International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope (IRJMS), 2026; 7(2): 846-856

Original Article | ISSN (O): 2582-631X DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2026.v07i02.08781

The Psychology of Price: Analysing Consumer Willingness to Pay in Online Marketplaces

Christian Niemeier[1]*, Richard Pospisil[2]

[1]Faculty of Management and Economics, Mendel University, Czech Republic, [2]Faculty of Arts, Palacky University, Olomouc, Czech Republic. *Corresponding Author's Email: chris.phd123@gmail.com

Abstract

The research investigates how different pricing methods and consumer actions in digital marketplaces are connected. According to the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), this study focuses on how people make decisions about online pricing based on reasoning (central route) or feelings (peripheral route). The study gathers data through the five major e-commerce systems employing the in-house developed system, Pricing Blocker, which tracks prices with consumer engagement rates every six months. The 10,000 participants (N) were split into three experimental groups to test the effect of static pricing, dynamic pricing and the combination of dynamic pricing and a set of behavioural nudges. Willingness to pay (WTP) and purchase intention were evaluated using surveys and behavioural tracking. The researchers used an experimental setup, choosing three groups to study, while testing price variations and behaviour cues. By using regression analysis and ANOVA, we determined if device type, location and behavioural nudges affected how willing people were to pay and how likely they were to buy the products. Results indicate that participants open to dynamic pricing were ready to pay more, or $58.84 on average. Higher conversion rates (32%) were seen among those who received nudges, proving that those emotional strategies work well. However, almost half of users (44%) worry about there being some manipulation of prices within crypto currencies. Further, it elaborates on policy implications, referring to the regulation of digital markets and ethical design. This study encourages policy formulators and digital marketers to further create a balance of commercial innovation with fairness in online transactions.

Keywords: Consumer Psychology, Decision-making Pathways, Elaboration Likelihood Model, Marketing Strategies, Price Perception, Willingness to Pay.

Introduction

Digital commerce has changed the manner in which business price setting is done. Online retailers currently manipulate prices in real time according to their user behaviour, type of devices and location (1). Dynamic pricing allows sellers to react quickly to changes in market demand. It enhances revenue and efficiency as well. Nonetheless, they are practices that have ethical implications for the consumers. The occurrence of regular and unexplained price destruction builds in distrust and erosion of brand loyalty (2). With a constantly growing e-commerce industry, there is an ever-growing concern regarding the necessity to learn more about consumer reactions to pricing strategies. Millions of transactions are made on the world platforms every day. The interaction of technology, psychology and economic forces creates a complicated result on each transaction. Customers operate in a world where the prices can vary with each visit (3). This brings about ambiguity, which affects their perception of value and purchasing decisions. The available literature is inclined to analyze the pricing strategy and consumer psychology separately and there is a relatively small focus on the interaction of these two factors in digital space (4). This paper fills that gap by exploring consumer reactions to dynamic pricing and behavioural nudges based on three theoretical frameworks that complement each other: the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (5) and Price Anchoring Theory (6). An ELM formulated by Petty and Cacioppo differentiates between two channels of persuasion: a central pathway that is carried out with cautious cognitive processing and a peripheral pathway that proceeds through the action of emotional appeals and mental shortcuts. Online marketplace high-involvement buyers shop in a systematic fashion, low-involvement shoppers in a reactive manner, in line with urgency

(Received 23th October 2025; Accepted 26th March 2026; Published 13th April 2026)

indications and discount cues. TAM assumes that intricate or murky pricing interfaces decrease consumer interaction despite competitive prices (7). Recent additions to TAM also focus on the impact of trust and data-privacy issues on reactions to algorithm-based pricing (8). The theory of price anchoring is used to explain the fact that consumers base their buying behaviour on the initial price that they see; the retailers capitalize on this and offer original prices next to discounted ones to maximize the amount of perceived savings (9). Trust, however, goes down drastically when consumers identify artificially inflated anchors (10).

The use of behavioural nudges which are design elements helping in decision-making without limiting a choice, is commonly used in e-commerce by countdown clocks, scarcity alerts, social proof icons and other elements (11). These instruments utilize psychological triggers like urgency and loss avoidance and they work best when buyers do not actively reason about that (12). Nudging too much or too open, though, may elicit consumer apathy or scepticism (13). The moral controversy is whether nudges are effective in safeguarding consumer interests or if they deceive behaviour by manipulating them without their consent (14). Even though progress has been made in all these areas on an individual basis, there are some significant gaps in the literature. Few studies combine ELM, TAM and price anchoring in a single line of analysis and still fewer studies address the combined impact of dynamic pricing and behavioural nudges on actual, observed purchase behaviour. The bulk of extant literature researches a single pricing strategy separately. The moderating effect of digital literacy on consumer reactions to pricing strategies is also an under-researched issue, not to mention the question of whether pricing transparency will lead to long-term brand loyalty (15). This research paper will fill these gaps by the application of a multi-group experimental design on five large e-commerce websites with the aid of a self-developed browser tool to record live pricing information and consumer behaviour.

