International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

Algorithmic Persuasion in Digital Retail: How Personalized Recommendations Shape Consumer Trust and Online Buying Intent

(An Empirical Study of Recommendation-System Perceptions Among Young Indian Online Shoppers)

Dr. Amruta Shyamkumar
MBA Department , Dr. D Y Patil institute of Management and Entrepreneur Development, Varale -Pune

Abstract - Recommendation engines have become a default feature of digital retail, quietly shaping which products shoppers see and, by extension, what they eventually buy. Yet the psychological chain that links a recommendation on a screen to a decision to purchase is still debated: does relevance alone drive intention, or do trust and a felt sense of personalization do the heavier lifting? This study examines that chain among 28 online shoppers in India, most of them students and young postgraduates who shop through platforms such as Flipkart, Amazon, Meesho, and Myntra. Using a structured questionnaire built around five constructs — recommendation relevance, perceived usefulness, perceived personalization, recommendation trust, and online purchase intention — each measured with five items on a five-point agreement scale, the study computes construct reliability, descriptive patterns, inter-construct correlations, and a multiple regression predicting purchase intention. All five scales showed strong internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha between 0.86 and 0.95). Respondents rated personalization as the strongest of the four antecedent constructs (M = 3.71), narrowly ahead of trust and relevance, while usefulness lagged slightly behind. The four antecedents jointly explained roughly two-thirds of the variance in purchase intention, with relevance emerging as the strongest individual predictor once the others were held constant. Notably, twenty-two of the twenty-eight respondents reported having bought a product after encountering it through a personalized recommendation, even though overall satisfaction with these systems was closer to neutral than enthusiastic. The findings suggest that recommendation systems succeed less by impressing users than by quietly matching their needs closely enough, often enough, to convert attention into action. Implications for platform design and directions for larger-sample confirmatory research are discussed.

Keywords: recommendation systems, personalization, consumer trust, online purchase intention, e-commerce, India

1. INTRODUCTION

Walk through any major e-commerce app today and it is difficult to find a screen that has not been shaped, in some way, by a recommendation algorithm. Homepages open with "picked for you" carousels, product pages close with "customers also bought," and search results are quietly re-ranked based on past clicks. What began as a convenience feature has become a central mechanism through which online retailers try to convert browsing into buying. This growing reliance on algorithmic curation raises a practical question for both researchers and platform designers: which part of the experience actually moves a shopper closer to a purchase — the accuracy of the suggestion, the sense that the platform "gets" them, the trust they place in the system, or simply the convenience it offers?

This question is not merely academic. E-commerce platforms invest heavily in recommendation infrastructure, yet the return on that investment depends on consumers actually responding to what is suggested. A recommendation that is technically well-targeted but that a shopper does not trust may go ignored; conversely, a shopper who trusts a platform in general may act on a mediocre suggestion out of habit. Untangling these relationships — relevance, usefulness, personalization, and trust — and their combined pull on purchase intention is the central aim of this study.

The present research addresses this aim using primary survey data collected from 28 online shoppers, predominantly young, educated respondents in India who report at least occasional exposure to personalized recommendations while shopping online. Rather than treating recommendation quality as a single undifferentiated variable, the study separates it into four conceptually distinct but related constructs and tests how strongly each relates to shoppers' stated intention to purchase recommended products. The result is a compact but statistically grounded picture of how algorithmic suggestions translate into buying behavior in a real, if modestly sized, consumer sample.

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

1.1 Purpose and Contribution

This paper contributes in three ways. First, it operationalizes four commonly discussed but rarely jointly tested antecedents of purchase intention — relevance, usefulness, personalization, and trust — using validated multi-item scales, and reports their reliability. Second, it quantifies how these constructs relate to one another and to purchase intention through correlation and regression analysis, offering a relative ranking of their influence rather than treating them as equally important by assumption. Third, it grounds the discussion in a specific and under-studied consumer segment: young, digitally native shoppers in urban India, whose shopping habits and platform preferences differ in meaningful ways from the Western samples that dominate much of the existing recommendation-systems literature.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Research on recommendation systems has generally converged on the idea that a suggestion only influences behavior once it clears a perceptual threshold on the part of the consumer — the shopper has to notice it, judge it as relevant, find it useful, sense that it was tailored to them, and trust it enough to act. This study treats these as four related but distinct constructs rather than a single "recommendation quality" score, on the reasoning that a platform could, in principle, score high on one dimension and low on another — for instance, a recommendation might be broadly useful for comparison shopping without feeling personally tailored, or it might feel personalized without necessarily being trusted.

