ASEAN Journal of
Economic and Economic Education

Journal homepage: https://ejournal.bumipublikasinusantara.id/index.php/ajeee

Algorithmic Pricing and Consumer Vulnerability: The Ethical and Economic Implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Driven Pricing Models

*M. Kamraju**

Army Welfare Education society, India
*Correspondence: E-mail: kamraju65@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rise of algorithmic pricing and Artificial intelligence (AI)-driven personalized pricing models has reshaped digital commerce, allowing businesses to adjust prices dynamically. Because these models rely on consumer data, urgency, and behavioral triggers, they often result in price discrimination and reduced market transparency. This study examines surge pricing in ride-hailing services, dynamic airfare adjustments, and e-commerce price steering, highlighting how these tactics exploit consumer psychology. Because regulatory oversight remains weak, companies can leverage AI-driven strategies without accountability, leading to financial strain on consumers. Using case studies and literature analysis, this paper reveals that pricing fairness and ethical AI governance are critical concerns in modern markets. Findings suggest that increased transparency, stronger regulations, and ethical algorithmic design are essential to ensure fairer digital pricing practices. The study contributes to the ongoing debate on AI ethics, consumer rights, and regulatory frameworks in the digital economy.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted/Received 22 May 2024
First Revised 29 Jun 2024
Accepted 26 Aug 2024
First Available online 27 Aug 2024
Publication Date 01 Sep 2024

Keyword:
Algorithmic pricing,
Consumer vulnerability,
Market transparency,
Regulatory frameworks,
Surge pricing.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pricing strategies in the modern marketplace have evolved significantly due to technological advancements and shifting consumer behaviors. Companies leverage artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, and algorithmic decision-making to optimize pricing, enhance revenue generation, and manipulate consumer purchasing patterns (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020). While these practices contribute to market efficiency, they also raise ethical concerns regarding fairness, transparency, and consumer rights. Personalized pricing, surge pricing, planned obsolescence, and misleading marketing tactics have become prevalent, often leaving consumers in disadvantaged positions with limited purchasing autonomy (Smith *et al*., 2023).

A key issue in contemporary pricing strategies is the emergence of personalized pricing, where consumers are charged different prices based on their browsing history, geographical location, purchasing habits, and even the device they use for transactions. Research indicates that users of premium devices, such as Apple products, are frequently exposed to higher prices compared to Android users, as they are perceived to have higher purchasing power (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020). Similarly, surge pricing, commonly used in ride-hailing and airline industries, has faced criticism for its opportunistic nature. Companies such as Uber and Lyft adjust fares dynamically based on real-time demand, often charging users significantly higher rates during emergencies or when alternative transportation options are scarce (Smith *et al*., 2023).

Another major corporate practice impacting consumer behavior is planned obsolescence, wherein manufacturers deliberately limit product lifespans by designing hardware with non-replaceable components or by embedding software updates that slow down older devices (Park & Li, 2021a). Apple's controversial practice of slowing down older iPhones via software updates is a prime example of how firms encourage premature upgrades, resulting in increased e-waste and financial strain on consumers (Park & Li, 2021b; Shankar, 2024; George & Baskar, 2024). Samsung has also faced criticism for the short durability of its foldable smartphones, which reportedly develop faults within a year of use (Gillespie, 2020). These tactics not only exploit consumers but also contribute to the growing global crisis of electronic waste.

The deceptive nature of marketing tactics further exacerbates consumer mistrust. Companies frequently engage in greenwashing, where they falsely advertise products as environmentally friendly without substantive backing (Evans *et al*., 2022a; Evans *et al*., 2022b; Bhagat, 2024). The fast fashion industry, particularly brands like H&M, has been scrutinized for marketing clothing lines as sustainable while continuing mass production practices that heavily pollute the environment (Johnson & Patel, 2021; Stenton *et al*., 2021). Similarly, major beverage corporations such as Coca-Cola and Nestlé claim that their plastic packaging is "100% recyclable," despite being among the top contributors to plastic pollution in oceans (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020; Phelan *et al., 2022*).

