Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology
ISSN: 2959-6386 (Online)
2024, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 113–125
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60087/jklst.v4.n2.010

Research Paper

AI-Powered Crisis Management: Revolutionizing Customer Service Emergencies

Akande Victor Ogbo[1], Debo Joseph Oyana[2]

[1]Management, South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russia
[2]Management, South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russia

Abstract

This study examines the potential of AI as a disruptive technology to address brand crisis customer service by spe-cifically analyzing the ability of AI to deliver personalized, real-time responses that can enhance customer percep-tions of a firm's handling of a crisis situation. The research design employed online surveys, semi-structured inter-views with customer service workers, a controlled experiment, and a secondary analysis of cases in a mixed-methods study. Among the most relevant conclusions, Artificial Intelligence has been proven to be able to reduce response times to initial crisis responses while adding a personalization capability driven by data. For basic requests, AI can offer immediacy such that information queries are not provided. They also highlight the ongoing need for human in-tervention in emotional and complex situations where empathy and nuances are key.

This study indicates that an optimum level of customer satisfaction is achieved using a hybrid human interaction model. This study is limited by its narrow focus on specific AI technologies, relatively small sample size, lack of de-mographic diversity, and dependence on a simulated crisis environment. Practice implications indicate that the role of AI in mobilization should involve providing this type of information, an initial point of contact that can be reached quickly, and clear and easy pathways for moving problems to a human who can handle more complexity. Its value lies in informing companies of useful practical implications in organizing responses to disasters and building trust in AI.

Keywords

Artificial intelligence, crisis management, customer service, brand crisis, emergency response, customer satisfaction, natural language processing, chatbots, sentiment analysis, personalized communication.

1. Introduction

*Corresponding author: Akande Victor Ogbo

Email addresses: Onodavictor@gmail.com

Onodavictor@gmail.com (Akande Victor Ogbo), Jsphdebo@gmail.com (Debo Joseph Oyana)

Received: 12-03-2025; **Accepted:** 16-04-2025; **Published:** 15-05-2025

Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology
ISSN: 2959-6386 (Online)
2024, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 113–125
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60087/jklst.v4.n2.010

Given the rapid nature of digital, hyperconnected crises today's age of social communication, brand managers are no longer protected from crises happening out of sight and mind; significantly, these crises can occur out of no-where and spread rapidly (Pendyala & Lakkamraju, 2024). A brand crisis is defined as an unexpected catastrophe or disruptive chain of events that produces unknown risks or dangers that threaten an organization's reputation, op-erational legitimacy, and financial viability. These crises often put a large strain on customer service departments (Taherdoost, 2021). Customers expect immediate, accu-rate, and empathetic responses during a crisis, be it product recall, service interruption, data leak, or public relations nightmares. Traditional customer service with high human operation is unable to support massive and intensive inquiries; therefore, this type of service has a longer response time, varies responses, and, in the worst case, makes customers feel unsatisfied and distrust-ed(Leocádio et al., 2024). Loss of trust can be devastating to a manufacturer's brand, brand loyalty, and market po-sition.

The development and pace of advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is posing a fundamental shift in the awareness of how companies organize in planning and caring for customer service at these important times. Machine learning, chatbots, natural language processing, and sentiment analysis, among others, all under the AI umbrella promise to automate, enhance, and expedite customer interactions, which can result in a cheap and often more effective frontline (R et al., 2024). In essence, this research question concerns the ways in which these AI technologies are not tools that supplement but are transforming customer service crises by allowing organi-zations to provide personalized, efficient response solu-tions that will lead to greater overall customer satisfac-tion.

This study aims to answer the following question: How does the use of AI-based technologies change online customer service interaction within a brand crisis context, and how does this in turn affect both the effectiveness of the response and levels of customer satisfaction? There-fore, this study was guided by the following aims:

1.Understanding the role of AI in accelerating and auto-mating customer service response times during a brand crisis.

2.To understand whether AI can send an optimized emer-gency message to customers.

3.To assess the impact of AI on overall customer satisfac-tion in crisis communication

4.To understand the problems and limitations of harness-ing AI for customer service in crisis contexts.

5.To lay out a possible model for successfully incorpo-rating AI into a crisis customer service strategy.

The literature review at the outset of this report will cover studies of traditional models of crisis communication as well as existing research on developments in AI for cus-tomer service more broadly and in the implementation of AI in crises. The following section, methodology, will then describe the mixed-methods study, with data collec-tion via surveys, in-depth interviews conducted over the Internet, an experiment, and a case study. The following section summarizes the analysis of this multifaceted in-formation, and a subsequent discussion section interprets these numbers in light of the research objectives. The report concludes with a summary of the insights, limita-tions, and directions for future research, emphasizing the radical possibilities offered by AI in the management of customer service emergencies.

2. Literature Review

Crisis communication in customer service has tra-ditionally been a human-centric domain, emphasizing timely, transparent, and empathetic interactions to miti-gate damage and restore trust (Rane, 2024). Theories such as Coombs' Situational Crisis Communication The-ory (SCCT) provide frameworks for organizations to se-lect appropriate response strategies based on the nature of the crisis and the

*Corresponding author: Akande Victor Ogbo

Email addresses: Onodavictor@gmail.com

Onodavictor@gmail.com (Akande Victor Ogbo), Jsphdebo@gmail.com (Debo Joseph Oyana)

Received: 12-03-2025; **Accepted:** 16-04-2025; **Published:** 15-05-2025

organization's perceived responsibil-ity (Coombs, 2017). In the customer service context, this often translates into dedicated hotlines, increased staffing, and scripted responses from human agents. However, these methods face significant challenges during large-scale crises. Despite their capacity for empathy, human agents are limited in number, leading to long wait times and customer frustration (Sun & Liu, 2023). Main-taining consistent messaging across a large team can be difficult, and the emotional toll on customer service rep-resentatives (CSRs) during high-stress situations can im-pact performance and lead to burnout (Jasmand et al., 2012). Furthermore, the sheer volume of inquiries, often arriving through multiple channels (phone, email, social media), can quickly overwhelm manual processing capa-bilities, hindering the organization's ability to respond effectively and at scale (Chang & Hsiao, 2024).

