Journal of Artificial Intelligence General Science (JAIGS)

ISSN: 3006-4023 (Online), Volume 5, Issue 1, 2024 DOI: 10.60087

Home page https://ojs.boulibrary.com/index.php/JAIGS

Adaptive Personalization through User Linguistic Style Analysis: A Comprehensive Approach

Raghu K Para
Independent Researcher, Artificial Intelligence & Computational Linguistics, Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

Adaptive or hyper-personalization has become a cornerstone of digital marketing, customer relationship management, and interactive user experiences. While current personalization strategies often depend on demographic data, browsing history, and explicit user feedback, a growing body of research highlights the potentiality of linguistic style analysis to refine, improve and elevate personalization. By evaluating how users naturally communicate—whether it be in formal vs. informal registers, succinct vs. elaborate expressions, or emotive vs. neutral tones—systems can adapt their own communication formats, ultimately increasing brand engagement for businesses and customer satisfaction. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the theoretical foundations, computational methods, and empirical findings related to user linguistic style analysis for hyper-targeted communication. We propose a multidisciplinary framework for analyzing user writing style via computational linguistic techniques, discuss algorithmic combinations to mapping style features to adaptive content formats, and present evidence of the positive impact of style-based and precise personalization on key performance indicators such as brand loyalty, online click-through rates, and customer satisfaction metrics. We conclude by outlining challenges such as data privacy, cross-cultural variability, and real-time deployment constraints, emphasizing directions for future research in adaptive user linguistic analysis.

Keywords: Linguistic Style, Personalization, Adaptive Communication, Brand Engagement, Customer Satisfaction, Computational Linguistics

***ARTICLE INFO**: Received: 01.10.2024 Accepted: 10.10.2024 Published: 20.10.2024*

1. Introduction

Personalization strategies have long been paramount to e-commerce, digital marketing, and interactive platforms, aspiring to deliver experiences that resonate closely with customer preferences (Adomavicius & Tuzhilin, 2005). Traditional personalization hinges upon demographic segmentation, purchase history, or explicit user feedback (Konstan & Riedl, 2012). However, the shift toward hyper-personalization (Lee et al., 2020) underscores the importance to incorporate deeper, context-sensitive insights about everyone's communication patterns and psychological proclivities. A critical emergent area in this domain is user linguistic style analysis, which involves recognizing and interpreting how individuals instinctively approach and formulate language—covering factors such as formality, brevity, rhetorical flair, or variability in emotional undertones.

While text-based sentiment analysis has become mainstream (Liu, 2012), style-specific cues often remain underutilized. A user's pronoun use, modal verb frequency, average sentence length, and idiomatic allusions or expressions can signal personality traits, social identity, or situational context (Pennebaker, 2011). By capturing these nuances, adaptive systems can dynamically reshape their communication strategies—for instance, adopting a more formally suited and structured tone for users who consistently write in precise language, or conversely using casual, emotive language for those who prefer and adopt an informal style (Heylighen & Dewaele, 2002). This style matching phenomenon can bolster consumer trust, reinstate brand loyalty, and perceived alignment between the customer and the platform's "voice" (Go & Sundar, 2019).

The stakes are high in brand engagement. Studies report that hyper-personalization can yield substantial lifts in user satisfaction, click-through rates, and overall conversions (Ho & Tam, 2005; Tam & Ho, 2006). Yet, many foundational personalization models lack real-time linguistic style inference or remain confined to large-scale demographic or psychographic data (Resnick & Varian, 1997; Koufaris, 2002). As a result, users may receive communication that feels misaligned or impersonal—an outcome that ironically undermines the original goal of personalization (Sundar & Marathe, 2010).

In this paper, we undertake a comprehensive examination of adaptive personalization through user linguistic style analysis. Section 2 offers a background on the theoretical foundations of linguistic style, describing style-related paradigms from discourse analysis and psycholinguistics. Section 3 delves into computational approaches for extracting style features, including part-of-speech usage, readability metrics, and state-of-the-art transformer-based language modeling. Section 4 presents frameworks for algorithmic adaptation, bridging style features to tailored communication strategies. Section 5 reviews empirical evidence and real-world applications, focusing on measuring brand engagement and customer satisfaction outcomes. Section 6 discusses ongoing challenges—data privacy, cross-cultural differences, model interpretability—and potential solutions. Finally, Section 7 highlights future directions, calling for more intricate, multidisciplinary research to refine style-based personalization models. Our goal is to demonstrate that linguistic style analysis holds promise as a core component of next-generation personalization architectures, transcending standard demographic, foundational or preference-based targeting.

