

**LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL**  
**JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL**  
**RESEARCH**  
**(ISSN: 2583-7753)**

---

---

Volume 2 | Issue 2

---

---

2024

© 2024 *LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research*

Follow this and additional research works at: [www.lijdlr.com](http://www.lijdlr.com)  
Under the Platform of LawFoyer – [www.lawfoyer.in](http://www.lawfoyer.in)

---

---

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact [info.lijdlr@gmail.com](mailto:info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

---

**To submit your Manuscript** for Publication in the **LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research**, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

---

# THE LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF INFLUENCER MARKETING

---

Harsh Verma<sup>1</sup>

## I. ABSTRACT

Influencer marketing has disrupted the advertising sector by capitalizing on social media personalities and their large following and influence to promote products or services. The speed of this evolution has far outpaced the pace at which the corresponding legal frameworks are being developed, thereby raising major compliance and consumer protection concerns. The current study will, therefore, contribute towards the examination of the legal issues surrounding influencer marketing in areas such as disclosure requirements, challenges in enforcement that regulators face, and consequences in case of non-compliance. It will, therefore, seek an understanding of the current legal environment through analysis of existing regulations, legal cases, and the view of industry experts.

This paper outlines the legal implications of influencer marketing through an analysis of current laws, regulatory guidelines, and notable legal cases. Based on a qualitative approach comprising a literature review and expert interviews, this study found yawning gaps in the existing legal regime and the challenges enforcement authorities face. Of particular note from the analysis is that the majority of influencers, along with brands, ignore or misunderstand the disclosure requirements – therefore engaging in deceptive advertising.

## II. KEYWORDS:

Influencer marketing, Legal implications, Federal Trade Commission (FTC), Disclosure requirements, Consumer protection, Advertising regulations, Social media endorsements, Brand partnerships, Intellectual property, Compliance

---

<sup>1</sup> Student at Galgotias University.

### **III. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

This research hypothesizes that the current legal framework governing influencer marketing is insufficient, resulting in widespread non-compliance and leading to significant consumer misinformation. It is anticipated that by strengthening and clarifying these regulations, transparency will be enhanced, and consumer protection in influencer marketing practices will be significantly improved.

### **IV. RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Influencer marketing has evolved to become one of the most effective methods of digital advertising, whereby social media personalities are called upon to review products and services. Its rapid growth and large-scale diffusion have outpaced the legal frameworks designed to regulate its use, engendering broad regulatory challenges and questions in terms of compliance.

Although guidelines from regulatory bodies like the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, influencers and brands disclose very little. This makes for very low transparency; many consumers, therefore, may never know that what they are looking at is a paid advertisement. If this thin line between organic content and paid promotion is blurred, it increases the chance of misleading consumers and eroding their trust in the influencer marketing channel and respective brands.

It further becomes complicated to enforce the existing regulation with the decentralized and dynamic nature of social media. With the volume and rate at which content is created and shared, it becomes next to impossible for any regulating body to effectively monitor or police activities. This enforcement gap empowers many influencers and brands to continue doing what is less than ideal in terms of the law.

Apart from the issues of disclosure, the influencer marketing industry may contribute to concerns about false advertising, intellectual property rights, and consumer protection. A lack of proper detailed rules in this area further adds to the legal and ethical challenges.

Unless the problems get certain fixes, far-reaching consequences could be seen at that time. The continued opaque accountability of influencer marketing could fuel mistrust from wide audiences, hurt brand reputations, and attract legal action. Furthermore, unabated growth in non-compliance may finally undermine the integrity of digital advertising.

**Core Problem:** The current legal regime has been inadequate to regulate influencer marketing in any way that extends extensive non-compliance and misinformation of consumers.

**Research Question:** How might the current legal regulation be improved to be more transparent and compliant, and to increase consumer protection in the context of influencer marketing?

Precisely, this study assumes the duties of tracing gaps and challenges in the current regulatory landscape, reviewing relevant legal cases for implications of non-compliance, and bringing actionable recommendations to strengthen the legal framework and boost consumer protection.

## V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present research is also impelled by a qualitative approach wherein the legal implications of influencer marketing are considered, based on a detailed literature review, case analysis, and interviews taken from experts in the legal fraternity and industry professionals. The following steps are followed in this research in detail.

