Journal link: http://kmf-publishers.com/tatscr/

Theoretical and Applied Technological Science Review

Volume: 4 Issue: 4 Year: 2026
ISSN-2958-7824



KMF PUBLISHERS

www.kmf-publishers.com/tatscr/

Received: 20 September 2026 | Revised: 25 October 2026 | Accepted: 28 October 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64907/xkmf.v4i4.tatscr.5

Published: 30 October 2026

Research Article

Intellectual Property Safeguards and the Role of Fairness in Acceptance of AI Generated Content

Mikat Jahan Sony[1*]; Sabbir Ahmed[1]; Suniya Khatun[1]; Kazi Abdul Mannan[2]

[1]Department of Law
[2]Department of Business Administration
Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology
Dhaka, Bangladesh

*Correspondence
Mikat Jahan Sony
Email: mikatjahan30@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Public endorsement of safeguards for AI-generated creative content does not establish how strongly fairness figures in personal acceptance of that content. This cross-sectional study distinguishes these judgements using 385 adult questionnaire records from Bangladesh. We analysed four statements on creator protection, transparent balancing rules, complaint access and transparency about data and content practices, and a fifth statement on the relevance of fairness to acceptance. We estimated full response distributions, joint endorsement and paired contrasts, followed by exploratory regressions of the original fairness-salience rating. Safeguard endorsement ranged from 78.2% to 80.3%, compared with 58.4% for the salience statement. Within-person differences ranged from 19.7 to 21.8 percentage points (all Holm-adjusted $p < 0.001$). Of the 301 respondents endorsing access to complaints, 176 also endorsed the salience statement. A copyright-oriented summary was associated with a higher salience rating in the adjusted model ($b = 0.358$, 95% CI 0.181 to 0.536; Holm-adjusted $p < 0.001$). Reported production precautions and the governance expectation summary did not meet the adjusted threshold. The association with copyright orientation persisted when the outcome was dichotomised and when the analysis was restricted to law students. The findings distinguish support for institutional protections from the reported place of fairness in personal judgement. They do not measure actual acceptance, legal compliance or the effect of changing a safeguard. The sample is concentrated in legal education and practice and does not establish national prevalence.

Keywords: generative AI; copyright; procedural fairness; creator protection; intellectual property; Bangladesh.

Copyright: 2026 by the authors. Licensee KMF Publishers (www.kmf-publishers.com). This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Generative AI can enter creative work at multiple stages. A person might use it to explore possible ideas, produce a first draft, modify an existing work or generate material for distribution. Each use raises different questions about the sources used, the nature of human contribution and the terms under which the result can be distributed. Whether a particular output attracts protection is separate from whether the production process used material belonging to another person or whether a platform has permitted a particular commercial use. Treating all of these questions as a single issue of ownership makes it harder to determine what evidence is needed in an individual case.[1]

A person may support creator protection and an effective complaints process while placing different weight on fairness when deciding whether to accept a particular work. Another may regard fairness as highly consequential without expressing the same view on every proposed safeguard. The two positions need not coincide because they concern different objects. One asks how institutions should govern the production and distribution of content; the other asks whether a judgement about fairness enters the respondent's personal acceptance. The distinction is consequential for survey research. An average score containing both types of statement can obscure a difference in endorsement and invite an unwarranted interpretation as a rating of the fairness of existing law.

The source questionnaire contains an item on whether perceived fairness affects acceptance. It does not ask whether the respondent accepts AI-generated content, whether a particular work is fair, or whether a particular country's system is fair. A person can answer affirmatively because perceived unfairness would reduce acceptance, or because a fair process would make a work more acceptable. The statement does not distinguish those directions. We use the term fairness salience to refer to agreement that fairness matters to acceptance. This keeps the interpretation close to the wording and separates it from actual use or approval of a product.

