AI-Driven Interiors: Balancing Innovation and Human Connection

Vishwajith A[1], Harshitha KV[2]

[1]M.Arch Student, Dayanandasagar College of Architecture, Bangalore, India

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, Dayanandasagar College of Architecture, Bangalore, India

Abstract

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) in interior design has revolutionized the way spaces adapt to user needs, blending personalization, energy efficiency, and automation. This research delves into the balance between innovation and human connection in AI-driven interiors, examining whether advancements in smart systems genuinely align with user-centric principles. Using a mixed-methods approach, the study combines quantitative surveys of architects, designers, and end-users with qualitative case studies and literature reviews to assess key dimensions: functionality, emotional engagement, privacy, and cost.

Findings reveal that while AI systems enhance functionality and efficiency, they often fall short in fostering emotional and sensory connections, leaving users feeling detached. Privacy concerns and high upfront costs further hinder adoption, despite potential long-term benefits. A strong correlation between emotional engagement and user satisfaction underscores the importance of designing spaces that resonate with human experiences, beyond mere automation. The study advocates for a holistic approach to AI integration, emphasizing transparency in data security, affordability, and a focus on human-centered design elements such as emotional connection and tactile materials. This balanced framework ensures that AI-driven interiors not only meet technological aspirations but also enrich human well-being and connection to space.

Introduction

Interior design is no longer confined to the static balance of aesthetics and functionality. UX(User Experience) has entered a new era the intelligent era and the popularization of AI-based intelligent products have brought new requirements and

opportunities to a new stage of UX practice (Xu, 2019b, 2020a; Xu, Gao, Ge, 2022)(Xu, n.d.).For example, by making use of AI (artificial intelligence), behavioral data can be used, and information on user preferences can be generated, enabling inhabitants to monitor and control a wide range of household appliances remotely and intelligently.(Valencia-Arias et al., 2023)

However, SREs (Smart Residential Environment) focusing more on technologies than users could lead to the gap between the delivered living environment and users' needs.(Yang & Kim, 2024), such as emotional connection, user privacy, and affordability. This raises a question, how do users perceive AI systems in terms of functionality, emotional connection, privacy, and cost?

Literature Review

Functional Benefits of AI

Now the smart home has entered a part of the family. Not only comfort the sense of use, but also make the safety and portability improved to a higher level. Even from an environmental perspective, it can provide a green and sustainable residential space for us.(Chen & Wang, 2020). And also, a smart home is a complete system that is expected to bring healthcare, safety and well-being services to the user's doorstep with the aid of modern technologies such as environmental and medical sensors, actuators, high performance computing processors, and wireless communication platforms.(Majumder et al., 2017). For example, systems like Philips Hue adapt to user activities, offering lighting that adjusts dynamically to enhance productivity and relaxation. For instance, warmer light tones are used for leisure, while cooler tones improve focus during work.

Emotional and Experiential Design

AI technologies can mine and analyze enormous data sets to discover minute human preferences and, through this, develop visually appealing, ecologically viable, and efficient spaces.(AlShkipi & Zahran, 2024).The emotional impact of interior spaces is integral to user satisfaction. While AI systems prioritize functionality, they often overlook the experiential and emotional dimensions of design, for example, tactile and sensory elements, such as fabrics, textures, and manual controls, foster emotional connection. Fully automated systems risk creating sterile environments that feel impersonal.

Privacy and Data Security

Increasing demand for utilizing IoTs (Internet of Things) in smart homes has raised ethical challenges in developing detection technologies over recent decades.(You et al., 2024). But on the contrary, in a smart building, various technologies are

combined to provide the occupants with high-grade and safe, secure and cost-efficient services, including data analytics, data collecting, data storage and data viewing.(Baduge et al., 2022)

Cost and Accessibility

Affordability is critical for the widespread adoption of AI-driven interiors. Despite the innovation and functional advantages of smart homes, there are various factors that discourage their adoption. The perceived sacrifices of smart home technology, which typically consist of difficult usability, cost burden, uncertainty about controllability, and risk awareness of security, are known to affect usage intent.(Chang & Nam, 2021). On the other hand, the possibility of long-term reductions in energy use and operational effectiveness makes a strong argument for the financial sustainability of these expenditures.(Larionova et al., 2024)

Methodology

Data Collection

The study employed an online survey distributed to 32 participants, including architects, interior designers, and end-users. From the survey, we observed that smart technology is predominantly integrated into living rooms and home offices, with limited usage in bedrooms, kitchens, and specific features like door locks. The survey consisted of two parts:

Quantitative Questions: Ten Likert-scale questions assessed functionality, ease of use, emotional engagement, privacy, cost, and satisfaction.

