

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

# NEUROMARKETING AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE: FRONTIERS AND PERSPECTIVES

Yulduzkhon Abdullaeva

Researcher of the Tashkent State University of Economics

### Abstract

This article examines neuromarketing as an emerging interdisciplinary scientific field situated at the intersection of marketing, neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and behavioral economics. The study analyzes the epistemological foundations of neuromarketing, its methodological framework, and its transformation from an auxiliary analytical tool into an independent research paradigm. Particular attention is paid to the role of emotions, preconscious decision-making processes, and predictive cognitive mechanisms in consumer behavior. The paper discusses the methodological limitations of neural data interpretation and highlights the risks of neurodeterminism. Ethical challenges associated with the application of neuromarketing technologies are explored, emphasizing the need for neuroethical regulation and institutional accountability. The research argues that neuromarketing should be understood not as a reductionist biological model, but as a comprehensive framework integrating biological, cognitive, and social dimensions of human behavior. The future of the discipline is linked to its institutionalization, integration with artificial intelligence, and the development of responsible human-centered applications. Neuromarketing is ultimately presented as a key indicator of the transition toward an attention economy, where understanding human perception becomes a strategic resource.



## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

**Keywords:** Neuromarketing, consumer neuroscience, interdisciplinary science, cognitive decision-making, attention economy, neuroethics, behavioral economics, predictive processing, digital marketing, human behavior.

### Introduction

Modern marketing is undergoing a stage of radical transformation driven by the development of cognitive sciences, neurobiology, and digital technologies. Traditional methods of studying consumer behavior based on surveys and self-reports increasingly demonstrate their limitations: a significant portion of decision-making occurs at an unconscious level and cannot be directly verbalized. In this context, neuromarketing emerges as an interdisciplinary field that integrates marketing, neuropsychology, cognitive science, and behavioral economics.

Neuromarketing investigates the neurophysiological mechanisms of attention, emotion, and decision-making in a consumer context. It aims to identify hidden determinants of choice that extend beyond rational explanations. However, as the popularity of this field grows, debates intensify regarding its scientific boundaries, methodological validity, and ethical implications.

### Literature Review and Methodology

Contemporary neuromarketing research forms an interdisciplinary domain that unites marketing, neuroscience, and cognitive psychology. Lee, Broderick, and Chamberlain view neuromarketing as an extension of marketing methodologies through psychophysiological measurements, emphasizing the necessity of methodological rigor. Ariely and Berns highlight the dual nature of the discipline: high scientific potential combined with the risk of commercial exaggeration.

The works of Plassmann and colleagues demonstrate that marketing stimuli can modulate neural representations of value and pleasure; however, the interpretation of neural data requires consideration of cultural and behavioral

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

contexts. Hubert and Kenning position neuromarketing within the broader framework of consumer neuroscience. The cognitive perspective relies on Kahneman's theory of bounded rationality, which confirms the primacy of emotional and intuitive processes in decision-making.

Overall, the literature indicates a transition from descriptive marketing toward a neurocognitive model of the consumer and stresses the need for a comprehensive methodology integrating biological and social analysis.

The present study is theoretical-analytical in nature and grounded in an interdisciplinary approach. It employs systematic and comparative analysis of scientific sources, conceptual interpretation of key categories, and philosophical reflection on the boundaries of the discipline. Such a methodological framework enables neuromarketing to be examined as an emerging scientific paradigm situated at the intersection of cognitive and social sciences.

### Results and Discussion

Contemporary neuromarketing research confirms that this field is no longer merely an auxiliary analytical tool but is gradually establishing itself as an independent interdisciplinary scientific paradigm. Its development reflects a broader epistemological shift in the humanities and social sciences—from describing declared behavior to analyzing preconscious mechanisms of perception and decision-making [1]. While traditional marketing relied primarily on verbal data and rational models of choice, neuromarketing works with biometric, neurophysiological, and behavioral indicators that reveal the hidden architecture of human decision-making.

A key finding of modern neuromarketing studies is the reconsideration of the role of emotions in economic behavior. Experimental evidence shows that emotional activation precedes rational evaluation and often determines the direction of subsequent analysis. The brain is not a neutral computational mechanism; it functions as an integrative system in which emotions act as a filter for interpreting

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

information [2]. In this sense, neuromarketing supports the conclusions of behavioral economics: the consumer is not a rational optimizer but a bounded agent operating under cognitive load and emotional uncertainty.

Particular attention should be paid to predictive information processing. Contemporary neuroscience views the brain as a system that continuously generates hypotheses about the future based on past experience. Advertising messages are embedded in pre-existing cognitive schemas, and their effectiveness depends on activating familiar neural patterns. Successful marketing therefore operates less through novelty and more through managing expectations and associative memory structures [3]. Neuromarketing thus converges with symbolic interactionism and cultural semiotics, where meaning is constructed through networks of social and cognitive relations.

Eye-tracking and biometric data reveal that attention is a strategic resource in the digital economy. The modern media environment is characterized by stimulus overload, and competition for attention has become a central arena of economic struggle. In this context, neuromarketing functions as a science of cognitive load management. It enables the design of visual architectures that minimize attentional dispersion while enhancing emotional engagement. Marketing practice consequently shifts toward neurocognitive design, where aesthetics is governed by perceptual laws.

