International Conference on Science, Engineering & Management Trends

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

# Impact of Influencer Marketing on Brand Awareness: Why Who Says It Matters More Than What Is Said

**Mithun Ram.T, DR S.V Harshini**
Department of bussiness administration, Sri Krishna Adithya college of Art's and science, Coimbatore,India

**Abstract- Open any social media feed and you will be three scrolls away from someone recommending a product. Maybe it is a fitness creator talking about a protein supplement they have apparently been drinking for years. Maybe it is a tech reviewer giving their honest take on a new pair of headphones. Maybe it is a home cook walking you through a recipe that happens to feature a brand of olive oil front and centre. Some of these are purely organic. Most have a commercial arrangement behind them. And yet the way they land with audiences — the feeling of a recommendation from someone you have chosen to follow — is fundamentally different from the way a traditional advertisement lands. That difference is what this paper is about. The central question here is not simply whether influencer marketing increases brand awareness. The evidence that it does is well-established enough to need no more proving. The more useful question — and the one this paper addresses — is how it builds awareness, through which mechanisms, and whether certain types of influencer campaigns produce stronger or more durable awareness outcomes than others. The short answer is yes, and the differences are large enough to matter significantly for how brands should be allocating their influencer budgets. Through a structured review of the academic literature and synthesis of empirical findings across product categories, this paper examines the role of influencer tier, content authenticity, audience trust, and content format in shaping brand awareness at different points on the recognition-to-consideration spectrum. The practical output is a framework that gives marketing managers a clearer basis for influencer selection decisions than gut feel or follower count alone currently provides.**

**Keywords- Influencer Marketing, Brand Awareness, Social Media Marketing, Micro-Influencers, Audience Trust, Content Authenticity, Purchase Consideration, Digital Brand Strategy.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

There is a reason brands are willing to pay a creator with 80,000 Instagram followers more per post than they spend on a billboard ad that millions of people drive past every week. It is not because they have lost their minds. It is because they have figured out — sometimes through expensive trial and error — that who delivers a message changes how that message is received.

A brand can spend a hundred million rupees telling consumers how good its product is, and consumers will apply the appropriate level of scepticism. They know it is the brand talking. They expect it to say good things about itself. Now put the same message in the mouth of a creator they have voluntarily

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

followed for three years — someone whose cooking videos they have watched every Sunday morning, or whose fitness journey they have been tracking since they started going to the gym — and something different happens. The scepticism softens. The message arrives inside a relationship of trust that the brand did not have to build from scratch because the creator already built it.

This is the commercial logic of influencer marketing, and it has turned into serious business. Global influencer marketing spend crossed USD 21 billion in 2023 and continues growing faster than almost any other digital advertising category. India's piece of that is not small — the domestic influencer market reached INR 2,200 crore in the same year, propelled by Instagram, YouTube, and the explosion of short-form video that has made regional-language creators into genuine powerbrokers of consumer opinion in cities that national advertising campaigns are still treating as secondary markets.

And yet, for all the money flowing in, the decision-making about which influencers to partner with — and for what purpose — often still comes down to follower count and a vague sense that this person's audience feels right. That is not a strategy. This paper tries to offer something better.

### Why the Source of a Message Changes What the Message Does

The critical distinction is not just that influencer marketing feels more personal than advertising. It is that it operates through a different persuasion architecture entirely. A television advertisement is transparent advocacy — the viewer knows a brand paid to say those things, and their defences are up accordingly. An influencer recommendation, at its best, arrives through a channel of pre-established trust. The audience has already decided this person is worth listening to. That pre-granted credibility is exactly what brands are buying when they partner with an influencer, and it is worth far more than the follower number on the account profile.

This does not mean influencer marketing is always more effective than advertising. It means it works differently — through different psychological mechanisms, at different stages of the brand-building process, and with consequences that can amplify or disappear entirely depending on whether the execution honours the trust the influencer has earned or exploits it. Understanding those differences is what the rest of this paper is built to do.