Qualitative Questions: Open-ended prompts invited participants to share their experiences, preferences, and concerns regarding AI systems.

Statistical Analysis

The survey data were analyzed using the following methods:

Descriptive Statistics: Calculated mean, median, mode, and standard deviation for each survey question to summarize trends and variability.

Correlation Analysis: Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to evaluate relationships between satisfaction and:

- Privacy and security
- Emotional engagement
- Cost

The formula for Pearson Correlation Coefficient:

$$r = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}$$

Where,

r = Pearson Correlation Coefficient

x_i = x variable samples y_i = y variable sample

$\bar{x}$ = mean of values in x variable $\bar{y}$ =mean of values in y variable

Findings and Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Ease of Use

Mean	4.0
Median	4
Mode	4
Standard Deviati	0.75

Question: "The smart systems in spaces I use or design are intuitive and easy to interact with."

A mean score of 4.0 reflects that most respondents agree smart systems are intuitive and user-friendly. With a mode of 4, the majority rated these systems positively. However, 25% of respondents gave a neutral response, suggesting that some users, particularly less tech-savvy individuals, may face accessibility challenges.

Emotional Engagement

Mean	3.53
Median	3
Mode	3
Standard Dev	0.92

Question: "Technology in interior spaces enhances emotional and experiential connections."

A mean score of 3.53 suggests that emotional engagement is moderately perceived, with a significant proportion of neutral (34.4%) and negative responses (12.5%). The results indicate that while some users appreciate the experiential value of smart systems, many feel they lack warmth and sensory appeal.

Privacy and Security

Mean	3.28
Median	3
Mode	3
Standard Dev	1.02

Question: "The integration of smart systems in spaces is mindful of privacy and ensures data security."

With a mean score of 3.28, privacy is one of the weaker aspects of user perception. A large percentage (40.6%) gave a neutral response, reflecting uncertainty about the adequacy of privacy safeguards. Combined with negative responses (18.8%), this highlights a lack of trust in data security.

Cost

Less than ₹50,000	21.9%
₹50,000–₹1,00,000	43.8%
₹1,00,000–₹2,50,00	18.8%
₹2,50,000–₹5,00,00	15.6%
More than ₹5,00,00	0%

Question: "What do you think is an appropriate cost range for integrating smart technology into an interior space?"

The majority of respondents (43.8%) preferred cost ranges between ₹50,000 and ₹1,00,000, while 21.9% opted for budgets below ₹50,000. Only 15.6% were willing to spend ₹2, 50,000–₹5, 00,000, and no one supported costs exceeding ₹5, 00,000. These results underscore the importance of affordability in driving adoption.

Satisfaction

Mean	4.3
Median	5
Mode	5
Standard Deviat	0.8

Question: "I am satisfied with how smart systems meet functional, aesthetic, and emotional needs in spaces I use or design."

With a mean score of 4.34, satisfaction is relatively high, driven by functionality and personalization. The majority of respondents (84.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that AI systems met their needs. However, privacy and emotional engagement concerns may limit satisfaction for some users.

Qualitative Analysis

Emotional Connection

Participants highlighted mixed feelings about automation. One participant stated:

"Automating drapes eliminates the tactile joy of selecting and feeling fabrics. It's convenient but lacks the emotional connection."

Complexity and Frustration

Several respondents mentioned system malfunctions as a source of frustration:

"When smart systems fail, they create more inconvenience than they solve, especially for those who aren't tech-savvy."

Privacy Concerns

Respondents expressed unease about data collection:

"The constant monitoring by smart devices feels intrusive. I'm worried about how this data is stored and used."

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis helps to identify relationships between variables, providing insights into how factors such as privacy, emotional engagement, and cost influence user satisfaction. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) is used to quantify these relationships.

Correlation: Satisfaction and Privacy

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Strength
Satisfaction and Privacy	0.52	Moderate Positive

The moderate positive correlation ($r=0.52$) indicates that higher satisfaction is associated with increased trust in the privacy and security of AI systems. While privacy is not the strongest determinant of satisfaction, it is significant enough to warrant attention. Participants who rated privacy and data security higher were more likely to report satisfaction with AI systems. Conversely, those expressing neutral or negative opinions about privacy were less satisfied overall.

