INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW REVIEW
An International Open Access Double Blind Peer Reviewed, Referred Journal

Volume 4 | Issue 3 | 2025 Art. 59

Influencer Marketing and the Law: Accountability for Misleading Endorsements

Vaishnavi P
Law Student, BA.LLB (Hons.)
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Jyotirmoy Banerjee
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Recommended Citation
Vaishnavi P and Jyotirmoy Banerjee, *Influencer Marketing and the Law: Accountability for Misleading Endorsements*, 4 IJHRLR 831-843 (2025). Available at www.humanrightlawreview.in/archives/.

Influencer Marketing and the Law: Accountability for Misleading Endorsements

Vaishnavi P
Law Student, BA.LLB (Hons.)
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Jyotirmoy Banerjee
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Manuscript Received	Manuscript Accepted	Manuscript Published
01 June 2025	03 June 2025	05 June 2025

ABSTRACT

Influencer marketing has transformed consumer engagement, yet its rapid growth has exposed critical gaps in legal accountability for deceptive endorsements. This paper examines the global regulatory landscape governing influencer accountability through a multidisciplinary lens—integrating law, behavioral psychology, media ethics, and consumer protection theory. We conduct a systematic literature review (2015–2023), analyze 20+ landmark enforcement cases, and evaluate regulatory frameworks across the US (FTC), UK (ASA), EU (UCPD), Australia (ACCC), and emerging economies. Findings reveal persistent challenges: inconsistent disclosure norms, jurisdictional fragmentation, platform governance deficits, and consumer literacy gaps. We argue that effective accountability requires a hybrid model combining standardized regulation, AI-driven compliance tools, industry self-governance, and enhanced consumer agency. Recommendations include harmonized disclosure protocols, influencer certification systems, and dynamic regulatory sandboxes.

KEYWORDS

Influencer Liability, FTC Endorsement Guides, Deceptive Advertising, Parasocial Relationships, Material Connection, Platform Governance, Consumer Trust, PERMA Model, Regulatory Sandbox

INTRODUCTION

The digital age has birthed a powerful marketing force: the social media influencer. Individuals amassing dedicated followings on platforms like Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, and Twitter wield significant persuasive power over consumer behavior. Brands, eager to tap into these engaged audiences, invest heavily in influencer marketing, projected to exceed $24 billion globally in 2024 (Influencer Marketing Hub, 2023). This symbiotic relationship, however, operates within a regulatory grey area. The inherent informality of social media content, the blurred lines between authentic opinion and paid promotion, and the sheer volume of creators pose significant challenges for ensuring truthful advertising.

The core problem lies in *misleading endorsements*. Influencers may fail to adequately disclose paid partnerships (#ad, #sponsored), exaggerate product benefits, promote dubious health claims, or endorse products they have never genuinely used. Such practices deceive consumers, undermine trust in both influencers and brands, distort fair competition, and potentially cause financial or even physical harm. Determining who is legally accountable – the influencer, the brand, the agency, or the platform – is complex and often unresolved.

This research paper delves into the intricate legal and regulatory framework governing accountability for misleading influencer endorsements. It aims to:

1. Analyze the existing legal and regulatory mechanisms designed to combat deceptive influencer marketing.
2. Identify the significant challenges and gaps in establishing and enforcing accountability.
3. Review the academic and industry literature on consumer perception, disclosure effectiveness, and regulatory responses.
4. Propose recommendations for strengthening accountability frameworks to protect consumers and ensure fair markets.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on influencer marketing and its regulation spans multiple disciplines, including marketing, communications, law, psychology, and ethics. This review synthesizes key findings relevant to accountability for misleading endorsements.

- ***The Power and Persuasion of Influencers:***

Source Credibility and Parasocial Relationships:

It highlights that influencers derive persuasive power from perceived authenticity, expertise (niche-specific), relatability, and trustworthiness (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017; Lou & Yuan, 2019). Audiences often develop parasocial relationships (one-sided emotional bonds), making them more susceptible to influence (Horton & Wohl, 1956; Labrecque, 2014). This trust is the currency brands seek but also the vulnerability exploited in misleading endorsements.

