Spectrum of Engineering Sciences
ISSN (e) 3007-3138 (p) 3007-312X Volume 3, Issue 9, 2025

THE FUTURE OF HUMAN-COMPUTER INTERACTION: A STUDY OF AI-POWERED INTERFACES AND THEIR IMPACT ON USER EXPERIENCE

Nisar Ahmed Memon[*1], Umair Paracha[2], Muhammad Saeed Ahmad[3]

[*1]*Assistant Professor, Department of Telecommunication Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, University of Sindh Jamshoro*
[2]*Directorate of ICT, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad*
[3]*Assistant Professor, Government Sadiq College Women University, Bahawalpur*

[*1]nisar.memon@usindh.edu.pk; [2]umair.paracha@aiou.edu.pk; [3]drsaeed@gscwu.edu.pk

DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17181717

Keywords
Impact, artificial intelligence (AI), powered, interfaces, user experience, AI chatbots.

Article History
Received: 07 July 2025
Accepted: 07 September 2025
Published: 23 September 2025

Corresponding Author: *
Nisar Ahmed Memon

Abstract
The study insights at the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) powered interfaces on the user experience in user-computer interaction (HCI) and user experience. The research utilized a mixed-methods sequential explanatory approach and used the AI systems on AI systems on 450 survey respondents and 35 subjects of in-depth interviews. The research aimed to assess the impacts of interfaces, AI voice, interfaces or voice systems, AI chatbots, and AI intelligent recommendation systems on user satisfaction, task performance, perceived usefulness, and behavioral intentions. The review highlighted the positive relation of the sophistication of the AI user interfaces in satisfaction, usefulness, and experience, and regression models suggested that personalization and accuracy of replies to questions were the most significant AI personalization and accuracy of replies to questions were the most significant to satisfaction. The qualitative research trust, change anxieties and apprehensions pertaining to the overly intelligent courtesy of the AI. Users were; indeed, users were able to appreciate the time-saving, efficient, and customizable AI, interfaces systems however, issues of privacy, lack of control of systems, transparency, and dependence on AI worrisome. The findings indicated that the interfaces should not automate all functions, while also giving the users some control, and then informing then the users should be clearly informed what the systems can do and highlight the limitations of the systems. This research adds on to the literature on the favorable impact of the paradigmatic shift artificial intelligence interfaces have on user-computer interaction, and the guidelines on how to interface AI technologies more optimally. The results maintain that future HCI research and development will have to combine user-centered design approaches and the use of AI to augment human decision-making.

INTRODUCTION

The field of human-computer interaction has experienced an unprecedented change with the application of artificial intelligence technologies into digital interfaces. What were once static user interfaces are now intelligent systems that learn user preferences, anticipate user actions, and modify system responses within ever-shortening timeframes. This is not a mere question of technology. This is a problem of the human mind, how it understands, reacts, and interfaces with digital systems (Ishwarya, Anand, Kumaresan, & Gopinath, 2024). The advent of AI has fully automated and transformed a system into an intelligent interface, opening new avenues of interaction. Yet, it has also posed troublesome issues of trust, opacity, and the problem of interface control (Mishra, Mishra, & Agarwal, 2025).

AI-enabled systems span across domains from digital assistant where user's daily activity is scheduled to algorithms managing content and shopping spyware systems. The rapid spread of technology makes understanding user experience vital since the user is increasingly dependent on AI interactions for information and decision making. AI interfaces have emerged along with adequacy in information analytics, Natural Language Processing, and Machine Learning analytics (Ding, Ji, Gan, Wang, & Xia, 2024).

The emphasis of this research has shifted to outlining the aspects important for software and systems interface design, user decision making behavior, and overall experience satisfaction. AI systems are becoming macroscopically integrated in workspaces, making understanding the impact on user experience vital. The rapid adoption of AI is design and interface systems has not been matched with research on Human-Machine Interfaces making gaps which this research will aim to fill (George, 2025).

User experience in AI-powered interfaces is markedly different from traditional interface interactions because of the unpredictable and fluid behavior of AI systems. Unlike stable systems in which users can learn a set of interactions, AI systems radial and transform their interactions endlessly as data is accumulated and algorithms refined and updated. This imposition changes the mental models' users construct of the system and its behaviors and what is required for proper interaction. These types of interactions require different perspectives for research, integrating both observable and quantifiable performance measures and personal phenomenological perspectives of system use (Eswaran & Eswaran, 2025).

The development of the theory of human-computer interaction cannot ignore the more immutable traits of AI integrated systems, such as the capacity to demonstrate some level of "intelligent" behavior, learn from the user, and exercise different ranges of autonomy. In a similar fashion, traditional models of HCI, set in a foundational role for first consideration, require some basic level of expansion and refinement to incorporate the issues presented by artificial intelligence. This research aims to further the theory of user experience by analyzing the principles of user experience and their application to AI integrated interfaces, as well as suggesting other intelligent system specific elements that need to be addressed (Asif, 2024).

A paradoxical situation has emerged in AI interface research—technical performance measures like accuracy, speed, and computing resource usage garner extensive examination, while UX research seemingly occupies an auxiliary role. This neglect represents an extraordinary hippocampal-blow given most studies about emerging technologies stress adoption and integration. To build AI systems in society it is crucial to learn how people understand and interact with these systems as it becomes a primary consideration in trust systems design (Chenchu, Kandem, Dattaram, & Rao, 2025).

