



### **Social Media Influencers & Transgressive Celebrity Endorsement in Consumption Community Contexts**

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-07-2019-0567.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Celebrity endorsement, Consumption communities, Online communities, Social media influencers, Influencer marketing, Netnography, YouTube, celebrity transgressions

## Social Media Influencers & Transgressive Celebrity Endorsement in Consumption Community Contexts

### Abstract

**Purpose:** This paper aims to elucidate instances whereby celebrity endorsements by social media influencers (SMIs) embedded within online consumption communities are perceived as transgressive by their fellow community members. In doing so, this research provides insights into the new challenges and considerations that such community contexts present for celebrity endorsement.

**Methodology:** The research team conducted a longitudinal, netnographic study of the YouTube beauty community, involving an initial phase of netnographic immersion followed by an investigative netnography that examined community members' response to celebrity endorsements by twelve SMIs within the community.

**Findings:** This research identifies five recurring celebrity endorsement transgressions, each violating an established moral responsibility within the community. The paper explores how community members attribute responsibility for transgressive endorsements and identifies consequences for both the SMI and the endorsed brand.

**Research limitations:** This study focused on a single consumption community, developing a deep understanding of the distinct moral responsibilities that shape the reception of celebrity endorsements within this context.

**Originality/value:** Our analysis extends prior research on celebrity endorsement by SMIs by explaining when and why SMI endorsements are likely to be perceived as transgressive by the community, and providing new insights into community member responses to transgressive SMI endorsements. It also extends wider theories of celebrity endorsement by highlighting the influence of consumption community contexts upon endorsement reception and examining consumer responses to celebrity endorsements perceived as transgressive in and of themselves.

**Practical implications:** The paper presents managerial recommendations that will aid both SMIs and brands in implementing celebrity endorsements that avoid communal perceptions of transgression.

**Keywords:** Celebrity endorsement, celebrity transgressions, social media influencers, influencer marketing, consumption communities, online communities, netnography, YouTube

**Paper type:** Research paper

## Introduction

Social media has given rise to new breeds of celebrity, and consequently to new forms of celebrity endorsement. Our study seeks to elucidate new challenges and considerations presented by an increasingly prominent form of celebrity endorser – social media influencers – by exploring instances in which their endorsements are perceived as transgressive by members of the online consumption communities in which they are embedded.

Companies are investing growing sums in online ‘influencers’ – celebrities with large online followings - in return for the endorsement of their brands and products on social media platforms such as YouTube, Twitter and Instagram. Indeed, global expenditure on ‘influencer marketing’ is predicted to reach \$15 billion by 2022 (Schomer, 2019). Influencer marketing can involve endorsements by traditional celebrities whose fame transcends and predates their social media presence. However, influencer marketing also involves celebrity endorsements by ‘social media influencers’ (SMIs), defined as “ordinary Internet users who accumulate a relatively large following on blogs and social media through the textual and visual narration of their personal lives and lifestyles” (Abidin, 2015, p.1). Recognised as celebrities in their own right due to the scale of their fame and influence (many SMIs have hundreds of thousands, even millions, of online followers), SMIs are also referred to as ‘micro-celebrities’ (Khamis et al., 2017) or ‘social media celebrities’ (Hou, 2019). Unlike traditional celebrities, SMIs’ fame does not predate their social media presence, but rather stems from it. Research indicates that many consumers – younger generations in particular – are more influenced by SMIs than traditional celebrities, placing greater trust in their recommendations (O’Neil-Hart and Blumenstein 2016). Consequently,

1  
2  
3 SMI's have attracted significant interest and investment from marketing practitioners,  
4  
5 who have recognised their potential as celebrity endorsers (Elmhirst, 2019).  
6  
7

8  
9 Whilst a celebrity endorser has traditionally been defined as "anyone who  
10 enjoys public recognition and who uses this recognition on behalf of a consumer good  
11 by appearing with it in an advertisement" (McCracken, 1989, p.310), Bergkvist and  
12 Zhou (2015, p.644) offer a broader definition: "a celebrity endorsement is an agreement  
13 between an individual who enjoys public recognition (a celebrity) and an entity (e.g., a  
14 brand) to use the celebrity for the purpose of promoting the entity." SMIs regularly  
15 engage in a variety of such celebrity endorsements, using their social media presence  
16 to promote products/brands to their large online followings. Brands frequently pay  
17 SMIs large sums to create advertorial social media posts promoting their product/brand  
18 (Elmhirst, 2019), whilst many have signed SMIs as long-term brand ambassadors (e.g.  
19 Mind, 2016; Hailes, 2018). Furthermore, marketers regularly 'gift' SMIs free products  
20 and experiences to encourage them to feature their product/brand favourably in their  
21 social media content (Elmhirst, 2019). Thus, SMIs have emerged as a prominent and  
22 influential form of celebrity endorser.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 However, whilst recent research provides valuable insights into factors that  
43 impact the effectiveness of SMI endorsements (Childers *et al.*, 2019; Lou and Yuan,  
44 2019; Shan *et al.*, 2019), these studies do not equip us to understand the new risks and  
45 challenges involved in using SMIs as celebrity endorsers. Specifically, these studies do  
46 not acknowledge the new considerations raised by the consumption community  
47 contexts within which many SMIs are situated. Many SMIs are embedded in online  
48 consumption communities that played a significant role in their rise to fame (Scaraboto  
49 and Fischer, 2013; Mardon *et al.*, 2018). When SMIs emerge within consumption  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 communities and act as celebrity endorsers, their fellow community members become  
4  
5 the target audience for their endorsements. Whilst existing celebrity endorsement  
6  
7 literature has yet to consider how such consumption community contexts influence the  
8  
9 reception of SMI endorsements, prior research on online consumption communities  
10  
11 highlights a complex moral dimension that is little understood (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010;  
12  
13 Mardon *et al.*, 2018). This research indicates that celebrity endorsements by SMIs may  
14  
15 be perceived as transgressive within community contexts (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010;  
16  
17 Mardon *et al.*, 2018), however we lack both a systematic examination of the *types* of  
18  
19 endorsements that community members perceive as transgressive and an explanation  
20  
21 as to why this might be. Furthermore, we have a limited understanding of how  
22  
23 communities respond to these transgressions, and the implications of such transgressive  
24  
25 celebrity endorsements for both the endorsing SMI and the endorsed brand.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 This study addresses this research gap by answering the following research  
33  
34 questions: 1) When and why are SMIs' endorsements perceived as transgressive by  
35  
36 their fellow community members? 2) How do community members respond to  
37  
38 transgressive celebrity endorsements by SMIs? 3) What implications do transgressive  
39  
40 SMI endorsements have for both the endorsing SMI and the endorsed brand? We  
41  
42 answer these research questions by drawing from a longitudinal, netnographic study of  
43  
44 the YouTube beauty community, which identified five recurring celebrity endorsement  
45  
46 transgressions - 1) underhand endorsement, 2) over-endorsement, 3) over-emphasis, 4)  
47  
48 over-saturation, and 5) over-indulgence – each underpinned by an established moral  
49  
50 responsibility within the community.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 Our research contributes to literature on SMI endorsement in several ways.  
56  
57 First, whilst previous research on SMI endorsement has tended to focus on the factors  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that enhance an endorsement's desirable outcomes (e.g., Childers et al., 2019; Lou and  
4  
5 Yuan, 2019; Munnukka et al., 2019; Shan et al., 2019), we instead highlight its risks,  
6  
7 revealing the community-level moral responsibilities that must be negotiated in order  
8  
9 to avoid perceived endorsement transgressions. Furthermore, whilst previous research  
10  
11 indicates that SMIs are held responsible for transgressive endorsements (Kozinets et  
12  
13 al., 2010; Mardon et al., 2018), we demonstrate that community members often engage  
14  
15 in situational attribution (Um, 2013) to reduce the SMI's perceived responsibility, and  
16  
17 show that the endorsing brand may also be considered culpable for transgressive SMI  
18  
19 endorsements. Additionally, whilst prior work has largely focused on the implications  
20  
21 of transgressive SMI endorsements for the endorsing SMI's reputation within the  
22  
23 community (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Mardon *et al.*, 2018), our study highlights a range of  
24  
25 negative consequences faced by both SMIs and the brands they endorse. In addition to  
26  
27 extending research on SMI endorsement, our study also contributes to broader theories  
28  
29 of celebrity endorsement by highlighting the influence of consumption community  
30  
31 contexts upon endorsement reception, recognising circumstances under which celebrity  
32  
33 endorsements may be perceived by consumers as transgressive in and of themselves,  
34  
35 and documenting the distinct ways in which consumers attribute responsibility for such  
36  
37 endorsement transgressions. This research has important implications for marketing  
38  
39 practitioners, and we present a series of managerial recommendations that will aid SMIs  
40  
41 and brands in avoiding communal perceptions of transgression, and thus the negative  
42  
43 consequences of transgressive endorsements.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 **Celebrity Endorsement by SMIs**

53  
54 A substantial body of research has explored the various factors that impact the  
55  
56 effectiveness of celebrity endorsement, including celebrity characteristics (Ohanian,  
57  
58 1990; Kamins, 1990) and associations (McCracken, 1989); celebrity-brand match-up  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Kamins, 1990; Kamins and Gupta, 1994); self-endorser match-up (Choi and Rifon,  
4 2012) and consumer-celebrity attachment (Ilicic and Webster, 2014). Research has also  
5  
6 considered the effects of various endorsement situations, including a single celebrity  
7  
8 endorsing multiple brands (Tripp *et al.*, 1994), multiple endorsers of a single brand (Hsu  
9  
10 and McDonald, 2002; Rice *et al.*, 2012), and the relative prominence of the celebrity  
11  
12 vs. the brand in an endorsement (Ilicic and Webster, 2014). This body of work has  
13  
14 investigated how these factors impact the achievement of desirable endorsement  
15  
16 outcomes, such as improved brand awareness, brand attitudes, and purchase intentions  
17  
18 (e.g. Erfgen *et al.*, 2015; Liu and Brock, 2011; Rice *et al.*, 2012).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 This research has focused almost exclusively on traditional forms of celebrity  
26  
27 endorser appearing within traditional endorsements (paid TV or print advertisements),  
28  
29 despite calls for research to consider celebrity endorsement's broader scope (Keel and  
30  
31 Nataraajan, 2012; Bergkvist and Zhou, 2015). Whilst recent studies have considered  
32  
33 celebrity endorsement in a social media context and recognised SMIs as a new type of  
34  
35 celebrity endorser, this work has followed traditional celebrity endorsement research in  
36  
37 examining how factors such as endorser characteristics (Lou and Yuan, 2019) and  
38  
39 degree of 'match up' between SMI and brand (Childers *et al.*, 2019) and SMI and  
40  
41 consumer (Shan *et al.*, 2019) impact endorsement effectiveness. For instance, research  
42  
43 has found that SMIs' trustworthiness, attractiveness, and perceived similarity (to their  
44  
45 followers) positively influences their followers' trust in endorsements (Lou and Yuan,  
46  
47 2019), whilst high congruence between the SMI's image and the consumer's self-image  
48  
49 produces more favourable brand attitudes (Shan *et al.*, 2019). This emergent body of  
50  
51 research has also considered the influence of new factors in the context of SMIs,  
52  
53 acknowledging the positive impact of parasocial relationships (Horton and Wohl, 1956)  
54  
55 on traditional measures of endorsement effectiveness, including perceived endorser  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 credibility (Munnukka *et al.*, 2019), brand perceptions, and purchase intentions (Chung  
4 and Cho, 2017).  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Whilst this work provides valuable insights into the factors that impact the  
10 effectiveness of SMI endorsements, it does not recognise the distinct risks involved in  
11 using SMIs as celebrity endorsers. Much of this work has been undertaken in  
12 experimental settings, involving fictional endorsements for fictional brands and/or  
13 endorsements by SMIs with which the majority of participants were unfamiliar (Chung  
14 and Cho, 2017; Munnukka *et al.*, 2019), rather than exploring existing followers'  
15 responses to SMI endorsements in situ. Consequently, existing research does not  
16 consider the distinct challenges presented by the online consumption communities  
17 within which many SMIs are embedded. Prior research on online communities indicates  
18 that commercial activities by SMIs may be perceived as transgressive within  
19 consumption community contexts (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Mardon *et al.*, 2018).  
20 However, existing research on celebrity endorsement does not explain when or why a  
21 celebrity endorsement may be perceived as transgressive by consumers, either within  
22 consumption community contexts or more broadly.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Celebrity Endorsement & Celebrity/Brand Transgressions**