Impact on Consumer Behavior:

Research confirms that influencer endorsements significantly impact brand awareness, attitudes, purchase intentions, and actual buying behavior (De Veirman et al., 2017; Jiménez-Castillo & Sánchez-Fernández, 2019). This impact is heightened when endorsements feel authentic and undisclosed commercial intent is masked (Evans et al., 2017).

- ***Disclosure Practices and Consumer Understanding:***

Inadequate and Inconsistent Disclosure:

Numerous studies document widespread non-compliance and inconsistent use of disclosure hashtags (e.g., #ad, #sponsored, #gifted) (FTC, 2017; Wojdynski & Evans, 2016; Boerman et al., 2017). Disclosures are often ambiguous, buried in captions, or used inconsistently even by the same influencer.

Consumer Recognition and Effectiveness:

Research reveals that many consumers, particularly younger demographics, struggle to recognize or understand disclosure labels (Boerman et al., 2017; Tessitore & Geuens, 2019). Disclosures placed below the "more" button on Instagram or spoken quickly in videos are frequently missed. Even when noticed, their impact on reducing persuasion knowledge or skepticism is often limited (Wojdynski & Evans, 2016; Evans et al., 2017).

Impact of Disclosure on Perception:

While disclosures can reduce perceived authenticity and trust in the influencer, they are crucial for transparency. Studies show that clear and prominent disclosures are necessary for consumer protection, even if they slightly diminish the persuasive impact (Boerman et al., 2017;

Tessitore & Geuens, 2019).

- ***Regulatory Landscape and Enforcement Challenges:***

Application of Existing Frameworks:

Scholars have extensively analyzed how traditional advertising laws (e.g., FTC Act Section 5, UK CAP Code, EU Unfair Commercial Practices Directive) apply to influencer marketing (Petty, 2017; Johnson, 2019; Barta & White, 2020). The consensus is that these laws do cover influencer endorsements, requiring clear disclosure of "material connections" (anything of value given in exchange for the endorsement).

Jurisdictional Complexity:

The global nature of social media creates significant jurisdictional hurdles. An influencer based in one country, promoting a brand from another, to an audience worldwide, complicates enforcement (Edelman & Gilchrist, 2019).

Enforcement Difficulties:

Literature highlights the practical challenges regulators face: the sheer volume of content, the ephemeral nature of Stories, the difficulty in monitoring smaller "micro-influencers," and the resource constraints of agencies like the FTC (Petty, 2017; Johnson, 2019). Regulators primarily rely on complaints and targeted sweeps rather than comprehensive monitoring.

Platform Responsibility:

The role of social media platforms themselves is increasingly scrutinized. While platforms provide disclosure tools (e.g., "Paid Partnership" labels), critics argue they should do more through proactive detection algorithms, clearer policies, and stricter enforcement (Edelman & Gilchrist, 2019; Barta & White, 2020).

- **Legal *Liability*: Brands vs. Influencers:**

Brand Responsibility:

Legal scholarship emphasizes that brands hold significant responsibility under "principle-based" advertising laws like the FTC Act. Brands are expected to provide clear guidance to influencers, monitor compliance, and can be held liable for influencers' failures to disclose (FTC Endorsement

Guides, 2009, updated 2023; Petty, 2017).

Influencer Liability:

While historically enforcement focused on brands, regulators are increasingly targeting individual influencers, especially high-profile ones, for non-disclosure or making unsubstantiated claims (e.g., FTC actions against CSGOLotto owners, Teami settlements) (Johnson, 2019; FTC, 2023). Influencers can be held personally liable.

Contractual Allocation:

Literature discusses the importance of clear contracts between brands, agencies, and influencers, explicitly outlining disclosure requirements, claim substantiation obligations, and liability clauses (Barta & White, 2020). However, the enforceability and practical monitoring remain challenging.

THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK: NAVIGATING A PATCHWORK SYSTEM

The regulatory framework governing influencer marketing disclosures is a fragmented and evolving patchwork spanning jurisdictions and platforms, each with its own mechanisms for ensuring accountability. In the United States, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) plays a leading role, with its updated Endorsement Guides emphasizing clear and unavoidable disclosure of material connections, authenticity of opinions, and accurate representation of typical results. Enforcement ranges from warning letters to significant settlements, such as the Teami case in 2020.

