International Journal of Business & Law Research 13(2):18-24, April-June, 2025

© SEAHI PUBLICATIONS, 2025 www.seahipublications.org ISSN: 2360-8986

doi:10.5281/zenodo.15204435

Ethical and Regulatory Challenges in AIDriven Content Marketing A Critical Examination of Intellectual Property and Data Privacy Issues

Chibueze Nnabuikem Edoga

Manchester Metropolitan University
23763413@stu.mmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT
AI-driven tools not only improve efficiency and creativity but also raise difficult ethical and legal questions as they become more ingrained in content marketing. Using Enugu, Nigeria, as the study area, this paper critically investigates public worries about intellectual property rights, data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the more general legal environment of AI-generated marketing content. Drawing on survey data from 100 respondents, findings reveal significant concern, with 70% expressing anxiety over security and data privacy, and 79% highlighting challenges in ensuring compliance with existing legal standards. Furthermore, 79% of participants expressed strong concern or concern about algorithmic bias and manipulation in AI-generated advertising. Implementing AI audit trails was the most popular suggestion for reducing these risks (49%), followed by the creation of ethical norms (30%). These results are consistent with new research that highlights the critical need for openness, equity, and legally binding frameworks when it comes to AI adoption. By emphasizing local viewpoints and providing useful policy insights relevant to the Nigerian and larger Global South context, the study adds to the continuing conversation on responsible AI usage.
Keywords: AI-driven marketing, data privacy, intellectual property, algorithmic bias, regulatory compliance, ethical AI, Enugu Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

The intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and content marketing has spurred significant ethical and regulatory challenges, particularly concerning intellectual property (IP) and data privacy issues. As businesses increasingly integrate AI tools to enhance their marketing strategies, they face pressing questions about the legality and ethicality of AI-generated content. This evolving landscape necessitates a critical examination of existing IP frameworks and data privacy regulations, as both are fundamental to ensuring responsible AI use and protecting consumer rights (Appel, 2023). One of the foremost challenges pertains to the implications of copyright law in the context of AI-generated works. Current legal interpretations often stipulate that such works may not be eligible for copyright protection, as many jurisdictions require a "human author" for eligibility, potentially relegating AI creations to the public domain (MarTech, 2019).This situation raises concerns for companies that rely on AI for content generation, as they may lack exclusive rights to their outputs and face legal liabilities related to copyright infringement. Notable lawsuits, such as those initiated by the Authors Guild against AI companies like OpenAI, underscore the contentious nature of these issues and their potential impact on the future of AI-driven content marketing (Laney, 2025). Data privacy is another critical concern in the realm of AI-driven

marketing, particularly as these technologies often depend on vast amounts of personal data. Legislative frameworks, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union, have established strict guidelines for data collection and processing, necessitating transparency and consent from consumers (Alves,2025).

Violations of these regulations can lead to severe penalties, making ethical compliance a financial imperative for organizations that utilize AI tools in their marketing efforts (Data Guide,2024). The ethical dimensions of data usage also encompass concerns about algorithmic bias and the "black box" problem, wherein AI systems operate without transparency, potentially eroding consumer trust (Osano,2025).In light of these complexities, it is essential for organizations to adopt ethical AI practices that prioritize transparency, fairness, and accountability in their marketing strategies. By navigating the intricate landscape of intellectual property and data privacy, companies can build sustainable relationships with consumers and contribute to a more responsible digital marketing ecosystem (Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner, 2025).

Theoretical Framework

This study is guided by Information Privacy Theory, developed by Alan Westin (1967) and later expanded by Daniel Solove (2006), which emphasizes the right of individuals to control how their personal data is collected, used, and shared. In the context of AI-driven content marketing, this theory helps explain why many consumers are concerned about their data being used without consent. AI tools often gather and process large amounts of personal information to create targeted ads and content, which can lead to serious privacy violations if not managed ethically (Alves, 2025). This theory is useful in understanding why regulations like the GDPR were created—to protect people's privacy and ensure companies are transparent and responsible in their use of AI technologies.

