The Role of Influencer Marketing in Shaping Consumer Perceived Value and Online Pricing

Anirudh Villai
Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV, USA.
anirudhp@unr.edu

Ravi M. Kohli
Department of Computer Science, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA.
ravi.kohli369@gmu.edu

Abstract

Influencer marketing has evolved from a peripheral promotional tactic into embedded socio-technical infrastructure that links content creators, platform algorithms, consumer valuation processes, and dynamic pricing systems. This paper examines the system-level role of influencer marketing in shaping consumer perceived value and online pricing. It conceptualizes influencer-mediated commerce as a multi-sided architecture in which algorithmic curation, promotional content, social proof, and behavioral demand data interact continuously. The paper analyzes how perceived value is produced through signal aggregation, authenticity cues, parasocial attachment, and social comparison, and how these transformations influence pricing algorithms, audience segmentation, and willingness-to-pay. It emphasizes structural trade-offs between efficiency and fairness, personalization and manipulation, platform scale and authenticity, and robustness and opacity. It further considers governance mechanisms, algorithmic accountability, disclosure requirements, consumer protection, and competition policy. Cross-domain comparisons illustrate how influencer effects differ across e-commerce, luxury goods, travel, hospitality, and digital financial content. The paper argues that sustainable governance requires architectural transparency, fairness-aware pricing audits, data minimization, and multi-dimensional consumer welfare assessment. Future research should integrate causal identification, platform ecology analysis, creator labor conditions, and resilience evaluation. The analysis contributes to systems research by framing influencer marketing not as isolated persuasive communication but as infrastructure that shapes price formation and value perception in digital markets.

Keywords

influencer marketing; consumer perceived value; online pricing; platform governance; algorithmic fairness; digital market infrastructure.

1. Introduction

The expansion of influencer marketing has transformed digital commerce from product-centric listings into socially embedded valuation environments. Contemporary marketing systems increasingly rely on distributed creators whose content operates simultaneously as entertainment, social proof, and commercial stimulus [1]. In these environments, consumer perceived value is not derived solely from objective product attributes or posted price; it is co-produced through social interaction, algorithmic recommendation, identity alignment, and ambient signals [2]. Influencer characteristics such as follower count, perceived authenticity, and content congruence can shift consumer interpretations of quality, relevance, and fairness [3]. These shifts create feedback between demand shaping and pricing decisions that extends far beyond traditional advertising effects.

A system-level perspective is necessary because influencer marketing now depends on platform architectures that connect creators, advertisers, consumers, payment infrastructures, and pricing engines. Structural trade-offs emerge among reach, authenticity, data intensity, latency, price personalization, fairness, and regulatory compliance. The pricing outcomes observed in influencer-mediated commerce are not simply the result of individual campaign choices; they arise from interactions among algorithmic curation, audience data, creator credibility, and platform governance. This paper therefore examines how influencer marketing shapes perceived value and online pricing through socio-technical systems. It focuses on architecture, governance, infrastructure, deployment, sustainability, robustness, fairness, and policy implications.

2. Conceptual Foundations and System Architecture of Influencer-Mediated Commerce

Influencer-mediated commerce can be understood as a multi-sided platform system. Social media engagement is driven by informational, entertaining, and relational gratifications, which platforms encode into metrics such as likes, shares, dwell time, and creator reputation [4]. These platforms function as matchmakers between advertisers and audiences, reducing search costs while extracting economic value from network effects [5]. Two-sided market theory highlights that pricing and participation decisions on one side affect utility on the other, producing cross-side externalities that differ from conventional supply chains [6]. Influencer content thus operates as an intermediation layer that connects brand-side supply with consumer-side attention and affect, while simultaneously feeding data into demand estimation and price adjustment processes.

