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I. INTRODUCTION

Nine years ago Michelle Phan uploaded her first YouTube video, a simple “Natural Looking Makeup Tutorial,” recorded on her laptop. She did not have an eye-catching backdrop, ring light, or a camera crew. Nevertheless, the video was viewed over 40,000 times within the first week. YouTube was not as saturated as it is today, so it was common to start from the bottom without the high tech devices. As the years went on, Michelle’s videos became a bit more creative, her camera quality improved, and she became a household name (in the YouTube beauty-world). To adapt with her increasing popularity, she became a full-time Beauty Influencer. Influencers are “digital natives who post… to their…followers – who then rush out and buy the products they recommend.” She established her brand and began creating sponsored videos, where she was compensated to review beauty products. Michelle believed YouTube would be the global television of the future, and she was determined to be a part of the culture.

Michelle is known in the YouTube beauty circles as one of the original Beauty Influencers, and most Beauty Influencers aspire to emulate her career. In 2012, Michelle added another aspect to her brand when she
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created Ipsy, a paid subscription service. Every month subscribers receive a glam bag filled with deluxe samples and full-sized beauty products. With over 1.5 million subscribers and a team of nine other Beauty Influencers, known as Ipsy Stylists, who post monthly videos about the glam bag, Ipsy is Michelle’s most lucrative business venture to date. Today, the company is valued at over $500 million. Since its inception, Ipsy has evolved into more than a subscription service. The company has an open studio with state-of-the-art equipment, props, cameras, and lighting for Beauty Influencers to create their own videos. Michelle believes the company’s success is attributed to her niche market on the internet, stating “the beauty of the internet is there’s a niche market for everything and if you can focus on it you can build a sustainable and viable business of it.”

In 2013, with over one billion YouTube views, and a successful business venture, Michelle started her own makeup line, Em, with the beauty company L’Oréal. Her cosmetic line had a wonderful start, but it was underperforming, despite its association with megabrand L’Oréal. In 2015, Michelle set out to “deconstruct [herself], [her] business, and find all of the holes in [her] empire.” She was determined to “fill the holes… with people who could do it better.” Last year Ipsy purchased Em from L’Oréal, allowing Michelle to assume full control of the brand. Despite the setbacks, Michelle Phan established herself as a brand. She is a Beauty Influencer and a business woman.
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Michelle paved the way for Beauty Influencers today. Beauty Influencers are like celebrities in their own right. They receive press packages from companies; they are sent on paid vacations to the Caribbean and Europe; some are paid as much as actors on television; and they have a fan base that value their opinions and look to them for inspiration. Companies allocate larger-than-ever budgets to digital strategy, and are spending less on celebrity endorsements and traditional advertising. Beauty Influencers are changing the fashion and beauty landscape. Women no longer rely on fashion and beauty magazines for advice; they now turn to Beauty Influencers.

Companies once relied solely on celebrity endorsements to reach their target market. For years, cosmetics company CoverGirl, focused on its celebrity ambassadors Queen Latifah, Ellen DeGeneres and Katy Perry. However, in 2016 it announced the company’s first “CoverBoy,” a 17-year-old, male Beauty Influencer. With Beauty Influencers now at the forefront of digital advertising, naturally, consumer protection concerns will arise. In an attempt to protect consumers in this new mode of advertising, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) requires the relationship between an Influencer and a brand to be disclosed. In 2009, the FTC released updated information regarding the Guides to “advise the public on how to conduct affairs
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regarding sponsorship disclosure.’”\textsuperscript{32} In 2015, it updated the “What People Are Asking” page, to address disclosure language, specifically social media disclosure, but it did not change the underlying principles and policies relating to endorsements.\textsuperscript{33}

Despite the new wave of social media and its continued influence on the beauty and fashion industry, the FTC has not made any major updates to the Guides itself.\textsuperscript{34} The FTC has not addressed this change head on, but it desperately needs to. Part I of this note will discuss the history of social media, specifically YouTube, and its relationship with Beauty Influencers. Part II will discuss the FTC, generally, and FTC disclosure law. Part III will address the holes in disclosure law, as applicable to current social media trends, which opens the door for Beauty Influencers and brands to engage in deceptive behavior. Part IV will provide suggestions as to how the FTC should address the current state of social media, Beauty Influencers and its influence on consumers.

