CRM

Will AI Replace Human Customer Relationship Managers? Advantages and Ethical Implications

Reetha Dinesh

Department of Management, IIBM, Chennai, India

Published November 2026

Abstract

The growing use of autonomous artificial intelligence (AI) agents in customer-facing operations raises a practical question for customer relationship management (CRM): can systems designed to automate interactions take over the work traditionally performed by human relationship managers? This conceptual paper examines that question by bringing together research on AI-enabled marketing, automated service agents, customer trust and ethical human–technology interaction. The analysis distinguishes the completion of individual service tasks from the broader responsibility of sustaining customer relationships. The literature indicates that AI can handle many predictable, information-intensive activities, including responding to standard enquiries, retrieving account information and supporting routine transactions. Yet efficiency in these settings should not be interpreted as evidence that automated agents can consistently manage ambiguity, emotional strain, exceptions or consequential decisions. The paper develops a framework based on three assessment dimensions: operational suitability, relational suitability and ethical acceptability. These dimensions inform three possible service arrangements: AI substitution for bounded tasks, AI augmentation of employee work, and human-led handling of complex or sensitive encounters. Six propositions are advanced for empirical investigation. The paper argues that the future of CRM is more likely to involve a redistribution of responsibilities than the wholesale elimination of human relationship managers. Its contribution is to connect task performance with relationship quality and responsible governance when organizations decide how much authority to delegate to AI.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; autonomous agents; customer relationship management; customer trust; human–AI collaboration

1 Introduction

Customer relationship management (CRM) is often associated with databases, sales records and service platforms. Those systems matter, but they do not capture the full nature of relationship work. Employees also interpret what customers mean, recognize when a standard answer is inadequate, negotiate solutions and maintain confidence after a service failure. Digital platforms have made customer information easier to retrieve and share. More recently, advances in artificial intelligence have enabled systems to classify requests, generate responses, recommend actions and, in some environments, execute sequences of tasks with limited human direction. These developments have moved the automation debate from simple chatbots towards agents that may exercise a degree of operational autonomy.

The central issue is not whether AI can communicate with customers. It is whether the technology can assume the responsibilities involved in managing an ongoing relationship. A request for a delivery update is relatively bounded: the system can retrieve a status and communicate it. A

complaint about repeated delivery failures is different. Resolving it may require the employee to consider the customer's history, identify the source of dissatisfaction, interpret circumstances that fall outside standard rules and decide what remedy is appropriate. The two interactions may occur through the same CRM channel, but they place different demands on judgement and accountability.

Research on automated agents suggests that comparisons with human service should be interpreted in relation to the task and outcome being assessed. Gelbrich et al. [1] synthesize evidence on customer responses to robots, chatbots and algorithms, while Huang et al. [2] examine the role of trust in chatbot-based service. Ethical questions surrounding customer–robot interactions have also received attention [3]. Taken together, this work cautions against treating automation as a single, uniform intervention. An agent that performs well in one service context may be unsuitable in another.

This paper addresses three questions: which CRM activities are suitable for autonomous AI; under what conditions does human involvement remain important to customer trust and relationship quality; and what ethical safeguards should govern the delegation of customer-facing decisions? The paper makes a conceptual contribution by integrating operational, relational and ethical considerations into one decision framework. It does not report primary data or claim to test causal relationships. Instead, it develops propositions that can guide subsequent empirical work.

2 Literature review

2.1 AI-enabled CRM and the allocation of work

AI has several distinct roles in marketing and customer service. Huang and Rust [4] distinguish forms of AI associated with mechanical, analytical and more human-oriented capabilities. This classification is useful for CRM because customer-facing work varies considerably in its demands. Repetitive processing can often be specified through rules; analytical tasks may involve detecting patterns in customer records; and interactions requiring sensitivity to emotion or social context are more difficult to standardize. The relevant managerial question is therefore not simply whether an organization possesses advanced AI, but whether a particular capability is appropriate for a particular task.

AI can support customer segmentation, lead prioritization, churn-risk identification, recommendation, enquiry classification and the retrieval of customer histories. Davenport et al. [5] describe the wider implications of AI for marketing analysis, targeting and interaction. In CRM operations, these applications may reduce the time employees spend searching for information and allow more attention to be directed towards cases requiring interpretation. Their usefulness, however, depends on data quality, the relevance of model outputs and the extent to which employees can challenge recommendations that appear inconsistent with the customer's circumstances.

A further distinction concerns the level of authority delegated to the system. A tool that proposes a response for an employee to review is not equivalent to an agent authorized to issue a refund, alter an account or refuse a request. The latter has a more direct effect on customer interests. As delegated authority expands, organizations need stronger controls over the actions an agent may take, the situations requiring approval and the routes through which customers can seek review.

