International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 07 | July- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

The Effect of Hyper-Personalized AI Advertising on Consumer Engagement and Brand Loyalty: A Mixed-Methods Study of Indian Digital Consumers

Chanchal Kanwar
Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, India
Under the guidance of Dr. Hemanth Kumar S, Area Chair and Professor

1. Abstract

Artificial intelligence has restructured digital advertising by enabling brands to replace broad demographic targeting with hyper-personalized communication driven by machine learning, predictive analytics, and real-time behavioural data. While such personalization promises higher relevance and engagement, it simultaneously raises concerns about privacy, surveillance, and algorithmic influence, producing a tension often described as the personalization–privacy paradox. This study investigates how digital consumers in India perceive and respond to hyper-personalized AI advertising, focusing on its effects on consumer engagement and brand loyalty. A sequential mixed-methods design was adopted, combining a structured survey of 130 Indian digital consumers measured through a 25-item Likert instrument across four constructs (AI Advertising Perception, Consumer Engagement, Brand Loyalty, and Privacy and Trust Concerns) with eight semi-structured interviews analysed thematically. The conceptual framework integrates the Technology Acceptance Model, Relationship Marketing Theory, and the Stimulus–Organism–Response framework. Quantitative analysis employed descriptive statistics, reliability testing, exploratory factor analysis, correlation analysis, regression, and a one-sample t-test. Consumers reported strongly favourable surface perceptions of AI advertising ($M = 4.43$, $p < .001$), supporting a positive perception hypothesis. However, the hypothesised effects of perception on engagement and of engagement on loyalty were not statistically supported, a result attributable to a pronounced ceiling effect that compressed response variance, yielding low reliability and weak inter-construct correlations. The qualitative phase, by contrast, surfaced six coherent themes-acceptance with awareness, conditional engagement, the convenience–privacy tension, trust-mediated brand connection, algorithmic skepticism, and demand for ethical practice-that revealed a differentiated and conditional consumer relationship the survey failed to capture. The study contributes Indian-context evidence and demonstrates that single-method survey research may systematically under-represent the complexity of consumer response to AI advertising.

Keywords: *Hyper-personalized advertising, artificial intelligence, consumer engagement, brand loyalty, privacy concerns, consumer trust, Technology Acceptance Model, Indian digital market.*

2. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has fundamentally restructured the architecture of contemporary digital marketing, shifting advertising practice from broad demographic targeting toward individual-level behavioural prediction. Within this transformation, hyper-personalized AI advertising has emerged as one of the most consequential developments in marketing communication. The term denotes the deployment of machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics, real-time behavioural data, and natural language generation systems to deliver advertising content dynamically tailored to the inferred preferences, intentions, and lifestyle patterns of each individual consumer. Unlike conventional personalization, which relies primarily on demographic segmentation or static interest categories, hyper-personalization operates at the granular level of micro-moments, drawing on continuously updated behavioural signals such as browsing history, search queries, location data, social interactions, purchase patterns, and inferred psychographic traits.

The economic significance of this shift is considerable. Global expenditure on digital advertising has now exceeded that of all traditional media combined, and within digital advertising, AI-driven personalization is regarded as the principal mechanism for improving return on advertising spend, conversion rates, and customer lifetime value. Platforms such as Meta, Alphabet, Amazon, Netflix, and Spotify have built their commercial models around AI-powered recommendation and advertising engines. The consumer, in turn, has become embedded within a continuous loop of measurement, prediction, and personalized communication, often without explicit awareness of the mechanisms shaping the content they encounter online.

Two outcome variables are of particular interest to marketing scholarship. Consumer engagement refers to the cognitive, affective, and behavioural investment that consumers make in their interactions with a brand, manifesting in observable behaviours such as clicking, sharing, and repeat visits, as well as in latent states such as attention and emotional resonance. Brand loyalty, by contrast, refers to the deep-seated commitment that motivates consumers to consistently repurchase a preferred brand despite situational influences and competitive efforts. Loyalty is widely regarded as one of the most valuable assets a brand can cultivate because it underpins retention, advocacy, premium pricing, and long-term profitability.

The theoretical relationship between personalized advertising, engagement, and loyalty is intuitively compelling: personalized content is expected to resonate more strongly, eliciting higher engagement, which in turn is hypothesised to deepen the brand relationship and translate into loyalty. The empirical landscape, however, is considerably more complex. A growing body of literature identifies the boundary conditions under which personalization yields beneficial outcomes and those under which it produces psychological reactance, perceived intrusiveness, and brand avoidance. The personalization paradox captures this tension: consumers simultaneously desire relevance and resent surveillance, appreciate convenience and fear manipulation, and value efficiency while distrusting the systems that produce it.

