



**A STUDY ON CONSUMER PERCEPTION TOWARDS PERSONALISED
MARKETING**

AUTHOR: LAKSHANYA RAMAKANTH, Student of BBA CA

**GUIDE NAME: DR.G.MURALI MANOHARI, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, Sri Krishna Aditya College of and Science,
Coimbatore**

ABSTRACT

Personalized marketing has become a prominent strategy in contemporary digital marketing, enabling firms to customize products, services, and promotional messages based on individual consumer preferences and behavioral data. While such practices enhance relevance and convenience for consumers, they also raise significant concerns related to data privacy, surveillance, and the potential misuse of personal information.

This study aims to examine consumers' perceptions towards personalized marketing, with particular emphasis on whether these practices are perceived as a beneficial convenience or as an invasion of privacy. The research adopts a descriptive research design and utilizes both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered to 124 respondents during the period from October to December 2025, while secondary data were obtained from journals, research articles, and published reports.

The study seeks to assess consumer awareness, attitudes, and levels of trust towards personalized marketing strategies employed by brands. The findings are expected to offer valuable insights into how marketers can effectively balance personalization with ethical data practices, thereby enhancing consumer trust and engagement.

Keywords: Personalized Marketing, Consumer Perception, Privacy Concerns, Data Privacy, Consumer Behavior

1. INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

Personalized marketing has evolved gradually alongside advancements in technology and the increasing availability of consumer data. In its early stages, personalization was primarily limited to basic demographic segmentation, where consumers were classified into broad groups based on factors such as age, gender, income level, and geographic location. Marketers relied on these generalized categories to design marketing messages that appealed to a particular segment rather than to individuals, resulting in limited customization.

During this period, traditional marketing tools such as loyalty programs, direct mail campaigns, and customer databases played a significant role in facilitating personalization.



As per UGC care Guidelines

Loyalty programs helped businesses track repeat purchases and reward customers based on their buying patterns, while direct mail campaigns allowed firms to send tailored offers to specific customer groups. Customer databases stored basic information that enabled organizations to maintain long-term relationships with their customers. Although these methods lacked real-time data analysis and advanced targeting capabilities, they provided valuable insights into consumer preferences and purchasing behavior.

These early personalization practices laid a strong foundation for modern personalized marketing by highlighting the importance of understanding customer needs and building long-term engagement. Despite the limitations in scope, accuracy, and scalability, they marked the beginning of a shift from mass marketing to a more customer-centric approach. Over time, continuous technological innovations have expanded these basic concepts into sophisticated data-driven personalization strategies used by businesses today.

EVOLUTION OF PERSONALIZED MARKETING PRACTICES

Personalized marketing has evolved gradually alongside developments in technology and data availability. In its early stages, personalization was limited to basic demographic segmentation, where consumers were grouped based on age, gender, or location. Traditional tools such as loyalty programs, direct mail campaigns, and customer databases were used to customize marketing messages in a limited manner. These early practices laid the foundation for understanding individual consumer preferences, even though the scope and accuracy of personalization were relatively restricted.

TRANSITION FROM TRADITIONAL TO DIGITAL PERSONALIZATION

With the expansion of the internet and digital platforms in the late 1990s and early 2000s, personalized marketing underwent a significant transformation. The growth of e-commerce, search engines, and social media enabled marketers to collect real-time behavioral data, including browsing patterns, search history, and online interactions.

This shift allowed organizations to move beyond static segmentation and adopt dynamic, behavior-based personalization. As digital touchpoints increased, marketing communication became more interactive, timely, and customized to individual consumer needs.

CONTEMPORARY PERSONALIZED MARKETING AND CONSUMER RESPONSE

In the present digital era, personalized marketing is driven by advanced data analytics, artificial intelligence, and machine learning technologies. These tools allow businesses to predict consumer preferences, automate content delivery, and provide highly relevant recommendations across multiple platforms. While such advancements have improved marketing efficiency and consumer convenience, they have also intensified concerns regarding data privacy, consent, and transparency. As a result, consumer perception towards personalized marketing has become



increasingly complex, reflecting both appreciation for its benefits and apprehension about its potential intrusiveness

RELEVANCE TO THE CURRENT STUDY

This historical transition from simple personalization techniques to sophisticated data-driven strategies highlights the growing importance of understanding consumer perception in today's marketing environment. As personalization becomes more embedded in daily digital interactions, consumers are more aware of data collection practices and their implications.

The present study builds on this evolution by examining how consumers perceive personalized marketing, the extent to which it influences their purchasing decisions, and how privacy concerns shape their overall attitude. By situating consumer perception within this broader transition, the study aims to provide meaningful insights for marketers seeking to balance personalization effectiveness with ethical responsibility.

