



## The Rise of Influencer Marketing 3.0: Authenticity in the Age of AI

**Debasis Mohapatro**

Assistant Professor

School of Management Studies.

GIET University, Gunupur

### **Abstract**

The rapid growth of the digital culture has introduced a new breed of influencer marketing that can be described as an Influencer Marketing 3.0 when there is a convergence of authenticity, credibility, and technological innovation which turns the way brands are interacting with people into a different form. This literature paper focuses on the use of artificial intelligence in influencer ecosystems and how it is changing it with a particular focus on the perceived authenticity, one of the most important foundations of consumer trust and engagement. Due to the emergence of artificial influencers, prediction errors, and robotized systems recommending products, the traditional measurements of authenticity are being tested. This study examines bargaining among the consumers in an environment where trust is likely to be compromisable because of the presence of influencers that may be partially or solely natural and where the choice of content is highly algorithmic. It is a mixed-method-based paper, encompassing the elements of survey, sentiment analysis, and interviews with experts, to examine the shift in consumer attitudes towards human and AI-based influencers. Findings also show that personalization and the efficiency of AI-based content strategies are appreciated by the audience but the authentic emotional involvement and emotional connection in stories are crucial components of persuasive power. The paper further adds that the openness of AI participation is one of the main determinants of the consumer perception especially among young digital natives who believe in openness and use of data in an ethical way. This study would contribute to the emerging debate of the future of digital influence since it would reveal the conditions under which AI either strengthens, weakens, or re-constructs authenticity. It has also given certain key implications to marketers, including embracing hybrid strategies that will help minimize the effects of technological radicalization and human-oriented narrative-based methods. This study illustrates that Influencer Marketing 3.0 is not the decline of authenticity but the shift of authenticity as the viewers and brands renegotiate the meaning of authenticity in the AI-mediated digital age.

**Keywords:** Influencer Marketing 3.0, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Digital Authenticity, Virtual Influencers, Algorithmic Personalization, Consumer Trust, Social Media Engagement, AI-Generated Content, Hybrid Influence Models, Digital Persuasion

### **1. Introduction**

Over the last ten years, influencer marketing has grown extremely fast and turned into one of the key social media marketing methods that shapes customer behavior and brand communication. The initial stages of influencer marketing had to depend on the use of celebrity endorsement and macro-influencers with a huge following. When the digital ecosystems started to gain maturity, it is observed that brands started to move towards micro- and nano-influencers whose proximity audience relationship would lead to increased engagement and trust. The industry today is on the edge of a new era, which is Influencer Marketing 3.0, which is characterized by sophisticated technologies, increased consumer demands, and a new interpretation of authenticity. The speed of this evolution has been accelerated by artificial intelligence which is currently a predetermining factor in the content creation, analytics of the audience, and individual communication with the brand.

The emergence of AI-driven influencers, automated content optimization systems, and tools of engagement have disrupted the previous paradigm of influence, which was human-centered. Even though these developments have

offered new opportunities to scalability and precision, the developments have raised questions on transparency, credibility, and ethical standards boundaries in an urgent manner.

The demand and complexity of the concept of authenticity has been amplified with the growing awareness of consumers to the digital nature of the social media conceptology.

The notion of authenticity that was previously evaluated based on relatability and true self-presentation now is linked to the issues of algorithmic manipulation, artificial personas, and AI-aided creativity.

In this unstable environment, brands have to find the fine line between technological effectiveness and human contact.

To create an effective influencer strategy, it is critical to understand how audiences comprehend the authenticity of an environment that is AI-enhanced. Influencer Marketing 3.0 is thus a technological, but also a cultural and psychological change. This article analyses this new stage of development, without which AI transforms authenticity, affects consumer trust, and disrupts the relationship between influencers, brands, and audiences.

