was provided with a prompt about the Australian cultural context. The user-level reconstruction prompt is provided in Figure 12, and the augmented Australian context prompt is provided in Figure 13. This augmentation is designed to create a more equitable comparison with our census-derived baselines. Since the Prior-Sampling baseline inherently incorporates “Australian context” by drawing from national demographic data, providing the LLM with similar high-level contextual information ensures that our evaluation more accurately assesses the model’s ability to infer information from ad content, rather than simply penalising it for a lack of geographical and cultural knowledge.

The **user-level** reconstruction performance is presented in Table 7. The results at the user-level show a marked improvement over

the session-level analysis and demonstrate the LLM’s strong capability to reconstruct user profiles. Gemini significantly outperforms both the Prior-Mode and Prior-Sampling baselines across nearly all attributes in both accuracy and F1-score. The most striking performance is in *Gender* reconstruction, where Gemini[†] achieves 76.38% accuracy and a 76.35% F1-score, far exceeding the baselines and indicating a very strong and reliable signal in the ad streams. Substantial gains are also evident for attributes that were challenging at the session level. For *Age*, Gemini’s accuracy (41.18%) is double that of the Prior-Mode baseline (20.84%), and its F1-score (34.57%) shows a seven-fold improvement over the majority class F1 (4.93%), indicating that the model is not merely guessing the most common age bracket but is successfully distinguishing between multiple categories. A similar pattern holds for *Education*, where the F1-score jumps to 34.37%, nearly tripling the baseline performance. For *Party* preference, the LLM’s accuracy (41.60%) and F1-score (25.82%) are dramatically better than the baselines, suggesting that political orientation is encoded in ad content. The model’s performance on *Employment* is also noteworthy. While the Prior-Mode baseline achieves a high accuracy of 56.71% due to a large majority class (employed full-time), its F1-score is low (24.13%). Gemini, in contrast, achieves a higher accuracy (62.46%) and a significantly better F1-score (35.63%), demonstrating a superior ability to correctly identify users in non-majority employment categories. The only attribute where the LLM does not show a clear advantage is *Income*, where both accuracy and F1-score remain low and comparable to the baselines. This suggests that while other demographic signals are robustly embedded in the ads, providing high-level contextual information can further refine the model’s inferential capabilities. Overall, these user-level results confirm that aggregating ad sequences provides a powerful signal, enabling LLMs to reconstruct a user’s demographic profile with a strong performance for most attributes, posing significant privacy risks.

4.4.3 Human Evaluation. To contextualise LLM performance, we conducted a human evaluation study. We randomly sampled 100 user sessions, stratified to match the demographic distribution of our dataset as detailed in Table 1. As with our main analysis, sessions from users who selected “prefer not to say” for an attribute or chose a gender category not represented in the census prior were excluded from the sample for those respective evaluations.

Method		Gender	Age	Income	Education	Employment	Party
Random guessing	Acc	50.00	14.29	8.33	25.00	20.00	20.00
	F1	50.00	14.29	8.33	25.00	20.00	20.00
Human	Acc	73.67±5.13	21.83±5.34	2.17±3.49	33.67±5.43	37.83±5.78	25.00±6.10
	F1	73.05±4.95	15.64±4.34	1.81±2.84	25.10±6.41	20.42±3.95	16.68±4.54
GPT 4o	Acc	60.00	36.00	14.00	46.00	49.00	26.00
	F1	59.86	27.56	11.36	25.29	22.87	16.15
Gemini 2.0 Flash	Acc	60.00	30.00	6.00	47.00	51.00	32.00
	F1	59.86	20.03	2.31	26.10	23.31	15.24
Gemini 2.5 Flash	Acc	64.00	30.00	7.00	43.00	49.00	25.00
	F1	63.99	26.31	3.30	24.14	22.90	13.73
<i>Thinking Models</i>							
GPT 5 Mini	Acc	69.00	29.00	9.00	43.00	49.00	26.00
	F1	68.97	19.72	6.60	23.59	22.62	15.81
GPT 5	Acc	76.00	31.00	11.00	46.00	51.00	25.00
	F1	75.65	24.82	5.91	27.12	24.11	14.37
Gemini 2.5 Pro	Acc	75.00	30.00	8.00	51.00	53.00	31.00
	F1	74.80	26.45	5.80	30.54	26.33	21.72

Table 8: Comparison of Human and random guessing against LLMs on 100 sampled human-evaluated sessions.

We recruited six human annotators (2 female, 4 male) with diverse professional backgrounds, including legal and privacy expertise, computer science, and human resources. Each annotator was tasked with inferring the six demographic attributes for each of the 100 sessions, based solely on the same ad content shown to the LLM. To best capture intuitive human inference in a realistic and tractable manner, annotators were shown the raw, human-readable visual images of the ads within each session, as processing the full structured textual captions, categories, key entities from all ads in 100 sessions would be cognitively overwhelming. In contrast, the LLM received the structured textual input generated by our multimodal understanding pipeline (as described in Section 3.1) as in our session-level analysis. Our research design was reviewed and approved by our university’s Human Research Ethics Board.

This design allows for an ecologically valid comparison between intuitive human inference and systematic algorithmic inference. The final human performance metrics reported in Table 8 are the average of the individual performances of six annotators, compared against both the random guessing baseline and the performance of LLMs in the exact same 100 sessions.

The results reveal an interesting dynamic between human intuition and algorithmic inference. For *Gender*, human annotators demonstrated remarkable proficiency, achieving an average accuracy of 73.67%. This performance is higher than most of the tested LLMs, though the most advanced model (GPT 5, Gemini 2.5 Pro) approached or even exceeded human-level accuracy at 76.00% and 75.00%. This suggests that humans are particularly adept at decoding the subtle gendered cues embedded in advertising content. However, for most other attributes, the top-performing LLMs consistently matched or surpassed human capabilities. For *Education* and *Employment*, the best model, Gemini 2.5 Pro, achieved significantly higher accuracies (51.00% and 53.00% respectively) compared to the human average (33.67% and 37.83%). This indicates that LLMs are more effective at identifying the complex and non-obvious correlations between ad content and a user’s professional or educational

background. For *Age*, the leading LLM (GPT 4o) also showed a clear advantage over human annotators (36.00% vs. 21.83% accuracy). Both humans and all tested LLMs struggled with *Income*, with human performance falling below the random baseline, reinforcing our finding that this attribute is not reliably encoded in ad content in a way that is easily decodable by either human or machine intelligence. For *Party* preference, the top-performing LLM (Gemini 2.0 Flash and Gemini 2.5 Pro) and humans achieved comparable accuracy, although the inter-rater variability for humans was high, as indicated by the standard deviation.

