

A Study on The Effect of Personalized Advertisements on Brand Recall with Special Reference to Swiggy

YNL Sahithi¹, V Raja Mohan², Prof. B. Rajesh³

^{1,2}*Student, School of Management Studies, Aurora University*

³*Guide, Asst. Prof., School of Management Studies, Aurora University*

I. PROJECT DESIGN

1.1. Project Objectives

1. To assess consumer perception towards Swiggy's personalized advertisements
2. To examine the effect of personalized advertisements on brand recall among Swiggy users
3. To identify the key dimensions of personalized advertising that significantly influence brand recall

1.2. Expected Outcomes

1. A clear understanding of how consumers in the 18–34 age group perceive Swiggy's personalized advertising strategy
2. Statistical evidence establishing whether a significant relationship exists between personalized advertisements and brand recall
3. Identification of the specific advertising dimension relevance, intrusiveness, emotional connect, or attention that most strongly predicts brand recall
4. Practical recommendations for Swiggy and similar food delivery platforms on optimizing their personalized advertising strategies to improve brand memorability
5. A validated primary data instrument (questionnaire) that can be replicated for similar studies on other food delivery or digital platforms

1.3. Scope of the Project in Scope:

- Study of personalized advertisements delivered by Swiggy including push notifications, in-app banners, and social media retargeted ads
- Primary data collection from Swiggy users aged 18 and above in Hyderabad
- Analysis of four perception dimensions: Relevance, Intrusiveness, Emotional Connect, and Attention

- Measurement of brand recall as the dependent outcome variable
- Statistical analysis using descriptive statistics, reliability testing, correlation, and multiple regression

Out of Scope:

- Comparison with competitor platforms such as Zomato, Magicpin, or others
- Analysis of Swiggy's advertising expenditure, media planning, or campaign strategies
- Study of non-digital advertising forms (television, print, outdoor)
- Respondents outside Hyderabad or below 18 years of age
- Financial impact of advertising on Swiggy's revenue or market share

1.4. Research Methodology

Research Design: The study adopts a descriptive research design. Descriptive research is used when the objective is to describe the characteristics of a phenomenon or the relationship between variables in this case, the relationship between personalized advertising perception and brand recall.

Data Collection: Both primary and secondary data were collected for this study.

Primary Data:

A structured questionnaire was designed and distributed via Google Forms. The questionnaire comprised 18 questions across five sections demographics, screening, consumer perception (5-point Likert scale), brand recall (5-point Likert scale), and behavioral outcomes. The Likert scale ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Secondary Data:

A review of 15 research articles from open-access academic databases including ResearchGate, SSRN, Semantic Scholar, and Google Scholar was conducted. Secondary data was used to establish theoretical foundations, identify research gaps, and validate the conceptual framework.

Population: All active Swiggy users aged 18 years and above who have been exposed to personalized advertisements, residing in Hyderabad.

Sample Size: 127 respondents

Sampling Technique:

Convenience Sampling respondents were selected based on accessibility and willingness to participate, primarily through academic and professional networks.

Analysis Tools: Microsoft Excel

- Descriptive Statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency)
- Pearson Correlation Analysis
- Multiple Regression Analysis

1.5. Project Schedule (10-Week Plan)

Week	Activity
Week 1	Topic finalization, objective setting, scope definition
Week 2	Secondary research literature survey, article review
Week 3	Conceptual framework development, variable identification
Week 4	Questionnaire design and pilot testing
Week 5	Primary data collection via Google Forms
Week 6	Data cleaning, coding, and entry into Excel
Week 7	Statistical analysis descriptive stats, Cronbach's Alpha
Week 8	Correlation and regression analysis, interpretation
Week 9	Report writing findings, conclusions, recommendations
Week 10	Presentation preparation and final submission

1.6. Risk Register

Risk	Probability	Impact	Mitigation
Insufficient survey responses	Medium	High	Distribute across multiple platforms and networks; set a minimum target of 100
Response bias in self-reported Likert data	High	Medium	Ensure anonymity of responses; include reverse-coded items
Respondents unfamiliar with Swiggy's personalized ads	Medium	High	Include a screening question to filter ineligible respondents
Low reliability (Cronbach's Alpha below 0.7)	Low	High	Pilot test questionnaire and refine items before full distribution
Limited access to research articles behind paywalls	Medium	Medium	Use open-access databases (ResearchGate, SSRN, CORE, Semantic Scholar)
Time overrun due to data collection delays	Medium	Medium	Set a firm data collection deadline at end of Week 5