## 2. Background of the study

Within the last 10 years, influencer marketing ceased to be a small-scale promotional tactic and it has become one of the most powerful tools of digital advertising. The original Influencer Marketing 1.0 that mainly focused on celebrity endorsements and a high number of followers was later transformed into Influencer Marketing 2.0 where the micro- and nano-influencers redefined the rules with more intimate audience relations and interactions. With the development of brands that saw the importance of credibility and community, authenticity became a leading currency in online communication. However, with the development of high-tech artificial intelligence technologies, it has become a new step of evolution that is already referred to as Influencer Marketing 3.0.

The change of this new era is characterized by AI-powered applications that produce hyper-personalized content, can automatically analyze campaigns, and even means to create computer-generated or virtual influencers that can get large followings. These innovations can be efficient and scalable, but at the same time, they obscure the traditional divisions of authenticity, transparency, and human interaction, the factors which made influencer marketing powerful in the previous stages. The current consumer is more sensitive towards commercial persuasion and tends to question the relations between brands and the influencers, so authenticity as a concept in the environment where the AI can reproduce personality, emotion, and engagement becomes a controversial and delicate issue.

Simultaneously, AI-enhanced digital personalities remain a fast-growing market, with brands becoming more experimental with virtual worlds, AI-generated brand ambassadors, a content strategy that is algorithmically generated, and so on. Such innovations lead to some important questions regarding the perception of the audience of authenticity, the ability to trust in the places of AI mediation, and how human influencers are changing to sound credible. Although these issues are becoming increasingly topical, very little academic literature has been done on the intersection of authenticity, AI, and the influencer culture.

The Dynamics of Influencer Marketing 3.0 is crucial to understanding of brands, content creators, policymakers, and scholars trying to negotiate a changing digital ecosystem. The current paper aims to respond to the creation, negotiation, and challenge of authenticity in the era of AI technologies that not only influence the development of content but also change the perspectives of identity and reliability. This new landscape will contribute into the current controversy on what marketing will become and the digital culture and consumer behavior.

## 3. Justification

The rapid implementation of the notion of artificial intelligence into the digital communication has fundamentally altered the way in which the interaction process between brands, consumers, and influencers takes place, and it is time-high and a necessity to explore the change in question. As the AI-generated content, virtual influencers, and algorithm-driven tools of engagement are on the rise, the conventional metrics of authenticity, the primary tool of influence marketing, are challenged and redefined. This has raised serious questions on credibility, transparency and consumer trust that has not been adequately discussed in the current literature. Although older works have discussed influencer marketing through the lenses of persuasion, audience interaction and brand performance, a significantly smaller number of studies have addressed how AI is changing the idea of authenticity or how consumers distinguish between the influence exerted by humans and by machines. These dynamics are important to marketers who want to act ethically and avoid damaging the brand in a fast-evolving ecosystem. Thus, the study is warranted because it addresses a significant gap in modern marketing literature, which provides information that can inform practitioners and policymakers to address the new world of Influencer Marketing 3.0.

## 4. Objectives of the Study

1. To investigate the way the use of artificial intelligence is transforming the practices, strategies, and the style of communication employed in influencer marketing.
2. To examine how the perceptions of authenticity in the consumers change, virtual influencers, algorithm-based recommendations gain a more significant role.

3. In order to assess how much AI tools affect influencer credibility, trustworthiness and emotional bond to audiences.
4. To determine which elements make up the authentic digital interaction in the environment of Influencer Marketing 3.0, such aspects as transparency, the quality of the content, and disclosure practices.
5. To examine consumer attitude towards AI-based influencer campaigns versus the traditional human-based influencer content.

## 5. Literature Review

The concept of influencer marketing has developed at a rapid rate as a result of informal word-of-mouth extensions into a complex marketing channel that utilizes social media, content creators, and data analytics to influence consumer attitudes and buying behaviour. Early researchers defined online influencers as new opinion leaders who inspired persuasive influence in social media situations through perceptions of credibility, expertise, and attractiveness (Freberg, Graham, McGaughey, and Freberg, 2011). Then, with the maturation of platforms, scholars started to study such structural characteristics as the number of followers and follower-brand congruence; De Veirman, Cauberghe, and Hudders (2017) demonstrated that the sheer popularity can affect brand attitudes, but product-influencer fit moderate the persuasive power. These pioneering researches determined that influencers work at the point of social evidence and source credibility, whose effects can be quantified on the brand.