44  
45 Prior research has examined consumer responses to broader moral transgressions by  
46 both celebrities and brands, and has found that where they are linked through celebrity  
47 endorsement activities, transgressions by one party have important – and usually  
48 negative – implications for the other, who may be deemed guilty by association.  
49 Although recent work by Carrillat *et al.*, (2019) and Sääksjärvi *et al.* (2016) has  
50 identified specific contexts whereby endorsement by a transgressive celebrity produces  
51 positive outcomes for the endorsed brand, previous research has typically observed  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 negative outcomes when using a celebrity endorser involved in a transgression. Indeed,  
4  
5 studies have found that celebrity transgressions can result in less favourable evaluations  
6  
7 of the endorser (Thwaites *et al.*, 2012), which may ‘transfer’ to or otherwise become  
8  
9 ‘associated’ with the endorsed brand, leading to more negative brand evaluations  
10  
11 (White *et al.*, 2009; Till and Shimp, 1998). Conversely, in the case of brand  
12  
13 transgressions, consumers may hold the brand’s celebrity endorsers partially  
14  
15 responsible through their association with the brand, resulting in a decline in their  
16  
17 attitude toward the celebrity (Thomas and Fowler, 2016). Thus, the association of  
18  
19 celebrity endorser and endorsed brand via celebrity endorsement may result in negative  
20  
21 outcomes for both parties when either commits a moral transgression.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Prior research indicates that the consequences of transgressions for the  
29  
30 endorsing celebrity and endorsed brand are influenced by each party’s perceived level  
31  
32 of responsibility. For instance, Louie *et al.*, (2001) found that the impact of celebrity  
33  
34 transgressions on the financial performance of the brands they endorse is dependent on  
35  
36 the celebrity endorser’s perceived level of blameworthiness. Previous studies have  
37  
38 explored the role of consumers’ attribution style, observing that consumers who  
39  
40 attribute a celebrity transgression to the celebrity’s personality, character or disposition  
41  
42 (dispositional attribution), judge both the endorser and the endorsed brand more  
43  
44 negatively than those who attribute blame to situations or circumstances external to the  
45  
46 celebrity (situational attribution) (Um, 2013; Zhou and Whitla, 2013). Indeed,  
47  
48 situational attributions of responsibility may elicit sympathy for, and improve the moral  
49  
50 reputation of, the celebrity endorser (Um, 2013; Zhou and Whitla, 2013). Thus, the  
51  
52 consequences of transgressions are shaped by consumers’ attributions of responsibility.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4           Whilst this body of literature has shed light on how consumers respond to  
5 transgressions by celebrity endorsers and endorsed brands, it focuses on transgressions  
6 within celebrities' personal or professional lives and transgressive business practices  
7 by brands; transgressions that are separate from the celebrity endorsement itself. In  
8 these instances, either the celebrity or the brand is typically the guilty party, whilst the  
9 other is merely guilty by association. This work does not explore instances in which  
10 celebrity endorsement activities are perceived as transgressive in and of themselves. As  
11 such, we have a limited understanding of when and why celebrity endorsements may  
12 be viewed as transgressive, and how consumers make sense of and respond to  
13 transgressive endorsements. How might consumers attribute responsibility for  
14 transgressive celebrity endorsements, where both the celebrity and brand might  
15 reasonably be considered culpable?  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32           Furthermore, previous research has studied traditional celebrity endorsers rather  
33 than SMIs within community contexts, consequently focusing on transgressions of  
34 wider societal norms, rather than the transgression of specific community norms, and  
35 thus the more personal betrayal of consumers as fellow community members.  
36 Additionally, this research overwhelmingly centres on consumers' responses to  
37 celebrity transgressions reported in – and portrayed as transgressive by – the mass  
38 media, rather than community members' judgement of, and responses to, transgressions  
39 witnessed first-hand, without such mediation. Consequently, this body of work does  
40 not equip us to understand when and why SMIs' fellow community members may judge  
41 their celebrity endorsement activities to be transgressive, nor how they might respond  
42 to such perceived transgressions. To do so, we must consider the wider consumption  
43 community within which these endorsements are situated.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **SMI Endorsement in Online Consumption Communities**

Consumption communities “are comprised of consumers who share a commitment to a product class, brand, activity, or consumption ideology” (Thomas *et al.*, 2013, p.1012). Drawing from sociological literature, Muñiz and O’Guinn (2001, p.413) propose three “core community commonalities” that characterise all communities, regardless of their focus. First, community members experience consciousness of kind – a shared sense of belonging to, and identification with, the wider collective. Second, communities exhibit rituals and traditions that perpetuate the community’s shared history, reinforcing consciousness of kind. Third, community members experience moral responsibility towards both the community as a whole and to individual community members, which can prompt them to defend the community and take action when communal norms are transgressed. Muñiz and O’Guinn (2001) observe that contemporary consumption communities are almost always, to some extent, imagined communities. In other words, whilst community members may experience consciousness of kind and moral responsibility towards specific community members that they have personally interacted with, they also form “a well-developed sense of vast, unmet fellow community members” towards which they may experience consciousness of kind and moral responsibility at a more abstract level (Muñiz and O’Guinn, 2001, p.413) Indeed, as consumption communities become less geographically bounded, facilitated by the rise of digital media, this imagined dimension becomes more prominent (Muñiz and O’Guinn, 2001).

Social media platforms, in particular, provide spaces for geographically dispersed consumers to congregate surrounding various consumption-related practices and passions (Kozinets, 1999). Within these online consumption communities, certain community members may develop celebrity status, exhibiting significant influence over

1  
2  
3 the consumption behaviours of other community members (Mardon *et al.*, 2018; Cocker  
4 and Cronin, 2017). In such instances, these community members may become SMIs;  
5  
6 ordinary community members who have developed a large online following, and who  
7  
8 commercialise their influence over their followers via celebrity endorsements (Abidin,  
9  
10 2015). Not all SMIs are embedded within consumption communities in this way – it is  
11  
12 possible for SMIs to develop an online audience without engaging actively with any  
13  
14 single online consumption community. However, many SMIs do exhibit such  
15  
16 community origins and enduring community ties (Mardon *et al.*, 2018; Gannon and  
17  
18 Prothero, 2018). This distinguishes these SMIs from other celebrities, since this  
19  
20 community context presents new risks and challenges for celebrity endorsement that  
21  
22 are little understood.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Prior research has found that SMIs engaging in celebrity endorsements may be  
31  
32 accused of “selling out” by prioritising their own interests, and those of the marketer,  
33  
34 above the interests of the community (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010), which can be interpreted  
35  
36 as a lack of loyalty to fellow community members, provoking anger and contempt  
37  
38 within the community (Mardon *et al.*, 2018). However, whilst this research recognises  
39  
40 that SMI endorsement may be perceived as transgressive it does not explore in detail  
41  
42 the *types* of endorsement that are perceived as transgressive. Furthermore, whilst SMI  
43  
44 endorsement activities involve both the SMI and the endorsed brand, prior work has  
45  
46 focused primarily on the implications for the SMI (e.g. Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Mardon  
47  
48 *et al.*, 2018), and does not consider how consumers attribute responsibility for  
49  
50 transgressive endorsements. Research is therefore needed to identify the types of SMI  
51  
52 endorsement activities that are perceived as transgressive by the community, and  
53  
54 explore the ways in which community members attribute responsibility for  
55  
56 transgressive endorsements, to better understand their implications for both SMIs and  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the brands they endorse. To respond to this research gap, we engaged in a longitudinal  
4  
5 netnographic study of the YouTube beauty community (hereafter YTBC).  
6  
7

### 8 9 **Research Context – The YouTube Beauty Community**

10  
11 The YTBC is an online consumption community united by a shared interest in beauty  
12  
13 consumption. The YouTube platform, like other social media sites, is designed to  
14  
15 encourage interaction via both video uploads and corresponding video comments  
16  
17 (Lindgren, 2012) and provides an online space where likeminded individuals can  
18  
19 congregate to discuss shared consumption interests, unconstrained by geographic  
20  
21 boundaries (Rotman and Preece, 2010). The platform is home to many consumption  
22  
23 communities, relating to a wide variety of consumption interests such as literature  
24  
25 (Sorensen and Mara, 2014) and gaming (Harwood and Garry, 2014). These  
26  
27 consumption communities typically congregate across multiple YouTube channels but  
28  
29 are characterised by a shared sense of community identity and purpose (Rotman and  
30  
31 Preece, 2010). In the YTBC the YouTube channels of beauty ‘vloggers’ (video  
32  
33 bloggers) are the community’s central gathering point, where community members  
34  
35 interact. Beauty vloggers upload beauty-related videos, including tutorials and product  
36  
37 reviews, to their YouTube channels, where they are watched by the rest of the  
38  
39 community, who can interact with the vlogger and with other viewers via the videos’  
40  
41 comments sections. In Table 1 we apply Thomas *et al.*’s (2013) 9 consumption  
42  
43 community dimensions in order to further shed light on the structure and dynamics of  
44  
45 the YTBC.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 The YTBC was selected as the research context for this study for several  
55  
56 reasons. First, several studies have evidenced that both YouTube beauty vloggers and  
57  
58 their viewers experience a sense of community (Gannon and Prothero, 2018; Mardon  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *et al.*, 2018). While this research does not explicitly apply Muñiz and O’Guinn’s (2001)  
4  
5 framework, the reported findings provide evidence of their proposed community  
6  
7 characteristics (see Table 1 for further details). Thus, whilst we ascertained in the  
8  
9 immersive phase of our netnographic study that the community did indeed exhibit  
10  
11 Muñiz and O’Guinn’s (2001) core community characteristics, this prior evidence of  
12  
13 community from previous research informed our selection of the YTBC as a relevant  
14  
15 context for our study.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Second, we selected this research context due to the large number of community  
22  
23 members that had become SMIs and were acting as celebrity endorsers when the study  
24  
25 commenced. Whilst not all beauty vloggers become SMIs, many vloggers within this  
26  
27 community have hundreds of thousands, even millions, of YouTube subscribers. SMIs  
28  
29 from this community have featured on the covers of leading women’s magazines and  
30  
31 appeared on primetime TV programmes. These SMIs have turned vlogging into a  
32  
33 lucrative career, and a significant portion of their social media content includes  
34  
35 celebrity endorsement, whether it be a paid advertorial, a brand ambassador role, or the  
36  
37 inclusion of ‘gifted’ PR products or experiences. The eminence of SMIs within this  
38  
39 community (see Gannon and Prothero, 2018; Mardon *et al.*, 2018), enabled us to study  
40  
41 community members’ response to celebrity endorsements by multiple SMIs within a  
42  
43 single consumption community, identifying recurring endorsement transgressions that  
44  
45 were not specific to a single SMI but indicative of wider community norms.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Finally, existing research indicates that celebrity endorsements within this  
53  
54 community may be perceived as transgressive (Mardon *et al.*, 2018), though it does not  
55  
56 identify specific endorsement transgressions. This prior evidence of communal tensions  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 surrounding SMI endorsements presented the YTBC as a fruitful context for our study  
4  
5 of transgressive SMI endorsements.  
6  
7

## 8 9 **Methodology**

10 We conducted a netnographic study of the YTBC in order to observe communal  
11 responses to SMIs' celebrity endorsements "in situ", "in native conditions of  
12 interaction" (Kozinets, 2015, p.5), and to contextualise these responses through an  
13 immersive understanding of the community (Kozinets, 2020). Following the guidance  
14 of Kozinets (2020), we conducted our netnography in two phases – an exploratory  
15 'immersive' phase that provided a rich understanding of the community, followed by a  
16 more focused 'investigative' phase of data collection and analysis.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 *Immersive Phase*