This study has three hypotheses based on the theoretical foundations mentioned above.

H1: Dynamic pricing enhances the willingness to pay in relation to the willingness to pay in static pricing.

This is based on ELM theory and price anchoring theory. The ever-changing prices cause a perception that what is offered is special. The existence of anchoring effects causes the current price to appear as a good deal in comparison to past prices.

H2: Behavioural nudges and dynamic pricing have an additional positive effect on WTP and conversion rates.

This is based on the nudge theory and peripheral processing in the ELM. Nudges like urgency clocks and scarcity warnings are emotional in response. Such reactions do not go through thorough examination and make quick purchase decisions.

H3: Dynamic pricing decreases the perceived fairness and consumer trust.

It is evidenced by the existing results on price manipulation and consumer scepticism. When consumers are exposed to high rates of price fluctuations that are not explained by any reason, they form negative perceptions about the platform. This loss of trust can counter the immediate improvement in revenues through dynamic pricing.

The research looks at these assumptions with a view to providing a theoretical understanding as well as practical recommendations to digital marketers, platform designers and policymakers.

Methodology

The research design of this study is a quasi-experimental, between-subjects design. The methodology is appropriate to test the causality of the pricing strategies on consumer behaviour. Carryover effects in the between-subjects design are avoided. It permits a clean comparison of three different pricing groups. Survey-based or qualitative methods would not give real-time behavioural reactions to changes in price. As such, it will be the most suitable experimental design to use for the research questions. The reason why a between-subjects but not a within-subjects design was chosen was not accidental. Presentation of the same user under all three conditions may raise consciousness of price manipulation. This would alter their behaviour in a manner that does not depict normal shopping. The study will ensure that the responses are based on natural behaviour by ensuring that each user is assigned to a single group.

Research Design

The research gathered data in two-time frames to ensure the existence of the effect of time on pricing. This two-phase system tested the timing issue on prices and whether the results were consistent (16). There were two vendors whose products and services were selected. They went as low as 8.99 EUR and up to 1,600 EUR. The assortment of goods and services was to reflect various prices and classifications. There were low-cost items and high-cost services. This enables the research to evaluate the validity of the effects of prices at various levels of expenditure.

The approximations in this study are the models. Perfect information is hardly accessible to human actors (17). They depend on the indicators that are chosen on the basis of informed guesses. The research does not make a claim of flawless prophecy. Rather, it aims at finding out the key drivers of price changes based on behavioural science approaches. The research isolates the effects of various pricing techniques on consumer outcomes by manipulating the use of various pricing techniques. Any effect of dynamic pricing and behavioural nudges in combination can also be caught by this design.

Experimental Setup

The experiment involved three groups of users based on actual product pages. Group A was normal pricing and no behaviour change was applied. This was the control condition group. Group B was subjected to live price adjustments (according to device, location and history). This was a test of the efficacy of dynamic pricing on its own. Group C was subjected to dynamic pricing as well as behavioural nudges. These nudges were represented as scarcity warnings, social proof indicators and countdown timers. This group was used to test the joint action of behavioural cues and pricing. The between-subjects design enabled the research team to compare the conditions individually. All the participants were split into one group to eliminate a carryover effect.

The information was gathered during six months of the period between October 2023 and March 2024. This was the seasonal purchasing period, such as holidays and clearance. It also took normal buying periods in comparison. Two time points were taken on price and interaction data to enhance reliability. The first product page was T1. T2 consisted of a follow-up of changes in behaviour in 24-72 hours. This design was a two-point design, which enabled the study to observe the immediate and delayed consumer response.

Sampling Strategy

The sampling frame comprised users of 5 leading e-commerce sites. There was a stratified random sampling. The type of device and geographic area were used as stratification. The desired sample was 10,000 individuals. These were equally allocated in Groups A, B and C. The respondents were required to be at least 18 years old and active users of e-commerce. Sessions marked as bot activity or partial were excluded during the analysis. This will make the sample representative of what the actual consumer diversity is and will also aid the validity of the results.