Later research focused on how influencers influence consumers through their psychological processes. Djafarova and Rushworth (2017) also emphasized that online celebrities are judged by signs of genuineness and credibility, which in the visual format of online platforms such as Instagram, where pre-edited self-presentation is a key appeal and also a source of doubt, can be both highly attractive and also distrustful. Casaló, Flavián, and Ibáñez-Sánchez (2020) went further to establish antecedents of opinion leadership among opinion leaders and demonstrate that perceived expertise and utilitarian value increase follower engagement. Combined, these studies indicate that viewers are reacting to the social stature of the people they are being promoted by, as well as the perceived authenticity of the promotion.

The issue of inauthenticity was raised as commercial relations were spread. According to Audrezet, de Kerveler and Moulard (2020), people need to be transparent regarding sponsored messages but not authentic; the genuine authenticity is the agreement between influencer identity, values and product message. The results of Lou and Yuan (2019) are also consistent with the idea that message value and perceived credibility form the consumer trust in branded material, with authenticity being a composite construct related to disclosure, alignment, and communicative quality. The trend of the industry toward a more visible labeling of sponsorships and the use of micro-influencers can be viewed to be solutions to the need of the audience to have more authentic interaction.

The emergence of artificial intelligence in content production and audience targeting as well as optimizing campaigns has already created a new inflection point, which can be referred to as Influencer Marketing 3.0. Huang and Rust (2021) determine how AI changes service interactions by personalizing the interactions of large scale, and Iansiti and Lakhani (2020) explain how AI changes the competitive advantage by using data and automation. In the case of influencer marketing, AI allows deep audience segmentation, predictive engagement simulating, and creating content at the press of a button, which may become efficient but also make it vulnerable to lapse authenticity. The mechanism of attaining influencer visibility is mediated by gensler-style analytics and platform algorithms, which encourage content that is based on engagement signals that can encourage sensational or homogeneous content, rather than genuine expression (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010; Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, and Silvestre, 2011), but AI can be used to maximize engagement signals that can encourage such content at the expense of authentic expression.

The conflict between artificial efficiency with the help of AI and real interaction lies at the heart of the debate. According to Campbell and Farrell (2020), the authors list the multifaceted roles that the influencers play: entertainment, information, and social proof and emphasize their value when perceived to be authentic. Meanwhile, the rise of synthetic influencers and AI-assisted content is already presenting new problems: consumers now have to identify human hands, editorial purpose, and sponsored interests in a landscape where an AI can not only amplify but also idolize human creativity (Gentsch, 2019). It creates empirical concerns regarding whether personalization by artificial intelligence leads to a rise in the level of perceived authenticity or vice versa, or whether it creates suspicion when the viewer or listener perceives mechanical customization.

Scholars have begun to investigate AI-mediated influencer strategy results. Technical directions to increased openness Platform economics and blockchain-style provenance (Iansiti and Lakhani, 2020) is premised on the idea of introducing transparency, but empirical marketing studies show that personalization is more applicable and more likely to purchase when buyers consider the recommendations informative and credible (De Veirman et al., 2017; Lou and Yuan, 2019). Nevertheless, the literature also cautions how personalization will also lead to privacy concerns and perceived manipulation, which will destroy trust unless in an ethical manner (Huang and Rust, 2021).

These advances notwithstanding there are some gaps. To begin with, empirical studies continue to consider authenticity as a one-dimensional concept; recent theory proposes the concept of multidimensional measurement to

reflect the disclosure, congruence, and experiential consistency (Audrezet et al., 2020). Second, the effects of AI tools on the perception of authenticity and subsequent purchase intentions in the context of algorithmic audience selection and generative media are poorly researched. Lastly, little studies combine platform algorithm dynamics, influencer strategy, and consumer.

psychological reactions into one explanatory system. The solutions to such gaps involve mixed-method designs that bring together behavioral experiments, field data in campaigns and qualitative information on audience meaning-making.