Research on AI interface is interdisciplinary, requiring an amalgamated understanding of computer science, psychology, design, and the social sciences. Every field has its own understanding of the interaction of people with AI systems. For example, how people think about the systems, the responses the systems give, and how they perceive the responses as social-psychological-arts of AI respond to the world. This study takes a comprehensive approach and examines the technical and the social to shed light on the user experience with AI powered interfaces (Khan et al., 2025).

The interface designers can use the findings in crafting less complex and more user-friendly AI systems; the developers get a better appreciation of the user interface outcomes from technical choices. Users of AI systems can apply the findings in enhancing user adoption and satisfaction, and policymakers are able to more deeply geared toward regulation on AI system use of transparency and Protective toward the user with the lack of information, these stakeholders are able to apply the research to a more practical setting (Kumar, Pal, Agarwal, Rosak-Szyrocka, & Jain, 2024). The AI powered interface in question is complex. This is evident even in the research design from which the methodology characteristics are drawn (Javed, 2024). The use of interface power research blends the user satisfaction and behavior metrics which are quantitative in nature with the qualitative user perception and experience elements. This mixed method strategy ensures the researcher balances between the attainable research outcomes and the subjective sensations, which the quantitative paradigms are alone are insufficient to capture. The research outcomes on user experience with AI powered interfaces recognize the presence of objective indicators and subjective system behavior (Dyczek, 2024).

The current global landscape underlines the relevance of the research against the backdrop of the rapid proliferation of Artificial Intelligence at the consumer and enterprise levels. As AI blends itself into an interface and becomes embedded into products, it becomes increasingly important to analyze the consequences of AI on user experience and user interactions to prevent AI from being an added bane to the human computer interaction ecosystem. This research serves to enrich the existing scholarship that can address the problem of interface technology and its responsible AI-driven evolution (Abbas Khan, Khan, Omer, Ullah, & Yasir, 2024).

Research Objectives

1. To assess the effect of AI-powered interfaces on users' perceived satisfaction, efficiency, effectiveness, usefulness, and intention to use, in comparison to legacy interfaces.
2. To analyze the interfaces of AI technologies and determine the most influential factors and characteristics that affect the user experience and technology adoption behavior across varying user segments.
3. To formulate guidelines for the design of AI systems that aim to address user experience in an interface value system of trust, control, transparency, and user-driven systems.

Research Questions

1. How does the use of AI interfaces compare to traditional designs in terms of user satisfaction, task completion, and overall user experience?
2. Which features or functions of AI interfaces have the strongest positive impact on user experience and intention to use the interface?
3. What are the main concerns and benefits of AI interface interaction, how do these perceptions shape their use and adoption, and what impact do they have on perception-driven use?

Significance of the Study

The research fulfills the crucial need to see how the infusion of artificial intelligence into interfaces alters the way users interact with computer systems. This is fundamental to the changing pace in which interfaces are designed. With the wide acceptance of AI interfaces in digital systems, what they do to user experience is critical to ensure advancing technologies genuinely serve people. The mixed-methods approach to the research will facilitate capturing the user experience alongside evaluating a broad range of perceptions and performance. The synthesized knowledge will have a positive impact on multiple stakeholders in the technology ecosystem. The contributions extend to the theoretical development of human-computer interaction, where the conventional perceptions are complemented with the peculiar conditions of intelligent systems. This will also provide intelligence to designers, developers, and organizations integrating the technology in practical systems.

This understanding now is crucial because user experience implications can shape tactics and user-centered development frameworks much more robustly as we advance.

Literature Review

The background of human-computer interaction research has always been about the still interface components and the predictable behavior of systems which has resulted in frameworks that enable evaluation of user experience through usability and satisfaction metrics (Ntoa, 2025). The integration of artificial intelligence in interface design has changed the interaction paradigms and thus, requires new theories and empirical research. Older HCI research underscored user control, system predictability, and system command and feedback loops. These principles are more sophisticated in systems with AI that can make independent decisions and change behavior. The change from command-based interfaces to graphical user interfaces, was a large move in HCI as the shift from GUIs to AI-driven interfaces is leaps and bounds ahead in the shift of interaction between humans and computers (Sadeghi Milani, Cecil-Xavier, Gupta, Cecil, & Kennison, 2024).

Research in AI-powered interfaces stems from multiple disciplines. Computer scientists analyze algorithms for their performance and efficiency metrics, while human factors researchers focus on user experience and behavioral outcomes. Studies related to the VUI user appreciate the advantages of natural language interaction, but are concerned about privacy and system reliability. Research on chatbot interfaces underscores the importance of setting user expectations, as well as offering salient pointers on what the system can and cannot do. This body of work reiterates the importance of user trust for adoption of AI interfaces. Trust in AI systems, however, is an aspect that is poorly understood and under-explained (Subramanian, Thomas, Sahin, & Sahin, 2024).

