

# Safeguarding the Rights of Child Influencers in the Digital Age

Yingying Jiang<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Law, University of Macau, Macao SAR, China

Corresponding author: Yingying Jiang (yc27201@um.edu.mo)

Submitted: 2026-02-10 / Accepted: 2026-03-30 / Published: 2026-03-31

**Abstract:** The growth of child influencers reflects the increasing monetization of children's online visibility within contemporary digital communication ecosystems, often facilitated by parental content production on social media platforms. This practice raises complex legal and regulatory concerns, including infringements of children's privacy, economic exploitation, risks of physical and psychological harm, and interference with the right to education. While assessing the best interests of the child poses procedural challenges and domestic exploitation often escapes effective oversight, this principle nevertheless remains a crucial normative foundation for child protection, even within digitally mediated, family-based contexts. This article proposes an integrated regulatory framework that combines ex-ante child rights impact assessments with accessible, child-centered ex post remedial mechanisms, aiming to enhance the governance of child influencer practices within the digital environment.

**Keywords:** child influencers, best interest of children, digital age

## 1. Introduction

Digital technologies have generated new forms of labor and commercial activity, among which influencer marketing has emerged as a prominent and rapidly expanding sector (Fishbein, 2022). Influencers operate as paid intermediaries who promote goods and services through social media platforms by producing personalized and audience-oriented content (Kim & Kim, 2021). Within this ecosystem, the phenomenon of child influencers has gained increasing visibility (Fineman, 2023). High-profile cases illustrate the scale of commercialization involved. For example, the US-based YouTube channel Ryan's World reportedly generated approximately USD 180 million in revenue and attracted over 30 million subscribers through toy-related content.<sup>1</sup> Such cases highlight the substantial economic incentives embedded in child-centered digital content production and the resulting motivations for parental participation.

As these incentives intensify, a growing number of parents actively facilitate their children's entry into influencer markets by systematically sharing children's images, videos, and daily activities on social media platforms (Fishbein, 2022). This practice accelerated by the proliferation of platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok, and reinforced by the monetization opportunities offered by platform-based attention economies (Edney, 2021). While the child influencer industry continues to expand, it simultaneously gives rise to a range of legal and regulatory concerns, particularly regarding the protection of children's rights within digitally mediated commercial environments.<sup>2</sup>

The expansion of this emerging industry has been accompanied by a corresponding set of legal, ethical, and regulatory challenges ([Fishbein, 2022](#)). As Fishbein observes, the commercialization of children's online presence exposes structural weaknesses in existing child protection regimes, particularly where economic incentives intersect with family decision-making. These concerns became especially visible during the Spring Festival period of 2025, when a high-profile controversy emerged surrounding “Yao Yi Yao Xiao Rou Bao” (瑶一瑶小肉包), a four-year-old social media personality with approximately 20 million followers. The child's sustained prominence on online trending lists was triggered by allegations of staged content production designed to maximize audience engagement. Public debate quickly moved beyond questions of content authenticity to encompass broader concerns about the legal and ethical boundaries of child influencer practices. The child's guardians were accused of deliberately orchestrating a “tripping” incident to generate traffic, while earlier videos depicting prolonged outdoor exposure under harsh conditions prompted allegations of potential neglect. Further scrutiny focused on the child's apparent absence from formal education, raising questions about whether her developmental and educational rights were being adequately safeguarded.<sup>3</sup>

Prevailing legal doctrine generally recognizes parents as primary custodians of children's rights and interests,<sup>4</sup> operating on the presumption that parental decision-making aligns with the child's best interests—a principle firmly embedded in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). However, it has been noted that that parents frequently violate children's rights through monetization practices in the child influencer economy. This article first identifies four categories of legal harm affecting child influencers: infringement of privacy rights, physical and psychological abuse, neglect of educational needs, and financial exploitation. The analysis then examines the obstacles to operationalizing the universally recognized best interests principle within the child influencer protection framework. In the last part, this article proposes a framework that incorporates child rights assessment procedures based on best interests principle of the child and child-centered remedial approaches to safeguard the rights of child influencers.