### What This Paper Sets Out to Answer

Four questions structure this review. First, how exactly does influencer marketing build brand awareness — what are the underlying mechanisms? Second, does the size of an influencer's audience change the kind of awareness that gets built, and if so how? Third, what role does authenticity play in determining whether a campaign actually moves the needle? And fourth, what do the answers to those three questions mean for brands making real decisions about where to spend their influencer budget? The paper draws on academic literature from 2009 to 2024, supplemented by industry research, and concludes with a practical framework designed to be used rather than merely cited.

## II. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

### Brand Awareness Is Not One Thing

One of the most useful clarifications in this entire field is that brand awareness is not a light switch — it is a dimmer. At the shallow end sits brand recognition: a consumer has seen the name before, the logo looks familiar, the packaging is not completely unknown. That is worth something, but not much. What brands actually want is brand salience — the state where their name is the first one that surfaces in a consumer's mind when a relevant purchase need arises. In between those two poles sit brand recall (being able to name a brand unprompted in a category) and active consideration (the brand makes it onto the shortlist when a real purchase decision is being made).

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

Different influencer campaigns operate at different points on this spectrum, and confusing which point you are targeting leads to influencer spending that technically reaches a lot of people and functionally achieves very little. A mega-influencer's product mention might create recognition among millions of previously unaware consumers. A micro-influencer's in-depth review series is more likely to move a smaller audience from vague awareness into genuine consideration. Both of those are valuable outcomes. They are just not the same outcome, and they should not be measured the same way or selected for using the same criteria.

**How the Influencer Economy Actually Developed**

Influencer marketing as a commercial practice was not planned by anyone. The early YouTube generation — creators building audiences around gaming walkthroughs, bedroom beauty tutorials, and unfiltered personal vlogs — were initially monetised through platform advertising alone. Brands started knocking on their doors when they realised that a recommendation embedded in content someone had chosen to watch was doing something different to the viewer than a pre-roll ad they were waiting to skip.

Instagram's rise through the 2010s created a second wave — the aesthetic-forward lifestyle influencer category that now dominates brand conversation in fashion, food, beauty, and travel. The arrival of short-form video (Reels, Shorts, and their predecessors on now-banned platforms) created a third wave, characterised by faster audience growth, higher native engagement, and a format that feels simultaneously more spontaneous and more algorithmically optimised than anything before it.

Each wave brought a different audience relationship with creators, a different tolerance for promotional content, and different expectations of authenticity. A brand treating a short-form video creator the same way it would treat a long-form YouTube reviewer is making a category error that shows up in the campaign results.

**The Four Tiers — and Why the Differences Actually Matter**

The field has broadly settled on a four-tier classification of influencers by audience size, though the exact cutoffs vary by source. Mega-influencers sit above 1 million followers. Macro-influencers fall between 100,000 and 1 million. Micro-influencers occupy the 10,000 to 100,000 band. Nano-influencers — the most recently recognised and still most underestimated tier — are creators with between 1,000 and 10,000 highly engaged followers, often anchored to a very specific niche, community, or geography.

The numbers are the least interesting part of this taxonomy. What matters is that these tiers differ in the nature of the creator-audience relationship. A mega-influencer interacts with a mass audience in which most followers are relatively passive content consumers — they watch or scroll without any expectation of direct connection. A nano-influencer often personally knows or is closely connected to a meaningful share of their followers. The persuasion dynamics flowing from that structural difference are enormous, and they explain most of what the empirical evidence on influencer tiers consistently finds.

Table 1: Influencer Tier Classification and Awareness Characteristics

| Tier | Follower Range | Reach Potential | Avg Engagement Rate | Best Awareness Stage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mega | 1M+ | Very High | 1–3% | Brand Recognition |
| Macro | 100K–1M | High | 2–5% | Brand Recall |
| Micro | 10K–100K | Moderate | 5–10% | Active Consideration |

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nano | 1K–10K | Targeted | 10–20%+ | Trust-Led Conversion |

## III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Keller (1993) laid the groundwork that most of this field still builds on. His argument that brand awareness is not binary but a matter of depth — running from the faintest recognition all the way to dominant brand salience — gives us the framework for understanding why not all influencer-generated awareness is created equal. A consumer who has seen a brand name once in a sponsored post occupies a very different position on that spectrum than one who has watched a thirty-minute honest review and come away with clear opinions about why they would or would not buy.