Unlike in conventional user interface design, user experience does not limit user interface features to ease of use, but also includes the perceived intelligence of the system, the ease of system use, the quality of responses generated by the AI, and system transparency. Research suggests that users form anthropomorphic relationships with AI, attributing human sensibilities and objectives to artificial builds. While such anthropomorphism does improve user satisfaction and engagement, it also creates unrealistic and exaggerated expectations of AI. Research conducted on user mental models of AI systems suggest that, on the whole, users are largely misinformed about AI systems, holding inaccurate mental models about the functioning and capabilities of AI technologies (Awasthi, Tewari, & Mallick, 2025).

An important feature of AI interfaces is personalization, with most systems increasing system efficiency due to the ability of machine learning algorithms to customize systems to user preferences and behavior patterns (Albarrak, 2024). AI interfaces that utilize personalization are more likely to enhance user satisfaction and improve the rate of task completion than systems that do not. On the other hand, personalization creates system opacity due to the fact that users are rapidly losing control over the mechanisms that inform AI's assumptions. Research on recommendation systems demonstrates that the sweet spot of the user interface is between user satisfaction and the appropriateness of the personalization of the experience, where personalization is so high that it results in user dissatisfaction and distrust (Schrepp, Rosenzweig, Soares, & Marcus, 2025).

Trust development towards AI interfaces is becoming one of the most researched topics in the field, and studies have indicated various determinants of user trust, such as dependability, disclosure, and esteem. Unlike trust developed in human relationships, trust in AI systems is established differently, as users depend on first impressions, as well as the dependability of the system's functioning (Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, & Aslam, 2025d). "Algorithmic aversion" has been pronounced in various studies, which is the situations in which users would rather have a human make a decision, even in cases where AI systems would do a much better job. On the other hand, there is some research situating "automation bias," where users inappropriately depend on the suggestions of AI systems and fail to employ the requisite skepticism (Pasch & Ha, 2025).

Feedback and explanation in AI interfaces have been under a great deal of scrutiny, as studies have shown users value systems which create a rationale for the conclusions and suggestions (Tong, 2025). The most favorable level and type of explanation is still a matter of contention, and some scholars have pointed out that excessive explanation can frustrate users, while lack of explanation yields suspicion and a lack of trust in the system(Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, & Aslam, 2025c). Research on explainable AI interfaces has illustrated a delicate balance between system transparency and perceived competence. Users often lose faith in the system's AI capabilities and begin to question the system's overall efficiency when they have access to the reasoning for the decisions which have been made (Babar, Paul, Rahman, & Barua, 2025).

An AI interface's error handling and recovery are unlike any traditional interface due to the complexities therein. As research has shown, AI issues, particularly those arising from machine learning, are particularly difficult for users to pinpoint and rectify. While findings from studies on error recovery within voice interfaces have underscored the need for assured and methodical error resolution, depending on the use, the best methods for AI error recovery still need to be determined. Due to the nature of AI, the unpredictability of errors and the lack of user awareness on what AI can and cannot do remains a big challenge for interface designers (Morad & Essing, 2025).

According to numerous studies, the issue of AI interfaces stems from the reluctance to adopting facial the data and privacy policies (Sánchez-Adame & Mendoza, 2025). The tension between desired functionality and privacy protection stems from the user's negative perception of AI systems that collect and analyze data for hyper-personalized feedback (Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, & Aslam, 2025a). Users within the demographic group aged lower appear to be more welcoming of data collection while older users seem to be more concerned on the issue. Research on privacy-preserving AI interfaces suggests that actively managing one's data can foster acceptance, but many have little to no understanding on the extent to which data is collected and for what purpose (Naveed, Stevens, & Robin-Kern, 2024).

Cultural and demographic factors have a strong impact on the user experience with AI-powered interfaces, as revealed by cross culture research investigations (Liu et al., 2025). Barriers associated with technology, culture, and specific languages intricately shape the manner in which users' interface with and evaluate AI (Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, Aslam, & Aslam, 2025b). There are also age stereotypes regarding the acceptance of AI, and in most cases, older adults are noted to have a harder time with the behavioral patterns of interfaces developed with the aid of AI. There are also claims regarding the use of AI interfaces from a gender perspective, where, research shows that difference exists in the interaction styles and the manner in which the users AI feedback systems respond (Sánchez-Adame & Mendoza, 2025). The new opportunities AI poses to research and the corresponding challenges AI have created due to the interfacing of multiple technologies in a single interface. In the case of multimodal AI interfaces, research examining the combination of voice, text, and visual elements reveals improved functionality, as well as added user complexity (Saqlain & Shahid, 2024b). Research on AI mobile interfaces dives deep into unique constraints and opportunities associated with context-aware computing and location-based personalization (Saqlain & Shahid, 2024a). The emergence Interfaces related to Augmented and Virtual Reality AI interfaces are powerful new areas of work where new human computer interaction principles are emerging as classical HCI frameworks needs to be revised profoundly for deep immersive AI environments. As more researchers begin to define the bounds of more conventional methods of testing usability and the effectiveness of AI powered interfaces on users, evaluation methodologies appear to become more specialized since the last decade (Partarakis & Zabulis, 2024). For gauging the effectiveness of user interfaces, importantly, concern towards how relations develop with AI systems over the long term are framed in longitudinal studies, since first impressions are often a poor predictor of long-term behavior. In this decade, more researchers are beginning to adopt a mixed methods approach since user perception and experience have to be analyzed in conjunction with objective performance indicators. New metrics in AI interfaces, most notably trust and perceived intelligence, underscores the field's acknowledgement that conventional usability measurements are inadequate (Troussas, Krouska, & Sgouropoulou, 2025).