II. HISTORY

A. Emergence of Social Media

The early 2000’s was a very important time for social media; Myspace launched in 2003, Facebook and Twitter in 2006 and Tumblr in 2007.\textsuperscript{35} For the first time in what seemed like forever, the way people interacted with each other changed. It became easier to catch up with friends from 10 years ago, meet family members you heard stories about, and interact with your peers when discussing important entertainment and political events.\textsuperscript{36} Fast-forward a decade, there is now an app or website for almost every form of communication. Sharing exciting photos with friends?
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Instagram.\textsuperscript{37} Sharing your thoughts in 140 characters or less? Twitter.\textsuperscript{38} Sharing a nine second video of a cool moment? Snapchat.\textsuperscript{39} The list goes on. In 2015, there was an estimated 2.14 billion social media users worldwide.\textsuperscript{40} Seven percent of American adults used social media in 2005, but usage skyrocketed to sixty-five percent in 2015.\textsuperscript{41} Ninety percent of young adults (age 18-29) use social media, while those aged sixty-five and older have continuously increased their usage since 2005.\textsuperscript{42}

B. Social Media Today: Effect on Celebrities and Beauty Influencers

1. Celebrities

Social media broadened the traditional definition of communication, and celebrities caught on. With social media at your fingertips, it is easier to keep up with your favorite Kardashian, receive fashion advice from your favorite model, and catch up on the latest celebrity gossip in real time. Celebrities are maximizing their fame and fortune simply by tweeting a fan or raving about their favorite beauty products on Snapchat.\textsuperscript{43} There is more to a celebrity’s social media profile than what the public thinks.\textsuperscript{44}

The way celebrities communicate with fans has evolved through social media. Their profiles are dedicated to maintaining their brand image, building relationships with their fan base, reforming their celebrity image and utilizing their profiles to distribute content.\textsuperscript{45} It is common for publicists to control celebrities’ social pages by consistently uploading content; however,
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it is evident that some celebrities control their own accounts. The content from the celebrity-controlled accounts is not as rigid and doesn’t appear too “perfect.” It is honest, funny and inviting. Supermodel Chrissy Teigen is known for her hilarious, filter-free tweets that fans love. Once they have established a connection with their fan base on social media, their profiles become the main source of updates. Trailers for their new movies will be posted on Facebook and pictures from an upcoming magazine cover will be uploaded to Instagram. Celebrities social media presences allows them to “directly distribute[] their own un-regulated content to their fans… [which] benefits the celebrity monetarily… [and] the fans [because] they feel a more personal connection to the stars they love.”

2. Beauty Influencers

In the next 60 seconds 300 hours of video footage will be uploaded to YouTube. The topics will range from beauty, fashion, comedy and technology. YouTube subscribers will learn about new products—l lipsticks, video games or vlogs (video blogs). Michelle Phan may have paved the way for Beauty Influencers today, but she is no longer the “go-to Beauty Influencer.” Almost every beauty brand has a select few Beauty Influencers that it relies on to review its products. Some started their career the old fashion way on YouTube (continuously posting videos and engaging with subscribers in the comments section), but others utilized social media sites such as Instagram and Facebook before joining YouTube. Today, it is not
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unusual for an influencer to build support and a fan base on other social media sites prior to joining YouTube. The most common platform is Instagram because it provides the visual aspect that YouTuber’s need to demonstrate their skills and their eye for creativity. That did not affect their career because like YouTube, Instagram is a visual-based site. It allows direct communication with followers and, at times, can be more personal. However, YouTube influencers are the “biggest” Beauty Influencers. They are first in line to receive public relation packages from fashion and beauty houses. They are chosen to travel to exotic locations with well-known makeup brands. And it is their faces you see on the newest beauty product campaign when you walk into your nearest drugstore or department store.