30  
31 Netnographic immersion involves gathering rich, descriptive and highly contextualised  
32 data by recording detailed observations, as well as the researcher's own reflections, in  
33 an immersion journal (the netnographic equivalent of ethnographic fieldnotes)  
34 (Kozinets, 2020). The research team conducted the immersive phase of the study from  
35 December 2016-December 2019, producing a rich, contextualised understanding of the  
36 YTBC through the observation and documentation of online vlogger-to-vlogger,  
37 vlogger-to-viewer and viewer-to-viewer interactions. Data collection primarily focused  
38 on interactions occurring on the YouTube platform via beauty vloggers' YouTube  
39 videos and their corresponding video comments. We also observed interactions in other  
40 online spaces (e.g. vloggers' websites/blogs, vloggers' profiles on other social media  
41 platforms, and 'gossip' websites dedicated to the discussion of vloggers) and consulted  
42 additional media sources that provided insights into the emergence and evolution of  
43 beauty vloggers as SMIs (e.g. vloggers' autobiographies, vlogger interviews in  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mainstream media outlets and on podcasts). Whilst data collection began in 2016, we  
4  
5 accessed data pre-dating the study's commencement, enabling us to document prior  
6  
7 community interactions. Each researcher kept a separate immersion journal, and the  
8  
9 research team held regular meetings throughout the 3-year immersion to compare  
10  
11 observations.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 This netnographic immersion served several purposes. First, it enabled the  
17  
18 research team to establish the extent to which this collective exhibited the core  
19  
20 community characteristics identified by Muñiz and O'Guinn (2001). Second, it enabled  
21  
22 the research team to familiarise themselves with the community, providing insight into  
23  
24 its structure, history, norms, terminology, rituals, and moral responsibilities. In  
25  
26 particular, our longitudinal approach sensitised us to changes within the community,  
27  
28 such as the introduction of new regulations, shifts in the quantity, type and execution  
29  
30 of SMIs' endorsements, and changes in community responses to these endorsements.  
31  
32 In doing so, it contextualised the investigative phase of our netnography. Finally, this  
33  
34 netnographic immersion informed the design of the subsequent investigative phase of  
35  
36 netnographic data collection. In particular, this immersion led us to refine the  
37  
38 boundaries of the data site by sensitising us to localised sub-sections of the YTBC. It  
39  
40 became apparent over the course of this immersive phase that community norms,  
41  
42 endorsement practices and endorsement regulations varied, depending on the beauty  
43  
44 vloggers' location. Beauty vloggers typically developed close ties to other vloggers  
45  
46 within the same locale, whilst their audiences tended to be dominated by viewers from  
47  
48 their country of residence (as evidenced by their video comments, and by beauty  
49  
50 vloggers' own discussion of their audience statistics). We therefore focused on the UK  
51  
52 sub-section of the community, enabling us to identify more consistent norms and  
53  
54 responsibilities, and to explore the impact of UK-specific regulatory changes.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### *Investigative Phase*

We conducted an investigative phase of data collection in 2019. Whilst immersive netnographic data collection is exploratory and focuses on capturing the wider context of a research phenomenon, investigative netnographic data collection is more structured and selective, with researchers engaging in a filtering process to select a smaller subset of data of direct relevance to the study's research questions (Kozinets, 2020). In order to generate this investigative dataset, we narrowed our focus to 12 of the UK's leading beauty vloggers (see Table 2). The primary consideration when selecting these focal vloggers was their relevance to the study. First, the vloggers that we selected were considered part of the community, by both themselves and their community members. Secondly, we ensured that our focal beauty vloggers were SMIs, selecting those with both a high number of YouTube subscribers and a history of celebrity endorsement. Thirdly, we selected beauty vloggers with a long history of YouTube uploads, enabling us to document the evolution of community responses to SMI endorsements.

We considered all videos (and corresponding viewer comments) posted to YouTube by our focal beauty vloggers prior to the end of December 2019, enabling us to observe direct interactions between community members. From this large quantity of available data, we captured an investigative dataset of direct relevance to our research questions. Specifically, we captured video comments that expressed disapproval of SMI endorsements, and therefore provided insight into community responses to transgressive celebrity endorsements. We captured the number of 'likes' that each comment had received and noted when the comment was amongst the top 10 'most liked' comments on the video, providing insight into the level of community consensus surrounding the commenter's expressed opinion. We also captured direct replies to these comments – which included replies by both other viewers and the

1  
2  
3 vlogger themselves - enabling us to study interactions between community members  
4  
5 surrounding perceived transgressions. Throughout the investigative phase of  
6  
7 netnographic data collection and analysis, all members of the research team remained  
8  
9 immersed within the community, ensuring that our analysis was informed by an  
10  
11 understanding of the wider research context.  
12  
13

14  
15 Our investigative dataset was collated into a single document and subjected to  
16  
17 established techniques of hermeneutic analysis, involving repeated iteration between  
18  
19 analysis and interpretation (Thompson *et al.*, 1994). Initially, we engaged in a process  
20  
21 of inductive coding that sought to identify emergent categories, patterns and  
22  
23 relationships within our data. Specifically, we sought to identify recurring categories of  
24  
25 transgressive SMI endorsement, to document how community members respond to  
26  
27 each type of perceived transgression, and to capture common consequences for  
28  
29 community members' perceptions of, and behaviour towards, both the SMI and the  
30  
31 endorsed brand. Then, in line with our hermeneutic approach (Thompson *et al.*, 1994),  
32  
33 we engaged in repeated iteration between analysis and interpretation, relating our  
34  
35 emerging interpretation of the data to prior theory, and drawing theoretical links that  
36  
37 informed subsequent analysis. For instance, during this process, we noticed that  
38  
39 endorsement transgressions were underpinned by communal expectations as to how  
40  
41 SMIs *should* and *should not* engage in celebrity endorsement within the community -  
42  
43 what Muñiz and O'Guinn (2001) term 'moral responsibilities'. We therefore returned  
44  
45 to our data to identify the specific moral responsibilities underpinning each of our  
46  
47 identified endorsement transgressions. Similarly, our initial process of inductive coding  
48  
49 revealed interesting variations in how community members attributed responsibility for  
50  
51 these transgressions, prompting us to engage in further coding informed by prior work  
52  
53 on attribution styles (Um, 2013). As a research team, we regularly debated and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 challenged our emergent interpretations, engaging in repeated iteration between  
4  
5 analysis and interpretation until we arrived at an agreed-upon interpretation of our data.  
6  
7

### 8 9 **Findings**

10  
11 To contextualise our findings, it is necessary to first explain the emergence and  
12  
13 evolution of SMI endorsements within the YTBC. At its inception, no community  
14  
15 members profited from the community. As YouTube's popularity grew, it enabled  
16  
17 vloggers to monetize their videos via display advertising, creating a financial incentive  
18  
19 for community members to pursue an SMI role. However, since SMIs had no control  
20  
21 over, and did not appear in, these display advertisements, they did not constitute  
22  
23 celebrity endorsement. As SMIs' fame and influence grew, however, celebrity  
24  
25 endorsement practices began to emerge, though they were initially largely unregulated  
26  
27 and often undisclosed. Initial celebrity endorsement involved brands sending SMIs  
28  
29 small PR samples and inviting them to local PR events, though these incentives were  
30  
31 not always disclosed to the viewer. Similarly, whilst SMIs sometimes mentioned  
32  
33 'working with' or 'collaborating with' brands, it was often unclear whether they had  
34  
35 been paid to do so. In 2015, however, the UK's Advertising Standards Authority (ASA)  
36  
37 introduced new regulations requiring SMIs to disclose paid advertorials, making their  
38  
39 existence more apparent to community members. Later UK regulatory changes in 2019  
40  
41 also demanded the disclosure of brand partnerships or ambassadorships, as well as the  
42  
43 receipt of complementary or discounted products, services and experiences, which were  
44  
45 deemed to constitute a non-monetary incentive to produce positive coverage. These  
46  
47 regulatory changes, and the consequent increase in the disclosure of SMI endorsements,  
48  
49 revealed the prominence of celebrity endorsement within the community to its  
50  
51 members.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4           When SMIs' endorsement activities first became apparent to community  
5 members, many expressed concerns that the receipt of incentives from brands  
6 contradicted SMIs' moral responsibility to provide unbiased product recommendations  
7 for the community. However, SMIs justified their engagement in celebrity endorsement  
8 activities, explaining that they provided free video content for community members and  
9 needed to monetize their YouTube channels in order to continue doing so. In particular,  
10 SMIs highlighted the skill and effort involved in the creation of their video content,  
11 further justifying their deservingness of financial compensation and other non-  
12 monetary rewards. Consequently, the community became more open to endorsements  
13 by SMIs, however new moral responsibilities emerged within the community that  
14 bound SMIs to only produce celebrity endorsements that met certain moral standards.  
15 Where these moral responsibilities were violated, SMIs' endorsements were perceived  
16 as transgressive by members of the community, who expressed their disapproval in the  
17 vlogger's video comments. Thus, rather than an outright rejection of all SMI  
18 endorsements, community members began to identify and articulate specific  
19 endorsement transgressions that violated established moral responsibilities within the  
20 community.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43           Within our investigative dataset, such endorsement transgressions began to  
44 emerge in 2014, and increased significantly following the introduction of the new ASA  
45 regulations in 2015. In total, 132 of our focal SMIs' endorsements were deemed  
46 transgressive by community members; an average of 22 transgressive endorsements per  
47 year during the 6-year period from 2014 to 2019. Some of the focal SMIs in our study  
48 transgressed more frequently than others; for instance, five SMIs transgressed more  
49 than 15 times during this 6-year period, whilst two did not transgress at all. However,  
50 whilst the quantity of transgressive endorsements varied across our focal SMIs,  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 transgressive endorsements were a frequent and widespread occurrence within our  
4 dataset. Furthermore, we observed significant community consensus surrounding the  
5 endorsement transgressions articulated by community members, indicated not only by  
6 the presence of multiple viewer comments identifying the perceived transgressions, but  
7 also in the high quantity of 'likes' that these comments received from other community  
8 members. Indeed, video comments identifying endorsement transgressions received a  
9 significantly higher number of 'likes' (an average of 29 likes per comment) than other  
10 viewer comments (an average of 4 likes per comment). In particular, comments that  
11 articulated perceived endorsement transgressions in greater detail typically received a  
12 higher number of likes from community members (the most 'liked' comment within  
13 our dataset received 881 likes), and many were amongst the videos' most 'liked'  
14 comments. In 'liking' these comments, community members exhibited agreement with  
15 the endorsement transgressions articulated by the commenter, indicating a level of  
16 community consensus.

17  
18  
19 Our analysis of viewer comments on these transgressive endorsements revealed  
20 five distinct and recurring forms of endorsement transgression: 1) underhand  
21 endorsement (49 instances), 2) over-endorsement (57 instances), 3) over-emphasis (29  
22 instances), 4) over-saturation (25 instances), and 5) over-indulgence (24 instances).  
23 Some transgressive SMI endorsements were deemed guilty of a single endorsement  
24 transgression, whilst other endorsements were perceived by community members to  
25 have simultaneously committed multiple forms of endorsement transgression. We  
26 explore each form of endorsement transgression in turn, identifying the violated moral  
27 responsibilities that underpin it, explaining how community members made sense of  
28 and attributed responsibility for this transgression type, and identifying the  
29 consequences of such transgressions for both the SMI and the endorsed brand.

### *Underhand Endorsement*

SIMs are considered by the community to have a moral responsibility to provide honest and unbiased reviews of products and services. Whilst community members initially expected SIMs to refrain from receiving incentives (financial or otherwise) from brands, which were perceived to bias their recommendations, they came to accept SIMs' need to monetize their content via endorsements. However, a new moral responsibility emerged - the community expected any celebrity endorsement activities by SIMs to be clearly disclosed to viewers. Failure to uphold this moral responsibility was viewed as transgressive, and we label this transgression 'underhand endorsement', referring to the perception that such endorsements were conducted in a secretive or dishonest manner.

Community members highlighted the occurrence of underhand endorsement to the SIM by commenting on transgressive videos, clarifying their expectations surrounding disclosure. In doing so, they often justified these expectations by making reference to UK regulations surrounding disclosure, and drawing comparisons with other SIMs' disclosure strategies:

*Jamie, we all love you, but please understand that it's the law that you have to verbally, clearly state that content is sponsored. <3 (3 likes)*

(JG, 2017)

*I love your channel but I do find it a bit odd nothing is ever marked as gifted (like I've seen with others) when some of it clearly has been sent to you. It's just sort of putting me off because I don't feel you're being upfront and I think we deserve that. (36 likes, 1<sup>st</sup> most liked comment)*

(AL, 2019)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*I love you and your videos! I know the description says ad, but it would be nice for you to say out loud "hey this is an ad" or "I was gifted these" etc. Just being open...kinda like Louise Pentland. (2 likes)*

(AE, 2019)

In each of the comments, we see that the SMI has not met the community member's expectations surrounding disclosure, resulting in a perceived endorsement transgression. It's important to note that whilst viewers often used UK regulations to justify their expectations surrounding disclosure, their expectations often went beyond current legal requirements. For instance, many community members expected SMIs to verbally disclose endorsements in their video content, something that is not required by law. Thus the community established its own standards for endorsement disclosure, which SMIs were expected to meet.

