LUISS

Department of *Business and Management*

Degree Program in *Management and Computer Science*

Chair of Introduction to Computer Programming

AI-Driven Dynamic Pricing in Ride-Hailing Services

Supervisor
Alessio Martino

Candidate
Omar Regragui (ID 282511)

Academic Year 2024/2025

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1 The Rise and Controversy of Dynamic Pricing

Prices in digital markets are now often set dynamically based on current demand, supply and other factors. At first, the model was used by airlines to fill seats and boost profits, but now it is used in e-commerce, hospitality and mobility services as well. In theory, dynamic pricing helps prices reflect what consumers are willing to pay. Yet, the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) and real-time personalization in marketing has led to worries about transparency, fairness and manipulating consumers.

Ride-hailing has seen dynamic pricing become more advanced and debated. Uber and Lyft have gone beyond just matching supply and demand and now use AI to adjust fares and learn from what users do, their previous transactions and the patterns in their area. They make it possible to charge different fares for similar journeys, which is efficient to set up but can be confusing for users. Therefore, dynamic pricing is now seen as both a technical and a social and ethical concern, involving economics, law, behavioral psychology and digital governance.

1.2 Literature Context: What We Know So Far

When it comes to the academic literature in dynamic pricing, they are well rooted in economics and operations research. Varian and Phillips provide the foundational framework on price discrimination and revenue optimization. Their models focus more on the role of price elasticity, segmentation, and temporal factors to maximize marginal revenue and seller returns. More recent work has focused on the algorithmic implementation of these concepts. Calvano et al. demonstrates how reinforcement learning agents can evolve and learn to set supra competitive prices, raising regulatory concerns. These papers are fundamental to understand dynamic pricing as a continuously adaptive system instead of a static rule.

The role of AI in pricing has introduced new challenges. Ezrachi and Stucke argue that autonomous pricing methods lead to tacit collusion without actual human intent, clearly complicating the work of antitrust laws. Vuletic et al extend this argument to the ride hailing sector in which platforms like uber act as hub in a "hub and spoke" pricing structure. This make uber the controller of both sides of the market , driver compensation and consumer fares, raising questions about neutrality and fairness.

Behavioral economics also adds a layer of complexity. Kahneman and Tversky's prospect theory and Thaler's work on mental accounting showed that consumers do not respond to fare changes in a rational way. Real drivers are actually the perception of fairness, reference pricing , these insights are particularly interesting for ride hailing since fares change drastically within minutes .Sharma et al. went beyond and proved that even when the price change was technically justified the consumer trust can be still undermined if the user feels targeted or misled.

other studies like Chen and Sheldon provide empirical evidence that the uber algorithm surge pricing increases driver supply during peak hours, supporting the idea that price incentives can improve service reliability. On the other hand, the research of Lio et al found that surge also reduce tipping suggesting that consumer internalize pricing decision as part of the overall service experience punishing the driver because of the price even though the driver doesn't have any control over it. All these studies highlight a fundamental tension :AI pricing systems may improve operational outcomes but at the cost of consumer goodwill.

Despite the growing number of studies, few works integrate the economic, technical and behavioral dimension of AI driven pricing in ride hailing services. Existing literature tends to focus on one domain. This thesis aims to address that gap by providing a cross-disciplinary examination of AI pricing systems and their effects on ride-hailing markets and user behavior.

1.3 Focus of the Thesis

in this thesis we will investigate what are the implication of the involvement of AI in dynamic pricing, with a particular focus on how they shape market dynamics consumer behavior and perception of fairness. The driving question of the thesis are how algorithmically determined prices affect not only transactional efficiency but also broader issues of trust and platform governance. The goal is to understand how the systems operate and how they differ from earlier pricing methods and what legal and behavioral consequences they bear particularly in the ride hailing services where users interact with prices in real time without transparency.

1.4 The Method

This thesis uses a conceptual and analytic method instead of an empirical one. It relies on a wide variety of research and secondary information to provide a detailed view of dynamic pricing. Instead of gathering new data, the analysis uses published economic and behavioral studies, technical papers on AI in pricing and case studies of ride-hailing platforms. Also, legal texts, regulations and public policy documents offer information about the governance issues related to algorithmic pricing. The thesis also includes industry reports and media articles when needed, to show how consumers react and what platforms do in real situations. All of these sources help us examine pricing algorithms from different angles, how they are viewed and how they are managed or challenged.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

In this thesis there will be three core chapters. Chapter two will be an excursus into the theoretical foundation of dynamic pricing, and it will review the evolution of it , comparing traditional approaches to AI driven models . this arguments will be put in a context of economic theory and behavioral psychology and it will address the various ethical and regulatory concerns brought with this practices .Chapter three will focus on the ride hailing sector we will use Uber and Lyft as case studies to examine how AI pricing has evolved , how it works and how it affects labor models and revenue generation. Chapter four will shift our focus to consumer behavior we will explore how they react to sudden changes in fares and how this also effects their tipping behavior.

2. Theoretical Framework of Dynamic Pricing

2.1 Definition and Evolution of Dynamic Pricing

The term Dynamic pricing refers to the practice in which the prices are adjusted in real time based on some factors such as demand fluctuations in consumer behavior, the market competition and also inventory levels. This strategy represents a significant shift from fixed pricing models allowing sellers to optimize their revenues by being able to respond more flexibly to market signals. The concept itself is not new, as early as 1980 and 1990 there were applications of dynamic pricing in the airline and hospitality sectors, where the revenue management strategies were employed to maximize occupancy and profits through tiered pricing based on the forecast demand and booking windows [1].

In its initial implementation dynamic pricing used to rely heavily on rule-based or econometric models designed by human analysts. One example can be found in airline companies, in which they would segment seats into so-called fare classes, allocating them dynamically based on projected demand curves [2]. These first systems made use of static estimations and required constant human oversight, which often limited their ability to be responsive. As digital commerce started to rise in the early 2000s it made it possible for dynamic pricing to expand beyond the previous sectors. Online retailers, like Amazon also began to use and implement repricing algorithms that have the ability to readjust prices across multiple products multiple times a day [3], such systems were still largely deterministic, prices changed only under specific rules and circumstances, but they signaled a shift toward automation and scale.

Recently with the proliferation of AI and machine learning, dynamic pricing has been driven into a new era in which unlike rule-based systems, modern Ai driven algorithms showed the capacity to learn optimal pricing strategies through iterative interactions with the market environment. in particular reinforcement learning has emerged as a powerful tool. These algorithms adapt pricing decisions based on rewards, for example profit margins, giving them a level of autonomy that was unattainable with previous traditional methods [4].

One example can be seen in the financial sector as Ai based models have been introduced to replace the classical pricing formulas like Black-Scholes in the realm of option pricing, these new , at least at that time, Ai models consume vast datasets (including also real time market data) and derive more accurate and also adaptive pricing mechanisms[5]. In the same way retail firms, ticketing firms and transportation firms increasingly use and employ machine learning systems to continuously optimize prices based on consumer segments, their history, competitors pricing and the new trends [6].

This strategic evolution marks a fundamental transformation in the way prices are determined in modern economies, and it also introduced changes like strategic behavior among algorithms, concerns about ethics, morals, fairness and discrimination and new regulatory implications that will be explored in the next sections.

2.2 Traditional vs. AI-Driven Pricing Models

The traditional dynamic pricing models are based on economic theory, deterministic logic and statistical forecasting. Basically, these models assume that a price is a function of observable market variables and that buyers and sellers act driven by rationality making their actions somehow predictable. Historically businesses have relied on tools like cost-plus pricing, historical demand modeling, or closed-form financial formulas to set the prices. As these techniques are quite easy and straightforward to use, they have a lot of limitations especially when working in high volatile markets, large product assortments or individual-level personalization.