The rise of AI within customer service Artificial Intelligence has made its way into customer service in multiple ways over the last two decades. The initial use cases were elementary Interactive Voice Response (IVR) systems and rule-based chatbots that could address common routine questions in limited domains (Pendyala & Lakkamraju, 2024). The sophistication of AI-driven tools has increased significantly with improvements in the fields of machine learning (ML) and natural language processing (NLP). Modern natural language processing chatbots and virtual assistants can not only understand natural language and user intent and access extensive knowledge bases but can also make transactions (Aslam, 2023). AI has also been employed in predictive analytics to predict customer needs, route inquiries to the most ap-propriate agent, and analyze customer feedback to iden-tify areas of service that require improvement (Bharadiya, 2023). AI has been adopted in customer service largely in the drive towards efficiency, cost cutting, scalability, and most of all, service support around the clock (Murugeah, 2024).

AI Technologies in Crisis Customer Service: The use of AI technologies in crisis customer service involves various technologies that attempt to mitigate the limita-tions of past services.

Chatbots and virtual assistants: AI-powered chatbots can manage a large number of inbound customer inquiries, providing immediate replies to questions regarding crises for which answers are readily available, such as guide-lines, safety precautions, up-to-date information, and re-fund policies (Kedi et al., 2024). This enables humans to focus on other, more complex, or emotionally charged problems/factors.

Natural Language Processing (NLP): NLP provides AI systems with the ability to understand and engage cus-tomer questions in a human language, whether written or spoken. This facilitates more natural and efficient inter-actions with chatbots, and can be used to classify and rank incoming messages by urgency or sentiment (Al-Shafei, 2024).

Sentiment Analysis: For instance, through the analysis of customer communications, such as emails, social media posts, and chat room logs, AI can analyze language to detect emotional tones and pick up on trends in increas-ing negative sentiments in real time (Singh et al., 2024). It becomes a form of advanced intelligence that organiza-tions can take measures to correct, or which suggests that they may want to respond in the way they communicate with their customers.

Machine Learning (ML): ML algorithms in AI allow sys-tems to learn from new data and to perform increasingly better. In times of crisis, ML can assist in improving chatbot responses, forecasting potential new concerns, and strengthening the ability to communicate with indi-vidual consumers based on past consumer data and be-havior.

Automated Triage and Routing: AI can automatically sort and route incoming customer queries to the appropriate resource, whether another AI module for a specific type of information or a specialized human agent, based on the content and urgency of the query (Chang & Hsiao, 2024).

3.2.4. The integration of AI into crisis customer services offers several benefits.

Speed and Scalability: One of the benefits of using AI systems is their ability to process enormous numbers of customer questions all at the same time and immediately, so that there is hardly any wait time in finding out what you need to know, and information can be quickly pushed out to a large number of people (Anane-Simon & Atiku, 2023).

24/7 Availability: Crises do not adhere to business hours. AI provides round-the-clock support, ensuring that cus-tomers can obtain information and assistance whenever required (Adam et al., 2022).

Consistency of Information: AI is also critical in assuring that all customers have consistent and accurate infor-mation, which is an important part of reducing panic and misinformation that can circulate during a crisis.

Data-driven Insights and Personalization: AI can imme-diately process incoming data to detect patterns, common issues, or particular customer segments that require spe-cific attention. True emotional empathy is a specific hu-man attribute, although AI can simulate a sense of per-sonal touch by reviewing customer histories to best adapt information or answers to specific situations. (Darzi, 2023).

Cost-effectiveness: Although the initial investment can be substantial, AI can reduce the long-term costs associated with scaling up human agent teams during crises.

Challenges and Limitations of AI in Crisis Custom-er Service: AI is not a panacea for crisis customer ser-vice. Some of the primary challenges are as follows:

Lack of empathy and nuances: Currently, AI is unable to imitate real human empathy, which is often necessary to

downplay serious situations and handle upset customers (Gelbrich, 2009). Ambiguous languages or emotional states can also pose a problem for AI.

Potential for Errors and Misinformation: If AI systems are improperly trained, based on or functioning with bad data, or running into novel situations, they can produce inac-curate or wrong responses, which in a crisis might bring us down a dangerous path. (Kalogiannidis et al., 2024).

Ethical Concerns and Data Privacy: Artificial intelligence deployed in customer service, particularly for crisis sce-narios, has ethical implications for data use, algorithm biases, and transparency issues (Osasona et al., 2024). Data privacy and security are critical issues.

Integration and Implementation Complexity: Integrating AI solutions with existing legacy systems can be both complex and expensive. Training AI models requires sig-nificant and relevant data (Bing & Leong, 2025).

Over-Reliance and Human Deskilling: Overdependence on AI may also be detrimental because there are fewer skilled human agents, which is necessary for dealing with complex problems that AI is incapable of handling. (Cui & Alias, 2024).

Theoretical Framework and Gaps in Literature: The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and its extensions, such as the unified theory of acceptance and use of tech-nology (UTAUT), are relevant for analyzing the use of AI technologies in crisis services, both by customers and employees, for the concepts of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, among others. This can assist crisis communication theories, including SCCT, and sensibly include ways in which AI enhances effective crisis responses.