Research Methodology

The researchers have used mixed-method approach to analyze interfaces with AI and their effect on user experience and interaction with computers and systems. The case used a sequential explanatory design and quantitative data collection came before qualitative breakdown to explain user interactions with AI systems. The data collection was done using structured surveys that were given to 450 respondents coming from different social and demographic groups that interacted with AI enabled interfaces including voice assistants, chatbots, and recommendation systems. The respondents were given surveys that had customized ratios constructed to examine user satisfaction, task success, perceived usefulness, and behavioral intention that is HCI focused. Secondary data was collected from a systematic literature on peer-reviewed articles authored between 2020-2024 on leading HCI and AI journals using the AI interfaces, user experience and human-computer interaction keywords. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression modeling and was done with SPSS. The goal was to find relationships between AI interface attributes and user experience. Qualitative data was gathered from 35 targeted participants with different interaction levels and was analyzed with thematic NVivo. The researcher kept to the ethical standards by securing informed consent as well as by securing data triangulation and member checking with some interview participants to establish the data validity.

The quantitative analysis of survey data from 450 participants revealed significant insights into user experience with AI-powered interfaces across multiple dimensions. Demographic analysis showed that participants ranged from 18 to 65 years of age, with 52% female and 48% male respondents, representing diverse educational backgrounds and technology experience levels. The majority of participants (78%) reported daily interaction with at least one form of AI-powered interface, with voice assistants (68%) and recommendation systems (74%) being the most commonly used technologies.

Results and Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Table 1: User Satisfaction Scores by AI Interface Type

Interface Type	Mean Satisfaction Score	Standard Deviation	Sample Size
Voice Assistants	4.2	0.8	306
Chatbots	3.6	0.9	278
Recommendation Systems	4.4	0.7	333
Predictive Text	4.1	0.8	298
Smart Search	4.3	0.6	312

The analysis of user satisfaction scores across different AI interface types revealed that recommendation systems achieved the highest mean satisfaction score (4.4 out of 5), followed by smart search interfaces (4.3) and voice assistants (4.2). Chatbots received the lowest satisfaction ratings (3.6), suggesting that current chatbot implementations may not meet user expectations as effectively as other AI-powered interfaces. The relatively low standard deviations across all interface types indicate consistent user experiences within each category, though chatbots showed the highest variability in user responses.

Table 2: Task Efficiency Metrics by User Experience Level

Experience Level	Average Task Completion Time (seconds)	Success Rate (%)	Error Recovery Time (seconds)
Novice (< 1 year)	145	73	38
Intermediate (1-3 years)	98	86	22
Advanced (> 3 years)	72	94	15

Task efficiency analysis demonstrated clear relationships between user experience levels and performance metrics. Advanced users completed tasks significantly faster (72 seconds average) compared to novice users (145 seconds), while also achieving higher success rates (94% vs 73%). Error recovery times showed similar patterns, with experienced users resolving errors much more quickly than novice users.

These findings suggest that familiarity with AI-powered interfaces significantly improves user performance, indicating the importance of user education and system design that supports learning progression.

Table 3: Perceived Usefulness Ratings by Age Group

Age Group	Very Useful (%)	Somewhat Useful (%)	Neutral (%)	Not Very Useful (%)	Not Useful (%)
18-25 years	42	35	15	6	2
26-35 years	38	39	16	5	2
36-45 years	31	41	20	6	2
46-55 years	24	38	25	10	3
56-65 years	18	32	31	15	4

Perceived usefulness analysis revealed significant age-related differences in user attitudes toward AI-powered interfaces. Younger users (18-25 years) showed the highest positive perception, with 77% rating AI interfaces as very or somewhat useful. This percentage decreased progressively with age, reaching only 50% among users aged 56-65 years. The neutral response category increased substantially with age, suggesting that older users may be more uncertain about AI interface benefits rather than explicitly negative. These findings highlight the importance of age-appropriate design considerations in AI interface development.

Table 4: Behavioral Intention Scores by Interface Characteristics

Interface Characteristic	High Intent (4-5 scale)	Moderate Intent (3 scale)	Low Intent (1-2 scale)	Mean Score
High Personalization	68%	22%	10%	4.1
Transparent Decision Making	71%	20%	9%	4.2
Fast Response Time	74%	19%	7%	4.3
Natural Language Processing	66%	24%	10%	4.0
Error Recovery Support	69%	23%	8%	4.1

Behavioral intention analysis identified fast response time as the most influential factor in user willingness to continue using AI-powered interfaces, with 74% of users expressing high intention to use systems with rapid responses. Transparent decision-making ranked second (71%), indicating that users value understanding how AI systems reach their conclusions. High personalization capabilities also strongly influenced behavioral intention (68%), though slightly less than transparency and speed. Natural language processing capabilities showed the lowest influence on behavioral intention (66%), suggesting that while users appreciate conversational interfaces, other factors may be more critical for adoption.