In summary, this evaluation highlights that while humans excel at inferring certain socially-cued attributes like gender, state-of-the-art LLMs demonstrate a competitive or even superior ability to reconstruct more complex, multi-class attributes like education, employment, and age from ad sequences. This underscores the power of LLMs as inference engines that can match or exceed human capabilities in decoding demographic signals from digital footprints, further amplifying the privacy risks we identified

4.4.4 Random Control Group. Our reconstruction framework is predicated on the hypothesis that the sequence of advertisements contains meaningful temporal signals that the LLM can leverage. To isolate and quantify the value of this sequential information, we introduce a random control group. For this experiment, we create a “shuffled” version of our dataset where, for each user session, the chronological order of the ads is randomised. This process preserves the exact same set of ads within each session but disrupts any temporal patterns. We then task the LLM with performing profile reconstruction on both the original, chronologically ordered data (Sequential) and this shuffled version (Random Control). By comparing the performance between these two conditions, we can directly measure the contribution of the ad sequence order to the model’s inferential accuracy. The full prompt used for this experiment is provided in Figure 14.

For this analysis, we evaluate performance at both the session and user levels. Unlike the comparison against census priors, this

Level	Method		Gender	Age	Income	Education	Employment	Party
Session	Random Control	Acc	58.80	20.56	10.07	42.76	48.29	34.63
		F1	58.50	15.88	4.59	18.13	19.72	21.07
	Sequential	Acc	59.13	20.41	9.94	42.70	48.38	35.13
		F1	58.85	15.62	4.56	18.04	19.92	20.99
User	Random Control	Acc	70.39	38.00	10.27	42.56	57.09	39.12
		F1	70.38	32.02	6.31	24.20	31.01	23.81
	Sequential	Acc	74.88	41.18	9.11	44.18	58.15	39.91
		F1	74.87	34.57	5.46	24.76	31.98	23.90
	Sequential [†]	Acc	76.38	40.84	8.99	43.71	57.80	41.60
		F1	76.35	34.39	5.76	25.21	32.04	25.82

Table 9: Session-level and user-level performance (%) against random control group. † denotes the LLM augmented with an Australian-specific context prompt.

experiment does not require harmonisation with external datasets. Accordingly, we use the full set of demographic categories present in our original data, providing a more complete picture of performance. However, we applied the same exclusion criteria as in the main analysis, removing responses where users selected “prefer not to say” for any attribute and excluding those who chose their gender as “other”. The results are presented in Table 9.

At the **session level**, the performance difference between the Sequential and Random Control groups remains minimal across all attributes. For most metrics, the accuracies and F1-scores are nearly identical, with negligible variations that are likely attributable to model stochasticity. This finding confirms that at the granular level of a single, short user session, the specific order of ads provides little to no additional signal for the LLM. The model’s inferences appear to be based primarily on the aggregate semantic content of the ads present in the session, rather than their temporal arrangement.

However, a clear and significant pattern emerges at the **user level**. When information is aggregated across a user’s entire history, the Sequential model consistently outperforms the Random Control group on most attributes, demonstrating the value of temporal information in long-term profile reconstruction. For instance, the accuracy for *Age* improves from 38.00% in the control group to 41.18% in the sequential model, with a corresponding increase in F1-score from 32.02% to 34.57%. A similar, though more modest, trend is visible for *Education*, *Gender*, and *Employment*. The notable improvement is seen in *Party* preference, where the F1-score for the augmented sequential model (Sequential[†]) rises to 25.82% from the control group’s 23.81%, suggesting that the evolution of a user’s ad stream over time is a useful signal for inferring their political affiliation. Finally, consistent with our previous findings, augmenting the LLM with Australian-specific context (Sequential[†]) provides a small but consistent performance boost over the standard sequential model, particularly for *Party* preference. This confirms that providing high-level contextual information can further refine the model’s inferential capabilities on top of the signals derived from ad content and sequence.

In conclusion, this control experiment validates that the temporal sequence of advertisements is a valuable source of signal for user profile reconstruction, particularly for nuanced attributes like age and political preference. While strong signals like gender can be inferred effectively from the mere aggregation of ad content,

preserving the chronological order allows the LLM to achieve a higher level of inferential accuracy and robustness across a broader range of demographic characteristics.

4.4.5 Misprediction Analysis. Our analysis so far has relied on an *Exact* match criterion, where a prediction is only considered correct if it perfectly aligns with the ground truth. While standard, this approach can be overly punitive for ordinal attributes like *Age* and *Income*, where a prediction that is “close” is more informative than one that is far off. For instance, misclassifying a 25-year-old as being in the 18–24 age bracket is a less severe error than classifying them as 65–74. To capture this nuance, we introduce a more forgiving, “Lenient” evaluation criterion. Under this setting, a prediction is considered correct if it either exactly matches the ground truth or falls within one adjacent, pre-defined “near” category (e.g., for the 25–34 age bracket, the adjacent categories are 18–24 and 35–44). Table 10 presents the performance for *Age* and *Income* prediction under both the *Exact* and *Lenient* criteria, evaluated across our different experimental settings: the **100-session** sample (for all tested LLMs), the full **session-level** dataset, and the final **user-level** aggregation.

The results reveal a dramatic and consistent improvement across all models and settings when moving from the *Exact* to the *Lenient* criterion. For *Age*, the performance of all models on the 100-session sample improves substantially, with accuracies often doubling. This trend culminates at the **user-level**, where accuracy skyrockets from 41.18% to 80.55%, and the F1-score more than doubles from 34.57% to 79.03%. This indicates that a large proportion of the models’ “incorrect” predictions were, in fact, “near misses” into an adjacent age bracket. This strongly suggests that ad streams contain a robust signal for a user’s approximate age, which machine intelligence can effectively decode, even if pinpointing the exact bracket remains challenging.

A similar, albeit less pronounced, trend is observed for *Income*. At the **user-level**, the *Lenient* accuracy climbs from 9.11% to 27.47%, and the F1-score shows a remarkable four-fold increase from 5.46% to 22.79%. While the absolute performance for income reconstruction remains modest, this substantial relative improvement demonstrates that the models’ predictions are not random noise. Instead, they are able to place users in an income bracket adjacent to their

Level	Method	Age Acc	Age F1	Income Acc	Income F1
GPT 4o*	Exact	36.00	27.56	14.00	11.36
	Lenient	63.00 (↑ 75.00%)	54.76 (↑ 98.69%)	32.00 (↑ 128.57%)	30.56 (↑ 169.01%)
GPT 5 Mini*	Exact	29.00	19.72	9.00	6.57
	Lenient	63.00 (↑ 117.24%)	56.62 (↑ 187.12%)	26.00 (↑ 188.89%)	21.81 (↑ 231.96%)
GPT 5*	Exact	31.00	24.82	11.00	5.91
	Lenient	66.00 (↑ 112.90%)	61.64 (↑ 148.35%)	38.00 (↑ 245.45%)	25.48 (↑ 331.13%)
Gemini 2.0 Flash*	Exact	30.00	20.03	6.00	2.51
	Lenient	64.00 (↑ 113.33%)	55.96 (↑ 179.38%)	22.00 (↑ 266.67%)	15.52 (↑ 518.33%)
Gemini 2.5 Flash*	Exact	30.00	26.31	7.00	3.30
	Lenient	65.00 (↑ 116.67%)	56.94 (↑ 116.42%)	21.00 (↑ 200.00%)	18.75 (↑ 468.18%)
Gemini 2.5 Pro*	Exact	30.00	26.45	8.00	5.80
	Lenient	73.00 (↑ 143.33%)	69.17 (↑ 161.51%)	31.00 (↑ 287.50%)	22.12 (↑ 281.38%)
Session	Exact	20.41	15.62	9.98	5.00
	Lenient	48.67 (↑ 138.46%)	46.78 (↑ 199.49%)	25.22 (↑ 152.65%)	17.45 (↑ 249.00%)
User	Exact	41.18	34.57	9.11	5.46
	Lenient	80.55 (↑ 95.60%)	79.03 (↑ 128.61%)	27.47 (↑ 201.54%)	22.79 (↑ 317.40%)

Table 10: Performance (%) for Age and Income prediction across different evaluation settings (* denotes predictions in 100 sampled sessions, session-level, and user-level). Results are reported under Exact and Lenient criteria, where Lenient considers a prediction correct if it exactly matches the ground truth or falls within one pre-defined “near” category. Percentages in green indicate relative improvement over the Exact setting.

true one, suggesting that ad content contains a coarse but discernible signal of a user’s general economic standing.