2.1 Recommendation Relevance

Relevance refers to the degree of fit between what a system suggests and what a shopper is actually looking for. It is typically considered the most immediate and observable quality of a recommendation: a shopper can judge relevance almost instantly, before any deeper evaluation of usefulness or trust takes place. In this sense, relevance functions as a gatekeeper — an irrelevant suggestion is unlikely to be processed further, regardless of how well-designed the underlying algorithm is.

2.2 Perceived Usefulness

Usefulness captures the instrumental value a shopper assigns to a recommendation — whether it saves time, narrows down choices, or otherwise makes the shopping task easier. This construct draws on the broader technology-acceptance tradition, which has long argued that people adopt and rely on a tool to the extent that it helps them accomplish a goal with less effort. Applied to recommendations, usefulness is less about whether a specific product is appealing and more about whether the recommendation mechanism, as a feature, makes shopping more efficient.

2.3 Perceived Personalization

Personalization reflects the shopper's sense that recommendations are tailored specifically to them, rather than generated generically for any visitor. This is a subjective and somewhat emotional judgment — it depends not just on the accuracy of the algorithm but on whether the shopper attributes that accuracy to genuine understanding of their preferences. A high sense of personalization can plausibly deepen engagement even when individual suggestions are only moderately relevant, because it signals an ongoing, adaptive relationship between shopper and platform rather than a one-off match.

2.4 Recommendation Trust

Trust concerns the shopper's confidence that recommendations are offered in good faith and are generally reliable, rather than being manipulative or purely promotional. Trust is often treated as a hinge variable in consumer behavior research: it can amplify the effect of positive perceptions (a relevant, useful, personalized recommendation is acted upon more readily when trusted) and dampen the effect of negative ones (occasional poor suggestions are more easily forgiven when overall trust is high).

2.5 Online Purchase Intention

Purchase intention is the outcome construct of interest — the shopper's self-reported likelihood of considering or buying a product because it was recommended. While intention is not identical to actual purchase behavior, it remains one of the most widely used and defensible proxies for it in consumer research, particularly in survey-based designs where observing real transactions is impractical.

2.6 Conceptual Model

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

Based on the constructs above, the study tests a simple conceptual model in which recommendation relevance, perceived usefulness, perceived personalization, and recommendation trust each act as potential predictors of online purchase intention. The model does not assume a fixed causal ordering among the four antecedents; instead, it treats them as parallel, correlated inputs and asks, empirically, how much unique explanatory weight each carries once the others are accounted for.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

The study pursues the following specific objectives:

- To examine the demographic and shopping-behavior profile of respondents exposed to personalized e-commerce recommendations.
- To assess the reliability and descriptive distribution of the recommendation relevance, perceived usefulness, perceived personalization, recommendation trust, and purchase intention scales.
- To examine the strength of association among the four antecedent constructs and online purchase intention.
- To identify, through regression analysis, which antecedent construct contributes most strongly to explaining purchase intention.

Correspondingly, the study tests the following hypotheses:

- H1: Recommendation relevance is positively associated with online purchase intention.
- H2: Perceived usefulness is positively associated with online purchase intention.
- H3: Perceived personalization is positively associated with online purchase intention.
- H4: Recommendation trust is positively associated with online purchase intention.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

The study follows a descriptive, cross-sectional survey design using primary data collected through a structured, self-administered questionnaire. This design was chosen because the research aims to capture consumers' existing perceptions and self-reported behavior at a single point in time rather than to test an intervention or track change over time.