2.2 Automated agents and human service

The evidence comparing automated and human agents does not support a universal ranking of one over the other. Gelbrich et al. [1] examine customer responses across different automated-agent

forms and service outcomes. The significance of this work is its attention to variation: the effect of automation depends on what the system is asked to do and how the customer evaluates the encounter. Results from a text chatbot should not automatically be generalized to voice assistants, recommendation algorithms or physical service robots.

Task completion is also an incomplete measure of relationship quality. A customer may receive accurate information but still regard the interaction as dismissive, difficult to navigate or insufficiently responsive to the underlying problem. CRM assessment should consequently extend beyond speed and completion rates. Customer effort, perceived fairness, confidence in the answer, repeat contact and the quality of service recovery are also relevant. Wirtz et al. [6] show why the introduction of service robots changes frontline service design, not merely the technology used to deliver it.

2.3 Trust, satisfaction and acceptance

Trust is important because customers cannot ordinarily inspect how an AI agent interprets their request, selects information or produces a recommendation. Their willingness to rely on the system may be shaped by prior experiences, general attitudes towards automation and the conduct of the current interaction. Huang et al. [2] investigate different dimensions of trust in chatbot service and report that a configuration combining chatbot interaction with limited human intervention can achieve outcomes comparable to human service on many measures in their research setting. This finding is relevant, but it should not be treated as proof that every customer or service context will respond in the same way.

Human access can matter most when the automated channel reaches the limits of its competence. Customers may accept AI for a routine enquiry yet request a person when the issue remains unresolved, the response is uncertain or the consequences are substantial. An escalation option is meaningful only if it is visible, timely and supported by an effective transfer of context. Requiring customers to repeat their history after escalation can undermine the very convenience that automation was intended to provide.

The experience of using AI also shapes customer responses. Puntoni et al. [7] argue that consumer reactions should be understood through the way AI affects the service experience, rather than through technical performance alone. Personalization may be useful when it anticipates a genuine need. The same practice may feel intrusive when customers do not understand what information has been used or cannot exercise meaningful control over it.

2.4 Human judgement and service recovery

Human relationship managers remain relevant where customer needs are unclear, emotionally charged or poorly served by standard procedures. Employees can ask clarifying questions, recognize frustration, interpret a sequence of events and exercise discretion within organizational policy. These capabilities are particularly important in service recovery. A dissatisfied customer may want not only a correction but also an acknowledgement that the organization understands the inconvenience or loss caused. A technically correct scripted response can fail if it ignores that dimension of the encounter.

This does not mean that human service is invariably superior. Employees can be inconsistent, unavailable or constrained by rigid procedures. The argument is narrower: some service situations

require contextual interpretation and accountable discretion, and organizations should not remove human involvement merely because a system can generate a plausible response.

2.5 Ethical questions in autonomous customer interaction

Ethical risks can arise throughout the CRM process: when customer information is collected, when profiles or predictions are generated, when recommendations are made and when an automated action is executed. Customers may not know which information informs a decision, whether sensitive attributes have been inferred or how long records are retained. Poor-quality or unrepresentative data can also produce unequal outcomes. When a decision is difficult to explain, customers may have little practical opportunity to challenge it.

Stock-Homburg and Kegel [3] identify ethical concerns in customer–robot service interactions and point to the need for further work in this area. For CRM, the relevant principles include transparency, privacy, fairness, autonomy and accountability. These are not separate from service quality. They influence whether customers consider the organization's use of AI acceptable and whether they believe that the organization will take responsibility when the system causes harm.

The degree of autonomy affects the level of risk. An AI assistant that drafts a message can be checked before the message is sent. An agent that independently changes a contract or rejects a claim can affect a customer's financial or contractual position. Such uses call for clearly bounded permissions, records of automated actions, monitoring for unequal outcomes and a practical route to human review.

3 Conceptual framework and propositions

The proposed framework evaluates the suitability of AI in CRM through three connected dimensions. Operational suitability concerns the extent to which a task is repeatable, predictable, rules-based and measurable. Relational suitability considers the need for empathy, contextual interpretation, negotiation, discretion and continuity. Ethical acceptability examines whether the use of customer information and the resulting decisions are fair, transparent, proportionate and open to challenge. A task may be technically feasible to automate yet remain inappropriate for full delegation if it is emotionally sensitive, consequential or dependent on data customers would not reasonably expect the organization to use.

The three dimensions inform different service configurations. AI substitution is appropriate when a task is bounded, low in consequence and supported by reliable rules and information. AI augmentation is preferable when the system can retrieve information, summarize interactions or generate recommendations while an employee retains responsibility for judgement. Human-led service is warranted when ambiguity, emotional intensity, customer vulnerability or the potential impact of an error makes autonomous handling unsuitable. These configurations should be reviewed as system capability, organizational controls and customer expectations evolve.