2. LITERATURE OF THE MAIN CONTENTS

2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study consumers' overall perception towards personalized marketing
- To analyze whether personalized marketing is perceived as a convenience or an invasion of privacy
- To examine consumer awareness regarding data collection and usage practices
- To assess the impact of privacy concerns on acceptance of personalized marketing
- To provide suggestions for improving ethical personalized marketing practices.

2.2 SCOPE OF THE STUDY



As per UGC care Guidelines

The scope of the study is confined to understanding consumers' perception towards personalized marketing, with specific emphasis on awareness, relevance, influence on purchase decisions, comfort levels, and concerns related to data privacy. The study covers respondents from diverse demographic backgrounds and analyzes their experiences with personalized marketing across digital platforms such as social media, e-commerce websites, and mobile applications. The findings of the study are intended to be useful for marketers, businesses, and academicians in designing ethical, consumer-centric personalized marketing strategies while recognizing privacy-related limitations.

2.3 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In the digital marketing environment, businesses increasingly rely on personalized marketing strategies to attract and retain consumers by offering tailored advertisements and recommendations. While such practices aim to enhance consumer experience and improve purchase decisions, they also raise significant concerns regarding data privacy, transparency, and consumer trust. Many consumers remain uncertain about how their personal data is collected, stored, and utilized, which may lead to discomfort or resistance towards personalized marketing efforts. Therefore, there is a need to examine consumers' perceptions of personalized marketing to understand whether it is viewed as a convenient marketing tool or as an invasion of privacy.

2.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is descriptive in nature and is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed using Google Forms to 124 respondents during October to December 2025. Secondary data were obtained from academic journals, research articles, books, and online sources related to personalized marketing and consumer privacy. Simple descriptive analysis using percentages and tables was employed to interpret the data.

2.5 COLLECTION OF DATA

- The study is based on both primary and secondary data.
- The data was collected from respondents across varied demographic backgrounds through digital platforms, without any geographical limitation.
- Convenience sampling was used to select respondents for the study.

2.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The study is conducted within a limited 6-month time period, which restricts the depth and extent of the analysis.
- The data collected represents only a sample of consumers and may not reflect the opinions of the entire population.
- Data accessibility is limited to publicly available resources and only survey-based responses from the respondents.

3. INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Age of Respondents

S.NO	GENDER	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	18-24	72	58.1%
2	25-40	36	29.0%
3	41-54	10	8.1%
4	55+	6	4.8%
5	TOTAL	124	100%

Interpretation: A majority of respondents belong to the 18–24 years age group, followed by 29% in the 25–40 years category. This indicates that the study predominantly reflects the perceptions of young adults who are frequent users of digital platforms.

Table 2: Gender of Respondents

S.NO	GENDER	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Male	52	41.9%
2	Female	66	53.2%
3	Others	2	1.6%
4	Prefer not to say	4	3.3%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Female respondents account for about 53.2% of the sample, while male respondents constitute 41.9%, with a negligible representation of other categories. This suggests slightly higher female participation in the study.

Table 3: Educational Qualification



S.NO	QUALIFICATION	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE
1	School Level	12	9.7%
2	Undergraduate	78	62.9%
3	Postgraduate	22	17.7%
4	Professional Qualification	12	9.7%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Around 62% of respondents are undergraduates, followed by 18% postgraduates and the remaining holding school-level or professional qualifications. This shows that the sample largely consists of individuals with higher educational exposure.

Table 4: Occupation

S.NO	OCCUPATION	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Student	70	56.5%
2	Salaried Employee	30	24.2%
3	Business/Self-employed	14	11.3%
4	Homemaker	6	4.8%
5	Others	4	3.2%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Students form the largest group at nearly 57%, followed by salaried employees at 24%. This reflects greater participation from individuals actively engaged in digital environments.

Table 5: Monthly Household Income

S.NO	INCOME LEVEL	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Below ₹19,999	36	29.0%
2	₹20,000–39,999	42	33.9%
3	₹40,000–59,999	28	22.6%
4	Above ₹60,000	18	14.5%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Approximately 34% of respondents fall within the ₹20,000–39,999 income group, followed by 23% earning below ₹20000. This indicates a moderately diverse income distribution among respondents.

Table 6: Awareness of Personalized Marketing

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Yes	94	75.8%
2	No	30	24.2%
3	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: About 76% of respondents reported being aware of personalized marketing practices, while 24% were not. This indicates high overall awareness among consumers.

Table 7: Noticing Tailored Advertisements Online

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Always	22	17.7%
2	Often	38	30.6%
3	Sometimes	40	32.3%
4	Rarely	16	12.9%
5	Never	8	6.5%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 50% of respondents stated that they often or always notice tailored advertisements online. This suggests widespread exposure to personalized marketing.