In the Indian digital marketplace, this paradox acquires additional contextual complexity. India represents one of the fastest-growing digital consumer markets in the world, with more than 800 million internet users and a rapidly maturing e-commerce ecosystem. Indian consumers exhibit high levels of platform engagement, particularly in the under-35 demographic, yet the regulatory environment around data privacy and algorithmic accountability remains formative. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act of 2023 introduced new statutory protections, but practical enforcement and consumer awareness lag behind the pace of technological deployment. Indian consumers therefore confront hyper-personalized advertising in an environment marked by limited transparency, ambiguous consent frameworks, and emerging questions about algorithmic fairness.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 07 | July- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

This research is positioned within that context. It investigates empirically how digital consumers in India perceive and respond to hyper-personalized AI advertising, with specific attention to engagement and brand loyalty. Adopting a sequential mixed-methods design, the study combines a structured survey of 130 digital consumers with semi-structured interviews involving eight respondents from diverse demographic and occupational backgrounds. The integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence provides both breadth of measurement and depth of meaning, capturing not only statistical patterns but also the subjective experiences and interpretive frameworks consumers bring to their encounters with AI-driven advertising. The study contributes empirical evidence from an under-represented setting, operationalizes engagement and loyalty within a single integrated framework drawing on the Technology Acceptance Model, Relationship Marketing Theory, and the Stimulus–Organism–Response framework, and triangulates measurement-based findings with naturalistic narrative data to surface tensions that survey methods alone often fail to capture.

Accordingly, the study pursues three objectives: to examine the effect of hyper-personalized AI advertising on consumer engagement; to analyse the relationship between consumer engagement and brand loyalty in the context of AI-driven advertising; and to evaluate consumer perceptions and experiences, including the role of privacy concerns and trust. These objectives translate into three formal hypotheses tested in the quantitative phase and elaborated through the qualitative analysis presented in the sections that follow.

3. Literature Review

Personalized advertising has its theoretical origins in the one-to-one marketing principles articulated by Peppers and Rogers (1993), who argued that emerging information technologies would enable firms to engage in individualized dialogue with consumers. Tucker (2014) provided early empirical evidence that personalization produces measurable lifts in advertising effectiveness but also generates consumer discomfort when perceived as invasive. Aguirre, Mahr, Grewal, de Ruyter, and Wetzels (2015) advanced this literature by introducing the personalization–privacy paradox, demonstrating that overt personalization triggers privacy concerns even when data collection is consensual, while Bleier and Eisenbeiss (2015) showed that personalization effectiveness depends on the alignment between personalization depth and consumer–brand familiarity.

The integration of AI into marketing has been comprehensively reviewed by Huang and Rust (2021), whose framework distinguishes mechanical, thinking, and feeling AI applications. Davenport, Guha, Grewal, and Bressgott (2020) emphasised the dual nature of AI in marketing-value creation through improved targeting alongside risks of data dependency, algorithmic bias, and trust erosion-while Kumar, Rajan, Venkatesan, and Lecinski (2019) demonstrated that AI-enabled personalization can lift engagement when implemented with appropriate creative and ethical guardrails.

Consumer engagement has become a central construct in marketing scholarship, building on Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric, and Ilic (2011) and operationalized through the multidimensional scale developed by Hollebeek, Glynn, and Brodie (2014). Within digital and social-media contexts, De Vries, Gensler, and Leeflang (2012) and Hutter, Hautz, Dennhardt, and Fuller (2013) established that vivid, interactive, and informative content drives engagement, while Schivinski, Christodoulides, and Dabrowski (2016) validated measures of engagement with brand-related social-media content. The brand-loyalty literature derives from Oliver (1999), who conceptualized loyalty as a cognitive–affective–conative–action cascade, and from Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001), who established brand trust and brand affect as parallel antecedents of loyalty-an insight of direct relevance to algorithmic advertising, where trust is especially contested.