Although general customer service via AI and traditional crisis communication have been widely discussed in the literature, empirical studies in the novel area of the spe-cific effects of AI on customer service in the context of brand crises – and, for instance, the tension between the efficiency of rapid, personalized responses and the ef-fects on overall customer satisfaction in a high-stakes environment such as a brand crisis – are notably lacking. Although much research on AI has been dedicated to its technical capabilities or organizational advantages, less research has been conducted on the lived experience of AI for customers in an emergency context. This is the gap that is sought to fill in this research, which, by being a mixed method, seeks to offer a rounded analysis of AI as a revolution in this particular space.

3. Methodology

To approach the AI revolution of customer service in brand crises, this study utilizes mixed-methods research in the form of a convergent parallel design. This is the process of working with quantitative and qualitative data in parallel, often focusing on the two approaches to an-swer similar questions and then combining the analysis of both to yield a richer and more complex understanding than either can produce alone. Quantitative data were obtained from an online survey and experiment, while qualitative data were obtained from online semi-structured interviews and secondary data analysis of a case study.

3.1. Data Collection Methods

Online Surveys:

Purpose: To collect quantitative data from a large sample of consumers on their perceptions, experiences, and preferences when interacting with AI rather than human agents in customer service during a brand crisis.

Instrument: Google Forms was used to design the struc-tured questionnaire. It comprises demographic data, the history of previous crises associated with brands, per-ceived immediacy and efficacy of AI's response capabili-ties, satisfaction with AI's responsiveness, and prefer-ences for AI representatives over humans regarding question categories during a crisis (informational, prob-lem-solving, and emotional support). Questions used Likert scales (1 – 5, from strongly disagree to strongly agree; or 1-5, very dissatisfied to very satisfied) and mul-tiple-choice response questions.

Sampling and Administration: Participants were selected using a convenience sampling method along with snow-ball sampling. The survey link was disseminated through online social networks (linked in and on Twitter) and email. With a master's level study, the estimated sample size ranges from 150 to 200 and is informative but suffi-ciently small to control. Anonymity was ensured to pro-mote candid responses.

Online Semi-Structured Interviews.

Purpose: To access detailed, qualitative perspectives from operators, managers, and experts on the implementation of AI, as well as the experiences, problems, and efficacy of AI in crisis customer service.

Instrument: An interview guide with open-ended ques-tions was developed. The questions focused on the bene-fits and drawbacks of AI in crisis scenarios, specific AI tools used or considered, impact on team dynamics and human agent roles, strategies for human-AI collaboration, and future outlook.

Sampling and Administration: A purposive sample of 8-10 participants with appropriate lived experiences will be selected. Potential interviewees were identified using LinkedIn and other professional networks. Interviews were held via video conference using platforms such as Zoom or Microsoft Teams, and each took about 15-30 minutes to complete.

Controlled Experiment:

Purpose: To compare the effectiveness (response time and resolution accuracy) and impact of an AI-powered re-sponse

versus a traditional human-agent simulated re-sponse on customer satisfaction in a controlled crisis scenario.

Design: A between-subjects design was employed with two groups of participants (target N=30 per group, total N=60).

Group 1 (AI Condition): Participants interacted with the mock-up of an AI chatbot interface (simulated using pre-scripted responses triggered by keywords, mimicking moderately sophisticated AI) to resolve a query related to a fictional product recall crisis.

Group 2 (Human Condition): Respondents engaged in a text-chat program with an experimenter playing the role of a human "agent" based on a detailed script that repli-cated the responses that human customer service would provide in the face of the same fictitious emergency. The script for the human agent was also designed to be useful but not unreasonably quick to mirror constraints in the real world.

Scenario & Variables: A standardized crisis scenario (e.g., "Your recently purchased electronic device has been re-called due to a battery overheating issue. You need in-formation on how to return it and get a re-fund/replacement.') were presented to all participants.

Independent Variable: Type of interaction (AI vs. human).

Dependent Variables: (1) time to first meaningful re-sponse in seconds, (2) successful task completion (di-chotomous: whether the query was resolved), (3) per-ceived quality of resolution on a Likert scale, and (4) levels of post-interaction customer satisfaction on a Lik-ert scale.

Procedure: Participants were recruited online through a university, signing up for a student pool and social media websites, and were randomly assigned to one of two con-ditions. Immediately after the interaction, the participants completed a brief post-task satisfaction and helpfulness questionnaire.

Secondary Data Analysis: Case Study of KLM Royal Dutch Airlines

Purpose: To analyze how AI is deployed in customer ser-vice by a major corporation during a crisis. KLM Royal Dutch Airlines has been a leader in using AI in customer service, with their chatbot "BlueBot.

Data Sources: Publicly available sources, such as KLM's official press releases, news stories, industry reports, ac-ademic case studies of KLM's use of AI, and analyses of comments made by customers on social media (for exam-ple, Twitter) during documented disruptions, such as flight cancellations due to weather or technical problems. Analysis: Content analysis was performed on the col-lected data to identify the types of AI deployed, the spe-cific functionalities used during crises (e.g., flight status updates, rebooking assistance, and FAQ responses), the reported impacts on response times and customer en-gagement, and any publicly discussed challenges or les-sons learned.

3.2. Data Analysis

Quantitative Data (surveys and experiments)

The data were entered into IBM SPSS Statistics (version 27).

For the survey questions and experimental outcomes, frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were reported as descriptive statistics.