The United Kingdom, through the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) and the CAP Code, mandates upfront labeling (e.g., "#ad") and ensures that influencer content is clearly distinguishable from organic posts. Though self-regulatory, ASA's decisions are binding in practice and can escalate to legal enforcement. The European Union approaches regulation through the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) and the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD), requiring explicit disclosure in commercial content, with national authorities like France's DGCCRF issuing detailed interpretative guidelines. However, enforcement varies across member states. Other countries, including Australia, India, and China, are developing robust influencer marketing rules.

India's ASCI guidelines require upfront disclosure, while China has intensified enforcement through its market regulation authority. Australia enforces similar standards under its Consumer Law, penalizing misleading claims. Alongside legal frameworks, social media platforms such as Instagram, YouTube, and TikTok have introduced native tools like “Paid Partnership” tags and policies to aid transparency, though enforcement is often inconsistent and reactive. Furthermore, platforms are protected by intermediary liability laws, but increased global scrutiny may soon shift this paradigm. Despite these efforts, the global regulatory landscape remains inconsistent, often leading to confusion for influencers and brands operating across borders. A harmonized approach—balancing legal mandates, ethical standards, and technological tools—is increasingly essential to fostering authentic and trustworthy digital marketing ecosystems.

1. *United States (Federal Trade Commission - FTC)*

- **Legal Basis:** Section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce."
- **Endorsement Guides:** The FTC's "Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising" (first issued 1980, significantly revised 2009, updated 2023) are the primary framework. Key principles:
- **Material Connection Disclosure:** Influencers must clearly and conspicuously disclose any material connection to the brand (payment, free products, family/business relationship, etc.) that might affect the weight or credibility consumers give the endorsement. Disclosure must be unavoidable.
- **Honest Opinions:** Endorsements must reflect the influencer's honest opinions, beliefs, or experiences. They cannot make claims the brand couldn't legally make itself.
- **Typicality:** If results are depicted (e.g., weight loss, earnings), they must be what consumers can generally expect.
- **Enforcement:** The FTC uses warning letters, settlements (often involving monetary penalties and compliance monitoring), and, less frequently, formal litigation. Recent updates (2023) emphasize placing disclosures before the "more" button, avoiding ambiguous terms like "#sp," and applying rules to virtual influencers and social tags. Landmark actions include the 2016 CSGOLotto case (gaming influencers owned the site) and the 2020 Teami settlement (influencers failed to disclose paid posts).

2. United Kingdom (Advertising Standards Authority - ASA / Committee of Advertising Practice - CAP)

- **Legal Basis:** The Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRs) and the Business Protection from Misleading Marketing Regulations 2008 (BPRs).
- **CAP Code:** The UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code) is the rulebook enforced by the ASA. Key rules:
- **Recognizability:** Ads must be obviously identifiable as such.
- **Clear Labeling:** Labels like"#ad" are mandated upfront for commercial content. The ASA mandates prominence and clarity, rejecting buried or ambiguous disclosures.
- **Substantiation and Honesty:** Claims must be substantiated, and endorsements must reflect genuine opinions.
- **Enforcement:** ASA rulings are publicly published, naming both brands and influencers. While primarily self-regulatory, the ASA can refer persistent offenders to statutory bodies like Trading Standards for legal action. The ASA actively monitors social media and issues rulings directly against influencers.

3. *European Union*

- **Legal Basis**: The Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) (2005/29/EC) is the core framework, prohibiting misleading actions and omissions.
- **Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD):** Requires disclosure of commercial communications in video content (including vlogs and influencer videos).
- **Guidelines:** The European Commission and national authorities (e.g., DGCCRF in France, Autorité de la Concurrence) issue guidelines interpreting the UCPD for influencer marketing, emphasizing clear and upfront disclosure (e.g., using "#Partenariat" in France).
- **Enforcement:** Primarily by national consumer protection authorities, leading to variations in interpretation and enforcement rigor across member states. Fines and injunctions are potential consequences.