Correlation: Satisfaction and Emotional Engagement

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Strength
Satisfaction and Emotion	0.67	Strong Positive

The strong positive correlation ($r=0.67$) indicates that emotional engagement significantly impacts user satisfaction. Participants who felt that AI systems enhanced emotional and experiential connections were more likely to report higher satisfaction levels. On the other hand, users who rated emotional engagement lower tended to report lower overall satisfaction. Participants frequently mentioned that while AI systems improve convenience and functionality, they often lack the warmth and tactile qualities that foster emotional connections. For example: One respondent noted: "Automating curtains eliminates the tactile joy of handling fabric. It feels functional but not personal." Another commented: "Smart systems work well but don't always feel welcoming. Spaces seem mechanical and lack a human touch."

Correlation: Satisfaction and Cost

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Strength
Satisfaction and Cost	-0.34	Weak Negative

The weak negative correlation ($r=-0.34$) suggests that higher costs slightly reduce satisfaction. While cost is not the most significant factor influencing satisfaction, it still plays a role, especially for users with budget constraints. Respondents who perceived smart systems as too expensive were less likely to report high satisfaction. 43.8% of respondents preferred cost ranges between ₹50,000 and ₹1, 00,000, while only 15.6% supported spending between ₹2,50,000 and ₹5,00,000. No respondents supported costs exceeding ₹5, 00,000, indicating clear budgetary limitations for the

majority. Several participants expressed concerns about the affordability of AI systems, one respondent said "The upfront cost is too high for what it offers. I'd consider it only if the prices dropped." Another commented, "AI systems are great, but they feel like a luxury rather than a necessity."

Conclusion

AI-driven interiors represent a significant evolution in design, offering enhanced functionality, energy efficiency, and personalization. However, their success depends on addressing key challenges, Spaces must go beyond functionality to foster emotional connection. Transparent data policies and robust security measures are essential to building user trust. Users must feel confident that their personal data is protected and used ethically. Developing cost-effective solutions is critical to making smart systems accessible to a broader audience. Highlighting the long-term benefits of energy savings can help justify initial investments. The findings of this study underscore the need for a human-centric approach to AI in interior design. By prioritizing emotional resonance, privacy, and affordability, designers and manufacturers can create intelligent spaces that harmonize technological innovation with human connection.

Bibliography

–AlShkipi, O. A., & Zahran, B. (2024). Implementation of Artificial Intelligence in Interior Design: Systematic Literature Review. Civil Engineering and Architecture, 12(4), 28892906. https://doi.org/10.13189/cea.2024.120429

Baduge, S. K., Thilakarathna, S., Perera, J. S., Arashpour, M., Sharafi, P., Teodosio, B., Shringi, A., & Mendis, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence and smart vision for building and construction 4.0: Machine and deep learning methods and applications. Automation in Construction, 141, 104440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2022.104440

Chang, S., & Nam, K. (2021). Smart Home Adoption: The Impact of User Characteristics and Differences in Perception of Benefits. Buildings, 11(9), 393. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11090393

Chen, Z., & Wang, X. (2020). Application of AI technology in interior design. E3S Web of Conferences, 179, 02105. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202017902105

Larionova, Y. V., Sharma, D., Nijhawan, G., Kumari, N., & Devi, S. (2024). The Economic Viability of Smart Home Investments: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. BIO Web of Conferences, 86, 01086. https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/20248601086

—Majumder, S., Aghayi, Emad., Noferesti, M., Memarzadeh-Tehran, H., Mondal, T., Pang, Z., & Deen, M. (2017). Smart Homes for Elderly HealthcareRecent Advances and Research Challenges. Sensors, 17(11), 2496. https://doi.org/10.3390/s17112496

Valencia-Arias, A., Cardona-Acevedo, S., Gómez-Molina, S., Gonzalez-Ruiz, J. D., & Valencia, J. (2023). Smart home adoption factors: A systematic literature review and research agenda. PLOS ONE, 18(10), e0292558. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0292558

Xu, W. (n.d.). A "User Experience 3.0 (UX3.0)" Paradigm Framework: User Experience Design for Human-Centered AI Systems.

–Yang, H., & Kim, M. J. (2024). A Critical Review of Smart Residential Environment Research Focusing HumanBuilding Interaction. Sage Open, 14(4), 21582440241289814. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241289814

You, L., Zhou, J., Li, Z., & Chen, F. (2024). AI Ethics in Smart Homes: Progress, User Requirements and Challenges (No. arXiv:2412.09813). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.09813