## **2. An Analysis of the Rights of Child Influencers**

The most conspicuous detriment confronted by child influencers is the severe invasion of their privacy ([Masterson, 2020](#)), which receives excessive attention among academics ([Plunkett, 2019](#)). Another widely recognized harm inflicted upon child influencers by their parents is the financial exploitation due to the absence of legal framework in place to confer children with ownership of their earnings at present unless their parents provide voluntary consent. The cruel fact is that child influencers, despite facing the peril of substantial financial loss, fall within the exemption of traditional child labor laws or child actor laws, consequently lacking legal entitlements to fair compensation for their efforts ([Masterson, 2020](#)).

Additionally, the physical and mental well-being of child influencers are also areas of concern. Reports indicate that when children do not perform satisfactorily in front of the camera, some parents resort to threatening violence against them. An illustrative case involves a mother in the US, who previously managed a widely followed YouTube channel “Fantastic Adventures”, has faced indictments for abusing children by pepper-spraying them, compelling them to take ice baths, and using clothes hangers to strike them when their on-camera performance fell short.<sup>5</sup> Child abuse includes physical abuse as well as psychological abuse.<sup>6</sup> As

for psychological abuse, the typical case is the YouTube channel “DaddyOFive”, which had over 750,000 subscribers, was known for its hundreds of so-called “prank videos”.<sup>7</sup> These videos involved the parents using foul language to berate their children (Alex, Ryan, Jake, Cody, and Emma) as well as encouraging them to engage in violent behavior towards one another.<sup>8</sup> An extreme case in China is observed in a TikTok account specializing in “mukbang” or eating broadcasts, titled “the day of Pei qi”. The primary content of this account revolves around a three-year-old girl voraciously consuming copious amounts of food. The conspicuous disproportionate weight of 70 pounds for her age has elicited widespread public concern and suspicions of potential abuse.<sup>9</sup>

Another potential legal consequence may arise when parents impede their children’s right to education to align with the demands of a shooting schedule or to participate in commercial activities. The Child Influencers, who gaining more than 700,800 followers and more than 242 million views, had not attended school for several years, as their mother allegedly withdrew them to concentrate on the influencer career. Consequently, the time allocated for formal education in a school setting was significantly curtailed.<sup>10</sup>

To mitigate the detrimental impacts on child influencers, legal measures have been enacted in various jurisdictions, targeting parents as the primary focus. These measures encompass issues such as invasion of privacy, financial exploitation, physical and mental abuse, and exemptions from educational requirements.

## 2.1. Invasion of privacy

In the influencer context, parents can decide to forfeit their children’s privacy for the chance at fame and wealth.<sup>11</sup> Social media influencers often film in their own homes, use their real names, and share their daily routines.<sup>12</sup> It is firmly argued that Children hold an inherent interest in privacy ([Steinberg, 2016](#)). Countries around the world have increasingly recognized the importance of safeguarding children’s privacy, especially in the digital age. One notable example of this trend is the legislative action taken in France. On February 28, 2023, the legislative committee of the French National Assembly unanimously endorsed draft legislation aimed at safeguarding children’s rights to their own images. The legislation incorporates the safeguarding of children’s privacy within the ambit of parents’ legal obligations. Under this provision, both parents assume joint responsibility for their child’s image rights, with an emphasis on involving the child based on their age and level of maturity. In cases of disagreement between parents, the legislation grants judicial authority the power to restrict one parent from posting or sharing the child’s pictures without the consent of the other. Furthermore, in severe instances where the dissemination substantially compromises the child’s dignity or moral integrity, a provision exists whereby parents may forfeit their parental authority over their child’s image rights. This pioneering bill represents a significant effort to safeguard children’s privacy on social media, as a representative legislation of parent-centric approach.<sup>13</sup>

## 2.2. Financial Exploitation

Considering that the behavior of oversharing is likely fueled for the purpose of monetizing the contents created by the parents, it is imperative to curb the financial exploitation of children by their parents, whether within the realm of commercial sharenting or not. Take Illinois as an example, this American state has enacted pioneering legislation, becoming the first in the nation to ensure that children featured in any online content

are entitled to a portion of the profits generated. This legal framework affords children the legislative capacity to take legal action against their parents if the earned funds are not appropriately preserved for their benefit, no matter via commercial sharenting or not.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, a French law targeting the commercial exploitation of children under the age of 16 on online platforms was enacted on October 19, 2020. The legislation aims to create a legal framework for the activities of child influencers on platforms like YouTube, TikTok, Instagram, and others. It expands existing protections, typically reserved for child performers and fashion models, to encompass online influencers. The law tackles a regulatory void in which the activities of child influencers had previously been largely unregulated, potentially leaving them vulnerable to economic exploitation by their parents. Pursuant to this legislation, parents are granted the right to receive only a portion of their child's income, with the remainder directed to a designated "special savings account". This fund becomes accessible to the child upon reaching adulthood. Consequently, under this legal framework, influencers are afforded protection akin to that provided to child models or child actors, as stipulated by the French Labor Code.<sup>15</sup>

