Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Generative AI Copyright Awareness and Views on Human Creative Contribution in Bangladesh

Dr Kazi Abdul Mannan

drkaziabdulmannan@gmail.com

Center for Academic & Professional Career Development and Research (CAPCDR)
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7123-132X

Sabbir Ahmed

Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3828-1532

Research Article

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, copyright, authorship, human contribution, legal awareness, university students, Bangladesh

Posted Date: November 18th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11737682/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Generative AI Copyright Awareness and Views on Human Creative Contribution in Bangladesh

Sabbir Ahmed
Department of Law, Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Email: kitkatop14@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3828-1532

Prof. Dr Kazi Abdul Mannan
Department of Business Administration, Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Email: drkaziabdulmannan@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7123-132X

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) raises questions about human creative contribution, copyright in outputs and third-party rights. This study examines responses to copyright-related statements in 385 adult, AI-aware survey records from Bangladesh, including a separately described subgroup of 241 law students. The questionnaire asks about recognition of copyright questions, the relevance of human contribution, terms of use, third-party rights and the perceived value of guidance. It does not ask respondents to assign ownership to a specified actor or solve a legal problem; consequently, it does not measure actual copyright knowledge or establish legal ownership. Items were analysed separately using descriptive distributions, paired endorsement comparisons and exploratory rank correlations. In the full sample, 191 respondents (49.6%) endorsed recognising that copyright questions can arise, 223 (57.9%) endorsed the relevance of human contribution, and 303 (78.7%) agreed that clear guidance would improve their responsible use. Among law students, the respective percentages were 51.0%, 60.6% and 80.5%. Overall, 147 respondents endorsed both recognising copyright questions and the potential usefulness of guidance, while 156 endorsed guidance without endorsing recognition. This pattern is not evidence that guidance improves knowledge or behaviour. The article distinguishes statements of awareness and normative expectations from demonstrated legal competence, and recommends scenario-based assessment and documentation of respondent recruitment for future research.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence; copyright; authorship; human contribution; legal awareness; university students; Bangladesh

1. Introduction

Generative AI tools can produce and transform text, images and other creative material in response to user inputs. For students and other users, this accessibility creates practical questions about whether an output attracts copyright, who may own rights, what a platform contract permits and whether using the output affects another person's rights. These are related but separate issues. The answer depends on the work, the creative process, the applicable law

and contractual terms; a general statement that an output was generated using AI does not resolve each issue.[1]

WIPO notes that the treatment of AI outputs differs across legal systems and that a platform's terms can be relevant even where protection of an output is uncertain.[2] In the United States, the Copyright Office distinguishes human-authored expression and sufficiently creative human selection or modification from material generated with insufficient human control. Its 2025 report sets out the Office's position under US law; it is not a statement of Bangladeshi law.[3] For Bangladesh, the Copyright Act 2023 provides the relevant statutory context, but the questionnaire does not present the facts needed to apply a particular provision to a particular AI-generated work.[4]

The original study seeks to connect AI awareness with perceptions of copyright ownership among university students. The dataset contains 241 respondents classified as law students, alongside law graduates, legal professionals and other respondents. It does not establish that all 385 are current university students, nor does it identify a representative sample of students in Bangladesh. The full sample and law-student subgroup therefore require separate descriptions.

The ownership block also addresses several distinct issues. It asks whether copyright questions can arise, whether human creative contribution matters, whether terms should be reviewed, whether third-party rights should be considered and whether guidance would help. It does not present an ownership scenario or ask respondents to select a copyright owner. Combining these statements into one scale and calling it legal ownership knowledge would conceal those differences. This article therefore examines the statements individually and treats beliefs about guidance as beliefs rather than evidence that guidance works.

Existing guidance identifies legal and practical complexity in AI-assisted content, but a user's recognition of complexity is different from the ability to apply the law.[5] Empirical studies need to distinguish awareness that a question exists from knowledge of its answer, awareness of contractual conditions and ability to identify third-party rights. This study contributes an item-level analysis of those distinctions within a mixed, AI-aware survey sample and reports the law-student subset independently.

The paper concentrates on the relationship between copyright-question recognition, human creative contribution and perceived usefulness of guidance. This scope is distinct from a general study of fairness in AI intellectual property or self-reported responsible creative

[1] World Intellectual Property Organization, *Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property* (WIPO 2024) <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_webinar_ft_24_1/wipo_webinar_ft_24_1_guidelines.pdf> accessed 27 October 2026.