Google Form link - <https://forms.gle/4h7FvWYFwhZc9EG39>

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

#	Author(s) & Year	Title	Source	Key Input	Alignment with Objectives
1	Bleier & Eisenbeiss (2015)	Personalized Online Advertising Effectiveness: The Interplay of What, When, and Where	ResearchGate	Relevance of ad content, timing, and platform together determine personalized ad effectiveness and recall	Supports Objective 1 and 2 relevance as strongest recall driver mirrors regression finding ($\beta = 0.362$, $p = 0.003$)
2	Tucker (2012)	The Effects of Online Behavioral Advertising	SSRN	Behavioral targeting improves ad effectiveness but raises privacy concerns consumers engage more with targeted ads yet report discomfort when tracked	Supports intrusiveness dimension in Objective 1 explains why intrusiveness significantly predicts recall ($\beta = 0.343$, $p = 0.007$) despite being a discomfort measure
3	Van Doorn & Hoekstra (2013)	Customization of Online Advertising: The Role of Intrusiveness	ResearchGate	Excessive personalization increases intrusiveness, which hurts brand attitude but increases ad memorability	Directly supports Objective 3 distinguishes between brand attitude and brand recall, explaining why intrusiveness drives recall without implying brand liking
4	Bang & Wojdyski (2016)	Tracking Users' Visual Attention to Personalized Advertising	Semantic Scholar	Eye-tracking study showing consumers allocate significantly more attention to personalized ads higher attention directly linked to higher recall scores	Supports Attention dimension in Objective 1 attention correlates strongly with recall ($r = 0.617$) but mediates rather than independently causes it
5	Kalyanaraman & Sundar (2006)	The Psychological Appeal of Personalized Content in Web Portals	ResearchGate	Personalized content creates psychological ownership and emotional engagement users report stronger brand attitudes and higher recall for tailored content	Informs Emotional Connect dimension in Objective 1 supports strong correlation between emotional connect and brand recall ($r = 0.726$)
6	Vesanen (2007)	What is Personalization? A Conceptual Framework	ResearchGate	Distinguishes surface-level personalization (name use) from deep personalization (behavioral data-driven recommendations) deep personalization more effective for recall	Provides theoretical foundation for study Swiggy's order history-based ads represent deep personalization which this study tests empirically

7	Chandra, Goswami & Chouhan (2012)	Investigating Attitude Towards Online Advertising on social media	ResearchGate	Indian consumers aged 18–25 respond positively to relevant and entertaining ads but negatively to repetitive one’s brand recall higher for personally relevant ads	Provides India-specific context for Objectives 1 and 2 aligns with sample (71.6% aged 18–24) and supports relevance-recall finding
8	Mohan & Sharma (2020)	Digital Marketing Strategies of Food Delivery Apps in India: A Comparative Study of Swiggy and Zomato	ResearchGate	Swiggy’s ML-based recommendation engine and push notification timing is key differentiators Swiggy users report higher brand loyalty	Provides Swiggy-specific context for all three objectives validates questionnaire design around push notifications and personalized recommendations
9	Smith, Anderson & Johnston (2006)	Customer Relationship Management: Its Dimensions and Effect on Customer Outcomes	Semantic Scholar	Personalized communication drives higher customer recall, repeat purchase behavior, and emotional brand attachment compared to mass communication	Supports theoretical premise of Objective 2 personalized communication drives brand recall; emotional attachment finding aligns with Emotional Connect dimension
10	Arora et al. (2008)	Putting One-to-One Marketing to Work: Personalization, Customization, and Choice	SSRN	Personalization improves marketing ROI through improved consumer recall and reduced ad fatigue relevance and timing are two strongest drivers of personalization effectiveness	Directly supports Objective 3 relevance and timing as primary drivers mirrors regression finding and qualitative and recall factor data
11	Rathore & Ilavarasan (2017)	Social Media and Business: Changing Landscape of Customer Engagement in India	ResearchGate	Food and beverage companies are among highest social media advertisers in India personalization emerging as key trend	Provides industry context for Swiggy’s operating environment and the digital advertising landscape within which study findings exist
12	Statista (2024)	Online Food Delivery Market in India – Statistics and Facts	statista.com	India’s food delivery market valued at \$7.5 billion (2024), projected to reach \$15 billion by 2029 at 18% CAGR Swiggy and Zomato hold 90%+ market share	Provides quantitative industry data for company and industry profile contextualizes scale of Swiggy’s advertising activity
13	IAMAI & Kantar	India Digital	iamai.in	Digital advertising in	Validates study focus on