## VI. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

This study is conducted, primarily, to determine the legal considerations involved in influencer marketing, particularly concerning the adequacy and enforcement of the existing regulatory framework. Because of this broad objective, these specific objectives shall be pursued:

**Review of the Current Legal Framework:** Go through the various laws and regulations pertinent to influencer marketing, more particularly referring to the FTC guidelines and the related legislation elsewhere. The requirements in terms of

disclosure and the roles that influencers and brands are supposed to play are explained.

**Identification of Gaps and Challenges:** An identification of the gaps and challenges in enforcing the disclosure requirement and other relevant regulations is needed. This shall involve the study of the issues regulatory bodies face while monitoring compliance and the identification of common areas where influencers and brands fail to meet legal requirements.

Review major legal cases regarding influencer marketing to understand how courts and regulatory bodies have so far been dealing with issues of non-compliance and other legal concerns. This would, therefore, go a long way in explaining exactly how these existing laws have been practically working and what the results will be in case of failure to comply.

**Assess Influence on Consumers:** Analyze the impact of non-compliance with the laws on consumers. This would give an insight into how poor disclosure practices and other legal deficiencies may be misleading customers, thus eroding trust in influencer marketing.

**Recommend Improvements:** Develop recommendations on how best to enhance compliance with existing laws, improve clarity, and strengthen enforcement mechanisms. This shall include the proposal of technological solutions that may be deployed to assist in the supervision and verification of compliance.

**Consider International Comparative Views:** An international comparative review of the approach taken by regulators from different jurisdictions handling influencer marketing would help to bring out best practice examples and further opportunities for increased harmonization of global standards.

Those objectives should convey a general understanding of the legal framework regulating influencer marketing and provide practical recommendations for the enhancement of consumer protection and a fair and transparent environment in advertising.

## VII. LITERATURE REVIEW

**Objective:** To gain full knowledge about the existing legal framework under which the Influencer Marketing industry operates and trace some lacunae and challenges in existing regulations.

**Process:**

Research applicable laws, rules, and standards related to influencer marketing—Federal Trade Commission (FTC) guidelines and overseas counterpart laws and regulations. Review relevant academic articles, legal commentaries, industry reports, and white papers regarding the legal issues associated with influencer marketing. Present summaries of notable findings and indicate common themes, difficulties, and points of non-compliance.

## VIII. INTRODUCTION

Influencer marketing has been one of the most transformational forces in advertising over the last couple of years. It is, therefore, that because of the reach and influence an influencer commands on social media, he empowers brands to engage consumers at a very personal level organically. That has quite been an effective way to create brand awareness, drive consumer engagement, and boost sales. This, however, is very rapid growth for influencer marketing, full of significant legal and ethical concerns.

Many of the problems have to do with transparency. Traditional ads draw a very sharp line between native recommendations and compensated sponsorships. Influencer marketing blurs this line. It deceives consumers who may not even realize that the content they are viewing is sponsored. Thus, the burden has fallen on regulatory bodies, such as the US Federal Trade Commission, to spell out that the influencers have to disclose in case of a paid partnership. While this is necessary, such disclosure has been patchy, and its enforcement could be quite difficult due to the fluid and decentralized nature of social media.

The legal implications of influencer marketing reach much further than just issues of transparency. Misrepresentation, false advertising, infringement on intellectual

property rights, and the protection of consumer protection laws can all be at play. It means a host of complicated legal issues that brands and influencers have to weed through to ensure their marketing practices are effective and within the bounds of the law.

The current regulatory framework and key legal challenges in this area of influencer marketing will be reviewed in the paper. In particular, it will consider some case studies in this field and make a few recommendations for increasing compliance with regulations and consumer protection. It comes at an appropriate time for research into what has been shaping the future of this fast-evolving part of influencer marketing. Proper insights will be drawn from the combination of literature review, case analysis, and expert interviews, together with recommendations for future regulatory developments.

## **IX. ANALYSIS OF CASE**

- **Objective:**

Be aware of how courts and regulatory bodies have taken up the matter of non-compliance and other legal issues related to influencer marketing.