The architecture of influencer commerce typically includes content creation interfaces, algorithmic feed curation, sponsorship disclosure mechanisms, affiliate tracking, audience analytics, and dynamic price adjustment modules. Each layer interacts with the others. Feed curation determines which influencer messages become visible. Affiliate tracking translates content engagement into commercial attribution. Audience analytics feed machine-learning systems that estimate demand shifts and segment consumers. These configurations create structural trade-offs. Open creator entry can increase diversity but degrade content quality. Centralized algorithmic controls can improve relevance but create opacity. Real-time pricing can improve inventory allocation but may undermine perceived fairness. The system is thus not a neutral conduit for product information; it actively restructures how consumers encounter, interpret, and respond to commercial offers.

3. Perceived Value Formation in Algorithmically Mediated Markets

Perceived value in algorithmically mediated markets is constructed through continuous comparison and social interpretation. Consumers evaluate price, quality, social proof, and contextual meaning. Influencer content can elevate utilitarian value by demonstrating product usage, hedonic value by associating products with aspiration, and social value by signaling membership in a desired community. The evaluation is recursive: consumers observe influencer endorsements, infer product worth, update willingness-to-pay, and respond to displayed prices. This recursive process differs from conventional advertising because the endorser is embedded in the same social graph as the audience, giving the message an interactive and relational character.

Large-scale behavioral data enable platforms and sellers to estimate value perceptions more precisely than traditional survey methods [7]. Variance in ratings and review signals shapes consumer inference: not only average valence but also disagreement among users can signal risk or niche suitability [8]. Online word-of-mouth functions as a communication mechanism that complements formal marketing messages and influences how consumers interpret price information [9]. Evidence further shows that word-of-mouth dynamics in e-business environments are systematically related to online pricing outcomes, indicating that pricing engines respond to social signal flows rather than only inventory and cost variables [10]. This points to a structural coupling between social valuation and price formation, in which influencer content becomes an input into automated pricing decisions.

However, the value-formation system is fragile. Influencer saturation, undisclosed sponsorships, comment manipulation, and algorithmic amplification can inflate perceived value temporarily while eroding trust over time. Consumers may develop skepticism toward sponsored content, causing them to discount influencer signals. Platforms then respond with authenticity markers, disclosure labels, and creator verification. These interventions reveal governance tensions: authenticity is partly a relational property that cannot be fully certified by algorithmic labels. The system must balance signal richness against manipulation risk while maintaining the credibility that underpins perceived value.

4. Online Pricing Mechanisms Under Influencer-Induced Demand Shaping

Online pricing systems increasingly operate as adaptive control loops that incorporate influencer-generated demand signals. Machine prediction reduces uncertainty about consumer behavior, allowing sellers to estimate willingness-to-pay, segment audiences, and adjust displayed prices [11]. Retargeting and information specificity further show that personalized advertising messages can influence purchase behavior, but high specificity can also trigger consumer reactance when perceived as intrusive [12]. Influencer data adds another layer: audience affinities, engagement types, and creator trust can be used to tune offer pricing, bundle composition, and discount depth. The result is a pricing system that is highly responsive to social media signals.

The infrastructure that enables such pricing often depends on continuous behavioral surveillance. Digital traces from content consumption, social interactions, location, and purchase history can be aggregated into consumer profiles that support real-time price discrimination [13]. This architecture creates efficiency benefits but also structural risks. Price personalization can improve matching between consumers and products, but it can also extract consumer surplus, reduce price transparency, and disadvantage less data-literate groups. The same influencer campaign may be used to justify premium pricing for engaged fans while lower prices are offered to comparison-sensitive shoppers. Such differential pricing may be efficient in a narrow economic sense yet contestable under fairness norms, particularly when consumers are unaware of the data flows that shape their offers.