Inferential statistics: Variables such as response time and satisfaction scores were analyzed using independent sample t-tests to compare the means of AI vs. human samples in the experiment. Categorical success, such as whether the completion of a task was successful, was compared using the chi-square test. Pearson's r correla-tions were calculated to analyze the associations between the variables obtained from the questionnaires (e.g., be-tween negative experiences and preferences for hu-man-like agents). Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Qualitative Data (interviews and case studies)

The interviews were transcribed verbatim.

Thematic analysis was applied to the interview transcripts and open-ended survey responses. This involved famil-iarization with the data, generating initial codes, search-ing for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing a report. NVivo software (or manual coding techniques) was used to manage and ana-lyze the qualitative data.

A detailed narrative was created to synthesize the find-ings from the content analysis, ultimately aimed at draw-ing descriptive patterns and insights related to KLM and its adoption of AI in the context of crisis customer ser-vice.

3.3. Ethical Considerations:

Ethics clearance for the study was treated as the norm by an ethics committee from the university for the master's dissertation. Before participating in the survey, interviews, and experiment, all participants received information about the study via an information sheet that included its purpose, proce-dures, potential risks and benefits, and rights. Consent was obtained from all participants prior to their participa-tion in the study. Participants' anonymity was maintained. Confidentiality for all participants in the study/experiment and the interviews was protected by coding their names and professional affiliations in the research report. The information was kept confidential and used only for research purposes. Participants were also informed that they were free to withdraw at any time without penalties.

4. Results

The following section reports and interprets the results of online surveys, semi-structured interviews, lab experiments, and the KLM Royal Dutch Airlines case study. These findings were collected for clarity and are reported in the Discussion section.

3.4.1. Online Survey Findings:

The online survey received 168 valid responses. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the sample.

Table 1. *Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents (N=168)*

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age Group	18-25	52	31
	26-35	68	40.5
	36-45	31	18.5
	46+	17	10
Gender	Male	75	44.6
	Female	89	53
	Prefer not to say/Other	4	2.4
Crisis Experience	Experienced a brand crisis	121	72
	Interacted with CS during crisis	105	62.5
	Interacted with AI CS in crisis	45	26.8

Key Survey Findings:

Online Survey Responses: The online survey received 168 valid responses. The descriptive statistics of the sample are provided in Table 1.

Satisfaction with AI: Among those who had interacted with AI customer service during a crisis (n=45), the average satisfaction score for the interaction was 3.2 out of 5 (where 1=Very Dissatisfied, 5=Very Satisfied). Common frustrations cited in the open-ended comments included the inability of the AI to understand nuanced queries and repetitive loops when the AI could not resolve the issue.

Tailored Responses: This translated to only 35% of the 1,000 respondents who believed that AI could provide specific individualized answers at a moment of crisis. Most were doubtful that AI could grasp anything about its own position beyond simple demographics.

Trust in Information: Sixty% of the respondents trusted the information provided by AI during a crisis if it was clearly from an official company channel, but this trust diminished if the AI seemed to struggle or provide generic answers.

4.2. Semi-Structured Interview Findings:

Of the participants, five were customer service managers and three were AI consultants for implementing the software. Thematic analysis revealed the following themes:

Theme 1:AI as first responder: All respondents noted the importance of AI as a tool to help field the immediate increase in customer questions during times of crisis.

"Without our chatbot during the [specific system outage], we would have drowned. It handled over 70% of initial contacts, mostly FAQs, which freed up our agents immensely." (CS Manager)

Theme 2: Empathy Gap and Escalation Imperative: While efficiency of AI was praised, all participants felt that it was currently unable to address emotional distress and complex and nonstandard issues.

"AI is fantastic for speed and facts, but it can't offer a virtual shoulder to cry on. A smooth, intelligent escalation path to a human agent is non-negotiable for serious crises." (AI Consultant)

Theme 3: Data-driven personalization – potential vs. reality–the interviewees acknowledged that AI could use personal data to be integrated, creating a more personalized experience, but also noted that achieving this fully in the midst of a crisis, such as this one, is difficult.

"We aim for our AI to pull relevant customer history to tailor responses, but in a real-time crisis, system integrations and data accuracy can be hurdles. It’s more often rule-based personalization for now." (CS Manager)

Theme 4: Training, maintenance, and development over time: Relying on high-quality training data and the maintenance of AI models are also recurrent concerns.

"An AI is only as good as its training. In crisis scenarios, it is necessary to anticipate query types and continually update their knowledge bases. It's not a 'set and forget' solution." (AI

Consultant)

Theme 5: Future of Human- AI Collaboration: It was agreed that the best model is one where AI will be accretive to human capabilities rather than replacing them completely.

"The sweet spot is AI handling the bulk, providing agents with context and suggested responses, and agents stepping in for the critical, empathetic interactions." (CS Manager)

4.3 Experiment: Results

Sixty participants (30 in each group) completed the experiment.

Response Time: The AI condition also exhibited faster first meaningful response times, at an average of 12.5 seconds (SD = 3.2), than the human condition, at a mean of 75.3 seconds (SD = 15.8), t (58) = -20.12, p < .001.

Task Completion Success

AI Condition: 86.7% (26/30) successfully resolved their queries.

Human Condition: 93.3% (28 out of 30) had their questions resolved.

The chi-square test revealed no statistically significant difference between the groups in the task completion rate, $\chi^2(1, N=60) = 0.69$, p=.405, indicating that both contexts equally facilitated the gathering of information relevant to such a scenario.

Perceived Resolution Quality (1-5 scale)

AI Condition: Mean = 3.8, SD = 0.9

Human Condition: Mean = 4.3, SD = 0.7

An independent samples t-test revealed that those in the human condition found the quality of the resolution to be significantly higher than that in the other condition, t(58) = -2.54, p = .014.