## 2.3 Physical and Mental Abuse

It's noticed that a growing inclination to tightly regulate the parental child abuse across jurisdictions, which could serve as a legal basis for the protection of Child Influencers. In China, for example, the related article is 260(1) of *Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China* "whoever has the duty to ward or nurse a juvenile, an elder person, a sick person, or a disabled person maltreats the person under his or her guardianship or nursing with execrable circumstances shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not more than three years or limited incarceration". *Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Minors* stipulates that parents of minors are prohibited from engaging in acts such as maltreatment or abandonment of minors, illegally placing minors up for adoption, or perpetrating domestic violence against minors. If violate this provision, the residents' committee or the villagers' committee at the place of his residence shall deter and intervene, promptly reporting to the public security authorities in severe situations.

In the UK, in cases where parents are found guilty of child cruelty, neglect, or violence, they may face a maximum sentence of 10 years imprisonment upon indictment, especially if evidence of emotional and behavioral repercussions of child abuse is presented, such as psychiatric or psychosomatic stress symptoms, low self-esteem, hyper-vigilance, and pseudo-mature behaviors.<sup>16</sup> If death occurs as a result of such offenses, the maximum penalty is 14 years' imprisonment or a fine, or both.<sup>17</sup>

Child abuse laws in the United States are primarily handled at the state level. All 50 states have enacted statutes that outline the obligations for reporting child abuse ([Trost, 1998](#)). Should a parent engage in actions that qualify as child abuse or neglect; they may face potential criminal charges. These charges can vary, being classified as either felony or misdemeanor cases depending on the circumstances of the situation. It is noteworthy that misdemeanor child abuse charges may occasionally coincide with domestic violence allegations. In instances of misdemeanor offenses, the legal system may opt for penalties such as probation, community service, or participation in treatment and education programs.<sup>18</sup>

## 2.4. Exemption of child influencer from education

With the drive of financial interest, some parents of child influencers would pull children out of school for commercial activities. According to police records, the seven Hobson children had not attended school in years to participate in YouTube series.<sup>19</sup> Another illustrative instance features a 12-year-old Australian child influencer named Deja, who was withdrawn from school to fully engage in the influencer sphere by her mother, which sparked heated debate on the Internet.<sup>20</sup> Even parents are granted certain autonomy in raising children,<sup>21</sup> the right to education of children is deemed as a fundamental human right, which is enshrined in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* various international human rights treaties and national laws.

*The Education Act 1996* of UK makes it compulsory for children between the ages of 5 and 16 to receive an education, either at school or through home education. Where a child is not receiving an education, the local authority is obligated to investigate the circumstances and intervene if deemed necessary. This intervention may involve issuing a school attendance order, compelling the parent to guarantee regular school attendance for the child, or potentially prosecuting the parent for neglecting their responsibility to ensure their child receives an education.<sup>22</sup>

In the United States, education laws are predominantly handled at the state level, leading to potential variations from one state to another. Take Ohio for example, compulsory education laws require children between the ages of 6 and 18 to receive an education, either at school or through home education. Parents who deny their children's right to education may face legal repercussions initiated by the state. An illustrative instance involves a penalty for parents who resist sending their children to school, entailing a \$500 fine or 70 hours of community service. In the event of non-compliance with the fine, there is the possibility of facing imprisonment for a duration of 10 to 30 days.<sup>23</sup>

The right to education can be seen in several laws in China. Article 46(1) of *Constitution of the People's Republic of China* asserts that "citizens of the People's Republic of China shall have the right and the obligation to receive education".<sup>24</sup> The article 2 of *Compulsory Education Law of the People's Republic of China* also states that "the compulsory education is the education which is implemented uniformly by the state and shall be received by all school-age children and adolescents".<sup>25</sup>

Although existing legal documents provide protection for specific child rights such as the right to privacy, the right to education, and safeguards against abuse and exploitation, these protections remain largely fragmented and sector specific. As a result, they tend to address discrete forms of harm rather than adopting a holistic perspective capable of capturing the interconnected and cumulative nature of children's rights within their lived experiences (Özkul et al., 2025). In practice, child influencers do not experience these rights in isolation. Their digital labor, family life, education, and personal development are deeply intertwined, often giving rise to situations in which multiple rights coexist, overlap, or even conflict. Regulatory approaches that address individual rights in a piecemeal manner therefore struggle to respond coherently to the cumulative and long-term risks associated with sustained participation in influencer economies.

