HOW INFLUENCER-BRAND RELATIONSHIP CAN BE PERCEIVED AS AUTHENTIC

Gwarlann De Kerviler IESEG SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT LEM-CNRS (UMR 9221) Raphaelle BUTORI ESSEC

Cite as:

De Kerviler Gwarlann, BUTORI Raphaelle (2022), HOW INFLUENCER-BRAND RELATIONSHIP CAN BE PERCEIVED AS AUTHENTIC. *Proceedings of the European Marketing Academy*, 51st, (107243)

Paper from the 51st Annual EMAC Conference, Budapest, May 24-27, 2022



HOW INFLUENCER-BRAND RELATIONSHIP CAN BE PERCEIVED

AS AUTHENTIC

Abstract

Because of the size of their audience and the relationship nurtured with followers, influencers

have become key elements in brands communication strategies. A central concept in

influencer marketing is authenticity: individuals expect influencers to be authentic in their

content, and they expect brands to be authentic in their values. In this research, we move

away from a one-sided perspective of authenticity to study how a relationship between a

brand and an influencer can be authentic. Through three studies, we identify two factors

which signal that a relationship between a brand and an influencer is authentic: intrinsic

motivations and transparency. However, the respective weights of these two drivers differ:

for influencers, intrinsic motivations are central, whereas for brands, transparency exert the

strongest influence. These findings reveal two potential distinct strategies when entering into

a partnership: Influencer intrinsic authenticity and Brand open-book authenticity.

Key words

Authenticity; Influencer Marketing; Brand-Influencer relationship

Track

Digital Marketing and Social Media

1. Introduction

The rise of social media created new affordances for some individuals who gained attention for the content they post and obtain a form of social capital through their audience. At the same time, brands search for new communication tools to address a younger target resistant to traditional communication practices (Audrezet, De Kerviler & Moulard, 2020). Thus, partnerships between recognized brands and popular influencers can be mutually beneficial. However, such collaborations create new challenges in how influencers and brands are perceived by consumers. At a time when consumers search for meaningful consumption, marketers and influencers are pushed to project authenticity and to develop long-term authentic and trustworthy partnerships.

In recent years, authenticity has become a keyword in the influencer industry. Research indicates that consumers trust independent (or at least perceived as such) third parties more than corporations as influencers' messages are perceived as "one of the few forms of real, authentic communication" (Scott, 2015, p. 295), providing apparently genuine, personal recommendations. However, influencers are sometimes criticized for promoting counterfeits or products from drop shipping. Influencers' authenticity might also be challenged when they collaborate with brands if they showcase products they would not ordinarily be interested in, leading to a perception that their collaborations are inauthentic.

While research in psychology has largely examined relationship authenticity between two people (Lopez & Rice, 2006), the specific case of a brand-influencer relationship has been overlooked while we believe it is a unique relationship for a few reasons. First, the relationship presents a contractual dimension but goes beyond a purely commercial exchange as there needs to be a mutual fit for the collaboration to work. Second, the relationship involves a human entity (the influencer) and a non-human entity (the brand), which is humanized through the brand managers behind it. We aim to fill a research gap by investigating authenticity of a relationship between a brand and an influencer. The paper builds on the two dimensions of an authentic relationship: transparency and motivations. These two perspectives have been separately acknowledged as inducing authenticity but limited research investigated the distinct consequences of using either transparency or motivations or both, and no study examined whether these dimensions should be applied differently for the two partners in the relationship.