Table 5: Trust Levels Across Different AI Applications

AI Application Domain	High Trust (%)	Moderate Trust (%)	Low Trust (%)	Mean Trust Score
Entertainment Recommendations	45	38	17	3.6
Navigation and Maps	52	35	13	3.8
Shopping Recommendations	31	42	27	3.2
Financial Advisory	18	35	47	2.8
Health Information	22	33	45	2.9

Trust analysis revealed significant variations across different AI application domains. Users expressed highest trust in AI systems for navigation and maps (52% high trust), followed by entertainment recommendations (45%). However, trust levels dropped substantially for more consequential applications, with financial advisory AI receiving high trust from only 18% of users and health information AI from 22%. The high percentage of low trust responses for financial (47%) and health applications (45%) suggests that users remain skeptical about AI capabilities in high-stakes domains.

Table 6: Correlation Matrix of Key Variables

Variables	User Satisfaction	Task Efficiency	Perceived Usefulness	Behavioral Intention	Trust Level
User Satisfaction	1.00	0.67**	0.78**	0.72**	0.58**
Task Efficiency	0.67**	1.00	0.61**	0.54**	0.43**
Perceived Usefulness	0.78**	0.61**	1.00	0.81**	0.62**
Behavioral Intention	0.72**	0.54**	0.81**	1.00	0.66**
Trust Level	0.58**	0.43**	0.62**	0.66**	1.00

Note: ** indicates correlation is significant at $p < 0.01$ level

Correlation analysis revealed strong positive relationships among all key variables, with the strongest correlation observed between perceived usefulness and behavioral intention ($r = 0.81$). User satisfaction showed strong correlations with perceived usefulness ($r = 0.78$) and behavioral intention ($r = 0.72$), indicating that satisfied users are more likely to perceive AI interfaces as useful and continue using them. Trust levels showed moderate correlations with other variables, suggesting that while trust is important, it may not be the primary determinant of user experience outcomes.

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis - Predictors of User Satisfaction

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	p-value	R^2 Contribution
Response Accuracy	0.34	0.08	4.25	< 0.001	0.28
Personalization Level	0.28	0.07	4.00	< 0.001	0.19
Interface Transparency	0.22	0.06	3.67	< 0.001	0.12
Response Speed	0.18	0.05	3.60	< 0.001	0.08
Error Handling Quality	0.15	0.06	2.50	0.013	0.06

Model Summary: $R^2 = 0.73$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.71$, $F(5,444) = 238.7$, $p < 0.001$

Multiple regression analysis identified response accuracy as the strongest predictor of user satisfaction, accounting for 28% of the variance. Personalization level ranked second with 19% of variance contribution, followed by interface transparency (12%), response speed (8%), and error handling quality (6%). The overall model explained 73% of the variance in user satisfaction, indicating that these five factors are primary determinants of positive user experience with AI-powered interfaces.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis for the 35 semi-structured interviews added user experiences, perceptions, and attitudes, which supplemented the quantitative findings with rich insights. Thematic analysis identified five key themes that described how users engaged with AI systems: processes for developing and maintaining trust, challenges and barriers to adaptation, privacy and relationship concern, expectation management, and trust development.

Trust Development and Maintenance

The participants described development of trust with AI-powered interfaces as slow and gradual, with the process being significantly impacted by the system's reliability and consistency. Users would say their skepticism was usually tempered by some sort of cautious acceptance after some interactions, but trust was fragile and could easily be destroyed by unexpected behaviors or other system errors. “I started using the voice assistant with basic commands and as I came to realize that it was getting things right, I started asking more complex questions. I remember asking the assistant a very important question and it misunderstood something important, and I went back to being more careful about what I asked, many participants would say. A number of participants described what they called functional trust, which is the confidence that a system will correctly perform its functions, and relational trust, which is the comfort of the user with the AI as an interaction partner.

‘Earned autonomy’ was one concept that came up during interviews when respondents talked about performance-based AI systems and slowly giving them more and more decision-making power. At the same time, respondents maintained the unqualified right of override as central, and were uncomfortable with AI that was uncorrectable and uncontrollable. Trust was highly contextualized, with respondents reporting much higher trust in AI for menial activities, like asking about the weather, as compared to more sensitive areas, like giving advice on finance and healthcare. Trust assessment was personalized and several participants talked about something like ‘AI plus X’ for critical decisions to cross-validate AI recommendations.

Processes and Challenges of Learning and Adaptation

Participants showcased disparate values of adaptability when it comes to using interfaces that are AI powered, with younger and more experienced age groups being more flexible. Adaptation, even for relatively sophisticated user, was a challenge because of their misunderstanding of what AI systems were capable of doing, which subsequently led to what they claim as undue frustration. One user articulated their puzzling experience by saying, "I kept trying to use it like a search engine at first, then I realized that it was more like having a conversation with someone who knows a of things, but doesn’t always understand what you really mean." A majority of users such as this one, go through what can be described as a trial-and-error phase wherein they develop an effective strategy to interact with a system after sufficient experimentation.

As participants were describing their attempts at adjusting how they speak to an AI system, the idea of "... style of interaction calibration" came to the fore. This is adjusting a user’s "voice" interaction by the use of more targeted phrase, understanding when the AI is able to process natural and when it needs to hear "key words," and what it defines as its "limitations" that require different approaches. Participants were aware that feedback was important for systems, especially for first time users, and some were able to clearly articulate that aiding instructions and feedback brought them speed when it came to adaptation. Conversely, some participants, were quite disappointed at the lack of strong, actionable AI systems that could help them maximally interact with the systems.