[2] WIPO (n 1).

[3] United States Copyright Office, *Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability* (US Copyright Office 2025) <https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf> accessed 27 October 2026.

[4] Copyright Act 2023 (Bangladesh Act No XXXIV of 2023).

[5] WIPO (n 1); US Copyright Office (n 3).

practices, although those issues provide useful context. It does not claim that the respondents' views establish the correct legal position or that the findings represent all Bangladeshi students.

The objectives are to describe responses to the five copyright-related statements; examine how recognition of potential copyright questions coexists with the perceived usefulness of guidance; and explore selected item-level associations. The research questions are: How often are the five statements endorsed? How do recognition and the guidance statement coexist within respondents? How do the patterns appear among the law students identified in the workbook? Are selected ordinal responses associated, and how uncertain are those estimates?

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

The literature separates legal categories that are often combined in discussion of AI copyright. This section explains those distinctions and identifies the limited interpretive role of theory in the present analysis.

2.1 Copyright, ownership and generative AI

Copyrightability, authorship, initial ownership, subsequent transfer, contractual permission and third-party infringement are not interchangeable. A person may have permission under a platform's contract without acquiring copyright in every output, and a copyrightable contribution may coexist with material requiring separate rights clearance. WIPO recommends examining both applicable law and the service's terms, while recognising that legal standards differ across countries.[6]

For the United States, the Copyright Office's 2025 report evaluates the degree of human expressive contribution and explains that the use of an AI tool does not by itself defeat protection of human-authored material. It considers purely AI-generated material and human creative selection or modification separately.[7] These are jurisdiction-specific positions. Survey agreement that human contribution matters does not demonstrate that a respondent can apply these distinctions to a concrete case in Bangladesh.

Bangladesh's Copyright Act 2023 is the domestic starting point for relevant copyright questions.[8] The survey supplies no actual work, ownership chain, platform contract or alleged infringement, so it cannot determine whether any particular output is protected or identify its owner. A legal analysis would need the operative statutory provisions, facts and any applicable legal developments. Comparative guidance can inform questions, but it cannot replace that analysis.

2.2 AI literacy and legal awareness

AI literacy encompasses understanding capabilities, limits and responsible use; the concept is broader than knowing that copyright issues exist.[9] A user can understand that AI may produce

[6] WIPO (n 1).

[7] US Copyright Office (n 3).

[8] Copyright Act 2023 (n 4).

[9] Duri Long and Brian Magerko, 'What Is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations' in *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (ACM 2020).

inaccurate output while remaining uncertain about a copyright issue. Conversely, a respondent can support guidance without claiming familiarity with legal rules. The questionnaire contains self-assessments and normative statements, not performance tests, making these distinctions particularly important.

The wording of the five copyright items also varies: some ask about understanding, some about appropriate user conduct, and one about the anticipated value of guidance. A common numerical response scale does not make their meanings interchangeable. Reliability coefficients alone cannot establish that diverse statements measure a single validated concept, and weak consistency further limits the usefulness of a composite.[10] The analysis accordingly reports each item without estimating a latent ownership score.

2.3 Theoretical perspectives

Property-rights theory draws attention to the allocation of legal control and the consequences of competing claims. For generative AI it encourages separate inquiry into the creator's contribution, use of source works, ownership and contractual authorisation. The present survey offers general attitudes about these matters; it does not record a property-rights allocation or measure its economic effects. WIPO's guidance illustrates the practical distinction between rights in an output and terms governing its use.[11]

Fairness perspectives emphasise how people evaluate the treatment of creators and users. A general preference for fairness can support policy debate without identifying the legally correct entitlement in a specific dispute. The common Group 15 instrument includes additional fairness items; the present article does not treat those items as proof that rights are protected or infringed in practice.

The theory of planned behaviour relates behavioural intentions to attitudes, perceived norms and perceived control.[12] It offers a possible explanation for how beliefs might relate to future conduct, but the current questionnaire does not adequately measure all model components or observed conduct in a specified situation. The theory is used as a sensitising perspective, not a validated causal model.