The Bangladesh Copyright Act 2023 supplies the domestic legal setting. Its treatment of information technology based digital works and its first-ownership provisions provide starting points for legal analysis. They should not be read as a blanket resolution of authorship, ownership or infringement for every generative workflow. The relevant question depends on the material, human contribution, applicable rules and facts. Neither respondents' preferences nor guidance from a foreign office settles how a Bangladeshi authority would determine a particular dispute.[2]

Comparative materials help show why the questions must be separated. The US Copyright Office's discussion of copyrightability focuses on whether a human contributed protectable expression. The EU AI Act's obligations concerning a copyright compliance policy and a public summary of training content concern providers of general-purpose AI models, subject to the Regulation's terms. These instruments address different actors and stages. They are used here as illustrations of questions that governance can address, not as domestic duties for the people in the survey.[3]

We ask how often respondents endorse each governance principle and the fairness-salience statement; how those endorsements compare within the same people; and whether copyright orientation, reported precautions and governance expectations covary with fairness salience. A further descriptive question is how often people endorse complaint access without endorsing the

[1] World Intellectual Property Organization, Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property (WIPO 2024).

[2] Copyright Act 2023 (Bangladesh), Act No 34 of 2023, ss 2(10), 15.

[3] United States Copyright Office, Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability (January 2025); Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act) [2024] OJ L 2024/1689, art 53(1)(c)–(d).

salience statement. The result can show how a remedy receives broad support even when respondents differ about the role of fairness in their own decisions.

This analysis uses the common Group 15 questionnaire. Related papers use the same observations to address copyright-oriented risk and reported production safeguards. The current analysis changes the focal outcome and makes a different comparison: institutional expectations versus personal salience. The shared source means the papers do not provide independent samples. The contribution is to show which claims remain supportable once the fairness block is separated into its component judgements and the outcome is removed from all explanatory summaries.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

The framework separates substantive protection, procedural governance and the importance respondents assign to fairness. Substantive protection asks whose interests the rules protect. Procedural governance asks how decisions are explained and reviewed. Fairness salience is a person's stated judgement about whether fairness matters to acceptance. These categories guide interpretation; they are not assumed to be latent variables measured by the questionnaire.

2.1 Creator interests and the scope of protection

The protection item is qualified: it concerns protected works used in ways governed by applicable law. Endorsement does not show that respondents want every use prohibited or that they can identify the legal boundary. Copyright can involve exceptions, licences and limits as well as exclusive rights. An analysis of AI-assisted creation should distinguish input materials, the human contributions to an output and the planned use of that output. A conclusion about one of these questions does not answer the others. For instance, an agreement with a tool provider does not necessarily determine whether a third party's rights have been affected.[4]

The balancing statement adds a different concern. Transparent rules can help people understand which interests are being considered and where they can find the relevant authority. But agreement that innovation and creator rights should be balanced does not reveal where a respondent would place the balance in a specific dispute. A policy could address attribution, remuneration or permission, each with different consequences. A respondent may support one in a defined setting without supporting another. The item is therefore interpreted as endorsement of a procedural and substantive principle, not as evidence for a particular legislative proposal.

[4] Copyright Act 2023, ss 2(10), 15; WIPO, Generative AI (n 1).

2.2 Procedural fairness and answerability

An accountability relationship requires an actor who can give an account and a forum capable of questioning it. This distinction helps explain why transparency and complaint access are not interchangeable. A provider can publish information about its general practices without giving a creator a way to contest a use. A complaint channel can exist without access to the information required to investigate a claim. Each can support procedural fairness, but they solve different problems.[5]

For a creator who believes a protected work was reproduced, useful information could include the allegedly relevant material, its location and who can examine the claim. For a platform reviewer, a different set of facts may be needed, including the version of the content, applicable terms and the reasons for a decision. A general disclosure about training or content-use practices can inform the surrounding debate, but does not resolve those case-specific questions. It may even reveal uncertainty that makes a user more cautious. Transparency is therefore evaluated better through its usefulness for understanding and review than through a presumption that it always increases acceptance.