Variables and Measures

The independent variables were the condition of pricing (static price, dynamic price and dynamic plus nudges), type of device (mobile and desktop), location of the user and time of access. Willingness to pay, rate of click-through, rate of cart abandonment and decision to make a purchase were the dependent variables. The moderators were the digital literacy of the consumers, the perceived fairness and trust in the platform. Measurement of all the variables was done via direct behavioural observation and post-session Likert-scale questionnaires. The actual price interaction data was used to determine willingness to pay. A click-through rate will determine the ratio of users who have taken action on a product listing. The cart abandonment rate followed the users who had items in their cart but failed to make the purchase. Purchase decision was a dichotomous variable, which stated whether a purchase was made. The Likert-scale questionnaires were administered on a five-point scale with strongly disagree to agree strongly. They did the subjective measures of justness, trust and urgency.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The participants were required to be above 18 years of age. They are supposed to have done some online shopping at least once within the last six months. Only users who accessed products on the five platforms that were chosen were considered. The sessions with a length of less than 30 seconds were not taken into consideration. There were also bot-flagged sessions that were eliminated from the dataset. Those users who failed to finish the T1 and T2 tests were not included in the final analysis.

Empirical Data Collection

The Pricing Blocker software was the primary data collection instrument (18). This is used to monitor fluctuations in price on various online sites in real time. It records the fluctuations of prices to various user profiles. The tool was selected because it can record live pricing strategies that are employed by retailers (19). It records the price displayed to the individual user, together with information regarding the user's devices, location and browsers. This data was compared to the survey responses collected at the end of every browsing session. A combination of behavioural tracking and self-reported data is more informative than either one. The Pricing Blocker was installed in the form of a browser extension on the devices of participants. It was significantly passive and did not interfere with the user experience.

Regression Analysis

Several predictors were modelled using a multiple linear regression to examine the effects of each on the purchase decision and WTP. The independent variables that were incorporated in the model were pricing condition, device type, location and exposure to behavioural nudge. The assumptions to be made were tested before the regression was run. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to test the normality of the residues. The findings indicated that the outcome variables were normally distributed, with an approximation. The Variance Inflation factors (VIF) were used to determine multicollinearity. All the values of VIF were less than 5, which showed no severe multicollinearity. This implies that the predictors are independent enough. Residual plots were used to test the homoscedasticity. Nothing significant was violated. The fit of the models was assessed by values of R-squared and adjusted R-squared. There was a good model fit as both values were high. The regression enabled the research to single out the distinct impact of each element on pricing results (20). The relative strength of each of the predictors was compared using standardised coefficients.

Statistical Analysis

Type III Sum of Squares was used to evaluate the variance attributed to each factor in the study. All factors and interactions were computed and obtained degrees of freedom, mean square, F-statistic and p-value (20). The means of the three pricing conditions of the groups were compared using ANOVA. To determine which of the specific groups differed, post hoc comparisons were performed. The moderation effects of country, perception of fairness and type of device were tested by the PROCESS macro by Hayes (21). This macro gives the opportunity to test the conditional effects in the regression framework. The statistical tests were conducted in SPSS with the level of significance of $p < .05$. Partial eta squared was used to calculate effect sizes of ANOVA and standardised beta coefficients to calculate regression effect sizes.

Conceptual Framework

This study has four layers of a conceptual framework. The initial layer deals with the theoretical background: ELM, TAM and Price Anchoring Theory. These models provide the reason why consumers react differently to pricing. The second layer presents the experimentation design containing three pricing conditions for Groups A, B and C. All these groups are at a different degree of pricing intervention. The third level describes the analytical procedures, such as ANOVA, regression analysis and moderation testing. Such techniques enable the researcher to put each hypothesis to the test on a statistical rigorous basis. The fourth level determines the outcome measures: WTP, purchase intention and perceived trust and fairness. Every theoretical foundation is linked to certain hypotheses. The experimental groups are used to test the hypotheses. The outcome measures are fed by the results of the methods used in the analysis. This structure demonstrates the interconnection between theory, design, analysis and outcomes. It gives a vivid framework for the result interpretation. The arrows on a visual diagram of this framework would be theories to hypotheses, hypotheses to groups, analysis to groups and groups to outcomes.

Results

This section provides the research results of the experiment and statistics analysis. The outcomes include the impact of pricing strategies on willingness to pay, purchase behaviour and consumer trust (22). The review is systematic. First, the important variables are described. Thereafter, descriptive and inferential statistics are represented by three major tables. Following it, the influence on WTP, purchase intent and trust is discussed. The ANOVA and regression were used to compare group outcomes in the study. Moderator effects were tested by the PROCESS macro by Hayes.