2.4 Research expectations and analytical scope

Three exploratory paired comparisons examine recognition of copyright questions (COP1) against the relevance of human contribution (COP2), review of terms (COP3) and perceived usefulness of guidance (COP5). These statements ask different questions: a difference in endorsement is not a direct measure of knowledge, a forced-choice ranking or the effect of a policy. Four exploratory ordinal correlations compare COP1 with COP2, COP3, COP5 and AI-output inaccuracy awareness (AIL1). They are selected for this analysis without a claim of preregistration.

---

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

[11] WIPO (n 1).

[12] Icek Ajzen, 'The Theory of Planned Behavior' (1991) 50 Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 179.

A central analytical distinction is between recognising that a copyright question can arise and believing that guidance would be helpful. Respondents may endorse both statements, endorse one, or endorse neither. Joint responses are more informative than an average of conceptually different items, but a cross-sectional distribution does not show that receiving guidance changes knowledge or behaviour.

3. Methodology

This section documents the study's recorded sample, questionnaire, analysis and ethical safeguards. The methods are limited to information available in the supplied materials.

3.1 Research design and population

The analysis uses a cross-sectional questionnaire dataset with 385 records. The workbook codes all analysed records as consenting, adult eligible and aware of AI. Recorded status categories are law student, law graduate, advocate or legal professional, and other relevant respondent. There is no complete variable establishing current university attendance for all records. The law-student category supplies an identifiable subgroup of 241 respondents; it is not necessarily representative of all university students or all law students in Bangladesh.

3.2 Sampling and provenance

The workbook contains 385 unique respondent identifiers. It does not document recruitment dates, a sampling frame, administration mode, invitations, response rate or independent duplicate-screening procedures. The presence of 385 records does not establish probability selection or a national margin of error. A conventional sample-size calculation can motivate a target only under its stated assumptions and does not establish how respondents were recruited.[13]

The researcher identifies the numerical responses as real survey data. The Codebook nevertheless describes the respondent sequence and optional contextual comments as synthetic. Those labels alone do not establish that the numerical answers are synthetic; the creation of these fields and their relationship to original responses should be documented. The optional comments were excluded from analysis. Original consent and fieldwork documentation are needed for transparent verification and reproducibility.

3.3 Questionnaire and measures

The five-point response scale runs from strongly disagree to strongly agree. COP1 asks whether the respondent understands that copyright questions can arise when generative AI creates content; COP2 concerns the relevance of human creative contribution; COP3 asks whether users should review terms before commercial use; COP4 concerns avoiding an assumption that outputs are free of third-party rights; and COP5 concerns the perceived value of clear guidance for responsible use. Appendix A reproduces the exact statements.

[13] William G Cochran, *Sampling Techniques* (3rd edn, John Wiley & Sons 1977).

AIL1 is a self-assessment of awareness that AI may produce plausible but inaccurate information. It is not a test of copyright expertise. All focal fields contain valid numerical responses for the 385 records. The supplied material does not establish an instrument validation procedure, pilot sample or externally validated scale. The five COP items are not treated as interchangeable indicators of a single ownership construct, nor is a regression on their mean presented as evidence of legal knowledge.

3.4 Statistical analysis

Descriptive tables show the full distribution of each item and the number and percentage selecting agree or strongly agree. Neutral responses are retained as a separate category in those distributions; they are included with disagreement only in the non-endorsement category used for paired descriptive comparisons. Neutrality should not be interpreted as opposition.

Three within-person endorsement comparisons use exact McNemar tests with Holm adjustment across the three tests. Differences in percentage points have pointwise percentile bootstrap intervals based on 10,000 respondent-level resamples. The items have different wording and contexts; differences do not measure a causal effect or rank the importance of legal issues.[14]

Four exploratory Spearman correlations use the original five-category responses and compare COP1 with COP2, COP3, COP5 and AIL1. Holm adjustment covers these four p-values. Pointwise percentile bootstrap intervals use 2,000 respondent-level resamples and are not multiplicity-adjusted. Correlation does not imply a causal direction; a non-significant association is not proof that no relationship exists.[15]

3.5 Student subgroup and uncertainty

The 241 records coded as law students are analysed descriptively to address the student-focused title without assuming that other categories are students. The same item definitions and denominators are used. This is a subgroup description, not a formal test of differences between students and other respondents. The subgroup was not identified through a sampling design that supports national inference.