5. Platform Governance, Pricing Fairness, and Consumer Protection

Governance of influencer-mediated pricing requires algorithmic regulation, disclosure regimes, consumer protection, and competition oversight. Algorithmic regulation involves the use of rules embedded in technical systems to constrain behavior, but it also raises questions about legitimacy, transparency, and contestability [14]. Accountability in algorithmic decision making is challenging because recommender and pricing models may involve many interacting variables, making individual decisions difficult to explain [15]. This opacity is especially consequential when influencer content shapes perceived value and willingness-to-pay, because consumers cannot easily distinguish authentic social information from optimized commercial persuasion.

From an economic governance perspective, platform intermediation can generate efficiencies while also concentrating market power [16]. Digital platform inquiries emphasize that competition, data control, and self-preferencing require coordinated regulatory responses [17]. In some cases, vertically integrated platforms may use their control over both content distribution and pricing to disadvantage rivals or manipulate consumer choice [18]. Influencer marketing adds complexity because creator independence is often formal rather than substantive; creators depend on platform algorithms for visibility and on brand partnerships for income, placing them between consumer interests and commercial optimization.

Policy responses should distinguish structural harms from individual persuasion. Disclosure mandates can improve transparency but do little to address algorithmic amplification of misleading content. Fairness-aware pricing audits can test whether influencer-driven segments receive systematically disparate prices. Consumer protection agencies need data access and algorithmic auditing capacity. Regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions further complicates enforcement. A coherent governance framework must therefore integrate platform responsibility, data governance, creator labor protections, and pricing fairness within a unified accountability structure.

6. Infrastructure, Robustness, and Sustainability of Influencer Marketing Systems

The robustness of influencer marketing systems depends on data infrastructure, model reliability, and resilience to manipulation. Probability models for customer-base analysis show that behavioral data can be used to understand acquisition, retention, and lifetime value, but such models require stable data-generating processes [19]. However, influencer-driven demand is often episodic, culturally embedded, and subject to sudden shifts. Machine-driven economic transformation amplifies scale but also creates dependencies on automated decision systems [20]. System failures, data leakage, bot-driven engagement, and coordinated inauthentic activity can distort both perceived value and pricing signals, leading to inefficient allocations and consumer harm.

Sustainability extends beyond environmental concerns to economic and informational sustainability. Creator ecosystems may exhibit boom-bust cycles, platform dependency, and burnout. Brand investment may chase short-term reach rather than durable relationships. From a governance standpoint, decentralized social production can support pluralism and user autonomy, but it also fragments accountability across content creators, platforms, brands, and analytics providers [21]. A sustainable infrastructure requires redundant data sources, adversarial auditing, transparent attribution, and mechanisms for creator and consumer voice. Without these, the system optimizes for immediate engagement while accumulating hidden social costs and reducing long-term trust.

7. Cross-Domain Comparisons and Policy Implications

Cross-domain comparison reveals structural variation in how influencer marketing shapes perceived value and pricing. In fast-moving e-commerce, price elasticity is high and influencer campaigns often drive short-term demand spikes, making dynamic pricing more common. In luxury markets, influencer content reinforces exclusivity and symbolic value, allowing price premiums to persist even when functional quality differences are small. In travel and hospitality, influencer-generated visuals shape destination desirability and perceived experience value, influencing revenue management systems. In digital financial content, influencer recommendations can alter risk perception and product uptake, raising acute consumer protection concerns.

These differences matter for policy and system design. In domains with high information asymmetry, algorithmic amplification of influencer claims can produce harmful feedback loops that reinforce inequality and reduce consumer agency [22]. Customer experience strategies that integrate personalization, trust, and relationship management can mitigate some harms, but they require governance mechanisms that align commercial incentives with consumer welfare [23]. Cross-domain learning suggests that fairness metrics, disclosure standards, and pricing oversight should be adaptive to domain-specific risk rather than uniformly applied. A one-size-fits-all approach may fail to address the distinct structural vulnerabilities of each market.

