OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 13

Special Issue: 3

Month: August

Year: 2025

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Citation:
J, Sundararaj . "Hyper-Personalization through AI: Enhancing Customer Experience in the Digital Age." *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities,* vol. 13, no. S3, 2026, pp. 45–56.

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v13iS2-Aug.10432

Hyper-Personalization through AI: Enhancing Customer Experience in the Digital Age

Dr. Sundararaj . J
Professor of Commerce, Department of Commerce,
Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar

Abstract

In today's digital and customer-focused world, the need for real-time, personalised, and context-aware experiences has led businesses to look into more advanced ways to personalise their services. This study looks into how Artificial Intelligence (AI) can help with hyper-personalization and how it affects two important parts of the consumer experience: satisfaction and engagement. This study uses a quantitative method with 320 digitally active customers in India. It is based on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Customer Experience (CX) Theory, and the Personalization–Privacy Paradox. We used Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to look at the connections between AI-driven hyper-personalization, customer pleasure, consumer engagement, trust, and privacy issues.

The results show that AI greatly improves hyper-personalized service delivery, which in turn makes customers happier and more engaged. Also, trust acted as a partial mediator, making the link between hyper-personalization and customer experience outcomes stronger. On the other hand, privacy concerns were found to lower satisfaction with personalised services, confirming the personalization-privacy conundrum in the real world of digital technology.

This study adds to both theory and practice by giving a complete picture of AI-based personalisation from the points of view of technology, behaviour, and ethics. It gives organisations useful information on how to use AI ethically to provide value while keeping consumer confidence and data integrity. The research also holds policy implications by stressing the necessity for transparent AI governance structures and consumer privacy protections in the era of intelligent automation.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI); Hyper-Personalization; Customer Satisfaction; Customer Engagement; Trust; Privacy Concern; Technology Acceptance Model (TAM); Customer Experience Theory; Personalization–Privacy Paradox; Digital Marketing; Ethical AI

Introduction

In today's digital age, firms are moving away from generic marketing and employing artificial intelligence (AI) to make each customer's experience more unique. This involves employing machine learning and real-time data to give people services and information that fit their needs, not just big groups of customers (Columbus, 2020). Davenport et al. (2020) say that businesses like Amazon and Netflix have shown how AI can make customers happier, more loyal, and more involved overall.

AI tools like natural language processing and predictive analytics enable brands send out timely and useful content on digital platforms like apps, websites, emails, and more. This makes it easier for customers to interact with the company and makes those interactions more meaningful (Kietzmann, Paschen, & Treen, 2018). This tendency is now spreading to fields like banking, healthcare, education, and e-commerce. According to McKinsey & Company (2021), companies that do a good job of personalising can make up to 40% more money.

But personalisation needs to be matched with privacy and trust in the data. Customers like personalised services, but they are also concerned about how their information is gathered and used (Martin & Murphy, 2017). It is important to employ AI in a way that is moral and follows rules like GDPR.

This study looks at how AI helps organisations provide personalised experiences and how these methods impact consumer satisfaction and engagement. It gives useful information for using AI responsibly and achieving long-term digital success.

Literature Review

From Personalization to Hyper-Personalization

Traditional personalisation in marketing relied mainly on static customer details such as demographics and past purchase behaviour, and therefore operated at a broad segment level. With the advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI), organisations have shifted towards hyper-personalization, which focuses on the individual customer and uses real-time behavioural data. Recent empirical studies show that hyper-personalization dynamically adapts content and services based on changing customer interactions, making it more accurate and responsive than earlier personalisation approaches (Murugasu, 2025; Murugasu et al., 2025).

AI as the Core Engine of Hyper-Personalization

AI acts as the backbone of hyper-personalization by integrating large volumes of customer data with machine learning and predictive analytics. Empirical research confirms that AI-powered recommendation systems and conversational tools improve perceived usefulness and trust when personalisation is relevant and transparent (Teepapal, 2025). Studies in AI-enabled e-commerce further indicate that personalised recommendations strengthen customer trust and satisfaction, which in turn support loyalty outcomes (Hassan et al., 2025).

Impact on Customer Satisfaction and Engagement

Recent evidence suggests that the benefits of hyper-personalization are largely driven through customer perceptions. AI-based personalisation improves engagement and satisfaction mainly by enhancing perceived relevance, usefulness, and trust (Khuong, 2025; Teepapal, 2025). Rather than direct effects alone, these psychological factors mediate the relationship between personalisation and behavioural outcomes, highlighting the importance of customer-centric design.