Traditional Models: Structure and Limitations

Traditional pricing can be put into two categories: rule based and econometric models. In the retail and service sectors the more often used models are the rule-based ones since they involve fixed markups, or the famous scheduled discounts based on seasonality or trends. For example, retail chains may use markdown optimization based on the average inventory levels and sales velocity. These models operate on pre-programmed instructions and lack the flexibility to respond to sudden market shifts or consumer data.
In financial markets instead the traditional pricing is heavily based on mathematical models. The Black-Scholes model, for example, estimates the fair value of options by mashing factors such as volatility , time to expiration, and the risk-free interest rate. Similarity, the binomial model estimates option value through a stepwise lattice of potential future outcomes , assigning probabilistic weights to each path . While they are robust under certain conditions , such models make assumptions that flaw their performances that simplify real-world complexities and introduce pricing errors[7].

According to Tudor(, such statistical models are limited in their predictive accuracy because often they ignore quantitative and latent variables that impact market pricing. For example, they do not incorporate sentiment, macroeconomic shifts or real-time anomalies in consumer behavior . Additionally in markets where prices move rapidly, traditional models fail to recalibrate fast enough [8].

AI-Driven Pricing: Architecture and Capabilities

In Opposition, Ai-driven pricing models use the so called data-driven learning techniques to estimate and optimize prices without relying on assumptions. Such models typically include decision trees , neural networks or reinforcement learning algorithms .

Artificial neural networks(ANNs), can be trained on vast datasets to learn non-linear relationships between different variables. In pricing , this allows ANNs to consider not just historical data but also customer demographics , product features, competitor actions and even behavioral clues such as clickstreams[9]. When trained these networks can produce highly accurate and reliable pricing recommendations in real time.

When it comes to reinforcement learning (RL), a branch of machine learning highlighted in Calvano et al., represent even more autonomous form of pricing . RL agents interact with their environment by trial and error gradually improving their pricing strategies based on the reward functions which usually are profit or revenue .One thing to note is that this agents do not need to be trained with pricing logic they discover it through iterative learning and can adapt continuously as conditions change[10]

Practically AI-based dynamic pricing is employed extensively across several sectors . ride-sharing platforms like uber adjust fares based on time, location and demand spikes .while streaming services like Netflix use the so-called collaborative filtering and predictive analytics to personalize offers and plan pricing tiers and in e-commerce, machine learning models update the products prices dynamically to optimize conversion rates , factoring in browsing behavior , cart abandonment , and competitor pricing .

Performance Comparison and Real-World Applications

Empirical studies shown that AI pricing models comfortably outperform the traditional ones in terms of both accuracy and profitability .Tudor's research , for example conducted a comparative analysis between Black-Scholes/Binomial models and AI driven models using RMSE and MAPE as error metrics . The findings suggest that the data driven neural networks output estimates that are closer to real markets prices than statistical models particularly under conditions of highly volatile or limited liquidity[11].

One other important advantage of AI pricing systems is their scalability and granularity. While traditional models usually work at market or segment level , AI models can operate at the level of individual customers ,SKUs (unique code given to a product used to identified it inside an inventory) or even single shopping sessions of single customers, this ability to micro target opens so many possibilities of highly personalized pricing , albeit raising questions of fairness and transparency.

However AI driven models are not without risks . their “black box” nature can obscure pricing logic making it difficult for both regulators and firms themselves to assess how the price was determined also without a careful design , learning algorithms can lead to discriminatory pricing , collusion , or self reinforcing pricing volatility.

2.3 Economic and Behavioral Theories Behind Dynamic Pricing

Dynamic pricing is grounded on tech capabilities, statistical modeling and also in economic theory and behavioral science. Understanding how individuals respond to prices - and how these responses deviate from rational economic behavior - is key for an effective design and ethical application of pricing strategies. This section will explain the classical economic principles that are used in dynamic pricing followed by behavioral theories that explain consumer responses.

Classical Economic Foundations

Dynamic pricing at its core is built on the principles of microeconomic optimization. Classical economics theory assumes that consumers are rational agents who maximize utility, and the firms try to maximize profits by adjusting their prices in responses to supply and demand . The law of demand suggests that as prices decrease demand increases, allowing firms to create price levels to target different segments of consumers’ willingness to pay.

A concept important to understand is price discrimination that defines the practice of charging different prices to different customers for the same product or service based on different aspects. The perfect price discrimination happens when the entire consumer surplus is captured by creating ad hoc prices, while second- and third-degree forms use pre-seen behavior or broad characteristics to set segment prices. dynamic pricing algorithms simulate before or automate in real time these forms of price discrimination based on deduced characteristics.

Moreover, game theory has a key role in understanding strategic behavior of firms in markets with multiple sellers. When each firm's pricing strategy affects the others, equilibrium outcomes like Betrand competition or tacit collusion emerge, AI algorithms when interacting with such situations repeatedly learn collusive behavior without an explicit human input through programming as demonstrated in the simulations by Calvan et al.[12]. Their reinforcement learning agents charged supra-competitive prices over time by learning to avoid mutual undercutting, echoing oligopolistic coordination predicted by classical game theory.

Behavioral Economics and Consumer Psychology

while economic theory assumes rationality behavioral economics reveals that in reality consumers react to changes in prices in a irrational way usually context dependent and emotionally driven , this field pioneered by researchers like Daniel Kahneman and Richard Thaler , provides insights into psychological biases and heuristics that shape purchasing decisions in dynamic pricing schemes Prospect theory , introduced by Kahneman and Tversky , assumes that individuals evaluate outcomes relative to a reference point rather absolute terms , central to this theory is loss aversion that is to say the idea that losses come to light larger than equivalent gains, in pricing context this implies consumer are more sensitive to price increases than to an equivalent discount . Dynamic pricing models that frequently

Raising prices can trigger disproportionately negative reactions even if the average prices remain favorable over time[13]

Closely related is the framing effect, in which the way a price is presented influence perception. Tversky and Kahneman showed that people respond differently to the same economic outcome depending on whether it is framed as a gain or loss. for example, a surcharge for a premium option feels worse than a discount for a basic one even if the net price is identical. firms employing dynamic pricing must be careful in how they communicate pricing shifts to avoid triggering loss aversion responses[14].

The concept of mental accounting introduced by Thaler explains how consumers categorize money into different "accounts", for example entertainment vs necessities and how they make decisions inconsistently across them. This behavior can affect dynamic pricing if a consumer compares current prices to personal or situational expectations instead of market benchmarks. One example is surge pricing in ride hailing may be perceived as unfair not because of the price itself but because it conflicts with what the consumer expects to pay based on previous experience.

Algorithmic Pricing and Behavioral Feedback Loops

A new era of discovery and research is exploring how algorithmic dynamic pricing systems interact with consumer psychology in feedback loops. Consumers frequently adjust their behavior based on observed price patterns and delay their purchases manipulating browsing behavior, or using VPNs to trigger different pricing algorithms, at the same time AI models trained on this behavior may inadvertently learn to reinforce their already existing biases or over optimize for short term gains at the cost of long-term trust.

These dynamics are compounded where consumers are aware of dynamic pricing and feel manipulated, a recent OECD report highlights that overly opaque or discriminatory pricing practices can lead to reputational damage, particularly in sectors like travel, ticketing and e-commerce where price comparison are easy and expectations of fairness are high[15].

Dynamic pricing systems should not be seen as simply tools for optimization; they are mechanisms that have to interact with complex and often irrational human decision-making processes. While grounded in economic theory , their success or failure hinges on psychological acceptance .Concepts like loss aversion , reference pricing , framing and perceived fairness plat a central role too in determining how consumers can respond to dynamic prices, as firms still increasingly adopt AI-based pricing models, incorporating behavioral insights is crucial not only to maximize revenue but also for maintaining customer trust and satisfaction.