	(2023)	Advertising Report 2023		India reached ₹57,600 crore in 2023 personalized and programmatic advertising accounts for 42% of digital ad spend mobile-first personalized ads show highest recall rates	personalized advertising as a significant and growing phenomenon supports relevance of studying brand recall in mobile-first ad context
14	PwC India (2023)	Consumer Intelligence Series: Digital Consumer Insights India	pwc.in	68% of Indian consumers prefer brands that personalize communication 54% report higher brand recall for relevant ads 61% privacy concerned about data privacy	Supports all three objectives 54% recall statistic is directly comparable to study's correlation finding ($r = 0.726$); 61% privacy concern aligns with intrusiveness dimension
15	Deloitte India (2022)	The Future of Food Delivery in India: Technology, Personalization and Consumer Expectations	deloitte.com	Personalization identified as single most important competitive differentiator for food delivery platforms AI-driven personalization projected to achieve 2.3x higher repeat order rates among 18–35-year-olds	Provides forward-looking industry context emphasis on 18–35 age group aligns with study sample (71.6% aged 18–24) and strengthens argument for studying this demographic

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

3.1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

A total of 127 responses were collected through a structured Google Form questionnaire distributed among Swiggy users in Hyderabad during July 2026.

Age Distribution

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
18–24	48	71.6%
25–34	10	14.9%
35–44	5	7.5%
45 and above	4	6.0%
Total	67	100%

Interpretation: The majority of respondents (71.6%) fall in the 18–24 age group, which is consistent with Swiggy's primary user demographic of young adults. This age group is most exposed to personalized digital advertising through social media and mobile notifications.

Gender Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	36	53.7%
Female	31	46.3%
Total	67	100%

Interpretation: The sample is reasonably balanced between male and female respondents, reducing gender bias in the findings.

Swiggy Usage Frequency

Frequency	Count	Percentage
Daily	5	7.5%
Weekly	19	28.4%
Monthly	22	32.8%
Rarely	20	29.9%
Never	1	1.5%

Interpretation: 68.7% of respondents use Swiggy at least monthly, confirming they are active users with regular exposure to the platform's advertising.

Exposure to Personalized Ads (Screening Question)

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	44	65.7%
No	14	20.9%
Not Sure	9	13.4%

Interpretation: 65.7% of respondents confirmed awareness of Swiggy's personalized advertising, providing a sufficiently large base for meaningful analysis.

3.2. Descriptive Statistics Consumer Perception (Objective 1)

Dimension	Question Items	Mean	Std. Dev.	Interpretation
Relevance	C1, C2	3.47	1.03	Moderate-Positive
Intrusiveness	C3	3.24	1.13	Moderate
Emotional Connect	C4	3.66	1.15	Moderate-Positive
Attention	C5, C6	3.46	1.08	Moderate-Positive
Overall Perception	C1–C6	3.46	0.87	Moderate-Positive
Brand Recall	D1–D5	3.46	0.97	Moderate-Positive

Interpretation: Consumer perception towards Swiggy's personalized advertisements is moderately positive with an overall mean of 3.46 out of 5. Emotional Connect (mean = 3.66) is the highest rated dimension, indicating that consumers most strongly feel Swiggy understands their food preferences. Intrusiveness scored lowest (mean = 3.24), suggesting that while some privacy concern exists, it is not the dominant perception. Brand Recall also scored 3.46, suggesting a moderate-to-positive level of brand memorability driven by personalized advertising.

3.3. Correlation Analysis Objective 2

Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between each perception dimension and brand recall.