Brands are turning to Beauty Influencers because of their close connection with target markets. Consumers are more likely to go online and seek advice or inspiration from Beauty Influencers than go to a department store and work with a professional beauty consultant. Beauty influencers filmed Eighty-six percent of the top 200 most-viewed beauty videos on YouTube, and only fourteen percent were filmed by beauty brands. However, Beauty Influencers have become professional consultants in their own right. Some have agents, their own production companies and full-time staff. They have press packages and negotiate fee contracts, much like what
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is expected of an international celebrity. By combining their creativity with an effective business plan, Influencers can turn their YouTube channel and other social media platforms into a full-time job, and in the long run, a career. On average, popular Influencers make at least $40,000 a year simply off creating, editing and posting videos. To be clear, however, that number will vary based on the Influencer’s subscribers, total views per video, engagement, ads placed throughout each video, and most importantly YouTube’s ever-changing algorithm. Solo YouTube videos are not always the only source of income. Most Influencers are signed to a network that promises to provide more opportunities and room for growth. Additionally, Influencers are paid for sponsored videos or social media posts. Influencers with over one million Instagram followers can make $15,000 per post.

Media’s Biggest Style Stars Really Make, MARIE CLAIRE (Aug. 17, 2016), http://www.marieclaire.com/fashion/news/a22091/business-of-style-stars/ (Chiara Ferragani created her fashion blog in 2009. Today, she has over 6.2 million followers on Instagram, receives $50,000 to host events, launched her own shoe line and works with popular fashion houses such as Yves Saint Laurent to promote their latest products. Almost a decade after her first blog post, she became a successful entrepreneur, employs 14 people, and has garnered approximately seven million dollars in revenue).
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Influencers continue to dominate the beauty and fashion industry. “They are businesswomen who are basically running mini-empires on their own.”

III. THE FTC

A. General Overview of The Federal Trade Commission

On September 26, 1914, the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTCA) was signed into Law. Its mission was to prevent unfair methods of competition in commerce as part of the battle to “bust trusts.” To keep up with the changing economy, Congress continues to pass additional laws giving the agency greater authority to police anticompetitive practices. In 1938, Congress broadened the scope of the Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) authority to encompass a broad prohibition against unfair and deceptive acts or practices.

Over time, the FTC has expanded its original purpose. It is committed to: (1) preventing business practices that are anticompetitive or unfair to consumers; (2) enhancing informed consumer choice and public understanding of the competitive process; (3) accomplishing this without unduly burdening legitimate business activity. The FTC’s vision and purposes are implemented through three strategic goals: protecting consumers, maintaining competition and advancing performance.

B. FTC Disclosure Law

1. Brief History

Relationships between brands and public figures have been a topic of conversation since the early twentieth century. In 1912 Congress enacted the Newspaper Publicity Act. It subsidized postage publishers so long as it distinguished content that was paid with money or other valuable consideration, as advertisements. When radio advertising came to the

---

70 Piazza, supra note 68.
72 Id.
73 Id.
74 Id.
75 Id.
76 Id.
78 Id. at 335.
79 Id.
forefront, Congress enacted §19 of the Radio Act of 1927 to combat any attempts to deceive listeners by requiring broadcasters to disclose the role of sponsors in their programming.\textsuperscript{80}

In 1934 Congress enacted the Communications Act to regulate interstate and international communications.\textsuperscript{81} Through the act, Congress later established the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).\textsuperscript{82} The FTCA and the Communications Act of 1934 are the only relevant pieces of legislation that address regulations for disclosure of sponsorship.\textsuperscript{83} The 1934 Act addresses sponsorship disclosure regulation in broadcasting\textsuperscript{84} and the FTCA governs all types of trade and commerce.\textsuperscript{85} Today, Influencers’ use of social media, as a source of advertising, is governed predominantly by the FTC under the FTCA.\textsuperscript{86}

2. FTC Authority

The FTC was created to regulate unfair methods of competition. The Commission’s goal is to protect consumers by focusing on unfair or deceptive practices in or affecting commerce.\textsuperscript{87}

Section 5 of the FTC Act declares unfair or deceptive practices unlawful. Section 12 specifically prohibits false ads likely to induce the purchase of food, drugs, devices or cosmetics. Section 15 defines a false ad for purposes of Section 12 as one which is “misleading in a material respect.”\textsuperscript{88}

The FTC reviews deceptive practices on a case-by-case basis based on the following elements. First, it will determine if there is a representation, omission or practice that is likely to mislead the consumer.\textsuperscript{89} Misleading practices may include:

- false oral or written representations, misleading price claims, sales of hazardous or systematically defective
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products or services without adequate disclosures, failure to disclose information regarding pyramid sales, use of bait and switch techniques, failure to perform promised services, and failure to meet warranty obligations.\textsuperscript{90}