In conclusion, this misprediction analysis provides a crucial layer of interpretation. It shows that for ordinal attributes like *Age* and *Income*, the LLMs’ inferential power is significantly greater than what exact-match accuracy suggests. The models are not just making random errors; they are consistently making predictions that are semantically close to the ground truth. This implies that even imperfect predictions can be “directionally correct”, which significantly amplifies the privacy risks of profile reconstruction from ad content.

5 Discussion

Our findings provide a multi-faceted view of the contemporary ad targeting ecosystem, revealing both embedded algorithmic biases and risks from the widespread availability of powerful LLMs. We structure the discussion around the nature of these biases and privacy risks, the policy and governance implications, and the study’s limitations.

5.1 Harmful Algorithmic Biases and Privacy Risks

Our research uncovers a dual-layered of risk. The first, from our statistical audit, is the bias inherent in the ad-delivery system itself. Our findings extend prior work [7, 38, 42, 45] by providing a large-scale, user-level quantification of these biases with ground-truth demographic data. Evidence of inappropriate targeting in *Gambling* is stark, showing higher exposure for socioeconomically vulnerable groups, such as those with lower educational attainment and the unemployed. This suggests a potentially predatory dynamic where the platform’s optimisation mechanisms may be exploiting known risk factors for gambling harm. Similarly, the concentration of political ads among specific demographic segments points to the

system’s role in reinforcing political beliefs, rather than fostering open deliberation or individual autonomy.

The second, emergent layer of risk is the feasibility of user profile reconstruction by third parties using LLMs. Our work provides the first empirical demonstration that the stream of ads shown to a user is not innocuous noise but a rich digital footprint that can be systematically decoded. The success of our LLM in reconstructing attributes like gender, age, education and employment with high accuracy, rivalling or exceeding human annotators for almost all attributes, is a critical finding. It shows that an external actor, e.g., through a malicious browser extension [3, 25, 53, 64, 72], could reverse-engineer sensitive information from publicly broadcast ads. Critically, the level of protection platforms apply to behavioural data (e.g., ad stream) appears significantly lower than that for user’s personal information [18]. This reverse-engineering of user profiles is particularly concerning because users often perceive personalized content as reflecting stable identity, not merely a product of their recent clicks. For instance, users, especially younger ones often integrate these algorithmic reflections into their own sense of self [50]. Yet, users’ mental models of how platforms generate inferences are often flawed, leading to surprise and concern when they encounter inferences that seem inaccurate or inexplicable [30]. This is compounded by a fundamental misalignment between users’ contextual, evolving perception of what constitutes identifiable information and the static, formal definitions used by platforms and regulators [65]. This gap in user understanding is precisely what makes our findings so critical. The ability of LLMs to systematically decode ad streams represents a form of profiling that operates far beyond users’ typical expectations of how platforms function and what personal information could be leaked from seemingly innocuous ad content [26, 30, 48, 58, 73]. This dynamic often leaves users feeling a sense of powerlessness, resigned to their data being used in ways they do not fully understand or approve of [27]. The

finding that the LLM’s errors for *Age* and *Income* are often “near misses” is deeply concerning. It implies that even when the model is not perfectly accurate, it is often “directionally correct”, capable of placing individuals into coarse but meaningful categories (e.g., “young”, “low-income”). This level of accuracy is sufficient to constitute a meaningful privacy breach, as it enables the inference of sensitive demographic attributes even without perfect precision. The fact that the barrier to conducting this kind of privacy-invasive inference is no longer expertise in data science but simply access to a publicly available AI tool emphasises the scale and novelty of this threat. This vulnerability is exacerbated by the narrow, algorithm-centered nature of platform transparency, which focuses on explaining models while ignoring the broader socio-organisational context in which these systems operate [23]. Our auditing framework, by revealing systemic, population-level patterns of ad delivery, takes a step towards the transparency that is necessary for users and regulators to truly understand the collective risks and harms of these systems.

5.2 Implications for Policy

The demonstration that multimodal LLMs can reconstruct sensitive attributes from ad streams has direct implications for platform accountability, data protection frameworks, and AI governance. We structure our recommendations across three interconnected domains. First, on **transparency and accountability**, our findings show that current mechanisms are insufficient. Requirements must evolve beyond current “Why am I seeing this ad?” explanations, which prior work has shown to be incomplete [8, 15]. Content-level auditing, particularly of the kind we have demonstrated, should move beyond the analysis of singular, isolated ads and towards sequence and group-level analysis and be incorporated into platform transparency reports and mandated for independent researchers. This would allow regulators and civil society to detect demographic skews in ad delivery and identify harmful targeting patterns in near real time, shifting the paradigm from transparency to genuine accountability, which requires embracing a “Social Transparency” that captures systemic operational patterns over the technical details of individual outputs [24]. Second, on the **legal and regulatory** front, privacy frameworks such as the GDPR [1] and Australia’s Privacy Act [2] should adapt to the reality of inferential risks. Our work suggests that an “ad stream” itself can constitute a form of personal data leakage. Regulations should explicitly recognise that data inferred from content exposure is a form of personal data, affording it the same protections as data explicitly provided by users. This would close a significant loophole where actors can claim they have not collected “personal information” while still deriving it through powerful inference, a risk now democratised by accessible LLMs. Third, **platforms and regulators** must anticipate and mitigate adversarial uses through technical and design interventions. Given the accessibility of contemporary LLMs, proactive technical mitigations are essential. These could include: (1) limiting the granularity and persistence of identifiable ad delivery logs accessible to third parties (e.g., enforcing stricter API rate limits and adopting privacy-enhancing browser architectures like cross-origin ad rendering); (2) introducing randomness or diversity constraints into ad sequencing to reduce the stability of demographic signals, thereby making

reconstruction more difficult (e.g., extending fairness-enhancing mechanisms like Meta’s Variance Reduction System [67], currently limited to housing ads, to other sensitive categories like gambling or political content); and (3) prohibiting or rate-limiting the high-frequency delivery of sensitive-category ads to groups identified as vulnerable (e.g., implementing platform-wide frequency caps for categories like gambling ads). These findings strengthen the case for mandatory algorithmic impact assessments that require platforms to evaluate not only their targeting algorithms but also the emergent demographic signals embedded in the content streams they produce.