2. Background and Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Defining Linguistic Style

Linguistic style refers to the systematic variations in how individuals or groups use language, beyond the fundamental meaning of the words themselves (Crystal, 2008). Style can encompass formality vs. informality (Heylighen & Dewaele, 2002), level of abstraction (Concrete vs. Abstract language), directness vs. hedging, and emotional expressiveness (Biber, 1988; Wolfe et al., 2022). These stylistic differences can be reliable personality markers—such as consistently formal writing in professional contexts—or they can shift with context (Giles et al., 1991).

In brand-customer interactions, style becomes significant because it formulates a perceived alignment between the user and the company's tone. A mismatch in formality, for instance, can convey incompetence or insincerity from the user's perspective (Go & Sundar, 2019). Similarly, a mismatch in emotional engagement—like an overtly "peppy" brand message to a user who typically communicates in a shy or a stoic manner—may come across as intrusive or off-putting. The rhetorical principle of communication accommodation posits that adjusting speech or writing style to match that of the interlocutor fosters rapport (Giles et al., 1991). Hence, strategic style adaptation may be a better and a more powerful enabler for brand engagement (Zhao & Brennan, 2021).

2.2 The Linguistic Style Matching Hypothesis

Linguistic Style Matching (LSM**)** is a concept in social psychology stating that individuals in a conversation often subconsciously align or diverge from each other's style (Ireland et al., 2011). High LSM is linked to higher rapport and brand persuasion (Niederhoffer & Pennebaker, 2002). In marketing, researchers have found that e-commerce conversational agents or chatbots or email campaigns that emulate user style elicit more positive responses (Go & Sundar, 2019). While previous studies addressed style matching in synchronous textual dialogues (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2012), the potential for asynchronous, algorithmic-driven alignment in brand communications remains underexplored. By evaluating user-submitted text (feedback forms, reviews, or messages), systems can adopt a complementary tone—be it formal, casual, emotive, or minimalistic—thus fostering a sense of empathy and personalization.

2.3 Psychological Underpinnings of Style Preferences

From a psychological standpoint, style preferences may reflect cognitive or personality factors (Pennebaker, 2011). For instance, extraverted individuals might use more socially exchanged words and emoticons, while conscientious users might prefer more cohesive or structured paragraphs with fewer errors or abbreviations (Mairesse et al., 2007). Additionally, context triggers style shifts: a user might be more formal during business hours and more relaxed in personal communications at night. Understanding these shifts and matching them can be very challenging but significantly enhance user comfort and brand affinity (Ho & Tam, 2005).

2.4 Pertinence to Hyper-Personalization

Hyper-personalization surpasses general personalization by aiming for real-time adaptation with finegrained data signals (Lee et al., 2020). Incorporating linguistic style analysis into hyper-personalization pipelines extends beyond recommending products or content; it shapes the format and tone of all brand-user interactions and sets a new brand communication strategy ranging from email subject lines to chatbot dialogues (Kiseleva et al., 2020). If a user's typical writing includes short, direct sentences, the brand might keep its notifications succinct, while a user who uses expressive exclamation points and a direct or a colloquial slang could receive messages that mirror that style. This technique can yield a psychologically resonant communication that fosters loyalty and engagement (Bogers & Wernersen, 2014).

3. Computational Methods for User Linguistic Style Analysis

3.1 Data Collection and Preprocessing

Before extracting linguistic style features, systems must acquire enough user-generated text samples. This text may stem from:

1. **User-Submitted Content**: Reviews, feedback forms, or messages to customer support (Liu, 2012).
2. **Social Media Content or Posts**: Public tweets or forum posts, provided user-generated consent and privacy compliance (Rao et al., 2010).
3. **Conversational Intelligence Interactions**: Real-time transcripts from user–chatbot dialogues (Fadhil & Gabrielli, 2017).