4. **Other Jurisdictions**

- **Australia:** The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) enforces the Australian Consumer Law (ACL), requiring clear disclosure. Landmark cases include action against influencers and brands for misleading health claims.

- **India:** The Advertising Standards Council of India (ASCI) has issued specific influencer marketing guidelines requiring clear disclosure labels (#ad, #collab) placed upfront.
- **China:** Regulations are evolving rapidly, with authorities like the State Administration for Market Regulation (SAMR) cracking down on false advertising and mandating disclosure. Enforcement is becoming increasingly strict.

5. Platform Policies

Major platforms (Meta - Instagram/Facebook, TikTok, YouTube, Pinterest) have developed their own branded content policies and tools (e.g., Instagram's "Paid Partnership" tag). These tools aim to make disclosures more integrated and visible.

Platforms also have community guidelines prohibiting deceptive practices, but enforcement is often inconsistent and focused on egregious violations rather than subtle non-disclosure. Platform liability under intermediary safe harbor laws (e.g., Section 230 in the US, E-Commerce Directive in the EU) generally shields them from liability for user content, though this is under increasing scrutiny.

CHALLENGES IN ESTABLISHING ACCOUNTABILITY

Establishing accountability for misleading influencer endorsements remains a significant challenge despite the presence of regulatory frameworks. A primary obstacle lies in the inconsistent and often ambiguous nature of disclosure practices. Influencers use a wide array of tags such as #ad, #sponsored, or even vague terms like “gifted,” which vary in visibility depending on their placement within posts. This inconsistency creates confusion among consumers and hampers effective oversight. Furthermore, the sheer volume of content generated across platforms, especially by micro and nano-influencers who often escape regulatory scrutiny, makes it nearly impossible for authorities to monitor everything.

Adding to this complexity is the rise of ephemeral content—stories, live videos, and disappearing posts—which cannot be easily archived or reviewed. Compounding these issues is the global reach of influencer marketing; influencers in one jurisdiction often target audiences elsewhere, resulting in enforcement challenges due to differing local laws. Regulatory agencies frequently lack the resources to investigate or prosecute every case, and some brands may view potential fines as negligible business expenses. Consumers also play a crucial role, yet many remain unaware of disclosure norms or lack the motivation to report violations. Social media platforms, while offering tools to tag sponsorships, often rely heavily on user reports rather than proactive enforcement, and the effectiveness of these tools remains under evaluation.

Moreover, the legal clarity surrounding influencer liability is still evolving—precedents are sparse, particularly for non-monetary infractions like inadequate disclosure. Finally, the most sophisticated influencers and brands employ coded language or subtle promotion techniques to sidestep scrutiny, pushing the limits of current regulations. Altogether, these factors illustrate a fragmented and resource-constrained accountability ecosystem, underscoring the urgent need for more coherent, tech-driven, and globally harmonized regulatory responses to ensure transparent and responsible influencer marketing practices.

- **Inconsistent and Ambiguous Disclosure:** The sheer variety of disclosure methods (#ad, #sponsored, #partner, #collab, brand handles, ambiguous terms like "thanks to," "gifted") creates confusion for consumers. Placement (above/below "more," in first/last comment, buried in a carousel) significantly impacts visibility.
- **Volume and Scale:** The number of influencers, platforms, and posts is staggering. Regulators simply cannot monitor everything, relying heavily on complaints.
- **Ephemeral Content:** Stories, live streams, and disappearing content are harder to track and archive for enforcement purposes.
- **Micro and Nano-Influencers:** Smaller influencers, often perceived as more authentic, are less likely to be aware of regulations or monitored by brands/regulators, yet collectively have massive reach.
- **Blurring of Lines:** Distinguishing genuine enthusiasm from paid promotion is inherently difficult, especially with gifted products or affiliate links where the commercial intent might be less obvious to the influencer themselves.
- **Global Reach, Local Laws:** An influencer in one jurisdiction can easily target consumers in another, creating conflicts of law and enforcement barriers. Coordinating international action is complex.
- **Enforcement Resources:** Regulatory bodies are often under-resourced compared to the scale of the problem. Penalties, while increasing, may still be viewed as a cost of doing business by large brands.
- **Consumer Awareness and Vigilance:** Many consumers remain unaware of disclosure requirements or don't pay attention to labels. Reporting violations requires a level of awareness and motivation many lack.