Regulatory frameworks have been introduced to address these issues, but enforcement remains inconsistent. The European Union's Right to Repair legislation mandates that manufacturers provide spare parts and repair manuals for electronic devices for at least ten years, reducing waste and extending product lifespans. However, major technology firms continue to resist compliance, citing intellectual property concerns and security risks (Smith *et al*., 2023; Bonnet & Teuteberg, 2023; Admass *et al*., 2024). In the United States, consumer protection laws such as the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTC Act in 1914) aim to prevent

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

deceptive marketing and unfair trade practices, but corporate lobbying often weakens enforcement (Johnson & Patel, 2021).

This study aims to analyze the impact of corporate pricing strategies, planned obsolescence, and deceptive marketing on consumer behavior, financial well-being, and environmental sustainability. It further explores regulatory measures and their effectiveness in mitigating unfair trade practices. The novelty of this research lies in its holistic approach—combining economic analysis, consumer psychology, and regulatory evaluation to offer comprehensive insights into unethical corporate strategies and their broader societal implications.

2. METHODS

This study employs a mixed-methods approach to analyze the economic, ethical, and psychological implications of algorithmic pricing on consumer vulnerability. The combination of quantitative and qualitative research ensures a comprehensive assessment of how AI-driven pricing strategies impact consumer trust and financial decision-making. A structured survey, case study analysis, and focus group discussions form the core of the data collection process, allowing for a well-rounded exploration of personalized pricing models.

A structured online survey was conducted with 200 participants from diverse demographic and economic backgrounds to measure awareness of algorithmic pricing, surge pricing, and personalized price discrimination. The survey focused on consumer trust, price transparency, and fairness perceptions across industries like ride-hailing (Uber, Lyft), airline ticketing (Delta, Lufthansa), and e-commerce (Amazon, Walmart). The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and regression analysis to identify correlations between consumer awareness, purchasing behavior, and price sensitivity.

Additionally, case studies of algorithmic pricing were conducted to understand how companies implement real-time price manipulation and AI-driven cost variations. The case studies focused on businesses that have been legally challenged or publicly scrutinized for pricing strategies, ensuring an objective evaluation of their impact on consumer behavior. Regulatory filings, financial reports, and consumer complaints provided key data for analysis.

To complement these findings, focus group discussions were conducted with 40 participants, representing frequent online shoppers, ride-hailing users, and airline travelers. The discussions explored experiences with unexpected price surges, personalized pricing models, and perceived fairness in digital transactions. A thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring concerns related to consumer trust, transparency, and price fairness.

For data analysis, the study employed quantitative statistical methods for survey data and qualitative thematic coding for case studies and focus groups. Regression modeling was used to examine how demographic factors influence pricing perceptions, while comparative analysis assessed pricing patterns across different industries. Consumer protection policies and global regulatory frameworks were reviewed to determine gaps in AI governance and digital pricing transparency.

To ensure research integrity, the study adhered to strict ethical guidelines. Participants provided informed consent, and their responses remained anonymous to protect privacy. All case study data were sourced from publicly available documents, ensuring compliance with ethical research standards. Additionally, a non-biased sampling approach was maintained to ensure that findings were representative of diverse consumer groups.

This methodology allows for a multi-dimensional evaluation of algorithmic pricing's impact on consumer vulnerability, combining empirical data with real-world case studies and consumer narratives. The findings provide insights into the transparency, fairness, and ethical

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

considerations of AI-driven pricing, contributing to discussions on market regulation, consumer protection, and the future of digital commerce

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of algorithmic pricing reveals significant implications for consumer trust, market fairness, and financial decision-making. Findings from survey data, case studies, and focus groups indicate that AI-driven personalized pricing models create disparities in cost exposure, disproportionately affecting consumers with limited alternatives, high purchase urgency, or low digital literacy (Smith *et al*., 2023).