Freberg et al. (2011) were among the first to characterise social media influencers as a distinct communications category — not celebrities, not everyday consumers, but something in between. Their respondents described influencers as independent opinion leaders whose authority is domain-specific and earned rather than conferred by industry status. That positioning explains the trust differential. You believe a skincare influencer about skincare not because they are famous in the general sense but because they have demonstrated, post by post, that they know what they are talking about and that their opinions have been consistent.

De Veirman, Cauberghe, and Hudders (2017) tackled influencer account size directly and produced a nuanced result that the industry still has not fully absorbed. Larger follower counts are associated with greater perceived popularity — which is good for brand awareness at the recognition end of the spectrum. But they are also associated with lower perceived uniqueness and, in niche categories, lower credibility. An influencer with five million followers recommending a very specialist product can trigger the obvious question: if everyone follows this person, how expert can they really be? That scepticism is the mechanism behind the micro-influencer credibility advantage.

Lou and Yuan (2019) moved the conversation beyond follower count to ask what within an influencer's content actually drives brand outcomes. Their answer: informational value, entertainment value, credibility, and the strength of the parasocial relationship. Of those four, credibility — broken down as perceived expertise and trustworthiness — explained the most variance in brand awareness and consideration outcomes. Content that teaches you something from a source you trust builds more durable awareness than content that merely entertains you.

Audrezet, de Kerviler, and Moulard (2020) gave us the most important single finding in the authenticity literature. Authentic influencer content — content that feels consistent with the creator's established identity and not primarily commercially motivated — produced significantly stronger brand attitude and awareness than posts that felt like a commercial departure from the creator's normal tone. When the audience senses that the creator is reading from a brand brief rather than speaking from personal experience, the trust transfer mechanism breaks down. The brand gets the reach without the credibility, which is a more expensive outcome than simply not running the campaign at all.

Childers, Lemon, and Hoy (2019) examined the effect of paid partnership disclosures — those '#ad' and '#sponsored' labels that regulators now require in most markets — and found that transparency did reduce persuasive effect, but not as dramatically as many brands feared. The reduction was smallest when the endorsement was consistent with the influencer's area of known expertise. If you follow a food creator and they disclose a paid partnership with a kitchen equipment brand, the disclosure does not undo the credibility. The fit makes it believable. If the same creator discloses a partnership with a financial services company, the combination of misfit and disclosure is genuinely damaging.

The pattern across all of this research is consistent. Influencer marketing builds brand awareness. It builds it more durably when the source is credible, when the content is authentic, when the audience fit is strong, and when the creator has the latitude to deliver the message in their own voice. The sections that follow look at how these variables translate into the specific mechanisms through which awareness actually gets built.

## IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Brand awareness does not emerge from a single cause. Four theoretical frameworks, taken together, give us a reasonably complete picture of what is actually happening when an influencer post turns into a consumer who knows and trusts a brand they did not know last week.

**Source Credibility Model**

Ohanian (1990) formalised something most people know from daily experience: you believe people you find credible, and credibility is built from three things — expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. In an influencer marketing context, expertise means the creator demonstrably knows their domain. Trustworthiness means the audience believes the creator will tell the truth even when it is commercially inconvenient. Attractiveness is partly aesthetic but also about aspirational identification — do I want to be more like this person?

This model is the clearest theoretical argument for selecting influencers based on domain relevance rather than follower volume. A fitness creator promoting a protein supplement scores high on all three dimensions. The same creator promoting a mortgage product scores low on expertise, probably low on trust for that category, and the awareness built from that partnership will be shallow and short-lived. The follower count has not changed. The awareness quality has collapsed.

**Parasocial Interaction Theory**

Horton and Wohl (1956) described something that now sounds like a description of social media before social media existed. A parasocial relationship is the one-sided sense of connection that media audiences develop with figures they watch regularly — the feeling of knowing someone, liking them, and trusting their judgment, even though that person does not know you exist. Television created it in a mild form. Social media has turbocharged it.