We found that the community held the SMI, rather than the brand, responsible for underhand endorsement. However, as the above comments illustrate, rather than immediately condemning the SMI, community members initially clarified their expectations surrounding endorsement disclosure in a polite and friendly manner, often simultaneously expressing support for the SMI and their content. Indeed, we often observed evidence of situational attribution (Um, 2013), with community members implying that underhand endorsements were not a deliberate or intentional transgression but the result of a mistake or a misunderstanding of the community's expectations:

*You forgot to type AD in your title which is a must to do. (20 likes)*

(AL, 2018)

*Fleur, just so you know the video description says it's not sponsored xxx Love you lots. (3 likes)*

(FDF, 2016)

1  
2  
3  
4 Some SMIs responded to these observations of underhand endorsement by  
5 clarifying the current UK regulations in an attempt to alter community members'  
6 expectations surrounding disclosure and avoid future perceptions of underhand  
7 endorsement. In other instances, SMIs responded by altering their endorsement  
8 practices to meet the community's existing expectations:  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 Viewer: *Girl you need to make it clearer that this is an AD in the title or visibly*  
16 *on the thumbnail. (32 likes, 6<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)*  
17

18 JG (replying): *I'm sure the laws are that it just has to be in the description bar*  
19 *but I've changed it to be totally transparent. Sorry for the confusion! (29*  
20 *likes)*  
21  
22

23 (JG, 2017)  
24  
25

26 Here the SMI implies that the community member has misinterpreted the current  
27 regulations, but nonetheless adapts her disclosure to meet the commenter's  
28 expectations. We found that both responses – altering disclosure to meet community  
29 expectations and attempting to negotiate these expectations – were positively received  
30 by members of the community, interpreted as an indication that their concerns were  
31 being acknowledged and considered by the SMI. However, we observed negative  
32 communal responses when SMIs did not respond to community members' observations  
33 of underhand endorsement and failed to alter their disclosure practices. Such repeat  
34 transgressions led community members to engage in dispositional attribution (Um,  
35 2013), interpreting SMIs' repeated engagement in this transgression as intentional and  
36 thus representative of the SMI's character. In these instances, community members  
37 accused SMIs of being greedy and dishonest, deliberately misleading their fellow  
38 community members, and showing a lack of respect or consideration for others within  
39 the community:  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57  
58 Viewer: *No mention of it being sponsored anywhere even in the description*  
59 *box, are you kidding me?! (55 likes, 8<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)*  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Viewer (replying): *The rules are in the UK that it used to have to be in the title*  
5 *(not sure if thats changed) AND the description box. It's not in either; it's*  
6 *incredibly insincere because it's like fooling people into watching the video*  
7 *for money because generally AD videos get fewer views. (3 likes)*

8  
9  
10 (SM, 2016)

11  
12 *They paid for the hotel, gave her a Dior bag, a Dior dress, in return for her*  
13 *sticking a load of sponsored links slyly listed with other brands, It should be*  
14 *listed as an ad and the links should be disclaimed as sponsored what a greedy*  
15 *sly woman she is. Shows what she really thinks of her subscribers. Shocking.*  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*(11 likes)*

(FDF, 2017)

Thus, where repeated perceptions of underhand endorsement led community members to engage in dispositional attribution, community members expressed negative sentiment towards the SMI. Whilst underhand endorsement was not blamed upon the endorsing brand, this endorsement transgression negatively impacted endorsement reception since viewers questioned the credibility of the endorsements posted by SMIs deemed guilty of repeated and deliberate underhand endorsement.

#### *Over-Endorsement*

Whilst community members came to appreciate that SMIs needed to earn a living from endorsements, they felt that SMIs had a moral responsibility to ensure that the majority of their videos remained organic (i.e. not featuring endorsements), thus providing the community with continued access to content unbiased by endorsements. SMIs were accused of the transgression of 'over-endorsement' when they violated this moral responsibility:

*Does anyone else wish we could see fewer Ad videos? I know Fleur has to make a living but I feel like all her videos are Ads these days :( (20 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)*

(FDF, 2019)

*My trust level with your reviews is declining because lately all your videos are Ads. (151 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)*

(EL, 2019)

Here, community members indicate that the proportion of the SMIs' video content that contains endorsements exceeds communal expectations. Indeed, through their immersion within the community, its members accumulated detailed knowledge of SMIs, enabling them to readily identify the ratio of endorsed vs. organic content on their YouTube channel, which they often reported in the video comments to support their accusations of over-endorsement. For instance, community members questioned SMI Estée Lalonde's credibility after observing an increase in endorsements on her YouTube channel:

*80% of your videos are paid advertorials...wtf??(38 likes, 9<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)*

(EL, 2015)

*When 4 out of your last 10 vids contain a paid advertorial I can't help but feel used. I understand that bills have to be paid and that this is your JOB at the end of the day but I am starting to get mixed feels – I subscribed for your honesty [...] now I am afraid that you will sneak up on me trying to sell me something at any moment. (63 likes, 3<sup>rd</sup> most liked comment)*

(EL, 2016)

We found that the SMI, rather than the endorsed brand, was held responsible for over-endorsement. As with underhand endorsement, viewers would initially clarify their expectations (i.e., appropriate ratios of organic vs. endorsed content). However, repeated over-endorsement led community members to engage in dispositional attribution, branding the SMI 'greedy', 'dishonest', and 'inauthentic', reporting a lack

1  
2  
3 of trust in the endorser's recommendations. In such instances, community members  
4  
5 often reported avoiding SMIs' endorsements and watching only their organic content,  
6  
7 whilst some unsubscribed from the SMI's YouTube channel altogether:  
8  
9

10 *I am done with all your ad videos. I know it's part of how youtubers make*  
11 *money, but I am no longer willing to spend my time watching commercials.*  
12 *Someone please correct me if I'm wrong, but wasn't your last new in beauty*  
13 *vid an ad too? I won't be watching this video. I only clicked in order to leave*  
14 *this message. I'll be back for non-sponsored content. (25 likes, 10<sup>th</sup> most liked*  
15 *comment)*  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 (FDF, 2017)  
21  
22

23 *So truly disappointing...Ads ads ads. I am your loooongest fan and have always*  
24 *thought you are one of the most unique, funniest and down to earth youtubers*  
25 *with a genuinely original style. But recently I feel like you have lost so much of*  
26 *that originality to brands taking over and you selling your viewers something*  
27 *video after video. What a shame, I will have to unsubscribe. (264 likes, 3<sup>rd</sup> most*  
28 *liked comment)*  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 (EL, 2019)  
35  
36  
37

38 These findings support prior research on multiple brand endorsements, which  
39 suggests that as the number of endorsements by a celebrity increases, consumers'  
40 perceptions of endorser credibility become less favourable (Tripp *et al.*, 1994). We  
41 extend this work by recognising that community members may strive to uphold  
42 established moral responsibilities by actively highlighting over-endorsement to other  
43 community members and to the SMI. Consequently, over-endorsement not only  
44 negatively impacts individual consumers' perceptions of SMIs' credibility, but  
45 community members' attempts to raise awareness of over-endorsement amongst less  
46 observant community members creates more widespread concerns surrounding  
47 endorser credibility.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 These concerns surrounding endorser credibility reduced the credibility of the  
5 SMI's endorsements, prompting community members to question whether SMIs  
6 perceived as guilty of over-endorsement actually used or liked the endorsed products:  
7  
8  
9

10 *I love watching Patricia's videos – I just wish there wasn't an ad in every*  
11 *single one of them! Makes me wonder if she actually uses the products she*  
12 *talks about. (109 likes, 3<sup>rd</sup> most liked comment)*  
13  
14

15 (PB, 2017)  
16  
17

18  
19 *All other YouTubers I watch put ads in their videos too which is totally fine,*  
20 *but every video seems a bit excessive. It also makes us question which*  
21 *products you genuinely like. (532 likes, 1st most liked comment)*  
22  
23

24 (EL, 2019)  
25  
26

27 Thus, whilst prior research on celebrity endorsement indicates that whether the  
28 celebrity actually uses the endorsed product is a relatively unimportant consideration  
29 for marketers (Erdogan *et al.*, 2001), our findings suggest that this is an important  
30 consideration in the SMI context. Here we see that although endorsement by SMIs  
31 perceived as guilty of over-endorsement did not result in retaliation against the brand,  
32 which was not considered culpable for this endorsement transgression, it lowered the  
33 perceived credibility of the brand's endorsement.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

#### 43 *Over-Emphasis* 44

45 SMIs have a moral responsibility to provide valuable (informative and/or entertaining)  
46 content for the community. Whilst community members have come to accept that some  
47 of SMIs' content will contain endorsements, community members deem the SMI to  
48 have a moral responsibility to ensure that these endorsements do not detract from the  
49 audience's enjoyment of their content. Where this moral responsibility is violated, we  
50 label this endorsement transgression 'over-emphasis'. Community members'  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

comments frequently drew attention to instances where an endorsed product/brand was visibly and/or verbally over-emphasized in SMIs' content:

*I expect a fair amount of branding in these videos, but this was EXCESSIVE on Clinique's part. Whoa. They hashtagged every surface and it seemed they expected their products to make an appearance in every passage of speech!*  
*(61 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)*

(AL, 2018)

In addition to overly scripted or staged endorsements, the community also responded negatively when the endorsed product/brand was the sole focus of a video.

*There is absolutely nothing wrong with paid videos. The problem is that you present only one brand in the video. I think you should include only the products that are really amazing along with products from your usual skincare routine. It looks more genuine in this way. (7 likes)*

(EL, 2018)

Thus, community members were quick to highlight transgressive over-endorsement that reduced their enjoyment of SMIs' video content, and clarified their expectations surrounding the integration of endorsements.

Whilst SMIs typically played an integral role in the integration of endorsements into their video content, we observed that community members often engaged in situational attribution, reducing the SMI's perceived responsibility by shifting blame instead onto the endorsed brand. In particular, the brand was often portrayed by community members as having demanded a high level of creative control over the video:

*Loved the vlog. Hated the OTT mentions of the product. At first I was interested in it but after the third mention I was thinking "how bad can this product be to need to pay for X number of mentions". Once or twice would be enough. But I assume the company asked to be named more than necessary. (5 likes)*

1  
2  
3  
4 (LP, 2016)

5 *Everyone @Waitrose: stop trying to make "Waitrose and partner" happen,*  
6 *it's not going to happen! Bless you Anna, I can only imagine it was an*  
7 *obligation to say it every time but good lord that was a lot (46 likes, 6<sup>th</sup> most*  
8 *liked comment)*

9  
10  
11  
12  
13 (AE, 2019)

14  
15  
16 Here we see the above commenters engaging in situational attribution – the SMI is  
17 assumed to be over-emphasizing the product because they have been instructed to do  
18 so by the brand. In line with prior research (Um, 2013; Zhou and Whitley, 2013), we see  
19 how such situational attributions of responsibility can lead community members to  
20 sympathize with SMIs for having to meet the brand's demands. Whilst this  
21 transgression did not typically result in retaliation towards the brand, brands were  
22 instead portrayed as community outsiders who had transgressed due to a lack of  
23 understanding of community norms and expectations.