Privacy and trust have received sustained attention. Martin and Murphy (2017) identified perceived control, transparency, and consent as critical determinants of consumer responses to data-driven personalization, while Acquisti, Brandimarte, and Loewenstein (2015) demonstrated that privacy preferences are context-dependent and frequently inconsistent with revealed behaviour. Hermann (2022) and Andre, Reinartz, Goldberg, and Bertini (2018) extended these concerns into the AI domain, foregrounding transparency, data minimization, and consumer welfare. Research on consumer responses to AI-generated content-Longoni and Cian (2022), Castelo, Bos, and Lehmann (2019), and Dwivedi et al. (2021)-documents systematic algorithm aversion in subjective and emotional domains and identifies consumer acceptance of AI as a research priority, particularly in emerging markets.

Research focused on the Indian digital consumer remains comparatively limited. Chopra and Bhilare (2019) found generally favourable millennial attitudes toward personalized advertising tempered by significant privacy concerns, and Sharma and Aggarwal (2022) reported that perceived informativeness and credibility predicted purchase intention more strongly than personalization itself. Kapoor et al. (2018) identified the Indian context as an under-studied but rapidly evolving research site characterized by multi-platform, mobile-first behaviour. Synthesizing these streams reveals five gaps that motivate the present study: the geographical concentration of existing scholarship in Western markets; the rarity of designs that integrate positive engagement–loyalty and negative privacy–trust pathways; the scarcity of mixed-methods integration; limited multi-theory application; and insufficient operationalization of hyper-personalization as distinct from rule-based personalization.

4. Methodology

The study adopts a sequential mixed-methods design combining a quantitative survey phase with a qualitative interview phase, following the explanatory sequential logic in which quantitative findings are subsequently elaborated through qualitative inquiry. The approach was selected because the research questions require both statistical generalization across a sample and the interpretive depth that only qualitative inquiry can provide. The quantitative phase employed a cross-sectional survey administered to digital consumers in India during November 2025; the qualitative phase employed semi-structured interviews. Both phases used convenience sampling, a non-probability approach appropriate for theory-building research at the thesis level, whose limitations are acknowledged below.

The quantitative instrument comprised a demographic section (age, gender, occupation, daily time online, and platforms used) and a 25-item Likert measurement section scored from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Items mapped onto four constructs: AI Advertising Perception (Q1–Q8), Consumer Engagement (Q9–Q15), Brand Loyalty (Q16–Q21), and Privacy and Trust Concerns (Q22–Q25). Items were adapted from established scales with adjustments for contextual relevance to the Indian market. The survey was distributed through digital channels including messaging applications, email, and social networks, yielding 130 complete responses over a four-week window.

The qualitative phase involved eight semi-structured interviews with respondents diversified across age (21–42 years), gender, occupation, and city of residence (Bengaluru, Pune, Hyderabad, Kochi, Chennai, and Mumbai). Interviews lasted 20–30 minutes, were guided by ten open-ended questions, and were conducted face-to-face or via video conferencing. Informed consent was obtained, and responses were anonymized using codes R1 through R8.

Three hypotheses guided the quantitative phase. H1: hyper-personalized AI advertising has a significant positive effect on consumer engagement. H2: consumer engagement has a significant positive effect on brand loyalty. H3: consumers hold a positive perception toward hyper-personalized AI advertising. H1 and H2 were tested using simple linear regression, and H3 using a one-sample t-test against the neutral midpoint of 3.0. Quantitative analysis was conducted in Python using pandas, scipy, statsmodels, pingouin, and factor_analyzer, proceeding through descriptive statistics, reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha), sampling-adequacy testing (KMO and Bartlett's test), exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation, Pearson correlation, and hypothesis testing at $\alpha = .05$. The qualitative data were analysed through the six-phase thematic analysis procedure of Braun and Clarke (2006).

5. Data Analysis and Implications

The final sample of 130 respondents was skewed toward younger consumers, with 60.0% aged 18–24 and 26.9% aged 25–34. The gender distribution was approximately balanced (51.5% male, 48.5% female). Working professionals formed the largest occupational segment (52.3%), followed by students (38.5%). Daily online engagement was concentrated in the four-to-six-hour band (48.5%), and 71.6% of respondents reported four or more hours online daily, confirming the digital-intensive character of the sample. Respondents maintained active presence across multiple platforms simultaneously, with Netflix and LinkedIn each reaching 47.7% and the aggregate platform-usage signal exceeding 300%.