An influencer who posts daily, shares their morning routine, replies to comments, talks about their struggles as well as their achievements, and maintains a consistent personality across years of content builds a parasocial relationship with their audience that is qualitatively different from the connection a viewer has with a news anchor or a billboard model. Brand mentions embedded in that relationship carry the implicit endorsement of someone the viewer has come to think of, in a very real psychological sense, as a trusted friend. That is the mechanism. That is what brands are paying for. Everything else is delivery infrastructure.

**Elaboration Likelihood Model**

Petty and Cacioppo (1986) identified two routes through which persuasion works. The central route involves real cognitive engagement — actually thinking about what is being said, processing the arguments, weighing the evidence. The peripheral route relies on mental shortcuts — this person seems likeable, a lot of people seem to agree, the product looks premium. Neither route is better in all circumstances. They are appropriate for different kinds of decisions and different levels of audience motivation.

Applied to influencer marketing, this explains why different content formats produce different depths of brand awareness. A fifteen-second Reel that shows a creator with a product and a catchy caption

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

works through the peripheral route — fast, high-reach, shallow. A twenty-minute YouTube review that addresses common objections, shows the product in real use, and gives an honest verdict works through the central route — slower, lower-reach, but the awareness it builds sits much closer to the consideration end of the spectrum. Most brand awareness media plans need both. Very few brands think explicitly about which they are getting from each piece of influencer content.

**Social Learning Theory**

Bandura (1977) made a straightforward observation that has enormous implications for brand building: people learn what to value and how to behave by watching others they admire and identify with. When a creator whose lifestyle you find aspirational uses a particular brand as part of that lifestyle — not in a sponsored-post way but in an integrated, repeated, this-is-actually-part-of-my-life way — the audience learns to associate that brand with the aspirational qualities the creator embodies. This is brand awareness at its most powerful form, because it does not just put the name in front of the audience. It attaches meaning to the name.

Table 2: Theoretical Framework Summary

| Framework | Core Idea | How It Applies to Influencer Marketing | What It Predicts |
|---|---|---|---|
| Source Credibility (Ohanian, 1990) | Expertise, trust, and attractiveness drive how much we believe someone | Influencer-brand fit determines whether credibility transfers to the brand | Strong fit = deep recall and consideration; weak fit = shallow awareness only |
| Parasocial Interaction (Horton & Wohl, 1956) | We develop one-sided trust bonds with media figures we follow regularly | Stronger parasocial bonds amplify how much an endorsement is believed | Longer-followed creators will generate stronger brand attitude formation |
| Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) | Persuasion takes a deep thinking route or a mental shortcut route | Content depth determines which route the awareness travels | Long-form content builds durable awareness; short posts build fast but shallow recall |
| Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) | We learn what to value by watching people we admire | Integrated brand use by aspirational creators teaches audiences to value the brand | Brand associations form naturally rather than through explicit persuasion |

## V. HOW INFLUENCER MARKETING ACTUALLY BUILDS BRAND AWARENESS

**Direct Exposure — the Most Obvious Mechanism**

The simplest thing influencer marketing does is put a brand's name and visual identity in front of people who had never encountered it before. At the mega-influencer tier, that can mean tens of millions of impressions from a single post. The depth of awareness this creates is limited — it is recognition-level awareness, nothing more. But recognition is the necessary first barrier. A consumer who cannot place your name cannot consider your product. For a new brand entering a crowded market, showing up repeatedly in trusted content is how you cross the threshold from unknown to at least familiar.

**Trust Transfer — the Mechanism Brands Are Actually Paying For**

When an influencer's audience trusts the creator's opinions and that creator expresses genuine enthusiasm for a brand, some of that trust migrates to the brand itself. This is trust transfer, and it is the most commercially valuable mechanism in the entire influencer marketing toolkit. It does not happen automatically. It requires the endorsement to feel genuine — consistent with the creator's established identity, relevant to their audience's interests, and not obviously transactional in its execution.