Table 8: Platform of Personalized Marketing Exposure

S.NO	PLATFORM	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Social Media	56	45.2%
2	Email	12	9.7%
3	E-commerce Websites	38	30.6%
4	Mobile Applications	14	11.3%
5	Others	4	3.2%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Social media platforms account for about 45% of personalized marketing experiences, followed by e-commerce websites at 30%. This indicates social media as the dominant channel for personalization.

Table 9: Understanding of Data Collection

S.NO	RESPONSES	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Completely	28	22.6%
2	To some extent	52	41.9%
3	Very little	30	24.2%
4	Not at all	14	11.3%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Around 65% of respondents understand data collection practices to some extent, while 35% have very little or no understanding. This reflects partial consumer awareness regarding data usage.

Table 10: Frequency of Personalized Recommendations

S.NO	RESPONSES	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Very Frequently	26	21.0%
2	Frequently	40	32.3%
3	Occasionally	38	30.6%
4	Rarely	14	11.3%
5	Never	6	4.8%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 58% of respondents encounter personalized recommendations frequently or very frequently. This indicates consistent exposure to personalized content.

Table 11: Relevance of Personalized Advertisements

S.NO	RATING	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	1	10	8.1%
2	2	18	14.5%
3	3	36	29.0%

4	4	40	32.3%
5	5	20	16.1%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: About 42% of respondents rated advertisement relevance as 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale. This suggests that many consumers find personalized ads reasonably relevant.

Table 12: Personalized Marketing Improves Shopping Experience

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	30	24.2%
2	Agree	46	37.1%
3	Neutral	28	22.6%
4	Disagree	14	11.3%
5	Strongly Disagree	6	4.8%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Approximately 67% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that personalized marketing improves their online shopping experience. This indicates a largely positive perception of personalization benefits.

Table 13: Preference for Personalized Advertisements

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	24	19.4%
2	Agree	40	32.3%
3	Neutral	34	27.4%
4	Disagree	18	14.5%
5	Strongly Disagree	8	6.4%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 61% of respondents preferred personalized advertisements over generic ones. This suggests a favorable inclination toward tailored marketing content.

Table 14: Personalized Marketing helps Purchase Decisions



S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	26	21.0%
2	Agree	44	35.5%
3	Neutral	30	24.2%
4	Disagree	16	12.9%
5	Strongly Disagree	8	6.4%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: About 63% of respondents agreed that personalized marketing helps them make better purchase decisions. This indicates perceived usefulness in consumer decision-making.

Table 15: Comfort Level with Personalized Messages

S.NO	RATING	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	1	12	9.7%
2	2	18	14.5%
3	3	34	27.4%
4	4	38	30.6%
5	5	22	17.8%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Around 54% of respondents rated their comfort level as 4 or 5 on the scale. This shows moderate to high comfort with receiving personalized messages.

Table 16: Increase in Interest due to Personalized Ads

S.NO	RESPONSES	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	22	17.7%
2	Agree	44	35.5%
3	Neutral	34	27.4%
4	Disagree	16	12.9%
5	Strongly Disagree	8	6.5%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 59% of respondents agreed that personalized advertisements increase their interest in products or services. This suggests effectiveness in capturing consumer attention.



Table 17: Likelihood of Clicking Personalized Ads

S.NO	RATING	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	1	16	12.9%
2	2	20	16.1%
3	3	36	29.0%
4	4	34	27.4%
5	5	18	14.6%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Approximately 47% of respondents rated their likelihood to click personalized ads as 4 or 5. This indicates a moderate engagement response.

Table 18: Influence of Personalized Offers

S.NO	RATING	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	1	16	12.9%
2	2	20	16.1%
3	3	36	29.0%
4	4	34	27.4%
5	5	18	14.6%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Around 41% stated that personalized offers influence their purchases, while 35% responded “depends.” This suggests conditional influence based on context.

Table 19: Repeat Purchase Likelihood

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	20	16.1%
2	Agree	40	32.3%
3	Neutral	38	30.6%
4	Disagree	16	12.9%
5	Strongly Disagree	10	8.1%



As per UGC care Guidelines

6	Total	124	100%
---	--------------	------------	-------------

Interpretation: About 56% of respondents agreed that personalized marketing increases repeat purchase likelihood. This indicates its role in customer retention.

Table 20: Concern about Data collection

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Yes	20	16.1%
2	No	40	32.3%
3	Maybe	38	30.6%
4	Never thought about it	16	12.9%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 60% of respondents expressed concern over how their personal data is collected and used. This highlights significant privacy apprehension.

Table 21: Privacy concerns Reducing Trust

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Yes	46	37.1%
2	No	22	17.7%
3	Maybe	36	29.0%
4	Never thought about it	20	16.2%
5	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: About 49% reported that privacy concerns reduce their trust in personalized marketing. This suggests privacy as a key trust-related issue.