### 3. Systematic Safeguarding of Child Influencers' Interests Through Best Interests Principle

The best interest of the child principle, one of the four general principles of the Convention for interpreting and implementing all the rights of the child.<sup>26</sup> It is a substantive right of children ensuring that their best interests are evaluated and given priority when conflicting interests arise. Even so, it is also acknowledged that the notion of the child's best interests is broad and intricate, necessitating a case-by-case determination of its content.<sup>27</sup>

#### 3.1. The best interest principle adopting a holistic approach

The preceding section mapped the principal categories of rights infringements faced by child influencers and examined the corresponding legal responses within existing regulatory frameworks. While these regimes provide targeted safeguards for discrete interests, their largely compartmentalized structure exposes a fundamental limitation in addressing the lived reality of child influencers, whose rights, welfare, and development are shaped by overlapping familial, commercial, and platform-mediated dynamics. In such contexts, the simultaneous engagement of multiple rights frequently generates tensions that cannot be adequately resolved through the isolated application of sector-specific rules.

Against this backdrop, effective protection demands a unifying normative approach capable of integrating diverse rights claims, mediating competing interests, and guiding decision-making across different regulatory sites. The principle of the best interests of the child, long recognized as a cornerstone of international and domestic child protection law, appears particularly well suited to this role ([Livingstone et al., 2024](#)). At the same time, the application of this principle to the phenomenon of child influencers presents distinct conceptual and practical challenges, especially in digital environments characterized by private family governance, opaque commercial incentives, and limited external oversight. This section therefore examines both the central importance of the best interest's principle in safeguarding child influencers and the difficulties inherent in translating this foundational norm into effective regulatory practice.

#### 3.2. The best interest principle providing a unified foundation

Article 3 of the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* affirms that the best interests of the child must be a central consideration in all decisions and actions affecting children as well as foundation principles form the basis for all other articles.<sup>28</sup> The principle of the best interests of the child has been formally adopted and operates across a broad range of legal and policy contexts ([Eekelaar, 2015](#)). It can be traced back to the 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child, where it was articulated as a cornerstone of child-centered governance. The principal functions both as an expression of a child-focused approach and as a mediating standard capable of reconciling tensions among competing rights and interests. It also provides an evaluative benchmark against which laws, policies, and practices concerning child protection may be assessed.<sup>29</sup>

Notably, the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* does not prescribe a fixed or exhaustive definition of what constitutes a child's best interests. This deliberate indeterminacy enables the principle to

operate flexibly across diverse social, cultural, and institutional settings (Özkul et al., 2025). The Committee on the Rights of the Child has clarified that the principle encompasses three interrelated dimensions: it functions as a substantive right, an interpretive legal principle, and a procedural rule. As a substantive right, it entitles every child, whether considered individually, as part of a defined group, or collectively, to have their best interests assessed and treated as a primary consideration whenever decisions involving competing interests are made.<sup>30</sup>

It is widely acknowledged that the interpretation and application of the best interests of the child can be shaped by numerous factors, particularly within the digital sphere, and these factors may at times be competing or contradictory. The online environment presents distinct challenges, as assessments of children's best interests are often made at a collective rather than an individual level. Millions of children across the globe engage with the internet in vastly different circumstances, with varying abilities, levels of guidance, knowledge, and capacity. As a result, conducting individualized assessments of the best interests of every child is neither realistic nor feasible (Özkul et al., 2025). In the context of child influencers, these challenges are further intensified, making the evaluation of the best interests principle even more complex, as parents may present justifications, asserting that their actions are in the best interest of their children.