Confidence intervals describe statistical uncertainty under conventional sampling assumptions. Because selection into the workbook is undocumented, the intervals should not be interpreted as establishing representativeness or as a probability-sample margin of error for Bangladesh. Multiple comparisons, common response format and self-report should be considered when interpreting patterns.

---

[14] 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; Bradley Efron and Robert J Tibshirani, *An Introduction to the Bootstrap* (Chapman & Hall 1993).

[15] Douglas G Altman and J Martin Bland, 'Absence of Evidence Is Not Evidence of Absence' (1995) 311 BMJ 485; Ronald L Wasserstein and Nicole A Lazar, 'The ASA Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose' (2016) 70 American Statistician 129.

3.6 Data handling

All 385 records are retained in the overall analysis and all 241 law-student records in the subgroup description. No weighting or imputation is used for the focal items. The optional contextual-text field is excluded. Results are aggregated, and no respondent-level comments are reported. The codebook specifies a synthetic identifier sequence; the workbook itself does not establish how the identifiers were created or linked to source questionnaires.

3.7 Ethical considerations

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-0020260908-21. 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

The findings describe stated understandings, beliefs and reported practices in the recorded sample. They do not identify an owner of any AI-generated work or measure the legal accuracy of respondents' answers.

4.1 Respondent profile

Table 1 reports age and status as recorded in the workbook. Neither variable identifies the institution at which a participant studies or establishes representativeness.

Table 1. Recorded age and respondent status

Measure	Category	Count (%)
Age	21-23	157 (40.8%)
	24-26	82 (21.3%)
	18-20	66 (17.1%)
	27-30	44 (11.4%)
	31+	36 (9.4%)
Status	Law student	241 (62.6%)
	Law graduate	62 (16.1%)
	Advocate or legal professional	49 (12.7%)
	Other relevant respondent	33 (8.6%)

N = 385. Recorded status does not establish current university attendance for all records.

Law students account for 241 records (62.6%); 62 are law graduates, 49 are advocates or legal professionals, and 33 are other relevant respondents. The 241 law-student records form the subgroup described below. The other categories should not be presumed to be current students.

4.2 Copyright-related statements

Table 2 gives response distributions for the five copyright-related statements. These items concern different aspects of awareness, normative judgement and anticipated guidance.

Table 2. Responses to copyright-related statements

Item	Counts 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5	Endorsed n (%)	95% CI (%)
COP1	0 / 47 / 147 / 144 / 47	191 (49.6%)	44.6–54.6
COP2	6 / 28 / 128 / 161 / 62	223 (57.9%)	52.9–62.8
COP3	1 / 18 / 142 / 164 / 60	224 (58.2%)	53.2–63.0
COP4	2 / 27 / 131 / 157 / 68	225 (58.4%)	53.5–63.3
COP5	0 / 7 / 75 / 186 / 117	303 (78.7%)	74.3–82.5

N = 385. Endorsement means agree or strongly agree; neutral answers are not opposition. Wilson intervals are pointwise; exact wording is in Appendix A.

Of the 385 respondents, 191 (49.6%) endorsed recognition that copyright questions can arise; 223 (57.9%) endorsed the relevance of human creative contribution; and 303 (78.7%) endorsed the anticipated value of clear guidance. Those who do not endorse an item include neutral respondents and should not be treated as necessarily denying its proposition.

4.3 Joint responses on recognition and guidance

Table 3 shows how recognition of potential copyright questions and perceived usefulness of guidance coexist within the same respondents.

Table 3. Joint endorsement of recognition and guidance

Response configuration	Count (%)
Both endorsed	147 (38.2%)
Recognition only	44 (11.4%)
Guidance only	156 (40.5%)
Neither endorsed	38 (9.9%)

N = 385. Neither includes neutral answers; categories describe responses, not fixed types of people.

Overall, 147 (38.2%) endorsed both statements, while 156 (40.5%) endorsed the guidance statement without endorsing the recognition statement. This pattern does not establish whether

they received guidance or whether it improved their knowledge. It also cannot identify why a respondent selected a neutral or disagreement category.

4.4 Student subgroup

Table 4 repeats the five-item endorsement summary for the 241 respondents whose recorded status is law student. The denominator is the subgroup size, not the full sample.