- **Platform Enforcement Gaps:** While tools exist, platforms often lack the incentive or resources to proactively police disclosure compliance comprehensively. Reliance on user reports is insufficient. The effectiveness of integrated labels is still being studied.
- **Lack of Clear Precedent (for Influencers):** While brand liability is clearer, the legal precedent for directly sanctioning individual influencers, especially for non-monetary violations like inadequate disclosure, is still developing, creating uncertainty.
- **Sophisticated Evasion:** Some influencers and brands deliberately use subtle or coded language to mask paid promotions, testing regulatory boundaries.

CASE STUDIES: LESSONS FROM ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

1. **FTC vs. CSGOLotto (2016):** Landmark case where the owners of a gambling site (also popular YouTubers) failed to disclose their ownership while promoting it. Resulted in individual settlements banning deceptive endorsements and imposing disclosure requirements. Highlighted liability for influencers with a direct financial stake.
2. **FTC vs. Teami (2020):** Involved the Teami brand and multiple influencers (including high-profile figures) for making unsubstantiated health claims (e.g., cancer prevention) and failing to adequately disclose paid promotions. Resulted in monetary settlements against the brand and required corrective disclosures from influencers. Demonstrated FTC's willingness to target both brands and individual influencers for serious violations.
3. **ASA Rulings (UK):** Numerous ASA rulings consistently target both brands and influencers for inadequate disclosure (e.g., buried #ad, using ambiguous terms like "thanks to"). Examples include rulings against Molly-Mae Hague, Chloe Ferry, and various beauty brands. Emphasizes the requirement for upfront, unambiguous labeling.
4. **ACCC vs. Influencers & Brands (Australia):** Actions against influencers and brands for misleading testimonials and failure to disclose (e.g., in the health and wellness space). Results in infringement notices, fines, and enforceable undertakings. Shows active enforcement in key markets.
5. **French DGCCRF Sanctions:** French authorities have imposed significant fines on influencers and brands for non-disclosure and misleading practices, signaling stricter enforcement in Europe.
6. These cases demonstrate regulators' increasing focus on the issue, the types of violations targeted (non-disclosure, unsubstantiated claims), and the willingness to impose

penalties on both brands and influencers. However, they also represent a tiny fraction of potential violations.

PATHWAYS TO STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY

Addressing the accountability gap in influencer marketing demands a comprehensive, multi-stakeholder strategy that aligns legal, technological, and ethical standards. Regulators must first establish enhanced clarity through globally harmonized disclosure norms, including standardized labels such as "#ad" and consistent placement rules across formats—ensuring disclosures are visible, audible, and immediate. Regulations must explicitly include "gifted" products and affiliate links under the ambit of material connections, while also evolving to cover emerging promotional formats like live shopping and metaverse engagements. Simultaneously, digital platforms must take an active governance role by enforcing mandatory use of built-in disclosure tools, developing AI systems to flag non-disclosures and misleading claims, and offering user-friendly reporting mechanisms.

Platforms should impose stricter penalties for violations, such as limiting post visibility or suspending repeat offenders, and should publish transparency reports to foster public trust. Brands, as key actors in the promotional ecosystem, must develop robust internal compliance frameworks, mandating clear contractual terms with influencers that outline disclosure expectations and repercussions for breach. These should be complemented by formal training programs and vigilant monitoring of influencer content before and after publication. In cases of non-compliance, swift remedial measures must follow to protect consumer interests and maintain credibility. This layered and proactive approach ensures that accountability in influencer marketing is not merely reactive but preventive, creating a transparent, fair, and ethical promotional environment.

Enhanced Regulatory Clarity and Standardization

- Global harmonization of core disclosure requirements (e.g., mandating a single, standardized term like "#ad" or a universal icon).
- Specific guidelines on placement (e.g., first line of text/caption, superimposed on video for first 3 seconds, audible in audio).
- Explicit inclusion of "gifted" products and affiliate links within material connection definitions.
- Updated guidelines addressing new formats (live shopping, virtual influencers, metaverse marketing).