4.2 Sample and Data Collection

Data were collected from 28 respondents through an online questionnaire. The sample is predominantly young and highly educated: 75 percent of respondents fall in the 18-25 age band, and 82 percent hold a postgraduate qualification or higher. Students make up the largest occupational group (71 percent), and 61 percent report no independent personal income, consistent with a largely student sample. This profile should be read as a limitation on generalizability as much as a description of the sample — the findings speak most directly to young, digitally fluent, education-oriented consumers rather than to online shoppers as a whole.

4.3 Measures

Five constructs were measured, each with five items rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree): recommendation relevance, perceived usefulness, perceived personalization, recommendation trust, and online purchase intention. Additional single items captured shopping frequency, platform preference, product category preference, frequency of noticing recommendations, overall satisfaction, prior purchase behavior following a recommendation, and the single factor respondents weigh most heavily when deciding whether to act on a recommendation. A construct-level score for each of the five scales was computed as the mean of its five items for each respondent.

4.4 Analytical Approach

Internal consistency of each five-item scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were computed for each construct score. Pearson correlations were used to examine bivariate associations among the five construct scores. Finally, a multiple linear regression was run with online purchase intention as the dependent variable and the

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

four antecedent construct scores (relevance, usefulness, personalization, trust) entered simultaneously as predictors, allowing an assessment of each construct's relative contribution once the others are statistically controlled.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Sample Profile

Table 1 summarizes the demographic composition of the sample. Consistent with the online, convenience-based recruitment method, the sample skews young, educated, and pre-income, with a roughly even gender split.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents (n = 28)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Age	18-25 years	21	75.0
	26-35 years	3	10.7
	36-45 years	4	14.3
Gender	Female	15	53.6
	Male	13	46.4
Education	Postgraduate	22	78.6
	Undergraduate	5	17.9
	Doctorate	1	3.6
Occupation	Student	20	71.4
	Salaried Employee	4	14.3
	Professional	3	10.7
	Self-employed / Business	1	3.6
Monthly Income	No personal income	17	60.7
	Below ₹25,000	2	7.1
	₹25,001-₹50,000	4	14.3
	₹50,001-₹75,000	3	10.7
	₹75,001-₹1,00,000	2	7.1

Shopping behavior data (Table 2) show that most respondents are relatively infrequent shoppers — half shop only one to two times a month, and a further 36 percent shop less than once a month. Flipkart is the dominant platform (54 percent), followed by Amazon (25 percent), Meesho (14 percent), and Myntra (7 percent). Clothing and fashion is by far the most commonly purchased category (68 percent), well ahead of electronics and beauty and personal care (14 percent each).

Table 2. Shopping Behavior and Platform Use (n = 28)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Shopping frequency	Less than once a month	10	35.7
	1-2 times a month	14	50.0
	3-5 times a month	4	14.3

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Preferred platform	Flipkart	15	53.6
	Amazon	7	25.0
	Meesho	4	14.3
	Myntra	2	7.1
Most-purchased category	Clothing & Fashion	19	67.9
	Electronics	4	14.3
	Beauty & Personal Care	4	14.3
	Home & Kitchen	1	3.6

Notably, awareness of recommendations is mixed: only 8 respondents (29 percent) notice personalized suggestions "often" or "very often," while 32 percent report noticing them "rarely" or "never." This suggests that a meaningful share of the sample interacts with recommendation systems without being highly conscious of doing so, which is itself relevant to interpreting the attitudinal results that follow.

5.2 Scale Reliability

All five construct scales demonstrated strong internal consistency, comfortably exceeding the conventional 0.70 threshold for exploratory research (Table 3). Perceived usefulness and online purchase intention showed the highest reliability (alpha above 0.94), while recommendation relevance, though still strong, showed the comparatively lowest alpha of the five scales.