The framework leads to six propositions for future empirical testing:

P1: The suitability of autonomous AI for CRM tasks increases as task standardization and predictability increase.

P2: The positive association between AI-enabled service efficiency and customer satisfaction is stronger when customers perceive the interaction as trustworthy and transparent.

P3: The availability of effective human intervention strengthens the relationship between AI-enabled service and customer relationship quality, particularly for complex or unresolved requests.

P4: Perceived service complexity has a stronger negative association with acceptance of autonomous AI when access to human assistance is limited.

P5: Perceived ethical governance, including privacy protection, fairness and accountability, is positively associated with customer trust in AI-enabled CRM.

P6: The relationship between AI personalization and customer loyalty depends on whether customers regard the personalization as useful rather than intrusive.

The propositions emphasize that AI capability alone is unlikely to determine CRM outcomes. Task characteristics, customer perceptions, access to human support and governance arrangements are expected to shape the consequences of automation.

4 Research methodology

4.1 Research design

The paper adopts a conceptual research design supported by an integrative review of published scholarship. No survey, interview or experiment was conducted, and the propositions have not been statistically tested. A conceptual approach is appropriate for the present purpose because the question spans marketing, service management, information systems, consumer behaviour and business ethics. The analysis seeks to connect relevant arguments across these areas and use the resulting synthesis to develop a framework for CRM decision-making.

4.2 Review approach and analytical procedure

The review draws on research concerning AI in marketing, frontline service automation, automated agents, chatbot trust, consumer experiences with AI and ethical customer–robot interaction. Recent contributions were considered alongside earlier studies that provide a theoretical foundation. The focal works include the studies by Gelbrich et al. [1], Huang et al. [2] and Stock-Homburg and Kegel [3], together with contributions by Huang and Rust [4], Davenport et al. [5], Wirtz et al. [6] and Puntoni et al. [7].

The literature was considered in relation to four questions: which customer-facing tasks are amenable to automation; how customers evaluate automated service; where human involvement contributes to relationship quality; and what risks arise when AI uses customer data or takes action on an organization's behalf. The analysis compared the selected work across operational performance, trust and satisfaction, relational capabilities and ethical governance. These themes informed the three dimensions of the proposed framework. The review is integrative and focused rather than systematic; it does not claim exhaustive coverage or a formal risk-of-bias assessment.

4.3 Ethical considerations

The study uses published scholarly material and did not recruit participants, collect personal data or intervene in organizational settings. Participant consent and institutional approval were therefore not applicable to this conceptual paper. All source-derived arguments should remain attributed to the relevant publications.

5 Results and discussion

The synthesis points to four connected conclusions. First, AI can substitute for selected tasks, but this does not establish that it can assume the full relationship-management role. Second, human–AI collaboration offers a practical way to distribute work according to task demands. Third, customer trust depends on the conduct and governance of the service process, not simply on a conversational interface. Fourth, ethical safeguards influence whether automated service is acceptable and sustainable.

5.1 AI as a substitute for bounded tasks

AI is a plausible substitute for activities with clear inputs and verifiable outputs. Examples include answering standard questions, retrieving account details, arranging appointments, classifying enquiries and providing product information from an authoritative knowledge base. When these tasks are automated reliably, customers may receive faster responses and employees may have more time for cases that require attention. The comparative evidence reviewed by Gelbrich et al. [1] indicates that automated agents can produce customer outcomes comparable to human agents in some circumstances.

The broader relationship role is less readily reduced to transactions. It involves remembering the context of earlier interactions, responding when policy does not fit the customer's situation and restoring confidence after a failure. An organization that evaluates automation only through cost per contact or response time may overlook these responsibilities. The appropriate unit of analysis is therefore the task, together with its consequences, rather than the job title in isolation.

5.2 Human–AI collaboration and service design

A hybrid service model can allocate predictable work to AI while reserving employee involvement for exceptions, unresolved cases and interactions requiring interpretation. The findings discussed by Huang et al. [2] provide support for considering such arrangements, although their results should be interpreted within the conditions of their studies. Hybrid service should not be treated as a simple fallback. It requires deliberate design: the system must recognize when it has reached a limit, transfer the relevant interaction history and allow the employee to take ownership of the case.

5.3 Trust and service conduct

A natural-sounding interface is not sufficient to establish trust. Customers need information that is accurate, appropriately qualified and consistent with the organization's actual policies. Where an agent is uncertain, it should communicate that uncertainty rather than invent an answer. It should not suggest that a person has reviewed a case when no such review has occurred. Trust is shaped by the organization's handling of data, the clarity of explanations and the quality of its response when automation fails.