5.1 Descriptive Statistics and a Pronounced Ceiling Effect

A striking pattern emerged at the item level: every one of the 25 items recorded a mean above 4.30, with no respondent selecting Strongly Disagree or Disagree on any item, uniformly low standard deviations, and consistently negative skewness. At the construct level, the four composite means were tightly clustered between 4.43 and 4.47, separated by only 0.04 points (Table 1). While these values superficially suggest strongly favourable attitudes, the absence of disagreement responses and the compression of variance constitute a ceiling effect that constrains the statistical capacity of the data to detect inter-construct relationships-an observation that frames the interpretation of all subsequent analyses.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Composite Constructs (N = 130)

Construct	Items	Mean	SD	Min	Max
AI Advertising Perception	8	4.430	0.219	3.75	4.88
Consumer Engagement	7	4.474	0.263	3.71	5.00

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
║ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ║
║ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ║
║ Volume: 09 | Issue: 07 | July- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ║

Construct	Items	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Brand Loyalty	6	4.472	0.235	3.83	5.00
Privacy and Trust Concerns	4	4.446	0.349	3.50	5.00

5.2 Reliability and Factorability

Internal consistency, assessed through Cronbach's alpha, fell well below the conventional 0.70 threshold for every construct, with two coefficients negative (Table 2). Near-zero or negative alpha indicates that items intended to measure the same construct exhibit negligible inter-item correlation-a pattern inconsistent with a coherent attitudinal structure and most plausibly explained by the restricted variance documented above. Sampling-adequacy diagnostics reinforced this conclusion: the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure was 0.463, below the 0.50 floor of acceptability, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was non-significant (χ^2 = 322.84, df = 300, p = .174), indicating that the correlation matrix was statistically indistinguishable from an identity matrix. Exploratory factor analysis accordingly failed to recover the theoretical four-construct structure, with the four-factor solution explaining only 15.2% of total variance.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α [95% CI]
AI Advertising Perception	8	−0.213 [−0.555, 0.079]
Consumer Engagement	7	0.087 [−0.175, 0.308]
Brand Loyalty	6	−0.335 [−0.725, −0.009]
Privacy and Trust Concerns	4	0.161 [−0.102, 0.374]
Overall scale	25	−0.105

5.3 Correlation and Hypothesis Testing

Consistent with the reliability and factorability findings, all inter-construct Pearson correlations were weak ($|r| < 0.10$) and statistically non-significant (Table 3). The expected positive associations among AI Advertising Perception, Consumer Engagement, and Brand Loyalty were not observable in the data. Hypothesis testing followed directly. Regression of Consumer Engagement on AI Advertising Perception (H1) produced β = −0.082, t(128) = −0.928, p = .355, and regression of Brand Loyalty on Consumer Engagement (H2) produced β = −0.075, t(128) = −0.851, p = .397; both hypotheses were therefore rejected. The one-sample t-test for H3 was highly significant, t(129) = 74.44, p < .001, with the perception mean of 4.43 lying far above the neutral midpoint, so H3 was accepted, albeit with the directional rather than substantive interpretation that the ceiling effect requires (Table 4).

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Matrix Among Constructs (N = 130)

	AI Advt.	Engage.	Loyalty	Privacy
AI Advertising	1.000	−0.082	−0.017	0.096
Engagement	−0.082	1.000	−0.075	−0.037
Brand Loyalty	−0.017	−0.075	1.000	0.088

	AI Advt.	Engage.	Loyalty	Privacy
Privacy Concerns	0.096	−0.037	0.088	1.000

Note. All correlations non-significant at α = .05.

Table 4. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

H	Statement	Key statistic	p	Decision
H1	AI Advertising → Engagement	$\beta = -0.08, t = -0.93$	.355	Rejected
H2	Engagement → Brand Loyalty	$\beta = -0.08, t = -0.85$	.397	Rejected
H3	Positive AI advertising perception	$t(129) = 74.44$	<.001	Accepted

5.4 Qualitative Findings

Where the survey detected little differentiation, the eight interviews revealed a richly conditional consumer relationship with AI advertising, organized into six themes (Table 5). Respondents accepted personalization while remaining acutely aware of the data practices behind it; as R1 observed, personalized ads feel relevant even as the user remains conscious of being tracked. Engagement was contingent on momentary relevance rather than automatic, and all eight respondents articulated the convenience–privacy tension that the literature terms the personalization paradox. Brand connection was mediated by perceived transparency, with trust strengthening when data practices were seen as honest and eroding when they were seen as exploitative. Several respondents, particularly older and creative professionals, expressed calibrated skepticism toward algorithmic authority, treating AI recommendations as one input among many. Finally, respondents consistently called for ethical and transparent practice-clearer disclosure, opt-in defaults, and data minimization-framing transparency not as a compliance burden but as an active brand-building asset.