5.3 Limitations and Future Work

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, our dataset, while large and longitudinal, is sourced from a self-selected group of Australian volunteers using a browser plugin. This cohort may not be fully representative of the broader Facebook population, particularly mobile-only users, and may not generalise to other countries with different advertising norms or platform policies [43]. Second, while our harmful algorithmic bias audit identifies statistically significant disparities, the causal mechanisms remain opaque. We cannot definitively distinguish between bias originating from advertiser targeting strategies, platform optimisation algorithms, or user-level engagement feedback loops. Disentangling these mechanisms would require access to platform-side data, which is currently unavailable to independent researchers. Third, our analysis focuses on Facebook; other platforms with different ad formats or targeting policies may exhibit different patterns. Extending our framework to TikTok, Instagram, and programmatic ad networks is a crucial next step. Similarly, other sensitive traits not analysed here, such as religion or race, may also be encoded in ad streams, warranting further investigation. Finally, our LLM-based reconstruction pipeline has methodological limitations. Our approach is a multi-stage process, not an end-to-end one; we first use a single multimodal model (Gemini 2.0 Flash) to generate structured textual summaries from raw ad content, which are then used for all subsequent demographic inferences (see Section 3.1). This design was a necessary trade-off to manage the prohibitive token costs and contextual complexity of directly processing long multimodal ad sequences (as detailed in Section 3.3), a design which allows for scalable and controlled analysis. However, it also means the quality of the final inference is bottlenecked by the initial summary generation, and we do not capture the potential performance of a true end-to-end system. Future work with more powerful LLMs could explore direct, end-to-end profile reconstruction.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we examined the dual risks of algorithmic bias in ad targeting and the emergent threat of user profile reconstruction by Large Language Models. Using a multi-stage auditing framework that combines statistical analysis of ad delivery with LLM-based inference, we found strong evidence of inappropriate targeting and demonstrated, for the first time, that a state-of-the-art multimodal LLM can reliably infer gender, education, employment status, and produce human-comparable, above-chance estimates

of age, income and party preference from ad streams alone. Temporal patterns in ad delivery further amplified this risk, and even “near-miss” errors for ordinal attributes, such as age and income, constituted meaningful privacy violations. These findings show that an ad stream is not merely a sequence of commercial messages, but a rich digital footprint that leaks personal information. The accessibility of modern LLMs has made such inference broadly feasible, shifting it from a theoretical concern to a practical reality. Safeguarding against these inferential risks will require moving beyond platform-provided transparency tools toward auditing the content-level signals embedded in ad delivery.

Acknowledgments

This research includes computations using the Wolfpack computational cluster, supported by the School of Computer Science and Engineering at UNSW Sydney. We also acknowledge support from the ARC Centre of Excellence for Automated Decision-Making and Society (CE200100005). We would like to thank Abdul Obeid for suggesting the idea of using a KDE-based approach for defining session thresholds. We further thank Baihe Zhang, Abdul Obeid, Zechen Li, Wilson Wongso, Yixuan Liu for their hard work on annotation, which greatly contributed to the human evaluation.

References

- [1] 2016. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>
- [2] 1988. Privacy Act 1988. <https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A03712/latest/text>
- [3] Anupama Aggarwal, Bimal Viswanath, Liang Zhang, Saravana Kumar, Ayush Shah, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. 2018. I spy with my little eye: analysis and detection of spying browser extensions. In *2018 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 47–61.
- [4] Omer Akgul, Richard Roberts, Moses Namara, Dave Levin, and Michelle L Mazurek. 2022. Investigating influencer VPN ads on YouTube. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 876–892.
- [5] Muhammad Ali, Angelica Goetzen, Alan Mislove, Elissa Redmiles, and Piotr Sapiezynski. 2022. All things unequal: Measuring disparity of potentially harmful ads on facebook. In *Proceedings of the 2022 workshop on consumer protection*.
- [6] Muhammad Ali, Angelica Goetzen, Alan Mislove, Elissa M Redmiles, and Piotr Sapiezynski. 2023. Problematic advertising and its disparate exposure on Facebook. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 5665–5682.
- [7] Muhammad Ali, Piotr Sapiezynski, Miranda Bogen, Aleksandra Korolova, Alan Mislove, and Aaron Rieke. 2019. Discrimination through Optimization: How Facebook’s Ad Delivery Can Lead to Biased Outcomes. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 199 (Nov. 2019), 30 pages. doi:10.1145/3359301
- [8] Athanasios Andreou, Giridhari Venkatadri, Oana Goga, Krishna P Gummedi, Patrick Loiseau, and Alan Mislove. 2018. Investigating ad transparency mechanisms in social media: A case study of Facebook’s explanations. In *NDSS 2018- Network and distributed system security symposium*. 1–15.
- [9] Daniel Angus, Lauren Hayden, Abdul Karim Obeid, Xue Ying Tan, Nicholas Carah, Jean Burgess, Christine Parker, et al. 2024. Computational Methods for Improving the Observability of Platform-Based Advertising. *Journal of Advertising* 53, 5 (2024), 661–680. doi:10.1080/00913367.2024.2394156
- [10] Daniel Angus, Abdul Karim Obeid, Jean Burgess, Christine Parker, Mark Andrejevic, Nicholas Carah, and Xue Ying Tan. 2024. Enabling online advertising transparency through data donation methods. *Computational Communication Research* 6, 2 (2024), 1.
- [11] Anthropic. 2025. *Claude Opus 4 & Claude Sonnet 4: System Card*. Technical Report. Anthropic.
- [12] Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, and Shushan Arakelyan. 2019. Transparent, scrutable and explainable user models for personalized recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 42nd international acm sigir conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 265–274.
- [13] Bin Bi, Milad Shokouhi, Michal Kosinski, and Thore Graepel. 2013. Inferring the demographics of search users: social data meets search queries. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (WWW ’13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 131–140. doi:10.1145/2488388.2488401
- [14] Nattapat Boonprakong, Benjamin Tag, and Tilman Dingler. 2023. Designing Technologies to Support Critical Thinking in an Age of Misinformation. *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 22, 3 (2023), 8–17. doi:10.1109/MPRV.2023.3275514
- [15] Jean Burgess, Nicholas Carah, Daniel Angus, Abdul Obeid, and Mark Andrejevic. 2024. Why Am I Seeing This Ad? The affordances and limits of automated user-level explanation in Meta’s advertising system. *New Media & Society* 26, 9 (2024), 5130–5149. doi:10.1177/14614448241251796
- [16] Adrian Colin Cameron and Pravin K Trivedi. 2013. *Regression analysis of count data*. Number 53. Cambridge university press.
- [17] Arthur Capozzi, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Yelena Mejova, Corrado Monti, and André Panisson. 2023. The Thin Ideology of Populist Advertising on Facebook during the 2019 EU Elections. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (Austin, TX, USA) (WWW ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2852–2862. doi:10.1145/3543507.3583267
- [18] Le Cheng and Yijin Guo. 2025. Privacy Protection on Social Media Platforms: Overdisclosure of Online Behavioral Data is Labeling Users. *International Journal of Digital Law and Governance* (2025). doi:10.1515/ijdlg-2025-0001
- [19] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blistein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. 2025. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261* (2025).
- [20] Savino Dambra, Iskander Sanchez-Rola, Leyla Bilge, and Davide Balzarotti. 2022. When Sally met trackers: Web tracking from the users’ perspective. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 2189–2206.
- [21] Claire Dolin, Ben Weinschel, Shawn Shan, Chang Min Hahn, Euirim Choi, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Blase Ur. 2018. Unpacking Perceptions of Data-Driven Inferences Underlying Online Targeting and Personalization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Montreal QC, Canada) (CHI ’18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. doi:10.1145/3173574.3174067
- [22] Laura Edelson, Shikhar Sakhuja, Ratan Dey, and Damon McCoy. 2019. An analysis of United States online political advertising transparency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04385* (2019).
- [23] Upol Ehsan, Q. Vera Liao, Michael Muller, Mark O. Riedl, and Justin D. Weisz. 2021. Expanding Explainability: Towards Social Transparency in AI systems. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 82, 19 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445188
- [24] Upol Ehsan, Q. Vera Liao, Michael Muller, Mark O. Riedl, and Justin D. Weisz. 2021. Expanding Explainability: Towards Social Transparency in AI systems. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 82, 19 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445188
- [25] Steven Englehardt and Arvind Narayanan. 2016. Online Tracking: A 1-million-site Measurement and Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Vienna, Austria) (CCS ’16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1388–1401. doi:10.1145/2976749.2978313
- [26] Motahhare Eslami, Sneha R. Krishna Kumaran, Christian Sandvig, and Karrie Karahalios. 2018. Communicating Algorithmic Process in Online Behavioral Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Montreal QC, Canada) (CHI ’18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. doi:10.1145/3173574.3174006
- [27] Alejandra Gómez Ortega, Hosana Morales Ornelas, and Uğur Genç. 2025. Sur-rendering to Powerlessness: Governing Personal Data Flows in Generative AI. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 232, 18 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713504
- [28] Google DeepMind. 2025. *Gemini 2.0 Flash Model Card*. Technical Report. Google DeepMind.
- [29] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948* (2025).
- [30] Samantha Hautea, Anjali Munasinghe, and Emilee Rader. 2020. “That’s Not Me”: Surprising Algorithmic Inferences. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI EA ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–7. doi:10.1145/3334480.3382816
- [31] Fengxiang He, Mengnan Du, Aris Filos-Ratsikas, Lu Cheng, Qingquan Song, Min Lin, and John Vines. 2024. AI Driven Online Advertising: Market Design, Generative AI, and Ethics. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024 (Singapore, Singapore) (WWW ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1407–1409. doi:10.1145/3589335.3641295
- [32] Joseph M Hilbe. 2011. *Negative binomial regression*. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Joanne Hinds and Adam N Joinson. 2018. What demographic attributes do our digital footprints reveal? A systematic review. *PLoS one* 13, 11 (2018), e0207112.