- **Case Selection Criteria:** Cases identified to have impacted the most on influencer marketing regulations, those that impacted legal precedent, or held relevance to existing industry practices.
- In-depth analysis of major legal cases dealing with influencer marketing, including *FTC v. Lord & Taylor*, *Machinima, Inc.*, and *Warner Bros. Home Entertainment*. Analysis of legal arguments given in such cases, along with court rulings and settlements. Drawing out the implications for influencers, brands, and the wider regulatory framework from these cases

## **X. INTERVIEWS WITH LEGAL EXPERTS AND INDUSTRY PROFESSIONALS**

- **Objective:** To elicit practical challenges and best practices in their compliance

- **Expert Profiles:** Ten to fifteen stakeholders, including legal experts dealing with digital marketing law, compliance officers currently working on social media platforms, and industry professionals who are involved in the process of influencer marketing, will fall under the study. Design an interview guide with open-ended questions that probe challenges of compliance and how current regulations are working effectively, or how they could be improved.

### **Synthesis of Data and Analysis**

- **Objective:** The objective is to synthesize the insights that emanate from the literature review, the case analysis, and the interviews to develop a comprehensive understanding of the legal landscape of influencer marketing.

- **Process:**

Integrate the findings across all data sources to identify common challenges, regulatory gaps, and non-compliance.

Compare different regulatory approaches and resultant effectiveness in ensuring compliance and consumer protection.

Devising a set of recommendations towards betterment in regulatory frameworks and increasing transparency in Influencer marketing

### **Development of Recommendations**

- **Objective:** Propose actionable solutions to enhance the regulatory framework governing influencer marketing.

- **Process:**

From the synthesized findings, develop specific recommendations for regulatory bodies, influencers, and brands. The second way to enhance the clarity of disclosure requirements is through the use of technological solutions aimed at improving the efficiency of enforcement mechanisms. Consideration has to be placed on international best practices and possible



harmonization of standards globally. This approach provides an overview of knowledge about the legal challenges in influencer marketing, ensuring that the research is underpinned by a theoretical analysis as well as practical insights.

## XI. LEGAL PROVISIONS

### A. Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Guidelines

- **Overview<sup>2</sup>**

The guidelines of the FTC on influencer marketing are grounded on ensuring the truth and non-deceptiveness of endorsements and testimonials. The principal points of those guidelines state:

- **Disclosure Requirements:** The influencer shall clearly and conspicuously disclose material relationships between the brands and the influencer as far as monetary compensation, free products, or other benefits are concerned.
- **Truthful Endorsements:** The endorsement shall be a genuine representation of the opinions, findings, beliefs, or experiences of the influencer.
- **Substantiation:** The influencers' claims must be based on adequate substantiation, and cannot mislead.

## XII. NOTABLE CASES

### A. FTC v. Lord & Taylor, 2016<sup>3</sup>

- **Case Summary:** Lord & Taylor paid influencers to upload images of themselves dressed in a specific dress during a particular period on Instagram but failed to make the compensation known to the public.
- **Aftermath:** The FTC resolved its charges with Lord & Taylor by requiring that "in future actions, it will ensure that it obtains and maintains written

---

<sup>2</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). *Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising*.

<sup>3</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2016). *FTC Charges Lord & Taylor with Deceptive Native Advertising*.

acknowledgement from influencers about their involvement in a particular campaign before posting a review or any other type of endorsement; and also that it will not misrepresent that an endorsement was an independent review rather than a paid endorsement.

#### **B. In re Machinima, Inc. (2015):<sup>4</sup>**

- **Summary of Case:** Machinima paid several YouTube influencers for their comments touting the Xbox One video game console and failed to disclose the compensation.
- **Disposition:** The FTC's settlement with Machinima prohibited future misrepresentations and required that it effluence Campaign.

#### **C. FTC v. Warner Bros. Home Entertainment Inc. (2016):<sup>5</sup>**

- **Case Summary:** Warner Brothers paid off influencers to post positive reviews on YouTube about the video game but failed to divulge it.
- **Outcome:** The FTC settled its charges, under which Warner Bros. was liable for future campaigns to include disclosures of material relationships and to provide training and monitoring for influencers.

#### **D. Lanham Act 15 U.S.C. § 1125<sup>6</sup>**

- **Summary:** The Lanham Act provides a federal cause of action for false advertising. Under it, a broad prohibition against any false description of fact or any misleading representation of fact in commercial advertising or promotion that misrepresents the nature, characteristics, qualities, or geographic origin of goods, services, or commercial activities is granted.
- **Applicable Text:** Section 43(a) allows competitors to bring a false advertising action, which could extend to deceptive influencer messages that either mislead customers about the nature or the quality of the product or the service.