Post-Interaction Customer Satisfaction (1-5 scale)

AI Condition: M=3.6, SD=1.0

Human Condition: Mean = 4.4, SD = 0.6

Participants in the Human condition also differed significantly in terms of satisfaction (t (58) =-3.87, p <.001).

Table 2: *Comparative Analysis of Crisis Response: AI vs. Simulated Human Agent in Experiment*

Metric	**AI Condition (Mean/%)**	**Human Condition (Mean/%)**	**Statistical Significance**
First Response Time (sec)	12.5	75.3	p < .001
Task Completion Success	86.7%	93.3%	p = .405 (NS)
Resolution Quality (1-5)	3.8	4.3	p = .014
Customer Satisfaction (1-5)	3.6	4.4	p < .001
(NS = Not Significant)			

4.4. Case Study:

KLM Royal Dutch Airlines Analysis of publicly available data on KLM's use of AI in customer service, particularly during disruptions, revealed several key points.

Proactive AI Deployment: KLM has strategically invested in AI, notably its "BlueBot" chatbot, which is integrated across multiple platforms such as Messenger, WhatsApp, and Google Assistant.

Scalability during Crises: During major disruptions (e.g., the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcano eruption, which predated advanced AI but highlighted the need and subsequent smaller-scale weather or operational issues), KLM reported its AI handling a significant percentage of inquiries, providing flight status, rebooking options, and answers to FAQs, thus reducing call center loads. (Um et al., 2020)

Personalization Efforts: BlueBot accesses booking information to provide personalized updates and rebooking assistance. KLM stated that AI aims to provide contextually relevant information to passengers.

Human Handoff: KLM emphasizes a seamless handoff from BlueBot to human agents when the AI cannot resolve an issue or when a customer requests human interaction. Their strategy appears to be a hybrid model (Bhuiyan, 2024).

Continuous Learning: KLM actively uses data from interactions to train and improve its AI capabilities, including expanding the range of languages and queries that it can handle.

Public Perception: Although generally beneficial for efficiency, online customer feedback (visible on social media) during mass service disruptions reveals that while rapid AI responses are favored for uncomplicated issues, complicated rebooking situations or heated interactions are still greatly enhanced by the presence of a trained human operator.

These four different types of findings offer a complex understanding of the place and its promise as well as some of the limitations of AI in the transformation of customer service

during brand crises.

5. Discussion

The goal of this study is to investigate how AI, used to provide instant and personalized responses, resolves and increases customer satisfaction. The findings support the common position of AI's strength, speed, and efficiency as well as the continued necessity of having the ability to empathize and solve problems.

5.1. AI's Impact on Speed, Efficiency, and Scalability

The overall quantitative result from both the survey and the experiment is overwhelmingly in favor of the idea that AI indeed helps respondents to be faster and more efficient in their operations. Survey respondents over-whelmingly identified AI as faster (78%), and the exper-iment confirmed a significant decrease in first response time in the AI condition (12.5 seconds vs. 75.3 seconds for human). This is consistent with other studies on the championing of AI based on its processing speed. This was further confirmed in the professional interviews, where some referred to AI as "the first responders we cannot live without' who could handle the tremendous number of inquiries in numbers that are impossible for entirely human teams to process. The KLM case study also illustrates how a major airline can use AI to deal with peaks in customer contact during disruptions (Geske et al., 2024). This is also important in a crisis because rapid communication helps reduce uncertainty and prevents the spread of false information (Karinshak & Jin, 2023).

5.2. Tailored Responses and Personalization:

While AI is designed to actuate personalized or tailored responses in the midst of crises, it holds true to this ambition, with less than satisfactory outcomes. Although AI, represented by KLM's BlueBot, can consult booking information to personalize their interaction with the consumer (e.g., personalized flight information), the same survey elicited customers 'skepticism about the ability of AI to genuine-ly personalize crisis support, where only 35% of custom-ers thought this was possible. Participants recognized the space between potential and reality and cited that ac-cessing this information was difficult to integrate into a dataset and the challenge of understanding a unique, emotionally charged situation. AI provides a rule-based type of personalization or segmentation, albeit one based on available data, rather than non-targeted mass commu-nication(Okeleke et al., 2024). The nuance and ability to personalize, especially in new or complex situations, are, of course, much greater with an experienced human agent. The' "tailored" nature of AI also appears to pertain to a usefulness of information delivery according to particu-lar queries, rather than true contextual or emotional per-sonalization to the subject to whom the machine is speaking.

5.3. Influence on Customer Satisfaction:

The effect of AI on customer satisfaction in times of crisis is complex. However, velocity was not the only factor affecting satis-faction. Although AI outperformed human recall and task completion performance, this experiment confirmed bet-ter satisfaction and perceived quality of resolution under human conditions. This implies that even in relatively uncomplicated crisis interactions, the quality of interac-tion and human touch (or lack thereof) affect satisfaction. Survey participants reflected on this, with 58% willing to engage with AI for simple, fast questions, but 82% want-ed to speak with a human in the case of complex or emo-tional problems. .AI is efficient for transactions, but in the midst of a crisis, if you feel vulnerable or upset, you want a human being. You want a human connection. While this case, as a good use case of AI, promotes efficiency, it also implies that human agents are necessary for satisfaction in more complex cases, given their hybrid model and customer feedback. otherhat words, AI can help provide positive contributions to the features of satisfaction asso-ciated with closeness and information access. However, reliance on AI alone may contribute to dissatisfaction if unaccompanied by human assistance in complex interac-tions.