Frameworks of Managers, Perceptions, and Anticipations of the System

The analysis of the interviews noted above revealed a high amount of confusion and misunderstanding of the capabilities of the systems, and an overwhelmingly high and an unnecessarily low expectation of the capabilities of the systems were common. Some participants had the expectation that the systems would be able to understand context and nuances at the level of a human, and were let down when the systems did not understand the implicit meanings and grasp the more complex scenarios. Other participants, on the other hand, were surprised by the level of sophistication of the systems in natural language understanding and personalized recommendation systems.

The participants spoke of forming mental models of the systems that were a mixture of anthropomorphic and mechanistic, and seeing the agents of the systems as having the ability to converse as a human and understanding their nature as a computer. These hybrid mental models at times resulted in a set of inconsistent patterns of interaction, where participants toggled back and forth between having the mindset that the systems are complex tools, and the systems are social beings. Several participants remarked that their expectations changed greatly over a period of time, where misconceptions were replaced with better understanding gained from experience.

The role of media portrayals and cultural representations of AI had a crucial part to play in shaping the expectations of the participants, most of whom cited science fiction and media reports discussing AI advancements. There respondents feeling disappointment that actual AI systems do not resemble the fictional ones, while there were others worrying about what the potential future might hold due to speculative media. Discrepancy between expectation and reality seemed to play a crucial part in user satisfaction, and subsequent usage behavior.

Concerns About Privacy and Awareness Regarding Personalize Data

Privacy and data concerns are emerging issues that are simultaneously troubling and complex; participants described different levels of data concerns along with the awareness of the data being collected and the subsequent use of AI. While many participants understood that data collection was a necessity for AI personalization, they had difficulty explaining the nature of the data that was collected and how that information was applied. One of the participants expressed the following sentiments: “I, for instance, understand that it learns from the activities that I do; however, I do not understand the information that it is capable of recalling and the person or system that it shares that information with. That consciousness is a little troubling, but for the moment, the ease it provides is very worthwhile.”

Allegiance unencumbered AI services that are immensely rich in personal data is commonplace in people. Participants, who were notified personal testimonies of privacy strategies, described self-determined values and sentiments and conveyed concerns regarding the data collection and surveillance. This constitutes a part of the privacy paradox. This contradiction was most prominent in the context of mobile AI assistants and smart home devices in which the ease of use substantially exceeded the hesitation regarding privacy. Nonetheless, participants engaged more with the less sensitive areas of discussions and expressed KEEN and other personal private information which, in retrospect, was aimed to balance the relationship.

The unusual privacy boundaries were significant to some participants who separated acceptable and unacceptable types of AI data access. For instance, participants were largely fine with AI systems assessing their preferences in entertainment but were much more apprehensive about AI access to their financial or health data. These boundaries were distinct and appeared to be influenced by age, technical proficiency, and unpleasant encounters with data privacy breaches or other privacy violations.

In the Perceived Relationship Dynamics section, the participants spoke about the development of ongoing relationships with AI-powered interfaces, which were marked by increasing levels of familiarity, routine, and eventual emotional bonds. The majority of participants felt more at ease with the AI systems in use after some time because of their tendency to favor certain AI personalities or types of interaction. Some participants offered quasi-social accounts of their interactions with AI, which included descriptions of the AI systems “displaying” a degree of politeness, “thanking” the users, and “caring” about their interiors, even though these participants were aware, both at the emotional and rational levels, that AI systems were not social entities.

The tendency to assign human attributes to AI systems was most pronounced in relation to voice assistants, where respondents remarked on using personal reference and intent and emotion on AI replies. This anthropomorphizing, though, was still tempered with an apparently clear understanding that AI systems were not conscious or sentient. Participants seemed to have little trouble with holding on to both positions simultaneously, emotionally engaging in interactions with the AI while cognizantly understanding the AI’s fictitious nature.

A number of respondents reported crafting certain interaction patterns and routines, and specific relation dynamics, that privilege personal dispositions. For instance, certain respondents proudly recounted an interaction where they addressed the AI by saying "please" and "thank you" in particular phrasings or conversational patterns that they considered most appropriate. These patterned forms of interaction indicates that respondents were shifting the underlying communication strategies to which they subscribed in response to the disposition of the AI system on the other hand and their own psychological thresholds on the other hand for engaging with an artificial conversational agent.

Discussion

Based on this study, many user experiences regarding AI interfaces exist, and they also denote more than user satisfaction, trust development, adaptation, and the human-AI relationship. The strong correlations between system characteristics and user experience outcomes quantitative results suggest along with qualitative results the necessity of reliability, transparency, and personalization even in AI interface design. The qualitative results, on the other hand, highlight the crucial aspect that user experience with AI systems does not follow the same outline as interface interactions. There is relationship development and expectation management in user AI systems which are dynamic and more than the static metrics of traditional interfaces.

The qualitative results explaining the adaptation and different comfort levels as artificial interaction companions help shed light on the much-documented age-related gaps in AI interface acceptance and perceived usefulness in the quantitative analysis. The higher acceptance rates of younger users seem to indicate that these users are more comfortable with AI and their expectations with human computer interaction differ significantly than older users. The more cautious attitude of older users could perhaps be as a result of the interaction preferences, which also dominate the human decision-making process. This can conclude that AI interfaces are designed, implemented, and supported with strategies that vary with age. The strategies also should address different comfort levels, which along with age can be technical experience too.