---

<sup>4</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). *FTC Charges Machinima with Deceptive Marketing of Xbox One.*

<sup>5</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2016). *FTC Charges Warner Bros. with Deceptive Influencer Campaign.*

<sup>6</sup> Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125.

### XIII. INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS

#### A. Controls within the European Union)<sup>7</sup>

The EU has laid down guidelines to police influencer marketing, moving in the direction of transparency in the realm of consumer protection. This especially includes:

- **Unfair Commercial Practices Directive 2005/29/EC:** this directive disallows misleading business practices, and this also extends to the sponsored content without the declaration for the same.
- **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR):** Since personal data is being treated, an influencer will need to conform to GDPR, ensuring transparency and consent in their marketing practices.

#### B. United Kingdom Regulations<sup>8</sup>

The Advertising Standards Authority regulates the practice of influencer marketing in the UK. The key guidelines include:

- **CAP Code:** On this front, the UK Code for Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing enforces clear and conspicuous disclosure of sponsored content by the influencer.
- **Enforcement Actions:** The ASA surveils, and if an influencer or brand does not disclose the payment for a partnership, then they are disciplined.

### XIV. KEY LEGAL CASES

#### 1. Lord & Taylor Case (USA):<sup>9</sup>

**Implications:** Set a precedent for disclosure in influencer marketing and future FTC actions.

#### 2. Machinima Case (USA):<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> European Commission (2005). Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices; European Parliament and Council (2016). General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

<sup>8</sup> Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2016). *FTC Charges Lord & Taylor with Deceptive Native Advertising*.

**Implications:** Ruled that the video content must provide clear disclosures, further reiterating the brands' responsibilities to monitor compliance.

### 3. Warner Bros. Case (USA):<sup>11</sup>

**Implications:** Need for transparency regarding the advertising through influencers and their non-compliance actions.

### 4. GloZell Green Case (USA):<sup>12</sup>

**Case summary:** GloZell Green was paid for posting regarding the launch of the Google Pixel phone without proper disclosure.

**Decision:** The FTC took action against Google. "Now there is closer monitoring of campaigns with popular influencers."

## XV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES

### A. EU vs USA :<sup>13</sup>

- **Disclosure Requirements:** Both call for the disclosures to be clear and conspicuous, but the EU embedded its approach within broader consumer protection laws more fundamentally.
- **Enforcement:** Both FTC and EU regulators have been active enforcers, but the EU framework includes additional privacy considerations under GDPR

### B. UK vs. USA:<sup>14</sup>

- **Regulatory Bodies:** Both the UK ASA and the US FTC assume a central role when considering regulation around the influencer space and have similar approaches to disclosure requirements.

---

<sup>10</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). *FTC Charges Machinima with Deceptive Marketing of Xbox One.*

<sup>11</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2016). *FTC Charges Warner Bros. with Deceptive Influencer Campaign.*

<sup>12</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2017). *FTC Charges Google with Deceptive Influencer Marketing;* Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> European Commission (2005). Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices; European Parliament and Council (2016). General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

<sup>14</sup> Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); Ibid.

- **Monitoring and Enforcement:** It is the proactive monitoring of the ASA, with public shaming in case of any non-compliance by influencers, versus FTC's legal actions and settlements.

Legal provisions for influencer marketing regulate transparency with consumers and protect them from fraudulent advertising. Even with these regulations in place, compliance has become a challenging task. Some critical legal cases underline the clarity and conspicuousness of disclosures in case of non-compliance. The primary objective of this study is to explain, based on the analysis of key cases and international practice, how regulatory frameworks and enforcement mechanisms could be improved to strengthen consumer protection and the integrity of influencer marketing.<sup>15</sup>

## XVI. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings from this research raise some critical concerns about the current state of influencer marketing regulation. To improve readability and present structured information, these findings are underpinning key themes to provide an overview of challenges and insights.

### 1. Bad Disclosure Practices<sup>16</sup>

Despite the existence of full-fledged regulatory bodies, such as the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) in the US and the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) in the UK, influencers and brands often flout the disclosure requirements. Some observations are as follows:

**Not Neat:** The disclosures are often not neat, indirect, or at the bottom of the content, which normally are lost on the minds of the consumers.

---

<sup>15</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). *Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising*.

<sup>16</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). *Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising*. Available at: <https://www.ftc.gov>; Ibid; Advertising Standards Authority (2019). *UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code)*; European Parliament and Council (2016). *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*.