Preprocessing often involves tokenization, lemmatization, and part-of-speech (POS) tagging to facilitate subsequent style metrics (Jurafsky & Martin, 2019). Some advanced pipelines also remove personally identifiable information (PII) to comply with data privacy and protection laws (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2017).

3.2 Stylistic Feature Extraction

Researchers have proposed numerous style-related metrics. Key categories include:

1. **Lexical Complexity**: Average word length, type-token ratio, or presence of advanced vocabulary (McCarthy & Jarvis, 2010).
2. **Syntactic Complexity**: Mean sentence length, subordinate clause frequency, POS distributions (Biber, 1988).
3. **Formality Indices**: Proportions of pronouns, articles, or function words that correlate with casual vs. formal discourse (Heylighen & Dewaele, 2002).
4. **Emotiveness**: Frequency of exclamation marks, emoji, intensifiers (absolutely, very), or emotional words (Johnson et al., 2021).

5. **Readability Metrics**: Flesch-Kincaid grade level, Gunning Fog index, reflecting how user text aligns with certain reading levels (Dubay, 2004).

6. **Interpersonal Markers**: Politeness strategies (e.g., please, thank you), disclaimers (e.g., maybe, I think), and hedges (sort of, kind of) that convey stance or politeness level (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2013).

These metrics can be aggregated into a "hyper-personalized style profile" for a given user, capturing general style tendencies over time (Mehl & Pennebaker, 2003).

3.3 Machine Learning for Style Classification

After extracting features, machine learning or deep learning algorithms can classify or cluster users by style. Approaches vary:

- **Supervised Classification**: With labeled training data (e.g., formal vs. informal text), a random forest or neural network can predict style categories for new user text (Kim et al., 2017).
- **Unsupervised Clustering**: Clustering methods (e.g., k-means, hierarchical) can cluster users by shared style patterns, e.g., colloquial slang users, polite or formal, stream-of-consciousness storytellers (Nechaev et al., 2019).
- **Neural Embeddings**: Contemporary language models (e.g., BERT, GPT) can produce embeddings that partially encode style, though typically optimized for semantic tasks. Fine-tuning on style-specific corpora (Briakou et al., 2021) can result in more robust style embeddings suitable for this exercise.

3.4 Incremental and Context-Sensitive Approaches

Because user style is not static, modern systems often adopt incremental learning. A user's style from five years ago may differ from their current style due to evolution, change in location or newer partnerships. The system regularly re-computes style features or updates a rolling average (Lee et al., 2020). Contextual triggers—time of day, type of device—may also influence style. For example, a user might write more formally on a laptop at work but more casually on a mobile phone while commuting (Eckert et al., 2021). Capturing these dynamic fluctuations requires context-aware style analysis that merges textual features with metadata (Bogers & Wernersen, 2014).

4. Algorithmic Adaptation: Mapping Style Features to Communication Forms

4.1 Stylometric Adaptation Modules

Once a system discovers a user's style, the next step is translating that style insight into adaptive communications. This typically involves a pipeline:

1. **Style Profile Classification**: The user is assigned a style label or receives a numerical vector describing relevant style facets (e.g., formality score, emotiveness score, complexity index).

2. **Template Selection/Assignment**: The system chooses from multiple message templates (e.g., formal vs. casual) or uses neural generation to produce style-consistent text.

3. **Linguistic Adjustment**: Tools like text-rewriting modules or advanced GPT-based language models are used to incorporate key style features—short sentences, emoticons, disclaimers—based on the user's profile (Briakou et al., 2021).

4. **Feedback Loop**: If user engagement is positive, the system gradually hones and solidifies the style mapping; if negative, it reiterates or refines the approach (Konstan & Riedl, 2012).

4.2 Use Case: Personalized Email Subject Lines

Email marketing often uses A/B testing to identify subject lines with high open rates (Chittenden & Rettie, 2003). By employing user style analysis, systems can adapt subject lines to each recipient. For instance, a user identified with a "concise & formal" style might receive a subject line like "Critical Update: Your Subscription Details." Another user with a more emotive style might see "Hey what's up! Exciting News Just for You." Over time, the system refines these subject lines based on open/click data and ongoing textual feedback from the user (Sundar & Marathe, 2010).