Table 5. Qualitative Themes from Thematic Analysis

Theme	Description	Key respondents
Acceptance with awareness	Conditional acceptance alongside explicit awareness of data practices	R1, R7
Conditional engagement	Engagement contingent on relevance to the current need state	R3, R8
Convenience–privacy tension	Simultaneous appreciation of convenience and discomfort with intrusion	R2, R6, R7
Trust-mediated brand connection	Connection stronger when data practices are transparent	R4, R5
Algorithmic skepticism	Calibrated trust in AI as one input among many	R7, R8
Calls for ethical practice	Active expectation of transparency and consumer control	R5, R8

5.5 Implications

Read together, the two strands point to a more nuanced conclusion than either alone. The quantitative analysis taken in isolation would suggest either that AI advertising has no effect on engagement or that the instrument was poorly calibrated; the qualitative analysis taken alone would suggest a coherent but statistically ungeneralizable pattern. Integrated, they support a refined model in which AI advertising perception influences engagement through a relevance-moderated pathway, and engagement translates into loyalty through a trust-mediated relational pathway, with privacy concerns operating as a parallel cognitive frame rather than a simple antagonist. The managerial implications follow directly: practitioners should prioritize real-time relevance over static profiling, treat transparency as a brand-building practice, offer graduated personalization with genuine consumer control, adopt appropriate humility in algorithmic claims to avoid reactance, and design segment-specific strategies rather than treating Indian digital consumers as homogeneous.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study set out to examine the effect of hyper-personalized AI advertising on consumer engagement and brand loyalty among Indian digital consumers. Four findings emerge. First, surface perceptions of AI advertising are favourable, confirmed by both the significant one-sample t-test and the consistently positive interview accounts. Second, the hypothesised inter-construct relationships were not supported quantitatively; H1 and H2 were rejected, diverging from prevailing theoretical expectation. The most defensible interpretation, supported by the reliability and factorability diagnostics, is that ceiling-effect responses compressed variance below the level needed to detect relationships, and that positively framed, single-occasion self-report is susceptible to acquiescence and social-desirability bias. Third, the qualitative analysis revealed a multi-dimensional relationship-acceptance with awareness, conditional engagement, convenience–privacy tension, trust-mediated connection, algorithmic skepticism, and ethical-practice expectations-that no single-construct measurement strategy captured. Fourth, and methodologically, the combination of high means, low alpha, and weak correlations suggests the population may treat AI-advertising questions as a generalized affective stance rather than as differentiated evaluations of specific attributes.

Theoretically, the study extends the Technology Acceptance Model, Relationship Marketing Theory, and the Stimulus–Organism–Response framework into the Indian context: the qualitative themes map onto usefulness and ease of use, the commitment–trust core of relationship marketing, and the stimulus–state–response architecture respectively. It contributes Indian-context evidence for the personalization–privacy paradox, supports a dual-pathway rather than a simple trade-off model, and surfaces calibrated trust as a useful intermediate construct between blind acceptance and blanket rejection.

Several limitations qualify these conclusions. The ceiling effect renders the inferential results exploratory rather than confirmatory and points to instrument-design problems, including the absence of reverse-coded items. Convenience sampling and a young, urban, digitally intensive sample limit generalizability. The cross-sectional design cannot capture the temporal development of loyalty, and self-reported behavioural constructs may diverge from observed behaviour. The qualitative sample of eight, while analytically rich, falls short of full thematic saturation. In conclusion, the surface attitudes of Indian digital consumers toward hyper-personalized AI advertising are favourable, but the underlying experience is more complex and conditional than single-method survey research can capture. The study reaffirms that marketing can responsibly harness AI only by pairing personalization accuracy with transparency, ethical data practice, consumer control, and trust-building-the conditions under which engagement and loyalty are most likely to follow.