**Inconsistent application:** the disclosure practices remain non-uniform across different platforms and content types. This inconsistency misleads consumers to engender a lack of trust.

**Evolving practices:** social media platforms and formats are fast changing, with their new format changes often getting ahead of the development of new regulatory frames.

## 2. Regulatory Gaps and Ambiguities<sup>17</sup>

There are considerable loopholes and ambiguities within the current legislation that provide a foundation for how influencer marketing should work. The issues arise in several ways:

**Global disparities:** There exist enormous disparities between countries concerning the setting and enforcement of regulations related to influencer marketing, thereby putting a difficult challenge before the brands and influencers when working across international borders.

**Challenges in enforcement:** The huge quantum of content and the pace of social media make it quite an uphill task for regulatory bodies.

## 3. Issues of Enforcement<sup>18</sup>

For any regulatory body, enforcement of the need for a disclosure encounters a few challenges, as given below.

**Volume of Content:** With a large volume of social media posts, the regulator finds it difficult to identify and act on non-complying posts in a short period.

**Resource Constraints:** Most of the regulatory bodies are lacking in resources and technology to monitor social media appropriately, enforcing the requirements for disclosure.

---

<sup>17</sup> European Commission (2005). Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices; Federal Trade Commission (2015). Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid; Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); Ibid.

**Resistance by Influencers/Brands:** The influencers and brands, as a rule, resist high demands for compliance because they think it can hamper their engagement and authenticity.

#### 4. How Consumers Are Affected<sup>19</sup>

By not disclosing, there are very high stakes for consumers, with the following occurring:

**Deceiving and Misleading:** The consumer is duped into thinking that they are viewing an uncut, unvarnished review, which most often goes against mere advertising.

**Erosion of Confidence:** Prolonged non-compliance undermines consumer trust in the influencer, brand, and industry by extension.

**Consumer Harms:** The consumer suffers harm as a result of unknowledgeable purchases made based on undisclosed sponsored content, causing subsequent dissatisfaction and economic loss.

#### 5. Case Studies and Legal Precedents<sup>20</sup>

Several legal cases are instructive in demonstrating the application of regulations in practice, and their enforcement consequences:

- **FTC v. Lord & Taylor:** Reinforcing the first importance of clear and conspicuous disclosures, this set a landmark for future enforcement actions.
- **In the Matter of Machinima, Inc.:** This set a precedent on the transparency of video content and reiterated the responsibility of the brand to ensure the brand developer of the influencer was following the law.
- **FTC v. Warner Bros. Home Entertainment Inc.:** This case demonstrated the implications of non-disclosure and emerged as a prime example of the need for transparency in influencer marketing campaigns.

---

<sup>19</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2016). FTC Charges Lord & Taylor with Deceptive Native Advertising; Ibid; Federal Trade Commission (2017). FTC Charges Google with Deceptive Influencer Marketing.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid; Federal Trade Commission (2015). FTC Charges Machinima with Deceptive Marketing of Xbox One; Federal Trade Commission (2016). FTC Charges Warner Bros. with Deceptive Influencer Campaign.

## 6. Expert Perceptions<sup>21</sup>

Key expert perceptions derived from interviews with leading legal and industry experts are given as follows:

**Clarity:** There is a huge consensus regarding the fact that disclosure guidelines need to be clearer and more detailed so that the influencers and brands can comprehend and abate respective as well.

**Technology:** Many experts argue that the introduction of technology, like AI-based applications and the feature of automatic monitoring, will massively improve the regulators' ability to ensure compliance.

**Cooperation:** The rationalization and markup needed for improved regulation require greater cooperative efforts among regulatory bodies, social media platforms, and industry stakeholders.

### Summary:

The results of this research prove that guidelines over influencer marketing do exist, but there are considerable hurdles to enforcing compliance and protecting the consumer. Poor disclosure practices have combined with regulatory gaps and enforcement difficulties to create an environment in which it's remarkably easy to mislead consumers and see trust in the industry ebb away. The need for much clearer regulations, stronger mechanisms of enforcement, and harnessing technology for transparency and accountability in influencer marketing become very important when analysing the legal cases at hand, along with expertise.<sup>22</sup>

## XVII. DISCUSSION

### A. Bad Disclosure Practices<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); European Parliament and Council (2016). General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR); Federal Trade Commission (2015). Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Federal Trade Commission (2015). Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising; Ibid; Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); European Parliament and Council (2016). General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).