2. Literature review

2.1. Influencer Marketing

Freberg et al. (2011) defined influencers as "a new type of independent third-party endorser who shapes public attitudes through blogs, tweets, and the use of other social media" (p.90). Marketers can leverage influencers' social and attention capital by incorporating brand information within their posts in return for rewards. Influencer marketing appears to be an effective and cost-efficient marketing tool, as it is often not perceived by consumers as advertising and guarantees a wide reach to highly engaged audiences. Brands may pursue a purely instrumental goal, selecting influencers who generate the highest return on investment and not be transparent with them so as to control the content shared. Influencer on their end may be motivated to collaborate with popular brands in order to enhance their recognition or to obtain personal rewards (e.g. free products, invitations to events or even monetary compensation). Moreover, in order to appear as fully independent in their choice of content, influencers may not disclose information and go into deceptive communication practices. At a time when authenticity is increasingly important, researchers have used oxymorons to highlight the tensions between realness and promotional logic of influencer practice, among them 'staged authenticity' and 'contrived authenticity' (Joo et al. 2019).

2.2 Brand-Influencer Relationship authenticity

As per the perspective of Colucci and Pedroni (2021), we argue that authenticity in the case of influencer marketing is a shared responsibility and the result of the work of both, the brand and the influencer, engaged in the relationship. We build our conceptualization of authenticity perceptions on the framework of self-determination theorists, who highlight two components of authenticity: intrinsic motivation and transparency (Ryan & Ryan, 2019).

When authentic, a person is volitionally engaged and intrinsically motivated to behave in ways that are congruent with her or his values and interests (Ryan & Deci, 2006). Intrinsically motivated behaviors are those that emanate from one's innate desires and passions, involving the "active engagement with tasks that [one] finds interesting" (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 233). Kernis and Goldman (2006) highlight intrinsic motivation as an essential component of authenticity, as one is "acting in ways congruent with one's values, preferences, and needs," whereas inauthenticity entails "acting merely to please others or to

attain rewards or avoid punishments" (p. 302). This has also been applied to brands to show how extrinsically motivated brands are perceived as inauthentic (Cinelli and LeBoeuf, 2020).

Transparency is also a key component of authenticity. Reis and Patrick (1996) defined authentic relationships as involving a reciprocal process of self-disclosure, intimacy, and trust. Kernis and Goldman (2006) described three elements in authentic relationships: openness and truthfulness, letting others "see the real you," and being authentic and not "fake." Past research also applied the notion of transparency to brand, claiming that brands that are transparent, sincere and honest towards the consumer are perceived as more authentic (Napoli et al. 2014). Thus, we suggest that a Brand-Influencer relationship is perceived as authentic when it entails intrinsic motivations and transparency. As such we hypothesize: *H1: An intrinsically motivated brand-influencer relationship is perceived more authentic than one extrinsically motivated*

H2: A more transparent brand-influencer relationship is perceived as more authentic

We go one step further and recognize that consumers may have different expectations in terms of the degree of motivations and transparency that the brand on one side and the influencer on the other side should have in the relationship. In particular, because brands can be viewed as inherently business oriented, consumers may not expect a high degree of intrinsic motivations from brand managers but may expect a high degree of transparency in how they conduct their business. Brands may be perceived as having potentially things to conceal about their processes and consumers search for signs of compliance with promises and absence of deception. In contrast, because influencers may be inherently perceived as being passionate about their topic and activity, consumers may expect a high degree of intrinsic motivations in how they conduct their mission but may be more tolerant regarding the degree of transparency given the recognized promotional dimension of the influencer business. We thus suggest: *H3: A brand-influencer relationship is perceived more authentic when the brand is transparent than when the influencer is transparent H4: A brand-influencer relationship is perceived more authentic when the influencer is intrinsically motivated than when the brand is intrinsically motivated*

3. Methodology

This research uses an experimental approach with three complementary studies, conducted with female respondents, aged 18 to 40 years old. We used a three-item semantic

differential scale for perceived authenticity of the brand-influencer relationship: *The* relationship is: Real – Fake; Genuine – Phony; Authentic – Inauthentic (Ewing et al., 2012) 3.1 Study 1