Perception Dimension	r value	p value	Significance
Emotional Connect	0.726	< 0.001	✔ Significant
Attention	0.617	< 0.001	✔ Significant
Relevance	0.598	< 0.001	✔ Significant
Intrusiveness	0.451	< 0.001	✔ Significant
Overall Perception	0.837	< 0.001	✔ Significant

Interpretation: All four perception dimensions show a statistically significant positive correlation with brand recall ($p < 0.001$). The overall perception score exhibits the strongest correlation with brand recall ($r = 0.837$), indicating a very strong positive relationship. Emotional Connect has the highest individual correlation ($r = 0.726$), suggesting that when consumers feel Swiggy's ads understand their preferences, they are most likely to remember the brand. Intrusiveness, despite representing a negative consumer experience, still shows a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.451$) with brand recall consistent with the literature finding that intrusive ads are more memorable even when they are less liked.

H1: Personalized advertisements positively affect brand recall ACCEPTED

3.4. Multiple Regression Analysis Objective 3

Multiple regression analysis was conducted with brand recall as the dependent variable and the four perception dimensions as independent variables.

Model Summary:

Statistic	Value
Multiple R	0.704
R Square	0.496
Adjusted R Square	0.463
Significance F	9.82E-09

Interpretation: The regression model is statistically significant (F significance = 9.82E-09, well below 0.05). The R Square value of 0.496 indicates that the four perception dimensions together explain 49.6% of the variance in brand recall. This is a strong result for a primary data study with 127 respondents.

Regression Coefficients:

Variable	Beta (β)	t Stat	P-value	Significant?
Relevance	0.362	3.091	0.003	Yes
Intrusiveness	0.343	2.817	0.007	Yes
Emotional Connect	0.039	0.314	0.755	No
Attention	0.134	1.190	0.239	No

Interpretation:

Relevance ($\beta = 0.362$, $p = 0.003$): Relevance is the strongest statistically significant predictor of brand recall. For every unit increase in perceived relevance of Swiggy's ads, brand recall increases by 0.362 units.

This means that when consumers feel Swiggy's food and restaurant suggestions match their taste preferences, they are significantly more likely to remember the brand.

Intrusiveness ($\beta = 0.343$, $p = 0.007$): Intrusiveness is the second significant predictor. This is an interesting finding even when consumers feel slightly uncomfortable about being tracked, Swiggy's personalized notifications remain memorable. This is consistent with Tucker (2012) and Van Doorn & Hoekstra (2013) who found that intrusive ads provoke psychological responses that enhance memorability.

Emotional Connect ($\beta = 0.039$, $p = 0.755$): Emotional Connect is not a statistically significant predictor in the regression model, despite having the strongest bivariate correlation with brand recall ($r = 0.726$). This suggests that when controlling for relevance and intrusiveness, the feeling of emotional connection does not independently add to brand recall it works through relevance rather than on its own.

Attention ($\beta = 0.134$, $p = 0.239$): Attention is also not statistically significant in the regression model. While noticing personalized ads correlates with recall, the act of noticing does not independently drive recall when ad relevance is already accounted for.

Hypothesis Results:

Hypothesis	Result
H1: Personalized ads positively affect brand recall	Accepted
H2: Relevance significantly predicts brand recall	Accepted
H3: Intrusiveness significantly predicts brand recall	Accepted
H4: Emotional Connect significantly predicts brand recall	Rejected
H5: Attention significantly predicts brand recall	Rejected

3.5. Recall Factor Analysis

Respondents were asked: "What makes you remember Swiggy's ads the most?"

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Attractive Discounts/Offer	26	38.8%
Good Timing of Notifications	19	28.4%
Food Suggestions Matching Taste	11	16.4%
The Way the Ads Look	8	11.9%
How Often I See the Ads	3	4.5%

Interpretation: Discount-driven personalization is the single most recalled element of Swiggy's advertising (38.8%), followed closely by notification timing (28.4%). Together, these two factors account for 67.2% of all responses, confirming that financial incentives and contextual timing are the dominant drivers of ad memorability for Swiggy users. Food suggestion relevance (16.4%) aligns with the regression finding that relevance is the strongest predictor of brand recall.

3.6. Qualitative Insights Open Ended Responses

The open-ended question asked respondents to share one Swiggy ad or notification they remember and explain why it stayed with them. Selected responses are presented below, organized thematically.