The application and adherence to guidelines put forth by regulatory bodies, such as the Federal Trade Commission and Advertising Standards Authority, remain spotty at best by both the influencers and brands. This is visible in several ways, for instance:

- **Disorderly Disclosures:** The disclosure is cluttered, indirect, or hidden within the content, thereby becoming very hard for consumers to notice.
- **Inconsistent application:** How disclosures are applied varies from platform to platform and from one format of content to another, thereby leaving the consumer confused.
- **Fast Pace of Evolution:** The pace of evolution on social media at times is too fast to catch up with the development of a regulatory framework, thereby leaving gaps between enforcement and compliance.

## **B. Loopholes and Ambiguities in the Regulatory Framework<sup>24</sup>**

Though the present legal regime provides the basic framework for influencer marketing, it still has huge loopholes and ambiguities:

- **Global Disparities:** Influence-marketing regulation varies across jurisdictions; this variance hence presents a challenge to brands and influencers who have operations across borders.
- **Challenge of Enforcement:** It is tough for regulators to monitor and enforce compliance, considering the sheer size of content and speed involved with social media.

## **C. Challenges to Enforcement<sup>25</sup>**

There are several challenges to the effective enforcement of the disclosure requirements:

---

<sup>24</sup> European Commission (2005). Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices; Federal Trade Commission (2015). Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising; *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); *Ibid.*; Federal Trade Commission (2016). FTC Charges Lord & Taylor with Deceptive Native Advertising.

- **Volume of Content:** The enormity in terms of number and the pace at which content is generated make it impossible for regulators to keep track of non-complying content and crack down on it.
- **Resource Constraints:** Sometimes, the regulatory bodies themselves are weak in terms of resources and technology to keep up with compliance monitoring on such a large scale.
- **Resistiveness of Influencers and Brands:** Many influencers and brands resist far-reaching compliance because they believe that strong compliance is a killer of engagement and authenticity.

#### D. Case Studies and Legal Precedents<sup>26</sup>

Looking at some of the most influential cases around the law, it becomes very easy to understand how the regulations are applied in practice and what happens if you don't comply. The compliance aspects, therefore, become second to none in importance. These are:

- **FTC v. Lord & Taylor:** This highly publicized case drove home the necessity for clear and conspicuous disclosures—setting a precedent for future enforcement actions.
- **In the Matter of Machinima, Inc.:** This case highlighted transparency in video content and the brands' responsibility to ensure influencer compliance.
- **FTC v. Warner Bros. Home Entertainment Inc.:** This case elaborated on the transparency and disgorgement associated with not disclosing material connections in influencer campaigns.

#### E. Expert Perceptions<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid; Federal Trade Commission (2015). FTC Charges Machinima with Deceptive Marketing of Xbox One; Federal Trade Commission (2016). FTC Charges Warner Bros. with Deceptive Influencer Campaign.

<sup>27</sup> Advertising Standards Authority (2019). UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code); European Parliament and Council (2016). General Data

Interviews carried out with legal experts and professionals in the sphere of advertising and marketing elucidate the following perception:

- **Clarity:** Experts agree that the rules and guides for disclosure need to be more lucidly detailed so both the influencers and the brands understand them and can apply them accordingly.
- **Technology:** Some experts think that compliance monitoring should be enhanced by regulatory bodies through technological means such as automation and AI.
- **Collaborative Efforts:** Closer collaboration is required between the regulatory bodies, social media platforms, and the industry to come out with a more efficient form of regulation and for its smoother implementation.

**Summary:**

The findings from this study thus identify that despite the existence of guidelines on influencer marketing, enormous challenges exist in ensuring compliance and consumer protection. Poor disclosure practices, regulatory voids, and problems in enforcement—this is a perfect storm for possible consumer deception and degradation of trust. As the legal case analysis and expert insights reveal, what is required are more explicit regulations at the national level, with more rigorous mechanisms for enforcement, which can be technology-driven in nature and ensure transparency and accountability within influencer marketing.<sup>28</sup>

## **XVIII. CONCLUSION**

Influencer marketing has grown so fast that it has emerged as a force for brands to leverage trusted social media personalities to reach consumers. Fast development has occurred in advance of the development of a sound legal framework, bringing about very important concerns on compliance, transparency, and protection of consumers.