### **3.3. Weighing Interest in Application Principle**

Since parents are generally presumed to act in their children's best interests, this presumption can make external scrutiny and legal intervention more difficult, regulatory measures are often less effective in private domains due to the essential role parents play in these contexts. Furthermore, parents may contest the legality of interventions into family life, as the freedom to raise children is acknowledged as a constitutional right in numerous countries. Take the United States as an example, the Supreme Court formally recognized a constitutional entitlement to parental authority in 1923. This acknowledgment affirmed that the right "to marry, establish a home, and bring up children" constitutes a protected liberty interest under the Fourteenth Amendment.<sup>31</sup>

Additionally, the universal legal assumption that parents are the best guardians of children's interests further complicate matters. Unless there are obvious evidence of child abuse or other explicitly illegal actions, regulating parents' decisions to share their children on social media becomes challenging. Some scholars have even challenged this principle on the grounds that it fails to respect the family.([Salter, 2012](#)) Besides, parents often justify their actions by claiming that the content they share serves their children's welfare, for example by providing financial benefits, future opportunities, or enhanced social visibility. For instance, if parents of child influencers argue that they need to use the special savings account for expenses that are in the best interest of their children, such as tuition fees for a high-quality private school. Such arguments can frame sharenting as a form of parental care or investment rather than exploitation.

Acknowledging that the concept of the child's best interests is designed to uphold all rights acknowledged in the Convention and foster the overall development of the child. Therefore, within these rights, there exists no hierarchy. Although the framework is widely recognized as an important tool for decision-making ([Kalverboer et al., 2017](#)), determining how competing interests should be weighed remains challenging. In the scenario mentioned, both aspects pertain to children's welfare: one involves the right to education, while the other

concerns protection from economic exploitation. These rights are both enshrined in the Convention, rendering it difficult to ascertain which holds superior importance.

## 4. A Legal Framework in safeguarding child influencers

In light of the normative and practical challenges identified in the preceding sections, it becomes evident that safeguarding child influencers cannot be achieved through ad hoc interventions or the piecemeal application of existing legal rules. What is required instead is an integrated governance framework capable of operationalizing the best interests of the child across the entire lifecycle of digital content creation and monetization. Such a framework must address both the anticipatory dimension of risk prevention and the remedial dimension of rights protection once harm has occurred.

At the ex-ante level, this entails the systematic incorporation of child rights impact assessment as a procedural safeguard, drawing on the guidance articulated in General Comment No. 14 of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. By requiring decision-makers to identify, assess, and balance the potential effects of commercialized digital activities on children's rights and development before harm materializes, this approach provides a structured method for translating the best interest principle into concrete regulatory practice. At the ex-post level, effective protection further depends on the availability of accessible, child-friendly remedies, including meaningful mechanisms for complaint, redress, and content removal, such as a practicable right to digital erasure. Together, these ex-ante and ex post components form a coherent regulatory architecture aimed at mitigating structural vulnerabilities, enhancing accountability among parents and platforms, and ensuring that the rights of child influencers remain central throughout the digital engagement process.

### 4.1 Ex-ante child rights impact assessment

To ensure that children's best interests are a primary consideration, the Committee proposes a continuous process of child rights impact assessment as a procedural safeguard. According to *General Comment No. 14 of the Committee on the Rights of the Child*, relevant factors in best-interests assessments include, inter alia, the child's views, identity, family environment and relationships, as well as the rights to health and education.<sup>32</sup> This framework provides a non-exhaustive but structured reference for decision-making.

In balancing these elements, the involvement of well-trained, independent third parties are essential to evaluate the specific circumstances at issue. Notably, these procedures have traditionally been applied on an individual basis rather than to collective or systemic contexts. Children should be afforded meaningful opportunities to express their views, with due regard to their evolving capacities and the relational context in which those views are formed.<sup>33</sup>

Although there is no uniform methodology exists for determining a child's best interests, such assessment processes are well established in areas such as immigration and child custody proceedings. While existing guidelines on best-interests assessment and determination address multiple dimensions of children's lives, they have yet to be fully adapted to the digital environment. In the digital age, the best-interests principle

should not be confined to the design phase of digital products or services, but should extend throughout the entire lifecycle, including mechanisms for remedy and redress (Öz kul et al., 2025).

## 4.2. Ex-post Remediation

Unlike adults, children often lack the cognitive maturity and social power necessary to meaningfully assess the long-term consequences of digital disclosure. Information generated or disseminated during childhood may therefore continue to affect personal autonomy, dignity, and future life opportunities well into adulthood (Donovan, 2020). Recognizing a child-specific right to erasure is not merely an extension of general data subject rights, but a corrective mechanism aimed at mitigating structurally asymmetric risks inherent in children's participation in digital environments.