2.4 Ethical and Regulatory Challenges in AI Pricing

The integration of AI into dynamic pricing methods has also introduced complex ethical questions and regulatory challenges. Even though AI pricing can enhance market efficiency, promote innovation, and deliver personalized experiences to consumers, it also raises significant in regard to fair transparency and discrimination and the potential for anticompetitive outcomes. This section will examine these challenges by focusing on primary areas: number one are the ethical concerns arising from AI-based price setting. and number two are the regulatory difficulties, especially in cases involving algorithm collusion and market manipulation.

Ethical Considerations in AI Pricing

Dynamic pricing powered by AI leads to differential treatment of consumers based on real-time behavioral and contextual data. Price discrimination is economically rational and desirable, but it can also become ethically contentious when it lacks transparency or when it can appear as a form of exploitation.

One central ethical issue is the fairness in pricing, what this means is that when AI pricing models, particularly those trained on biased or opaque datasets may result in discriminatory outcomes, for example two consumers may be offered two different prices solely based on their browsing history, their location or from which device they are purchasing. When such actions and disparities are discovered, they can actively undermine consumer trust and trigger public backlash. Fairness is further complicated by the fact that consumers cannot and are not required to understand how AI makes its pricing decisions, leading to perceptions of arbitrary or manipulative practices[16].

Transparency is also a important ethical concern. AI systems, especially those based on deep learning, are usually described as “black boxes” cause of the difficulties in explaining the thought process. This opacity hinders both consumer understanding and accountability. If the consumer doesn’t know why they were offered a certain price they cannot either consent or challenge it, so form a business ethical point firms are increasingly expected and required to provide clear information about how their pricing systems work, particularly when these prices differ between consumers[17].

Also, there are concerns related to manipulation and behavioral targeting. AI systems learn how to exploit cognitive biases that means raising prices just after a customer shows intent of purchasing a product. While this activity may increase short-term revenues, it raises questions about the ethical use of psychological profiling for economic gain. Moreover, in sectors like healthcare, housing or insurance such strategies may result in systematic exclusion or exploitation of more vulnerable groups.

Algorithmic Collusion and Legal Liability

One particularly urgent topic when it comes to regulatory issues is the risk of algorithmic collusion , that happens when AI agents autonomously learn to coordinate their prices in a way that lowers market competition .Unlike the traditional collusion in which an agreement between parties is required , algorithmic collusion can happen without direct communications .It poses significant enforcement challenges for competition authorities due to the decentralized and autonomous nature of this phenomena .

Calvano et al. (2019) demonstrated that reinforcement of learning algorithms, trained competitive environments, can learn to maintain supra-competitive prices by avoiding mutual undercutting a behavior functionally equivalent to tacit collusion[18]. These findings are echoed in broader legal literature, which warns that AI systems can substitute the risk of competition with algorithmic coordination [19].

The paper by Vuletić et al. (2024) expands on this by categorizing forms of algorithmic collusion into various regulatory scenarios [20]:

- **Messenger**: where human actors use algorithms to implement known price-fixing strategies. Legal responsibility in these cases is straightforward and fits within existing frameworks.
- **Digital Eye**: where algorithms independently monitor and respond to competitors' behavior, aligning prices through autonomous adaptation. This represents tacit collusion without human intent, complicating liability.
- **Predictable Agent**: where algorithms behave consistently and predictably, allowing competitors to anticipate and mirror their pricing behavior without direct coordination.
- **Hub-and-Spoke**: where a central platform (e.g., Uber) sets pricing rules for independent sellers, potentially reducing competition among them.

In each of these cases the regulators face the challenge of proving intent, agreement or control elements that are often nonexistent in AI driven systems.

Regulatory Frameworks and Their Limitations

Current competition law frameworks, both in the EU and US are designed around the premise of human intent and explicit coordination. Under article 101 TFEU and section 1 of the Sherman Act, collusion typically requires some form of agreement of communication. This model struggles to accommodate cases where autonomous systems learn anti-competitive strategies without human instructions[21].

Several efforts have been made to adapt existing rules to AI environments. The Eu Horizontal Guidelines (2023) acknowledge that algorithms can facilitate collusion and illegal information exchange. Firms are now expected to ensure that algorithmic tools do not infringe competition law , even if outcomes arise without deliberate programming[22]. Nonetheless, the ability to enforce rules are very limited by the technical opacity of many AI models, and by the difficulties in assigning liabilities across software developers, platform operators, and data providers.

emerging policy discussion propose that design obligations be imposed on the algorithms creators, for example algorithms could be required to incorporate randomness, heterogeneity or constraints that can discourage alignment in pricing .Vuletić et al. recommend mandating ex ante design constraints and internal auditability to prevent convergence toward collusive equilibria. Others have argued for greater cooperation between antitrust authorities and technical experts to enable algorithmic forensics during investigations[23].

additionally, there is growing international monument to create forward looking regulatory instruments. The proposed EU Artificial Intelligence Act classifies high-risk AI systems and imposes requirements related to transparency ,human oversight, and robustness[24]. While the act does not focus specifically on pricing , its general provisions may indirectly affect AI pricing methods used in sensitive sectors. The OECD and G7 have similarly emphasized the need for cross-border coordination in dealing with algorithmic collusion and market manipulation[25].

Accountability and Enforcement Challenges

One of the most issues is determining who is accountable when AI systems engage in unlawful pricing behavior. In traditional cases responsibility lies onto the individuals/firms that enter into agreements. in AI driven cases may be shared by multiple actors including, developers, data suppliers and the platform owners(sometimes also end users).The problem is exacerbated by the adaptive nature of machine learning. algorithms can evolve in ways not foreseen by their creators. As such, firms may claim that they neither intended nor could reasonably predict the anti-competitive outcome .Legal scholars debate whether such claims should absolve liability or whether deploying high-risk pricing algorithms should carry strict responsibilities, including the obligation to anticipate harmful outcomes[26].

AI-based pricing brings a deep ethical and legal question. Although such systems can advantage consumers by achieving efficiency and personalization, at the same time they are likely to lead to discrimination, opacity, and weakened competition. With algorithms becoming autonomous, the chance for tacit collusion and manipulation increases. Regulatory frameworks have to change in order to create accountability, transparency and fair play in the market without killing innovation. Multidisciplinary multifaceted approach, the partnership of legal reform, technical supervision and ethical design will be required to tame the challenges presented by AI-based pricing in contemporary economies.

3. AI in Ride-Hailing Services

3.1 History of Pricing Models in Uber and Lyft

The evolution of pricing models in ride-hailing service platforms like Uber and Lyft represent a crucial change in the economics of transportation. Contrary to traditional taxi fare structures , which are regulated and based on distance and time, Uber and Lyft introduced flexible, algorithmically controlled pricing systems that adapt in real time to changes in demand and supply. This evolution in the sector reflects not only technological advancement but also a strategic rethinking and new understanding from consumers of how value is captured and distributed on two-sided platforms.

At the time of their launch, Uber in 2009 and Lyft in 2012, both companies used very simple pricing structures . These models combined a fixed base fare with per-mile and per-minute, very similar to traditional taxi meter pricing but implemented through mobile applications .This pricing strategy was static and uniform with minor differences based on the city or regulatory compliance . In the very beginning of their existence both Uber and Lyft emphasized both convenience and reliability of their service, not price elasticity or micro-optimization. There was no change in fare based on demand patterns, and both platforms subsidized rides heavily to attract users and drivers in key markets. Lyft introduced some features like "happy hour pricing", which as it says offered off-peak discounts to encourage usage but they were still far from dynamic pricing algorithms as we understand them.

Introduction of Surge and Prime Time Pricing

The introduction of surge pricing by Uber and prime time pricing by Lyft marked a significant turning point. Uber launched their pricing model publicly in 2012 meant as a manual override mechanism for periods of high demand like holidays, concerts etc.. The point was to incentivize drivers to log into the app and accept requests and subsequently increase ride availability. Lyft followed shortly after with Prime-Time Pricing that applied a similar logic of multiplying fares during periods of excess demand.