Ethical and Operational Challenges

Despite its advantages, AI-driven hyper-personalization raises concerns related to privacy, transparency, and user autonomy. Empirical studies show that customers may experience discomfort when data use is unclear or perceived as intrusive (Hardcastle, 2025). Research on explainable AI also indicates that users expect clarity on how recommendations are generated and how their data are protected (Haque, 2025). Therefore, ethical design and transparency are essential for sustaining trust and long-term effectiveness of hyper-personalization initiatives.

Literature Gaps

Researchers believe that AI has a lot of potential, but not many have actually studied how it affects customer pleasure and engagement. Also, there isn't much research that looks at both the benefits of technology and the ethical issues that come with it. This study fills in these gaps by looking at AI-based hyper-personalization from all angles, not just how it works but also how customers feel about it and what ethical rules must be followed.

There is a lot of evidence in the literature that AI can be a very useful tool for making customer experiences better through hyper-personalization. Machine learning and predictive analytics are two examples of technologies that help organisations better understand their clients and give them more personalised service. But for hyper-personalization to work, it's not enough to just have the right technology; you also need to make sure that data is clear, fair, and that AI is used in an ethical way. This study extends on these ideas by looking at how real customers react to AI personalisation and giving advice on how to utilise it in a responsible and sustainable way in the digital era.

Statement of the Problem

In the digital age, clients want more than simply basic encounters; they want experiences that are real-time, relevant, and tailored to them. Old ways that use demographic profiles and data from the past aren't enough anymore (Davenport et al., 2020). To satisfy these higher standards, a lot of organisations are already using AI tools like machine learning, natural language processing (NLP), and predictive analytics to make their products and services more personalised. These technologies let businesses guess what clients want and send them personalised material right away (Chatterjee, Rana, & Dwivedi, 2020).

Businesses are putting more money into AI, but it's still not clear how much these methods really make customers happier and more engaged. Big companies like Amazon and Netflix have been successful, but smaller ones often have trouble because of problems including data protection, technical readiness, and lack of strategic planning (McKinsey & Company, 2021).

At the same time, people are becoming more worried about how their personal information is collected and utilised, especially when global rules like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) require fairness and openness. There are also big problems with ethics, like bias in algorithms and a lack of trust (Martin & Murphy, 2017).

So, our study's goal is to fill this gap by looking at whether AI-driven hyper-personalization really makes customers' experiences better or is just another tech trend. It wants to give businesses more useful and ethical ways to employ AI in personalisation by showing how it works in real life.

Research Objectives

1. To study how artificial intelligence helps businesses deliver more personalized experiences to customers.
2. To find out how AI-based hyper-personalization affects customer satisfaction and engagement.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework with Hypotheses

The study "Hyper-Personalization through AI: Enhancing Customer Experience in the Digital Age" is based on a multi-theoretical approach that helps us understand both the technological and behavioural sides of AI-driven personalisation. The theoretical framework brings together three well-known models: the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Customer Experience (CX) Theory, and the Personalization–Privacy Paradox Theory.

Davis (1989) created the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which describes how people use technology based on two primary factors: how helpful they think it is (PU) and how easy they think it is to use (PEOU). TAM helps explain why organisations employ AI technologies like recommendation engines, predictive analytics, and chatbots in this study. It also helps explain why customers are more likely to use these solutions when they are valuable and easy to use (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). This is the basis for Objective 1 and Hypothesis H1, which says that artificial intelligence makes it much easier to provide personalised experiences.

The second hypothesis, Customer Experience (CX) hypothesis, was proposed by Lemon and Verhoef (2016). It says that value is produced when customers have consistent and emotionally rewarding experiences with a business before, during, and after they buy something. AI improves these experiences by giving people timely, relevant, and personalised content on websites, mobile apps, and social media. In this way, Hypotheses H2a and H2b look at whether AI-based hyper-personalization has a beneficial effect on consumer happiness and engagement. This is how Objective 2 is met. Previous research shows that personalised experiences make people feel more connected and loyal (Chatterjee, Rana, & Dwivedi, 2020).

Awad and Krishnan (2006) came up with the third idea, the Personalization–Privacy Paradox, which talks about the conflict between the benefits of personalisation and privacy concerns. Customers like personalised content, but they are also concerned about how their data is gathered and handled. This idea is really significant in India, where more and more people are using digital technology but still learning about their data rights. The approach uses trust as a mediating variable and privacy concern as a moderating variable to explain how customers act. Hypothesis H3 says that customer trust affects the link between AI personalisation and engagement, while Hypothesis H4 says that perceived privacy concern affects the link between personalisation and satisfaction (Martin & Murphy, 2017).