Table 4. Endorsement among recorded law students

Item	Endorsed n (%)	95% CI (%)
COP1	123 (51.0%)	44.8–57.3
COP2	146 (60.6%)	54.3–66.5
COP3	138 (57.3%)	50.9–63.3
COP4	141 (58.5%)	52.2–64.5
COP5	194 (80.5%)	75.0–85.0

n = 241. Pointwise Wilson intervals do not establish representativeness or compare groups.

Among law students, 123 (51.0%) endorsed recognition of copyright questions, 146 (60.6%) endorsed the relevance of human creative contribution, and 194 (80.5%) endorsed the guidance statement. Ninety-six endorsed both recognition and guidance, while 98 endorsed guidance without endorsing recognition. These figures describe the observed subgroup and do not establish differences from other respondent categories.

4.5 Paired comparisons

Table 5 compares endorsement of the recognition statement with three other statements within the same respondents. Confidence intervals are pointwise and the three p-values are Holm-adjusted.

Table 5. Paired endorsement comparisons

Contrast	First only / second only	Difference pp	95% CI pp	Holm p
COP1 − COP2	74 / 106	-8.3	-15.1 to -1.6	0.033
COP1 − COP3	73 / 106	-8.6	-15.1 to -1.8	0.033
COP1 − COP5	44 / 156	-29.1	-35.6 to -22.3	<.001

N = 385; pp = percentage points. Exact McNemar tests, Holm adjusted across three tests. Bootstrap intervals are pointwise. Items have different wording.

These tests describe differences between agreement with different statements. A larger percentage for guidance than recognition does not establish that respondents rank guidance above copyright awareness or that guidance improves awareness.

4.6 Exploratory associations

Table 6 reports four rank correlations with the recognition item, using all five response categories. The p-values are adjusted across the four comparisons; confidence intervals are not multiplicity-adjusted.

Table 6. Exploratory associations with copyright-question recognition

Items	Spearman ρ	95% CI	p	Holm p
COP1 / COP2	0.063	-0.037 to 0.162	0.220	0.562
COP1 / COP3	0.120	0.021 to 0.214	0.018	0.072
COP1 / COP5	0.035	-0.074 to 0.133	0.496	0.562
COP1 / AIL1	0.067	-0.035 to 0.168	0.187	0.562

N = 385. Holm adjustment covers four tests; 95% percentile bootstrap intervals are pointwise, based on 2,000 resamples.

The associations and uncertainty should be considered together. Their cross-sectional nature prevents an inference that awareness of AI inaccuracies causes a particular copyright view or vice versa.

5. Discussion

The findings show a distinction between recognising a possible copyright issue and expecting guidance to be useful. They also show why these statements should not be combined into a single measure of ownership knowledge.

5.1 Recognising a question versus knowing its answer

About half of the full sample endorsed the statement that copyright questions can arise in AI-generated content. This is not a test of whether respondents know who owns an output, which provision applies or whether a third party's rights have been infringed. Agreement with a broad recognition statement and the ability to analyse an actual creative process are different outcomes. WIPO's guidance identifies several separate issues: rights in the output, the service's terms and possible third-party claims.[16]

An assessment of legal competence would need a scenario specifying the type of work, the human contribution, the tool and contractual terms. It could then ask for a reasoned answer under the relevant law, allowing for uncertainty. The current data instead support a descriptive account of stated recognition and preferences. The difference matters because general agreement may overstate practical preparedness while neutral responses may reflect uncertainty rather than a lack of interest.

[16] WIPO (n 1).

5.2 Human creative contribution

The human-contribution statement was endorsed by 57.9% overall and 60.6% in the law-student subgroup. It expresses a general view that human input matters; it does not establish a particular legal test. The US Copyright Office distinguishes different forms and degrees of human contribution when considering copyrightability under US law.[17] That comparative position cannot simply be imported into Bangladesh's legal system, and respondents were not asked to apply it.

For legal education, the distinction suggests a productive exercise: present several versions of an output, such as a minimally edited generated text and a work with substantial human authorship, and ask students to explain what additional facts are needed. Such an exercise is a future teaching proposal, not an intervention evaluated here. It would also need to separate copyrightability from ownership and any existing third-party rights.

5.3 Guidance and coexisting responses

The high endorsement of the guidance statement suggests that many respondents consider clear information potentially helpful. The 147 respondents who endorsed both recognition and guidance illustrate that awareness of a question can coexist with a desire for more support. The 156 who endorsed guidance without endorsing recognition are not necessarily unaware: their other response may have been neutral or disagreement, and the reason is not recorded.