8. Future Research Directions and System-Level Challenges

Future research should develop causal models that separate influencer effects from baseline demand, seasonal cycles, and platform algorithmic changes. This requires data sharing agreements, privacy-preserving analytics, and independent auditing. System-level studies should examine how creator labor conditions, platform ranking changes, and brand pricing strategies jointly produce consumer outcomes. Fairness research should move beyond individual price discrimination to consider structural disadvantage arising from algorithmic attention allocation. Further work is needed on the environmental sustainability of influencer-driven consumption and the resilience of pricing infrastructures under adversarial manipulation. These directions require interdisciplinary collaboration among marketing, computer science, economics, law, and information systems.

Another challenge is the evaluation of perceived value without reducing it to engagement metrics. Consumer welfare cannot be fully captured by click-through rates, conversion, or average order value. Value includes trust, autonomy, privacy, and long-term satisfaction. System designers should therefore incorporate multi-dimensional welfare metrics into platform governance and pricing audits. This will require new forms of algorithmic transparency that do not expose proprietary models or enable gaming. The goal is not to eliminate influencer marketing but to embed it within accountable and sustainable socio-technical architectures that preserve both innovation and consumer protection.

9. Conclusion

This paper has argued that influencer marketing functions as a system-level force in the co-production of consumer perceived value and online pricing. It operates through multi-sided platform architectures, algorithmic curation, social signal processing, and adaptive pricing engines. The structural trade-offs involve efficiency and fairness, personalization and manipulation, reach and authenticity, and robustness and opacity. Governance must integrate disclosure, algorithmic accountability, competition policy, and consumer protection. Sustainable deployment requires resilient data infrastructure, creator ecosystem health, and multi-dimensional welfare assessment. Influencer marketing is not a peripheral promotional tactic; it is embedded in the informational and economic fabric of digital markets. Future research and policy should treat it accordingly.

References

1. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson.

2. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. Journal of Marketing, 52(3), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302

3. De Veirman, M., Cauberghe, V., & Hudders, L. (2017). Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. International Journal of Advertising, 36(5), 798–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2017.1348035

4. Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2016). Social media engagement behaviour: A uses and gratifications perspective. Journal of Strategic Marketing, 24(3-4), 261–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2015.1095222

5. Evans, D. S., & Schmalensee, R. (2016). Matchmakers: The new economics of multisided platforms. Harvard Business Review Press.

6. Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. Journal of the European Economic Association, 1(4), 990–1029. https://doi.org/10.1162/154247603322493212

7. Varian, H. R. (2014). Big data: New tricks for econometrics. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28(2), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.2.3

8. Sun, M. (2012). How does the variance of product ratings matter? Management Science, 58(4), 696–707. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1110.1458

9. Chen, Y., & Xie, J. (2008). Online consumer review: Word-of-mouth as a new element of marketing communication mix. Management Science, 54(3), 477–491. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1070.0810

10. Jin, K. (2023). Impacts of Word of Mouth (WOM) on E-Business Online Pricing. Journal of Global Information Management (JGIM), 31(3), 1-17.

11. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence. Harvard Business Review Press.

12. Lambrecht, A., & Tucker, C. (2013). When does retargeting work? Information specificity in online advertising. Journal of Marketing Research, 50(5), 561–576. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0472

13. Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.

14. Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158

15. Diakopoulos, N. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision making. Communications of the ACM, 59(2), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1145/2844110

16. Tirole, J. (2017). Economics for the common good. Princeton University Press.

17. Stigler Committee on Digital Platforms. (2019). Final report. Stigler Center for the Study of the Economy and the State, University of Chicago.

18. Khan, L. M. (2017). Amazon's antitrust paradox. Yale Law Journal, 126(3), 710–805.

19. Fader, P. S., & Hardie, B. G. S. (2009). Probability models for customer-base analysis. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 23(1), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2008.11.003

20. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W. W. Norton & Company.

21. Benkler, Y. (2006). The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom. Yale University Press.

22. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.

23. Peppers, D., & Rogers, M. (2017). Managing customer experience and relationships: A strategic framework (3rd ed.). Wiley.