2.3 Copyright orientation and reported precautions

The copyright items distinguish several aspects of orientation. Recognising that copyright questions arise is not the same as identifying a rule. Endorsing review of terms is not the same as reading or understanding them. Avoiding assumptions about third-party rights is a prudent orientation, but it does not establish that a specific work is infringing or that an individual checked it. The three selected items describe attention to copyright questions rather than measured knowledge. They are analysed as an observed summary, with no claim that their average is a validated test.

The production items ask about checking material before publication, avoiding certain imitation requests, documenting contributions and seeking permission or guidance when substantial uncertainty arises. These are self-reports, and not every respondent necessarily publishes or has had an opportunity to seek advice. A response can describe a general tendency or a hypothetical practice. We therefore describe the resulting mean as reported precautions rather than verified conduct. RCC5 is excluded because it asks about a perceived benefit of knowledge instead of a reported practice.

2.4 Exploratory analytical framework

The model examines three focal associations with fairness salience. Copyright orientation may coincide with a greater stated role for fairness if respondents who attend to copyright issues also consider fairness when judging content. Reported precautions could be associated if the effort respondents say they devote to avoiding problems reflects the importance they assign to fairness. Governance expectations might track fairness salience if people who support institutional protections also give fairness more weight in their decisions. Each association could also be weak because the predictor and outcome ask about different judgements. Common wording, shared response tendencies and unmeasured experience could contribute to a positive result.

The framework does not posit a temporal sequence in which knowledge changes practices and practices change acceptance. The measures were recorded together and no disclosure or safeguard was manipulated. The adjusted model is exploratory, and its interpretation depends on the item wording. Our primary comparison concerns the relative breadth of endorsement; the regression examines covariance after limited adjustment.

[5] Mark Bovens, ‘Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework’ (2007) 13 European Law Journal 447.

3. Methodology

We conducted an item-level reanalysis of a cross-sectional questionnaire. The reporting separates the achieved sample from a target population and the interpretation of uncertainty from claims about national prevalence.[6]

3.1 Source and data screening

The workbook contains a Data sheet, a codebook and a README linking the questionnaire to the Group 15 research topics. The unit of analysis is a respondent record. All 385 records contain affirmative consent, adult eligibility and general AI awareness. No case was removed. We checked record sequence uniqueness, the completeness of analysed fields and the valid range of the 20 agreement items. No duplicate response and profile patterns were found after excluding the sequence and contextual text. “None” was retained as a valid tool category.

The study team identified the synthetic labels on the sequence and contextual fields as metadata errors and confirmed the numerical responses as real survey data. Contextual text was excluded and is neither quoted nor coded. Exact fieldwork dates, distribution mode, recruitment frame and invitation denominator were not documented in the available materials. We do not calculate a response rate, design weight or probability-sample margin of error.

3.2 Measures and roles

Table 1 shows the measure definitions. IPF1-4 describe expectations about creator protection, transparent balance, complaints and transparency about relevant practices. IPF5 measures the reported salience of fairness for acceptance. It does not enter the explanatory governance mean. COP1, COP3 and COP4 form the copyright-oriented mean. COP2 and COP5 are omitted to keep the summary focused on risk recognition, terms and third-party rights rather than authorship preferences or anticipated benefits from guidance.

Table 1. Roles of the observed measures

Measure	Items	Interpretation
Governance	IPF1-4	Expected institutional safeguards
Salience	IPF5	Fairness relevance to acceptance
Copyright	COP1, COP3, COP4	Recognition, terms and rights assumptions
Precautions	RCC1-4	Reported production precautions
Orientation	AIL1-3	General AI orientation

All summaries are equal-weight means. IPF5 is excluded from the predictors.

The precaution mean contains RCC1-4. The general AI orientation mean uses AIL1-3. The summaries are equal-weight means on the original scale and are not latent variables. Alpha and rank correlations describe the IPF block, but alpha cannot establish dimensionality or justify pooling items with different meanings. Appendix A presents the exact wording.[7]

[6] Erik von Elm and others, ‘The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement’ (2007) 4 PLoS Medicine e296.