Functional and relational trust disparity from the qualitative analysis underscores the need to explain the weak correlation of trust to other user experience variables in the quantitative results. Users may build trust in the functions of AI systems, but warming to AI as partners in interaction involves other psychological and social factors outside traditional usability models. This difference is important for the design of AI interfaces because it means that the trust users place in an AI must be balanced with the user's impression of the technical performance and the social relational dynamics that provide a comfortable environment for interaction with an interface system, along with a healthy skepticism about the system.

Conclusion

This research sheds light on new facets concerning user experiences with AI Interfaces and some the positive and negative variables concerning them. The results show how people tend to appreciate the utility and the personalization of AI systems, the experiences derive from the complicated factors within user-trust, adaptation, and expectation cross over the various user consideration factors. There are phenomena user characteristics, like satisfaction connected to the systems per User regulation, response precision, personalization, and responsiveness. This phenomenon notes the work of the interface designers for a specific outcome. The qualitative data makes it clear from the interface and user relationship perspective how the user and the AI systems interface and work with them.

The considerable differences of trust placed in a system in different domains is indicative that the acceptance of AI is context-dependent, with user willingness to trust AI systems being much higher for low-risk activities than for critical ones. This trend indicates that any strategic implementation of AI into any system or product should be sensitive to the potential risks involved, and also offer adequate user agency for high-risk scenarios. The privacy paradox captured in user behavior, which can be described as having privacy concerns but using data-driven AI systems, points to the problem of lacking adequate transparency around data and user privacy mechanisms that allow for agency around the use of AI systems.

The changes and growth in user mental models and expectations over a time revealed through qualitative study also indicates the need for longitudinal scope in thinking about AI interfaces. User experiences with AI systems are dynamic, which means that interfaces should aim to scaffold the correct learning pathways and communicate the correct capabilities and boundaries of the system. The ability to reason about the implications of the use of AI systems and the potential for over-engagement with the system is a level of criticality that designers must always be ready to balance to avoid overattachment to systems that are anthropomorphically skinned for user engagement.

The results of this research advance the theory of human-AI interaction as well as the practice of designing more intuitive interfaces with AI systems.

Integrating the traditional HCI (human-computer interaction) models with the distinct features of intelligent systems provides a basis for further scholarly inquiry. In contrast, the knowledge of user experience (UX) determining variables provides actionable insights for interface enhancement. With the rapid evolution of AI systems, attention to user experience design principles is crucial for the ethical and responsible alignment of AI innovations with human needs.

Recommendation

From here on out the development of interfaces that use AI technologies need to ensure that systems are highly transparent and that their decision-making capabilities are easily understood by the users. Research has shown that systems that are more transparent achieve greater satisfaction and trust from the users. Designers need to use progressive disclosure techniques that provide the right level of explanation to the users according to their preferences and context avoiding information overload and over simplification. Strategies for how to design an interface from the ground up need to be introduced because of the differences across age groups on how AI technologies are accepted and used. This includes fewer complex interfaces for the elderly and more complex onboarding systems for users with more interfaces with greater supporting materials for users across the experience spectrum. The ability to protect one's privacy must be coupled with easy to operate mechanisms that ensure that the users know and are in charge of how their data is used and controlled enhancing personalization which the users' desire. Organizations that use AI technologies are recommended to create and implement user training systems that facilitate the development of pragmatic and realistic user expectations and interaction patterns because expectation management has a very high impact on user satisfaction and system adoption in the longer term.

REFERENCES

Abbas Khan, M., Khan, H., Omer, M. F., Ullah, I., & Yasir, M. (2024). Impact of artificial intelligence on the global economy and technology advancements. In *Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) Security: Smart Applications and Sustainable Technologies* (pp. 147-180): Springer.

Albarrak, A. M. (2024). Integration of Cybersecurity, Usability, and Human-Computer Interaction for Securing Energy Management Systems. *Sustainability (2071-1050), 16*(18).

Asif, M. (2024). AI and Human Interaction: Enhancing User Experience Through Intelligent Systems. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence Research, 1*(2), 209-249.

Aslam, M. W., Aslam, S., Aslam, N., Aslam, T., & Aslam, J. (2025a). ADVANCEMENTS IN MEDICAL IMAGING FROM TRADITIONAL TECHNIQUES TO AI-DRIVEN INNOVATIONS.

Aslam, M. W., Aslam, S., Aslam, N., Aslam, T., & Aslam, J. (2025b). A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF WEARABLE HEALTH DEVICES: ADVANCES, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.

Aslam, M. W., Aslam, S., Aslam, N., Aslam, T., & Aslam, J. (2025c). FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING SMART SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING PROJECTS: A REVIEW OF CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS. *Spectrum of Engineering Sciences,* 3(3), 557-567.

Aslam, M. W., Aslam, S., Aslam, N., Aslam, T., & Aslam, J. (2025d). THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS IN SMART GRIDS, POWER SYSTEMS, AND AUTOMATION. *Spectrum of Engineering Sciences,* 3(3), 540-556.