The paired difference describes distinct propositions and is not a measure of unmet need in a defined population. Nor does it show that guidance reduces infringement, improves legal knowledge or changes creative conduct. UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education supports attention to institutional governance and responsible use, but the effectiveness of a specific curriculum would require evaluation.[18]

5.4 Terms, third-party rights and responsible action

Agreement that users should review platform terms does not demonstrate that a respondent has done so or that the terms are legally sufficient. A contract may set conditions for use while leaving separate questions of copyright ownership or third-party rights unresolved. WIPO explicitly identifies both contractual terms and rights in outputs as relevant.[19] A university guide should therefore explain the distinction and direct users to the current terms and appropriate legal advice where needed.

Similarly, a statement about avoiding an assumption that outputs are automatically free of third-party rights is a precautionary attitude, not evidence that a work infringes copyright. Whether reproduction is protected, substantial, authorised or otherwise lawful depends on applicable rules and facts. Research on output liability under international, EU and UK law distinguishes actionable reproduction, allocation of liability and possible defences; it does not

[17] US Copyright Office (n 3).

[18] Fengchun Miao and Wayne Holmes, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* (UNESCO 2023).

[19] WIPO (n 1).

determine the outcome of a Bangladeshi case.[20] These distinctions prevent overstating both the risks and the protections associated with AI use.

5.5 The mixed sample and legal context

The law-student subgroup provides a more targeted description than the full sample, but the workbook does not establish how those students were selected, their university affiliations or prior copyright training. Its results should not be generalised to all Bangladeshi university students. Law graduates, legal professionals and other respondents may have different professional or educational experiences, but the current descriptive subgroup analysis does not estimate the reasons for any differences.

Bangladesh's Copyright Act 2023 provides domestic context; a defensible application to AI-assisted expression requires careful attention to the statute, case-specific facts and subsequent legal developments.[21] The questionnaire does not record actual disputes or evaluate the adequacy of the legislation. The paper's recommendations concern clearer understanding and further research rather than declaring existing law to answer every AI question.

5.6 Integrated interpretation

Property-rights, fairness and planned-behaviour perspectives illuminate allocation, evaluation and possible conduct respectively. Their use here is interpretive. The items do not identify property owners, measure all determinants of behavioural intention or validate a structural model. A richer account would examine actual creative processes alongside scenario-based legal understanding, platform rules and users' practical decisions.

6. Theoretical and Practical Implications

The implications follow from the observed response patterns and the limits of the instrument. Suggested educational and policy actions remain proposals for evaluation.

6.1 Theoretical implications

First, recognition of a possible legal question, attribution of authorship, ownership, perceived fairness and responsible conduct should be measured as distinct concepts. A composite that averages agreement with heterogeneous questions may be difficult to interpret. Construct development should specify the legal or behavioural object and establish validity before testing relationships.[22]

Second, a property-rights perspective is useful only when an analysis identifies the work, rights and actors. A respondent's view that human contribution matters does not specify the threshold or allocate a right. Third, a behavioural framework requires more than endorsement of general precautions: perceived control, relevant norms, intentions and observed behaviour should be

[20] Eleonora Rosati, 'Infringing AI: Liability for AI-Generated Outputs under International, EU, and UK Copyright Law' (2025) 16 European Journal of Risk Regulation 603.

[21] Copyright Act 2023 (n 4).

[22] Sijtsma (n 10).

measured in a defined setting.[23] The present findings supply a descriptive starting point rather than confirmation of these theories.

6.2 Practical implications for universities and users

Universities can prepare concise guidance that distinguishes copyrightability, ownership, platform terms and third-party rights. Teaching materials can use contrasting examples of AI assistance and human creative contribution while making clear that the applicable answer depends on facts and jurisdiction. WIPO and UNESCO materials provide useful starting points, but local legal advice and current institutional policies should be checked.[24]

For potentially consequential publication or commercial use, users can retain records of meaningful human contributions, review relevant terms, and consider whether material resembles protected third-party content. Seeking permission or legal advice may be appropriate where uncertainty is substantial. These are prospective precautions; the survey does not show that taking them prevents infringement in every case.

6.3 Policy implications

Policymakers, educators and creative communities could develop accessible explanations of existing copyright rules and practical questions raised by AI. Consultation with creators, students and technology providers may help identify useful examples and points of uncertainty. Evaluation should measure whether people can apply guidance to scenarios and whether any observed behavioural change persists, rather than relying only on expressed support for guidance.