The study also draws from Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Theory, rooted in the work of John Locke (1689) and Georg Hegel (1821), which explains why people or organizations should have ownership rights over the content they create. However, when content is generated by AI, it becomes unclear who actually owns it—since AI lacks human authorship. This theory helps explore current challenges in copyright law, where AI-created content often falls into legal grey areas and may not qualify for protection (Laney, 2025). For businesses using AI in marketing, this creates risks around content ownership and copyright infringement. Together, these two theories offer a strong foundation for critically examining the ethical and regulatory challenges of using AI in content marketing today (Appel, 2023; Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner, 2025)

Study Objective

This study aims to critically examine the ethical and regulatory challenges associated with AI-driven content marketing, with a particular focus on intellectual property (IP) and data privacy issues. The research seeks to:

1. .Evaluate the data privacy challenges posed by AI-driven marketing tools, including compliance with legal frameworks such as the GDPR and potential violations.
2. Assess the ethical considerations surrounding AI in content marketing, including concerns related to algorithmic bias, transparency, and consumer trust.
3. Identify best practices and policy recommendations for businesses to navigate the regulatory landscape while ensuring responsible AI adoption in content marketing.

METHODOLOGY

This study, which included 100 participants and was carried out in Enugu, Nigeria, aimed to comprehend the moral and legal issues surrounding AI-powered content marketing. It employed a survey research design using structured questionnaires to gather data from two key groups: marketing professionals with at least two years of experience using AI in content marketing, and consumers who interact with AI-generated content online. A purposive sampling technique was adopted to ensure that only respondents with relevant expertise and exposure to AI marketing tools were included in the study.

To analyze the collected data, descriptive statistics were performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). These analyses helped identify patterns, trends, and associations between variables related to intellectual property concerns, data privacy issues, and ethical marketing practices. The study adhered strictly to ethical research standards. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their anonymity and data confidentiality were guaranteed throughout the research process, in accordance with established ethical guidelines (Ali, 2021).

FINDINGS

AI-driven marketing tools pose significant data privacy challenges, particularly concerning security risks, compliance with regulations, and potential violations of legal frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Respondents expressed concerns about AI's role in data privacy breaches and the difficulty of ensuring compliance with existing legal and regulatory standards.

Table 1: Concerns About AI Leading to Security and Data Privacy Issues

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Concerned	33	33
Concerned	37	37
Neutral	20	20
Slightly Concerned	9	9
Not Concerned	1	1
Total	**100**	**100.0**

Source: *Author's fieldwork 2024*

Table 1 presents data on respondents' concerns about the potential of artificial intelligence (AI) to cause security and data privacy issues. The findings indicate a high level of apprehension among respondents. A combined 70% of participants (33% *strongly concerned* and 37% *concerned*) expressed significant worry about AI-related security and privacy threats. This suggests a prevailing anxiety about how AI technologies handle sensitive data and their vulnerability to breaches or misuse. Meanwhile, 20% of the respondents maintained a neutral stance, reflecting uncertainty or a balanced perspective toward the issue. Only 10% (9% *slightly concerned* and 1% *not concerned*) showed minimal or no concern, suggesting that a very small proportion of respondents trust current AI data protection mechanisms or are less aware of associated risks. Overall, the data reveal that the majority of the respondents are either moderately or strongly concerned about the implications of AI on data security and privacy. This trend emphasizes the need for stronger ethical guidelines, transparent AI governance, and robust security frameworks to address public concerns.

Table 2: Challenges in Ensuring Compliance with Legal and Regulatory Standards

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Concerned	46	46
Concerned	33	33
Neutral	16	16
Slightly Concerned	4	4
Not Challenging	1	1
Total	**100**	**100.0**

Source: *Author's fieldwork 2024*

Table 2 reveals the respondents' views on the challenges associated with ensuring compliance with legal and regulatory standards in the context of AI. A significant portion—79%—of the respondents (46% *strongly concerned* and 33% *concerned*) consider compliance a major issue. This underscores a general consensus that navigating legal frameworks and adhering to regulations is a substantial challenge in the deployment and use of AI technologies

Table 3: Concerns about Algorithmic Bias and Manipulation in AI-Generated Advertising

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Concerned	40	40
Concerned	39	39
Neutral	12	12
Slightly Concerned	5	5
Not Challenging	4	4
Total	**100**	**100.0**

Source: *Author's fieldwork 2024*

Table 3 reveals that a majority of respondents (79%) are either *strongly concerned* (40%) or *concerned* (39%) about algorithmic bias and manipulation in AI-generated advertising. This indicates a strong perception that AI-driven ad systems may perpetuate unfairness or influence consumer behavior unethically. Only 12**%** remained neutral, while a small portion (9%) viewed the issue as only slightly concerning or not challenging. These findings underscore the importance of transparency and fairness in AI advertising practices to maintain public trust.