[7] Klaas Sijtsma, ‘On the Use, the Misuse, and the Very Limited Usefulness of Cronbach’s Alpha’ (2009) 74 Psychometrika 107.

3.3 Descriptive and paired analyses

We report all five response categories and define endorsement as a rating of 4 or 5. Non-endorsement includes neutral answers. The cross-tabulation compares complaint access and fairness salience. We also count endorsement of all five statements, as an observed pattern rather than a qualification threshold.

Each governance statement is contrasted with fairness salience. The paired percentage-point estimate is the number endorsing only the governance statement minus the number endorsing only salience, divided by 385. Exact McNemar tests condition on discordant pairs; pointwise percentile intervals use 10,000 whole-respondent resamples with replacement and seed 20261104. Holm adjustment applies across the four contrasts. These intervals describe uncertainty under an independent-respondent working model, not design precision for a national population.[8]

3.4 Exploratory models and sensitivity analyses

We fit linear models of the original fairness-salience rating. The focal predictors are copyright orientation, precautions and governance expectations. The adjusted specification adds general AI orientation and categorical terms for status, location, formal training and generative AI use frequency. Treating profile categories as categorical avoids assuming equal changes between response levels. We report unstandardised coefficients, HC3 standard errors and pointwise normal-approximation intervals. Holm adjustment applies to the three focal terms within each model.[9]

Sensitivity analyses model endorsement with a linear probability specification and repeat the original rating model among law students. The former uses a 0-1 outcome, so its estimates are probability differences. The latter is an overlapping subset and is not an independent replication. The models are exploratory and do not establish causation; a high or low fit does not validate the measures.

3.5 Ethics and data protection

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Center for Academic & Professional Career Development and Research (CAPCDR), an external institutional body, under approval reference CAPCDR: SMUCT/LLB/SS-0020260908-20. External ethical review was sought because Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology does not have an institutional ethics committee responsible for reviewing this type of research.

4. Results

We present the recorded profile, item distributions and joint endorsements before the adjusted analysis. All primary comparisons use the same 385 records.

4.1 Sample profile

Table 2 shows age, status, location and training. There were 241 law students, 62 law graduates, 49 advocates or legal professionals and 33 other respondents. Dhaka accounted for 151 records. The concentration in legal education and practice matters for interpretation because the survey does not identify a representative sample of professional creators or members of the public.

[8] Quinn McNemar, ‘Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages’ (1947) 12 Psychometrika 153; Sture Holm, ‘A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure’ (1979) 6 Scandinavian Journal of Statistics 65.

[9] James G MacKinnon and Halbert White, ‘Some Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimators with Improved Finite Sample Properties’ (1985) 29 Journal of Econometrics 305; Holm (n 8).

Table 2. Respondent profile

Characteristic	Category	n (%)
Age	21-23	157 (40.8%)
Age	24-26	82 (21.3%)
Age	18-20	66 (17.1%)
Age	27-30	44 (11.4%)
Age	31+	36 (9.4%)
Status	Law student	241 (62.6%)
Status	Law graduate	62 (16.1%)
Status	Advocate or legal professional	49 (12.7%)
Status	Other relevant respondent	33 (8.6%)
Location	Dhaka	151 (39.2%)
Location	District town	92 (23.9%)
Location	Other city corporation	81 (21.0%)
Location	Upazila-rural area	52 (13.5%)
Location	Other	9 (2.3%)
Training	No	211 (54.8%)
Training	Yes, short orientation	120 (31.2%)
Training	Yes, course or certified training	54 (14.0%)

General AI awareness was required by the questionnaire. It does not verify that participants published AI-assisted content, used it commercially or brought a copyright complaint. Their responses should be read as the judgements of the observed sample.