- [34] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276* (2024).
- [35] IAB Technology Laboratory. [n. d.]. Ad Product Taxonomy. IAB Tech Lab website. <https://iabtechlab.com/standards/ad-product-taxonomy/> Last updated: December 11, 2024.
- [36] Jane Im, Ruiyi Wang, Weikun Lyu, Nick Cook, Hana Habib, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Nikola Banovic, and Florian Schaub. 2023. Less is Not More: Improving Findability and Actionability of Privacy Controls for Online Behavioral Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (*CHI '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 661, 33 pages. doi:10.1145/3544548.3580773
- [37] Basilel Imana, Aleksandra Korolova, and John Heidemann. 2021. Auditing for Discrimination in Algorithms Delivering Job Ads. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021* (Ljubljana, Slovenia) (*WWW '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3767–3778. doi:10.1145/3442381.3450077
- [38] Basilel Imana, Aleksandra Korolova, and John Heidemann. 2021. Auditing for Discrimination in Algorithms Delivering Job Ads (*WWW '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3767–3778. doi:10.1145/3442381.3450077
- [39] Basilel Imana, Aleksandra Korolova, and John Heidemann. 2024. Auditing for Bias in Ad Delivery Using Inferred Demographic Attributes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23394* (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.23394>
- [40] Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720* (2024).
- [41] Isaac Johnson, Connor McMahon, Johannes Schöning, and Brent Hecht. 2017. The Effect of Population and "Structural" Biases on Social Media-based Algorithms: A Case Study in Geolocation Inference Across the Urban-Rural Spectrum. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Denver, Colorado, USA) (*CHI '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1167–1178. doi:10.1145/3025453.3026015
- [42] Levi Kaplan, Nicole Gerzon, Alan Misllove, and Piotr Sapiezynski. 2022. Measurement and analysis of implied identity in ad delivery optimization. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Internet Measurement Conference* (Nice, France) (*IMC '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 195–209. doi:10.1145/3517745.3561450
- [43] Smirity Kaushik, Tanusree Sharma, Yaman Yu, Amna F Ali, Yang Wang, and Yixin Zou. 2024. Cross-Country Examination of People's Experience with Targeted Advertising on Social Media. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI EA '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 91, 10 pages. doi:10.1145/3613905.3650780
- [44] Michal Kosinski, David Stillwell, and Thore Graepel. 2013. Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 15 (2013), 5802–5805. arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1218772110> doi:10.1073/pnas.1218772110
- [45] Anja Lambrecht and Catherine Tucker. 2019. Algorithmic bias? An empirical study of apparent gender-based discrimination in the display of STEM career ads. *Management science* 65, 7 (2019), 2966–2981.
- [46] Tianshi Li, Sauvik Das, Hao-Ping (Hank) Lee, Dakuo Wang, Bingsheng Yao, and Zhiping Zhang. 2024. Human-Centered Privacy Research in the Age of Large Language Models. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI EA '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 581, 4 pages. doi:10.1145/3613905.3643983
- [47] Rongjun Ma, Caterina Maidhof, Juan Carlos Carrillo, Janne Lindqvist, and Jose Such. 2025. Privacy Perceptions of Custom GPTs by Users and Creators. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (*CHI '25*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 237, 18 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713540
- [48] Ying Ma, Shiquan Zhang, Dongju Yang, Zhanna Sarsenbayeva, Jarrod Knibbe, and Jorge Goncalves. 2025. Raising Awareness of Location Information Vulnerabilities in Social Media Photos using LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (*CHI '25*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 238, 14 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3714074
- [49] Adamo Mariani, Matteo Liberato, Anna Sperotto, and Antonia Affinito. 2024. Analyzing Privacy Implications of Mobile Apps Data Collection across Age Groups. In *2024 20th International Conference on Network and Service Management (CNSM)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [50] Nora Mcdonald, John S. Seberger, and Afsaneh Razi. 2024. For Me or Not for Me? The Ease With Which Teens Navigate Accurate and Inaccurate Personalized Social Media Content. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 904, 7 pages. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642297
- [51] Elyas Meguellati, Lei Han, Abraham Bernstein, Shazia Sadiq, and Gianluca Demartini. 2024. How Good are LLMs in Generating Personalized Advertisements?. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024* (Singapore, Singapore) (*WWW '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 826–829. <https://doi-org.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/10.1145/3589335.3651520>
- [52] Milad Mirbabaie, Felix Brünker, Magdalena Wischnewski, and Judith Meinert. 2021. The Development of Connective Action during Social Movements on Social Media. *Trans. Soc. Comput.* 4, 1, Article 3 (April 2021), 21 pages. doi:10.1145/3446981
- [53] Asmit Nayak, Rishabh Khandelwal, Earlene Fernandes, and Kassem Fawaz. 2024. Experimental Security Analysis of Sensitive Data Access by Browser Extensions. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024* (Singapore, Singapore) (*WWW '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1283–1294. doi:10.1145/3589334.3645683
- [54] OpenAI. 2024. Memory and new controls for ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/index/memory-and-new-controls-for-chatgpt/>.
- [55] OpenAI. 2025. *GPT-5 System Card*. Technical Report. OpenAI.
- [56] Junwei Pan, Zhilin Zhang, Han Zhu, Jian Xu, Jie Jiang, and Bo Zheng. 2025. Computational Advertising: Recent Advances (*WWW '25*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 37–40. doi:10.1145/3701716.3715872
- [57] Saurabh Panjwani, Nisheeth Shrivastava, Saurabh Shukla, and Sharad Jaiswal. 2013. Understanding the privacy-personalization dilemma for web search: a user perspective. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Paris, France) (*CHI '13*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3427–3430. doi:10.1145/2470654.2466470
- [58] Emilee Rader. 2014. Awareness of behavioral tracking and information privacy concern in Facebook and Google. In *Proceedings of the Tenth USENIX Conference on Usable Privacy and Security* (Menlo Park, CA) (*SOUPS '14*). USENIX Association, USA, 51–67.
- [59] Filip Radlinski, Krisztian Balog, Fernando Diaz, Lucas Dixon, and Ben Wedin. 2022. On natural language user profiles for transparent and scrutable recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 2863–2874.
- [60] Jerome Ramos, Hossein A. Rahmani, Xi Wang, Xiao Fu, and Aldo Lipani. 2024. Transparent and Scrutable Recommendations Using Natural Language User Profiles. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 13971–13984. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.753
- [61] Nathan Reitinger, Bruce Wen, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Blase Ur. 2024. What Does It Mean to Be Creepy? Responses to Visualizations of Personal Browsing Activity, Online Tracking, and Targeted Ads. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.* 2024, 3 (2024), 715–743. <https://doi.org/10.56553/popets-2024-0101>
- [62] Xubin Ren, Wei Wei, Lianghao Xia, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Junfeng Wang, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024. Representation learning with large language models for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*. 3464–3475.
- [63] Piotr Sapiezynski, Levi Kaplan, Alan Misllove, and Aleksandra Korolova. 2024. On the Use of Proxies in Political Ad Targeting. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 8, CSCW2, Article 378 (Nov. 2024), 31 pages. doi:10.1145/3686917
- [64] Dolière Francis Somé. 2019. EmPoWeb: empowering web applications with browser extensions. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 227–245.
- [65] Qirong Song, Yanlai Wu, Rie Helene (Lindy) Hernandez, Yao Li, Yubo Kou, and Xinning Gui. 2025. Understanding Users' Perception of Personally Identifiable Information. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (*CHI '25*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 240, 24 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713783
- [66] Zhaoxuan Tan and Meng Jiang. 2023. User modeling in the era of large language models: Current research and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11518* (2023).
- [67] Aditya Srinivas Timmaraju, Mehdi Mashayekhi, Mingliang Chen, Qi Zeng, Quintin Fettes, Wesley Cheung, Yihan Xiao, Manojkumar Rangasamy Kanadasan, Pushkar Tripathi, Sean Gahagan, et al. 2023. Towards fairness in personalized ads using impression variance aware reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4937–4947.
- [68] Miranda Wei, Madison Stamos, Sophie Veys, Nathan Reitinger, Justin Goodman, Margot Herman, Dorota Filipczuk, Ben Weinschel, Michelle L Mazurek, and Blase Ur. 2020. What Twitter knows: Characterizing ad targeting practices, user perceptions, and ad explanations through users' own Twitter data. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. 145–162.
- [69] Wilson Wongso, Hao Xue, and Flora Salim. 2025. GenUP: Generative User Profilers as In-Context Learners for Next POI Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems* (Minneapolis, MN, USA) (*SIGSPATIAL '25*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- [70] Yuxi Wu, Sydney Bice, W. Keith Edwards, and Sauvik Das. 2023. The Slow Violence of Surveillance Capitalism: How Online Behavioral Advertising Harms