Table 22: Willingness to share Personal Information

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	True	58	46.8%
2	False	66	53.2%
3	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Around 53% of respondents were willing to share personal information for improved experiences. This indicates cautious but conditional acceptance.

Table 23: Clear Communication Improves Acceptance

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	36	29.0%
2	Agree	48	38.7%
3	Neutral	26	21.0%
4	Disagree	10	8.1%
5	Strongly Disagree	4	3.2%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 71% of respondents agreed and strongly agreed that clear communication would improve acceptance of personalized marketing. This emphasizes the importance of transparency.

Table 24: Strategy to Improve Attitude

S.NO	STRATEGY	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Better Data Privacy	18	14.5%
2	More Relevant Content	16	12.9%
3	Transparency	22	17.7%
4	Control Options	14	11.3%
5	All of the Above	54	43.6%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation and Inferen: About 38% selected “all of the above,” combining privacy, relevance, transparency, and control. This indicates a holistic consumer expectation.

Table 25: Brand Appeal

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
------	----------	-------------	--------------



1	True	56	45.2%
2	False	34	27.4%
3	Not sure	34	27.4%
4	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Approximately 58% felt that personalized marketing makes brands more appealing. This suggests positive brand perception effects.

Table 26: Preference for Personalized offers

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Yes	50	40.3%
2	No	30	24.2%
3	Maybe	44	35.5%
4	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 62% of respondents preferred personalized offers over general discounts. This reflects consumer interest in customized value propositions.

Table 27: Need for Consumer Control

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Strongly Agree	44	35.5%
2	Agree	46	37.1%
3	Neutral	20	16.1%
4	Disagree	10	8.1%
5	Strongly Disagree	4	3.2%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: About 74% of respondents agreed that brands should provide more control over personalization. This indicates strong demand for consumer autonomy.

Table 28: Transparency Increases Trust

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE%
1	True	56	45.2%
2	False	34	27.4%
3	Not sure	34	27.4%
4	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Nearly 69% of respondents believed transparency in data usage would increase trust. This reinforces transparency as a trust-building factor.

Table 29: Overall Comfort Level

S.NO	RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
1	Very Comfortable	20	16.1%
2	Comfortable	38	30.6%
3	Neutral	34	27.4%
4	Uncomfortable	20	16.1%
5	Very Uncomfortable	12	9.8%
6	Total	124	100%

Interpretation: Approximately 57% of respondents reported feeling comfortable or very comfortable with personalized marketing. This suggests general acceptance despite existing concerns.

OVERALL INFERENCE OF THE STUDY:

The study reveals that consumers generally exhibit a moderately positive perception towards personalized marketing, particularly in terms of relevance, convenience, and improved shopping experience. A significant proportion of respondents acknowledge that personalized advertisements and recommendations assist in better purchase decisions and enhance brand appeal. However, the findings also indicate noticeable concerns regarding data privacy, transparency, and control over personal information. While awareness of personalized marketing is high, understanding of data collection practices remains limited.

An additional observation from the study highlights the growing importance of trust in shaping consumer attitudes toward personalized marketing. Respondents tend to favor brands that clearly communicate how personal data is collected, stored, and used, as this transparency reduces perceived risks and builds confidence. This indicates that businesses must strike a balance between customization and privacy, ensuring that personalization efforts are perceived as helpful rather than invasive. Therefore, the success of personalized marketing largely depends on responsible data management, clear communication, and respect for consumer autonomy.



SUGGESTIONS:

- Companies should clearly communicate how consumer data is collected, stored, and used to improve transparency and trust.
- Marketers should provide consumers with greater control over personalization settings and data-sharing preferences.
- Personalized marketing efforts should focus on relevance and usefulness rather than excessive targeting.
- Strict adherence to data protection and privacy regulations should be ensured at all stages of marketing activities.
- Brands should prioritize ethical and consumer-centric personalization strategies to build long-term relationships.

CONCLUSION:

Personalized marketing has emerged as a powerful tool in the digital marketing landscape, offering consumers tailored content and enhanced shopping experiences. The findings of the study indicate that while consumers largely appreciate the convenience and relevance of personalized marketing, concerns related to data privacy and misuse of personal information persist. The study concludes that personalized marketing is effective when implemented responsibly, balancing customization with transparency and consumer control. By addressing privacy concerns and adopting ethical marketing practices, businesses can strengthen consumer trust and acceptance of personalized marketing strategies.

REFERENCES:

- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2014). *Consumer Behavior* (11th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Arora, N., et al. (2008). Putting one-to-one marketing to work: Personalization, customization, and choice. *Marketing Letters*, 19(3–4), 305–321.
- Kumar, V., & Reinartz, W. (2016). Creating enduring customer value. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 36–68.



As per UGC care Guidelines

- Smith, A. N., & Anderson, M. (2018). Privacy concerns and digital advertising. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 35(4), 345–357.