4.2 Item distributions and measurement diagnostics

Table 3 reports each rating category. Creator protection was endorsed by 309 respondents (80.3%); balancing rules and complaint access by 301 each (78.2%); and transparency about relevant data and content practices by 305 (79.2%). Fairness salience was endorsed by 225 (58.4%), while 133 selected neutrality and 27 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 3. Distribution of governance and salience ratings

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Endorsed
IPF1	0	6	70	180	129	309 (80.3%)
IPF2	0	6	78	183	118	301 (78.2%)
IPF3	0	4	80	179	122	301 (78.2%)
IPF4	0	7	73	173	132	305 (79.2%)
IPF5	4	23	133	174	51	225 (58.4%)

Endorsement combines categories 4 and 5.

The five-item alpha was 0.324, and the rank correlations between fairness salience and the other four items ranged from 0.015 to 0.178. The observed ratings do not move together closely. That finding and the heterogeneous wording support reporting the statements separately rather than interpreting a mean as the perceived fairness of current law.

4.3 Joint endorsement and paired contrasts

Table 4 shows that 176 respondents (45.7%) endorsed both complaint access and fairness salience. Another 125 endorsed complaint access without endorsing salience; 49 showed the reverse pattern and 35 endorsed neither. Among those who endorsed complaint access, 58.5% endorsed salience, compared with 58.3% of other respondents.

Table 4. Joint endorsement of complaint access and fairness salience

Complaint access	Salience not endorsed	Salience endorsed	Total
Not endorsed	35 (9.1%)	49 (12.7%)	84 (21.8%)
Endorsed	125 (32.5%)	176 (45.7%)	301 (78.2%)
Total	160 (41.6%)	225 (58.4%)	385 (100.0%)

Percentages are of all 385 records.

The similarity of these conditional percentages shows why substantial overlap need not imply a strong association. Ninety-eight respondents (25.5%) endorsed all five statements. This count describes a response pattern; it is not a measure of informed or responsible conduct.

Table 5 compares each governance item with salience. Creator protection exceeded it by 21.8 percentage points, transparent balancing rules and complaint access by 19.7 each, and transparency about practices by 20.8. All four differences retained Holm-adjusted p values below 0.001.

Table 5. Paired contrasts with fairness salience

Contrast	Governance only	Salience only	Gap (pp)	95% CI (pp)	Holm p
IPF1 – IPF5	119	35	21.8	15.8 to 27.8	<0.001
IPF2 – IPF5	125	49	19.7	13.2 to 26.2	<0.001
IPF3 – IPF5	125	49	19.7	13.2 to 26.2	<0.001
IPF4 – IPF5	124	44	20.8	14.5 to 27.0	<0.001

Pointwise percentile intervals and Holm-adjusted exact McNemar tests.

The creator-protection difference was based on 119 governance-only versus 35 salience-only endorsements. For complaint access the counts were 125 and 49. These differences apply to the statements as worded. They do not estimate whether respondents would choose a particular safeguard over another.

4.4 Exploratory associations

Table 6 reports the regression estimates. The adjusted copyright coefficient was 0.358 (95% CI 0.181 to 0.536; Holm-adjusted $p < 0.001$). A one-point higher copyright summary corresponded to a higher rating on the original 1-5 salience item under the fitted model. The precautions coefficient was 0.041 (95% CI −0.156 to 0.239) and the governance coefficient was 0.135 (95% CI −0.061 to 0.332). Neither met the adjusted threshold. The adjusted model explained 12.3% of the observed variance, compared with 7.3% in the model with only the focal terms.