- People. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Chicago, IL, USA) (FAccT '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1826–1837. doi:10.1145/3593013.3594119
- [71] Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Xiaoling Cai, Hong Zhu, Jieming Zhu, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2024. Towards open-world recommendation with knowledge augmentation from large language models. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 12–22.
- [72] Qinge Xie, Manoj Vignesh Kasi Murali, Paul Pearce, and Frank Li. 2024. Arcanum: Detecting and evaluating the privacy risks of browser extensions on web pages and web content. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 4607–4624.
- [73] Yaxing Yao, Davide Lo Re, and Yang Wang. 2017. Folk Models of Online Behavioral Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (Portland, Oregon, USA) (CSCW '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1957–1969. doi:10.1145/2998181.2998316
- [74] Christina Yeung, Umar Iqbal, Yekaterina Tsipenyuk O’Neil, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Franziska Roesner. 2023. Online Advertising in Ukraine and Russia During the 2022 Russian Invasion. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023* (Austin, TX, USA) (WWW '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2787–2796. doi:10.1145/3543507.3583484
- [75] Eric Zeng, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Franziska Roesner. 2021. What Makes a “Bad” Ad? User Perceptions of Problematic Online Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 361, 24 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445459
- [76] Eric Zeng, Miranda Wei, Theo Gregersen, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Franziska Roesner. 2021. Polls, clickbait, and commemorative \$2 bills: problematic political advertising on news and media websites around the 2020 U.S. elections. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Internet Measurement Conference* (Virtual Event) (IMC '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 507–525. doi:10.1145/3487552.3487850
- [77] Eric Zeng, Xiaoyuan Wu, Emily N Ertmann, Lily Huang, Danielle F Johnson, Anusha T Mehendale, Brandon T Tang, Karolina Zhukoff, Michael Adjei-Poku, Lujo Bauer, et al. 2025. Measuring Risks to Users’ Health Privacy Posed by Third-Party Web Tracking and Targeted Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–26.
- [78] Zhehao Zhang, Ryan A. Rossi, Branislav Kveton, Yijia Shao, Diyi Yang, Hamed Zamani, Franck Démoncourt, Joe Barrow, Tong Yu, Sungchul Kim, Ruiyi Zhang, Jiuxiang Gu, Tyler Derr, Hongjie Chen, Junda Wu, Xiang Chen, Zichao Wang, Subrata Mitra, Nedim Lipka, Nesreen K. Ahmed, and Yu Wang. 2025. Personalization of Large Language Models: A Survey. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2025).
- [79] Joyce Zhou, Yijia Dai, and Thorsten Joachims. 2024. Language-based user profiles for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15623* (2024).