To address the issue of significant privacy loss associated with child influencers, commonly recognized legal approach involves granting child influencers the right to delete their photos or videos. This is achieved by requiring platforms such as TikTok, YouTube, or Instagram to remove such content upon request, a concept referred to as “the right to be forgotten” (Bunn, 2019). The right to be forgotten, also known as the right to erasure, is established in Article 17 of the *General Data Protection Regulation* (GDPR) as a fundamental right.<sup>34</sup> Of particular relevance to the child seeking to remove personal data shared during their youth is Article 17(1)(a) of the *General Data Protection Regulation* (GDPR), which states: “The data subject shall have the right to obtain from the controller the erasure of personal data concerning him or her without undue delay, and the controller shall have the obligation to erase personal data without undue delay where the personal data are no longer necessary in relation to the purposes for which they were collected or otherwise processed.” The right to be forgotten for child influencers is explicitly outlined in French influencer law. This provision mandates internet platforms to promptly remove content upon request.<sup>35</sup>

Within the Chinese legal framework, Article 47 of the *Personal Information Protection Law of the People's Republic of China* mandates that a personal information processor shall proactively delete personal information on its own initiative where the purpose of processing has been achieved, unable to achieve, or is no longer necessary to achieve. The endeavor to provide special protection for the rights of minors in cyberspace is evident in Article 34 of *Regulation on the Protection of Minors in Cyberspace*. This article elaborates on the clarification of minors' right to deletion, offering a more thorough understanding of the topic. Article 20 of the *Regulations on the Online Protection of Children's Personal Information* offers a more precise and normatively appropriate basis for this right than the general deletion provisions under the *Personal Information Protection Law*. The article obliges network operators to promptly delete children's personal information upon request by the child or their guardian in specified circumstances. Importantly, its protective rationale supports an interpretive expansion beyond the enumerated situations to include cases where the child, as the data subject, later objects to the continued retention or dissemination of the information. Such an interpretation aligns with the principle of the best interests of the child and reflects a dynamic understanding of consent that evolves with the child's age and capacity.

From a legislative design perspective, this right should be institutionalized through clear procedural safeguards. Platforms should establish an intelligent complaint handling mechanism that aligns with the

characteristics of child developmental psychology. They may refer to the technical standards of the *Age-Appropriate Design Code* to create multi-dimensional, age-appropriate designs.<sup>36</sup>

Platforms can utilize diverse interactive forms of guidance, such as animated demonstrations, graphical icons, voice assistance, and tiered text explanations to adapt to the cognitive development abilities of different age groups. Besides, accessible and child-friendly reporting and complaint channels must be established, ensuring that children and former child users can exercise their erasure rights without excessive procedural or technical barriers. In conjunction, network operators should bear a proactive compliance obligation, including transparent review mechanisms, reasonable response timelines, and accountability measures for unjustified refusals. Therefore, by implementing simplified and user-friendly procedures, a child-friendly complaint and feedback mechanism can be established to safeguard children.

## 5. Conclusion

This article has examined the various categories of rights infringements faced by child influencers and argued that existing legal responses to child influencer exploitation remain structurally fragmented, addressing individual rights in isolation while failing to capture the cumulative and intersecting nature of harms experienced in digital environments. To overcome these limitations, the best interests of the child principle should be understood as a unifying normative anchor capable of integrating competing rights and guiding decision-making. However, recognizing its importance is insufficient without mechanisms that render the principle operational. Accordingly, the article proposes an integrated framework combining ex-ante child rights impact assessment, informed by *General Comment No. 14 of the UNCRC*, with ex-post child-friendly remedies, including accessible complaint mechanisms and effective rights to erasure. By embedding the best interest principle across the full lifecycle of child influencer activity, this approach offers a more coherent and practicable pathway for safeguarding children's rights in the digital economy.