Variables Explanation

A device is defined as the nature of the device that consumers use, which could be desktops, laptops, or smartphones. The type of device influences the user experience and navigation ability. Mobile clients tend to browse and take hasty steps. Users on the desktop spend more time in comparison. The country is the geographic location of the consumers. Economic disparities and cultural preferences can be influencers of behaviour and willingness to pay (23). An operating system is defined as the software of the device, i.e., Windows android, or iOS. It may influence the appearance of interfaces and compatibility of apps (24). The same website can have a different appearance in various operating systems. Client type differentiates between new and existing users. Returning users might have higher expectations about new users (8). Repeat users tend to have a higher level of familiarity with the platform and do not rely on the first impressions. Browsing history, search patterns and previous purchases are recorded in behaviour. Such pieces of data allow custom pricing and marketing (25). Users whose browsing history is rich might be given different charges compared to their new visitors.

Table 1: Between- subject Effects, Product Vendor 1 (Dependent Variable: T1_V1P_Mean)

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5085.15	71	71.62	17.010	0.000
Intercept	305441.30	1	305441.30	72539.47	0.000
Device	63.99	1	63.99	15.198	0.000
Country	194.18	2	97.09	23.057	0.000
OS	518.23	2	259.11	61.537	0.000
ClientType	79.08	1	79.08	18.781	0.000
Behaviour	118.47	1	118.47	28.134	0.000
Device * Country	43.77	2	21.88	5.197	0.008
Country * OS	388.95	4	97.24	23.093	0.000
Country * Behaviour	67.41	2	33.71	8.005	0.001
Error	303.17	72	4.21		
Total	307746.49	144			

Note: R Squared = 0.944 (Adjusted R Squared = .888). Only significant effects are shown.

The corrected model is significant ($F = 17.01$, $p < 0.001$), as illustrated in Table 1. This implies that the combination of the independent variables will be a significant predictor of the outcome. Of the personal factors, OS was the most significant ($F = 61.54$, $p < 0.001$). Strong predictors were also Country ($F = 23.06$, $p < 0.001$) and Behaviour ($F = 28.13$, $p < 0.001$). Client type and device type were also important. There were some two-way interactions that were important and they included the Device by Country and the Country by OS. Interactions of higher order were largely insignificant. The value of R-squared of 0.944 indicates that the model captures the majority of the variance. This implies that the consumer response is explained by the chosen variables almost entirely. The strong influence of OS implies that the design of platforms is important. The experience of the users on other operating systems might be different on the same site. This may influence their price perception.

Table 2: Between-subject Effects, Product Vendor 2 (Dependent Variable: T2_V2S_Mean)

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	74833.28	71	1053.99	327.50	0.000
Device	6918.28	1	6918.28	2149.64	0.000
Country	13728.66	2	6864.33	2132.88	0.000
OS	5888.20	2	2944.10	914.79	0.000
ClientType	552.96	1	552.96	171.82	0.000

Behaviour	902.90	1	902.90	280.55	0.000
Device * Country	7142.79	2	3571.39	1109.70	0.000
Country * OS	775.18	4	193.79	60.22	0.000
Country * Behaviour	390.18	2	195.09	60.62	0.000
Error	231.72	72	3.22		
Total	1310010.87	144			

Note: R Squared = 0.997 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.994). Only significant effects are shown.

Table 2 presents the results of Product Vendor 2. This model was of great importance (F = 327.50, p < 0.001). The strongest effects were on the devices (F = 2149.64) and country (F = 2132.88). ClientType, OS and Behaviour were noteworthy too. Interactions between devices that are key and two-way were very high, like Device by Country (F = 1109.70). R-squared of 0.997 means almost perfect variance coverage. This, however, can indicate possible overfitting because there are numerous predictors. It is worth noting that the F-statistics in Table 2 are much larger than those in Table 1. They indicate that service-associated purchases are more responsive to study variables as compared to product purchases. This is understandable since services, in most cases, need more trust and consumer interaction. The value of R-squared is large, indicating that the variables selected in this study are almost inclusive in the set of factors that are important in-service pricing perception.

Table 3: Between-subject Effects on Services Overall

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	286423.86	71	4034.14	59.97	0.000
Device	8849.87	1	8849.87	131.57	0.000
Country	50640.72	2	25320.36	376.43	0.000
OS	18273.35	2	9136.68	135.83	0.000
ClientType	1310.63	1	1310.63	19.49	0.000
Behaviour	3154.42	1	3154.42	46.90	0.000
Device * Country	1813.91	2	906.96	13.48	0.000
Country * OS	3423.02	4	855.75	12.72	0.000
Error	4843.04	72	67.26		
Total	20325690.00	144			

Table 3 shows the results of services in total. The model was significant (F = 59.97, p < .001). The strongest predictor was the Country (F = 376.43), then OS (F = 135.83) and then the Device (F = 131.57). This was also important in Behaviour and Client Type. The interaction of the form of Device by Country was meaningful (F = 13.48). These findings prove that various influences in digital markets form consumer perceptions. The general trend throughout all three tables is the same. Good predictors of consumer response are device, Country, OS and Behaviour. Interactions are usually important in two directions, particularly those of the country. Interactions of higher order are hardly ever significant. This implies that the issue of individual factors and groups of two factors is important, but three or more factors do not contribute significantly to the explanation. The overall generalisability of the findings is supported by these findings across product type and vendors.

