E-ISSN: 1116 - 2619 P-ISSN: 3026-8524
MPRI-JHLAR | INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES, LITERATURE AND ART RESEARCH
VOL. 10 NO. 6 – OCTOBER, 2025

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE GOVERNANCE: LEGAL AND PUBLIC POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR DATA PRIVACY AND ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

***MICHAEL OGHALE IGHOFIOMONI; **OLUWABUSAYO OLUFUNKE AWOYOMI; ***RAPHAEL POPOOLA; ****EMMANUEL CHIAGOZIE AHAIWE; *****CONFIDENCE ADIMCHI CHINONYEREM; & ******NIMOTALLAHI ADESAYO AZEEZ**

*Southern Delta University, Ozoro, Nigeria, Department of Computer Engineering and Systems Engineering. **University of Albany, United States, Department of Computer. ***Western Illinois University United States, Department Computer science. ****University of Portsmouth, UK, Department of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. *****Abia State Polytechnic, Nigeria, Department of Accountancy. ******Tennessee Technological university United States, English language (professional technical communication)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70382/mejhlar.v10i6.078

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is an explanatory force in modern government and presents fundamental legal and public policy issues concerning data protection and algorithmic accountability. As AI calculations become more deeply embedded in decision-making in healthcare, finance, policing, and public administration, they strain existing regulation to safeguard personal data and promote equity. This research takes into account the function and legal implications of policy in the oversight of AI-based data collection and machine decision-making, particularly the need for effective governance structures that promote transparency, fairness, and accountability. By learning from international models such as the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Draft Artificial Intelligence Act, the

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Implications, Public Policy, Data Privacy, Algorithmic Accountability, Governance, Ethics, Transparency, Human Rights, Regulation

study seeks to prove that legislation and ethical codes are capable of encompassing promises of data abuse, discrimination, and bias in algorithmic decision-making within them. The study highlights that optimal AI regulation hinges on marrying innovation with core human rights principles and ensuring technology is leveraged for the greater good without breaching privacy or justice. Strengthening the governing structures, providing assurance mechanisms, and upholding ethical regulation are essential in attaining a balance between society protection and technological advancement.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence in recent years has swiftly developed theoretical technological idea revolutionary influencing practically every part of governance, economics and organization. It helps in predicting policies, health care and digital finance (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Majorly, artificial intelligence influences human decision and public broad scale impact. Artificial intelligence is used by government. Artificial intelligence systems are increasingly shaping human decision and public outcomes at scale (Akinnagbe, 2024). Although the technologies are assuring efficiency, objectivity, and economic development, they have also raised fundamental issues on data privacy, transparency, accountability, and ethics. As governments and private players deploy AI-based systems for decision-making, (Adewumi & Chinonyerem, 2025) the regulation of AI has become a ubiquitous legal and policy issue (Roxanne, 2025). The debate is no longer if AI needs to be regulated but how to balance innovation with the safeguard of essential rights. Data privacy is at the centre of the debate. Data-driven exponential growth in AI models is dependent on massive datasets that tend to be made up of highly sensitive personal information. Consent, surveillance, and data commodification have created new ethics and legal concerns (Arora & Thota, 2024). In most jurisdictions, data protection law like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and upcoming AI systems of governance in other regions of the globe like the United States, China, and Africa focus on making the collection, storage, and processing of data legal and transparent. Their compatibility with AI, however, has exposed gigantesque loopholes in governance especially regarding automated decision-making, profiling, and algorithmic process transparency (Grimmelikhuijsen, 2022). These gaps highlight the necessity of strong legal and institutional frameworks that can tackle the particular threats posed by AI technologies.

Algorithmic accountability, or the possibility to explain, justify, and appeal decisions of AI systems, is another important element. Algorithms are largely "black boxes," their internal logic concealed even from their creators (Wieringa, 2020) . That transparency is against elementary principles of judicial and administrative accountability, particularly

when independent systems make or decide individual rights such as access to public services, employment, or loans. (Moch, 2024) Lacking transparent regimes of liability also becomes increasingly difficult towards fixing the question of who should be held responsible when AI systems are failing, discriminating, or causing harm. As a result, policymakers and legal scholars are struggling to identify the way to apply standards of transparency, fairness, and traceability to algorithmic systems without inhibiting innovation.

AI governance thus seems to be an area of interdiscursivity that intersects law, ethics, technology, and public administration. It requires a design that not only governs the use of data but also brings accountability into AI design and deployment (Li, 2025). Public policy is at the center of this endeavor, setting norms, institutional practice, and incentives for compliance. Governments need to reconcile interlocking interests (Naruetharadhol et al., 2024): encouraging technological innovation so as to be competitive in the world, establishing public confidence in digital systems, and protecting citizens' rights and privacy. This balancing requires a joined-up government framework of legal tools, ethical norms, and cross-sector collaboration among actors. In the emerging economies, especially in Africa and other developing economies, the implications of AI for governance are even more nuanced. According to (Mbah, 2024) There is restricted regulatory capacity, data privacy mechanisms, and societal awareness that leave such societies susceptible to exploitation and algorithmic prejudice repatriated from international AI systems. (Ajuzieogu, 2025) The task is thus to develop context-driven and inclusive governance frameworks to ensure equal cooperation with the international AI ecosystem while safeguarding national sovereignty and citizen welfare.