At the same time, the expansion of neuromarketing capabilities exposes methodological limitations. Neural data are highly complex and require interpretation within behavioral and cultural frameworks. Isolated measurements of brain activity cannot fully explain motivation [4]. Consumer behavior emerges at the intersection of biology, culture, and social experience. Neuromarketing must therefore be regarded as part of a comprehensive research model rather than a universal explanatory tool.

Critical discussion of the discipline involves the problem of neurodeterminism – the tendency to explain complex social phenomena solely through

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

neurophysiology. Such reductionism ignores symbolic, cultural, and historical dimensions of human behavior. The strength of neuromarketing lies in synthesis, not reduction; it must maintain balance between biological and social analysis. Integration with artificial intelligence marks a new stage of development. Machine learning enables the processing of large volumes of neural data and detection of hidden behavioral patterns [5]. This opens the possibility of adaptive marketing systems that respond to users' emotional states in real time, transforming communication from mass-oriented to individualized. However, technological feasibility does not equal social legitimacy. This raises a fundamental ethical question: where is the boundary between personalization and manipulation?

The neuroethical dimension of neuromarketing becomes central to scholarly debate. Access to preconscious decision mechanisms increases the responsibility of researchers and practitioners [6]. Marketing gains entry into psychological domains traditionally considered private. This requires the development of normative frameworks regulating acceptable forms of influence. The scientific maturity of the discipline depends not only on technological progress but also on its integration into systems of social accountability.

Philosophically, neuromarketing reflects a transformation in the image of the human subject in modern science. The classical rational actor gives way to a neurocognitive subject whose decisions arise from the interaction of emotion, memory, and embodied processes [7; 8]. Marketing thus approaches anthropology and philosophy of mind, becoming a laboratory for studying human perception rather than merely an applied science of sales.

The future of the discipline is tied to institutionalization: standardization of experimental methodology, educational programs, interdisciplinary laboratories, and ethical committees are required. Without institutional foundations, neuromarketing risks remaining a commercial trend rather than a stable scientific

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

field. Its future depends on combining empirical rigor with humanistic responsibility.

Ultimately, neuromarketing can be interpreted as a symptom of a broader cultural transformation—the shift toward an attention economy in which understanding human psychology becomes a strategic resource. It reveals the potential for a new synthesis of human sciences and communication technologies. However, such synthesis demands philosophical oversight to prevent scientific knowledge from becoming an instrument of uncontrolled influence.

### Conclusion

Neuromarketing is emerging as a significant interdisciplinary field reflecting profound changes in understanding human behavior in the digital economy. Its development signals a shift from descriptive marketing models to neurocognitive analysis focused on preconscious mechanisms of perception and decision-making. Neuromarketing expands the empirical boundaries of marketing research by integrating neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and behavioral economics.

At the same time, neuromarketing is not a universal explanatory framework. Its effectiveness depends on integration with traditional social science methods [9]. Human behavior cannot be reduced to neurophysiology alone; it is shaped by culture, social norms, and personal experience. The scientific value of neuromarketing lies in constructing a comprehensive analytical framework that unites biological, cognitive, and social dimensions [10].

Ethical considerations are central to the discipline's future. Access to preconscious decision mechanisms heightens the responsibility of researchers and practitioners. Neuromarketing's sustainability depends on the development of neuroethical standards and institutional regulation. Only within a humanistic framework can it serve as a tool of responsible development rather than manipulation.

## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

The future of neuromarketing rests on its integration with digital infrastructures, collaboration with artificial intelligence, and the creation of personalized communication models. Scientific maturity requires institutionalization: standardized methodologies, educational development, and interdisciplinary research structures.

Neuromarketing thus stands at the intersection of brain science and human science. Its potential lies in deepening understanding of human choice, while its future depends on maintaining balance between technological progress and humanistic responsibility. This balance represents both the main challenge and the principal promise of neuromarketing as a science of the 21st century.

### References

1. Ariely, D., & Berns, G. S. (2010). Neuromarketing: the hope and hype of neuroimaging in business. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(4), 284–292.
2. Plassmann, H., Ramsøy, T. Z., & Milosavljevic, M. (2012). Branding the brain: A critical review and outlook. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(1), 18–36.
3. Hubert, M., & Kenning, P. (2008). A current overview of consumer neuroscience. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 7(4–5), 272–292.
4. Morin, C. (2011). Neuromarketing: The new science of consumer behavior. *Society*, 48(2), 131–135.
5. Lee, N., Broderick, A. J., & Chamberlain, L. (2007). What is “neuromarketing”? A discussion and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 63(2), 199–204.
6. Plassmann, H., Venkatraman, V., Huettel, S., & Yoon, C. (2015). Consumer neuroscience: Applications, challenges, and possible solutions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(4), 427–435.
7. Kenning, P., & Plassmann, H. (2008). Neuroeconomics: An overview from an economic perspective. *Brain Research Bulletin*, 67(5), 343–354.



## Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

8. Ramsøy, T. Z. (2019). Introduction to Neuromarketing and Consumer Neuroscience. Neurons Inc. / Copenhagen Business School Press.
9. Lindstrom, M. (2008). Buyology: Truth and Lies About Why We Buy. Crown Business.
10. Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.