Second, it “examine[s] the practice from the perspective of a consumer acting reasonably in the circumstances.”\textsuperscript{91} It also examines representations or practices directed toward a particular group by examining the reasonableness from the perspective of that group.\textsuperscript{92} Third, the Commission will examine whether the representation, omission, or practice is material:

The basic question is whether the act or practice is likely to affect the consumer's conduct or decision with regard to a product or service. If so, the practice is material, and consumer injury is likely, because consumers are likely to have chosen differently but for the deception. In many instances, materiality, and hence injury, can be presumed from the nature of the practice. In other instances, evidence of materiality may be necessary.\textsuperscript{93}

Accordingly, a practice is deceptive, if to a consumer's detriment, it is likely to mislead a consumer acting reasonably under the circumstances.\textsuperscript{94}

3. FTC Endorsement Guides

In an attempt to assist consumers and brands in the scope of disclosure law, the FTC released Endorsement Guides (the Guides).\textsuperscript{95} It is essentially a “frequently asked question” section of the FTC’s website. Entitled “What People Are Asking,” the page is a source of informal guidance relating to the Guides.\textsuperscript{96} The Guides apply to all advertising media – social media and traditional media.\textsuperscript{97} The Guides are the Commissions interpretations of the Act, and its main principle is to promote honesty.\textsuperscript{98} The FTC promotes a truth-in-advertising principle which follows that endorsements must be honest and not misleading.\textsuperscript{99} It “must reflect the honest opinion of the endorser and can’t be used to make a claim that the product’s
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marketer couldn’t legally make.” Since the FTC regulates practices only after they are reported, “the Guides were designed to encourage voluntary compliance by informing endorsers and advertisers of how to conform their practices to the requirements of the Act.”

a. Legal Basis for the Guides

Standing alone, the Guides do not have the force of law. However, practices that do not align with them, may violate sections of the FTCA. The Guides’ legal authority stem from Section 5 of the FTCA. The FTCA prohibits “unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.” The Guides spell out a three-part test to determine whether a representation, omission or act is deceptive. First, “the representation, omission, or practice must mislead or be likely to mislead the consumer.” Second, “the consumer’s interpretation of the representation, omission, or practice must be reasonable under the circumstances.” Lastly, “the misleading representation, omission or practice must be material.” In 2009, the FTC promulgated changes that focused on consumer-generated content, and the amendment clarified the Guides applicability to new technology endorsements by including examples.
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108 Id.; 16 C.F.R. § 255.0 (2009) (Example 8: “A consumer who regularly purchases a particular brand of dog food decides one day to purchase a new, more expensive brand made by the same manufacturer. She writes in her personal blog that the change in diet has made her dog’s fur noticeably softer and shinier, and that in her opinion, the new food definitely is worth the extra money… Assuming the consumer joins a network marketing program under which she periodically receives various products about which she can write reviews if she wants to do so. If she receives a free bag of the new dog food through this program, her positive review would be considered an endorsement under the Guides”).
b. Proper Disclosure

1. Endorsements: Defined

Under Section 255.0, an endorsement is:

any advertising message (including verbal statements, demonstrations, or depictions of the name, signature, likeness or other identifying personal characteristics of an individual or the name or seal of an organization) that consumers are likely to believe reflects the opinions, beliefs, findings, or experiences of a party other than the sponsoring advertiser, even if the views expressed by that party are identical to those of the sponsoring advertiser. The party whose opinions, beliefs, findings, or experience the message appears to reflect will be called the endorser and may be an individual, group, or institution.110

The FTC categorizes testimonials as advertisements.111 Thus, when “advertisements” are mentioned, the language also applies to testimonials.112

2. When to disclose

Influencers must disclose an endorsement if there is any material connection between an endorser and an advertiser.113 Because most Beauty Influencers are compensated for posting onto their social media platforms, the FTC considers this to be a material relationship, and it requires disclosure.114 Disclosure is also required if the Influencer is promoting a brand with which she has a relationship.115 Using Michelle Phan as an example, she must disclose her status as founder of Ipsy when she is promoting it to her followers. Furthermore, an Influencer must disclose her affiliation with the brand if she is being compensated in any way to promote or endorse a product or brands.116
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The disclosure requirement does not discriminate. A simple photo can trigger the rule. By posting a photo of a product, it can potentially convey a positive opinion, and if it does, disclosure is required.