Against this backdrop, the current paper critically analyzes the public policy and legal aspects of regulating AI with particular focus on algorithmic accountability and data privacy (Anwar, et al 2024). The paper maps available regulatory instruments, specifies areas of fault in leading models, and traces primary strategies to strengthen AI regulation. Drawing together law, ethics, and technology policy knowledges, the study adds to the developing global debate about responsible and transparent regulation of AI. Finally, the study will inform the creation of governance structures that enable innovation while ensuring justice, fairness, and respect for human dignity in the intelligent machine age.

Conceptualizing AI Governance

AI governance is the sum of laws, regulation, standards, and institutional practice aimed at maintaining that AI technologies are created and used responsibly, ethically, and in a transparent manner (Zeng, Lu, & Huang, 2021). Technical control such as algorithm development, data utilization, and auditing and policy measures that ensure accountability and safeguard the public interest are included. With increasing ubiquity of

AI in high-stakes domains like healthcare, transportation, and the justice system, global debate about the question of aligning innovation with human rights and societal values has been heightened (Cath et al., 2018), (Emeghai & Orie, 2021). AI must be regulated on multiple levels: company board, industry regulation, and state and international policy (Floridi, 2021), (Iwuozor et al., 2025). These levels facilitate that ethical concerns like fairness, transparency, privacy, and anti-discrimination are infused throughout the entire life cycle of AI. However, the lack of one single set of standards and enforcement mechanisms continues to hinder effective regulation across the globe.

Global Evolution of AI Legal and Policy Frameworks

The worldwide reaction to regulating AI has been uneven across jurisdictions. The European Union (EU) took the lead in regulating AI with its Artificial Intelligence Act (2024), which categorizes AI systems based on risk and imposes stringent requirements on high-risk uses (European Commission, 2024). The EU approach is rights-based, focusing on protecting privacy, non-discrimination, and human oversight. Complementary tools like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) have added to global data governance norms (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2017).

Conversely, the United States takes a market and sectoral strategy, with multiple agencies regulating AI use in finance, healthcare, and consumer protection. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) published the AI Risk Management Framework (2023), encouraging voluntary compliance and risk management practices (NIST, 2023). While less normative than the EU system, the U.S. system encourages innovation but could lead to inadequate accountability and uneven enforcement.

The administrative style of China focuses on state control and social stability, integrating AI within its digital sovereignty strategy. The Algorithmic Recommendation Management Provisions (2022) require transparency in algorithms and registration with the state, demonstrating an aspiration for political stability on the cost of private anonymity (Ding, 2022). Emerging economies, especially those on the African continent, are starting to set their own agendas for governance. The African Union's Continental AI Strategy (2024) encourages inclusive and human-centered AI development but admits infrastructural and capacity limitations in regulation. Early legislative action in nations like Nigeria, Kenya, and South Africa such as Nigeria's Data Protection Act (2023) seeks to synchronize national policy with international governance standards (Adewumi & Olayinka, 2024).

Data Protection and Privacy During the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Data privacy is essential to regulation of AI because AI models are built on massive datasets that they use for training, prediction, and decision-making. Privacy mechanisms help protect people from abuse of personal data and provide transparency in data

collection and processing (Tisne, 2021), (Nwobuoke-Frank et al., 2024). The GDPR is now the global benchmark of data protection, employing principles of lawfulness, fairness, purpose limitation, and data minimization (Voigt & Von dem Bussche, 2017). But a few research papers recognize the limitation of classical privacy models in capturing the transparent and dynamic style of machine learning systems (Brkan, 2019), (Ighofiomoni et al., 2025). It is difficult to keep track of their secondary reuse and inferences after data is gathered and inputs are provided to AI algorithms. Researchers suggest shifting from consent-based models to collective and contextual management frameworks of privacy that are suitable for contemporary data environments (Yao et al., 2025).

In the global south, protection of privacy is also limited by low institutional capacity, low enforcement, and low public awareness (Adewumi & Olayinka, 2024). This asymmetrical setting has provided room for multinationals to take advantage of loopholes in regulations, practicing cross-border data transfers and surveillance capitalism, where profits dominate human rights (Zuboff, 2019).

Algorithmic Accountability and Transparency

Algorithmic accountability is the question that AI systems and their developers ought to be held responsible for the output produced using computerized decision-making (Burrell, 2016). It involves developing tools to interpret, audit, and challenge AI-based outcomes. Nevertheless, the "black box problem" of machine-learning model transparency remains the access code to trials of real accountability (Akinlabi et al., 2025). Recent research emphasizes the necessity of XAI as a regulatory and moral imperative. Not only is transparency relevant to algorithmic inference but also to the social setting of deployment to make sure that AI systems promote fairness and justice, says Mittelstadt (2021). The EU AI Act and the Canada Directive on Automated Decision-Making (2020) have established transparency and human oversight requirements for high-risk AI systems, indicating a move from self-regulation to legally enforced responsibility.