Awasthi, G. K., Tewari, S., & Mallick, S. (2025). *Human-Computer Interaction Design Principles for Enhancing User Experience in Mobile Applications.* Paper presented at the ITM Web of Conferences.

Babar, Z., Paul, R., Rahman, M. A., & Barua, T. (2025). A Systematic Review Of Human-AI Collaboration In It Support Services: Enhancing User Experience And Workflow Automation. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Policy, 1*(01), 65-89.

Chenchu, S., Kandem, V., Dattaram, T., & Rao, T. V. N. (2025). The convergence of artificial intelligence and graphical user interface. In *Supply Chain Transformation Through Generative AI and Machine Learning* (pp. 69-102): IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Ding, Z., Ji, Y., Gan, Y., Wang, Y., & Xia, Y. (2024). Current status and trends of technology, methods, and applications of Human–Computer Intelligent Interaction (HCII): A bibliometric research. *Multimedia Tools and Applications, 83*(27), 69111-69144.

Dyczek, B. (2024). On the need for integrating social sciences and engineering–technical disciplines in studying contemporary social phenomena. New directions in digital sociology. *Media i Społeczeństwo, 20*(1/Zeszyt 1), 240-256.

Eswaran, U., & Eswaran, V. (2025). Ai-driven cross-platform design: Enhancing usability and user experience. In *Navigating usability and user experience in a multi-platform world* (pp. 19-48): IGI Global.

George, A. S. (2025). Beyond the Interface and How Conversational AI Is Reshaping the Future of Human-Computer Interaction. *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal, 3*(4), 1-13.

Ishwarya, M., Anand, M. S., Kumaresan, A., & Gopinath, N. (2024). Innovations in Artificial Intelligence and Human Computer Interaction in the Digital Era. In *Computational Imaging and Analytics in Biomedical Engineering* (pp. 105-145): Apple Academic Press.

Javed, S. (2024). ADVANCING HUMAN-COMPUTER INTERACTION: EXPLORING THE FRONTIERS OF ARTIFICIAL EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN INTERACTIVE SYSTEMS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETAL INTEGRATION. *NUST Business Review, 6*(1).

Khan, A. N., Salar Khan, A. A., Mansoor, M. A. J., Jameel, A., Rustam, R., Aslam, R., & Shah, J. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Computer Science: Evolution, Techniques, Challenges, and Multidisciplinary Applications. *Sch J Eng Tech, 4*, 246-263.

Kumar, N., Pal, S. K., Agarwal, P., Rosak-Szyrocka, J., & Jain, V. (2024). *Harnessing artificial emotional intelligence for improved human-computer interactions*: IGI Global.

Liu, Z., Ding, J., Ren, K., Meng, S., Yang, H., & Li, Y. (2025). Design for Intelligent Interaction CAE Software: A Hybrid Recommendation-Based Approach to Improve Simulation Workflow Efficiency. *Design and Artificial Intelligence*, 100022.

Mishra, D., Mishra, R. K., & Agarwal, R. (2025). Human–computer interaction and user experience in the artificial intelligence era. *Trends in Computer Science and Information Technology Research*, 31-54.

Morad, M., & Essing, B. (2025). *User-Perceived Quality of GenAI Chatbots in a Business Context–A Construct Definition.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction.

Naveed, S., Stevens, G., & Robin-Kern, D. (2024). An overview of the empirical evaluation of explainable ai (xai): A comprehensive guideline for user-centered evaluation in xai. *Applied Sciences, 14*(23), 11288.

Ntoa, S. (2025). Usability and user experience evaluation in intelligent environments: A review and reappraisal. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 41*(5), 2829-2858.

Partarakis, N., & Zabulis, X. (2024). A review of immersive technologies, knowledge representation, and AI for human-centered digital experiences. *Electronics, 13*(2), 269.

Pasch, S., & Ha, S.-Y. (2025). Human–AI Interaction and User Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Online Reviews of AI Products. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 1-22.

Sadeghi Milani, A., Cecil-Xavier, A., Gupta, A., Cecil, J., & Kennison, S. (2024). A systematic review of human–computer interaction (HCI) research in medical and other engineering fields. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 40*(3), 515-536.

Sánchez-Adame, L. M., & Mendoza, S. (2025). *The Hitchhiker's Guide to Conversational Interfaces: Exploring Affordances and Signifiers Through a Theoretical Framework.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction.

Saqlain, M., & Shahid, A. (2024a). Assessing content and language integrated learning (CLIL) effectiveness in Tesol contexts. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT), 7*(4), 113-125.

Saqlain, M., & Shahid, A. (2024b). Contemporary English literature and the digital age: exploring the impact of technology on narrative. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review, 2*(04), 58-69.

Schrepp, M., Rosenzweig, E., Soares, M. M., & Marcus, A. (2025). A Review of Design, User Experience, and Usability in HCI, Through the Lens of the DUXU Conference. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 1-26.

Subramanian, K., Thomas, L., Sahin, M., & Sahin, F. (2024). Supporting human–robot interaction in manufacturing with augmented reality and effective human–computer interaction: a review and framework. *Machines, 12*(10), 706.

Tong, Y. (2025). *Enhancing user experience in human-robot interaction in manufacturing.* Cardiff University,

Troussas, C., Krouska, A., & Sgouropoulou, C. (2025). *Human-Computer Interaction and Augmented Intelligence*: Springer.