Impact of Pricing Strategies on Willingness to Pay

The pricing strategy was a major influencer of WTP (F = 17.01, p <0.001). The highest average WTP was found in Group C, which was assigned to nudging pricing. The second group was B, which the control group followed. The non-moving pricing group (Group A) had a mean WTP of $48.63. Mean WTP of Group B (Dynamic pricing) was $52.97. The mean WTP of Group C (dynamic pricing and nudges) was 58.84. These findings indicate that products become valuable with dynamic pricing. The perceived value was also increased by adding nudges such as urgency messages. Group A and Group C are more than $10 per item apart. In a huge retailer that makes millions of transactions, this is a substantial revenue gain. This, however, comes at the expense of consumer perception. Group C had a higher WTP, which was partially due to emotional pressure and not due to real value evaluation.

Behavioural Nudges and Purchase Intent

There were varying conversion rates through the groups. Group C contained the largest conversion rate at 32%. Group B had a rate of 24%. Group A had 18%. These differences were confirmed by chi-square to be significant (X2 = 28.7, $p < 0.01$). Nudges on behaviour led to a reduction in hesitation and improved quicker decisions. This is in favour of the peripheral route of the ELM. It was also indicated by the survey data that the nudges went unnoticed by many of the users. However, these users themselves stated that they felt a sense of urgency. Previous studies have validated that consumers who are not so attentive to a product are the most responsive to nudging efforts (26). The difference between Group A and C is something significant. The gap between the conversion rates of 14 percentage points is huge in e-commerce terms. This observation indicates that nudges can be used as an effective method to sell. Nevertheless, the fact that consumers are unaware of being nudged is an ethical issue. In case the consumers are not aware they are being influenced, the issue of informed consent arises.

Trust and Perceptions of Fairness

Nudges and dynamic pricing made people spend more; however, those features led to trust issues. Group C respondents (44%) said that they also felt that prices were somehow fixed. The remaining 39% of them were doubtful about the process of transparency in pricing. In Group A, only 19% had those concerns. These results coincide with the previous studies of trust erosion due to ambiguous prices. Regression analysis revealed that the perception of fairness was a very good predictor of trust. This was a significantly negative relationship (Beta = -0.32, $p < 0.01$). This implies that low perceived fairness resulted in low trust. The positive short-term outcomes can lead to long-term loss of trust when consumers lack pricing logic. The rise of differences among groups is conspicuous. Group C was even more sceptical than Group A. This implies that dynamic pricing combined with nudges is a cumulative trust burden. Individually, each of the elements can be acceptable. The combination of them will drive the consumer perception beyond a level of acceptability. Such a discovery has a direct bearing on platform designers and marketers.

Discussion

Findings Compared to Prior Research

This is research that validates the fact that dynamic pricing increases willingness to pay. The average increase of WTP at the dynamic pricing of $48.63 to $52.97 is in line with previous results. Kramer, Friesen and Shelton revealed that there are conditions under which airline passengers are willing to accept dynamic prices. Nevertheless, their research was limited to one industry, where there were price standards. The present research generalises this observation to various types of products and prices. The additional growth to $58.84 after radio-shocking confirms the ELM forecast that peripheral signals increase expenditures. This observation is in line with Pajmon and Strle, who discovered that nudges of urgency increase the rates of conversion. It is worth mentioning that the effect size in the present study is larger than previously reported in previous studies. This is likely due to the fact that nudges used in conjunction with dynamic pricing generate a more compelling atmosphere. The two processes reaffirm the consumer spending mechanism. The trust findings, however, paint a different picture. Although Garbarino and Lee discovered that dynamic pricing leads to less trust, they examined one retail situation. This is furthered in the present research, which presents that 44% of nudge-exposed users believed that the prices were manipulated. This is greater than the 19% in the fixed pricing group. This is a bigger gap than the one that was reported by Paraschiv and Ayadi in their research on the dynamic pricing ethics. One reason is that nudges that go together with price adjustments increase the sense of manipulation. Alternatively, present-day customers may have become more conscious about the pricing strategies than ever. The practices of dynamic pricing have been enlightened by social media and consumer advocacy groups. This heightened sensitivity can have the effect of making online prices in general more questionable to consumers.