The goal of Study 1 is to test the differential effect of transparency and motivations of the partners on perceived authenticity of the relationship. We recruited 120 Prolific female panelists between 18 and 40 years old ($M_{age} = 25.3$ years) who were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions of a 2 (Transparency: High vs. Low) \times 2 (Motivations: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic) between-subject design (see Appendix). Respondents were confronted with a hypothetical collaboration between an influencer (given a generic name of "Lou") and a brand (given a made-up name "La Roseraie"), then asked to evaluate the authenticity of their relationship. In the low transparency condition, the message stressed that the influencer and the brand shared limited, only publicly available information while in the high transparency condition the message stressed that they both were open to share rich information and to disclose personal data with each other openly so they better know each other. In line with the seminal work of Deci and Ryan on motivations, the message in the intrinsic motivation condition stressed a mutual crush and that the influencer and the brand found pleasure in and were excited about the collaboration in itself, while in the extrinsic motivation condition, the message stressed a mutual commercial interest, and that the influencer and the brand needed the collaboration as a mean to an end. A manipulation check confirmed that our manipulations of transparency and of motivations were successful such that respondents evaluated transparency and motivations as intended.

In support of H1 and H2, an ANOVA shows that both motivations (F(1, 116) = 24.63; p < .01) and transparency (F(1, 116) = 36.21; p < .01) exert significant main effects on perceived authenticity of the relationship. People in the High Transparency condition perceive the relationship as being more authentic (M = 4.32, SD = 1.49) compared to those in the Low Transparency condition (M = 2.79, SD = 1.54). In addition, people in the Intrinsic Motivation condition perceive the relationship as being more authentic (M = 4.18, SD = 1.65) than people in the Extrinsic Motivation condition (M = 2.93, SD = 1.50). These results confirm our proposal that even in a contractually based relationship, psychological factors have an influence on perceived authenticity. It is interesting to note that transparency and motivations do not interact to influence the perceived authenticity of the relationship (F(1, 116) = .07; p = 79), suggesting that they have distinct impacts and that one does not influence the other.

3.2 Study 2a and 2b

The goal of these two studies is to complement the first study by disentangling the effect of alignment/misalignment between the influencer and the brand in terms of transparency (Study 2a) and in terms of motivations (Study 2b). For that purpose, we continued with the relationship between Lou and La Roseraie and created 8 scenarios as follows (see Appendix):

- In the four scenarios of Study 2a, we vary the influencer transparency (High *vs.* Low) and the brand transparency (High *vs.* Low) in a 2 × 2 between-subject design. In the High transparency condition for the influencer, Lou is presented as being fully open about her tastes and style as well as sharing openly her expectations. In the High transparency condition for La Roseraie, the brand is presented as sharing their vision and giving access to personal information. In the Low transparency conditions, Lou and La Roseraie are described as much more cautious, not giving access to personal or strategic information.
- In the four scenarios of Study 2b, we vary the influencer motivations (Intrinsic *vs.* Extrinsic) and the brand motivations (Intrinsic *vs.* Extrinsic) in a 2 × 2 between-subject design. In the intrinsic motivations for the influencer, the scenario presents Lou as being fan of the brand and truly enjoying the collaboration in itself. In the Intrinsic motivations for La Roseraie, the scenario presents the brand as really interested in knowing more about the influencer and sharing its tastes. The extrinsic motivations conditions highlight the economic side of the partnership and the collaboration is described as a financial necessity for both the influencer and the brand.

We collected data from 324 Prolific female respondents: 162 for Study 2a ($M_{age} = 26.1$ years) and 162 for Study 2b ($M_{age} = 25.3$ years). For each study, participants were randomly assigned to one of the 4 conditions. Our manipulation of transparency and motivations was again successful. Corroborating H3, people confronted with the Transparent Brand perceive the relationship as more authentic (M = 4.35, SD = 1.37) compared to those confronted with the Transparent Influencer (M = 3.35, SD = 1.22; t(78) = 3.45, p < .01). Confronted with the Intrinsically Motivated Influencer (M = 3.58, SD = 1.46), respondents perceive the relationship as more authentic in comparison with people confronted with the Intrinsically Motivated Brand (M = 3.21, SD = 1.45). However, this difference does not reach significance (t(78) = 1.14, p = .26), so we cannot confirm H4. Interestingly, we find an interaction effect,

such that when one of the partners is intrinsically motivated, then the effect of the motivation of the other partner on relationship authenticity is strengthened $(F(1, 158) = 5.16; p = .02)^1$.