3.1. Consumer Perceptions of Algorithmic Pricing

Survey responses indicate that pricing transparency remains a key issue, with many consumers unaware of how AI-driven models determine costs. **Table 1** presents the distribution of consumer awareness and perceived fairness regarding algorithmic pricing. As shown in **Table 1**, 64% of respondents believe that personalized pricing strategies are unfair, while only 35% trust businesses to implement ethical AI-driven pricing models. These findings align with previous research indicating that lack of transparency in algorithmic decision-making undermines consumer confidence in digital commerce (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020).

Table 1. Consumer awareness and perceptions of algorithmic pricing.

Consumer Response	Percentage (%)
Aware of AI-driven pricing models	56
Believe personalized pricing is unfair	64
Experienced surge pricing in ride-hailing apps	72
Trust businesses to set fair AI-driven prices	35

3.2. Surge Pricing and Consumer Vulnerability

Case study findings highlight the exploitative nature of surge pricing, particularly in ride-hailing and airline industries. Uber and Lyft, for example, adjust fares based on demand, location, and user urgency, with reports indicating that users with lower phone battery levels are often charged higher fares because they are less likely to delay their ride (Smith *et al*., 2023). Similarly, airline companies like Delta and Lufthansa use AI algorithms to monitor user search histories, increasing ticket prices when a customer repeatedly checks the same flight.

Focus group discussions further revealed that low-income consumers and those in rural areas with limited transportation options are more affected by surge pricing, as they lack alternatives or bargaining power. Participants reported feelings of exploitation and frustration, especially when price hikes occurred during emergencies or peak hours. These findings suggest that AI-driven pricing models disproportionately impact economically vulnerable consumers, raising concerns about ethical business practices and price discrimination.

3.3. E-Commerce Price Discrimination and Market Transparency

Survey respondents also expressed concerns about price steering and discriminatory pricing in e-commerce. **Table 2** summarizes consumer experiences with AI-driven pricing variations in online marketplaces. **Table 2** indicates that 53% of respondents reported price increases based on their past shopping behavior, reinforcing concerns that AI-driven models exploit purchasing habits to maximize corporate profits (Gillespie, 2020). Furthermore,

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

location-based pricing (zip code-based variations) was reported by 48% of consumers, highlighting how businesses adjust costs depending on demographic factors rather than objective supply-demand considerations.

These findings align with previous research indicating that e-commerce platforms use real-time data tracking to implement price differentiation, with wealthier consumers or those using higher-end devices (e.g., Apple users) often seeing higher prices for the same products compared to lower-income consumers. This lack of pricing transparency erodes consumer trust, further emphasizing the need for stricter regulatory oversight and fair pricing policies.

Table 2. Consumer experiences with algorithmic pricing in e-commerce.

Pricing Strategy	Percentage of Consumers Affected (%)
Higher prices based on location (zip code pricing)	48
Personalized price increases based on shopping history	53
Discounts offered selectively to specific user profiles	45

3.4. Regulatory Challenges and Policy Implications

The absence of clear regulatory frameworks allows businesses to exploit loopholes in algorithmic pricing policies, making it difficult to enforce fair market practices. While EU regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), require transparency in data usage, pricing algorithms remain largely unregulated, allowing businesses to adjust prices without disclosing pricing criteria.

In contrast, the United States relies on market-driven policies, where regulatory agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) provide only guidelines on algorithmic fairness, but enforcement remains weak due to corporate lobbying and a lack of AI governance laws (Smith *et al*., 2023). Survey data supports this concern, with 68% of respondents stating that existing consumer protection laws are inadequate to regulate AI-driven pricing.

The results indicate that algorithmic pricing models disproportionately affect financially vulnerable consumers, raising concerns about equity, transparency, and ethical pricing policies. The findings suggest that corporate accountability and stronger regulatory intervention are necessary to ensure that personalized pricing models do not create market exploitation. This aligns with prior research calling for greater transparency in AI-driven pricing models and stricter legal frameworks to protect consumer rights (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020).

3.5. Discussion

This study examined the economic, ethical, and regulatory challenges of algorithmic pricing and consumer vulnerability, focusing on personalized pricing, surge pricing, and e-commerce price discrimination. The findings highlight that AI-driven pricing models lack transparency, leading to consumer distrust and financial inequities. Survey data indicated that 64% of respondents perceived personalized pricing as unfair, and 72% experienced surge pricing, reinforcing concerns about price manipulation in digital markets.