5.4. The Human-AI Hybrid Model:

In summary, the re-sults clearly support a hybrid human-AI system as the best crisis customer service solution. AI is particularly good for routine, high-volume questions, provides imme-diate answers, and can serve as an initial sorting medium. This enables human operators to deploy their expertise and insights into highly complex, sensitive, and emotion-ally laden situations that require the unique capabilities of empathy, judgment, and creative problem-solving. This synergy was evident as an overarching theme that emerged in the interviews ("Human-AI Collaboration as the Future") and is also KLM's operative strategy. The survey data also contain implicit evidence for this, as preferences for AI versus humans vary according to the query type. In the latter sense, the real meaning of effec-tive crisis management is not to substitute AI for humans, but to reinforce and enhance human capacities to have a more resilient and flexible customer service ecosystem (Edilia & Larasati, 2023).

5.5. Challenges and Considerations for

Implementation:

The study also confirmed some of the obstacles posed. The "empathy gap" was the main concern. Respondents often noted the importance of strong training data for AI, ongoing maintenance, and thoughtful human escalation. Although not explicitly examined within the data col-lected for this study, two major ethical issues around data privacy and concerns about algorithmic bias are of con-cern and are addressed in the literature, regardless of the capabilities of an AI system, and should be kept in mind when considering its deployment (Vatankhah et al., 2024). The integration of AI into the broader customer service pipeline must be developed through a broader organiza-tional investment, not just in technology, but also in stra-tegic planning to integrate the technology and in training the human agents who will be working alongside AI.

5.6. Connecting to Theoretical Frameworks:

This un-derstood in part because of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The perceived value of AI (speed, 24/7 access) leads to the acceptance of certain tasks. In more complicated crisis interactions, if the AI does not perform well with nuances, then the perceived ease of use may decrease, and additional factors beyond TAM, such as those associated with emotional needs and trust, tend to become more relevant according to crisis communication theories such as SCCT and its focus on victim-centered communication. (Ulnicane, 2024).

The speed and scale of AI have transformed customer service crises. It offers fast and somewhat customized information solutions. This revolution is not entirely au-tomated, but it is one of developing a more complex symbiotic relationship between A.I. and humans to pro-vide better service and more efficient crisis management and, by extension, to enhance customer satisfaction as a whole.

6. Limitations of the Study

Although this study provides valuable insights, several limitations must be acknowledged.

Scope of AI Technologies: The online design and use of convenience and snowball sampling could have affected the generalizability of the results to other populations. The specific demographic profile may not be well distributed or reflective of all consumer segments or geo-graphical regions.

Experimental Realism: The controlled experiment, which is useful for isolating variables, presented a fictional cri-sis scenario. Participants' responses in this simulated environment may differ from their reactions during genuine, emotionally charged brand crises.

Qualitative Sample Size: Although quality of data ob-tained from eight interviews was high, more interviews with professionals from many other industries and com-pany sizes may have yielded varied perspectives.

Case Study Limitations: The case study relied on publicly available data, which might be subject to company branding, and may not reveal internal challenges or the full spectrum of customer experience.

Self-Reported Data: The survey participation data were dependent on self-reports, and the interviews and surveys were subject to both recall bias and social desirability bias.

The dynamic Nature of AI: The AI technology is advanc-ing rapidly. The presented findings are in line with the current capacity and awareness of AI at the time of the study and may change as AI evolves.

These limitations mean that while the findings of this study can be supported by the data, its conclusions must be taken tentatively, and further work is warranted to remedy these limitations.

7. Future Considerations

Several possible future research directions can be identi-fied based on the findings and limitations of this study.

Longitudinal Studies: Studying the effects of AI interac-tions in a crisis on customer loyalty, trust, and brand per-ception over time would give researchers a better sense of whether a positive initial reaction would continue in the long term.

Cross-Cultural Studies: Looking into the role of culture in shaping customer expectations and acceptance of AI in crisis customer service in various select global markets may also be worthwhile.

Impact of Individual AI Capabilities: A detailed research agenda is needed to understand the impact of individual, more advanced capabilities of AI, such as ml-based hy-per-personalization, proactive AI outreach, or the use of AI-generated empathetic language and its perceived au-thenticity, on the experience of customers in crisis situa-tions.

Ethical Deep Dives: Further studies should focus on the core ethical issues of AI in crisis communication, includ-ing algorithmic bias, data privacy in emotionally height-ened states, and the psychological toll on customers who feel unable to connect with a person.

Application of AI for preventative and early detection: In addition to the use of AI in response, it can be useful to engage in sentiment analysis and pattern recognition, combined with other types of technologies, to help in the early detection and prevention of customer service emergencies.

Assessing the ROI of AI in Crisis Service: Creating robust models for understanding the ROI of AI in crisis customer service that consider not only direct cost savings but also

indirect benefits such as brand preservation and customer retention.

Training and development for humans working with AI: Research on effective training programs that prepare customer service agents to interoperate with AI tools, handle escalations, and concentrate on high-value emo-tional labor.

Comparative study of different AI platforms: An as-sessment of the potential performance of different ad-vanced AI platforms for crisis management in customer service from commercial firms and open-source solu-tions.

Taking this into account can add additional insights into how to best use AI to not only handle but also transform customer service during moments of a brand crisis.