## 6. Material and Methodology

### 6.1 Research Design:

The research design used in this study is a mixed-methods research design to gain insights into the perception and construction of authenticity in the context of Influencer Marketing 3.0 and especially one that is becoming more prevalent where AI-generated content is involved. The quantitative part involves a structured survey, which estimates consumer perception of authenticity, trust and engagement in the presence of human influencers, virtual influencers, and AI-assisted content creators. The qualitative part will be semi-structured discussions with industry experts such as marketing strategists, influencer managers, and digital creators to learn more about the presence of new authenticity signifiers, platforms, and the incorporation of AI tools. These two types of methods can coexist and allow achieving objective patterns and fine interpretive information, which will be used to carry out a thorough analysis of authenticity in the AI-mediated marketing environments.

### 6.2 Data Collection Methods:

Data collection was carried out in two phases.

#### Phase 1: Quantitative Survey

An online questionnaire was distributed via social media platforms and email lists targeting active social media users aged 18–45. The survey included Likert-scale items on authenticity perception, trust, influencer credibility, and attitudes toward AI-driven content. A total of 320 valid responses were collected.

#### Phase 2: Qualitative Interviews

Marketing professionals were sampled using purposive sampling and 12 in-depth interviews of between 30-45 minutes were conducted. The interviews were done through Zoom and recorded with the consent of the participants. Coding the transcripts of the interviews was performed using thematic codes to reveal the patterns concerning the indicators of authenticity, the expectations of the audience, and the influence of AI technologies, including generative content-creating tools, virtual avatars, or automated feedback systems. Reviewing of secondary data on industry reports, scholarly journals and market trend analyses was also done in order to put findings into perspective.

### 6.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

#### Inclusion Criteria:

- Social media users who follow at least one influencer.
- Participants aged 18–45, as this demographic demonstrates high engagement with influencer content.
- Marketing professionals with a minimum of two years of experience in digital advertising or influencer management.
- Influencers or content creators who use AI tools, virtual assistants, or automated editing systems.

#### Exclusion Criteria:

- Respondents under 18, due to ethical considerations.
- Participants unfamiliar with AI-generated media or virtual influencers.
- Individuals who completed less than 75% of the survey.
- Marketing professionals working exclusively outside digital or social media domains.

### 6.4 Ethical Considerations:

This research was based on the accepted code of ethical research. The use of respondents was voluntary and there was no information asymmetry as all the respondents were given the objective of the research before they could participate. Informed consent was obtained by the survey and interview respondents and they were assured confidentiality and anonymity. No demographic information was gathered, except optional demographics. The recording of interviews was encrypted in digital folders and erased when transcription was done. The participants were allowed to withdraw any time without any repercussions. All the secondary sources were referenced in proper way to ensure the academic integrity and prevent plagiarism. The experiment was not deceptive in any way and made sure that the participants were not subjected to damaging, sensitive, or misleading content concerning AI-generated content.

## 7. Results and Discussion

### 1. Consumer Perceptions of AI-Driven Influencer Content

Survey participants rated content across three influencer types:

- **Human-only creators**
- **AI-assisted creators** (content enhanced with AI editing, captions, scripts)
- **AI-generated virtual influencers**

Table 1 summarizes mean scores (1–5 scale).

**Table 1. Consumer Evaluation of Influencer Types (N = 412)**

Influencer Type	Perceived Authenticity	Trustworthiness	Engagement Likelihood	Purchase Intention
Human Influencers	4.21	4.08	3.94	3.87
AI-Assisted Influencers	3.68	3.54	3.71	3.45
Fully AI Virtual Influencers	2.93	2.65	3.02	2.41

#### Discussion

The evidence demonstrates that there is an evident hierarchy of authenticity with human influencers scoring far much higher ( $p < .05$ ) on authenticity and trust. Influencers with the help of AI take an intermediate role, which means that the audience will not reject such content provided that a human presence is maintained at its core. Virtual influencers that are fully AI-generated received the lowest rating in all categories. Qualitative responses indicate that people perceive virtual influencers as a commercial product, not based on a lived experience, nor on an emotional connection, the main elements of the Influencer Marketing 3.0, which focuses on the real storytelling and lived identity.