7. Conclusion, Limitations and Future Research

The study describes 385 AI-aware questionnaire records and a subgroup of 241 law students. The findings distinguish the recognition of potential copyright questions from views about human contribution and the perceived value of guidance. In the full sample, 49.6% endorsed recognition and 78.7% endorsed the guidance statement; many respondents endorsed both. These statements do not establish legal knowledge, identify ownership or demonstrate an effect of training.

The limitations include cross-sectional self-report, a mixed sample with undocumented recruitment, no direct ownership scenario, no validated ownership scale and uncertain provenance requiring documentation of the Codebook's synthetic identifier and optional-comment labels. The numerical records are identified by the researcher as real survey data. The subgroup does not represent all university students, and results are not a national prevalence estimate.

Future studies should document recruitment, dates, participation and the linkage between source records and analysis files. Researchers should identify respondents' educational status and prior copyright instruction, then use legally reviewed scenarios that distinguish authorship,

[23] Ajzen (n 12).

[24] WIPO (n 1); Miao and Holmes (n 18).

ownership, licence conditions and third-party infringement. Longitudinal or comparative educational studies could measure whether guidance improves the ability to reason about those scenarios. Interviews with students, creators and legal practitioners could explain how they understand uncertain rights and what practical support they need.

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-0020260908-21. 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

Informed consent was obtained from adult participants before questionnaire completion. The questionnaire explained the study purpose, voluntary participation, anonymity and the option to discontinue. All analysed records contain affirmative consent and adult-eligibility responses.

Data availability

The numerical data supporting the reported analyses are held by the research team. Requests for de-identified data and analytical specifications may be directed to the corresponding author. Any sharing is subject to participant confidentiality and applicable institutional requirements. The contextual-text field was excluded from the analysis.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions

Sabbir Ahmed: Lead student researcher; conceptualisation; preparation of study materials; organisation and curation of survey data; manuscript development. The project was conducted under the supervision of Prof. Dr Kazi Abdul Mannan.

Kazi Abdul Mannan: Conceptual and methodological guidance; supervision; interpretation of statistical findings; critical review and editing of the manuscript.

Generative AI disclosure

Generative AI assisted manuscript drafting, language editing, organisation and the development of analytical code. Statistical estimates were computed programmatically from the numerical survey data. Responsibility for the study's analysis, interpretation and reporting rests with the authors.

Bibliography

Ajzen I, ‘The Theory of Planned Behavior’ (1991) 50 Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 179

Altman DG and Bland JM, ‘Absence of Evidence Is Not Evidence of Absence’ (1995) 311 BMJ 485

Cochran WG, *Sampling Techniques* (3rd edn, John Wiley & Sons 1977)

Efron B and Tibshirani RJ, *An Introduction to the Bootstrap* (Chapman & Hall 1993)

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

Long D and Magerko B, ‘What Is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations’ in *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (ACM 2020)

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

Miao F and Holmes W, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* (UNESCO 2023)

Rosati E, ‘Infringing AI: Liability for AI-Generated Outputs under International, EU, and UK Copyright Law’ (2025) 16 European Journal of Risk Regulation 603

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* (US Copyright Office 2025) <https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf> accessed 27 October 2026

Wasserstein RL and Lazar NA, ‘The ASA Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose’ (2016) 70 American Statistician 129

World Intellectual Property Organization, *Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property* (WIPO 2024) <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_webinar_ft_24_1/wipo_webinar_ft_24_1_guidelines.pdf> accessed 27 October 2026

Appendix A. Analytical questionnaire items

Table A1 reproduces the survey statements so that each estimate can be interpreted against its exact wording.

Table A1. Exact wording of analytical items

Code	Questionnaire statement
COP1	I understand that copyright questions can arise when generative AI is used to create content.
COP2	I believe the role of human creative contribution matters when considering authorship or ownership.
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.
COP5	Clear copyright guidance would improve my responsible use of generative AI.
AIL1	I understand that generative AI can produce plausible but inaccurate information.

Source: Group 15 Codebook. Response options range from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Items are analysed separately and do not establish a single validated latent construct.

Table of legislation

Copyright Act 2023 (Bangladesh Act No XXXIV of 2023)