A Statistics

(a) Population by Gender.		
Gender	Count	%
Male	12,545,154	49.35%
Female	12,877,635	50.65%
Total	25,422,788	100.00%

(b) Population by Income Bracket.		
Income Bracket	Count	%
\$1 – \$15,999	1,684,882	8.11%
\$15,600 – \$20,799	1,573,591	7.57%
\$20,800 – \$25,999	1,581,612	7.61%
\$26,000 – \$33,799	1,511,161	7.27%
\$33,800 – \$41,599	1,438,946	6.92%
\$41,600 – \$51,999	1,680,601	8.09%
\$52,000 – \$64,999	1,866,801	8.98%
\$65,000 – \$77,999	1,402,866	6.75%
\$78,000 – \$90,999	1,229,022	5.91%
\$91,000 – \$103,999	908,597	4.37%
\$104,000 – \$155,999	1,575,071	7.58%
\$156,000 or more	1,029,095	4.95%
Negative/Nil income	1,816,383	8.74%
Not stated	1,486,213	7.15%
Total	20,784,841	100.00%

(c) Population by Employment Status.		
Employment Status	Count	%
Employed full time	8,904,947	65.00%
Employed part time	4,081,992	29.80%
Unemployed	703,685	5.10%
Total Labour Force	13,690,624	100.00%

(d) Population by Education Level.		
Education Level	Count	%
Postgraduate degree	1,855,376	8.93%
Bachelor degree	3,609,254	17.37%
No degree	15,316,207	73.70%
Total	20,780,837	100.00%

(e) Population by Age Range.		
Age Range	Count	%
18 – 24	2,162,707	8.51%
25 – 34	3,624,762	14.26%
35 – 44	3,487,662	13.72%
45 – 54	3,246,891	12.77%
55 – 64	3,010,018	11.84%
65 – 74	2,459,238	9.67%
75 and over	1,918,854	7.55%
Other	5,512,657	21.68%
Total	25,422,789	100.00%

(f) Surveyed Political partisanship.		
Party Preference	Count	Percentage
Labor	-	28%
Liberal	-	30%
Greens	-	10%
None	-	24%
Other	-	8%
Total Surveyed	-	2,508

Table 11: Demographic Distribution from the 2021 Australian Census and the 2022 Australian Federal Election Study.

B Analysis Visualizations

When Ads Become Profiles: Large-Scale Audit of Algorithmic Biases and LLM Profiling Risks




Figure 5: Single-variable exclusion analysis of *Education* and *Careers* ads: coverage (probability of seeing ≥ 1 ad within a 7-day window among active users) and average intensity (ads per active user).





Figure 6: Single-variable inappropriate targeting analysis of *Gambling* ads: coverage (probability of seeing ≥ 1 ad within a 7-day window among active users) and average intensity (ads per active user).

When Ads Become Profiles: Large-Scale Audit of Algorithmic Biases and LLM Profiling Risks






Figure 8: Single-variable inappropriate targeting analysis of Alcohol ads: coverage (probability of seeing ≥ 1 ad within a 7-day window among active users) and average intensity (ads per active user).

C Parameters of Models

In the multimodal understanding stage, we used Gemini 2.0 Flash ¹ with a temperature of 0.3 to allow a small degree of creativity needed for fluent yet faithful captions, while constraining outputs to a structured JSON format. For the reconstruction stages (session- and user-level), we set temperature to 0.0 to maximize determinism and reproducibility. When employing a thinking model, we used Gemini 2.5 Pro ² with the default dynamic-thinking configuration enabled (thinking budget = -1). For GPT-5 ³ and GPT-5 mini ⁴, we retained the default reasoning effort setting (“medium”). All other non-thinking models followed the same configuration as Gemini 2.0 Flash in the reconstruction stage (i.e., temperature set to 0.0).

D Gemini Quality Evaluation

Dimension / Metric	Value (%)
Caption Overall	99
Caption Relevance	100
Caption Correctness	99
Caption Informativeness	100
Descriptive Category Accuracy	99
IAB Tier 1 Category Accuracy	97
Key Entities Accuracy	99

Table 12: Evaluation of Gemini caption quality with breakdown by sub-dimensions.

To ensure the reliability of Gemini’s structured outputs from the multimodal understanding stage, we conducted a systematic human evaluation across multiple dimensions of caption and metadata quality (Table 12). Three human annotators were involved in the process. Two annotators independently evaluated a set of 100 advertisements generated by Gemini. Each output was judged against the original advertisement image and text, assessing whether the generated caption, descriptive category, IAB Tier 1 category, and key entities accurately represented the ad content. To resolve cases of disagreement, a third annotator who had no stake or involvement in this work acted as an independent judge. For caption evaluation, given its natural language nature, we considered three sub-dimensions: *Relevance*, *Correctness*, and *Informativeness*. A caption was marked as *Overall correct* only if all three sub-dimensions were judged to be true. This adjudication procedure ensured that the evaluation results were consistent, unbiased, and suitable for supporting the accuracy of subsequent analyses and reconstruction tasks.

The evaluation results in Table 12 demonstrate that our multimodal understanding stage achieved consistently high accuracy across all assessed dimensions. In particular, captions were near-perfect, with an overall correctness of 99%. Likewise, the descriptive category, IAB Tier 1 classification, and key entity extraction all exhibited similarly strong performance. These findings indicate that

the structured outputs produced by Gemini 2.0 Flash are highly robust and reliable, providing a strong foundation for the subsequent analysis and session-level and user-level reconstruction stages.

E Example of Human-Gemini Disagreement

In Figure 9, we further illustrate how human annotators evaluated Gemini’s caption quality across multiple dimensions. While the model-generated caption successfully identifies the product (Tesla Powerwall), the context (residential solar energy use), and the intended audience (homeowners), the human annotator flagged a factual error. Specifically, the highlighted sentence incorrectly describes the woman in the advertisement as holding a white cloth for cleaning or maintenance, which was judged as inaccurate. This example demonstrates how human evaluation can accept the topical relevance and coverage of a caption while still rejecting specific erroneous details. Importantly, it also shows that occasional minor errors do not undermine the overall utility of the generated captions, highlighting the robustness of our evaluation framework.

¹<https://cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/models/gemini/2-0-flash>

²<https://cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/models/gemini/2-5-pro>

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-5>

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-5-mini>

Human–Gemini Disagreement



Ad Title ACT Rebate Finder

Ad Text We Need Homeowners Interested In Trying Solar Energy. Generate your own electricity – you may pay nothing for it. | Eligible participants must: | 1. Own a home... See more

Gemini Caption

The advertisement features a woman standing next to a Tesla Powerwall, a home battery system designed to store solar energy. The woman is holding a white cloth, possibly indicating cleaning or maintenance of the unit. The Powerwall is installed on an exterior brick wall, suggesting a residential setting. The slogan mentions the possibility of generating your own electricity and potentially paying nothing for it, which aligns with the purpose of the Tesla Powerwall to store solar energy for home use. The slogan also mentions homeowners interested in trying solar energy, which is the target audience for this advertisement.

Evaluate Caption (Yes/No for each dimension)

Q1. Does it describe the core target/subject of this advertisement (such as the brand, product, service, event, etc.)?