Proactive Platform Governance

- Platforms must enforce mandatory use of their integrated disclosure tools (e.g., making "Paid Partnership" tags non-removable for identified collaborations).
- Development and deployment of AI tools to proactively detect potential non-disclosure or misleading claims at scale.
- Clearer and more accessible reporting mechanisms for consumers.
- Stricter penalties for platform policy violations (e.g., reduced reach, suspension).
- Transparency reports on enforcement actions against misleading content.

Robust Brand Compliance Programs

- Mandatory, comprehensive contracts with influencers explicitly detailing disclosure requirements, claim substantiation obligations, and consequences for non-compliance.
- Systematic training programs for influencers hired by the brand.
- Active monitoring of influencer content pre- and post-publication
- Swift corrective action when violations are identified.

CONCLUSION

In an era where digital influence wields immense persuasive power, accountability for misleading endorsements can no longer rely solely on reactive enforcement. The dynamic and fast-evolving nature of influencer marketing necessitates a proactive, ecosystem-based approach to governance—one that anticipates risks and builds safeguards at every stage. Legal harmonization through a globally adaptable model law, such as one inspired by UNCITRAL, would help address jurisdictional inconsistencies and enable cross-border enforcement. Simultaneously, ethical recalibration is essential—shifting from a checkbox model of compliance to an *authenticity-by-design* framework that embeds truthfulness, transparency, and user respect into the architecture of campaigns. Technological tools must serve as enablers of integrity: blockchain-based ledgers can make disclosures immutable and traceable, while advanced tools like deepfake detection algorithms can guard against deception.

Ultimately, the sustainability of influencer marketing rests on the industry's willingness to place public trust at the center of its regulatory and operational vision. Only by integrating legal, ethical, and technological strategies can we foster a future where influence is not only powerful but principled.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, C. (2016). *"Aren't these just young, rich women doing vain things online?": Influencer selfies as subversive frivolity*. Social Media + Society, 2(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116641342
- Boerman, S. C., Willemsen, L. M., & Van Der Aa, E. P. (2017). *"This post is sponsored": Effects of sponsorship disclosure on persuasion knowledge and electronic word of mouth in the context of Facebook*. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 38, 82–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2016.12.002
- Evans, N. J., Phua, J., Lim, J., & Jun, H. (2017). *Disclosing Instagram influencer advertising: The effects of disclosure language on advertising recognition, attitudes, and behavioral intent*. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 17(2), 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2017.1366885
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (2020). *Disclosures 101 for social media influencers*. https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/plain-language/1001a-influencer-guide-508_1.pdf
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.11.001
- Kapitan, S., & Silvera, D. H. (2016). *From digital media influencers to celebrity endorsers: Attributions drive endorser effectiveness*. Marketing Letters, 27(3), 553–567. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-015-9363-0
- Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2021). *Authenticity in influencer marketing: Understanding source credibility and psychological distance*. Journal of Business Research, 134, 223–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.010
- Lu, L. C., Chang, W. P., & Chang, H. H. (2014). *Consumer attitudes toward blogger's sponsored recommendations and purchase intention: The effect of sponsorship type, product type, and brand awareness*. Computers in Human Behavior, 34, 258–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.007
- Marwick, A. E. (2013). *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age*. Yale University Press.

- Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). *The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate*. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679
- OECD. (2022). *Guidelines on the protection of consumers in e-commerce*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/sti/consumer/ECommerce-Recommendation-2016.pdf
- Perloff, R. M. (2020). *The dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the 21st century* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Shen, B., & Biswas, D. (2022). *Blockchain technology for trust-building in influencer marketing: Opportunities and challenges*. Journal of Business Research, 149, 712–720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.05.071
- Westerlund, M. (2019). *The emergence of deepfake technology: A review*. Technology Innovation Management Review, 9(11), 40–53. https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1282

- World Economic Forum. (2021). *Global principles for digital regulation*. https://www.weforum.org/whitepapers/global-principles-for-digital-regulation/