Uber's earliest surge pricing known as Surge 1.0 used multiplicative factors like 1,5x or 2,0x based on simple thresholds of supply and demand imbalance in a given area. This strategy while it was effective in addressing drivers shortage it drew criticism from both consumers and regulators for it perceived unfairness, especially during emergencies like snowstorms or public transport outages.

Academic studies, including work by Chen and Sheldon, who had access to Uber's internal data, demonstrated that surge pricing increased the supply of drivers in areas of high demand and thus improved service reliability[27]. The authors conducted a natural experiment and found that removing surge pricing resulted in significantly higher wait times and ride cancellations, confirming its operational utility.

However, public backlash intensified over time. The perception that surge pricing was exploitative, combined with the platform's lack of transparency, led Uber to iterate on its model . In 2017 , Uber deployed Surge 2.0, a system designed to enhance the efficiency and productivity of the pricing model and also address the various ethical and regulatory concerns. Instead of showing multiplicative factors to passengers, fares were displayed as flat upfront prices. The surge component wasn't explicit instead, it was embedded directly into the price, reducing the salience of price spikes and shifting the pricing logic toward algorithmic discretion.

Algorithmic Personalization and Predictive Models

At about the same period, Uber and Lyft started incorporating machine learning algorithms to fine-tune their pricing model. These algorithms leveraged historical and real-time data, including location, time of day, weather, and user behavior, to forecast demand spikes and pre-emptively modify pricing. Lyft's Prime Time pricing became a more granular system that could use different pricing in micro-geographic areas and customer cohorts.

Uber took it a step further by testing personalized pricing, which did not only consider the market conditions but also the price sensitivity of an individual rider. Although the company never openly admitted to this practice in full detail, internal reports and academic findings indicate that Uber used consumer behavioral data to infer willingness to pay and set prices accordingly[28]. This change triggered a new wave of concern among scholars and regulators on algorithmic discrimination and lack of transparency.

These algorithmic pricing models also had spatial optimization features. Platforms started to use heatmaps and forecast models to predict rider demand and implement incentive schemes or temporary fare increases to shift driver supply in advance. According to Yuan and Van Hentenryck , this evolution is a shift from reactive surge pricing to anticipatory control systems, where model predictive control (MPC) is used to optimize pricing and driver placement at the same time[29].

Regulatory Responses and Transparency Concerns

As dynamic pricing gained more prominence, it also attracted more attention from the regulators and the public. The black box nature of AI-based pricing systems, particularly those that are based on personalized or non-linear logic, created doubts about consumer protection and fair competition. In Europe, pricing models that allow a central platform to determine pricing for independent contractors have been looked at through the lens of hub-and-spoke collusion. Vuletić et al. speak about how Uber's model puts the platform at the "hub," with the prices being set algorithmically while drivers (the "spokes") follow these prices without being able to negotiate, which may raise antitrust concerns[30].

Public transparency has also been at the forefront. Although Uber's interface no longer shows multipliers, the company has been subject to criticism of algorithmic opacity. Scholars assert that the elimination of the visible surge multipliers has covered the actual cost structure and has concealed the users from making informed decisions and reduced price salience that can manipulate consumer behavior[31].

3.2 Evolution of Uber's Surge Pricing Algorithm

Uber's surge pricing algorithm is one of the most visible and controversial applications of artificial intelligence in the consumer economy. In the beginning it was introduced withe the purpose to match supply and demand during high-usage moments of the platform and traffic jams, Surge evolved from a basic rule-based multiplier model into a very complex real-time system informed by predictive analytics, machine learning and consumer behavior data. This section will trace the key stages of Uber's surge algorithm development and it will also highlight how AI has progressively taken over pricing logic and how it reshape the rider and driver experience.

Surge 1.0: Static Multipliers Based on Local Demand Shocks

The original surge pricing algorithm implemented by Uber, often called Surge 1.0, was created to simply motivate drivers to go online when demand was high. During times when too many ride requests were received for the number of drivers in a certain area, the system automatically raised the base fare by a set surge multiplier (e.g., 1.5× or 2.0×). The multipliers were shown to users clearly before they could confirm a ride, and accompanying messages explained that the rise in price was due to increased local demand.

In operation, it was a good approach to drawing the drivers into the high-demand zones. [5] Chen and Sheldon provided empirical evidence of how surge pricing led to an increase in the supply-side response and decrease in waiting times[32]. Their natural experiment – surge pricing was turned off randomly-in select zones- showed that the absence of surge resulted in a 4.5% rise in cancellation rates and longer pickup times, which underlined the model's value for managing dynamic market situations.

However, Surge 1.0 was a reactive instead of predictive system. It replied to imbalances detected and not to the imbalances that were forthcoming. Besides, it was visible to the user which had adverse reputation implications. In times of emergencies or public events, public outcry and media attention ensued each time there were felt price surges, which more often than not put the model in an exploitative frame.

Surge 2.0: Upfront Pricing and Reduced Transparency

As the criticism kept increasing Uber decided to implement a big change and start using Surge 2.0 in the beginning of 2017. This version eliminated the displayed surge multiplier for the riders and replaced it with an upfront pricing, where the final fare is an integer amount without disclosing how much of it was due to surge conditions[33].

The goals of Surge 2.0 were two: first was to reduce price salience and thereby reducing negative emotional responses from users; and second was to give the platform more flexibility in how it calculated fares. By embedding surge into the final price Uber now could integrate behavioral pricing logic and concepts into its algorithmic decisions.

This shift added to new behavioral research that suggests consumers react more negatively to framed price increases than to higher prices without context[34]. Uber's change in the UI design intelligently obscured the pricing logic, a move analyzed critically in pricing psychology literature as a form of perception management.

Drivers however kept seeing the surge multiplier on their interface , leading to asymmetric information between the platform drivers, drivers and passengers. This new challenges including complaints of algorithmic manipulation including the complaints of algorithmic manipulation by the drivers who felt misled by fare discrepancies. The platform increasing use of trip based surge bonuses, in which drivers received fixed bonus amounts rather than proportional multipliers , further fueled criticism about opacity and loss of control[35].

Predictive Modeling and AI Integration

Early surge models were largely rule-based while more recent versions are built upon predictive and machine learning architectures. As Uber accumulated more granular data across time, geography and user behavior Uber began to implement AI to anticipate where and when surge was supposed to be used, shifting from a reactive approach to proactive demand forecasting approach .

These newer models use real time inputs like weather, events , historical ride data and mobile location tracking to predict demand spikes before they actually happen . The reinforcement learning login identified in Calvano et al., where pricing agents learn optimal strategies through iterative interaction—mirrors the type of algorithmic feedback loops embedded in Uber's dynamic pricing infrastructure[36].

Uber never fully disclosed the technical architecture of its current surge pricing engine,but related studies like Yuan & Van Hentenryck suggest that platforms now integrate model predictive control (MPC) and multi agent optimization to jointly optimize pricing and driver reallocation[37]. These systems aim to stabilize rider experience increase platform revenue and manage fleet efficiency by anticipating behavioral responses across the marketplace.

Personalized and Shadow Pricing Experiments

Uber reportedly tried and experimented on the concept of personalized pricing, a strategy that aims to use individual rider data to tailor fares on their estimated willingness to pay. Although the company has denied using full first-degree price discrimination, reports suggest that prices changed between users with similar trip characteristics based on behavioral or contextual signals.these methods use techniques similar to AI-generated shadow pricing , where the systems tests alternate price levels internally before deploying them in production.

Obviously these strategies of user tailor price fares attracted many concerns and controversies about the ethical and regulatory consequences of these acts.Vuletić et al. frame these developments within the concept of hub-and-spoke control, where Uber as the central agent dictates the prices across transactions while drivers have no visibility or negotiating power[38].This raises antitrust concerns particularly when algorithmic coordination stable and supra competitive prices outcomes across time frame and geographic positions.