Brands typically work with Beauty Influencers for long periods of times, and this relationship is also affected by the disclosure requirement. For example, prior to launching its new line of concealers, cosmetics company NARS, worked with Beauty Influencer Jackie Aina. She released a series of YouTube Videos, Instagram posts, and Tweets demonstrating how to use the product, and referred to it as “one of her favorite concealers.” In a situation like Jackie’s, disclosure is required for each individual post and upload.

Twitter is known for its 140-character limit updates; in fact, the limit is what makes Twitter, Twitter; however, the FTC says character limits are not an excuse for failing to disclose. To work around the character limit issue, “Ad” or “#ad” can be used instead of spelling out the entire word.

The rules govern contests as well. When conducting giveaways on their social media platforms, Beauty Influencers and brands must disclose all rules from the beginning.

In sum, the FTC states disclosures in social media posts require the inclusion of “clear and conspicuous” disclosures near the beginning of each post.

3. How to Disclose

At the center of the disclosure requirement for material connections between advertisers and endorsers is the need for “clear and conspicuous” disclosures. In Section 255.5, the FTC broadly defines “clear and conspicuous,” and included factors it considers when determining whether a disclosure is clear and conspicuous. Disclosure is required near the
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beginning of posts. Abbreviations such as “ad” or clear statements that the/a brand has endorsed the post, will suffice. ‘Sp’ is not accepted. The disclosure must be:

- “Close to the claims to which it relates (ie., do not hide the disclosure all the way at the bottom of the post or bury it amongst other text or other hashtags, or add "ad" at the end of another hashtag);
- In an easily readable font and font size;
- In a color that stands out against the background (ie., one cannot hide the disclosure this way either);
- [For video ads] On the screen long enough to be noticed, read, and understood; and
- [For audio disclosures] Read at a cadence that is easy for consumers to follow and in words consumers will understand.”

Additionally, disclosures are measured by a reasonable consumer’s perception and understanding of the disclosure. Influencers have freedom as to how they formulate disclosures so long as they are large, clear, and appropriate. In sum, disclosures cannot be hidden among texts or at the end of other hashtags. Disclosures must be in an easily readable font and font size, and must be in a color that stands out against the background. For sponsored videos- disclosure must be on the screen long enough to be noticed read and understood.

IV. CRITICISM OF THE GUIDES: WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING

A. Commentators and Bloggers Differing Opinions

Prior to the 2015 Q&A section of the FTC’s website, the Guides were last updated in 2009. The change came in response to changes in the forms
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Blogger and professor, Dan Gillmor, published an article in response to the FTC’s release and received support on his viewpoints from fellow bloggers. According to Gillmor, the FTC’s disclosure requirements for advertisers and endorsers, which are centered around material connections, and penalties of up to $11,000 in fines for violations, are “unworkable in practice.” Gillmor believes the rules are “worryingly vague and wide-ranging.” The Guides focus appears to be on giving traditional print and broadcast journalists a pass, but it applies “harsh regulations to bloggers (and others using conversational media of various kinds).” He goes on to say the Guides, in the end, are “an attack on markets and free speech, based on the 20th Century notion of media and advertising that simply does not map to the new era.” Gillmor opines that there is a difference between advertising of the past, and present day advertising. Advertising of the past was a one-to-many system, but today, the internet is a many-to-many system. Furthermore, advertisers and endorsers must rely on examples to determine
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when disclosure is required. However, the examples cannot provide the advertisers or endorsers with a level of security. Bloggers or Influencers are not always sure when they are required to disclose a relationship with a brand.

Gillmor concludes, by stating the FTC’s motives “seem to be well-intentioned,” and it is always better to disclose than hide an affiliation with a company, but he loathes the idea of using bloggers and other online conversations are “commercial sock puppets in a sleazy online word-of-mouth operation.” He further elaborates that the real focus should be enforcing fraud laws against “serious fraudsters” that continue to get away with the illegal acts before imposing harsh regulations on speech.

Alternatively, some commentators believe the FTC’s new found focus on non-traditional media is “good.” Ryan Jones, commentator and analyst, believes there is nothing to worry about, in regards to the Guides. Jones states the Guides can only help bloggers. If they (bloggers) want to be treated as seriously as newspaper journalists, they too need to start following the same rules and guidelines. He goes on to state, “the FTC rules are pretty simple” and easy to abide by. If there is truly confusion as to whether disclosure is required, to be on the safe side, just disclose. If someone is still worried about whether to disclose, Jones believes the decision is simple: do not do paid review or posts, and do not accept freebies.