## References

- [1] Bunn, A. (2019). Children and the 'Right to be Forgotten': What the right to erasure means for European children, and why Australian children should be afforded a similar right. *Media International Australia*, 170(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X19848503>
- [2] Donovan, S. (2020). 'Sharenting': The Forgotten Children of the GDPR. *Peace Human Rights Governance*, 4(Peace Human Rights Governance 4/1), 35–59.
- [3] Edney, A. (2021). 'I Don't Work for Free': The Unpaid Labor of Child Social Media Stars. *University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 32(3), 547–572.
- [4] Eekelaar J. (2015). The Role of the Best Interests Principle in Decisions Affecting Children and Decisions about Children. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02301003>
- [5] Fineman, M. N. (2023). Honey, I Monetized the Kids: Commercial Sharenting and Protecting the Rights of Consumers and the Internet's Child Stars. *THE GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL*, 111.
- [6] Fishbein, R. (2022). Growing up Viral: 'Kidfluencers' as the New Face of Child Labor and the Need for Protective Legislation in the United Kingdom Notes. *George Washington International Law Review*, 54(1), 127–156.

- [7] Kalverboer, M., Beltman, D., Van Os, C., & Zijlstra, E. (2017). The Best Interests of the Child in Cases of Migration: Assessing and Determining the Best Interests of the Child in Migration Procedures. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 25(1), 114–139. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02501005>
- [8] Kim, D. Y., & Kim, H.-Y. (2021). Influencer advertising on social media: The multiple inference model on influencer-product congruence and sponsorship disclosure. *Journal of Business Research*, 130, 405–415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.020>
- [9] Livingstone, S., Cantwell, N., Özkul, D., Shekhawat, G., & Kidron, B. (2024). The best interests of the child in the digital environment.
- [10] Masterson, M. A. (2020). When Play Becomes Work: Child Labor Laws in the Era of 'Kidfluencers' Comment. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 169(2), 577–608.
- [11] Özkul, D., Vosloo, S., & Baghdasaryan, B. (n.d.). Best Interests of the Child in Relation to the Digital Environment.
- [12] Plunkett, L. A. (2019). *Sharenthood: Why We Should Think before We Talk about Our Kids Online*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11756.001.0001>
- [13] Salter, E. K. (2012). Deciding for a child: A comprehensive analysis of the best interest standard. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 33(3), 179–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-012-9219-z>
- [14] Steinberg, S. B. (2016). Sharenting: Children's Privacy in the Age of Social Media. *Emory Law Journal*, 66(4), 839–884.
- [15] Trost, C. T. (1998). Chilling Child Abuse Reporting: Rethinking the CAPTA Amendments Notes. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 51(1), 183–216.

---

## Footnotes

1. Nailbuzz. (2020, December 28). How much money Ryan's world makes on YouTube - net worth. <https://naibuzz.com/much-money-ryan-toys-review-makes-youtube>. ↵
2. Mooney, T. (2019, August 25). Companies make millions off kid influencers, and the law hasn't kept up. CBS News. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/kid-influencers-companies-make-millions-law-hasnt-kept-up-cbsn-originals/>. ↵
3. Tencent News. (2025, February 14). Little influencer 'Yao Yiyao' tripped and cried: Children must not be reduced to 'tools for traffic' [News article]. Retrieved March 1, 2025, from <https://news.qq.com/rain/a/20250214A077MW00>. ↵
4. 15 U.S.C. §§ 6501-6506 (2012). ↵
5. CBS News. (2019, March 26). YouTube mom charged with 30 counts of child abuse. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/machelle-hobson-charged-youtube-mom-behind-fantasticadventures-channel-indicted-30-counts-child-abuse/>. ↵
6. According to CAPTA, the term child abuse and neglect means, at a minimum, any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker, which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation (including sexual abuse as determined under section 111), or an act or failure to act which presents an imminent risk of serious harm. ↵