### 34 35 *Over-Saturation*

36  
37 As discussed above, the community came to accept the need for SMIs to engage in  
38 celebrity endorsements to financially sustain their role as an SMI, but held the SMI  
39 morally responsible for ensuring that these endorsements did not detract from the  
40 community's enjoyment of SMIs' content. Whilst some endorsements violated this  
41 moral responsibility via the transgression of over-emphasis, others did so via the  
42 transgression of over-saturation. Over-saturation occurs when brands partner with  
43 multiple SMIs within the same community, and commission them to post similar  
44 endorsements for the brand in quick succession, eroding community members'  
45 enjoyment of SMIs' video content, which was perceived as repetitive and boring:

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 *Second YouTube ad I've seen in 2 days for this toothbrush, what a bore. (3*  
59 *likes)*  
60

(SM, 2016)

*Hello Fresh seems to sponsor a good 80% of the people I watch. It's overkill.  
(21 likes)*

(AE, 2018)

As with over-emphasis, community members tended to engage in situational attribution, reducing the SMI's responsibility for over-saturation by shifting blame onto the brand. Indeed, community members often portrayed SMIs as victims of the brand's wider endorsement strategy:

*This is the third video I've seen with the same AD in the space of a few days...I know it's not their [the SMI's] fault but it's just so boring for us as the audience. I'm not criticising Sam at all, I love her vlogs! (16 likes)*

(SM, 2018)

Several SMIs reinforced this situational attribution of responsibility, confirming their own lack of control over the brand's multiple endorser strategy, as illustrated by the below exchange in the comments section of an endorsement for brand 'Hello Fresh' by SMI Lily Pebbles:

Viewer: *I always love your videos and vlogs! I am so bored of so many vlogs (not just yours!) being so centred around hello fresh though - it's getting really boring and repetitive - not a dig at you at all I love your videos and won't stop me watching, just to let you know - I just skip through them now. Loved the rest of the vlog (150 likes, 1<sup>st</sup> most liked comment)*

Viewer (replying): *Yeah, it's not her fault and she needs to make an income, but Hello Fresh is sponsoring seemingly everyone. They're overdoing it with the sponsorships... feel like I hear about Hello Fresh constantly, which really turns me off the company. (14 likes)*

LP (replying): *I get that it's frustrating if a lot of people you watch do the same ads (sometimes the audience don't overlap but in your case they obviously do), but unfortunately we don't have control over how many creators a brand works with and who they choose to work with. (23 likes)*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(LP, 2019)

Here we see community members agreeing that the SMI is not to blame for over-saturation, instead treating the brand as the culprit, something that the SMI reinforces in her response by denying responsibility for this transgression. This exchange provides insights into the implications of over-saturation for the brand, with community members claiming that such over-saturation “turns [them] off the company”. Indeed, many community members reported that such over-saturation rendered them unlikely to purchase from the transgressing brand. These findings contrast with prior research, which suggests that the use of multiple endorsers can reduce audience boredom (Hsu and McDonald, 2002) and produce more favourable brand attitudes (Rice *et al.*, 2012). Instead, we found that the use of multiple SMI endorsers within a single consumption community resulted in perceptions of transgressive over-saturation for which brands were held responsible, resulting in negative sentiment towards the brand, negative brand perceptions and even claims of brand avoidance.

Though SMIs were not considered responsible for over-saturation, they were often negatively impacted by this transgression since creating similar content to other SMIs reduced community members’ enjoyment of their video content:

*Love this! But my only concern is that it's the 3rd "Autumn Haul" via Zalando as a paid advertorial. I just feel like these videos are so disingenuous, as a way for YouTubers to market the brand, which for the brand is great but for the YouTube person in front of camera makes you look unoriginal. (42 likes, 10<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)*

(EL, 2015)

Thus, whilst community members do not blame SMIs for over-saturation, this transgression can inadvertently lead viewers to perceive the SMI’s content as unoriginal, repetitive and boring.



### *Over-Indulgence*

Whilst community members accepted the need for SMIs to engage in endorsements, they deemed SMIs to have a moral responsibility to only endorse products/services that they genuinely use and like. Furthermore, as with all community members, SMIs were perceived to have a responsibility to avoid engaging in activities that would negatively impact other community members. These moral responsibilities were violated when SMIs received excessive incentives from brands that community members perceived to risk biasing their opinion, and to therefore potentially disadvantage other community members by reducing their access to honest, unbiased product recommendations. We refer to this endorsement transgression as ‘over-indulgence’.

In the context of paid endorsements and brand ambassadorships, the financial incentives that SMIs received from brands were typically undisclosed, making it difficult for community members to evaluate the scale of the incentive. However, the scale of ‘gifted’ PR products, services and experiences was more readily observable, particularly once regulatory changes in 2019 obligated SMIs to disclose these incentives. Lavish, all-expenses-paid press trips and excessive PR packages have become commonplace within the YTBC. For example, cosmetic brand Benefit flew SMIs to a luxury Maldives resort to launch their new mascara, whilst their competitor Nars flew SMIs to Ibiza and Bora Bora to launch their new products (a mascara and an eyeshadow palette respectively). These lavish trips were perceived to jeopardise SMIs’ credibility; many community members believed that the scale of these incentives left SMIs obligated to share a positive review, even if they did not like the product:

*I would love to have this opportunity but the thought of Benefit being so up all these beauty gurus asses giving them this amazing trip just so they can give a mascara a good review?? I mean if Benefit gave me this trip and this*

1  
2  
3 *experience I would feel bad to say they came out with a shit mascara. (4*  
4 *likes)*

5  
6  
7 (SM, 2018)

8  
9 Viewer: *I now see why makeup companies charge us so much for their*  
10 *products. No shade on you...I would go too!!! (58 likes, 5<sup>th</sup> most liked*  
11 *comment)*

12  
13  
14  
15 Viewer (replying): *plus, there is no way any of those influencers give a bad*  
16 *review after Benefit buys them that trip. (29 likes)*

17  
18  
19 (JG, 2018)

20  
21 Thus, whilst beauty vloggers rose to fame due to their impartial product reviews, this  
22  
23 ‘over-indulging’ of SMIs with enticing non-monetary incentives caused community  
24  
25 members to doubt their credibility. Furthermore, we see that these incentives were seen  
26  
27 to favour some community members (SMIs), at the expense of others (SMIs’ viewers),  
28  
29 who were seen to shoulder the costs of these lavish trips via increased product costs.  
30  
31 Thus, community members’ comments highlighted that these excessive incentives  
32  
33 violated established moral responsibilities within the community, jeopardising SMIs’  
34  
35 commitment to providing honest, unbiased reviews whilst simultaneously  
36  
37 disadvantaging other community members.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 However, as in the case of over-emphasis and over-saturation, we found that  
45  
46 community members typically made situational attributions that reduced SMIs’  
47  
48 responsibility for over-indulgence and instead considered the brand culpable for this  
49  
50 transgression. Indeed, many community members acknowledged that they too would  
51  
52 be tempted to accept these incentives:  
53  
54

55  
56 Viewer: *All of this for a mascara?!?! Not hating on Sam at all - who would*  
57 *turn this down? But this certainly puts me off Benefit. Ridiculous (103*  
58 *likes, 9<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Viewer (replying): *I agree, I know its a business and advertising PR and all*  
4 *the rest of it, but it does stick in the throat a bit cos that's what we're*  
5 *paying for. However as a blogger who would turn down this opportunity!*  
6  
7 *(2 likes)*

8  
9  
10 (SM, 2018)

11  
12  
13 Viewer: *The amount brands give to YouTubers actually puts me off that*  
14 *brand... Love Jamie and Jack though, killing it as always xx (48 likes, 7<sup>th</sup>*  
15 *most liked comment)*

16  
17  
18  
19 Viewer (replying): *I know, that's why I won't purchase them! I get that the*  
20 *budget they used to use on traditional advertising is now used to give*  
21 *bloggers the chance to advertise it but it's so excessive and vulgar xx (3*  
22 *likes)*

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 (JG, 2018)

28  
29 In the above exchanges we see how community members developed negative  
30 perceptions of those brands perceived as guilty of over-indulgence, and even expressed  
31 negative consequences for their purchase intentions.

### 32 33 34 35 36 37 **Discussion**

38  
39 Our findings extend extant research on the reception of celebrity endorsements by SMIs  
40 in several ways. Whilst prior research on SMIs as celebrity endorsers has focused on  
41 factors that enhance celebrity endorsement's desirable outcomes (e.g. Childers *et al.*,  
42 2019; Lou and Yuan, 2019; Munnukka *et al.*, 2019; Shan *et al.*, 2019), our study  
43 highlights the new challenges and risks presented by SMI endorsement. Looking  
44 beyond the dyadic parasocial relationships between SMIs and their followers that have  
45 been the focus of prior research (Chung and Cho, 2017; Munnukka *et al.*, 2019), we  
46 recognise the impact of the broader consumption community contexts within which  
47 many SMIs are embedded. Whilst extant literature acknowledges that SMI  
48 endorsement in community contexts may be perceived as transgressive and has broadly  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recognised that SMIs' communal ties introduce a moral dimension to celebrity  
4 endorsement (Kozinets et al. 2010; Mardon et al. 2018), we provide additional insight  
5 by identifying five recurring celebrity endorsement transgressions – underhand  
6 endorsement, over-endorsement, over-emphasis, over-saturation and over-indulgence  
7 – each underpinned by a distinct moral responsibility surrounding SMI endorsement.  
8 In doing so, we explain when and why community members perceive SMI  
9 endorsements to be transgressive, and reveals the moral responsibilities that must be  
10 negotiated in order to avoid such transgressive endorsements.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Furthermore, our study sheds light on the ways in which consumers identify and  
23 articulate these perceived transgressions within the community. Whilst scholars have  
24 previously expressed concerns surrounding consumers' advertising literacy in the  
25 context of new forms of 'embedded' or 'native' online advertising (e.g. An *et al.*, 2014),  
26 the consumers in our study not only identified SMI endorsements, but actively  
27 highlighted perceived endorsement transgressions. They often used industry jargon  
28 such as "long-term partnership", "gifted", "paid advertorial", and "sponsored content",  
29 identified specific ratios of endorsed vs organic content, and supported their articulation  
30 of perceived transgressions by drawing comparisons with other SMIs' endorsement  
31 activities and by making reference to specific regulations governing SMI endorsement.  
32 We observed in particular that community members were often able to articulate clearly  
33 and constructively what they would consider an acceptable SMI endorsement. In  
34 communicating perceived transgressions, and articulating their expectations, these  
35 community members served to reinforce and protect established moral responsibilities  
36 within the community.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our findings also provide insights into community members' attribution of  
4 responsibility for endorsement transgressions. Prior research indicates that SMIs are  
5 held responsible for transgressive endorsements (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Mardon *et al.*,  
6 2018). However, we find that whilst some endorsement transgressions (underhand  
7 endorsement, over-endorsement) are blamed on the SMI, other transgressions are  
8 blamed primarily on the endorsed brand (over-emphasis, over-saturation, over-  
9 indulgence). Thus, whilst brands are not considered community members, our research  
10 demonstrates that they can nonetheless be considered culpable for transgressive SMI  
11 endorsements in which they are involved, even in instances where the SMI is not held  
12 responsible. Indeed, we found that community members often attempted to excuse the  
13 SMI for their role in endorsement transgressions. For instance, where over-emphasis  
14 occurred, community members often sympathised with SMIs, who they portrayed as  
15 being forced into this transgression by an overly controlling brand. Similarly, in  
16 situations of over-indulgence, community members empathised with SMIs, recognising  
17 that they too would be tempted to accept the enticing incentives offered by brands.  
18 Thus, community members engaged in various forms of situational attribution (Um,  
19 2013) in order to limit the SMI's perceived responsibility for the transgression. Notably,  
20 engaging in situational attribution as a means to reduce the SMI's responsibility for the  
21 transgression simultaneously involved community members placing increased blame  
22 on the endorsed brand. However, where the community initially engaged in situational  
23 attribution to excuse the SMI for their role in a transgression, continued transgressions  
24 by SMIs often led community members to switch instead to dispositional attribution,  
25 interpreting repeated transgressions by an SMI as intentional, and thus as representative  
26 of negative character traits.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Our research also highlights the negative outcomes faced by both SMIs and brands  
5 when their endorsement activities fail to successfully negotiate moral responsibilities  
6 within the community. Prior work has largely focused on the implications of  
7 transgressive SMI endorsements for the endorsing SMI's reputation within the  
8 community (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Mardon *et al.*, 2018), providing limited insight into  
9 the implications for endorsement reception or for community members' perceptions of  
10 the endorsed brand. Our research indicates that whilst the endorsing brands are not  
11 community members, they may nonetheless suffer negative consequences when moral  
12 responsibilities within the community are violated. Where the brand is blamed for the  
13 transgression, as is the case for over-indulgence, over-saturation, and over-emphasis,  
14 community members express negative sentiment towards, and may even threaten to  
15 boycott, the brand. However, even when the brand is not held responsible for the  
16 transgression, as in underhand endorsement and over-endorsement, these transgressions  
17 negatively impact endorsement reception, with endorsements perceived to lack  
18 credibility. We also demonstrate that transgressive endorsements have negative  
19 consequences for the SMI. Where the SMI is blamed for a transgression, as in instances  
20 of persistent underhand endorsement and over-endorsement, community members may  
21 express negative sentiment towards the endorser, doubt their credibility, avoid their  
22 social media content, unsubscribe from their YouTube channel, and even report their  
23 content for breaking regulations. Furthermore, we see that even when the SMI is not  
24 held responsible for an endorsement transgression, they may face negative  
25 consequences since such transgressions may erode community members' enjoyment of  
26 their content and negatively impact their perceived credibility. Thus, our study  
27 highlights the negative consequences of SMI endorsements for both the SMI and  
28 endorsed brands, and demonstrates that although attributions of responsibility lead to  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 more severe consequences, both parties experience negative consequences even when  
4  
5 they are not perceived as culpable by the community.  
6  
7