Table 3. Reliability of Multi-Item Scales

Construct	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Recommendation Relevance (RR)	5	0.860	Good
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	5	0.940	Excellent
Perceived Personalization (PP)	5	0.869	Good
Recommendation Trust (TR)	5	0.927	Excellent
Online Purchase Intention (OPI)	5	0.949	Excellent

5.3 Descriptive Construct Scores

On the five-point scale, all four antecedent constructs clustered in a narrow, moderately positive band, with perceived personalization scoring highest and perceived usefulness scoring lowest, though the differences among them are small relative to their standard deviations (Table 4). Purchase intention itself averaged close to the midpoint of "neutral" and "agree," with the widest spread of any construct, indicating more disagreement among respondents about their likelihood of buying recommended products than about how relevant or personalized those products feel.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Construct Scores (1-5 scale)

Construct	Mean	SD	Rank
Perceived Personalization	3.71	0.85	1
Recommendation Trust	3.61	0.92	2
Recommendation Relevance	3.59	0.82	3

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

Construct	Mean	SD	Rank
Perceived Usefulness	3.56	0.99	4
Online Purchase Intention	3.54	1.09	—

Overall satisfaction with personalized recommendations (Table 5) was similarly moderate: half of respondents reported being "satisfied," 39 percent were "neutral," and only a small minority reported dissatisfaction. Despite this restrained satisfaction, a large majority — 22 of 28 respondents (78.6 percent) — confirmed they had actually purchased a product after discovering it through a personalized recommendation, with only two respondents (7.1 percent) denying having done so. When asked what factor matters most in deciding whether to act on a recommendation, "relevance to my needs" was the clear leader, chosen by more than half of respondents, ahead of usefulness of the information, brand reputation, trust, and price.

Table 5. Satisfaction and Purchase Behavior (n = 28)

Item	Category	n	%
Overall satisfaction	Satisfied	14	50.0
	Neutral	11	39.3
	Very dissatisfied	2	7.1
	Dissatisfied	1	3.6
Purchased after a recommendation	Yes	22	78.6
	Not sure	4	14.3
	No	2	7.1
Most important deciding factor	Relevance to my needs	15	53.6
	Usefulness of the information	5	17.9
	Brand reputation	5	17.9
	Trust in the recommendation	2	7.1
	Price	1	3.6

5.4 Correlations Among Constructs

All construct pairs were positively and, for the most part, strongly correlated (Table 6), consistent with the idea that these four antecedents, while conceptually distinct, tend to move together in respondents' minds — a shopper who finds recommendations relevant also tends to find them useful, personalized, and trustworthy. Perceived personalization showed the strongest links to the other antecedents, particularly usefulness ($r = .849$) and trust ($r = .853$), suggesting it may function as something of a hub construct in this sample. Purchase intention correlated most strongly with recommendation relevance ($r = .757$) and somewhat less strongly with the other three constructs, foreshadowing the regression results below.

Table 6. Pearson Correlations Among Construct Scores

	RR	PU	PP	TR	OPI
Recommendation Relevance (RR)	1.000	0.645	0.811	0.720	0.757
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	0.645	1.000	0.849	0.686	0.676

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

	RR	PU	PP	TR	OPI
Perceived Personalization (PP)	0.811	0.849	1.000	0.853	0.687
Recommendation Trust (TR)	0.720	0.686	0.853	1.000	0.688
Online Purchase Intention (OPI)	0.757	0.676	0.687	0.688	1.000

5.5 Regression Analysis

A multiple regression with online purchase intention as the dependent variable and the four antecedent constructs entered simultaneously produced an R^2 of 0.679, meaning the model accounts for roughly 68 percent of the variance in respondents' purchase intention scores — a substantial share for a four-predictor model in a sample of this size (Table 7). Recommendation relevance emerged as the strongest positive predictor by a clear margin, followed by perceived usefulness and recommendation trust. Perceived personalization's coefficient was negative once the other three constructs were held constant, which — given its strong positive zero-order correlation with purchase intention reported above — points to shared variance (multicollinearity) among the four antecedents rather than a genuine suppressing effect of personalization on intention. This pattern is consistent with the small sample size and the high inter-correlations documented in Table 6, and is discussed further in Section 6.

Table 7. Regression of Online Purchase Intention on Antecedent Constructs

Predictor	Unstandardized B
(Intercept)	-0.321
Recommendation Relevance	0.820
Perceived Usefulness	0.528
Perceived Personalization	-0.702
Recommendation Trust	0.453

Model $R^2 = 0.679$; $n = 28$.