7. Future Scope for the Research

Several directions follow from the findings and limitations. First, future studies should resolve the measurement challenges identified here through more discriminating instrument design, including reverse-coded items, behavioural anchors, and choice-based measures that resist social-desirability bias. Second, probability sampling and larger samples would support population-level generalization beyond the young, urban profile studied here. Third, longitudinal designs would clarify how consumer attitudes and behaviours toward AI advertising evolve over time, an essential step for studying loyalty as a developing rather than static construct. Fourth, integrating behavioural data from advertising platforms or experimental manipulations would complement self-report and provide more direct evidence of engagement and loyalty effects. Fifth, cross-cultural comparative work would establish the generalizability of these findings beyond the Indian context. Sixth, future research should examine mediating and moderating variables-data literacy, brand familiarity, product-category involvement, and regulatory awareness-that may govern the conditional pathways the qualitative analysis surfaced. Finally, qualitative inquiry at greater scale, including focus groups and ethnographic methods, would enrich the interpretive understanding of consumer experience and move the thematic structure toward saturation.

8. References

1. Acquisti, A., Brandimarte, L., & Loewenstein, G. (2015). Privacy and human behavior in the age of information. Science, 347(6221), 509–514. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1465
2. Aguirre, E., Mahr, D., Grewal, D., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2015). Unraveling the personalization paradox: The effect of information collection and trust-building strategies on online advertisement effectiveness. Journal of Retailing, 91(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2014.09.005
3. Andre, Q., Reinartz, W., Goldberg, P., & Bertini, M. (2018). Consumer choice and autonomy in the age of artificial intelligence and big data. Customer Needs and Solutions, 5(1), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40547-017-0085-8
4. Bleier, A., & Eisenbeiss, M. (2015). Personalized online advertising effectiveness: The interplay of what, when, and where. Marketing Science, 34(5), 669–688. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2015.0930
5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
6. Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011). Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. Journal of Service Research, 14(3), 252–271. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511411703

7. Castelo, N., Bos, M. W., & Lehmann, D. R. (2019). Task-dependent algorithm aversion. Journal of Marketing Research, 56(5), 809–825. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719851788
8. Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. Journal of Marketing, 65(2), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255
9. Chopra, K., & Bhilare, P. (2019). Personalized advertising and consumer attitude: A study of Indian millennials. Indian Journal of Marketing, 49(8), 7–23.
10. Davenport, T., 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
11. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008
12. De Vries, L., Gensler, S., & Leeflang, P. S. H. (2012). Popularity of brand posts on brand fan pages: An investigation of the effects of social media marketing. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 26(2), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2012.01.003
13. Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., … Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 57, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002
14. Hermann, E. (2022). Leveraging artificial intelligence in marketing for social good: An ethical perspective. Journal of Business Ethics, 179(1), 43–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04843-y
15. Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002
16. Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 49(1), 30–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00749-9
17. Hutter, K., Hautz, J., Dennhardt, S., & Fuller, J. (2013). The impact of user interactions in social media on brand awareness and purchase intention: The case of MINI on Facebook. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 22(5/6), 342–351. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-05-2013-0299
18. Kapoor, K. K., Tamilmani, K., Rana, N. P., Patil, P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Nerur, S. (2018). Advances in social media research: Past, present and future. Information Systems Frontiers, 20(3), 531–558. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-017-9810-y
19. Kumar, V., Rajan, B., Venkatesan, R., & Lecinski, J. (2019). Understanding the role of artificial intelligence in personalized engagement marketing. California Management Review, 61(4), 135–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619859317

20. Longoni, C., & Cian, L. (2022). Artificial intelligence in utilitarian vs. hedonic contexts: The "word-of-machine" effect. Journal of Marketing, 86(1), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920957347
21. Martin, K. D., & Murphy, P. E. (2017). The role of data privacy in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 45(2), 135–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-016-0495-4
22. Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). An approach to environmental psychology. MIT Press.
23. Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58(3), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302
24. Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? Journal of Marketing, 63(Special Issue), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.2307/1252099
25. Peppers, D., & Rogers, M. (1993). The one to one future: Building relationships one customer at a time. Currency Doubleday.
26. Reichheld, F. F., & Schefter, P. (2000). E-loyalty: Your secret weapon on the web. Harvard Business Review, 78(4), 105–113.
27. Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). Measuring consumers' engagement with brand-related social-media content: Development and validation of a scale that identifies levels of social-media engagement with brands. Journal of Advertising Research, 56(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-2016-004
28. Sharma, A., & Aggarwal, R. (2022). Role of social media advertising on consumer purchase intention: An empirical study from India. Journal of Indian Business Research, 14(2), 159–177.
29. Tucker, C. E. (2014). Social networks, personalized advertising, and privacy controls. Journal of Marketing Research, 51(5), 546–562. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0355
30. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186–204. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926