8  
9 In addition to extending research on SMI endorsements, our research also  
10  
11 contributes to the broader celebrity endorsement literature. Our findings indicate that  
12  
13 consumption community contexts may shape endorsement reception in ways that are  
14  
15 not accounted for by extant research. For instance, whilst prior research has found that  
16  
17 the use of multiple endorsers can reduce audience boredom (Hsu and McDonald, 2002)  
18  
19 and produce more favourable brand attitudes (Rice *et al.*, 2012), we find that the use of  
20  
21 multiple SMI endorsers within a consumption community can produce transgressive  
22  
23 over-saturation that results in brand fatigue, negative brand attitudes, and even threats  
24  
25 of brand avoidance. Furthermore, prior work has argued that celebrity endorsements  
26  
27 should single-mindedly communicate the brand-celebrity pairing, avoiding other  
28  
29 elements that may serve as a distraction (Till, 1998). However, we find that for SMI  
30  
31 endorsements, community members expect the brand-celebrity pairing to be just one  
32  
33 element within a video featuring other recommended products/brands, and that failing  
34  
35 to meet this expectation may lead to transgressive over-emphasis, producing negative  
36  
37 consequences for both the SMI and the endorsed brand. Thus, our study provides  
38  
39 insights into the ways in which consumption communities' distinct characteristics  
40  
41 shape endorsement reception.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Our findings also provide new insights into the implications of celebrity and  
50  
51 brand transgressions for celebrity endorsement. Prior research explores how moral  
52  
53 transgressions in celebrities' personal and professional lives impact the brands that they  
54  
55 endorse (Carrillat *et al.*, 2014), and conversely how brands' transgressions may  
56  
57 negatively impact their celebrity endorsers (Thomas and Fowler, 2016). We contribute  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to this work by demonstrating that SMI endorsements in consumption community  
4 contexts may be perceived as transgressive in and of themselves, with the celebrity and  
5 the brand therefore complicit in this transgression. For each of the given endorsement  
6 transgressions that we identify, we provide insight into the perceived responsibility of  
7 both the celebrity and the brand, and explore the implications of attributed culpability  
8 for both parties. Our findings present several departures from previous literature. For  
9 instance, whilst prior research has suggested that consumers tend towards either  
10 situational or dispositional attribution styles (Um, 2013), we find that community  
11 members may alter their attribution style over time, in response to repeated  
12 transgressions. Additionally, whilst Um (2013) found that consumers' attempts to  
13 reduce celebrities' responsibility for a transgression through situational attribution  
14 reduces the negative outcomes for both celebrity *and* brand (Um, 2013), we found that  
15 community members' engagement in situational attribution to reduce the SMI's  
16 responsibility for the transgression shifted blame *onto* the endorsed brand, resulting in  
17 increased negative consequences for this brand. Furthermore, prior research tends to  
18 associate reduced perceptions of responsibility with reduced negative consequences  
19 (Louie *et al.*, 2001; Zhou and Whitla, 2013). Our research indicates that in the case of  
20 endorsement transgressions – where the endorsement is perceived as transgressive in  
21 and of itself rather than due to some external celebrity/brand transgression – attributions  
22 of responsibility tend to amplify the negative consequences for the 'guilty' parties, yet  
23 innocent parties may still suffer undesirable outcomes from transgressions for which  
24 they are not deemed responsible.

#### 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 *Managerial Recommendations* 57 58 59 60



1  
2  
3 Drawing insights from the endorsement transgressions identified in our study, we offer  
4 recommendations for both brands utilising SMI endorsements and SMIs engaging in  
5 endorsement activities (see Table 4). We propose that following these  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 recommendations may reduce the likelihood of endorsement transgressions, and thus  
11  
12 produce a more favourable communal response.  
13  
14

15  
16 Many of our recommendations for brands involve simple changes in how brands  
17 plan and execute celebrity endorsements involving SMIs (e.g. avoiding scheduling  
18 endorsements by multiple SMIs within the same community in quick succession,  
19 constructing creative briefs that allow the SMI a level of creative control over  
20 endorsement execution). However, other recommendations may require a more  
21  
22 significant investment of time and effort from brands' management teams. In particular,  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 our study suggests that brands should inspect prospective SMI endorsers' social media  
28 content, and corresponding viewer comments, prior to endorser selection in order to  
29  
30 avoid endorsement by SMIs perceived by the community to be guilty of underhand  
31 endorsement or over-endorsement. Whilst marketers have been found to base the  
32 selection of SMI endorsers primarily on brand-celebrity fit (Childers *et al.*, 2019), our  
33 findings indicate that conducting this additional research during the endorser selection  
34 phase will enable brands to reduce the likelihood of transgressive SMI endorsements  
35 that have negative consequences for endorsed brands. This research can be performed  
36  
37 in-house by a member of the brand's marketing team, and indeed many brands now  
38 have in-house staff responsible for collaborating with SMIs. Alternatively, many social  
39 media marketing and influencer marketing agencies enable brands to outsource such  
40  
41 research, should they not have in-house capabilities.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our research also provides insights to guide SMIs and their management teams in  
4 their celebrity endorsement ventures. Many of our recommendations involve simple  
5 changes to endorsement execution (e.g. avoiding over-emphasising a single  
6 product/service/brand within an endorsement), scheduling (e.g. interspacing  
7 endorsements with organic content, rather than posting multiple endorsements  
8 consecutively), and disclosure (e.g. disclosing endorsements in line with both local  
9 regulations and community expectations). Other recommendations involve more  
10 significant shifts in how SMIs collaborate with brands when planning endorsements  
11 (e.g. requesting a level of creative control over endorsement execution; asking brands  
12 to disclose their schedule of planned endorsements by other SMIs within the  
13 community). However, SMIs have management teams that represent them in  
14 discussions with brands, who can (and increasingly do) make such requests. We propose  
15 that more effective communication with endorsing brands during the planning stages of  
16 celebrity endorsements can enable SMIs to produce more favourable endorsements that  
17 avoid community retaliation.

#### 38 39 *Limitations and Future Research*

40 Engaging in an immersive, longitudinal study of the YTBC enabled us to develop a  
41 deep understanding of the established moral responsibilities that shape the reception of  
42 celebrity endorsement within this context. However, it is possible that other online  
43 consumption communities may exhibit distinct moral responsibilities surrounding SMI  
44 endorsement, or may respond differently to perceived endorsement transgressions.  
45 Thus, future research might compare communal responses to SMI endorsement  
46 transgressions within multiple online consumption communities in order to evaluate the  
47 generalisability of our findings. Such research can establish whether community  
48 characteristics such as duration, dispersion, marketplace orientation and structure of  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 resource dependency (Thomas *et al.*, 2013) have implications for community members'  
4 identification of, and response to, endorsement transgressions. Do different types of  
5 community perceive different endorsement qualities as transgressive? Do different  
6 community types vary in how they respond to perceived endorsement transgressions,  
7 and how might this shape the implications of such transgressions for the SMIs and  
8 brands involved? Answering such questions would contribute to theories of SMI  
9 endorsement, and celebrity endorsement more broadly, by extending our understanding  
10 of the way in which community contexts shape endorsement reception.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Furthermore, whilst our netnographic approach captured the reactions of vocal  
23 community members who commented on SMIs' social media content, as well as the  
24 wider community consensus indicated by the 'liking' of these comments, it did not  
25 capture the responses of those community members that did not express their opinions  
26 online. Future studies could use interview or survey research to capture the views and  
27 experiences of these individuals in order to provide additional insight into the responses  
28 of more peripheral community members who infrequently post online. Such research  
29 would contribute to the SMI endorsement literature by exploring variations in how  
30 different types of community members perceive and respond to SMI endorsements.  
31  
32 Furthermore, speaking directly to members of an online consumption community may  
33 provide insight into the role of other community members in shaping their perceptions  
34 surrounding endorsement transgressions. For instance, how does reading other  
35 community members' online comments regarding a perceived endorsement  
36 transgression shape the individual's own perceptions of the endorsement? Prior  
37 research on celebrity and brand transgressions often documents consumers' individual  
38 responses to transgressions reported in the media (e.g. Um, 2013; Carrillat *et al.*, 2014),  
39 however in the context of online consumption communities it becomes apparent that  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 we must acknowledge and understand the collective way in which community  
4  
5 members' perceptions of, and response to, endorsement transgressions evolves.  
6  
7