4.3 Conversational Agent Personalization

In chat-based interactions, real-time style adaptation can yield a more "human-like" sense of empathy and rapport (Go & Sundar, 2019). After analyzing user messages for formality and emotional tone, the chatbot can respond with matching language—e.g., using fewer formalities, more emojis, or pertinent slang. This approach has proven especially valuable in areas like mental health support, where empathetic style adaptation and alignment can boost trust (Fadhil & Gabrielli, 2017).

4.4 Platform-Wide Consistency vs. Individual Variations

Organizations often maintain brand guidelines that define style and tone. Balancing these guidelines with user-level personalization could be a challenge (Zhao & Brennan, 2021). Some frameworks adopt partial adaptation, ensuring specific brand voice elements remain constant while more dynamic segments adapt to user style. This approach offers the best of both worlds: consistent brand identity while continuing to deliver nuanced personal touches (Ho & Tam, 2005).

5. Empirical Evidence and Impact in Real-World

5.1 Brand Engagement Metrics

Brand engagement typically encompasses user loyalty, customer repeat visits, and openness to recommend (Dwivedi, 2015). Field experiments convey that style-personalized emails or correspondence can significantly improve open rates and conversions (Kim et al., 2017). In e-commerce, time-limited discounts framed in a style aligned with the user's typical communication pattern yield higher sales (Tam & Ho, 2006). The psychological principle of self-congruence—the match between brand persona and user persona—appears to drive these positive outcomes (Sirgy, 1982; Goldsmith, 2021).

5.2 Customer Satisfaction and Delight

User satisfaction is another key metric. Surveys show that recipients of style-matched communications feel their unique voice is acknowledged, fostering satisfaction and authenticity (Niederhoffer & Pennebaker, 2002; Zhao & Brennan, 2021). The concept of customer delight, which extends beyond mere satisfaction to a sense of positive surprise, has also been linked to advanced personalization features (Oliver et al., 1997). Linguistic style matching is a potent channel to elicit such delight, as it signals an unexpectedly nuanced form of personalization (Go & Sundar, 2019).

5.3 Click-Through and Conversion Rates

Empirical evaluations in digital advertising have shown modest but significant lifts in click-through rates (CTRs) when style alignment is in place, often in the range of 5–10% (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2012; Kiseleva et al., 2020). While not as substantial as content-based personalization leaps, style-based improvements are statistically consistent across multiple contexts—indicating that the approach systematically enhances user engagement rather than relying on on-demand or one-off campaign successes (Bogers & Wernersen, 2014).

5.4 Reduced Perceived Intrusiveness

Personalization can backfire if users find it intrusive or creepy (Awad & Krishnan, 2006). Notably, style-based personalization—focusing on how to communicate rather than extracting personal secrets—can feel less invasive, as it deals with publicly accessible linguistic attributes. Qualitative interviews suggest that users rarely perceive style alignment as an invasion of privacy if done transparently and tastefully (Zhao & Brennan, 2021). Instead, they interpret it as thoughtful consideration, leading to decreased suspicion of data exploitation (Trepte et al., 2020).

6. Challenges and Limitations

6.1 Data Privacy and Ethical Considerations

Gathering user text for style analysis may inadvertently expose sensitive information or patterns, especially when integrated with large-scale personalization frameworks (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2017). The potential for cross-referencing style cues with personal data (location, finances) raises ethical and regulatory concerns. Ensuring compliance with GDPR or CCPA requires anonymizing or aggregating style data and offering robust and categorical user consent mechanisms (Acquisti et al., 2016).

6.2 Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

Communication style is culturally dependent. A formality measure optimized for English might be ineffective for languages like Japanese or Arabic, which have distinct rules for politeness or other morphological constructs (Heylighen & Dewaele, 2002). Moreover, cross-cultural differences in expression could cause misclassifications if the training data fundamentally lacks linguistic diversity. Future research must explore language-specific or region-specific style models and incorporate dialects and cues to avoid cultural bias (Milanovic et al., 2021).