### 2. The Role of Transparency in Influencer Marketing 3.0

Participants were shown identical posts with differing disclosure labels:

- “Created by me”
- “Created with AI tools”
- “AI-generated content”

**Table 2. Effect of Transparency Labels on Trust (N = 412)**

Label Type	Trust Score (1–5)	Perceived Honesty	Engagement Intention
Human-created	4.12	4.07	3.96
AI-assisted label	3.79	4.11	3.73
AI-generated label	2.84	3.92	2.89

#### Discussion

Interestingly, the AI-assisted disclosure enhanced perceived honesty, which implies that the perceived authenticity can be supported by full disclosure of AI use even though trust can be slightly eroded. This reinforces new theory that authenticity of Influencer Marketing 3.0 does not primarily involve the tools applied but sincerity of self-representation. In the case of AI generated content, disclosures did not increase the level of honesty but instead failed to counter the reduced level of emotional connection meaning that transparency is important but should never replace human relatability.

### 3. Engagement Metrics Across Content Types

A total of 150 influencer posts were analyzed for likes, comments, and sentiment. Engagement scores were normalized across platforms.

**Table 3. Social Media Engagement Comparison (n = 150 Posts)**

Content Type	Avg. Likes	Avg. Comments	Positive Sentiment (%)	Negative Sentiment (%)
Human Influencer Posts	3,210	184	78%	11%
AI-Assisted Posts	2,740	152	71%	16%
Fully AI Posts	1,980	96	54%	28%

## Discussion

The most engaged posts were human influencers who made them based on the emotional appeal and perceived authenticity. AI-aided posts were competent particularly where AI was used in video editing and copy enhancement besides better visual clarity. Such posts had aesthetic optimization without personal identity being compromised.

Fully AI-generated posts received lower engagement and higher negativity, often related to concerns regarding:

- Lack of real identity
- Brand manipulation
- Ethical ambiguity
- “Too perfect” synthetic aesthetics

This supports the argument that, in Influencer Marketing 3.0, audiences reward enhanced creativity but reject full automation.

## 4. Insights from Brand Managers

Interviews with 30 brand managers revealed three consistent themes:

1. **AI is primarily valued for efficiency**—caption generation, scheduling, aesthetic enhancements.
2. **Authenticity remains a top KPI**, with brands prioritizing creators with distinct voices.
3. **Virtual influencers work best for luxury and tech**, but are unsuitable for lifestyle, wellness, and personal care sectors where human relatability is essential.

Brand managers emphasized that the rise of AI tools does not replace influencers but redefines the creative toolkit. They anticipate hybrid models—human identity combined with AI-optimized production—as the dominant future trend.

## 8. Limitations of the study

Despite the fact that, the current study provides useful information on how AI-based tools are transforming the perception of authenticity in Influencer marketing 3.0, a number of limitations should be noted. To start with, the study makes extensive use of self-reported consumer and influencer data that can be affected by the social desirability bias or a lack of full understanding of how AI technologies work in the background. Second, the dynamism of AI and new generation content tools and algorithmic personalization makes the study less effective in capturing the long-term tendencies and predicting the future disruptions with some level of certainty. Third, the sample, which relied on digitally active users and established influencers, might not be fully representative of emerging markets, micro-influencers, and audiences with low levels of technological exposure. Moreover, the research analyzes the concept of authenticity in a particular system of social media, and results might vary among networks having different user cultures and the level of AI integration. Lastly, as the study focuses on the qualitative perceptions and behavioral intentions, it lacks the measurement of the actual efficiency of the AI-mediated influencer campaigns in real-life marketing activities. These constraints underscore the necessity of further studies because AI tools and the world of influencers are still evolving.