8. Conclusion

The present research adopts a narrow lens on how artificial intelligence has transformed customer service communication efforts in a brand crisis, specifically in the sense of providing instant personalized responses and the effects on customer satisfaction. The introduction illustrates both the increase in brand vulnerability to crises and the inability of conventional customer service models to manage crises, indicating that AI has the potential to transform this situation. The context provided in the literature review included traditional crisis communication, the development of AI customer service, the general utilization and advantages of AI technology in crises, and relevant concerns, such as the empathy gap and ethics. A mixed-methods research design using online surveys, semi-structured interviews, an experiment, and a case study of KLM was used to provide a robust understanding of this phenomenon.

Together, these multiple sources of evidence support the unanimous conclusion that AI transforms the speed and scale of solutions offered to customers in the context of a crisis. The experimental survey also showed that artificial interaction was significantly faster than human simulation, whereas the survey responses and interviews demonstrated the efficiency of AI. This finding supports the argument that AI enables rapid solutions, particularly for informational queries. The findings also suggest that there is some level of personalized response that AI can provide, as is apparently the case in the KLM study, where AI has access to booking information. However, surveys and interviews also show that the deep, empathetic level of personalization is still challenging for AI, and consumers often feel that the type of personalization driven by AI is superficial.

The results for customer satisfaction were mixed. The immediate availability of AI was valued, especially for simple problems, but greater satisfaction, perceived qual-ity, and resolution came from interacting with humans. This finding was further supported by surveys of preferences for humans in complex or emotionally laden situations and interviewees' focus on the "empathy gap" in AI. This indicates that AI can lead to satisfaction through efficiency, whereas humans are essential when dealing with more emotionally based and complex problem-solving skills that become urgent during crises. The combined case study and interview data strongly suggest that, at least for now, a human-AI combination is the best route, with AI for volume and speed, combined with humanity and high-level support that other humans can provide.

In light of this, it can be argued that AI is, in fact, a trans-formative of customer service emergencies, predominantly with regard to the tremendous increase in response capabilities and times, but also in terms of the rudimentary capacity for the customization of information. How-ever, this revolution is the greatest tool and benefit and will yield the best overall customer satisfaction when AI's strengths can be harnessed and deployed in combination with the irreplaceable empathetic and complex problem-solving skills of human agents. AI is not intended to replace human presence and capabilities but to complement them to provide a more robust, efficient, and customer-oriented crisis management structure.

Appendix

A. Full Survey Questionnaire Instrument B. Semi-Structured Interview Protocol Guide C. Detailed Experimental Scenario and Task Instructions D. Partici-pant Consent Forms and Information Sheet E. Annotated List of KLM Case Study Sources F. Thematic Analysis Codebook Example.

Authors' Contributions Statement

Akande Victor Ogbo: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data analysis, writing – original draft, and corresponding author. Debo Joseph Oyana: Contributed to conceptualization, provided critical review, and as-sisted with manuscript editing and refinement.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There are no conflicting financial interests or competing personal interests in this work declared by Akande Victor Ogbo and Debo Joseph Oyana, and none of them would have affected the research findings or their interpretation. No specific funding was received for this study.

Funding Statement

This study did not receive a specific grant from any funding

agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. No funding sources were available for this research; it was carried out with the personal re-sources of the authors and with common support institutions provided to graduate students to conduct their studies.

Data Access Statement

The anonymized datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study, including anonymized survey respons-es, interview transcripts, and experimental data, are available from the corresponding author, Akande Victor Ogbo, upon reasonable request, considering confidential-ity and ethical standards.

Ethics Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Surveys, interviews, and experimental data were collect-ed anonymously, with maximum confidentiality. Partici-pation was voluntary based on the freedom to withdraw without any repercussions.

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge the support and efforts of all those who made this study possible. In particular, we would like to thank the Higher School of Economics and Management of South Ural State University (National Research University) for their support. We express our gratitude to the following professors: associate profes-sors, the Department of Management and Economics, and the Department of Information Technology and Tele-communications. To our curator and supervisor, associate professor Dobrynina Yana Sergeevna, we are forever grateful for your support, mentorship, and encourage-ment throughout this process.

Abbreviations

AI (Artificial Intelligence), CSR (Customer Service Rep-resentative), FAQ (Frequently Asked Question), IBM (In-ternational Business Machines), IT (Information Tech-nology), IVR (Interactive Voice Response), KLM (Kon-inklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij (Royal Dutch Airlines)), ML (Machine Learning), NLP (Natural Language Pro-cessing), ROI (Return on Investment), SCCT (Situational Crisis Communication Theory), SD (Standard Deviation), SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), TAM (Technology Acceptance Model), UTAUT (Unified The-ory of Acceptance and Use of Technology).

References

[1] Pendyala, M. K., & Lakkamraju, V. V. (2024). Impact of Artificial Intelligence in Customer Journey. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT), 1528–1534. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/ijisrt24aug807

[2] Taherdoost, H. (2021). A Review on Risk Management in Information Systems: Risk Policy, Control and Fraud De-tection. Electronics, 10(24), 3065. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10243065

[3] Leocádio, D., Guedes, L., Oliveira, J., Reis, J., & Melão, N. (2024). Customer Service with AI-Powered Human-Robot Collaboration (HRC): A Literature Review. Procedia Computer Science, 232, 1222–1232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.01.120

[4] R, M., B, S. K., & Soju, A. V. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Service Marketing Innovation (pp. 150–172). igi global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2153-9.ch007

[5] Rane, N. L. (2024). ChatGPT and similar generative arti-ficial intelligence (AI) for smart industry: role, challeng-es, and opportunities for Industry 4.0, Industry 5.0, and Society 5.0. Innovations in Business and Strategic Man-agement. https://doi.org/10.61577/ibsm.2024.100002

[6] Coombs, W. T. (2017). Revising Situational Crisis Com-munication Theory (pp. 21–37). routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749068-3