B. Basis for the Criticisms

The criticism of the Guides is centered around four basic topics: 1) restricting speech, 2) a double standard in traditional and new advertising mediums, 3) the unenforceability of the Guides and 4) imbalance of responsibility between advertisers and bloggers or Influencers.
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1. Restricting Speech

As stated earlier in this note, Dan Gillmor, along with other commentators believe the requirements imposed by the Guides can, and will affect Influencers free speech. 160 With the fear of fines looming over each post or paid sponsorship, Influencers will be discouraged from expressing their honest, or paid opinion about products. 161 According to commentators, this will result in advertisers cutting back on relying on Influencers to reach a certain target market. 162 The FTC strongly stated that testimonials “are regulated only when a blogger purports to be representative of all product users and when the advertiser cannot substantiate the bloggers claims.”163

It is important to note, however, the Guides may restrict speech under certain circumstances. An honest opinion, idea or belief is protected under the First Amendment, but an opinion that does not reflect a genuine belief of the reviewed, and is limited to the reviewed experience is not protected under the First Amendment.164 Influencers may be fined when they present misleading opinions to their audiences.165 Despite the nature of the Guides and whether it actually restricts free speech, the FTC has authority to regulate speech under Central Hudson v. Public Service Commission.166

2. Traditional and New Advertising Mediums

Bloggers and Influencers believe the FTC is cracking down on their respective mediums,167 but the FTC disagrees. It stated the restrictions on the new advertising mediums was an attempt to distinguish between those who receives the compensation and who does the review.168 FTC Commissioner Richard Cleland stated the FTC’s main criteria is the degree of relationship between the advertiser and the blogger.169

The primary situation is where there’s a link to the sponsoring seller and the blogger,’ said Cleland. And if a blogger repeatedly reviewed similar products (say, books or
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smartphones), then the FTC would raise an eyebrow if the blogger either held onto the product or there was any link to an advertisement.\textsuperscript{170}

To further explain the difference between the mediums, the commissioner uses an example: a blogger and a newspaper both receive books to review.

In the case where the newspaper receives the book and it allows the reviewer to review it, it’s still the property of the newspaper. Most of the newspapers have very strict rules about that and on what happens to those products. In the case of books, Cleland saw no problem with a blogger receiving a book, provided there wasn’t a linked advertisement to buy the book and that the blogger did not keep the book after he had finished reviewing it. Keeping the book would, from Cleland’s standpoint, count as “compensation” and require a disclosure.

Cleland said that a disclosure was necessary when it came to an individual blogger, particularly one who is laboring for free. A paid reviewer was in the clear because money was transferred from an institution to the reviewer, and the reviewer was obligated to dispense with the product. I wondered if Cleland was aware of how many paid reviewers held onto their swag.

I expect that when I read my local newspaper, I may expect that the reviewer got paid,” said Cleland. His job is to be paid to do reviews. Your economic model is the advertising on the side.

From Cleland’s standpoint, because the reviewer is an individual, the product becomes “compensation.”\textsuperscript{171}

According to the commissioner, the relationship between traditional media and sponsors, and new media users (such as bloggers) and sponsors, is different. Which is why disclosure requirements are different.\textsuperscript{172}

\textbf{3. Unenforceability of the Guides}

The FTC does not investigate every blog post, YouTube upload, or Tweet posted by a blogger or Influencer.\textsuperscript{173} It would be impossible to do so. Thus, the FTC has imposed unenforceable guidelines and it has acknowledged that fact.\textsuperscript{174} It stated however, the main purpose of the Guides
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is not to “police the Internet and prosecute bloggers who have violated the guidelines, but rather educate bloggers as to the proper practices and their ethical obligations when endorsing products online.”\textsuperscript{175} The FTC still expects bloggers and Influencers to hold themselves to a high standard and abide by the rules.