6.3 Dynamic, Contextual Variation

A user's style can shift dramatically across contexts (e.g., work vs. personal time, public vs. private domain). Systems that rely on a static style profile risk mismatch if they fail to detect context dynamism (Eckert et al., 2021). A user might welcome casual messaging from a music streaming or a dating app but prefer a formal style of introduction from a financial services platform. Real-time context detection—such as time of day or type of device—may mitigate these mismatches, but poses non-trivial engineering and privacy challenges (Bogers & Wernersen, 2014).

6.4 Model Interpretability

Some advanced style classifiers employ black-box neural networks with high accuracy but limited interpretability (Briakou et al., 2021). In regulated domains like finance or healthcare, systems need to explain or justify how they arrived at a style classification. Techniques like SHAP or LIME can offer partial insight into which text features influenced a classification (Ribeiro et al., 2016). However, interpretability in dynamic style adaptation remains a primitive area, requiring multidisciplinary collaboration (Jacovi & Goldberg, 2020).

6.5 Maintenance

Like many personalization approaches, style-based systems demand ongoing maintenance. Language evolves, slang drifts, and individual preferences shift. Periodic model retraining, continuous data collection, and careful curation of style-labeled corpora are essential (Lee et al., 2020). Without such updates, systems risk delivering stale, absurd or tone-deaf communications.

7. Future Directions

7.1 Intricate Style Dimensions

While existing frameworks largely emphasize broad style categories—formal vs. informal—real-world communication is very nuanced. Future research could examine micro-styles such as humor, sarcasm, or rhetorical flourish, using advanced language models to detect these subtle tones (Briakou et al., 2021). Personalized humor or witty rhetoric could heighten user affinity if done skillfully, though it may also severely risk misunderstandings.

7.2 Multi-Modal Style Integration

User style in text may correlate with other channels, such as voice or video. Multi-modal analysis—

combining textual style with vocal prosody or visual expressions—could yield deeper personalization. For instance, a system could detect a user's speaking style in voice messages and adapt both textual and spoken responses to maintain coherence (Brady et al., 2016; Latif et al., 2020). This strategy aligns with the trajectory of next-generation conversational agents and immersive brand experiences.

7.3 Personality vs. Situation-Driven Style

An obvious question is whether style primarily reflects interpretable and stable personality traits or situational contributors. Tools like the Big Five Personality model or the MBTI have been used to assess and predict writing styles (Mairesse et al., 2007). Future systems may combine personality-based predictions with real-time situational cues to strike a much-needed balance between stable, trait-driven adaptation and context-informed fluidity (Lee et al., 2020).

7.4 Scalability Considerations and Deployment

Scalability is a concern: can style adaptation systems operate in real time for millions of concurrent users (Kiseleva et al., 2020)? Streaming data pipelines that continuously parse user text and deliver style-matched content within seconds require more advanced performance computing and robust fault tolerance (Zhao & Brennan, 2021). Edge computing solutions that handle ephemeral data locally may reduce latency and preserve privacy but comes with the trade-off of limited model capacity (Eckert et al., 2021). However, large language models and petabytes of Cloud computing infrastructure can start paving the way.

7.5 Longitudinal Studies

Most studies on style-based personalization are either short-term lab experiments or small-scale pilot tests. Large-scale, longitudinal research measuring brand engagement over longer time can better demonstrate the enduring impact of style adaptation (Go & Sundar, 2019). The interplay between brand identity, dynamically changing consumer preferences, and the evolving nature of language in social media calls for extended observational periods, real-world stress testing, and iterative model refinements.

8. Conclusion

This paper has presented a comprehensive overview of Adaptive Personalization through User Linguistic Style Analysis, showcasing how analyzing writing style enables more finely tuned communication strategies in marketing, customer relationship management and engagement, and user-facing platforms. By capturing users' formality levels, emotional intensities, semantic preferences, and other stylistic indicators, organizations can craft interactions—emails, chat bot responses, notifications—that align more naturally with individual communication patterns. This alignment fosters brand loyalty, consumer satisfaction, and can lead to measurable lifts in key performance indicators like click-through rates, repeat visits, and overall brand affinity.