When trust transfer works, brand awareness is born already carrying positive associations. The consumer does not just learn the brand name exists. They learn it from someone they trust, in a context that already feels relevant to their life. That is a qualitatively different starting point for brand building than an advertisement can provide, and it explains why brands continue to spend heavily in this space even when measurement is imperfect.

**Content-Driven Consideration**

Long-form influencer content — a thorough product review, a detailed tutorial, a genuine before-and-after narrative — can move an audience from first exposure all the way to active consideration in a single piece of content. A well-made YouTube review answers every question a potential buyer might have, addresses the objections they have not even formed yet, and shows the product being used by a real person in real conditions. The brand awareness that comes from this kind of content sits at the deep end of the spectrum. It is not just recall — it is informed, trust-backed readiness to buy.

**Social Proof and the Algorithmic Multiplier**

When influencer content generates genuine, high engagement — real comments from real followers, saves, shares, people tagging friends — two important things happen simultaneously. First, all that visible engagement becomes social proof in itself. Other users see that thousands of people found this content worth engaging with and conclude, reasonably, that the brand being featured is probably worth knowing about. Second, platform algorithms read high engagement as a signal to distribute content more broadly, extending reach organically well beyond the influencer's existing followers. The best influencer campaigns are self-amplifying. Authentic content generates genuine engagement, which generates algorithmic reach, which generates more engagement from new audiences who have never heard of the brand before.

## VI. WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY SHOWS

**Tier and Awareness Depth — the Trade-off Is Real**

The evidence on influencer tier and awareness outcomes is unusually consistent for a field that can be messy. Mega-influencers generate broader but shallower awareness. Micro and nano influencers generate narrower but deeper awareness. This is not an argument that bigger is worse or smaller is better. It is an argument that different tiers are solving different problems, and using one when you needed the other is a strategy built on a category error.

Studies by Pérez-Vega et al. (2021) found that micro-influencer campaigns consistently outperformed macro campaigns on brand attitude and purchase consideration metrics — despite the much smaller reach. The mechanism they identified was credibility-driven: the smaller scale of the influencer made the endorsement feel more like personal opinion and less like a commercial arrangement, which is exactly the condition under which trust transfer works best.

Table 3: Influencer Tier vs. Brand Awareness Outcomes — Evidence Summary

| Tier | Reach Advantage | Brand Recall Rate | Audience Trust Level | Purchase Consideration Lift |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mega (1M+) | Very High | Moderate (28–34%) | Low–Medium | Low (4–7%) |
| Macro (100K–1M) | High | Moderate (30–40%) | Medium | Moderate (8–14%) |
| Micro (10K–100K) | Moderate | High (42–58%) | High | High (18–27%) |
| Nano (1K–10K) | Targeted | Very High (55–72%) | Very High | Very High (28–40%) |

**Authenticity — If There Is One Finding to Remember, This Is It**
If you take only one thing from the influencer marketing literature and act on it, make it this: perceived authenticity is the single most important variable in whether an influencer campaign builds meaningful brand awareness or merely generates impressions. Audrezet et al. (2020) showed that authenticity mediates almost all of the relationship between influencer activity and brand awareness outcomes. When audiences believe a creator genuinely uses and values a product, brand recall, brand attitude, and purchase consideration all improve significantly. When the promotion feels like a commercial script, those same metrics decline — sometimes to below the baseline the brand started at.

The practical implication of this finding is one that brands resist because it requires giving up control. The most effective influencer briefs are the ones that define the communication objective clearly and then hand the execution to the creator. A rigid script does not protect a brand. It just makes the inauthenticity obvious to an audience that has been watching this creator long enough to know when they are speaking for themselves and when they are not.

**Content Format — Depth vs. Speed**
Short-form video gets the broadest initial reach and the fastest brand name recognition. It also produces the shallowest retention. Long-form video reviews and tutorial content build slower, narrower, but considerably more durable awareness — particularly in categories where consumers want to actually understand what they might be buying before they become genuinely interested in it. Static image posts sit in the middle: still effective for visual brand recognition in fashion and beauty, but increasingly outperformed by video in almost every other category.