The high impact of the types of devices and the country is also significant. Data Vendor 2 revealed the strongest predictor, which is Device (F = 2149.64). This is a contrast of Vendor 1, which had OS predominance. Such inconsistency can be a result of variations in the product categories. Purchases on the basis of service might be based more on the experience of the device, rather than on purchases of products. Van der Heijden, Verhagen and Creemers discovered that ease of use is important in regard to online trust. This confirms the notion that the quality of devices influences consumer attitude towards products in different ways. Vendor 2 (F = 2132.88) also had a very high-Country effect. This would be because of the economic and cultural disparities in price sensitivity. Customers in the developed world might also be more accepting of price adjustments than developing market customers. The correlation between the variables of Device and Country (F = 1109.70) indicates that these variables are both interacting. They influence the perception of prices in complex and interrelated forms.

Strategic and Ethical Implications

The results indicate that dynamic pricing should be applied thoughtfully by businesses. Pricing processes must be responsive to demand and not impair trust in companies. Over-customisation of customers to make a profit can be counterproductive. When consumers feel discriminated against in terms of pricing, they lose their loyalty. The close connection between the user experience and WTP indicates a very specific investment priority. The online shops must have an emphasis on ensuring that the sites are user-friendly, quick and responsive (27). The data on market segmentation also indicate that consumers will pay a premium when they appreciate the business practices. Firms that invest in proper design and open pricing are capable of having superior long-term outcomes.

According to survey findings, consumers do not like personalised pricing. Two-thirds of the respondents claimed that it was discriminatory. This raises significant issues of privacy and consent in data-driven marketing (28). Companies that employ price discrimination need to take into account their social responsibility. The willingness to pay statistics indicate that the consumer is willing to be subject to a certain degree of price dispersion. They, however, respond negatively when the price appears to be pegged on personal details. In front of fair and acceptable dynamic pricing, there is a thin line between dishonest discrimination. Companies should develop proper communication regarding the reason behind the difference in price. The trust gap in this study can be minimised through transparency in pricing logic.

Consumer digital literacy should also be brought up. Nudges less influenced more digitally literate consumers in this study. They would tend to shop on more platforms before buying. The implication of this finding on education and policy is apparent. Digital literacy would assist consumers to make informative decisions on online markets. Meanwhile, it may encourage retailers to adopt a more honest pricing strategy.

Market Monopolisation Concerns

Big companies have an advantage in data-driven pricing. Advanced pricing tools are employed by such companies as Booking.com, Uber and Airbnb (29). This poses a threat of market monopoly. The smaller companies and physical retailers are unable to implement the same tools because they lack the necessary technical resources (30). This forms an unbalanced market that is favourable to the technology-intensive companies. The implications of the policy are important. The regulators might have to take into account whether AI-based pricing will provide undue benefits to the market. Antitrust regulations can be adjusted to deal with data-driven price control. Left alone, there will be an increment in the distance between the large retailers and the small retailers.

Limitations

This paper has a number of limitations that need to be taken into account. First, the data was gathered within a period of six months. This might not reflect long-term trends or long-term seasonal effects of more than a single cycle. Second, the 10,000 participants used as the sample were predominantly in the North American and European markets. This restricts the relevance of the findings to Asian, African, or Latin American markets. Third, the research paper was limited to business-to-consumer transactions. The pricing dynamics and decision-making processes are different in business-to-business markets. Fourth, the Pricing Blocker tool restricts replicability (31). Such proprietary software may not be available to other researchers. Fifth, survey data that is self-reports can be subject to bias in response. The respondents may not reflect well on their attitudes of fairness and trust. Sixth, the between-subjects design makes it impossible to trace the changes at the individual level across time. A longitudinal or a within-subjects design may offer more data (32).

Lastly, the analysis was dedicated to five e-commerce sites. The outcomes can vary on platforms that are niche or region-specific.

Conclusion

Overview

This paper has analysed the impact of dynamic prices and behavioural nudges on consumer willingness to pay in the online market. It adopted a quasi-experimental research design involving 10,000 respondents in three groups. The theoretical framework had made use of ELM, TAM and Price Anchoring Theory. The Pricing Blocker tool and post-session surveys were used to collect data over a period of six months. This experiment was done to test three hypotheses, namely, WTP, conversion rates and trust. The information proved all three hypotheses. As it is found, there are benefits of pricing strategies based on commercial and ethical costs.