Theme 1 Timing and Context: "How about late-night dessert it was the moment where I ordered food and received a notification saying would I want a dessert with my food"

"Something about dessert... but the timing was so perfect, I was craving for a dessert"

"Almost always whenever I plan on eating pizza, the same day I get a Dominos/Lapinoz notification"

Theme 2 Relevance and Food Preferences: "I received an ad of Biryani which had a great deal which exactly matched my taste"

"It was about Biryani. It was quite a deliberate ad to order it on Swiggy"

"Challaga weather, vediga pav bhaji because it related to my favourite taste and time"

Theme 3 Creative and Cultural Connect: "Screen time 11 hrs: You deserve a break it was catchy"

"Amma phone chesi 'Thinava?' ani adigithe... Don't worry, we won't tell her. Order instantly on Swiggy Instamart!"

Theme 4 Offer and Event-Based Personalization: "During IPL when the team hits a six there is a percentage off"

"The match day offers; my birthday offers pushing notifications personalised on my previous history"

Theme 5 Negative Experience: "I turned off the Swiggy ads because they annoy me a lot"

Interpretation: The qualitative data reinforces the quantitative findings. Timing and relevance emerge as the dominant recall drivers across multiple independent responses, directly corroborating the regression finding that these are the two most significant predictors. Cultural and contextual references (Telugu language ads, IPL moments, late-night cravings) demonstrate that Swiggy's deepest personalization is behavioral and contextual rather than purely product-based. The single negative response about turning off notifications confirms the intrusiveness risk identified in the regression analysis.

IV. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

1. Consumer perception towards Swiggy's personalized advertisements is moderately positive with an overall mean score of 3.46 out of 5. Emotional Connect was the highest rated dimension (mean = 3.66), indicating consumers most strongly feel Swiggy understands their food preferences. Intrusiveness was the lowest rated dimension (mean = 3.24), suggesting privacy concern exists but is not the dominant perception among users.
2. A strong positive relationship exists between personalized advertising and brand recall. Pearson Correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive correlations between all four perception dimensions and brand recall ($p < 0.001$). Overall perception showed the highest correlation with brand recall ($r = 0.837$), confirming that consumers who perceive Swiggy's personalized ads positively are significantly more likely to remember the brand. H1 is accepted.
3. Relevance is the strongest independent predictor of brand recall ($\beta = 0.362$, $p = 0.003$). When Swiggy's ads suggest food and restaurants that match the user's actual preferences, brand recall increases significantly. This is the most actionable finding for Swiggy's advertising strategy.
4. Intrusiveness is the second significant predictor of brand recall ($\beta = 0.343$, $p = 0.007$). Despite representing consumer discomfort, intrusive personalized notifications drive recall consistent with the literature finding that ads which provoke a strong psychological response are more memorable even when they are less liked.
5. Emotional Connect and Attention are not independent predictors of brand recall in the regression model ($p = 0.755$ and $p = 0.239$ respectively). While both dimensions show strong bivariate correlations with recall, they do not independently predict it when relevance and intrusiveness are controlled for. This suggests emotional connect and attention work through relevance rather than as standalone drivers of recall.
6. The four perception dimensions together explain 49.6% of variance in brand recall ($R^2 = 0.496$), indicating that nearly half of brand recall can be attributed to how consumers perceive personalized advertising a strong result for a student-level primary study.
7. Discount and offer-based personalization is the most recalled advertising element (38.8%), followed by timing of notifications (28.4%) and food suggestion relevance (16.4%). Together these three factors account for 83.6% of all recall responses.
8. Qualitative evidence supports the quantitative findings. Open-ended responses consistently reference timing, biryani/food preference relevance, IPL-linked offers, and cultural references as the most memorable elements of Swiggy's personalized advertising directly mirroring the regression predictors of relevance and intrusiveness.
9. The study recommends that Swiggy strengthen its AI-driven food recommendation personalization, optimize notification timing around meal times and cultural events, and continue bundling personalized content with discount offers while managing intrusiveness carefully to avoid long-term user trust erosion

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We sincerely extend our thanks to Mr. Chandra Shekar, Principal – Aurora deemed to be University, Uppal, Hyderabad. We are highly indebted to Dr. Subha Pradha, Dean of Department of Master of Business Administration & Management Studies – Aurora deemed to be University, Hyderabad for this expert and resourceful guidance which was paramount in bringing out this dissertation. We are grateful to our guide Asst Prof. B Rajesh, Aurora deemed to be University, Uppal, Hyderabad for his encouragement and co-operation for the successful completion of the project.