[7] Sun, X., & Liu, W. (2023). Expanding Service Capabilities Through an On-Demand Workforce. Operations Research, 73(1), 363–384. https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2021.0651

[8] Jasmand, C., De Ruyter, K., & Blazevic, V. (2012). Gener-ating Sales While Providing Service: A Study of Customer Service Representatives' Ambidextrous Behavior. Journal of Marketing, 76(1), 20–37. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.10.0448

[9] Chang, T.-S., & Hsiao, W.-H. (2024). Understand resist use online customer service chatbot: an integrated inno-vation resist theory and negative emotion perspective. Aslib Journal of Information Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/ajim-12-2023-0551

[10] Aslam, F. (2023). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Chatbot Technology: A Study on the Current Advance-ments and Leading Innovations. European Journal of Technology, 7(3), 62–72. https://doi.org/10.47672/ejt.1561

[11] Bharadiya, J. P. (2023). The role of machine learning in transforming business intelligence. International Journal of Computing and Artificial Intelligence, 4(1), 16–24. https://doi.org/10.33545/27076571.2023.v4.i1a.60

[12] Murugeah, M. K. (2024). Enhancing efficiency and Per-sonalization in Food and Beverage Service through AI: Future Trends and Challenges. International Journal for

Multidimensional Research Perspectives, 2(7), 01–17. https://doi.org/10.61877/ijmrp.v2i7.162

[13] Kedi, W., Ijomah, T., Idemudia, C., & Ejimuda, C. (2024). AI Chatbot integration in SME marketing platforms: Im-proving customer interaction and service efficiency. In-ternational Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 6(7), 2332–2341. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i7.1327

[14] Al-Shafei, M. (2024). Navigating Human-Chatbot Inter-actions: An Investigation into Factors Influencing User Satisfaction and Engagement. International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 41(1), 411–428. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2301252

[15] Anane-Simon, R., & Atiku, S. O. (2023). Artificial Intelli-gence and Automation for the Future of Startups (pp. 133–153). igi global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0527-0.ch007

[16] Adam, H., Ghassemi, M., Balagopalan, A., Alsentzer, E., & Christia, F. (2022). Mitigating the impact of biased artifi-cial intelligence in emergency decision-making. Commu-nications Medicine, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-022-00214-4

[17] Darzi, P. (2023). Could Artificial Intelligence be a Thera-peutic for Mental Issues? Science Insights, 43(5), 1111–1113. https://doi.org/10.15354/si.23.co132

[18] Gelbrich, K. (2009). Beyond Just Being Dissatisfied: How Angry and Helpless Customers React to Failures When Using Self-Service Technologies. Schmalenbach Business Review, 61(1), 40–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03396779

[19] Kalogiannidis, S., Papaevangelou, O., Kalfas, D., Chat-zitheodoridis, F., & Giannarakis, G. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence Technology in Predictive Risk As-sessment for Business Continuity: A Case Study of Greece. Risks, 12(2), 19. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks12020019

[20] Osasona, F., Atadoga, A., Amoo, O., Abrahams, T., Farayola, O., & Ayinla, B. (2024). REVIEWING THE ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF AI IN DECISION MAK-ING PROCESSES. International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 6(2), 322–335. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i2.773

[21] Bing, Z. J., & Leong, W. Y. (2025). Ethical Design of AI for Education and Learning Systems. ASM Science Jour-nal, 20(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.32802/asmscj.2025.1917

[22] Cui, P., & Alias, B. S. (2024). Opportunities and challeng-es in higher education arising from AI: A systematic liter-ature review (2020–2024). Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, 8(11), 8390. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i11.8390

[23] Um, T., Chung, N., & Kim, T. (2020). How does an Intel-ligence Chatbot Affect Customers Compared with Self-Service Technology for Sustainable Services? Sus-tainability, 12(12), 5119. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12125119

[24] Bhuiyan, M. S. (2024). The Role of AI-Enhanced Person-alization in Customer Experiences. Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies, 6(1), 162–169. https://doi.org/10.32996/jcsts.2024.6.1.17

[25] Geske, A. M., Herold, D. M., & Kummer, S. (2024a). Inte-grating AI support into a framework for collaborative decision-making (CDM) for airline disruption manage-ment. Journal of the Air Transport Research Society, 3, 100026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jatrs.2024.100026

[26] Karinshak, E., & Jin, Y. (2023). AI-driven disinformation: a framework for organizational preparation and response. Journal of Communication Management, 27(4), 539–562. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcom-09-2022-0113

[27] Okeleke, P., Ezeigweneme, C., Ajiga, D., & Folorunsho, S. (2024). Predictive analytics for market trends using AI: A study in consumer behavior. International Journal of En-gineering Research Updates, 7(1), 036–049. https://doi.org/10.53430/ijeru.2024.7.1.0032

[28] Edilia, S., & Larasati, N. D. (2023). Innovative Approaches in Business Development Strategies Through Artificial Intelligence Technology. IAIC Transactions on Sustainable Digital Innovation (ITSDI), 5(1), 84–90. https://doi.org/10.34306/itsdi.v5i1.612

[29] Vatankhah, S., Bamshad, V., Arici, H. E., & Duan, Y. (2024). Ethical implementation of artificial intelligence in the service industries. The Service Industries Journal, 44(9–10), 661–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2024.2359077

[30] Ulnicane, I. (2024). Intersectionality in Artificial Intelli-gence: Framing Concerns and Recommendations for Ac-tion. Social Inclusion, 12. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.7543.

Research Field

Data Analysis, Computational Analysis, Project Manage-ment, Business Analysis, Marketing Analytics