4. Imbalance of Responsibility Between Influencers and Advertisers

To abide by the guidelines imposed on new media, advertisers must and should take the lead in their relationships with Influencers and bloggers.\textsuperscript{176} Advertisers are liable if Influencers post fraudulent claims or fail to disclose any affiliations they have with an advertiser.\textsuperscript{177} Advertisers are not required to inform Influencers about the regulations, but since they will pay the cost if there is a violation, it would be in their best financial interest to do so.\textsuperscript{178}

It may be difficult to ensure the Influencer is properly disclosing its material relationship with an advertiser, but it will most likely be easier than it appears. Brands and Influencers enter into a contract that states the terms and what is expected of the Influencer. The brand knows ahead of time what the Influencer will produce and how it will go about it. Thus, it can simply require a draft to review prior to the post going live on the Internet. It would be in the brands best interest to spell out the FTC’s requirements in every contract with an Influencer to avoid future violations and fines.

V. PROPOSAL

A. The FTC is Too Lenient

The FTC recently vowed to “crack down on misleading celebrity endorsements,”\textsuperscript{179} but brands and celebrities probably won’t take that threat
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seriously. At the center of the FTC regulation are voluntary disclosures and compliance. The FTC does not investigate every instance in which endorsements are present. That, however may be the problem.

With a quick Google search, few articles will come up with the headline “XYZ company fined by FTC,” but much more will pop stating “FTC settles with XYZ company” or “FTC imposes slap on the wrist for XYZ Company.”

1. Past FTC Sanctions

The FTC has reiterated time and time again that it will “crack down” on regulation violations in the world of new media advertising. But will this actually happen? Based on its past imposition of fines, it seems unlikely.

There are few monetary components for violations of the blogger endorsement rules. A few examples are listed in this note. In 2011 the FTC fined Legacy Learning Systems $250,000 in settlement damages. The company violated disclosure rules by deceptively advertising its products through online affiliate markets that falsely posed as ordinary consumers or independent reviewers. Legacy was charged with disseminating deceptive advertisements without clearly disclosing that affiliates were paid for every sale they generated. This was the first ever monetary component for a violation of the blogger endorsement rules.

---
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In 2014, the FTC sued Warner Brothers for failing to adequately disclose that it paid online Influencers to share scripted, positive YouTube videos and social media posts.\textsuperscript{188}

It argued that Warner Brothers misled consumers by suggesting the Influencers reviews of the game reflected independent or objective views.\textsuperscript{189} The Influencers were hired by Warner Brothers’ advertising agency to help promote the release of the company’s new video game.\textsuperscript{190} The Influencers received advanced copies of the game, were paid thousands of dollars, and were required to post positive reviews about the game.\textsuperscript{191} They could not mention any glitches or bugs, and they were also required to post the FTC disclosures in the description box (which most viewers do not pay attention to, unless the Influencer mentions it).\textsuperscript{192} Furthermore, Warner Brothers was aware some videos did not meet the disclosure requirements.\textsuperscript{193} The Influencers did not disclose the extent of their relationship with Warner Brothers.\textsuperscript{194} They only mentioned the early release access to the game.\textsuperscript{195} Despite the violations, the FTC did not impose an $11,000 fine. It settled with Warner Brothers.\textsuperscript{196} The settlement:

Prohibits Warner Bros. from misrepresenting that any gameplay videos disseminated as part of a marketing campaign are independent opinions or the experiences of impartial video game enthusiasts. Further, it requires the company to clearly and conspicuously disclose any material connection between Warner Bros. and any Influencer or endorser promoting its products.\textsuperscript{197}

Warner Brothers must clearly and conspicuously disclose any material connection it has with Influencers or endorsers promoting its products.\textsuperscript{198} It is required to take minimum steps to abide by disclosure regulations when the company, and any Influencer it hires to conduct campaigns must post
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about Warner Brothers products.\textsuperscript{199} It must educate Influencers regarding sponsorship disclosures, monitor Influencer’s videos for compliance, terminate or withhold payment for noncompliance – under certain circumstances.\textsuperscript{200} The settlement appears to be the FTC reiterating its disclosure guidelines. Every element of the settlement aligns with the FTC Guides. The FTC claims brands that violate its rules will receive fines or a suit filed against them, but it seems to be handing out a slap on the wrist to companies, like Warner Bros., that should know better.