6. DISCUSSION

The results paint a picture in which recommendation systems work not by dazzling consumers but by quietly clearing a fairly modest bar, often enough, to nudge behavior. Construct means hovered around the midpoint of the scale rather than at its ceiling, and overall satisfaction leaned more "neutral" than "delighted." Yet the behavioral outcome — a reported purchase triggered by a recommendation — was affirmed by nearly four in five respondents. This gap between muted attitudinal enthusiasm and fairly widespread behavioral follow-through is, in itself, an interesting finding: it suggests that purchase intention in this context may be driven less by how impressed a shopper is with the recommendation experience overall and more by whether any single suggestion happens to land well enough, at the right moment, to prompt action.

The regression results lend some support to this interpretation. Recommendation relevance was the strongest predictor of purchase intention once the other constructs were controlled for, echoing the survey's direct evidence that "relevance to my needs" was, by a wide margin, the factor respondents cited most often as decisive. This is broadly consistent with H1 and suggests that, at least for this sample, the most direct path to purchase runs through simple fit between what is shown and what the shopper wants — rather than through a more elaborate sense of being personally understood by the platform.

The negative regression coefficient on perceived personalization, despite its strong positive correlation with purchase intention on its own, deserves a cautious reading rather than a literal one. With only 28 respondents and correlations among the four antecedents running as high as 0.85, the regression is likely affected by multicollinearity: because relevance, usefulness, personalization, and trust move so closely together in this sample, the model has difficulty cleanly separating personalization's unique contribution from

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

that of its correlated neighbors. The safer conclusion is that H3 receives support at the bivariate level but cannot be confirmed as an independent driver of intention once the other three constructs are accounted for in a sample this size — a question better resolved with a larger, more statistically powered dataset.

Perceived usefulness and recommendation trust both contributed positively to the regression model, consistent with H2 and H4, though neither matched relevance's contribution. This ordering — relevance first, usefulness and trust close behind, personalization uncertain — suggests a plausible practical hierarchy for platform designers: getting the basic match right may matter more, on the margin, than layering on cues of tailoring or building general platform trust, at least for converting a single recommendation into a purchase intention.

The demographic profile of the sample adds useful context. A sample dominated by students and young postgraduates with limited personal income, shopping mainly for clothing and fashion on Flipkart, is a population for whom price sensitivity and browsing-driven discovery may already be high; a recommendation that is obviously relevant to a specific need may cut through more efficiently for this group than an elaborate personalization narrative would. Whether the same hierarchy of predictors would hold for older, higher-income, or more categorically diverse shoppers is an open question this study cannot answer.

7. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

For e-commerce platforms, the findings suggest that investment in recommendation accuracy — ensuring suggestions genuinely match a shopper's expressed or inferred needs — may offer more direct returns on purchase intention than investment in surface-level personalization cues (such as "picked for you" messaging) that do not correspond to a real improvement in fit. At the same time, the consistently positive role of usefulness and trust across the analysis indicates that relevance alone is not sufficient on its own terms: recommendations that are relevant but effortful to evaluate, or that come from a platform the shopper does not yet trust, may still underperform. A balanced strategy — prioritizing match quality while maintaining transparency and consistency that sustains trust — is likely to be more robust than optimizing any single construct in isolation.

The finding that a majority of shoppers act on recommendations despite only moderate satisfaction also has a design implication: platforms should not necessarily treat neutral satisfaction scores as a signal of failure. In this sample, the recommendation feature was doing meaningful commercial work even without generating enthusiastic endorsement, which suggests that satisfaction surveys alone may understate a recommendation system's practical impact on conversion.

8. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

- Sample size: with 28 respondents, the study is exploratory rather than confirmatory. Regression coefficients, in particular, should be treated as indicative rather than precise, and the negative coefficient on personalization likely reflects multicollinearity rather than a true suppressing effect; replication with a larger sample is needed to resolve this.
- Sample composition: the heavy skew toward young, postgraduate, low-income, student respondents limits how far the findings can be generalized to the broader online shopping population, including older consumers, working professionals with higher disposable income, and shoppers outside urban, digitally engaged segments.
- Self-reported measures: both the antecedent constructs and purchase intention were captured through self-report, which is subject to social desirability and recall effects. Purchase intention, in particular, is a proxy for behavior rather than a direct behavioral measure.
- Cross-sectional design: data were collected at a single point in time, which precludes any claim about how these perceptions might change with repeated platform use or over longer shopping histories.
- Category concentration: because clothing and fashion dominated the reported purchase category, findings may be more reflective of recommendation dynamics in that category than in others, such as electronics or groceries, where decision processes differ.