Regulatory Pushback and Interface Revisions

In various jurisdictions, regulators are reacting to the consequences of Uber's way of setting charges for rides. The surge model put in place by Uber in the EU has been a target of competition law scrutiny, mainly because independent drivers are expected to follow the price increases but have no real say in setting those prices. The fact that the algorithm can change supply, take extra money from riders, and the opacity of the pricing logic and how it can manipulate supply worries many regulators.

In response to pressure from the public and the law, Uber has decided to offer more information on drivers' earning structures and has reintroduced surge notices, now less visible, in some markets. In response, Uber has reinstated surge charts directly and allowed drivers to see information regarding their earnings. However, neither riders nor regulators are able to fully understand how the algorithm makes its choices as it operates as a black box.

3.3 How AI Optimizes Pricing in Real-Time

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into ride-hailing pricing systems has transformed how platforms like Uber and Lyft balance rider demand with driver supply. Unlike traditional transportation pricing which is based upon static fare tables or distance-time formulas, modern AI-based pricing operates dynamically and probabilistically. These systems analyze high-frequency data inputs to generate adaptive , real-time fare recommendations that optimize for multiple goals: profit maximization, service reliability, supply distribution and consumer conversion. This section will examine the AI methods and system architectures that operate in real-time pricing, with an emphasis on uber implementation and and the other breather implications od this strategy for market design and user experience.

Core Architecture of Real-Time AI Pricing Systems

AI systems rely on multi-agent, data driven architectures that continuously update prices based on contextual inputs. These systems consume both at the same time real-time data like location , supply and demand conditions and historical data like rider behavior and city traffic patterns to anticipate demand surges and adjust fares accordingly.

Yuan and Van Hentenryck describe anticipatory pricing with real-time relocation strategies (AP-RTRS), where both pricing and vehicle dispatch are co-optimized using (MPC)[39]. In these situations the system forecasts future demand over a short time horizon for example 15 minutes and then adjusts prices to redistribute supply preemptively. simulating rider and driver behavior under different pricing scenarios, the algorithmic selects the configuration expected to provide the best system performance.

This differs from previous “reactively” designed systems such as the Surge 1.0 which adjust prices based on consumer demand only but the new MPC system uses AI to predict demand and preemptively modify pricing and driver allocation, leading to a smoother market and shorter wait times.

Reinforcement Learning , Multi-Objective Optimization

Reinforcement learning forms the basis for how the pricing systems algorithm operates. It is a subfield of machine learning where agents learn the best strategies by interacting with their environment.[1]Calvano et al. illustrated how such agents, even in a competitive environment can learn pricing strategies that converge to stable , supra-competitive prices[40]. While their focus was more about retail pricing simulations, the core logic still applies directly to ride-hailing : algorithms optimize fares by learning from past outcomes and adjusting in pursuit of performance metrics such as profits, ride acceptance rates, or fulfillment efficiency.
Such companies like Uber imbedded these RL agents into a multi-objective optimization framework in which pricing is not considered just a function of revenue maximization but also service quality and fairness .For instance, a pricing model may prioritize high acceptance rates over marginal revenue if the system recognizes that riders are giving up their requests due to perceived unfair pricing.[3]Yuan and Van Hentenryck’s work further emphasizes the multi-agent nature of this systems. Each vehicle is considered an agent with its own trajectory and constraints, and the pricing engine must account for spatial interdependence between agents. This means that the optimization models solve for global systems outcomes rather than just for price at a single point, this marks a significant leap from single-variable pricing models used in other sectors.

Inputs to AI Pricing: Data and Behavioral Feedback

The strength of AI pricing systems lies in their ability to integrate **diverse data sources**. These include:

- **Temporal factors**: time of day, day of the week, proximity to holidays or major events
- **Geographic data**: location-based demand clusters, traffic congestion levels
- **Weather data**: real-time updates on rain, snow, or extreme heat, which influence rider behavior
- **Rider behavior history**: prior cancellations, willingness to pay during peak hours

- **Driver availability**: current and projected supply levels based on logins and location

These streams of data are fed to prediction models that estimate rider elasticity and driver responsiveness to pricing signals .Chen and Sheldon found that surge pricing led to increased driver availability in high-demand areas, particularly within 10-minute time windows[41]. These findings support the logic of short-term data sensitivity fare adjustment to influence system equilibrium.

AI pricing has imbedded into it behavioral feedback loops like if a rider repeatedly declines high fares in certain places , the system may adjust future prices to or delay notifications , in a similar fashion if drivers ignore incentives to take on rides the system will then updated bonus offers or raise surge levels in a selective manner , this ways of adaptive learning, while powerful they introduce various concerns on manipulation and fairness[42].

Micro-Targeting, Segmentation, and the Role of Shadow Pricing

An interesting edge that AI can allow to be used is the ability to segment at a granular level meaning that instead of giving the same price to a whole city or zone , the platform can assign different fares to similar trips based on the singular rider's willingness to pay.Altough Uber and Lyft never disclosed their pricing algorithms there is evidence, as cited by Calvano et al. and [Vuletić et al. , that these platforms experiment with shadow pricing in which systems test different price levels internally without showing them before deploying them into production environments[43].

This type of strategy obviously raised some ethical questions by both the public and regulatory bodies , particularly on the opacity and various discriminatory outcomes. Sharma et al. emphasize on the fact that even rational price adjustments can appear as manipulative if the perceived fairness of the system is undermined[44]. This tension between optimization and perception is central to the public critique of AI pricing in consumer services.

AI Pricing vs. Manual Market Design

AI-driven pricing in ride-hailing holds one significant advantage the ability to autonomously adapt to real time conditions , something manual pricing schemes or rule based models cannot achieve .Taxi fares were update via regulatory processes and revised at most annually while AI models can do it minute by minute, reacting to even minor fluctuations in demand traffic or supply. However this ability comes with some tradeoffs. The lack of interpretability in machine learning in machine learning models makes it difficult for regulators to address pricing fairness. Furthermore, the platform’s control over fare setting and supply incentives like driver bonuses or surge zones means that it effectively orchestrates both sides of the market, this blurs the line between algorithmic coordination and market manipulation .

Vuletić et al. classify this type of pricing under the broader concept of “digital cartelism” where platforms do not collude with external actors but create internally managed price-setting ecosystems[45]. While this may be legal under the current frameworks , it raises pressing questions about the future of competition , transparency and user autonomy.

3.4 Impact on Drivers and Revenue Models

AI-driven pricing models determine not only the consumer fares but also shape the earnings, behavior and welfare of drivers .As of now Uber and Lyft rely completely on AI mediated pricing systems to set the fares of each ride , this means that drivers went from independent operators in the platform to algorithmically managed participants in a digitally coordinated market.This section will examine how dynamic pricing affects drivers life and incentives, income variability, labor autonomy, and the platform’s revenue strategies.

Driver Behavior and Supply Elasticity Under Surge Pricing

one of the biggest arguments in defense of Surge pricing is that its used as a mechanism to restore balance between demand and supply , as raising prices will when demand exceeds supply will incentive financially the drivers to take on the rides and position themselves in high demand areas .Empirical research support this claim as Chen and Sheldon, using Uber’s internal data , demonstrated that the introduction of surge pricing led to increased driver availability during peak periods[46] . Their study debunked the “income-targeting” hypothesis, which posits that drivers work only until they reach a certain monetary goal. Instead what was found is that drivers respond to marginal price signals, especially in short time intervals , indicating that surge pricing effectively mobilizes latent supply.

However this responsiveness comes with limitations as drivers more than often engage in strategic behavior like waiting for surges to activate and selectively logging in during predicted peak times. this “gaming”of the algorithm can lead to market inefficiencies, such as oversupply for specific surge zones and artificially inflated demand patterns.Plus the opacity of real-time surge activations has made it more difficult for the drivers to predict and anticipate pricing signals with also the introductions of trip-based bonuses and upfront fares, the link between market conditions and compensation has become even more opaque.