Conceptual Framework Linkages

Construct	Theoretical Base	Explanation
AI Adoption	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	AI is adopted when it is perceived as useful and easy to use
Hyper-Personalization	TAM + CX Theory	AI enables timely and relevant experiences across touch-points
Customer Satisfaction	CX Theory	Personalized services increase satisfaction when expectations are met
Customer Engagement	CX Theory	Engaging, personalized content builds deeper brand interaction
Trust	Personalization–Privacy Paradox	Trust supports positive response to personalization
Privacy Concern	Personalization–Privacy Paradox	Higher concern can weaken the impact of personalization

Hypotheses

The conceptual framework makes it clear how these ideas are connected: TAM affects AI adoption; AI use leads to hyper-personalization, which affects customer satisfaction and engagement, as CX Theory says; and trust and privacy concern, from the privacy paradox point of view, shape the ethical view of AI use. The following hypotheses are based on these connections:

H1 – AI enables personalized experiences;

H2a – Hyper-personalization improves satisfaction;

H2b – Hyper-personalization enhances engagement;

H3 – Trust mediates the relationship between personalization and engagement;

H4 – Privacy concern negatively moderates the effect of personalization on satisfaction.

This integrated framework gives a whole picture of how AI technology is used and understood, how it changes the user experience, and how ethical issues affect how well it works. It gives empirical testing a logical basis and supports both academic theory and real-world use in the fast-changing world of digital technology.

Methodology

Research Design and Approach

This study uses a quantitative, cross-sectional survey to look at how Artificial Intelligence (AI) helps with hyper-personalization and how it affects consumer happiness and engagement. A descriptive and causal research approach is utilised to find patterns that are already there and see if there are any links between the variables (Creswell, 2014). The study uses a positivist paradigm and a deductive approach, which is good for testing hypotheses and making generalisations about large groups of people (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019).

Sampling Framework

The target group is Indian internet consumers who have used AI to personalise their experiences in areas like e-commerce, banking, OTT platforms, and online shopping. A purposive sample method is used to choose just individuals who utilise features like AI chatbots, personalised emails, or recommendation systems on a regular basis. This strategy makes sure the data is good by include people with relevant experience (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). According to SEM rules, a minimum of 300 replies is statistically acceptable (Kline, 2016).

Data Collection and Ethical Compliance

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with closed-ended statements measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, covering five key constructs: AI-driven hyper-personalization, customer satisfaction, customer engagement, trust, and privacy concerns. The survey was administered online through Google Forms, which was appropriate for the digitally literate Indian respondent base and enabled efficient and wide data collection. Prior to data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the appropriate institutional authority. Participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained electronically after clearly explaining the purpose of the study, the academic nature of the research, and the confidentiality of responses. No personally identifiable information was collected, and respondents were informed of their right to withdraw at any stage, ensuring compliance with standard ethical research practices. All measurement items are adapted from validated sources in prior literature.

Measurement of Variables

Construct	Examples of Items	Sources
AI-Driven Hyper-Personalization	Contextual recommendations, real-time content	Kumar et al. (2021); Chatterjee et al. (2020)
Customer Satisfaction	Overall experience, expectations met	Oliver (1997); Lemon & Verhoef (2016)

Customer Engagement	Emotional involvement, brand connection	Hollebeek, Glynn, & Brodie (2014)
Trust	Data security, fairness in AI use	Martin & Murphy (2017)
Privacy Concern	Worry over data misuse, consent, transparency	Awad & Krishnan (2006)

Data Analysis Procedure

The collected data is analyzed using IBM SPSS 26 and AMOS/SmartPLS for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

The steps include:

- Descriptive analysis (mean, SD, normality),
- Reliability testing (Cronbach's alpha > 0.70; CR > 0.70),
- Validity checks including AVE (> 0.50) and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker & HTMT), and
- Path analysis to test hypotheses, including model fit indices like CFI, RMSEA, GFI, and TLI.

Mediation and moderation analyses are also planned for trust and privacy concerns, using a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$.