Table 6. Associations with the fairness salience response

Model (n)	Term	Estimate	95% CI	Holm p	R^2
Unadjusted (385)	Copyright	0.361	0.192 to 0.530	<0.001	0.073
Unadjusted (385)	Safeguards	0.033	-0.153 to 0.219	0.729	0.073
Unadjusted (385)	Governance	0.194	0.004 to 0.384	0.091	0.073
Adjusted (385)	Copyright	0.358	0.181 to 0.536	<0.001	0.123
Adjusted (385)	Safeguards	0.041	-0.156 to 0.239	0.683	0.123
Adjusted (385)	Governance	0.135	-0.061 to 0.332	0.355	0.123
Binary endorsement (385)	Copyright	0.156	0.049 to 0.262	0.012	0.083
Binary endorsement (385)	Safeguards	0.013	-0.111 to 0.138	0.834	0.083
Binary endorsement (385)	Governance	0.060	-0.067 to 0.186	0.707	0.083
Law students (241)	Copyright	0.449	0.231 to 0.667	<0.001	0.181
Law students (241)	Safeguards	0.050	-0.206 to 0.306	0.701	0.181
Law students (241)	Governance	0.154	-0.097 to 0.405	0.457	0.181

HC3 intervals are pointwise. Binary endorsement coefficients are probability differences; other coefficients are on the 1-5 scale.

The adjusted probability-scale estimate for copyright orientation was 0.156 (95% CI 0.049 to 0.262; Holm-adjusted $p = 0.012$). In the 241 law students the coefficient on the original outcome was 0.449 (95% CI 0.231 to 0.667; adjusted $p < 0.001$). These checks support the direction of the copyright association under the analysed specifications. The student result is not a test that the association is stronger for students, and neither check provides evidence about actual acceptance.

5. Discussion

The clearest result is a difference between the breadth of support for institutional safeguards and the reported role of fairness in personal acceptance. Each governance statement was endorsed by about four fifths of respondents, while the salience statement was endorsed by fewer than three fifths. This is a useful distinction for consultations that seek to understand both what institutions should do and how individuals evaluate content. It is not a contradiction: a person can regard a fair procedure as an entitlement even if it is not decisive in their own consumption decisions.

5.1 Governance endorsement is not a rating of existing law

Broad endorsement of creator protection, transparent rules, complaint access and transparency does not tell us whether respondents consider current arrangements adequate. None of the four items asks respondents to evaluate a named law, platform or dispute. Indeed, an individual might endorse each principle because they believe it is poorly implemented. Another may endorse the same principles because they believe the institutions already apply them. The survey cannot distinguish those accounts. A study of institutional performance would need to identify the process or rule under review and ask about its practical consequences.

The overlap of complaints and salience illustrates how a policy preference can be widespread regardless of personal reliance on fairness. Of the respondents who supported complaint access, 125 did not endorse the salience statement. That group includes neutral responses and should not be described as indifferent to fairness. It may include respondents who understood the acceptance question differently, who had no particular work in mind or who regard fair treatment as important to others regardless of their own choices. The institutional implication is to assess complaint access on its own merits. An effective forum should be able to receive a concern, obtain relevant material and explain its response. Its value does not depend solely on whether it changes consumer acceptance.[10]

5.2 Copyright orientation and fairness salience

The adjusted association with copyright orientation was positive and persisted in the binary and student specifications. This is consistent with the view that attention to copyright questions accompanies greater weight on fairness. The association is not evidence of a teaching effect. Respondents who consider fairness important may pay more attention to rights and terms, and a third factor such as involvement in legal study or content production could influence both. Adjustment for recorded status, training and AI use does not address all such factors. The three copyright items also differ in whether they ask about recognition, a normative expectation or a personal precaution. A task measuring legal understanding would provide stronger evidence about the role of knowledge.

The coefficient for reported precautions did not survive multiplicity adjustment. This does not imply that precautions are ineffective or that fair-minded respondents do not take them. The precaution statements are self-reports, and the survey does not measure opportunities to apply each practice. A person who rarely publishes may report little need to maintain production records or seek permission. A person who publishes regularly may maintain records for commercial reasons regardless of the importance they assign to fairness in accepting another person's output. The predictor and outcome refer to different roles and decisions. A study that observes both could evaluate whether those roles account for the weak relationship in the present

[10] Bovens (n 5).

data.