Table 4: Best Practices and Policy Recommendations for Responsible AI Adoption

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Development of AI audit trails to track content generation and minimize privacy risks.	49	49
Establishing ethical guidelines to mitigate misinformation and bias.	30	30
Designing AI tools with algorithmic transparency and fairness in mind	6	6
Partnering with regulatory bodies to refine AI governance frameworks. Promoting industry-wide collaboration to establish AI best practices	14 1	14 1
Total	**100**	**100.0**

Source: *Author's fieldwork 2024*

Table 4 presents respondents' views on best practices and policy recommendations for responsible AI adoption. The most favored approach, cited by 49**%**, is the development of AI audit trails to track content generation and reduce privacy risks. This is followed by establishing ethical guidelines (30%) to address misinformation and bias. Other recommendations include partnering with regulatory bodies (14%) to enhance governance, designing AI tools with transparency and fairness (6%), and promoting industry-wide collaboration (1%). The responses suggest a strong preference for accountability, ethics, and regulatory involvement as key to fostering trust and safety in AI use

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study's findings demonstrate widespread public concern about several aspects of artificial intelligence (AI), including its influence on data privacy, regulatory compliance, algorithmic prejudice, and the need for responsible governance. 70% of respondents expressed high worry or concern about AI-related data privacy and security threats. This reinforces the growing literature raising concerns about how AI systems manage personal data. According to Zuboff (2019), AI is key to "surveillance capitalism," in which personal data is captured and turned into commodities, frequently without user consent. This highlights concerns that AI-powered systems may jeopardize people's digital privacy.

Similarly, Binns (2018) observes that the opacity of AI decision-making might result in a lack of responsibility, particularly in data handling procedures. However, privacy-preserving technologies like as differential privacy and federated learning have emerged as potential answers to these concerns (Abadi et al., 2016). While these developments are promising, their adoption remains restricted in real-world applications, highlighting the significance of participants' concerns. Also, findings from the study revealed that 79% of respondents view compliance with legal and regulatory standards as a significant challenge. This perception is validated by Brundage et al. (2018), who argue that regulatory frameworks often lag behind AI advancements, creating a policy vacuum. This gap poses challenges for ensuring fairness, accountability, and user protection. However, Gasser and Almeida (2017) present a more optimistic view, suggesting that many existing legal instruments—such as data protection laws and consumer rights legislation—can be adapted to accommodate AI-related issues. Still, they emphasize the importance of clear institutional coordination and enforcement mechanisms. The public's concern reflects uncertainty about how well these regulations are being applied or understood in the context of emerging technologies.

In Table 3, 79% of respondents expressed concern about bias and manipulation in AI-generated advertising. This echoes concerns raised by Noble (2018) in *Algorithms of Oppression*, where she demonstrates how search engine algorithms reinforced racial and gender stereotypes, leading to real-world harms. Additionally, research by Cowgill, Dell'Acqua, and Deng (2021) finds that biased training data and opaque algorithms can result in discriminatory outcomes in online advertising. These findings align with the concerns raised in this study, particularly regarding AI's potential to manipulate consumer behavior and perpetuate inequality. Nevertheless, scholars like Mitchell et al. (2019) propose solutions such as model cards—documentation tools that disclose AI system characteristics, including ethical and fairness considerations. While not yet mainstream, such practices can increase transparency and help mitigate bias. Furthermore, findings from the study showed that respondents favor accountability and ethical oversight as top priorities for responsible AI adoption. Nearly half (49%) recommend implementing AI audit trails to track content generation and minimize privacy risks, followed by 30% who support ethical guidelines to combat misinformation and bias.