4. Theoretical contribution

The research herein offers evidence that motivations and transparency both concur to generate a perception that a brand-influencer relationship is authentic. A brand can be authentic not just in terms of how it addresses customers but also other stakeholders such as communication partners. In the same vein, an influencer can be authentic not only in its behaviors towards followers but also towards brands. A very interesting finding is that Influencer and Brand may pursue two distinct authenticity strategies when entering into a partnership: Influencer intrinsic authenticity and Brand open-book authenticity. Authentic influencers are those that are intrinsically motivated rather than extrinsically motivated. That is, they are driven by their inner desires and passions when they decide which brand to promote and how to work with them. Authentic brands are transparent with their partners, disclose information, explain their strategies and open the doors of their offices.

5. Managerial implications

The results provide guidance for authenticity management when influencers engage in collaborations with brands. Influencers who are not intrinsically motivated when they enter into a partnership may fail in the long run as they adopt an overly commercial orientation and are not true to themselves. Influencers' role should be fulfilled around products and brands that fit their tastes and interests. For brands, transparent authenticity represents an opportunity to maintain trustworthy relationships and enhance the brand image. By providing access to internal information, not only managers allow influencers to better capture the meaning of the brand, but they also project a more authentic brand image. Finally, we also identify an interaction effect such that the intrinsic motivation of one partner strengthens the effect of the motivation of the other partner. As such, influencers should express openly their intrinsic motivations so that the brand managers also appreciate the collaboration in itself and take pleasure in sharing tastes, styles and values with the influencer.

¹ We also replicated Study 1 findings and found that respondents in the High \times High Transparency condition perceive the relationship as being more authentic (M = 4.93, SD = 1.43) compared to those in the Low \times Low Transparency (M = 2.82, SD = 1.33; t(80) = 6.89, p < .01), and that people in the Intrinsic Motivation condition perceive the relationship as being more authentic (M = 5.24, SD = 1.42) than people in the Extrinsic Motivation condition (M = 2.54, SD = 1.13; t(80) = 9.50, p < .01).

7. Limitations and future research

As we wanted to avoid biased answers if respondents recognized a brand or an influencer, we worked with fictional brand and influencers, while followers are often exposed to partnerships with well-known brands and familiar influencers. Future research could be conducted in collaboration with an agency to test real partnerships with brands. It might be that even if a popular brand is not transparent, followers believe that the influencer knows the brand sufficiently well that there is no need for information disclosure. It might also be that if the influencer is not intrinsically motivated but collaborates with a brand because followers love it, then the influencer is still considered authentic. Moreover, we examined a one-time collaboration, while it might be interesting to investigate how the relationship is perceived over time. Also, if an influencer is constantly changing partners, then followers might question his/her intrinsic motivations for each brand promoted.

References

- Audrezet, A., de 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.
- Cinelli, M. D., & LeBoeuf, R. A. (2020). Keeping it real: How perceived brand authenticity affects product perceptions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *30*(1), 40-59.
- Colucci, M., & Pedroni, M. (2021). Got to be real: An investigation into the co-fabrication of authenticity by fashion companies and digital influencers. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14695405211033665.
- Ewing, D. R., Allen, C. T., & Ewing, R. L. (2012). Authenticity as meaning validation: An empirical investigation of iconic and indexical cues in a context of "green" products. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *11*(5), 381-390.
- 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.
- Joo, S., Miller, E. G., & Fink, J. S. (2019). Consumer evaluations of CSR authenticity: Development and validation of a multidimensional CSR authenticity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 98, 236-249.
- Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: Theory and research. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *38*, 283-357.
- Lopez, F. G., & Rice, K. G. (2006). Preliminary development and validation of a measure of relationship authenticity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *53*(3), 362.