5.3 Implications of the response wording

The comparisons are between substantively different statements, not equally worded indicators of a single attitude. The first four items identify desirable protections or governance conditions, whereas the last asks about a personal response. Agreement with a broad normative principle may be easier than affirming that it affects one's own behaviour. This makes the difference useful for evaluating the instrument, but limits conclusions about the relative strength of underlying attitudes. Future studies could match wording and specificity across questions, measure both normative and personal views for the same scenario, and report separate results for people with and without relevant production experience.

The analysis also distinguishes a perception of fairness from the direction in which it changes acceptance. A respondent may become less accepting when told a work was produced in a way they regard as unfair. Another may become more accepting after learning that a creator had an opportunity to contest the use. The salience item cannot distinguish these effects. Researchers should test each with a defined comparison rather than interpreting strong agreement as support for greater adoption.

6. Theoretical and Practical Implications

The study supports a distinction between support for institutional governance and the weight an individual gives to fairness in evaluating content. In practice, this means designing separate measures of whether a process is fair, whether people can use it and whether it changes a decision. A single score cannot establish all three.

6.1 Measurement and theory

An empirical model could distinguish a person's understanding of an obligation, their judgement of a named procedure and the decision they make after receiving information. The current association between copyright orientation and salience suggests that copyright-related judgements deserve specific measurement rather than being included in a broad AI literacy index. It does not establish an ordering among the variables. An experiment could vary which facts are disclosed while holding the underlying work constant. Measuring perceived fairness and willingness to use or share the work separately would help determine whether the information changes one or both.

6.2 Guidance for creators and organisations

Practical guidance can organise copyright questions by stage. Before production, a user can identify what material is supplied and which permissions or terms may matter. Before publication, the user can review the output for potentially protected material, record significant contributions where appropriate and seek advice when the proposed use is uncertain. For a complaint, the institution can explain what evidence a claimant needs and what the reviewer can do. Guidance should make clear when a checklist is an aid to review rather than a guarantee of lawful use.[11]

A provider can evaluate the usefulness of a transparency notice by asking whether users can locate the relevant statement, distinguish general practices from case-specific facts and identify whom to contact. Creators and ordinary users may need different information. The provider should also assess what happens when a notice fails to answer a question. A well-designed channel can route the question to someone with access to the relevant record and explain whether

[11] WIPO, Generative AI (n 1); Copyright Act 2023, ss 2(10), 15.

a correction, referral or further review is possible.[12]

6.3 Policy and evaluation

Consultation on AI and intellectual property can present concrete examples involving inputs, human contribution and distribution. It can then ask separately what rule respondents support and what decision they would make as a user. A comparison of oversight procedures can specify who gives reasons, who receives them and whether the decision can be reviewed. Such a design is better suited to evaluating policy alternatives than asking respondents to endorse a general commitment to fairness. Legal analysis remains necessary to establish the authority and scope of any proposed procedure.

7. Conclusion Limitations and Future Research

In this Bangladesh survey, endorsement of four intellectual property safeguards exceeded endorsement of the proposition that fairness affects acceptance of AI-generated content. Paired contrasts showed differences of 19.7-21.8 percentage points. A copyright-oriented summary was positively associated with the fairness-salience rating after adjustment, while the other focal terms were imprecise. The results support reporting institutional expectations and personal salience separately rather than claiming that respondents rated the current system as fair or that safeguards increase acceptance.

The sample contains substantial representation from legal education and practice. Exact recruitment details and the sampling frame were not documented. The study cannot estimate national prevalence or describe the views of professional creators as a distinct population. Each governance statement covers a different subject, and the single salience item does not measure the level or direction of acceptance. The summaries are exploratory; their components rely on self-report and shared response anchors. Observational adjustment does not establish temporal order. Companion Group 15 papers use the same records and should not be counted as independent corroboration.