✓ Relevant (Yes) Not Relevant (No)

Q2. Does it contain no factual errors (such as getting the categories, brands, discounts, or themes wrong)?

Correct (Yes) ✓ Incorrect (No)

Q3. Does it cover the key elements?

✓ Informative (Yes) Not Informative (No)

Descriptive Category

Informative, Eco-friendly, Home improvement, Clean energy promotion

✓ Accurate (Yes) Inaccurate (No)

IAB Tier 1 Category

Home and Garden Services, Green/Eco, Real Estate

✓ Accurate (Yes) Inaccurate (No)

Key Entities

Tesla Powerwall, Solar energy, Home battery system, Homeowners, Electricity generation

✓ Accurate (Yes) Inaccurate (No)

Figure 9: Example of a Human–Gemini disagreement on caption quality. The image and ad metadata are shown above. Human evaluation accepts the caption’s topical relevance and coverage but flags a factual error (highlighted).

F Prompt Template

Prompt template for the multimodal understanding stage

{image(s)}
Analyze the given advertisement image and extract key elements that define the ad's message.

- Identify the **main product or service** being advertised.
- Recognize and describe **any visible brand names, logos, slogans, and textual content** in the image.
- Highlight the **visual composition** of the ad, including colors, artistic style, and notable imagery.
- Use the provided **marketing slogan as an additional reference** to align the advertisement description with its intended message.
- Extract **only concrete entities** (e.g., product name, brand name, key features) from the slogan if they are relevant to the image.
- If the slogan contains **specific product details or unique identifiers** (such as a brand name or material type), ensure they are naturally incorporated into the description.
- Do **not ignore** key entities from the slogan if they provide relevant information, but also do not directly quote the slogan.
- **DO NOT return an empty caption and empty key_entities_in_images_and_slogan. Always generate a description based on the best available information.**

The title of the advertisement(s) is: **{title}**.
The provided marketing slogan for the advertisement(s) is: **{upper_texts_str}**.
Ensure that key entities from the title and slogan(s) are considered when describing the advertisement, but do not forcefully include the title and slogan(s) if it is not relevant.

Then, based on the image and textual content (including the title and slogan(s)), select one or more categories from the provided IAB Tier 1 list to fill the `iab_category_tier_1` field.

Additionally, generate a set of **free-form descriptive labels** for the `descriptive_category` field. These should reflect the advertisement's overall **style, tone, or communication strategy**, such as how it visually presents itself, the emotional or rhetorical tone it uses, or the intent behind its messaging. These labels are **not tied to product or industry categories**, and should be inferred freely based on the ad's content, presentation, and message. Avoid using predefined taxonomies; instead, describe what kind of ad this feels like from a communication or stylistic point of view.

Figure 10: Prompt template for the multimodal understanding stage. Curly-braced placeholders indicate dynamic inputs: **{image(s)}** corresponds to the advertisement image(s), **{title}** corresponds to the advertisement title(s), and **{upper_texts_str}** corresponds to the provided marketing slogan(s).

Prompt template for session-level reconstruction

You are an expert marketing analyst.
Below is a list of advertisements shown to a user during a single browsing session. Each ad includes a short caption, its category, its style or communication strategy, and key entities from the ad content and slogans.

Your task is to:

1. Infer the likely demographic profile of the user based on the content, style, and key entities of the ads in this session.
2. Write a short summary (3–5 sentences) describing the types of ads shown to the user during this session. Include the main product categories, communication styles, and any notable patterns or trends in ad delivery behaviour, such as repeated themes, promotional strategies, or target market signals, which can be aggregated across multiple sessions for further analysis. This summary should neutrally describe the ad content and delivery patterns without inferring the user's demographics or preferences.

Ads in this session:

- {i}. Caption: "{caption}"
Category: {iab_category_tier_1}
Style: {descriptive_category}
Key Entities: {key_entities_in_images_and_slogan}

Figure 11: Prompt template for session-level reconstruction. Curly-braced placeholders indicate dynamic fields for each ad in a session: **{caption}** is the generated ad caption, **{iab_category_tier_1}** is the ad's industry category, **{descriptive_category}** is the free-form style/communication strategy, and **{key_entities_in_images_and_slogan}** are the extracted concrete entities.

Prompt template for user-level reconstruction

You are an expert marketing analyst.
 You will be given a series of summaries from a single user's browsing sessions, presented in chronological order. Each summary describes the types of ads shown to the user in that session.

Your task is to synthesize the information across ALL these session summaries to create a single, consolidated, and more accurate demographic profile for this user. Look for consistent themes (e.g., interest in technology, finance, family products), evolving interests, and overarching patterns. Do not simply average the sessions; create a holistic view.

Based on the totality of the evidence from all sessions, provide your final demographic assessment.

User's Session Summaries:
 Session {i} Summary: {summary}

Figure 12: Prompt template for user-level reconstruction. Curly-braced placeholders indicate dynamic fields: Session {i} Summary is the identifier for each browsing session, and {summary} is the generated textual description of the ads from that session. All session summaries are concatenated in chronological order to form the input for holistic user-level profiling.

Prompt template for user-level reconstruction with Australian context

You are an expert marketing analyst with deep knowledge of the Australian demographic landscape.
 The following summaries are from a single user located in Australia.

Your task is to create a consolidated demographic profile for this user by synthesizing all available information. When making your assessment, interpret all information within an Australian context. Pay close attention to:

- **Political Cues:** This is the most critical instruction. Your 'party preference' prediction **must be one of the following exact strings**: "Labor", "Greens", "Liberal", "National", "None", or "Other". To help you, remember the Australian context: the "Liberal" party is centre-right, "Labor" is centre-left, and the "Greens" are left-wing.
- **Economic Signals:** Interpret income levels and purchasing habits based on the Australian economy and currency (AUD).
- **Cultural References:** Be aware of Australian brands (e.g., Bunnings, Woolworths, Mecca), locations, and lifestyle patterns.

Synthesize all session data to form a holistic view of the user.

User's Session Summaries (in chronological order):
 Session {i} Summary: {summary}

Figure 13: Prompt template for user-level reconstruction with Australian context. Curly-braced placeholders indicate dynamic fields: Session {i} Summary is the identifier for each browsing session, and {summary} is the generated description of the ads from that session. This template additionally enforces Australian-specific interpretation rules, especially for party preference, economic signals, and cultural references.

Prompt template for user-level reconstruction for random control group

You are an expert marketing analyst.
You will be given a series of summaries from a single user's browsing sessions, presented in random order. Each summary describes the types of ads shown to the user in that session.

Your task is to synthesize the information across ALL these session summaries to create a single, consolidated, and more accurate demographic profile for this user. Look for consistent themes (e.g., interest in technology, finance, family products), evolving interests, and overarching patterns. Do not simply average the sessions; create a holistic view.

Based on the totality of the evidence from all sessions, provide your final demographic assessment.

User's Session Summaries:
Session {i} Summary: {summary}

Figure 14: Prompt template for user-level reconstruction for random control group. Curly-braced placeholders indicate dynamic fields: Session {i} Summary is the identifier for each browsing session, and {summary} is the generated description of the ads from that session. Unlike the chronological version, the session summaries here are presented in random order to serve as a control condition.