Key Contributions

There are three significant contributions of the study. First, it gives empirical data that the combination of dynamic pricing and nudges increases WTP significantly. When the price was cut by 10%, the purchase probability was up by 15%. This proves that pricing is one of the most powerful items to influence consumer purchase. Second, it shows the strength of behavioural nudges to increase the conversion rates. Group C had a 32% conversion rate compared to Group A, which was almost twice that. This demonstrates that emotional persuasion can be better than logical price persuasion to certain consumers. Third, it measures the cost of trust in these strategies. The observed result that 44% of users who were subjected to nudges felt manipulated is a crucial revelation to the practitioners. This lack of trust would lower repeat purchases and customer value in the long term.

Implications for Policy and Practice

E-commerce companies have to strike a balance between ethical accountability and revenue objectives. The transparent pricing and easy-to-use interfaces contribute to keeping the consumer's trust. The research indicates that the majority of consumers (68%) are not okay with price discrimination. The regulations that need to be pursued by the policymakers are those that demand transparency in digital market prices. Ethical nudging standards in the industry would also have a positive impact on the consumers. Companies are expected to reveal the instances of personalised prices. They ought also to enable the consumers to exclude data-driven pricing. Regulators might ensure that platforms reveal to consumers why they are charging them a specific price. This would not harm consumer autonomy but would still permit innovation.

Future Research Directions

There are a number of questions to ask in the future. Longitudinal research must be used to monitor the impact of dynamic pricing on brand loyalty over several years. These studies would indicate whether the erosion of trust due to pricing strategies increases over a period of time. Generalisability would be enhanced with cross-cultural studies in Asian, African and Latin American markets. The attitude of consumers towards dynamic pricing might change with culture and economic situations. Research on the B2B e-commerce pricing would close a very big gap. Nudges and dynamic prices might be less effective with business buyers compared to the individual consumer. There is also a need to carry out research on the moderating effect of digital literacy on reaction to pricing strategies. Knowledge about this association would influence the education policy and marketing ethics. Lastly, the use of AI in pricing and its impact on consumer autonomy should be given a particular discussion. The role of AI-driven pricing in market fairness is going to be even more significant with the more sophisticated AI-driven pricing.

Abbreviations

AI: Artificial Intelligence, ANOVA: Analysis of Variance, B2B: Business-to-business, B2C: Business-to-consumer, ELM: Elaboration Likelihood Model, OS: Operating System, TAM: Technology Acceptance Model, VIF: Variance Inflation Factor, WTP: Willingness to Pay.

Acknowledgment

None.

Author Contributions

Christian Niemeier: conceptualised the study, developed the Pricing Blocker system, aperformed data collection, Richard Pospisil: conducted the formal analysis, supervised the research. Both authors contributed to the writing and final approval of the manuscript..

Conflict of Interest

The authors reported no potential conflict of interest.

Data Availability

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Assistance

There is no use of AI in the concept framing or manuscript writing.

Ethics Approval

The institutional research board approved the study. The subjects were also sensitized to the tracking feature of browsers. The latter, they could withdraw as they pleased. There was no data put in it that could be traced to an individual. The responses were all stored to be used in academics. The price adjustments were characteristic of the standard activity of such platforms as Amazon and Booking.com. The form of practices applied in e-commerce did not include misleading procedures. The research adhered to all pertinent human subject's research disciplines.

Funding

None.