Results and Findings

This section presents the key results and findings based on data collected from 320 respondents. The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS 26 and AMOS for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Descriptive statistics, reliability and validity assessments, structural model fit, and hypothesis testing outcomes are presented below.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	176	55.0%
	Female	144	45.0%
Age Group	18–25	82	25.6%
	26–35	108	33.8%
	36–45	74	23.1%
	Above 45	56	17.5%
Education Level	Graduate	138	43.1%
	Postgraduate	150	46.9%
	Doctorate	32	10.0%
Occupation	Student	76	23.8%
	Working Professional	178	55.6%
	Entrepreneur/ Self-Employed	36	11.3%
	Retired/Other	30	9.4%

Platform Used	E-commerce	216	67.5%
	OTT (Streaming)	168	52.5%
	Digital Banking	188	58.8%

The Table1 reveals that gender-balanced (55% male, 45% female), with a concentration in the 26–35 age group. Most respondents were postgraduates (47%) and working professionals (56%), indicating a digitally literate population. The most frequently used platforms included e-commerce (67.5%), digital banking (58.8%), and OTT platforms (52.5%)—reflecting strong exposure to AI-based personalized services.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Constructs

Construct	No. of Items	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
AI-Driven Hyper-Personalization	5	4.12	0.58
Customer Satisfaction	4	4.08	0.62
Customer Engagement	4	4.15	0.56
Trust	3	3.92	0.67
Privacy Concern	3	3.10	0.85

The Table 2 also further shows that the mean scores for key constructs on a 5-point Likert scale showed that respondents largely agreed with the presence of AI personalization (M = 4.12), were satisfied with services (M = 4.08), and reported high engagement (M = 4.15). Trust scored moderately high (M = 3.92), while privacy concern was relatively lower (M = 3.10), suggesting a cautious but open attitude toward data use in personalization. These patterns reflect the personalization–privacy paradox identified in earlier studies (Awad & Krishnan, 2006).

Table 3: Reliability and Validity of Constructs

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Hyper-Personalization	0.83	0.86	0.61
Customer Satisfaction	0.85	0.88	0.66
Customer Engagement	0.87	0.89	0.68
Trust	0.79	0.83	0.59
Privacy Concern	0.75	0.80	0.56

Table 3 depicts that all measurement scales showed good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.75$) and met accepted thresholds for composite reliability and average variance extracted (AVE > 0.50), confirming strong internal consistency and convergent validity (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 4: Structural Model Fit Indices

Fit Index	Value	Acceptable Threshold
CFI	0.965	> 0.90 (Good Fit)
TLI	0.951	> 0.90 (Good Fit)
RMSEA	0.045	< 0.08 (Acceptable)
SRMR	0.036	< 0.08 (Good Fit)
Chi-square/df (χ^2/df)	2.13	< 3.0 (Acceptable)

The structural equation model showed in Table 4 an excellent fit with CFI = 0.965, TLI = 0.951, RMSEA = 0.045, and χ^2/df = 2.13, indicating the proposed model was statistically sound and appropriate for hypothesis testing (Byrne, 2016).

Table 5: Hypotheses Testing – Path Analysis

Hypothesis	Standardized Coefficient (β)	t-value	p-value	Inference
H1: AI → Hyper-Personalization	0.72	11.35	< 0.001	Supported
H2a: Hyper-Personalization → Satisfaction	0.63	9.48	< 0.001	Supported
H2b: Hyper-Personalization → Engagement	0.69	10.15	< 0.001	Supported
H3: Trust as Mediator	0.41	5.86	< 0.001	Partially Sup-ported
H4: Privacy Concern as Moderator	–0.28	–4.45	< 0.001	Supported

Table 6 illustrates the outcomes of all five hypotheses, and they were all statistically valid.

H1 showed that AI really helps hyper-personalized experiences ($\beta = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), which backs up its function in digital engagement (Chatterjee et al., 2020).

H2a and H2b indicated that hyper-personalization greatly improves both customer satisfaction (= 0.63) and engagement (= 0.69). This is in line with Customer Experience Theory, which says that timeliness and relevance are linked to emotional connection (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016).

H3 demonstrated that trust partially mediates the effect of hyper-personalization on engagement ($\beta = 0.41$), which means that customers who trust the system are more inclined to get involved (Martin & Murphy, 2017).

H4 demonstrated that privacy concern adversely moderates satisfaction ($\beta = –0.28$), which shows that even well-personalized services might fail if customers don't feel their data is safe or used in a way that is ethical (Awad & Krishnan, 2006).

These results back up the ideas that come from TAM, CX Theory, and the Personalization–Privacy Paradox. They show that hyper-personalization based on AI not only works, but it works best when people trust one other and their privacy is protected. Real-time and context-aware personalisation can help businesses make customers happier and more involved. But to keep customers' trust and stop bad feelings, you need to have clear rules about how data is used and make sure that AI is designed in a way that is ethical.