Erosion of Driver Autonomy Through Algorithmic Management

The more pricing algorithms evolve and get more sophisticated the more the platform exerts control over drivers. Vuletić et al. argue that Uber's model creates a form of "hub-and-spoke "organization in which the central platform(hub) unilaterally sets prices and dispatch logic, while the drivers(spokes) have very limited control over either [47]. These types of conditions blur the line between private independent contracting to algorithmic employment. Drivers have no authority to debate fares or see the complete pricing formula, and their vision is not considered in decision making processes.

This obvious imbalance has some legal and economic implications. While drivers are classified as independent contractors, their lack of say in any decision combined with algorithmically enforced quotas suggest a high degree of behavioral management. Some scholars characterize this model as form of algorithmic labor discipline, where dynamic pay fluctuations are used to elicit compliance and optimize supply across geographic zones. Dynamic pricing also inserted an aspect of psychological uncertainties as is very difficult for the drivers to predict what their monetary earnings are gonna be, combined with the platforms control over their work visibility and incentive design , can contribute to labor precarity. This is particularly highlighted in those markets where ride volume is very inconsistent or where algorithmic volatility amplifies income wings.

Incentives, Bonuses, and Manipulable Earnings Logic

As a way to continue earning money with lower fares, ride-hailing apps combine dynamic pricing with driver bonuses, steady incentives for their time and promotions in particular parts of the city. Incentives for Uber drivers are updated by algorithms regularly and differ based on location, time and a driver's performance. Known as 'ways to earn', they actually guide drivers' habits to satisfy what the platform wants.

In some cases, companies use bonuses to help convince drivers to drive at unpopular times or work an extra shift. Having flexible earnings does not always result in clear logic when reporting earnings. It is common for drivers to have to accept a job with low pay because it will help them achieve a special bonus.

It follows the trend economists call menu cost optimization, making use of architecture to modify choices without changing major rules. When people drive in such situations, some make bad decisions because of uncertainty which often affects those who are less knowledgeable. In addition, companies often adjust the rewards they offer, meaning drivers find it hard to respond quickly. Because earnings from driving are not always dependable, those who depend totally or largely on the platform’s earnings endure lasting issues.

Impact on Driver Earnings and the Tipping Paradox

AI pricing not only affects base fares but it also indirectly affects consumer tipping behavior [6] Liu et al. showed that dynamic pricing leads to statistically significant decrease in tipping[48]. Specifically , a 1% increase in fare correlates to a 0,2% decrease in tip percentage . this phenomenon is usually attributed to a perceived breach in fairness, riders that feel they are overpaying due to surge pricing are less inclined to tip even though the driver is not responsible for fare adjustments.

This situation of course causes tension between the platform and the driver as both their revenue goals come into conflict . While dynamic pricing can increase total fare revenue it may unintentionally suppress gratuities which are a main component of the driver financial earnings .Additionally cause platforms don’t pass fully surge premiums to drivers particularly in fixed bonuses or time-based pay structures, the advantages of dynamic pricing are not equally shared. The long-term negative effect is the social contract between driver and rider, riders can associate fare increases with platform manipulation rather than service quality and by doing so their willingness to reward good service diminishes. This dynamic illustrates how algorithmic pricing, though technically efficient, can undermine informal economic norms that support labor dignity and reciprocity.

Revenue Models and Platform Profitability

For platform AI dynamic pricing plays a central role in reaching its objective as path to profitability. Unlike traditional firms, ride-hailing platforms operate under a “growth firs margin later” framework that requires fine tuning monetization strategies. Pricing algorithms allow Uber and Lyft to get more margin out of price. Insensitive consumers while subsidizing fare reductions to increase ride frequency among more elastic users. This exceeded dynamic pricing as a mere operational tool and makes it into a full-on strategic revenue management function, as it enables price segmentation. time based monetization and market thinning as needed and the ability to adjust prices adds on the real time response edge of the platform being able to react to market shifts immediately.

However, all these benefits need to be weighed on a scale against the reputation and regulatory costs of this strategy. Public backlash and labor advocacy forced these platforms to invest in transparency initiatives and new alternative ways of compensation like minimum guarantees or driver pay calculators. at the systemic level the ability to set prices for both labor and consumers raises foundational questions about market neutrality as when the platform controls all pricing signals it doesn’t act anymore as a simple intermediary but as an active market maker with interest that diverge from the one of both end users of the platform.

4. Consumer Responses to AI-Driven Pricing

4.1 Perceived Fairness and Trust in Algorithmic Pricing

The biggest driver of consumer behavior is the perception of fairness , especially when prices are handled by an algorithm instead of a human . As said in the previous chapter in ride hailing service the delegation of pricing to algorithms increased opacity, which undermines consumer trust. Trust and fairness are closely linked in consumer psychology, particularly when prices change and fluctuate fast and consumers are left with no explanation on how they are charged these prices .

The core of this matter is how consumer interpet pricing logic as for traditional pricing systems like posted fares, menus and taxi meters they are perceived as fair and objective .In contrast to algorithmic pricing that introduces aspect of personalization and adaptivity that can feel arbitrary and discriminatory, or manipulative to users . This change challenges long-held consumer expectations about what prices are and how they should behave.
[7]Kahneman and Tversky's work on prospect theory explains extensively on why consumers react negatively to increases in price when they feel these are unfair or unpredictable . Consumers don't assess outcomes in an absolute way but rather they compare them to past experiences of what is usual or expected price. A price that is substantially higher or than what was recently paid triggers a sense of loss or exploitation , regardless if the increase in price is justifiable or not . In surge pricing scenarios this is particularly problematic since the prices may change in the span of few minutes due to demand conditions , consumer perceive these shifts not as legitimate market signals but as opportunistic extraction by the platform.[49]

Thaler extended these insights in his work on mental accounting , in which consumers categorize expenses into mental budgets and evaluate fairness based on contextual cues. For example, a beer that costs more in a resort than a convenience store consumer tolerates the difference if the pricing feels fair or justified[50]. However ride hailing apps obscure many of these cues that help consumers justify the price making it feel as a form of exploitation . Uber doesn't display surge multipliers anymore and instead presents upfront fares; the whole mechanism behind the price is invisible, increasing feelings of ambiguity and mistrust.
Studies like [7]sharma et al. reinforce this dynamic in algorithmic contexts, it was found that consumer trust declines when price variations are not accompanied by clear explanations or when users suspect behavioral targeting . Their study emphasized that even if an algorithmic

pricing is technically inefficient it may be perceived as unfair if it lacks transparency[51].This is a key vulnerability for AI-based systems.
Another driver of consumer lack of trust is whether or not they are being treated consistently relative to others. When consumers discover acts of personalized pricing they often see it as a breach of marketplace norms .Consumers may accept general surge pricing during peak hours , but not individualized pricing that appears to penalize them for previous willingness to pay. Such scenarios can erode platform legitimacy and provoke consumer backlash.[52]

Additionally by removing any sense of agency from algorithms the sense of opacity increases tenfold. In traditional markets consumers can "defend " themselves by delaying purchases, comparing competitors or negotiating instead AI pricing removes these levers: there is no way to tell how long surge will last, no clear alternatives and no ability to challenge the algorithm's decision.Ezrachi et al. argue that this imbalance fosters a market structure where consumers are datafied monitored and segmented into pricing categories they cannot see or escape[53]

Vuletić et al. note that information asymmetry is not only a consumer issue but also a regulatory concern, particularly when it comes to companies with dominant market positions which they use to dictate opaque pricing structures. They argue that such systems can undermine the principle of competitive markets , where informed consumer choice is a foundational assumption.[54]
trust in AI pricing is not simply about accuracy or efficiency but actually it comes down to perceived intention.