## 8 9 **References**

- 10  
11 Abidin, C. (2015), "Communicative intimacies: Influencers and perceived  
12 interconnectedness", *Ada*, Vol.8, pp.1-16.  
13  
14  
15  
16 An, S., Jin, H.S. and Park, E.H. (2014), "Children's advertising literacy for  
17 Advergaming: Perceptions of the fame as advertising", *Journal of Advertising*,  
18 Vol.43 No.1, pp.63-72.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of*  
23 *Nationalism*. London: Verso.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Bergkvist, L. and Zhou, K.Q. (2016), "Celebrity endorsements: a literature review and  
28 research agenda", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol.35 No.4, pp.642-  
29 663.  
30  
31  
32  
33 Carrillat, F.A., d'Astous, A. and Christianis, H. (2014), "Guilty by Association: The  
34 Perils of Celebrity Endorsement for Endorsed Brands and their Direct  
35 Competitor", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol.31 No.11, pp.1024-1039.  
36  
37  
38  
39 Carrillat, F.A., O'Rourke, A.M. and Plourde, C. (2019), "Celebrity endorsement in  
40 the world of luxury fashion—when controversy can be beneficial", *Journal of*  
41 *Marketing Management*, Vol.35 No.13-14, pp.1193-1213.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Childers, C.C., Lemon, L.L. and Hoy, M.G. (2019), "# Sponsored# Ad: Agency  
46 Perspective on Influencer Marketing Campaigns", *Journal of Current Issues &*  
47 *Research in Advertising*, Vol.40 No.3, pp.258-274.  
48  
49  
50  
51 Choi, S.M. and Rifon, N.J. (2012), "It is a match: The impact of congruence between  
52 celebrity image and consumer ideal self on endorsement effectiveness",  
53 *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.29 No.9, pp.639-650.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Chung, S. and Cho, H. (2017), "Fostering parasocial relationships with celebrities on  
5 social media: Implications for celebrity endorsement", *Psychology &*  
6 *Marketing*, Vol.34 No.4, pp.481-495.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Cocker, H.L. and Cronin, J. (2017), "Charismatic authority and the YouTuber:  
11 Unpacking the new cults of personality", *Marketing Theory*, Vol.17 No.4,  
12 pp.455-472.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Elmhirst, S. (2019), It's genuine, you know?: why the online influencer industry is  
17 going 'authentic'. *The Guardian*.  
18 [https://www.theguardian.com/media/2019/apr/05/its-genuine-you-know-why-](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2019/apr/05/its-genuine-you-know-why-the-online-influencer-industry-is-going-authentic)  
19 [the-online-influencer-industry-is-going-authentic](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2019/apr/05/its-genuine-you-know-why-the-online-influencer-industry-is-going-authentic) (accessed 01.05.19).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Erdogan, B.Z., Baker, M.J. and Tagg, S. (2001), "Selecting celebrity endorsers: The  
25 practitioner's perspective", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol.41 No.3,  
26 pp.39-48.  
27  
28  
29  
30 Erfgen, C., Sebastian, Z. and Henrik, S. (2015), "The vampire effect: when do  
31 celebrity endorsers harm brand recall?", *International Journal of Research in*  
32 *Marketing*, Vol.32 No.2, pp.155-163.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Gannon, V. and Prothero, A. (2018), "Beauty bloggers and YouTubers as a  
38 community of practice", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.34 No.7-8,  
39 pp.592-619.  
40  
41  
42  
43 Hailes, S. (2018). "Thomas Sabo names new UK & Ireland ambassador".  
44 [https://www.professionaljeweller.com/thomas-sabo-names-new-uk-ireland-](https://www.professionaljeweller.com/thomas-sabo-names-new-uk-ireland-ambassador/)  
45 [ambassador/](https://www.professionaljeweller.com/thomas-sabo-names-new-uk-ireland-ambassador/) (accessed 15.01.20).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 Harwood, T. and Garry, T. (2014), "Co-creation and ambiguous ownership within  
51 virtual communities: the case of the Machinima community", *Journal of*  
52 *Consumer Behaviour*, Vol.13 No.2, pp.148-156.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 Hou, M. (2019). "Social media celebrity and the institutionalization of YouTube",  
58 *Convergence*, Vol.25 No.3, pp.534-553.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Horton, D. and Richard Wohl, R. (1956), "Mass communication and para-social  
4 interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance", *Psychiatry*, Vol.19 No.3,  
5 pp.215-229.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Hsu, C.K. and McDonald, D. (2002), "An examination on multiple celebrity  
11 endorsers in advertising", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol.11  
12 No.1, pp.19-29.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Ilicic, J. and Webster, C.M. (2014), "Eclipsing: When celebrities overshadow the  
17 brand", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.31 No.11, pp.1040-1050.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Kamins, M.A. (1990), "An investigation into the "match-up" hypothesis in celebrity  
22 advertising: When beauty may be only skin deep", *Journal of Advertising*,  
23 Vol.19 No.1, pp.4-13.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Kamins, M.A. and Gupta, K. (1994), "Congruence between spokesperson and product  
28 type: A matchup hypothesis perspective", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.11  
29 No.6, pp.569-586.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Keel, A. and Natarajan, R. (2012), "Celebrity endorsements and beyond: New  
35 avenues for celebrity branding", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.29 No.9, pp.690-  
36 703.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Khamis, S., Ang, L. and Welling, R. (2017), "Self-branding, 'micro-celebrity' and the  
41 rise of SMIs", *Celebrity Studies*, Vol.8 No.2, pp.191-208.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Kozinets, R.V. (1999), "E-tribalized marketing?: The strategic implications of virtual  
46 communities of consumption", *European Management Journal*, Vol.17  
47 No.3, pp.252-264.  
48  
49  
50  
51 Kozinets, R.V., De Valck, K., Wojnicki, A.C. and Wilner, S.J. (2010), "Networked  
52 narratives: Understanding word-of-mouth marketing in online communities",  
53 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.74 No.2, pp.71-89.  
54  
55  
56  
57 Kozinets, R.V. (2015). *Netnography: Revisited*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., SAGE Publications Ltd:  
58 London.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kozinets, R.V. (2020). *Netnography: The Essential Guide to Qualitative Social Media*  
4 *Research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., SAGE Publications Ltd: London.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Lindgren, S. (2012), "It took me about half an hour, but I did it!" Media circuits and  
9 affinity spaces around how-to videos on YouTube", *European Journal of*  
10 *Communication*, Vol.27 No.2, pp.152–170.  
11  
12  
13  
14 Liu, M.T. and Brock, J.L. (2011), "Selecting a female athlete endorser in China: The  
15 effect of attractiveness, match-up, and consumer gender difference", *European*  
16 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.45 No.7/8, pp.1214-1235.  
17  
18  
19  
20 Lou, C. and Yuan, S. (2019), "Influencer Marketing: How Message Value and  
21 Credibility Affect Consumer Trust of Branded Content on Social Media",  
22 *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, Vol.19 No.1, pp.58-73.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Louie, T.A., Kulik, R.L. and Jacobson, R. (2001), "When bad things happen to the  
28 endorsers of good products", *Marketing Letters*, Vol.12 No.1, pp.13-23.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Marchand, A., Hennig-Thurau, T. and Best, S. (2015), "When James Bond shows off  
33 his Omega: does product placement affect its media host?", *European Journal*  
34 *of Marketing*, Vol.49 No.9/10, pp.1666-1685.  
35  
36  
37  
38 Mardon, R., Molesworth, M. and Grigore, G. (2018), "YouTube Beauty Gurus and  
39 the emotional labour of tribal entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Research*,  
40 Vol.92, pp. 443-454.  
41  
42  
43  
44 McCracken, G. (1989), "Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the  
45 endorsement process", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.16 No.3, pp.310-  
46 321.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Mind (2016), "Zoella becomes first Digital Ambassador for Mind",  
51 [https://www.mind.org.uk/news-campaigns/news/zoella-becomes-first-digital-](https://www.mind.org.uk/news-campaigns/news/zoella-becomes-first-digital-ambassador-for-mind/)  
52 [ambassador-for-mind/](https://www.mind.org.uk/news-campaigns/news/zoella-becomes-first-digital-ambassador-for-mind/) (accessed 15.01.20).  
53  
54  
55  
56 Muñiz, A.M. and O'Guinn, T.C. (2001), "Brand community", *Journal of Consumer*  
57 *Research*, Vol.27 No.4, pp.412-432.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Munnukka, J., Maity, D., Reinikainen, H. and Luoma-aho, V. (2019), "Thanks for  
4 watching". The effectiveness of YouTube vlog endorsements", *Computers in*  
5 *Human Behavior*, Vol.93, pp.226-234.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ohanian, R. (1990), "Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity  
11 endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness and attractiveness", *Journal of*  
12 *Advertising*, Vol.19 No.3, pp.39-52.  
13  
14  
15  
16 O'Neil-Hart, C. and Blumenstein, H. (2016), "Why YouTube stars are more influential  
17 than traditional celebrities", [https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-](https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-insights/youtube-stars-influence/)  
18 [insights/youtube-stars-influence/](https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-insights/youtube-stars-influence/) (accessed 30.06.19).  
19  
20  
21  
22 Rice, D.H., Kelting, K. and Lutz, R.J. (2012), "Multiple endorsers and multiple  
23 endorsements: The influence of message repetition, source congruence and  
24 involvement on brand attitudes", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol.22  
25 No.2, pp.249-259.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Rotman, D. and Preece, J. (2010), "The 'WeTube' in YouTube—creating an online  
31 community through video sharing", *International Journal of Web Based*  
32 *Communities*, Vol.6 No.3, pp.317-333.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Sääksjärvi, M., Hellén, K. and Balabanis, G. (2016), "Sometimes a celebrity holding a  
38 negative public image is the best product endorser", *European Journal of*  
39 *Marketing*, Vol.50 No.3/4, pp.421-441.  
40  
41  
42  
43 Scaraboto, D. and Fischer, E. (2013), "Frustrated fatshionistas: An institutional theory  
44 perspective on consumer quests for greater choice in mainstream markets",  
45 *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.39 No.6, pp.1234-1257.  
46  
47  
48  
49 Schomer, A. (2019). Influencer Marketing: State of the social media influencer  
50 market in 2020. [https://www.businessinsider.com/influencer-marketing-](https://www.businessinsider.com/influencer-marketing-report?r=US&IR=T)  
51 [report?r=US&IR=T](https://www.businessinsider.com/influencer-marketing-report?r=US&IR=T) (accessed 20.01.20).  
52  
53  
54  
55 Shan, Y., Chen, K.J. and Lin, J.S. (2019), "When social media influencers endorse  
56 brands: the effects of self-influencer congruence, parasocial identification, and  
57 perceived endorser motive", *International Journal of Advertising*, DOI:  
58 10.1080/02650487.2019.1678322.  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Sorensen, K. and Mara, A. (2014), "BookTubers as a networked knowledge  
4 community". In M. Limbu & B. Gurung (Eds.), *Emerging pedagogies in the*  
5 *networked knowledge society: Practices integrating global media and*  
6 *society*. Hershey: Information Science Reference.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Statista (2019). YouTube: annual beauty content views 2009-2018.  
12 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/294655/youtube-monthly-beauty-content-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/294655/youtube-monthly-beauty-content-views/)  
13 [views/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/294655/youtube-monthly-beauty-content-views/) (accessed 22.05.20).  
14  
15  
16  
17 Thomas, T.C., Price, L.L. and Schau, H.J. (2013). "When differences unite: Resource  
18 dependence in heterogeneous consumption communities", *Journal of Consumer*  
19 *Research*, Vol.39 No.5, pp.1010-1033.  
20  
21  
22  
23 Thomas, V.L. and Fowler, K. (2016), "Examining the Impact of Brand Transgressions  
24 on Consumers' Perceptions of Celebrity Endorsers", *Journal of Advertising*,  
25 Vol.45 No.4, pp.377-390.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Thompson, C.J., Pollio, H.R. and Locander, W.B. (1994), "The spoken and the  
30 unspoken: a hermeneutic approach to understanding the cultural viewpoints that  
31 underlie consumers' expressed meanings", *Journal of Consumer Research*,  
32 Vol.21 No.3, pp.432-452.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Thwaites, D., Lowe, B., Monkhouse, L.L. and Barnes, B.R. (2012), "The impact of  
38 negative publicity on celebrity ad endorsements", *Psychology & Marketing*,  
39 Vol.29 No.9, pp.663-673.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Till, B.D. (1998), "Using celebrity endorsers effectively: lessons from associative  
45 learning", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol.7 No.5, pp.400-409.  
46  
47  
48  
49 Till, B.D. and Shimp, T.A. (1998), "Endorsers in advertising: The case of negative  
50 celebrity information", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol.27 No.1, pp.67-82.  
51  
52  
53 Tripp, C., Jensen, T.D. and Carlson, L. (1994), "The effects of multiple product  
54 endorsements by celebrities on consumers' attitudes and intentions", *Journal of*  
55 *Consumer Research*, Vol.20 No.4, pp.535-547.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Um, N.H. (2013), “Celebrity scandal fallout: How attribution style can protect the sponsor”, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.30 No.6, pp.529-541.

White, D.W., Goddard L. and Wilbur N. (2009), “The effects of negative information transference in the celebrity endorsement relationship”, *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol.37 No.4, pp.322–335.

Zhou, L. and Whitla, P. (2013), “How negative celebrity publicity influences consumer attitudes: The mediating role of moral reputation”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.66 No.8, pp.1013-1020.

European Journal of Marketing

Table 1: The YouTube Beauty Community – Consumption Community Characteristics and Dimensions

Consumption Community Characteristics (Muñiz and O’Guinn, 2001)	Evidence from Prior Research on the YouTube Beauty Community
1. Consciousness of Kind	Community members use the term ‘community’ to describe the collective, refer to the collective as ‘we’ and ‘us’, and exhibit a shared understanding of practices and identities – a shared sense of “who beauty bloggers and YouTubers are and of what they do” (Gannon and Prothero, 2018, p.602).
2. Shared Rituals and Traditions	Beauty vloggers and their viewers engage in shared rituals and traditions and exhibit a shared vocabulary (e.g. ‘vlogs’, ‘hauls’, ‘collabs’, ‘dupes’, ‘get ready with me’, ‘empties’) (Gannon and Prothero, 2018).
3. Moral Responsibility	Beauty vloggers are expected to demonstrate honesty and trustworthiness at all times, show gratitude towards their viewers, and respond to constructive feedback and requests from viewers (Gannon and Prothero, 2018; Mardon <i>et al.</i> , 2018).
Consumption Community Dimensions (Thomas <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	
1. Focus	Primarily centered on a consumption activity (beauty consumption), rather than a focal brand or ideology, although community members also cohere around, and forge strong connections with, key figures within the community (influential beauty vloggers, many of whom become SMIs).
2. Duration	An enduring community that has been active for over 10 years.
3. Appeal	The community has broad appeal, since beauty consumption is a popular consumption activity worldwide (e.g. beauty-related video content generated more than 169 billion views on YouTube in 2018 (Statista, 2019))
4. Access	Consumers can easily join the community as viewers by accessing beauty vloggers’ free video content online, and are able to participate by liking and commenting on these videos. Consumers can also upload their own beauty-related video content to the YouTube platform with relative ease, though some equipment costs may be involved when filming high quality content (e.g. cameras, lighting equipment, video editing software). However it is difficult to attract the large audience required to become a successful beauty vlogger with SMI status within the community.
5. Dispersion	The community exists primarily in a dispersed online environment. The YouTube channels of beauty vloggers are the community’s central gathering point, where