5.4 Ethical governance and legitimacy

Organizations should make clear when customers are interacting with AI and provide an accessible route for questioning consequential decisions. Responsibility cannot be transferred to the software provider or the automated agent: the organization deploying the system remains responsible for the service it offers. Employees also need the authority and training to correct AI-generated errors rather than being expected to defend them. Monitoring should include recurring complaints, escalation

outcomes, error patterns, customer effort and differences in service quality across customer groups, in addition to speed and cost.

5.5 Theoretical implications

The framework contributes to CRM discussion by distinguishing operational suitability, relational suitability and ethical acceptability. This distinction explains why a system may perform a task efficiently without being an appropriate substitute for the employee responsible for the wider customer relationship. It also places customer autonomy and organizational accountability alongside the more familiar criteria of speed, cost and accuracy. The framework shifts the debate from a general contest between people and machines towards the allocation of responsibility within a service system.

5.6 Managerial implications

Managers should begin with a task-level review before deciding which CRM activities to automate. Relevant considerations include repetition, ambiguity, emotional intensity, consequence, reversibility and data sensitivity. Routine tasks may be delegated when system performance is dependable and customers retain access to assistance. AI is better used as an employee aid when it improves information access or prepares recommendations for review. Human-led handling should remain available for complaints, vulnerable customers, complex negotiations and high-impact decisions.

Workforce planning should reflect the changing composition of CRM work. Employees may spend less time retrieving information and more time supervising automated outputs, resolving exceptions and repairing relationships. Training should therefore combine CRM expertise with AI literacy, data ethics, critical evaluation and communication. Frontline employees should also be involved in system design because their experience can reveal recurring customer difficulties and weaknesses in automated processes.

6 Conclusion and implications

The literature considered in this paper does not justify a general prediction that autonomous AI will replace human customer relationship managers. AI can perform many routine and information-intensive activities at scale, but the ability to complete such tasks does not demonstrate an equivalent capacity to interpret complex circumstances, exercise discretion or take responsibility for consequential decisions. The likely direction is a redistribution of CRM work rather than the disappearance of the human role.

The proposed framework offers a way to make that allocation more carefully. AI substitution is most defensible for bounded tasks; augmentation is appropriate when AI improves employee access to information or decision support; and human-led service remains important where judgement, empathy, accountability or the consequences of error require direct involvement. This position does not assume that human service is always more effective. It recognizes instead that different encounters call for different capabilities and forms of responsibility.

For managers, the implication is to evaluate automation in relation to customer outcomes and the risks attached to delegated authority. Disclosure, privacy protection, fairness monitoring, escalation and employee training should be built into service design rather than added after problems emerge. Policymakers and regulators also have a role in clarifying accountability and routes to redress when automated agents act on behalf of organizations.

7 Limitations and future research

This paper is conceptual and its propositions remain untested. The literature synthesis is focused rather than exhaustive and was not conducted through a preregistered systematic-review protocol. The studies discussed cover different technologies, service settings and outcome measures; their findings should not be assumed to apply uniformly across industries or customer groups. These limitations mean that the framework should be treated as a basis for further investigation rather than as an empirically validated model.

Future studies could test the propositions through controlled experiments and multi-country surveys that compare AI-only, human-only and hybrid service. Research designs should distinguish routine enquiries from complaints and high-consequence decisions. Longitudinal studies could examine how repeated interactions with AI influence trust, loyalty and relationship quality over time. Further work could also investigate how automation changes employee roles and whether escalation design, disclosure and governance practices produce different outcomes across sectors and cultural settings.

References

[1] Gelbrich K, Roschk H, Miederer S, Kerath A. Automated versus human agents: A meta-analysis of customer responses to robots, chatbots, and algorithms and their contingencies. *Journal of Marketing*. 2026;90(2):1–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429251344139

[2] Huang D, Markovitch DG, Stough RA. Can chatbot customer service match human service agents on customer satisfaction? An investigation in the role of trust. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 2024;76:103600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103600

[3] Stock-Homburg RM, Kegel MM. Ethical considerations in customer–robot service interactions: Scoping review, network analysis, and future research agenda. *International Journal of Social Robotics*. 2025;17(6):1129–1159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-025-01239-0

[4] Huang MH, Rust RT. A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 2021;49:30–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00749-9

[5] Davenport T, Guha A, Grewal D, Bressgott T. How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 2020;48:24–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0

[6] Wirtz J, Patterson PG, Kunz WH, Gruber T, Lu VN, Paluch S, et al. Brave new world: Service robots in the frontline. *Journal of Service Management*. 2018;29(5):907–931. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-04-2018-0119

[7] Puntoni S, Reczek RW, Giesler M, Botti S. Consumers and artificial intelligence: An experiential perspective. *Journal of Marketing*. 2021;85(1):131–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920953847