Future research would benefit from a larger, stratified sample that varies age, income, and platform use more deliberately, allowing the four antecedent constructs to be entered into more statistically powered models — potentially including structural equation modeling to formally test personalization's role as a mediator between relevance/usefulness and trust, rather than as a parallel, independent predictor. Experimental designs that manipulate recommendation relevance or personalization directly, rather than relying solely on perceptual self-report, would also help clarify the causal direction that a cross-sectional survey like this one cannot establish.

9. CONCLUSION

This study set out to understand which qualities of e-commerce recommendations — relevance, usefulness, personalization, or trust — most strongly relate to consumers' intention to purchase recommended products. Drawing on survey data from 28 young, educated online shoppers in India, the analysis found that all four antecedents are positively associated with purchase intention at the bivariate level, that recommendation relevance stands out as the strongest individual predictor once the others are statistically controlled, and that a large majority of respondents have already translated recommendation exposure into an actual purchase, even amid only moderate overall satisfaction. The picture that emerges is one in which recommendation systems succeed less through emotional resonance and more through practical fit — a reminder that, for at least this segment of consumers, getting the basic match right may be the single most important thing a recommendation engine can do. Given the modest sample size, these conclusions should be read as a well-grounded starting hypothesis for larger confirmatory research rather than a final word on the subject.

REFERENCES

[1] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211.
[2] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319-340.
[3] Komiak, S. Y. X., & Benbasat, I. (2006). The effects of personalization and familiarity on trust and adoption of recommendation agents. MIS Quarterly, 30(4), 941-960.
[4] Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709-734.
[5] McKnight, D. H., Choudhury, V., & Kacmar, C. (2002). Developing and validating trust measures for e-commerce: An integrative typology. Information Systems Research, 13(3), 334-359.
[6] Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
[7] Pappas, I. O., Kourouthanassis, P. E., Giannakos, M. N., & Chrissikopoulos, V. (2017). Sense and sensibility in personalized e-commerce: How emotions rebalance the purchase intentions of persuaded customers. Psychology & Marketing, 34(10), 972-986.
[8] Ricci, F., Rokach, L., & Shapira, B. (2015). Recommender systems: Introduction and challenges. In Recommender Systems Handbook (pp. 1-34). Springer.
[9] Tam, K. Y., & Ho, S. Y. (2006). Understanding the impact of web personalization on user information processing and decision outcomes. MIS Quarterly, 30(4), 865-890.
[10] Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186-204.

Appendix A: Construct Definitions and Item Sources (Survey Instrument)

All items below were rated on a five-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree).

Recommendation Relevance (RR1-RR5)

Recommended products match my needs; Recommendations suit my current needs; Recommendations match my interests; Suggested products fit my requirements; Recommended products are relevant to me.

Perceived Usefulness (PU1-PU5)

Recommendations help me find products quickly; Recommendations save my search time; Recommendations help me compare products; Recommendations make shopping easier; Recommendations help me make purchase decisions.

Perceived Personalization (PP1-PP5)

Recommendations seem selected for me; Platforms understand my preferences; Recommendations reflect my past interests; Recommendations fit my personal needs; Recommendations make shopping more relevant.

Recommendation Trust (TR1-TR5)

I trust e-commerce recommendations; Recommended products are usually suitable for me; Recommendations from familiar platforms are reliable; I feel confident using recommendations; I am comfortable considering recommended products.

Online Purchase Intention (OPI1-OPI5)

I am likely to consider recommended products; Relevant recommendations increase my buying intention; I would consider buying a suitable recommended product; Recommendations can influence my purchase decision; I am likely to buy appropriately recommended products.