\textbf{B. The Fines}

\textit{1. Create A Set-In-Stone Fine “Guide”}

The FTC should impose actual repercussions for violating the rules. Not simply threats of “fines up to $11,000.”\textsuperscript{201} The fine should be clear and distinct. The FTC should release a counterpart to the Guides monetizing each violation. Every Influencer and company that it works with should be aware of the financial costs of their violations. For example, when YouTuber Jackie Aina worked with cosmetics brand NARS to promote the re-launch of its concealers, she posted on about the product on all her social media outlets.\textsuperscript{202} She abided by the FTC disclosure rules by including ‘#ad’ in her posts.\textsuperscript{203} Hypothetically, if she did not disclose that she had a material relationship with NARS and that she was compensated in any way to promote this product, a quick search on the FTC’s website should inform her of future fines for this violation. This form of clarity would bring transparency to the regulations. The FTC would not have to put in extra hours to ensure brands and Influencers are complying with the rules. The set-in-stone monetary cost of violation will ensure all parties involved are utilizing honest practices when targeting consumers. The fear of the fine will be the driving force.

\textit{2. Influencers and Brands Should Be Responsible for Violations}

The FTC stated that advertisers are liable when the Influencers they work with do not comply with disclosure regulations.\textsuperscript{204} That should change. Influencers should also be liable for their violations. As mentioned in Part III of this note, there is an imbalance between the responsibility placed upon advertisers and brands, compared to that of Influencers. Advertisers are responsible for Influencer’s actions in connection with their contractual
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relationship. This is a logical business relationship, but it would not be out of the norm if the responsibility was even. At the heart of this relationship stands a contract between the two parties. Most contracts spell out the terms of the relationship such as the term period, requirements, and compensation. Advertisers should also be allowed to contract the responsibility of complying with FTC disclosure rules. With the permission of the FTC and other state regulations that may come into play, Influencers should bear the responsibility of their actions or posts. The brands should still ensure, however, that the contracts spell out the disclosure requirements and inform the Influencers of their potential liability. By addressing this issue most commentators seem to address, the weight is even. Influencers will also be liable for failure to properly disclose in a clear and conspicuous manner their material relationship with advertisers.

3. Yearly Audits

It is difficult to police every advertisement, blog post and YouTube video. But there are other avenues the FTC can take to actually enforce the disclosure requirements that most view as unenforceable. The FTC can conduct yearly audits of bloggers, Influencers and advertisers. It could take notes from the IRS’ yearly audits, but in a much simpler, straightforward way. Influencers and Brands should submit yearly reports to the FTC listing their sponsorships. The report should include how they disclosed their material relationships with advertisers in a clear and conspicuous manner. They should discuss compensations, if any, the purpose of the sponsorship, general details about the duration of the sponsorship and their reach, such as engagement, audience interaction, and potential views. This information would not encroach on their privacy, but would provide as much information as necessary to understand the basics of the parties’ relationship. This approach would not replace the voluntary disclosure requirements, but it will ensure all parties are abiding by the FTC’s rules. By combining the second proposal as mentioned above with this proposal, parties would be responsible for their actions. Influencers will be responsible for ensuring they are abiding by the FTC disclosure requirements and advertisers will still be responsible for ensuring Influencer are aware of the FTC disclosure requirements. Nothing incites compliance like fear. With brands and Influencers, a lot is at stake when they work together. They both want the relationship to be fruitful without any interference from the federal government. By complying with the FTC rules, keeping records of their posts and basic details of their relationships with advertisers and Influencers, each party will have nothing to worry about when, or if, audited by the FTC.
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VI. CONCLUSION

As the name says, Influencers have the power to influence thousands, even millions of people on a daily basis. They have closer, more emotional connections with consumers, and to a certain extent, the interactions appear to be more genuine than the traditional celebrities. But, as time goes on, and the influence continues to increase, the FTC will always be playing catch-up. Federal regulations have historically moved at a snail’s pace, and with the ever-evolving, complex world of social media, it will continue to have a hard time keeping up.

The FTC guides are helpful, but, nevertheless, not enough. To really regulate this non-traditional industry, changes must be made. The FTC needs to be hands on, connected and in tune with this new media. Self-regulation at its current level, is a great start, but it is only the beginning. The FTC and the consumers it was created to protect will be better served if a revamped and well-created system is implemented. The system should be designed to identify business practices, prevent the unfair and anticompetitive actions, and ensure the consumer and general public are aware of the competitive process. Those standards should be implemented without unduly burdening legitimate business activity.