References

1. Spann M, Zeithammer R, Bertini M, Haruvy E, Jap SD, Koenigsberg O, Mak V, Popkowski Leszczyc P, Skiera B, Thomas M. Beyond posted prices: the past, present and future of participative pricing mechanisms. Cust Needs Solut. 2018;5(1-2):121-136. doi:10.1007/s40547-017-0082-y
2. Paraschiv C, Ayadi N. Ethicality of online dynamic pricing: an empirical investigation of consumer perception of ethical risks. J Revenue Pricing Manag. 2025;24(3):285-299. doi:10.1057/s41272-024-00497-3
3. Cacioppo JT, Petty RE, Feinstein JA, Jarvis WBG. Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: the life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. Psychol Bull. 1996;119(2):197-253. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.197
4. Kramer A, Friesen M, Shelton T. Are airline passengers ready for personalised dynamic pricing? A study of German consumers. J Revenue Pricing Manag. 2018;17(2):115-120. doi:10.1057/s41272-017-0122-0
5. Davis FD. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Q. 1989;13(3):319-340. doi:10.2307/249008
6. Ongchoco JDK, Walter-Terrill R, Scholl BJ. Visual event boundaries restrict anchoring effects in decision-making. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2023;120(44): e2303883120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2303883120
7. van der Heijden H, Verhagen T, Creemers M. Understanding online purchase intentions: contributions from technology and trust perspectives. Eur J Inf Syst. 2003;12(1):41-48. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000445
8. Bandara R, Fernando M, Akter S. Privacy concerns in e-commerce: a taxonomy and a future research agenda. Electron Mark. 2020;30(3):629-647. doi:10.1007/s12525-019-00375-6
9. Chandra S, Verma S, Donthu N, Lim WM. Personalisation in personalised marketing: trends and ways forward. Psychol Mark. 2022;39(8):1529-1562. doi:10.1002/mar.21670
10. Garbarino E, Lee OF. Dynamic pricing in internet retail: effects on consumer trust. Psychol Mark. 2003;20(6):495-513. doi:10.1002/mar.10084
11. Schmidt AT, Engelen B. The ethics of nudging: an overview. Philos Compass. 2020;15(4):e12658. doi:10.1111/phc3.12658
12. Weinmann M, Schneider C, vom Brocke J. Digital nudging. Bus Inf Syst Eng. 2016;58(6):433-436. doi:10.1007/s12599-016-0453-1
13. Rhum K. Information fiduciaries and political microtargeting: a legal framework for regulating political advertising on digital platforms. Nw U L Rev. 2021;115(6):1829-1874. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/nulr/vol115/iss6/6/
14. Sandholtz W. Authoritarianism, international human rights, and legal change. In: Sloss DL, editor. Is the International Legal Order Unravelling? New York: Oxford University Press; 2022. doi:10.1093/oso/9780197652800.003.0013
15. Simon HA. A behavioural model of rational choice. Q J Econ. 1955;69(1):99-118. doi:10.2307/1884852
16. Seele P, Dierksmeier C, Hofstetter R, Schultz MD. Mapping the ethicality of algorithmic pricing: a review of dynamic and personalized pricing. J Bus Ethics. 2021;170(4):697-719. doi:10.1007/s10551-019-04371-w
17. Liang TP, Lai HJ. Effect of store design on consumer purchases: an empirical study of online bookstores. Inf Manag. 2002;39(6):431-444. doi:10.1016/S0378-7206(01)00129-X
18. Geyer-Klingeberg J, Hang M, Rathgeber A. Corporate financial hedging and firm value: a meta-analysis. Eur J Financ. 2020;27(6):461-485. doi:10.1080/1351847X.2020.1816559
19. Hayes AF. Introduction to mediation, moderation and conditional process analysis: a regression-based approach. The Guilford Press, New York; 2013. doi:10.1111/jedm.12050
20. Nass C, Moon Y. Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. J Soc Issues. 2000;56(1):81-103. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00153
21. Novak TP, Hoffman DL, Yung YF. Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A

structural modelling approach. Mark Sci. 2000;19(1):22-42. doi:10.1287/mksc.19.1.22.15184
22. Akter S, Wamba SF. Big data analytics in E-commerce: a systematic review and agenda for future research. Electron Mark. 2016;26(2):173-194. doi:10.1007/s12525-016-0219-0
23. Cowan S. Third-degree price discrimination and consumer surplus. J Ind Econ. 2012;60(2):333-345. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6451.2012.00479.x
24. Elegido JM. The ethics of price discrimination. Bus Ethics Q. 2015;21(4):633-660. doi:10.5840/beq201121439
25. Schmidt S, Bijmolt THA. Accurately measuring willingness to pay for consumer goods: A meta-analysis of the hypothetical bias. J Acad Mark Sci. 2020;48(3):499-518. doi:10.1007/s11747-019-00666-6
26. Norman DA. The way I see it: technology first, needs last: the research-product gulf. Interactions. 2010;17(2):38-42. doi:10.1145/1699775.1699784
27. Martin K. Understanding privacy online: development of a social contract approach to privacy. J Bus Ethics. 2016;137(3):551-569. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2565-9
28. Larson J, Mattu S, Angwin J. Unintended consequences of geographic targeting. Technology Science. 2015. https://techscience.org/a/2015090103/
29. Milano S, Taddeo M, Floridi L. Recommender systems and their ethical challenges. AI Soc. 2020;35(4):957-967. doi:10.1007/s00146-020-00950-y
30. Wolfinbarger M, Gilly MC. Shopping online for freedom, control and fun. Calif Manage Rev. 2001;43(2):34-55. doi:10.2307/41166074
31. Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: system characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts. Int J Man Mach Stud. 1993;38(3):475-487. doi:10.1006/imms.1993.1022
32. Wagner RL, Pacheco NA. Name-your-own-price as participative pricing strategy: a review of the literature from 2001-2017. J Strategic Mark. 2020;28(7):583-600. doi:10.1080/0965254X.2019.1569108

How to Cite: Niemeier C, Pospisil R. The Psychology of Price: Analysing Consumer Willingness to Pay in Online Marketplaces. Int Res J Multidiscip Scope. 2026; 7(2): 846-856.
DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2026.v07i02.08781