1		community members meet and interact, however community members also congregate
2		on other social media platforms (e.g. Instagram, gossip forums) and, occasionally, at
3		offline events (e.g. at offline conventions and 'meet-ups').
4		
5	6. Marketplace orientation	When beauty vloggers first began collaborating with brands, viewers were highly
6		resistant to commercial involvement within the community. However, over time the
7		community has become more open to commercial activity and endorsements by beauty
8		vloggers are now commonplace. SMIs are perceived to have a moral responsibility to
9		produce endorsements that meet certain moral standards, and endorsements may be
10		perceived as transgressive when these standards are not met.
11		
12	7. Structure of resource dependency	Beauty vloggers provide entertaining and informative video content that benefits
13		viewers and thus attracts a large audience, which vloggers commodify via celebrity
14		endorsements targeting their viewers. This resource dependency structure enables
15		beauty vloggers to profit from their audience without charging viewers directly for
16		access to their video content, and both the viewer and vlogger mutually benefit from
17		this arrangement.
18		
19	8. Collective belonging	A sense of collective belonging exists for community members, particularly amongst
20		those most invested in the community (i.e. vloggers and regular viewers, rather than
21		infrequent/casual viewers). There is a sense of community both between the vloggers
22		themselves (who often interact with one another online and offline), and the vloggers
23		and viewers more broadly. Both vloggers and viewers refer to the collective as a
24		'community'. Offline conventions and 'meet-ups' serve to enhance a sense of
25		collective belonging amongst community members.
26		
27	9. Heterogeneity	A heterogeneous rather than homogeneous consumption community. Community
28		members take on different roles (e.g. beauty vloggers as SMIs and their viewers). Some
29		viewers are highly vocal and express their opinions in the video comments, whilst
30		others are more passive but may express their opinions by liking and disliking videos
31		and by liking other viewers' comments.
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		

Table 2: Focal Beauty Vloggers

YouTube Channel Name*	Number of Subscribers**	Date of Earliest Available YouTube Video***	Available Videos***
Zoella (ZL)	11.5 million	2009	930
Tanya Burr (TB)	3.5 million	2009	111
Patricia Bright (PB)	3 million	2010	910
Sam & Nic Chapman (SNC)	2 million	2008	931
Samantha Maria (SM)	2 million	2009	1,219
FleurDeForce (FDF)	1.5 million	2009	1,923
Estée Lalonde (EL)	1 million	2011	950
Inthefrow (ITF)	1 million	2013	605
Jamie Genevieve (JG)	1 million	2014	430
Amelia Liana (AL)	0.5 million	2013	666
Lily Pebbles (LP)	0.5 million	2012	800
The Anna Edit (AE)	0.5 million	2010	816

\* Vlogger's primary YouTube channel (some have multiple YouTube channels).

Researcher's label in parenthesis

\*\*As of December 2019

\*\*\* Across all of the vlogger's YouTube channels, as of December 2019

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Table 3: Additional Illustrations of Perceived SMI Endorsement Transgressions

SMI Endorsement Transgression	Example Video Comments
Underhand Endorsement	<p data-bbox="1161 521 1193 1115"><i>Does this not have to say Ad in the title?? (11 likes)</i></p> <p data-bbox="1082 611 1114 1675"><i>Viewer (replying): I want to know before I click on the video that there's an ad in it. (5 likes)</i></p> <p data-bbox="986 611 1058 1904"><i>Viewer (replying): I'd also like to know when there's an ad in a video before I watch it. There's no hate, I'm just fairly sure that's the law for youtube these days so I'm wondering what's changed. (0 likes)</i> (EL, 2017)</p> <p data-bbox="858 521 922 1836"><i>Not trying to be rude or anything, but aren't you supposed to clearly state that this is an ad somewhere in the title (although I do see it in the description box)? (93 likes, 4<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p data-bbox="802 611 834 1137"><i>Viewer (replying): I definitely agree! (0 likes)</i></p> <p data-bbox="707 611 778 1933"><i>Viewer (replying): Yup, it's supposed to be in the title. It's recommended that you report the video so YouTube can notify her to update it. (2 likes)</i></p> <p data-bbox="619 611 691 1948"><i>Viewer (replying): I have reported it, cause it's just lame. It would not hurt anybody to type two more letters - AD - DONE (4 likes)</i> (AL, 2018)</p> <p data-bbox="531 521 563 1377"><i>Shouldn't you be disclosing this as an ad? (94 likes, 4<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p data-bbox="475 611 507 1948"><i>Viewer (replying): She did :) it came up on the bottom right hand corner when she started talking about it x (7 likes)</i></p> <p data-bbox="387 611 459 1921"><i>Viewer (replying): I spotted that (after some searching around) but full disclosure means clearly labeling both in the title and the description...not good! (52 likes)</i> (SM, 2016)</p>
Over-Endorsement	<i>Why do you keep posting ADs lol. (11 likes)</i>

	<p>AE (replying): <i>It happens that they've all been set to go live around a similar time. As always I only partner with brands I genuinely like and would recommend and I post them on a Wednesday so that they are additional content.</i> X (31 likes)</p> <p>Viewer (replying): <i>It's a shame because I do like your what I eat in a day [a video series regularly posted by the SMI], but hate that it's always an AD so I skip them.</i> (3 likes) (AE, 2018)</p> <p><i>Is every video you do an AD these days?</i> (54 likes) (EL, 2018)</p> <p><i>Almost every video of yours says 'ad', this kiitinda puts me off. just sayin</i> (58 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)</p> <p>Viewer (replying): <i>from the people I am subscribed to, she has the most sponsored videos.</i> (7 likes) (FDF, 2015)</p>
Over-Emphasis	<p><i>: (I usually love your content but this just felt so scripted to me and not your true self by how many times you had to say you were excited to work with the company but it didn't come off as genuine.</i> (342 likes, 7<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)</p> <p>Viewer (replying): <i>I've watched a few other youtubers talk about it and the issue is also that companies aren't loosening the reigns and letting the influencer go off script. If they had just given her some talking points and let her talk about her own experience with the product and not make her follow an exact script then it would feel more natural.</i> (2 likes) (EL, 2018)</p> <p><i>Reading out loud the "facts" from the paper given from the marketing department is pretty ridiculous.</i> (45 likes, 5<sup>th</sup> most liked comment) (SNC, 2019)</p> <p><i>Bloody hell how many times did they ask you to mention the product in the video.</i> (94 likes, 3<sup>rd</sup> most liked comment) (LP, 2016)</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

<p>Over-Saturation</p>	<p><i>I am honestly so tired of watching youtubers eating their hello fresh meals ... It's just not as fun to watch (188 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p>AE (replying): <i>Thanks for the feedback Rikke X (20 likes)</i></p> <p>Viewer (replying): <i>AGREED. Soooooo overdone. (14 likes)</i></p> <p>Viewer (replying): <i>I love Anna so much but feel the Hello Fresh thing is being done to death (22 likes)</i></p> <p>Viewer (replying to AE): <i>Thank you for listening x (13 likes)</i></p> <p>(AE, 2018)</p> <p><i>The advertising for the Simple miceller water is just too much, it's got to the point where I actually don't want to try it because of how much promotion for it is being shoved down my throat (30 likes)</i></p> <p>(FDF, 2015)</p> <p><i>I wish influencers would stop accepting so many Hello Fresh sponsorships. It's quite boring to watch someone making a meal from a box. They've become so annoying that even if I do ever use a food delivery service I'm not going to use Hello Fresh! (136 likes, 3<sup>rd</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p>(LP, 2019)</p>
------------------------	--

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46



<p>Over-Indulgence</p>	<p><i>And this explains why Nars products are so expensive. Someone has to pay for all that extravagance and unfortunately it's the consumer. (70 likes, 2<sup>nd</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p>(LP, 2018)</p> <p><i>Who need 30 FULL SIZE bottles of foundation? I'm sick of companies with "more is more" approach. The WOW factor must be in the products (quality, efficacy etc.) and not the hype around it. (66 likes, 4<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p><i>Viewer (replying): I agree, I wanna know what YouTubers do will full size bottles of every shade. (0 likes)</i></p> <p>(SNC, 2018)</p> <p><i>How serious can we take reviews from NARS and Benefit after these trips from these reviewers though? They will always subconsciously remove negative comments because they got these trips and don't want to sound ungrateful. (19 likes, 6<sup>th</sup> most liked comment)</i></p> <p>(ITF, 2018)</p>
------------------------	---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Table 4: Managerial Recommendations

Related SMI Endorsement Transgression	Recommendations for SMIs	Recommendations for Brands
<i>Underhand Endorsements</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SMIs should clearly disclose all celebrity endorsements. Beyond following legal regulations surrounding endorsement disclosure, SMIs should monitor comments posted by community members in order to establish whether they have additional expectations surrounding disclosure that must be either adhered to or further negotiated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When considering SMIs as prospective celebrity endorsers, brands should examine comments on their prior social media content, enabling them to identify and avoid SMI endorsers perceived by the community to be guilty of underhand endorsements.</li> <li>For endorsements over which brands have a level of creative control (e.g. paid advertisements), they should ensure that the endorsement is disclosed in a way that both adheres to legal regulations and meets communal expectations surrounding disclosure (which can be established by observing community members' comments on previous SMI endorsements).</li> </ul>
<i>Over-Endorsement</i>	<p>SMIs should carefully manage the ratio of endorsed vs organic content on their social media channels. They should ensure that the majority of their content remains organic and that endorsements are not posted consecutively, but rather interspaced with organic content.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When considering SMIs as prospective celebrity endorsers, brands should inspect their prior social media content, paying particular attention to the ratio of organic vs endorsed content and avoiding those who post consecutive endorsements and/or primarily post endorsed content.</li> <li>When considering SMIs as prospective celebrity endorsers, brands should also examine comments on their prior social media content, enabling them to identify and avoid SMIs who are perceived by the community to be guilty of over-endorsement.</li> <li>When implementing SMI endorsements over which the brand has some level of creative control (e.g. paid advertorials), the brand should request that the SMI post the endorsement following an organic post, rather than another endorsement. This request can be incorporated as a requirement within the SMI's creative brief.</li> </ul>

<p><i>Over-Emphasis</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMIs should avoid over-emphasizing a product/brand in their endorsements (e.g. too many verbal mentions, the inclusion of scripted promotional messages, focusing on a single brand/product), and ensure that the endorsement does not erode the informational and/or entertainment value of their social media content.</li> <li>• When engaging in SMI endorsements over which the brand has some level of creative control, SMIs should ensure that they retain a level of creative freedom over how the product/brand is featured in their content and should avoid collaborating with brands that will not allow this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When implementing SMI endorsements over which the brand has some level of creative control (e.g. paid advertorials), brands should construct creative briefs that grant the SMI a level of creative freedom over how the product/brand is featured in the content and avoid prescriptive requirements surrounding endorsement execution (e.g. requiring a specific number of brand mentions, the integration of scripted promotional messages, a set amount of 'screen-time', or that no other brands are featured in the social media post).</li> </ul>
<p><i>Over-Saturation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When collaborating with brands to produce SMI endorsements, SMIs should ask brands to disclose which other SMIs they are working with within the community and to share their schedule of planned endorsements.</li> <li>• SMIs should consider declining SMI endorsements where the brand is working with a large number of other SMIs within the community simultaneously.</li> <li>• When involved in a multiple endorser campaign, SMIs should ensure that their own endorsements are not posted immediately following those of other endorsers within the community. SMIs should also discuss plans for endorsement execution with both the brand and with other endorsers within the community, to ensure that their own endorsement is sufficiently distinct from those of the other endorsers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If adopting a multiple endorser strategy, brands should consider whether SMIs are part of the same online consumption community and therefore likely to share the same audience. Where possible, brands should avoid selecting a large number of SMI endorsers within a single consumption community.</li> <li>• Where multiple SMIs from a single consumption community are used in a multiple endorser strategy, brands should pay particular attention to the scheduling of endorsements (ensuring that SMIs are not posting endorsements in quick succession) and endorsement execution (ensuring that SMI endorsements are sufficiently varied).</li> </ul>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46</p> <p><i>Over-Indulgence</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMIs should consider asking brands' PR teams to scale back incentives (e.g. only sending a small number of shades of a makeup product, rather than all shades in the range). SMIs can also request that their management teams require SMI approval before accepting PR products from brands.</li> <li>• When accepting lucrative incentives from brands (e.g. lavish press trips and excessive PR packages), SMIs should consider collaborating with brands to ensure that these endorsements also benefit the community (e.g. running related competitions for their audience, in collaboration with the endorsing brand).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brands should consider scaling back SMI press trips and PR packages.</li> <li>• Where brands do provide more lucrative incentives for SMIs (e.g. lavish press trips and excessive PR packages), they should ensure that these activities also benefit the wider consumption community (e.g. combining endorsement activities with competitions open to the SMI's audience, giving them the chance to win similar products or experiences for themselves).</li> </ul>
---	--	---