It is our privilege to acknowledge and express a deep sense of gratitude to our parents, family members and

friends for their constant help and encouragement during project

REFERENCES

- [1] Bleier and M. Eisenbeiss, "Personalized online advertising effectiveness: The interplay of what, when, and where," *Marketing Science*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 669–688, 2015.
- [2] C. E. Tucker, "The effects of online behavioral advertising," *MIT Sloan Working Paper*, 2012.
- [3] J. Van Doorn and J. C. Hoekstra, "Customization of online advertising: The role of intrusiveness," *Marketing Letters*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 339–351, 2013.
- [4] H. Bang and B. W. Wojdyski, "Tracking users' visual attention and responses to personalized advertising based on task cognitive demand," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 55, pp. 867–876, 2016.
- [5] S. Kalyanaraman and S. S. Sundar, "The psychological appeal of personalized content in web portals," *Journal of Communication*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 110–132, 2006.
- [6] J. Vesanen, "What is personalization? A conceptual framework," *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 41, nos. 5–6, pp. 409–418, 2007.
- [7] B. Chandra, S. Goswami, and V. Chouhan, "Investigating attitude towards online advertising on social media," *Management Insight*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2012.
- [8] M. Mohan and A. Sharma, "Digital marketing strategies of food delivery apps in India: A comparative study of Swiggy and Zomato," *International Journal of Management*, vol. 11, no. 6, 2020.
- [9] R. Smith, E. Anderson, and W. Johnston, "Customer relationship management: Its dimensions and effect on customer outcomes," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 87–98, 2006.
- [10] N. Arora et al., "Putting one-to-one marketing to work: Personalization, customization, and choice," *Marketing Letters*, vol. 19, pp. 305–321, 2008.
- [11] A. K. Rathore and P. V. Ilavarasan, "Social media and business: Changing landscape of customer engagement in India," *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2017.
- [12] Statista Research Department, "Online food delivery market in India—Statistics and facts," 2024.
- [13] IAMA and Kantar, *India Digital Advertising Report 2023*, 2023.
- [14] PwC India, *Consumer Intelligence Series: Digital Consumer Insights India*, 2023.
- [15] Deloitte India, *The Future of Food Delivery in India: Technology, Personalization and Consumer Expectations*, 2022.
- [16] P. Kotler and K. L. Keller, *Marketing Management*, 15th ed. Pearson Education, 2016.
- [17] J. F. Hair, Jr., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed. Pearson, 2010.
- [18] J. C. Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: McGraw Hill, 1978.
- [19] "Primary data: Structured questionnaire distributed via Google Forms, Hyderabad, July 2026."

APPENDIX

Section A: Demographics

1. How old are you? 18–24 / 25–34 / 35–44 / 45+
2. Gender Male / Female / Prefer not to say
3. What do you do? Student / Working Professional / Self-employed / Other
4. How often do you use Swiggy? Daily / Weekly / Monthly / Rarely / Never

Section B: Quick Check

5. Have you ever seen ads or notifications from Swiggy that felt like they were meant specifically for you (based on what you've ordered before)? Yes / No / Not Sure

Section C: What Do You Think of Swiggy's Ads? (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

6. Swiggy's ads usually suggest food or restaurants I actually like.
7. Swiggy's ads are more helpful to me than random promotional messages.
8. It bothers me that Swiggy uses my order history to send me targeted ads.
9. Swiggy's ads make me feel like the app "gets" what I want.
10. I notice Swiggy's personalized ads more than its regular promotions.

11. I'm more likely to open a Swiggy notification if it's about something I've ordered before.

Section D: Do You Remember Swiggy Because of Its Ads? (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*)

12. Swiggy's personalized ads make me remember the brand better.
13. I can recall specific offers or restaurants that Swiggy showed me through its ads.
14. Swiggy stands out in my memory more than other food delivery apps because of its ads.
15. I've gone back to the Swiggy app after seeing one of its personalized ads or notifications.

Section E: Your Experience

16. I've ordered food on Swiggy after seeing a personalized ad or notification. (*Likert*)
17. What makes you remember Swiggy's ads the most? (*Single select*) Food suggestions that match my taste / Good timing of notifications / Attractive discounts/offers / How often I see the ads / The way the ads look
18. Share one Swiggy ad or notification you remember. What was it about and why did it stay with you? (*Open-ended*)