7. BBC News. (2017, May 2). DaddyOfive parents lose custody 'over YouTube pranks'. <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-39783670>. ↵
8. Wong, J. (2017, May 6). When family-friendly gets dark: DaddyOfive and the dark side of family-friendly YouTube content. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/entertainment/daddyofive-youtube-issues-1.4101607>. ↵
9. Sohu News. (2022, November 29). 3-year-old girl was fed to 70 pounds by her parents to make money. [https://acg.sohu.com/a/610929791\\_121387802](https://acg.sohu.com/a/610929791_121387802). ↵
10. Wong, J. C. (2019, April 24). It's not play if you're making money: How Instagram and YouTube disrupted child labor laws. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2019/apr/24/its-not-play-if-youre-making-money-how-instagram-and-youtube-disrupted-child-labor-laws>. ↵
11. Nottingham, E. (2019). "Dad! Cut that part out!" Children's rights to privacy in the age of 'generation tagged': Sharenting, digital kidnapping and the child micro-celebrity. Routledge. ↵
12. The Labrant Fam. (2023, October 18). Our morning routine!!! (Get ready with us) [Video]. Dailymotion. Retrieved February 14, 2024, from <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x8aqife>. ↵
13. Politico. (2023, March 7). France aims to protect kids from parents oversharing pics online. <https://www.politico.eu/article/emmanuel-macron-france-law-aims-to-protect-kids-against-oversharing-parents>. ↵
14. NPR News (2023, August 23). *A new Illinois law wants to ensure child influencers get a share of their earnings*. NPR News. <https://www.npr.org/2023/08/23/1195508847/a-new-illinois-law-wants-to-ensure-child-influencers-get-a-share-of-their-earnings> ↵
15. Law Library of Congress (U.S.). (2020, October 30). France: Parliament adopts law to protect child influencers on social media. Library of Congress. <https://www.loc.gov/item/global-legal-monitor/2020-10-30/france-parliament-adopts-law-to-protect-child-influencers-on-social-media/>. ↵
16. Great Britain. Children and Young Persons Act 1933, c. 12. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/23-24/12/contents>. ↵
17. Great Britain. Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004, c. 28. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/28/contents>. ↵
18. FindLaw. (2023, August 23). Child abuse penalties and sentencing. Thomson Reuters. <https://www.findlaw.com/criminal/criminal-charges/child-abuse-penalties-and-sentencing.html>. ↵
19. Wong, J. C. (2019, April 24). It's not play if you're making money: How Instagram and YouTube disrupted child labor laws. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2019/apr/24/its-not-play-if-youre-making-money-how-instagram-and-youtube-disrupted-child-labor-laws>. ↵
20. Mirror. (2023, December 4). I pulled my 12-year-old daughter out of school to focus on her influencer career. <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/weird-news/i-pulled-12-year-old-31591088>. ↵

21. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2012). Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Article 14 –Right to education. <https://fra.europa.eu/en/eu-charter/article/14-right-education>. ↵
22. United Nations. (1989, November 20). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Treaty Series, 1577, 3. ↵
23. Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3313.672, 2024. ↵
24. National People's Congress. (2018, March 11). Constitution of the People's Republic of China. Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. Retrieved March 26, 2024, from <http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/constitution2019/202201/0a58c8ff55c64d2dad3d60b2d7b25c7.shtml>. ↵
25. Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. (2018, December 29). Compulsory Education Law of the People's Republic of China. National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. Retrieved March 26, 2024, from <http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/c23934/202012/8c79c7d5cecf4b17b81bda3f53d7e1ea.shtml>. ↵
26. Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2003, April 27). General comment No. 5 (2003): General measures of implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (arts. 4, 42 and 44, para. 6) (U.N. CRC/C/GC/05). United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/493418?ln=en>. ↵
27. Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2013, May 29). General comment No. 14 (2013) on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (art. 3, para. 1) (U.N. CRC/C/GC/14). United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/778523?ln=en>. ↵
28. United Nations. (1989, November 20). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Treaty Series, 1577, 3. ↵
29. UNICEF. (1998). Guidelines for a human rights-based programming approach: A human rights approach for children and women. TODAY. <https://www.today.com/parents/law-protects-finances-privacy-child-social-media-stars-ti93881>. ↵
30. Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2013, May 29). General comment No. 14 (2013) on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (para. 6(a)) (U.N. CRC/C/GC/14). United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/778523?ln=en>. ↵
31. Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923); Pierce v. Soc’y of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510, 534-35 (1925). ↵
32. Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2013, May 29). General comment No. 14 (2013) on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (U.N. CRC/C/GC/14). United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/778523?ln=en>. ↵
33. Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2013, May 29). General comment No. 14 (2013) on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (art. 83) (U.N. CRC/C/GC/14). United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/778523?ln=en>. ↵
34. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). Official Journal of the European Union, L 119, 1–88. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>. ↵
35. Breen, K. (2020, October 9). New law aims to protect finances, privacy of child social media stars. ↵

36. Information Commissioner's Office. (2021). *Age-appropriate design code: A code of practice for online services.* ↩