- Napoli, J., Dickinson, S. J., Beverland, M. B., & Farrelly, F. (2014). Measuring consumer-based brand authenticity. *Journal of business research*, 67(6), 1090-1098.
- Reis, H. T., & Patrick, B. C. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component processes. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 523–563). The Guilford Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will?. *Journal of personality*, 74(6), 1557-1586.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Ryan W.S. & Ryan R.M. (2019), Toward a Social Psychology of Authenticity: Exploring Within-Person Variation in Autonomy, Congruence, and Genuineness Using Self-Determination Theory, Review of General Psychology, 23(1), 99–112.
- Scott, David M. (2015). The New Rules of Marketing and PR (5th Edition). New York, NY: Wiley

Appendix

Scenario Study 1

	Transparency HIGH	Transparency LOW
Intrinsic	Hello, Today, i am very happy to tell you how i	Hello, Today, i am very happy to tell you how i developed a
Motivations	developed a partnership with my favorite brand La	partnership with my favorite brand La Roseraie :-). I met the
	Roseraie:-). I met the brand manager at a party and	brand manager at a party and from the start I felt a common
	from the start I felt a common crush so that after	crush so that after some talks, we really wanted to work
	some talks, we really wanted to work together and	together and had plenty of ideas for a nice collaboration! A
	had plenty of ideas for a nice collaboration! A true	true happiness for me who is a big fan of the brand for many
	happiness for me who is a big fan of the brand for	years. We started rapidly and the interactions have been
	many years. We started rapidly and the interactions	purely professional. We briefly exchanged a few fact-basd
	have been intimate. We have exchanged at length in	useful pieces of information. The brand directed me to their
	full transparency and a strong mutual trust with La	website so that i know their products. They gave me some
	Roseraie. I had access to their offices, laboratory	official documents detailing the history and mission of the
	and factory as well as all internal documents to	brand. However, I did not access their office nor laboratory
	discover the essence and DNA of La Roseraie. On	because information and fabrication process are
	my side, I was always able to show my real face	confidential. On my side, I showed the face of the influencer
	during our interactions. I felt that I could really	that the brand was expecting during our interactions but I
	open myself without filters.	never opened myself.
Extrinsic	Hello, Today, i am very happy to tell you how i	Hello, Today, i am very happy to tell you how i developed a
Motivations	developed a new partnership with La Roseraie. It is	new partnership with La Roseraie. It is a recent brand which
	a recent brand which needs partnerships to be	needs partnerships to be known. I met the brand manager
	known. I met the brand manager during a	during a professional event because i needed to find
	professional event because i needed to find	collaborations. Without collaborations, it is difficult to live
	collaborations. Without collaborations, it is difficult	off being an influencer. Thus, I was reassured we could
	to live off being an influencer. Thus, I was	agree on working together, even if I am not a big fan of the
	reassured we could agree on working together, even	brand. We started rapidly and the interactions have been
	if I am not a big fan of the brand. We started rapidly	professional. We briefly exchanged a few fact-based useful
	and the interactions have been intimate. We have	pieces of information. The brand directed me to their
	exchanged at length in full transparency and a	website so that i know their products. They gave me official
	strong mutual trust with La Roseraie. I had access	documents detailing the history and mission of the brand.
	to their offices, laboratory and factory as well as all	However, I did not access their office nor laboratory
	internal documents to discover the essence and	because information and fabrication process are
	DNA of La Roseraie. On my side, I was always	confidential. On my side, I showed the face of the influencer
	able to show my real face during our interactions. I	that the brand was expecting during our interactions but I
	felt that I could really be myself without filters.	never opened myself.