Several key takeaways emerge. First, style extends beyond sentiment alone, involving language structure, grammar, tone, and rhetorical flair—often reflecting deeper psychological or contextual factors. Second, implementing style-based personalization requires robust pipelines for textual data collection, more advanced feature extraction, and dynamic template generation or neural text generation. Third, real-world results indicate that style-matching improves brand engagement while minimizing perceived intrusiveness, provided privacy and ethical safeguards are in place. Lastly, the challenges remain around cultural variability, dynamic context shifts, model interpretability, and ongoing maintenance of style-labeled data. Addressing these challenges can pave the way for next-generation hyper-personalization, where brand communication feels more empathetic and user-centric than ever before.

As interactive technology and AI-driven marketing continue to grow, adaptive linguistic style analysis may well become a core dimension of consumer services in the new era of hyper-personalization. Its potential to humanize digital interactions promises a never seen frontier in brand-user relationships— where every user's voice, quite literally, shapes how technology can communicate back. Future research, combining linguistic, psychological, and computational insights, will irrefutably hone these approaches and unlock even richer, more context-aware personalization constructs.

References

1. Acquisti, A., Brandimarte, L., & Loewenstein, G. (2016). Privacy and human behavior in the age of information. *Science*, 347(6221), 509–514.

2. Adomavicius, G., & Tuzhilin, A. (2005). Toward the next generation of recommender systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and possible extensions. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 17(6), 734–749.

3. Awad, N. F., & Krishnan, M. S. (2006). The personalization privacy paradox: An empirical evaluation of information transparency and the willingness to be profiled online for personalization. *MIS Quarterly*, 30(1), 13–28.

4. Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing.* Cambridge University Press.

5. Bogers, T., & Wernersen, R. (2014). Explanations in recommender systems: An overview. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing*, 4(1), 2–6.

6. Brady, E., Zhong, Y., & Zhong, H. (2016). Leveraging voice features for user personality and emotion detection. *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.

7. Briakou, E., Jia, R., & Riloff, E. (2021). Pseudo-parallel corpus creation for style transfer. *EMNLP 2021 Workshop on Stylistic Variation*.

8. Chittenden, L., & Rettie, R. (2003). An evaluation of e-mail marketing and factors affecting response. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 11(3), 203–217.

9. Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.* John Wiley & Sons.

10. Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., Gamon, M., & Dumais, S. (2012). Mark my words!: Linguistic style accommodation in social media. *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, 745–754.

11. Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., Sudhof, M., Jurafsky, D., Leskovec, J., & Potts, C. (2013). A computational approach to politeness with application to social factors. *ACL*, 250–259.

12. Dubay, W. H. (2004). *The principles of readability.* Costa Mesa, CA: Impact Information.

13. Dwivedi, A. (2015). A higher-order model of consumer brand engagement and its impact on loyalty intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 24, 100–109.

14. Eckert, K., Rausch, L., & Sasse, M. (2021). Context-aware writing style detection in enterprise environments. *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (UMAP)*.

15. Fadhil, A., & Gabrielli, S. (2017). Addressing challenges in promoting healthy lifestyles: The AI-chatbot approach. *CHI Extended Abstracts*, 236–243.

16. Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. *Contexts of Accommodation*, 1–68.

17. Go, E., & Sundar, S. S. (2019). Humanizing chatbots: The effects of visual, identity, and conversational cues on humanness perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 304–316.

18. Goldsmith, R. E. (2021). *Digital marketing strategies for fashion and luxury brands.* Springer.

19. Heylighen, F., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2002). Variation in the contextuality of language: An empirical measure. *Foundations of Science*, 7(3), 293–340.

20. Ho, S. Y., & Tam, K. Y. (2005). An empirical examination of the effects of web personalization at different stages of decision making. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 19(1), 95–112.

21. Ireland, M. E., Slatcher, R. B., Eastwick, P. W., Scissors, L. E., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2011). Language style matching predicts relationship initiation and stability. *Psychological Science*, 22(1), 39–44.

22. Jacovi, A., & Goldberg, Y. (2020). Towards faithfully interpretable NLP systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? *ACL*, 4198–4205.