A follow-up could use cases that specify the nature of human contribution, the source material and the proposed distribution. A vignette experiment could vary the clarity of disclosure, availability of a complaint forum and type of review. Participants could report procedural fairness, willingness to accept a work and ability to identify the relevant copyright question separately. Recruitment could distinguish creators, legal professionals and users, with actual publishing experience documented. A field evaluation could then examine whether creators understand available channels and whether those channels provide a meaningful response to disputed uses.

Declarations

Ethical approval and oversight

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Center for Academic & Professional Career Development and Research (CAPCDR), an external institutional body, under approval reference CAPCDR: SMUCT/LLB/SS-0020260908-19. External ethical review was sought because Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology does not have an institutional ethics committee responsible for reviewing this type of research.

Informed consent

All 385 analysed records contain affirmative consent and adult eligibility responses.

[12] Bovens (n 5).

Data availability

Requests for de-identified numerical data and analytical specifications may be directed to the corresponding author, subject to confidentiality and applicable institutional requirements.

Funding and competing interests

No external funding or competing interest was disclosed in the available study materials.

Author contributions

Mikat Jahan Sony led the student research, developed the research question, organised the study materials and prepared the initial manuscript. Prof. Dr Kazi Abdul Mannan supervised the research, provided conceptual and methodological guidance, contributed to interpretation and critically revised the manuscript. Kazi Abdul Mannan is the corresponding author.

Generative AI disclosure

Generative AI assisted drafting, language editing and preparation of analytical code. Numerical results were computed programmatically from the supplied workbook. The authors are responsible for verifying and approving the analysis, interpretation and reporting.

Bibliography

Bovens M, ‘Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework’ (2007) 13 European Law Journal 447

Holm S, ‘A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure’ (1979) 6 Scandinavian Journal of Statistics 65

MacKinnon JG and White H, ‘Some Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimators with Improved Finite Sample Properties’ (1985) 29 Journal of Econometrics 305

McNemar Q, ‘Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages’ (1947) 12 Psychometrika 153

Sijtsma K, ‘On the Use, the Misuse, and the Very Limited Usefulness of Cronbach’s Alpha’ (2009) 74 Psychometrika 107

United States Copyright Office, *Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability* (January 2025)

von Elm E and others, ‘The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement’ (2007) 4 PLoS Medicine e296

World Intellectual Property Organization, *Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property* (WIPO 2024)

Appendix A Questionnaire wording

Table A1 gives the statements used in the analytical models and paired comparisons.

Table A1. Exact questionnaire wording

Code	Questionnaire statement
AIL1	I understand that generative AI can produce plausible but inaccurate information.
AIL2	I verify important AI-generated information before relying on it.
AIL3	I understand that AI outputs may reflect bias or incomplete data.
COP1	I understand that copyright questions can arise when generative AI is used to create content.
COP3	Users should review the terms governing AI-generated content before commercial use.
COP4	I avoid assuming that all AI-generated content is automatically free of third-party rights.
IPF1	Creators should receive fair protection when their protected works are used in ways governed by applicable law.
IPF2	AI innovation and creator rights should be balanced through transparent rules.
IPF3	People should have effective ways to raise legitimate IP complaints involving AI-generated content.
IPF4	Transparency about relevant training-data and content-use practices can improve perceived fairness.
IPF5	Perceived fairness affects my acceptance of AI-generated creative content.

Code	Questionnaire statement
RCC1	I check whether AI-assisted content may reproduce protected material before publication.
RCC2	I avoid deliberately prompting AI to imitate protected content in ways that may infringe rights.
RCC3	I keep records of significant human and AI contributions when appropriate.
RCC4	I seek permission or legal guidance when intended use creates substantial copyright uncertainty.

Source: Group 15 Codebook. Ratings range from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree.

IPF5 is the outcome and does not enter the governance expectations mean.

Table of Legislation

Copyright Act 2023 (Bangladesh), Act No 34 of 2023, ss 2(10), 15

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act) [2024] OJ L 2024/1689, art 53(1)(c)-(d)