Scenario Study 2a

	Transparency Influencer HIGH	Transparency Influencer LOW
Trans-	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a partnership
parency	partnership with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand	with La Roseraie:-). I met the brand manager at a party.
Brand	manager at a party. Since our first interactions, i really	Since the beginning of our interactions, I was cautious not
HIGH	played the game and shared openly my expectations. I	to say too much about my expectations. I did not give any
	opened my personal photo files and my posts, I	personal information and I showed the face of the
	explained my approach, my tastes and my style. I	influencer that the brand was expecting during our
	opened myself and I showed my real face without	interactions. I never really opened myself.
	filter.	However, La Roseraie truly disclosed itself and honestly
	La Roseraie truly disclosed itself and honestly	explained to me its processes and objectives. They open
	explained to me its processes and objectives. They	their doors and gave me access to their office, its factory
	open their doors and gave me access to their office, its	and all internal document so that i could discover the
	factory and all internal document so that i could	essence and DNA of La Roseraie.
	discover the essence and DNA of La Roseraie	
Trans-	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a partnership
parency	partnership with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand	with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand manager at a party.
Brand	manager at a party. Since our first interactions, i really	Since the beginning of our interactions, I was very
LOW	played the game and shared openly my expectations. I	cautious not to say too much about my expectations. I did
	opened my personal photo files and my posts, I	not give any personal information and I showed the face of
	explained my approach, my tastes and my style. I	the influencer that the brand was expecting during our
	opened myself and I can say that I showed my real face	interactions. I never really opened myself.
	without filter.	Also, the brand did not disclose itself and did not explain
	However, the brand did not disclose itself and did not	its objectives. They directed me to their website so that I
	explain its objectives. They directed me to their	know the products and gave me some documents. I did not
[.	website so that I know the products and gave me some	have access to their offices or their laboratory, because
[]	documents. I did not have access to their offices or	information is confidential.
1	their laboratory, because information is confidential.	

Scenario Study 2b

	Motivations Influencer HIGH	Motivations Influencer LOW
Motivations	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a partnership
Brand HIGH	partnership with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand	with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand manager at a party.
	manager at a party. La Roseraie only works with	La Roseraie only works with influencers that correspond
	influencers that correspond them well. they followed	them well. they followed me for a long time and knowe
	me for a long time and know well my tastes and my	well my tastes and my approach. They really liked it and
	approach. They really liked it and it was coherent with	it was coherent with the brand DNA.
	the brand DNA.	However, on my side, i do not want to know if i like a
	Also for me, it is exactly the brand i want to work	brand or not, if i like their style and all thatwhat is
	with because i love their values and style. What is	important to me it that the collaboration is financially
	important to me is to collaborate with brands that I	interesting and grows my community. It is just business
	love. I need to have a crush to make it work.	after all.
Motivations	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a	Hello, Today i will tell you how i developed a partnership
Brand	partnership with La Roseraie :-). I met the brand	with La Roseraie:-).I met the brand manager at a party.
LOW	manager at a party.	It seemed that La Roseraie was not willing to know
	It seemed that La Roseraie was not willing to know	whether they appreciated my style, my values, and allI
	whether they appreciated my style, my values, and	had the feeling that what was important for the brand was
	allI had the feeling that what was important for the	that the collaboration was financially interesting and that
	brand was that the collaboration was financially	it gives them access to my community. For La Roseraie it
	interesting and that it gives them access to my	is just business after all.
	community. For La Roseraie it is just business after	On my side, i do not want to know if i like a brand or not,
	all.	if i like their style and all thatwhat is important to me it
	However for me, it is exactly the brand i want to work	that the collaboration is financially interesting and grows
	with because i love their values and style. What is	my community. It is just business after all.
	important to me is to collaborate with brands that I	
	love. I need to have a crush to make it work.	