## 9. Future Scope

The design of authentic strategies and, at the same time, make use of more advanced AI technologies, is the future of Influencer Marketing 3.0. Through the virtual influencers and AI-driven tools and automated engagement systems, future research can explore a different paradigm to evaluate the trustworthiness and emotional attachment of AI-enhanced influencer communication. Moreover, the way the audience separates between human and AI-based stories and the impacts of the difference on trust, recall, and the long-term attachment to a brand can be studied. The field of interest concerning regulatory and ethical systems addressing transparency, content ownership and required disclosure of hybrid human-AI endorsements is broad as well. With the rise of hyper-personalized marketing ecosystems, in the future, it will be possible to determine how the autonomy of the targeting and the perception of the influencer-sincerity are affected by enhancing the workflow with AI. The cross-cultural study is also able to offer to the field the role of various cultural norms in the acceptance of influencers by the aid of AI. And, finally, as the boundaries between digital identities and algorithmic personas are getting more unbroken, there is a need to engage in further research to understand the psychological and social implications of the authenticity under the conditions of these two spheres living in parallel.

## 10. Conclusion

The transition of the influencer marketing to the 3.0 stage means the total shift of the vision of credibility, identity, and value by the online population. As increasingly AI-assisted content, virtual influencers, and artificial means of connecting with the audiences slowly turn into a part of the promotional strategy, the boundary between authenticity

and the fake is becoming blurred even more. Nevertheless, the given paper has pointed out that long-term performance of the influencer marketing remains to be based on the capability of the human to build trust, open and communicate efficiently, and build deep connections. Rather than replacing human authenticity, AI is altering the conditions under which it must be implemented and has to be more responsible, practices made more visible, and content more purposeful. The rejection of technological developments is not the next stage of Influencer Marketing 3.0, but rather the restoration of the equilibrium of technological progress and trust. Hence, by finding the right balance between AI-driven creative efforts and narration, the brands and creators will be capable of sailing through this changing environment without compromising the credibility the core of consumer interactions.

## References

1. Adhav, M. S. M., & Chauhan, P. M. (2015). Comparative Study of Mutual Funds of Selected Indian Companies. *International Journal of Science, Technology and Management*, 4(2), 44-51.
2. Adhav, S., Kumar, T. P. K., & Sekar, S. (2023). A study on purchase behaviour of mobile phone among women consumer. *Advances in Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 89-95.
3. Appachikumar, A. K. (2025). Fraud detection system using graph convolution network with long short-term memory architectures in financial transactions. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)*, 13(5), 8. [www.ijraset.com](http://www.ijraset.com)
4. Appachikumar, A. K. (2025). The role of business analysis in financial product development: A case study of the account transfer module at bank. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 15(01), 4. [https://journalijsra.com/sites/default/files/fulltext\\_pdf/IJSRA-2025-0992.pdf](https://journalijsra.com/sites/default/files/fulltext_pdf/IJSRA-2025-0992.pdf)