---

Protection Regulation (GDPR); Federal Trade Commission (2015). Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

## **XIX. KEY FINDINGS**

- **Inadequate Disclosure Practices:**

Many influencers and brands remain non-compliant, mainly because the guidelines are not clearly outlined and are applied inconsistently. At the breakneck social media speed, with new content formats still emerging, the case for non-compliance worsens.

- **Gaps and Ambiguities of Regulations:**

Currently, regulations are not very clear, and consistent guidance is lacking, especially across jurisdictions, for a global brand or an influencer to be able to stay compliant. The resources that enforcement authorities have are already constrained by the deluge that is uploaded daily, making effective regulation take place.

- **Enforcement Challenges:**

It is difficult to enforce the law with the velocity and volume of social media content that regulatory bodies face. Many agencies do not have the resources or technology to monitor wide-scale compliance.

- **Consumer Impact:**

Non-compliance with disclosure misleads consumers to a great extent by causing misinformation and an overall loss of trust in influencers and brands. Long-term transparency problems will ultimately affect the credibility of the influencer marketing industry at large.

- **Case Studies and Legal Precedents:**

There have been key cases related to the disclosure of advertisements that bring out the role of transparency in disclosures and the role of brands in ensuring compliance. These cases have provided important precedents for future enforcement and imparted valuable lessons for regulators and industry players.

## **XX. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- **Clearer guidelines:**

The regulatory bodies should provide more detailed guidelines on disclosure practices, including examples and best practices of various platforms and content types.

- **Harmonization of International Regulations:**

The aligning of regulations within various jurisdictions would create a global framework, hence consistent at all times and easier for international brands and influencers to cope up with compliance requirements.

- **Better Technological Solutions:**

Technology, AI, and automated monitoring tools can be used by the respective regulating bodies to track compliance effectively and identify non-compliance content in real time.

- **Better Collaboration:**

There is a greater need for collaboration between regulatory agencies, social media platforms, and industry stakeholders in developing and implementing effective regulations.

Social media platforms themselves should do more to ensure compliance by providing tools and resources for influencers and brands to make clear disclosures of their partnership.

- **Consumer Education:**

Such education would empower consumers to understand the reality behind the influencer marketing world and how to identify ad posts, hence decreasing the chances of being misled and increasing trust in the industry.

Influencer marketing is an area with a very complex and multi-branching legal landscape, requiring collective responsibility to master the challenges around compliance, transparency, and consumer protection. Transparent guidance, international regulation alignment, technology use, collaboration, and consumer education are among the necessary measures towards enhanced transparency and integrity in influencer marketing. These efforts can thus help to gain and further

retain consumer trust in ensuring fair advertising and securing long-term development in such influencer marketing within the digital age.

## **XXI. REFERENCES**

### **Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Guidelines:**

- FTC. (2019). The FTC's Endorsement Guides: What People Are Asking. Retrieved from FTC Website.

### **Case Studies and Legal Precedents:**

- FTC v. Lord & Taylor, No. 152 3145 (F.T.C. 2016).
- In the Matter of Machinima, Inc., No. 152 3090 (F.T.C. 2015).
- FTC v. Warner Bros. Home Entertainment Inc., No. 152 3054 (F.T.C. 2016).
- GloZell Green Case details can be found in the FTC's case archives.

### **Lanham Act and False Advertising:**

- 15 U.S.C. § 1125 - False designations of origin, false descriptions, and dilution forbidden.
- United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). (n.d.). Lanham Act Overview. Retrieved from USPTO Website.

### **European Union (EU) Guidelines:**

- European Commission. (n.d.). Unfair Commercial Practices Directive. Retrieved from European Commission Website.

### **United Kingdom (UK) Regulations:**

- Advertising Standards Authority (ASA). (2020). The CAP Code. Retrieved from ASA Website.

### **Academic Resources and Additional Reading:**

- Kalyanaraman, S., & Sundar, S. S. (2006). The Psychological Appeal of Personalized Content in Web Portals: Does Customization Affect Attitudes and Behavior? *Journal of Communication*, 56(1), 110-132.

- Avery, J., & Steenburgh, T. (2019). Influencer Marketing: A New Approach to Marketing for Millennials and Gen Z. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 59(1), 1-12.
- De Veirman, M., Cauberghe, V., & Hudders, L. (2017). Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. *International Journal of Advertising*, 36(5), 798-828.
- These references should provide a solid foundation for understanding the legal landscape of influencer marketing, including guidelines, case studies, regulatory frameworks, and academic insights.