4.2 Behavioral Spillovers: Tipping, Loyalty, and Usage Patterns

beyond immediate reactions AI driven dynamic pricing has broader consequences that affect tipping behavior, consumer loyalty and long-term usage of the platform. These effects even though are secondary; they shape much of the landscape when it comes to sustainability of dynamic pricing systems.
One of the most documented spillovers is in tipping behavior. Liu et al provide empirical evidence that dynamic pricing significantly reduces rider gratuities, as tipping is a social and voluntary driven action the study found that 1% increase due to AI-driven surge reduced the tipping percentage by approximately 0.2% on average[55]. This may seem small but it actually

compounds across millions of riders and disproportionately affects drivers, whose earnings rely heavily on gratuities (basically drivers pay indirectly for the platform prices).

The mechanism behind this behavior is psychological since consumers cannot distinguish between the platform's pricing algorithm and the driver, the entire transaction is treated as one experience , if they feel they have been exploited by dynamic pricing the customer will "retaliate" by reducing tip or even not giving them , even though the driver has no power over the setting of prices .This reflects a kind of miscredited blame, where dissatisfaction with the algorithm lowers generosity toward the human agent.

Plus, without fare transparency undermines consumer goodwill . . Because of this doubt, some customers become less loyal to delivery apps and might switch to others. Many customers these days compare several apps for each trip, check for the best prices or avoid rides when they think there might be a surge, even if they have to travel.

It may impact on how well we remember things in the future. Most customers use ride-hailing for regular trips such as going to work or running errands in the city. If users feel they cannot rely on the app's pricing or understand why it works, they will use it less frequently. This is especially harmful because having predictable and reliable services is a main reason people use platforms.

Charging more for AI could reduce how often moderate users take rides, even though they still make a big contribution to the platform's revenue. Customers who use the platform only occasionally are more likely to notice if they think something is overpriced and bad experiences may cause them to stop using it. One major event such as a high surge in bad weather, can cause lasting mistrust.

In addition, when consumers are frustrated, they sometimes react with social criticism. People who are unhappy with an app may post negative reviews, speak out on social networks or urge for new rules. As a result, platforms may need to change the way they discuss pricing with users. One reason for Uber's move was that people were upset about the company raising fares during emergencies[56].

It's also worth mentioning that these reactions may not make sense, but they can be predicted. Prospect theory shows that people tend to feel more strongly about losses than about gains[57]. The emotional effect of a $10 overcharge during a crowded time can last longer than the job of a $10 discount when demand is low. AI systems that focus on quick revenue do not often consider how users might feel in the future.

4.3 Consumer Resistance and Platform Reactions

Even with advanced AI in pricing, how the public views these models determines if they will last. If people feel that pricing algorithms are taking advantage of them, they may react by organizing and sometimes bring about changes for the entire platform. They provide useful examples of how pricing design relates to trust, ethics and the ability of platforms to adjust.

A clear example of consumer resistance happened during the 2014 Sydney hostage crisis, when Uber's surge pricing was activated because many people were trying to get to the central business district. At that point, Uber's system would automatically raise prices by up to four times the usual fare when demand for rides increased. Even though it made sense within the platform's supply-demand system, many people criticized the decision as unfair. Because of the public response, Uber apologized, gave refunds and made changes to its surge policy, offering free rides to those leaving disaster areas[58].

The same thing happened during New Year's Eve, snowstorms and transit strikes in Boston and New York. In several of these situations, the media made Uber's pricing seem unfair which increased user anger. Even though the system automatically set prices to restore supply, people were more concerned with the company's intentions than with the results. It shows that algorithmic neutrality does not prevent platforms from suffering harm to their reputation, especially when the outcomes seem biased.

As a result of these ongoing issues, Uber changed the way it displays prices in 2017. It took away the surge multiplier and began showing the total fare amount upfront, without breaking it down. Although the change was promoted to make things easier for users, it was also a way to improve the company's reputation. When the multiplier is hidden, Uber made price increases seem less important which reduced the emotional reaction, even if the total cost was higher[59]. Yet, some experts suggest that the new approach resulted in more hidden exploitation, as it replaced the old problem of being seen too much with a new one about pricing. People could not check how their fare was set or why it was not the same as before. Although it calmed people in the short term, it also made people more suspicious of the platform's algorithms over time[60].

In addition to updating their designs, platforms have started using strategic communication to reduce negative reactions. Now, Uber, Lyft and similar companies use in-app messages to explain that the reason for higher prices is a lack of drivers, not a company choice. This approach makes it seem like the market is to blame, but the algorithm is still in charge.

Yet, these ways of messaging are not fully successful. According to research on pricing psychology, consumers react more to what they think the seller's motives are than to the information itself [61]. If users believe a platform is being dishonest, no words can make them trust it again. As a result, people start to avoid these platforms, and they may also face tougher regulations.

In fact, in the EU, people's concerns have led to demands for more transparency and accountability from algorithms. The EU Artificial Intelligence Act and several national consumer protections bills now mention Uber's surge pricing as an example in discussions about how AI should be used with consumers. They prove that consumer resistance is not just a story—it is now affecting the rules and laws that guide businesses[62].

They demonstrate that people are upset by more than just prices; they also care about trust, fairness and the platform's responsibility.

4.4 Structural and Cultural Sensitivities in Consumer Reaction

AI-driven pricing is not understood in isolation from the culture around it. People's responses to algorithmic price adjustments differ greatly depending on where they live, how developed their market is, their cultural background and how much they trust institutions. While a number of markets have made dynamic pricing common, others have expressed concerns and asked for more openness, fairness and rules.

How people feel about price personalization and negotiation is a major reason for these differences. In the United States, most people are used to dynamic pricing in air travel, hotels and ride-hailing. Although some consumers get annoyed, they are used to seeing prices change depending on when, where or how much is being sold. By contrast, European consumers appear to be more reluctant to accept algorithmic pricing that is hard to understand which is partly because of their strong data protection laws and traditions of consumer advocacy. The EU's GDPR and AI Act shows that being fair and explainable is now a basic requirement for platforms to be accepted by regulators[63].

You can also see these cultural differences in how people expect companies to influence the prices they charge. Simply because they are social-democratic or collectivist, many in these societies might think of essential services such as transportation, as belonging to everyone, not just to be bought or sold. During such situations, using AI-based surge pricing is considered both unfair and ethically wrong, especially when it is used during emergencies or when many people are traveling at the same time. In Germany, France and Southeast Asia, people often protested Uber because it did not meet their deeply held expectations.

On the other end in countries and regions where price volatility is common and bargaining is part of the culture like south America and south Asia, pricing algorithms may be seen as less problematic, However if the customer feels the fare is a result of user specific behavioral patterns then the backlash will be present unlike in situations where the price may be justified by visible demand cues like during rush hour.

consumers trust is also tied to institutional trust and digital literacy. in countries where platform act in alignment with consumer interest, the willingness to accept AI-mediated pricing is higher than countries with poor governance or a history of corporate exploitation , algorithmic opacity fuels distrust, user may perceive fluctuations not as neutral market signals but as manipulative tactics

More and more, platforms are acknowledging these regional and structural sensitivities. Uber has changed its pricing and messaging to suit each region, describing surge pricing as a way to improve service in some places, but making it less strict in others to avoid problems with regulators. In some places, the company has teamed up with local officials to get pricing structures approved in advance, something that was never considered in the company's early days.

It is important to note that AI pricing is not always accepted in the same way. The way people feel about a platform is affected by its media coverage, reputation, user satisfaction and what is said in policy discussions. With more use of algorithmic pricing, people are asking for more openness, user control and fairness. What starts as focusing on profits must later be balanced with the cultural standards for treating people in digital marketplaces.

+

5. Conclusion

Dynamic pricing based on AI is now responsible for how Uber determines fares, manages its resources and shapes the user experience. Although these systems are meant to be efficient and fast, they can make it harder to ensure transparency, fairness and public trust.

This thesis explored how the move from traditional to algorithmic pricing is made possible by AI which allows platforms to instantly adjust and improve pricing for users. It examined why dynamic pricing is used in the economy and how people react to it, especially by feeling like they are being taken advantage of. Ride-hailing apps do not only follow the market; they also shape it, deciding both working hours for drivers and the rates charged to passengers.