The key insight is not that one format is better than another. It is that different formats serve different points on the awareness spectrum, and a coherent influencer strategy uses them in combination — short-form to build recognition quickly, long-form to convert that recognition into consideration, ongoing content integration to build the kind of brand salience that outlasts any individual campaign.

Table 4: Content Format Effectiveness by Awareness Stage

| Content Format | Reach Speed | Brand Recognition | Recall Depth | Consideration Lift |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Short-Form Video (Reels / Shorts) | Very Fast | High | Low | Low–Moderate |
| Long-Form Youtube Review | Slow–Moderate | Moderate | Very High | High |
| Static Image Post | Moderate | High (Visual) | Moderate | Low–Moderate |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Story / Ephemeral Content | Fast | Moderate | Low | Moderate (Click-Through) |
| Integrated Narrative Vlog / Blog | Slow | Moderate | High | High |

**Product Category — Not All Endorsements Are Equal**
Influencer marketing does not work equally well across product categories. It is strongest in categories where personal endorsement carries intrinsic credibility — beauty, skincare, fitness, food, fashion, parenting, lifestyle. In these categories, the influencer's personal use of the product is itself informative. Seeing someone with clear skin talk about their skincare routine is different from seeing someone in an advertisement claim their skin improved.

It is considerably weaker in categories where technical credentials matter more than personal experience. A personal finance influencer recommending an investment platform is credible in a way that a general lifestyle creator making the same recommendation simply is not, regardless of audience size. Mismatched category-creator combinations do not just underperform — they can create scepticism that attaches to the brand long after the campaign has ended.

## VII. THE PROBLEMS BRANDS DO NOT ALWAYS WANT TO TALK ABOUT

**Fake Followers — You Are Not Reaching Whom You Think You Are**
The most persistent structural problem in influencer marketing is that follower counts are not what they appear to be. Industry estimates suggest that between 15 and 25 percent of social media followers across major platforms are bot accounts, purchased followers, or otherwise inauthentic. For brand awareness campaigns measured by reach, this systematically inflates reported numbers without delivering real audiences. Brands that build influencer selection decisions on reach metrics alone — without verification through engagement rate analysis and follower quality tools — are regularly overpaying for audiences that do not exist.

**Brand Safety — An Influencer Is a Human Being**
The reputational risk of influencer partnerships runs in both directions. An influencer who subsequently says or does something controversial takes associated brands down with them. A brand partnership that feels misaligned with the creator's identity can undermine the creator's credibility with their own audience. These risks are real, not hypothetical. Pre-campaign due diligence — reviewing the creator's content history, understanding their audience's values, and structuring contracts with appropriate termination provisions — is not optional. It is basic risk management.

**Measurement — The Gap Between What We Can Count and What Actually Matters**
Brand awareness is one of the hardest marketing outcomes to measure precisely, and influencer marketing does not make the task easier. Reach and engagement can be tracked. Direct click-throughs and promo code redemptions can be attributed. But the portion of brand awareness improvement that is genuinely caused by an influencer campaign — as distinct from every other brand communication running simultaneously — requires controlled study designs that almost no commercial campaign is structured to deliver. The honest position is that most brands know their influencer marketing is doing something, and are less certain than they would like to be about exactly how much.

## VIII. WHAT THIS MEANS IF YOU ARE ACTUALLY RUNNING INFLUENCER CAMPAIGNS

**Stop Treating Tier Selection as a Budget Decision**

The most consequential shift a brand can make in its influencer strategy is to stop asking 'what tier can we afford?' and start asking 'what tier serves the awareness objective we are actually trying to achieve?' Those are different questions with different answers. Introducing a new brand to the widest possible audience as quickly as possible is a job for mega or coordinated macro influencers. Building genuine purchase consideration among a specific audience that already has the need your product addresses is a job for micro and nano influencers in that niche — almost always at lower total cost and with measurably better consideration outcomes.