This means that managers need to use AI in a responsible way and work to explain how data is used, develop trust, and keep people's privacy safe. These results support McKinsey's (2021) claim that personalisation leads to higher ROI when it is combined with fairness and ethical behaviour.

Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

This study examined the impact of AI-driven hyper-personalization on customer satisfaction and engagement in the Indian digital context using SEM analysis. The findings strongly support all the proposed hypotheses and show that AI significantly enables hyper-personalization, which in turn enhances customer satisfaction and engagement. Trust plays a partial mediating role in this relationship, while privacy concerns reduce the positive effects. Together, these results provide a balanced view of how customers respond to AI-based personalization.

The strong relationship between AI and hyper-personalization ($\beta = 0.72$) supports the Technology Acceptance Model, which explains that users are more likely to adopt technologies they perceive as useful and easy to use (Davis, 1989; Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). This explains why AI tools such as machine learning, natural language processing, and predictive analytics are increasingly integrated into digital marketing strategies. The positive effects of hyper-personalization on customer satisfaction ($\beta = 0.63$) and engagement ($\beta = 0.69$) are consistent with Customer Experience Theory, which highlights the value of relevant, timely, and meaningful interactions (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). These findings align with earlier research showing that personalised marketing improves customer value and retention (Arora et al., 2008).

Trust emerges as a critical factor in the personalization process. Its mediating effect ($\beta = 0.41$) indicates that customers are more willing to engage with AI-driven systems when they believe these systems are transparent, secure, and ethical. This finding reflects Social Exchange Theory, which emphasises trust and fairness as foundations for sustained relationships (Martin & Murphy, 2017). At the same time, privacy concerns show a significant negative moderating effect ($\beta = –0.28$), supporting the Personalization–Privacy Paradox (Awad & Krishnan, 2006). Even satisfied customers may resist personalization if they fear data misuse. This issue is particularly relevant in India, where digital adoption is expanding rapidly while privacy awareness and regulation are still evolving.

From a practical perspective, the results suggest that AI-driven hyper-personalization can improve customer loyalty, engagement, and long-term value when implemented responsibly. Organisations should adopt transparent data practices, obtain informed consent, and allow customers control over their data. Since customers differ in their comfort with data sharing, firms should use flexible and phased personalization strategies rather than uniform approaches. Training marketing and IT teams in ethical AI use and data protection is also essential.

From a policy and social standpoint, the study highlights the need for clear AI governance frameworks that address data privacy, algorithmic fairness, and user consent. Ethical AI certifications and public awareness initiatives can help reduce fear and build trust, especially in developing economies like India. When implemented responsibly, AI-driven hyper-personalization can also improve access to digital services in areas such as banking, education, and healthcare. However, this requires parallel efforts in digital literacy to help individuals understand both the benefits and risks of personalization.

Overall, the study concludes that AI-powered hyper-personalization is effective only when supported by trust, transparency, and strong privacy safeguards. Future research can extend this framework to other sectors and explore cultural factors that shape privacy perceptions, trust, and acceptance of AI-driven personalization.

Limitations and Scope for Future Research

This study, while providing meaningful insights into AI-driven hyper-personalization and customer behaviour, has certain limitations that are common in empirical research. These limitations do not reduce the value of the findings but indicate the boundaries within which the results should be interpreted.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study is based on cross-sectional data collected at a single point in time, which restricts the analysis of changes in customer perceptions over time.
2. Data were collected through self-reported questionnaires, which may involve response bias or socially desirable responses.
3. The focus on Indian digital consumers, particularly in e-commerce, OTT platforms, and digital banking, may limit the generalisability of the findings to other regions or sectors.
4. The study includes a limited number of constructs, while other potentially relevant variables were not examined.

These limitations were addressed by using validated measurement scales, ensuring respondent anonymity, applying rigorous SEM techniques, and collecting data from a diverse group of digital users to improve reliability and internal validity.

Scope for Future Research

Building on the present findings, future research can further strengthen understanding in this area.

1. Longitudinal or experimental studies may be conducted to capture changes in customer behaviour and establish causal relationships.
2. Future models may include additional variables such as algorithmic transparency, digital literacy, perceived fairness, and emotional attachment.
3. Comparative studies across countries, cultures, or industries can help assess the broader applicability of the findings.
4. Sector-specific research may explore AI-driven hyper-personalization in domains such as education, healthcare, public services, and sustainability.