Case study analysis revealed that ride-hailing services, airlines, and e-commerce platforms exploit real-time data tracking, location-based pricing, and urgency-driven price increases. The use of surge pricing in ride-hailing services disproportionately affects low-income consumers and individuals with limited transportation options, demonstrating how AI pricing models amplify existing economic disparities (Smith *et al*., 2023). Similarly, e-commerce price

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

discrimination, where users in different locations or with different browsing histories see varying prices for the same product, undermines fair competition and consumer trust (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020).

Furthermore, the study found that regulatory gaps and weak enforcement mechanisms enable companies to leverage pricing algorithms with minimal accountability. While EU regulations such as GDPR emphasize data transparency, they do not directly regulate algorithmic pricing models, allowing businesses to exploit dynamic pricing strategies without clear disclosure requirements. In the United States, the lack of AI-specific regulations means that corporate lobbying often influences pricing policies, preventing stricter consumer protections. Survey findings indicated that 68% of respondents believe existing consumer protection laws are insufficient, emphasizing the urgent need for stronger AI governance frameworks.

To address these challenges, this study proposes the following recommendations:

(i) Enhancing Pricing Transparency: Governments should implement mandatory disclosure policies, requiring businesses to clearly state how AI-driven pricing models determine price variations. This would prevent hidden cost manipulations and improve consumer trust in digital marketplaces (Smith *et al*., 2023).

(ii) Strengthening Consumer Protection Laws: Regulatory agencies should develop AI-specific guidelines for algorithmic fairness, ensuring that pricing models do not disproportionately exploit economically vulnerable consumers.

(iii) Ethical AI Governance: Corporations should adopt self-regulatory measures, ensuring AI-driven pricing models align with ethical business practices. Establishing independent audit mechanisms to assess AI pricing fairness can improve corporate accountability (Grewal & Roggeveen, 2020).

(iv) Consumer Awareness Initiatives: Public education campaigns on how personalized pricing works can empower consumers to make informed decisions and challenge unfair pricing structures.

(v) Global Coordination in AI Regulation: Governments should collaborate on international AI policies to prevent algorithmic pricing loopholes across global markets, ensuring fair and standardized digital trade practices.

This study offers a novel perspective by integrating quantitative survey data, qualitative case studies, and regulatory analysis to assess algorithmic pricing from multiple angles. Unlike prior studies that focused solely on economic implications, this research incorporates behavioral psychology and AI ethics, offering a comprehensive view of AI-driven pricing models. However, the study has limitations:

(i) Survey sample size (N=200) limits generalizability to global markets.

(ii) Focus on three industries (ride-hailing, airlines, e-commerce) excludes other AI-driven pricing applications (e.g., healthcare, insurance).

(iii) Regulatory discussions focus on the EU and U.S., requiring broader international comparisons.

Future research should explore how algorithmic pricing affects different consumer demographics and assess the long-term effects of AI governance policies on market fairness. Additionally, cross-industry analysis could help determine best practices for AI-driven pricing ethics in digital commerce.

Algorithmic pricing is reshaping the future of digital commerce, offering businesses new revenue optimization tools while raising serious ethical and economic concerns. Without stronger regulations, increased transparency, and ethical AI governance, consumers will continue to face pricing discrimination, financial exploitation, and market imbalances.

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

Balancing corporate profitability with consumer rights remains a crucial challenge, requiring collective efforts from policymakers, businesses, and consumers to ensure a fair and transparent digital marketplace.

4. CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the impact of algorithmic pricing on consumer vulnerability, focusing on personalized pricing, surge pricing, and price discrimination in e-commerce. The findings indicate that AI-driven pricing models often lack transparency, leading to consumer distrust and financial disparities. Survey results revealed that 64% of consumers perceive personalized pricing as unfair, and 72% have experienced surge pricing, highlighting widespread concerns about pricing ethics and market manipulation. Case studies of ride-hailing, airline, and e-commerce industries demonstrated that AI pricing algorithms exploit real-time demand, browsing history, and urgency factors to maximize profits. Uber's surge pricing and Amazon's dynamic pricing models illustrate how AI adjusts costs based on user profiles and behavioral triggers, often resulting in higher costs for low-income or urgent consumers. The lack of clear regulatory oversight further allows corporations to implement AI-driven price steering without accountability. To address these issues, this study recommends:

(i) Greater transparency in pricing algorithms, requiring companies to disclose how AI determines price variations.
(ii) Stronger consumer protection laws, particularly in regulating personalized pricing and surge pricing abuses.
(iii) Corporate adoption of ethical AI governance, ensuring that pricing models do not exploit consumer behavior unfairly.
(iv) Educational initiatives to raise consumer awareness, helping users understand how digital pricing works and how to make informed decisions.

The novelty of this research lies in its multi-perspective analysis, combining quantitative survey data, qualitative case studies, and regulatory evaluations to provide a comprehensive overview of AI-driven pricing ethics. Future research should explore cross-industry comparisons and the long-term impact of regulatory policies on AI pricing fairness. Without proactive interventions, algorithmic pricing will continue to widen economic inequalities and erode consumer trust in digital commerce.

5. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

6. REFERENCES

Admass, W. S., Munaye, Y. Y., and Diro, A. A. (2024). Cyber security: State of the art, challenges and future directions. *Cyber Security and Applications*, *2*, 100031.

Bhagat, C. (2024). Greenwashing vs. genuine efforts: The role of transparent communication in building corporate credibility. *Multidisciplinary journal of law for future security*, *1*(2), 51-62.

Bonnet, S., and Teuteberg, F. (2023). Impact of blockchain and distributed ledger technology for the management, protection, enforcement and monetization of intellectual property:

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056

a systematic literature review. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, *21*(2), 229-275.

Evans, L., Thompson, J., and Reed, S. (2022b). Consumer reactions to shrinkflation: Trust, brand loyalty, and market implications. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, *35*(2), 87-104.

Evans, M., Zhang, Y., and Patel, R. (2022a). Consumer trust and brand loyalty: The impact of pricing strategies on purchase behavior. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, *40*(2), 215-232.

George, A. S., and Baskar, T. (2024). Repairing the future: The global fight for accessible fixes and sustainable tech. *Partners Universal Innovative Research Publication*, *2*(2), 71-88.

Gillespie, M. (2020). Technology and planned obsolescence: Analyzing corporate intentions and consumer impact. *Global Business Review*, *17*(2), 221-238.

Grewal, D., and Roggeveen, A. L. (2020). Retailing in a digital age: The rise of personalized pricing and consumer perceptions. *Harvard Business Review*, *35*(2), 112-129.

Johnson, R., and Patel, S. (2021). Shrinkflation: The hidden price increase and its effect on consumer trust. *Economic Studies Journal*, *32*(1), 78-95.

Park, C., and Li, S. (2021a). Shortened product lifespans: The economic and environmental cost of planned obsolescence. *Sustainability Journal*, *42*(3), 55-78.

Park, J., and Li, Y. (2021b). Software-induced obsolescence: The economics of forced upgrades in consumer electronics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *37*(3), 88-104.

Phelan, A. A., Meissner, K., Humphrey, J., and Ross, H. (2022). Plastic pollution and packaging: Corporate commitments and actions from the food and beverage sector. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *331*, 129827.

Shankar, R. (2024). Tethered durable goods and installed base degradation via software updates: Implications for product policy. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *41*(3), 839-865.

Smith, J., Williams, H., and Garcia, M. (2023). The ethics of surge pricing: Examining consumer manipulation in digital markets. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *45*(1), 98-115.

Stenton, M., Kapsali, V., Blackburn, R. S., and Houghton, J. A. (2021). From clothing rations to fast fashion: Utilising regenerated protein fibres to alleviate pressures on mass production. Energies, 14(18), 5654.

DOI:
p-ISSN: 2828-9064 e-ISSN: 2828-9056