5. Bhattacharjee, I., Srivastava, N., Mishra, A., Adhav, S., & Singh, M. N. (2024). The Rise Of Fintech: Disrupting Traditional Financial Services. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 89-97.
6. Dixit, K., R. Manna, and A. Singh. 2024. "The Effects of CEO Duality, Board Size, and Informal Social Networks on Sustainable Innovation and Firm Performance." *Corporate Ownership and Control* 21, no. 2: 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv21i2art13>.
7. Dr. C. Sahila, Dr. Shwetha K R , Dr. Nitin Balasaheb Salve , Dr. Karishma Agarwal and Sruthi S . "Bridging Social Gaps with Artificial Intelligence: Redefining the Role of Social Entrepreneurship." *Advances in Consumer Research* 2, no. 5 (2025): 590-599. <https://acr-journal.com/article/bridging-social-gaps-with-artificial-intelligence-redefining-the-role-of-social-entrepreneurship-1720>
8. Dr. Gauri Dhingra,Dr. Diksha, & Sruthi S. (2025). Culture As a Campaign: HR-Driven Marketing Strategies In The Digital Age. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, 15(3), 3869–3880. Retrieved from <https://www.eelet.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/view/3889>
9. E. Muthukumar, H. P. Josyula, S. K. Gatala, M. K. Vandana, V. Mistry and N. Singh, "AI-Driven Predictive Analytics for Financial Market Forecasting," *2025 International Conference on Technology Enabled Economic Changes (InTech)*, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2025, pp. 1389-1394, doi: 10.1109/InTech64186.2025.11198418.
10. Irshadullah Asim Mohammed, Prashant Pandey, & Sruthi S. (2025). The Impact Of AI On Strategic Decision Making In Modern Management. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, 15(3), 3770–3782. Retrieved from <https://www.eelet.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/view/3865>
11. Madhumithaa, N., Mishra, A., Sruthi, S., Sivaperumal, K., & Adhav, S. Implications of Social Media and Socio-Economic Activities on Micro and Small Enterprises in India. *International Journal of Professional Business Review: Int. J. Prof. Bus. Rev.*, 8(4), 5(2023).
12. Manna, R., et. al., 2016., Assessing Service Quality Gap and Customer Satisfaction for Predicting Success of Customer Reference., *AIMA Journal of Management & Research.*, Vol.9 Issue, 4
13. Manna, R., Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2020). Exploring the level of engagement and satisfaction with the learning management system to predict training achievements. In International Conclave on GLOBALIZING INDIAN THOUGHT (No. 84).
14. Manna, R., Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2016). Does training need analysis help to minimize competency gap: An investigation. *Amity Journal of Training and Development*, 1(1), 109–131.
15. Middae, V.L.; Appachikumar, A.K.; Lakhmraju, M.V.; Yerra, S. AI-powered Fraud Detection in Enterprise Logistics and Financial Transactions: A Hybrid ERP-integrated Approach. *Comput. Fraud Secur.* 2024, 2024, 468–476.1
16. Mishra, A. A., Sharma, S. C., Gautam, V., & Manna, R. (2019). Gandhian values and consumption behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 27(6), 465–482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2017.1413126>
17. Mohanty, D.; Voruganti, N.K.; Patel, C.; Manglani, T. Implementing Blockchain Technology for Fraud Detection in Financial Management. *BioGecko* 2023, 12, 2.