Conclusion

In today's digital age, when smart technology and real-time content define what customers want, giving them personalised experiences has become a fundamental to corporate success. This study looked at how AI helps hyper-personalization by providing real-time, context-aware services that go beyond simple segmentation. The study included a sample of 320 digital consumers in India and was based on ideas like TAM, Customer Experience Theory, and the Personalization–Privacy Paradox. It found that AI is a big part of making customers happier and more engaged.

The results show that hyper-personalization makes customers happier by giving them content that is timely and useful. But trust is a big part of how well these AI-powered services work. Customers are more likely to respond positively when they see AI systems as safe and open. Privacy issues, on the other hand, can make people less happy, even when services are tailored to their needs. This shows how important it is to utilise data ethically and develop AI responsibly.

This study adds to theory by providing a comprehensive framework that connects the use of AI to moral and behavioural issues. In practice, it gives organisations clear ideas on how to use AI to develop strong and honest relationships with customers. It also says that there should be strong AI governance and data protection policies, especially in India, where digital use is rising quickly.

The results suggest that AI-driven hyper-personalization can provide value over time, but only when it is paired with ethics, empathy, and responsibility. The future of AI in marketing isn't simply automation; it's also design that puts people first, where personalisation respects privacy and develops trust.

References

1. Arora, N., Dreze, X., Ghose, A., Hess, J. D., Iyengar, R., Jing, B., ... & Shankar, V. (2008). Putting one-to-one marketing to work: Personalization, customization, and choice. Marketing Letters, 19(3), 305–321.
2. Awad, N. F., & Krishnan, M. S. (2006). The personalization privacy paradox. MIS Quarterly, 30(1), 13–28.
3. Byrne, B. M. (2016). Structural equation modeling with AMOS (3rd ed.). Routledge.
4. Chatterjee, S., Rana, N. P., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2020). AI-driven technologies and customer engagement. Journal of Business Research, 118, 420–430.
5. Columbus, L. (2020). 10 charts that will change your perspective of AI in marketing. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com
6. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Sage.
7. Davenport, T. H., Guha, A., Grewal, D., & Bressgott, T. (2020). How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(1), 24–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0
8. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness and user acceptance of IT. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.
9. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of sampling methods. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1–4.
10. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage.
11. Haque, A. K. M. B. (2025). An empirical investigation of AI-based recommendations on social media content recommendation from the perspective of end users. Electronic Markets.
12. Hardcastle, K. (2025). Understanding customer responses to AI-driven personalized journeys: Impacts on the customer experience. Journal of Advertising. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2025.2460985
13. Hassan, N., Abdelraouf, M., & El-Shihy, D. (2025). The moderating role of personalized recommendations in the trust–satisfaction–loyalty relationship: An empirical study of AI-driven e-commerce. Future Business Journal, 11, Article 66.
14. Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Brand engagement in social media. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28(2), 149–165.
15. Khuong, A. N. G. (2025). AI-powered personalized advertising and purchase intention: The mediating roles of perceived relevance, perceived trust, and perceived usefulness. Journal of Business Research.
16. Kietzmann, J., Paschen, J., & Treen, E. (2018). AI in advertising. Journal of Advertising Research, 58(3), 263–267.

17. Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
18. Kumar, V., Dixit, A., Javalgi, R. G., & Dass, M. (2021). Digital transformation of customer services. Journal of Business Research, 122, 779–790.
19. Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Customer experience throughout the journey. Journal of Marketing, 80(6), 69–96.
20. Martin, K. D., & Murphy, P. E. (2017). Data privacy in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 45(2), 135–155.
21. McKinsey & Company. (2021). The value of getting personalization right—or wrong—is multiplying. https://www.mckinsey.com
22. Murugasu, U. S. G. (2025). Empirical method for developing a hyper-personalization artifact. Expert Systems with Applications.
23. Murugasu, U. S. G., Subbarao, A., & colleagues. (2025). Artificial intelligence and hyper-personalization: Design and empirical validation. Expert Systems with Applications.
24. Paschen, J., Kietzmann, J., & Kietzmann, T. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and personalization. Business Horizons, 63(2), 177–186.
25. Resnik, D. B. (2018). The ethics of research with human subjects. Springer.
26. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). Research methods for business students (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
27. Teepapal, T. (2025). AI-driven personalization and consumer engagement on social media. Computers in Human Behavior, 165, 108549.
28. Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and future research. Decision Sciences, 39(2), 273–315.