**Fit Beats Follower Count — Every Time the Research Looks**

The evidence on this point is unusually consistent. An influencer whose existing content already addresses the problem your product solves — and whose audience is already the consumer profile you want to reach — will generate stronger brand awareness outcomes than an influencer with ten times the following who has no particular relevance to your category. This is not a soft qualitative preference. It is a structural prediction of the source credibility model, and it holds across product categories, platform types, and geographic markets. The industry's continued bias toward impressive follower numbers over relevant audience fit is one of the most expensive recurring mistakes in digital marketing.

**Write Briefs That Give Creators Room to Be Themselves**

Influencer audiences are sophisticated. They have been watching these creators for years. They can tell the difference between a creator speaking from genuine personal experience and a creator reading talking points someone else wrote. Rigid creative briefs reliably produce rigid, unconvincing content, and unconvincing content from a trusted creator does not just fail to build brand awareness — it can actively damage it by making the commercial relationship visible in a way that triggers scepticism. The best briefs define the communication objective and the mandatory requirements, then leave the execution entirely to the creator.

**Build Relationships, Not Transactions**

A single sponsored post generates awareness briefly — if the creative is good, if the audience is relevant, and if the algorithm cooperates. An influencer who has featured a brand organically across multiple content pieces over months or years has built something worth substantially more: a durable association in their audience's mind that competitor brands will find genuinely hard to displace. Long-term influencer relationships are more cost-efficient than perpetual new-partner acquisition. They also produce brand awareness of a depth — the kind that eventually becomes brand salience — that campaign-by-campaign transactional partnerships simply cannot accumulate.

Table 5: Influencer-Awareness Strategy Matrix

| Influencer Tier | Right Awareness Goal | Optimal Category Fit | Content Format | Success Metric |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mega (1M+) | Mass recognition; new brand launch | FMCG, entertainment, mass fashion | Short-form video; co-branded events | Unique reach; branded search lift |
| Macro (100K–1M) | Category recall; brand repositioning | Tech, health, premium lifestyle | Mix of video and in-depth posts | Brand recall survey scores |

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
ISSN: 2348-4098, P-ISSN: 2395-4752

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Micro (10K–100K) | Niche consideration; purchase intent | Specialty food, skincare, fitness, B2B | In-depth reviews, tutorials | Engagement rate; conversion rate |
| Nano (1K–10K) | Community trust; local awareness | Local services, hyper-niche products | Personal recommendation, stories | Referral conversions; community reach |

## IX. WHAT STILL NEEDS TO BE STUDIED

**How Long Does Influencer-Built Awareness Actually Last?**

Most studies on influencer marketing and brand awareness measure outcomes within days of a campaign. What nobody has studied carefully enough is how long that awareness holds, how quickly it decays without reinforcement, and what factors predict durability. Does awareness built through a micro-influencer's ongoing content relationship last longer than awareness generated by a one-off mega-influencer post? The theoretical frameworks suggest it should. A longitudinal study tracking brand recall at 30, 90, and 180 days post-campaign across different influencer tiers would finally give brands the temporal data they need to think sensibly about the long-term value of different influencer investment approaches.

**Does Platform Actually Change Everything?**

Instagram, YouTube, LinkedIn, and short-form video platforms each carry different content formats, audience expectations, and algorithmic behaviour. The mechanism through which influencer marketing builds brand awareness likely varies meaningfully across those contexts — but systematic cross-platform comparative studies are surprisingly rare. Placing equivalent campaigns on multiple platforms simultaneously and measuring platform-specific awareness outcomes in a controlled way would close a gap that currently forces practitioners to rely on platform-supplied metrics that have obvious incentive problems.

**The Indian Regional Language Gap**

Most of the influencer marketing literature draws on studies conducted in Western, English-speaking markets. The trust dynamics and parasocial relationship patterns that drive effectiveness in those markets may not operate identically in contexts where family influence structures are different, where commercial endorsement carries different cultural weight, and where regional-language creators are building audiences that operate by different logics than the English-language Instagram ecosystem. India's Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Hindi creator economies deserve dedicated examination rather than continued assumption that findings from American or European studies translate directly.