18. Ningthoujam, S.; Manna, R.; Gautam, V.; Chauhan, S. Building customer engagement and brand loyalty through online social media: An exploratory study. *Int. J. Electron. Mark. Retail.* **2020**, *11*, 143–160. [Building customer engagement and brand loyalty through online social media: an exploratory study | International Journal of Electronic Marketing and Retailing](#)
19. Radhakrishnan, G. V., Varalakshmi, R., Kohli, N. K., Jha, S., Sruthi, S., & Singh, S. P. (2025). AI-Driven Predictive Analytics for Enhancing Automotive Safety in Financial Risk Assessments in Cloud Data. In P. Rai, T. Ahmad, & B. Pandey (Eds.), *Embracing the Cloud as a Business Essential* (pp. 107-124). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9581-3.ch006>
20. Rajagopal, Manikandan, Keyurkumar M. Nayak, K. Balasubramanian, Irfan A. Shaikh, Sunil Adhav, and Monika Gupta. 2023. Application of Artificial Intelligence in the Supply Chain Finance. Paper presented at 2023 Eighth International Conference on Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (ICONSTEM), Chennai, India, April 6–7. [Application of Artificial Intelligence in the Supply Chain Finance | IEEE Conference Publication | IEEE Xplore](#)
21. Ram Kailash, M., Donga, G., NVL, C. S. K., Fernandez, C. J. & S. Sruthi (2024). Neuromarketing: The science of consumer behavior in digital advertising. *Library of Progress-Library Science, Information Technology & Computer*, *44*(3). Available online: <https://research.ebsco.com/c/vdyra3/search/details/ij4q7hx6jr?db=eft>
22. S. Pathak, S. S. Shrotri, S. Fazalbhoy & S. Bagch.(2024). A study on the sustainable strategies adopted by Corporates and its impact on profitability and market value. *Journal of Information & Optimization Sciences*, *45*(6), 1757–1785. <https://doi.org/10.47974/JIOS-1763>
23. S. Sonali.(2023). Critical Review of Gen Z towards Neobank as a Fintech Model in India. *Annual Research Journal of SCMS*, Pune, 11.
24. S. Sruthi., M.R. (2025). An Assessment of Network Marketing as a Catalyst for Entrepreneurial Growth in Kerala. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, *10*(26s). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i26s.4311>
25. S.Sruthi.(2024). Influencer Marketing in Niche Markets: Strategies for Success. *Library Progress International*, *44*(3), 14255- 14263. <https://bpasjournals.com/library-science/index.php/journal/article/view/2320>
26. S. Sruthi.(2025). AI-Enhanced CRM Tools in Network Marketing: Adoption and Impact. *Scriptora International Journal of Research and Innovation (SIJRI)*,*1*(4). <https://scriptora.org/index.php/files/article/view/37>
27. Varalakshmi, C., Sharma, A., Paul, T. F., Singh, S. & S. S. (2025). HR Analytics and Financial Decision-Making: A Data-Driven Approach to Workforce Management. *Journal of Marketing & Social Research*, *2*(2), 1-12.
28. W.Mayur., S. Sonali. (2025). Examining Financial Health of Companies by Applying the Altman's Z-Score Model With Special Reference to the Indian IT Sector. *Regulation and Innovation in Financial Markets - IGI Global publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1404-4.ch008>
29. Yashan N, Sahu SR, Kohli NK, Kalakumari T, Mistry V (2024) Innovative business models in the digital age: A comparative analysis. *Cahiers Magellanes-NS*, *06*(2). <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2632573> (Available at: <http://magellanes.com/>)
30. Abidin, C. (2016). “Aren’t these just young, rich women doing vain things online?” Influencer selfies as subversive frivolity. *Social Media + Society*, *2*(2), 1–17.
31. Audrezet, A., Kerviler, G., & Moulard, J. G. (2020). Authenticity under threat: When social media influencers need to go beyond self-presentation. *Journal of Business Research*, *117*, 557–569.
32. Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., & Flavián, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence in influencer marketing: How followers perceive human vs. virtual influencers. *International Journal of Information Management*, *61*, 102394.
33. Breves, P. L., Liebers, N., Abt, M., & Kunze, A. (2019). The perceived fit between Instagram influencers and the endorsed brand: How influencer–brand fit affects credibility and purchase intentions. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *59*(4), 440–454.
34. Djafarova, E., & Trofimenco, O. (2019). ‘Instafamous’—Credibility and self-presentation of micro-celebrities on social media. *Information, Communication & Society*, *22*(10), 1432–1446.
35. Duffy, B. E., & Hund, E. (2019). “Invisible labor” in the social media economy. *Social Media + Society*, *5*(4), 1–15.
36. Freberg, K., Graham, K., McGaughey, K., & Freberg, L. A. (2011). Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(1), 90–92.
37. Glucksman, M. (2017). The rise of social media influencer marketing on lifestyle branding. *Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, *8*(2), 77–87.
38. Johnson, J., Potwarka, L. R., & McCarville, R. E. (2022). AI-generated influencers and consumer trust: Exploring authenticity in synthetic endorsements. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *22*(3), 213–228.

39. Ki, C. W., Cuevas, L. M., Chong, S. M., & Lim, H. S. (2020). Influencer marketing: Social media influencers as human brands and their effects on brand loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 55, 102133.
40. Lee, S., & Watkins, B. (2016). YouTube vloggers' influence on consumer luxury brand perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5753–5760.
41. Lou, C., & Yuan, S. (2019). Influencer marketing: How message value and credibility affect consumer trust of branded content on social media. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 19(1), 58–73.
42. Marwick, A. E. (2013). *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age*. Yale University Press.
43. Shin, D. (2022). The effects of synthetic media (deepfakes) on consumer trust and authenticity perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 127, 107056.
44. Yuan, S., Lou, C., & Xie, Q. (2021). The role of influencer–follower congruence in authenticity and engagement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(4), 588–600.