It was found that not knowing how algorithms work causes consumers to doubt a company, that price changes can decrease loyalty and tipping and that people often react negatively when a company's prices seem unethical. Maximizing profits with AI could bring risks to a business's reputation and compliance if there is not enough accountability and transparency.

All in all, dynamic pricing in ride-hailing affects the social realm, not only the economy or technology. Everyone concerned—platforms, regulators and users—should ensure that pricing innovation follows fairness, predictability and responsibility.

REFERENCES:

1. McAfee, R. P., & te Velde, V. (2006). *Dynamic pricing in the airline industry*. In Hendershott, T. J. (Ed.), *Handbook on Economics and Information Systems*. Elsevier.

2. Phillips, R. (2005). *Pricing and Revenue Optimization*. Stanford University Press.

3. Chen, L., Mislove, A., & Wilson, C. (2016). An empirical analysis of algorithmic pricing on Amazon Marketplace. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 1339–1349).

4. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405.

5. Tudor, A. (2022). *Comparison between Traditional and Modern Option Pricing Models*. University of Twente.

6. OECD (2018). *Algorithms and Collusion: Competition Policy in the Digital Age*.

   https://www.oecd.org/competition

7. Hull, J. C. (2018). *Options, Futures, and Other Derivatives* (10th ed.). Pearson.

8. Tudor, A. (2022). *Comparison between Traditional and Modern Option Pricing Models*. University of Twente.

9. Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer.

10. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405.

11. Ruf, J., & Wang, W. (2019). *Neural Networks for Option Pricing and Hedging: A Literature Review*. SSRN Working Paper.

12. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405

13. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.

14. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.

15. Lichtenstein, D. R., Burton, S., & Netemeyer, R. G. (1990). Distinguishing coupon proneness from value consciousness: An acquisition-transaction utility theory perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(3), 54–67.

16. Martin, K., & Murphy, P. (2017). The role of data in AI pricing: The ethics of consumer profiling. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 45–58.

17. OECD (2018). *Algorithms and Collusion: Competition Policy in the Digital Age*. [https://www.oecd.org/competition/algorithms-collusion-competition-policy-in-the-digital-age.htm]

18. .Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405

19. . Ezrachi, A., & Stucke, M. E. (2017). Artificial Intelligence and Collusion: When Computers Inhibit Competition. *University of Illinois Law Review*, 5, 1775–1810.

20. Vuletić, D., Bradvica, M., Krstulović, D., Gvozdić, S., & Kachkouche, R. (2024) *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8 – Special Issue, University of Zagreb.).

21. Case 48/69 ICI v Commission [1972] ECR 619.

22. European Commission (2023). *Horizontal Cooperation Guidelines*, OJ C259/01.

23. Caforio, V. (2023). Algorithmic Tacit Collusion: A Regulatory Approach. Competition Law Review, 15(1), 9–30.

24. European Commission (2021). *Proposal for the Artificial Intelligence Act*. COM(2021) 206 final.

25. G7 (2023). *Compendium on Competition in Digital Markets*. [https://www.jftc.go.jp/en/pressreleases/yearly-2023/November/231108G7_result2EN.pdf]

26. Picht, P. G., & Leitz, A. (2024). Algorithms and Competition Law: Status and Challenges. *SSRN*. [https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4716705]

27. Chen, M. K., & Sheldon, M. (2015). *Dynamic Pricing in a Labor Market: Surge Pricing and Flexible Work on the Uber Platform*. Working Paper.

28. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405.

29. Yuan, N., & Van Hentenryck, P. (2021). *Real-Time Pricing Optimization for Ride-Hailing Quality of Service*. Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI).

30. Vuletić, D., et al. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8, University of Zagreb.

31. Sharma, P., et al. (2024). *The Psychology of Pricing: How Pricing Strategies Affect Consumer Perception*. Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research.

32. Chen, M. K., & Sheldon, M. (2015). *Dynamic Pricing in a Labor Market: Surge Pricing and Flexible Work on the Uber Platform*. Working Paper.

33. Uber Newsroom. (2017). *Upfront Fares Now Available for Every Trip*. [https://www.uber.com/newsroom/upfrontpricing]

34. Sharma, P., et al. (2024). *The Psychology of Pricing*. Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research.

35. Liu, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, X. (2024). *The Effect of Dynamic AI Pricing on Tipping Behavior*. Journal of Service Research (forthcoming).

36. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405.

37. Yuan, N., & Van Hentenryck, P. (2021). *Real-Time Pricing Optimization for Ride-Hailing Quality of Service*. IJCAI Proceedings.

38. Vuletić, D., et al. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8, University of Zagreb.

39. Yuan, N., & Van Hentenryck, P. (2021). *Real-Time Pricing Optimization for Ride-Hailing Quality of Service*. IJCAI Proceedings.

40. Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolò, V., & Pastorello, S. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*. CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13405.

41. Chen, M. K., & Sheldon, M. (2015). *Dynamic Pricing in a Labor Market: Surge Pricing and Flexible Work on the Uber Platform*. Working Paper.

42. Uber Engineering Blog (2019). *How Uber Uses Machine Learning to Improve Pricing and ETA Accuracy*. [https://eng.uber.com/pricing-eta-ml/]

43. Vuletić, D., et al. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8, University of Zagreb.

44. Sharma, P., et al. (2024). *The Psychology of Pricing: How Pricing Strategies Affect Consumer Perception*. Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research.

45. Vuletić, D., et al. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8, University of Zagreb..

46. Chen, M. K., & Sheldon, M. (2015). *Dynamic Pricing in a Labor Market: Surge Pricing and Flexible Work on the Uber Platform*. Working Paper.

47. Vuletić, D., Bradvica, M., Krstulović, D., Gvozdić, S., & Kachkouche, R. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. ECLIC 8, University of Zagreb.

48. Liu, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, X. (2024). *The Effect of Dynamic AI Pricing on Tipping Behavior*. Journal of Service Research (forthcoming).

49. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.

50. Thaler, R. H. (1980). Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 1(1), 39–60.

51. Sharma, P., Kadian, M., Shah, J., & Heena. (2024). *The Psychology of Pricing: How Pricing Strategies Affect Consumer Perception*. *Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research*, 13(2), 105–114.

52. Martin, K., & Murphy, P. (2017). The role of data in AI pricing: The ethics of consumer profiling. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 45–58.

53. Ezrachi, A., & Stucke, M. E. (2017). Artificial Intelligence and Collusion: When Computers Inhibit Competition. *University of Illinois Law Review*, 5, 1775–1810.

54. Vuletić, D., Bradvica, M., Krstulović, D., Gvozdić, S., & Kachkouche, R. (2024). *Algorithmic Collusion in Competition Law: Overview*. *ECLIC 8 – Special Issue, University of Zagreb*.

55. Liu, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, X. (2024). *The Effect of Dynamic AI Pricing on Tipping Behavior*. *Journal of Service Research* (forthcoming).

56. Uber Newsroom. (2017). *Upfront Fares Now Available for Every Trip*. https://www.uber.com/newsroom/upfrontpricing

57. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.

58. Hern, A. (2014). "Uber raises fares in Sydney during hostage crisis." *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/dec/15/uber-raises-fares-in-sydney-during-hostage-crisis

59. Uber Newsroom. (2017). *Upfront Fares Now Available for Every Trip*. https://www.uber.com/newsroom/upfrontpricing

60. Martin, K., & Murphy, P. (2017). The role of data in AI pricing: The ethics of consumer profiling. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 45–58.

61. Sharma, P., Kadian, M., Shah, J., & Heena. (2024). *The Psychology of Pricing: How Pricing Strategies Affect Consumer Perception*. *Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research*, 13(2), 105–114.

62. European Commission (2021). *Proposal for the Artificial Intelligence Act*. COM(2021) 206 final.

63. European Commission (2021). *Proposal for the Artificial Intelligence Act*. COM(2021) 206 final.