This aligns with proposals from the OECD (2021), which advocate for AI systems that are transparent, accountable, and human-centered. Doshi-Velez and Kim (2017) also argue for interpretable machine learning, noting that human understanding of AI systems is essential for ethical oversight. Interestingly, only 1% of respondents favored industry-wide collaboration, perhaps reflecting distrust in the private sector's ability to self-regulate, a concern mirrored in O'Neil's (2016) critique of unchecked algorithmic power in *Weapons of Math Destruction*. These findings reinforce the need for robust, external governance mechanisms to balance innovation with public interest.

CONCLUSION

The study provides strong evidence that the public is deeply concerned about the ethical, legal, and operational risks of AI. Concerns about data privacy, legal compliance, and algorithmic bias are particularly dominant, supported by a robust body of literature. Respondents also emphasize the importance of auditability, ethical standards, and regulatory cooperation in fostering responsible AI use. While promising solutions like differential privacy and model transparency tools exist, their adoption must be scaled up. It is crucial for developers, regulators, and civil society to collaborate in building trustworthy AI systems that uphold human rights, equity, and democratic values.

REFERENCES

Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., & Zhang, L. (2016). *Deep learning with differential privacy*. Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 308–318. https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318

Alves (2025) Building Trust In The AI Era: Content Marketing Ethics And Transparency.https://www.searchenginejournal.com/content-marketing-ethics-and transparency/534525/

Alves, M. (2025). *AI, data ethics, and consumer privacy: A modern-day dilemma*. European Journal of Digital Policy, 12(1), 45–59.

Appel, G. (2023). *Marketing in the age of artificial intelligence: Trends, risks, and ethical concerns*. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 63, 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2023.03.004

Appel, G., Neelbauer, J., & Schweidel, D. A. (2023). Generative AI has an intellectual property problem. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2023/04/generative-ai-has-an-intellectual-property-problem

Binns, R. (2018). *Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy*. Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287583

Brundage, M., Avin, S., Clark, J., Toner, H., Eckersley, P., Garfinkel, B., ... & Anderson, H. (2018). *The malicious use of artificial intelligence: Forecasting, prevention, and mitigation*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07228. https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.07228

Cowgill, B., Dell'Acqua, F., & Deng, S. (2021). *Biased Programmers? Or Biased Data? A Field Experiment in Operationalizing AI Ethics*. Columbia Business School Research Paper. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3611241

DataGuard Insights. (2024). The growing data privacy concerns with AI: What you need to know. *DataGuard*. https://www.dataguard.com/blog/growing-data-privacy-concerns-ai/

Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). *Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608. https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08608

Gasser, U., & Almeida, V. A. (2017). *A layered model for AI governance*. IEEE Internet Computing, 21(6), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.1109/MIC.2017.4180835

Hegel, G. W. F. (1821). *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Laney, A. (2025). *AI, authorship, and accountability: Legal battles over machine-generated content*. Journal of Law and Artificial Intelligence, 8(2), 87–104.

Laney, D. B. (2025). Copyright or copywrong? AI's intellectual property conundrum. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/douglaslaney/2025/02/11/copyright-or-copywrong-ais-intellectual-property-paradox/

Locke, J. (1689). *Two Treatises of Government*. Awnsham Churchill.

MarTech (2019) Privacy, a year later: How the GDPR has affected AI-powered marketing. https://martech.org/privacy-a-year-later-how-the-gdpr-has-affected-ai-powered-marketing/

Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., ... & Gebru, T. (2019). *Model cards for model reporting*. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 220–229. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.

OECD. (2021). *OECD Framework for the Classification of AI Systems*. OECD Digital Economy Papers, No. 323. https://doi.org/10.1787/cb6d9eca-en

Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner (2025). Artificial intelligence and privacy – issues and challenges. https://ovic.vic.gov.au/privacy/resources-for-organisations/artificial-intelligence-and-privacy-issues-and-challenges/

Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner. (2025). *Artificial intelligence and privacy: A guide for organizations*. https://ovic.vic.gov.au

Osano Staff. (2025). AI and data privacy: Exploring the privacy risks in the era of artificial intelligence. *Osano*. https://www.osano.com/articles/ai-and-data-privacy

Solove, D. J. (2006). A taxonomy of privacy. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 154(3), 477–564. https://doi.org/10.2307/40041279

Westin, A. F. (1967). *Privacy and Freedom*. Atheneum

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.