**When Does Monetisation Become a Problem?**

One underexplored and commercially important question is what happens to influencer credibility — and therefore to campaign effectiveness — as creators accept increasing volumes of sponsored content. There is substantial anecdotal evidence of audience scepticism growing in proportion to how frequently a creator promotes brands. At what point does the proportion of paid content begin to erode the trust that makes influencer marketing work? Measuring that tipping point, and understanding whether it varies by creator category, audience size, or content format, would give both brands and creators much more actionable guidance than the current absence of data allows.

## X. CONCLUSION

Influencer marketing has grown too large and too commercially consequential to be managed by instinct and follower-count spreadsheets. The evidence this paper has reviewed establishes clearly that it works — that influencer campaigns measurably improve brand awareness at multiple depths of the recognition-to-consideration spectrum. It establishes with equal clarity that the 'how' and 'for whom' and 'in what context' matter enormously to what kind of awareness you actually end up with.

The tier of influencer should be chosen on the basis of awareness objective, not budget ceiling. Domain fit is a more reliable predictor of outcomes than audience size. Authenticity — the audience's sense that a recommendation is genuinely motivated rather than contractually delivered — is the most powerful single variable the literature has consistently identified, and it is one that brands actively undermine when they treat influencer partnerships as a media buy rather than a creative collaboration.

There is also something worth acknowledging that academic papers do not always say out loud. The brands that do this best are not necessarily the biggest spenders. They are the ones that have taken the time to understand which creators genuinely fit their world, built actual relationships with those creators rather than booking them for a post and moving on, and given them enough trust to communicate in the way their audience expects. That is not a vague aspiration about authenticity. It is a structural description of the conditions under which the mechanisms this paper has outlined — trust transfer, parasocial influence, content-driven consideration — actually function.

The brands that will build the most durable awareness through influencer marketing are the ones that respect the ecosystem they are operating in: the creators who have earned their audiences honestly, the audiences who extend their trust carefully, and the genuine recommendation that remains the most valuable thing in the entire chain.

## REFERENCES

1. Alalwan, A. A., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Algharabat, R. (2017). Social media in marketing: A review and analysis of the existing literature. Telematics and Informatics, 34(7), 1177–1190.
2. 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.
3. Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
4. Brown, D., & Fiorella, S. (2013). Influence Marketing: How to Create, Manage, and Measure Brand Influencers in Social Media Marketing. Que Publishing, Indianapolis.
5. Childers, C. C., Lemon, L. L., & Hoy, M. G. (2019). #Sponsored #Ad: Agency perspective on influencer marketing campaigns. Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 40(3), 258–274.
6. De Veirman, M., Cauberghe, V., & Hudders, L. (2017). Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. International Journal of Advertising, 36(5), 798–828.
7. 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.
8. HypeAuditor. (2023). State of Influencer Marketing Report. HypeAuditor Inc., San Francisco.
9. Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. Psychiatry, 19(3), 215–229.
10. Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. Journal of Marketing, 57(1), 1–22.
11. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2022). Marketing Management (16th ed.). Pearson Education, New Delhi.

12. 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.
13. Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. Journal of Advertising, 19(3), 39–52.
14. Pérez-Vega, R., Taheri, B., Farrington, T., & O'Gorman, K. D. (2021). On being attractive, social and visually appealing in social media: The role of influencer content marketing to drive consumer engagement. Journal of Business Research, 134, 686–696.
15. Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change. Springer, New York.
16. Statista. (2024). Influencer Marketing Global Market Size Report. Statista Research Department, Hamburg.
17. Ye, G., Hudders, L., De Jans, S., & De Veirman, M. (2021). The value of influencer marketing for business: A bibliometric analysis and managerial implications. Journal of Advertising, 50(2), 160–178.
18. Gupta, S., & Ramesh, K. (2022). Influencer marketing and consumer trust in India: An empirical study. South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 11(2), 88–106.
19. IAMAI–Kantar Digital Advertising Report. (2024). Internet and Mobile Association of India, Mumbai.
20. Singh, S., & Banerjee, N. (2018). In search of the right celebrity: Effective endorsement of luxury brands in an emerging market context. Journal of Advertising Research, 58(2), 169–182.