23. Johnson, S., Graham, S., & Yilmaz, E. (2021). Emotiveness in user-generated reviews: A cross-domain study. *Information Processing & Management*, 58(5), 102528.

24. Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2019). *Speech and language processing* (3rd ed., draft). Prentice Hall.

25. Kim, J., Park, H., & Oh, S. (2017). Effects of tailored web-based communications on user engagement and product sales. *Decision Support Systems*, 97, 91–102.

26. Kiseleva, J., Plumbaum, T., & Chuklin, A. (2020). Personalizing e-commerce with knowledge graphs. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin*, 43(3), 28–39.

27. Konstan, J., & Riedl, J. (2012). Recommender systems: From algorithms to user experience. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, 22(1), 101–123.

28. Koufaris, M. (2002). Applying the technology acceptance model and flow theory to online consumer behavior. *Information Systems Research*, 13(2), 205–223.

29. Lee, D. H., Gregg, D. G., & Park, M. C. (2020). The moderating role of personalization in the relationship between online word-of-mouth and consumer intention to purchase. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 21(2), 91–107.

30. Liu, B. (2012). *Sentiment analysis and opinion mining.* Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies. Morgan & Claypool.

31. Mairesse, F., Walker, M. A., Mehl, M. R., & Moore, R. K. (2007). Using linguistic cues for the automatic recognition of personality in conversation and text. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 30, 457–500.

32. McCarthy, P. M., & Jarvis, S. (2010). MTLD, vocd-D, and HD-D: A validation study of sophisticated approaches to lexical diversity assessment. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42(2), 381–392.

33. Mehl, M. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2003). The sounds of social life: A psychometric analysis of students' daily social environments and natural conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 857–870.

34. Milanovic, M., Santos, D. O., & Thakur, D. (2021). Linguistic difference and cultural adaptation in style-based NLP solutions. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 55(2), 223–245.

35. Nechaev, R., Romanov, P., & Sochenkov, I. (2019). Clustering text fragments based on writing style: The comparative analysis of approaches. *Procedia Computer Science*, 156, 302–310.

36. Niederhoffer, K. G., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2002). Linguistic style matching in social interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 21(4), 337–360.

37. Oliver, R. L., Rust, R. T., & Varki, S. (1997). Customer delight: Foundations, findings, and managerial insight. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(3), 311–336.

38. Pennebaker, J. W. (2011). The secret life of pronouns: What our words say about us. *Bloomsbury Press*.

39. Rao, D., Yarowsky, D., Shreevats, A., & Gupta, M. (2010). Classifying latent user attributes in Twitter. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Search and Mining User-generated Contents (SMUC)*, 37–44.

40. Resnick, P., & Varian, H. R. (1997). Recommender systems. *Communications of the ACM*, 40(3), 56–58.

41. Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). Why should I trust you?: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*, 1135–1144.

42. Sirgy, M. J. (1982). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(3), 287–300.

43. Sundar, S. S., & Marathe, S. S. (2010). Personalization vs. customization: The importance of agency, privacy, and power usage. *Human Communication Research*, 36(3), 298–322.

44. 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.

45. Trepte, S., Masur, P. K., & Eicher, C. (2020). Privacy literacy and privacy behavior in online contexts. *Social Media + Society*, 6(2), 1–13.

46. Voigt, P., & Von dem Bussche, A. (2017). *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A practical guide.* Springer.

47. Wolfe, C. T., Simon, S., & Melchiori, K. J. (2022). Exploring the power of pronouns: Relationship satisfaction and pronoun usage in romantic partner interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(3), 765–781.

48. Zhao, X., & Brennan, C. (2021). A framework for brand tone-of-voice adaptation in personalized campaigns. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 27(7), 681–704.

Biography

Raghu Para is an Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Expert with a strong focus in Natural Language Processing and Computational Linguistics used to improve personalization, segmentation and other marketing functions. His Bachelors and master's in information technology, Journalism and Digital Media Ventures and Entrepreneurship, coupled with his proven track record of implementing full stack engineering and data science solutions has largely helped companies in Asia, Australia and North America drive large-scale projects and generate multi-billion dollars in annual revenue. His work has significantly enhanced product and technology offerings and market presence.