Challenges, however, arise in assigning legal responsibility where harm or discrimination is caused by algorithms. Conventional administrative law and tort systems fail to assign responsibility correctly, particularly in multi-agent environments when AI systems are co-created and utilized on a cross-border scale (Wachter, Mittelstadt, & Russell, 2021). Thus, experts call for algorithmic impact assessments and independent audit agencies to ensure compliance with ethics, accuracy, and fairness standards (Reisman et al., 2018).

Ethical and Public Policy Aspects of AI Regulation

Ethics and public policy cannot be divorced in regulating AI. Ethical principles foreground values of non-maleficence, autonomy, fairness, and transparency (Floridi & Cowls, 2019). Public policy, by contrast, translates these into law, institutional design, and compliance.

Contemporary international efforts eg UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) and OECD AI Principles (2019) emphasize people-centered and inclusive AI regulation. The technologies enhance policy convergence across countries and increase multi-stakeholder collaboration, aligning technological advancement with democratic and human rights (Jobin, Ienca, & Vayena, 2019).

Nonetheless, the literature suggests an enduring gap between practice on the ground and ethics principles. Most of the guidelines of AI ethics are non-binding, creating inconsistency in application. Furthermore, in developing countries, technical incapacity and policy fragmentation delay bridging ethical frameworks with enforceable law.

Public trust becomes the top driver of effective AI regulation. Citizens will be willing to embrace AI systems if there are accessible, fair, and accountable governance structures (Rahwan et al., 2019), (Mariam et al., 2024). Policymakers must therefore create participatory frameworks in which AI innovation takes into account societal goals and aspirations beyond state or corporate interests.

Importance Of Legal and Public Policy Implications for Data Privacy and Algorithmic Accountability

Artificial Intelligence (AI) governance are structures, guidelines, directives, rules, and institutional frameworks that decide the ethical innovation, development, and regulation of AI technology. It involves balancing the facilitation of innovation and ensuring that AI systems respect social justice, human rights, and the rule of law. As Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena (2019) write, AI governance is not technological regulation but a multi-faceted system of ethical principles, legal structures, and policy instruments. It seeks to balance the shortcomings of bias, discrimination, and obscurity that accompany algorithmic systems and establish trust and accountability. Around the world, AI regulation has developed in light of increasing concerns about data exploitation, surveillance, and risk automatization. Floridi and Cowls (2021) contend that regulation of AI is expected to reconcile normative principles like fairness, transparency, and human control. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2020) further stipulates that responsible AI must be robust, accountable, and human-centric. These guidelines constitute an evolution from voluntary codes of ethics to binding regulation instruments altogether.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) governance are structures, guidelines, directives, rules, and institutional frameworks that decide the ethical innovation, development, and regulation of AI technology. It involves balancing the facilitation of innovation and ensuring that AI systems respect social justice, human rights, and the rule of law. As Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena (2019) write, AI governance is not technological regulation but a multi-faceted system of ethical principles, legal structures, and policy instruments. It seeks to balance

the shortcomings of bias, discrimination, and obscurity that accompany algorithmic systems and establish trust and accountability.

Around the world, AI regulation has developed in light of increasing concerns about data exploitation, surveillance, and risk automatization. Floridi and Cowls (2021) contend that regulation of AI is expected to reconcile normative principles like fairness, transparency, and human control. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2020) further stipulates that responsible AI must be robust, accountable, and human-centric. These guidelines constitute an evolution from voluntary codes of ethics to binding regulation instruments altogether.

Ethical and Policy Aspects of AI Regulation

Aside from legal control, governance of AI mostly rests on ethics and public policy. Bryson (2020) points out that good governance should incorporate moral responsibility, human dignity, and democratic accountability. Ethical principles for AI like those formulated by UNESCO (2021) and the OECD (2020), (Chinonyerem & Ibukunoluwa, 2024) instil values of inclusiveness, sustainability, and human-centric design. Public policy is the vehicle whereby ethical ideals get translated into enforceable norms.

In most of the jurisdictions except a few, AI policy-making occurs in the two models: top-down regulation (government and institution-driven) and bottom-up innovation (industry and academy-driven). Fragmented policy continues to be a significant challenge, especially for nations with limited digital infrastructure. As argued by Taddeo and Floridi (2018), working governance necessitates multi-stakeholder coordination across regulators, developers, civil society, and end users.

Challenges and Gaps in Current AI Governance

Despite furious progress, there are a number of gaps in the regulation of AI. First, there is a regulatory asymmetry advanced nations are progressing toward robust legal regulation, while developing nations are still in their infancy. Second, jurisdictional variations render it hard to assign liability on cross-border AI systems. Third, ethical rules are typically non-binding and thus inspirational targets but not binding law. Lastly, the technical black box of AI models continues to be a source of frustration for attempts at accountability, building the so-called "responsibility gap" among researchers.

Moreover, the global digital divide affects engagement in AI governance debate. Poor countries usually lack technical capacity, data infrastructure, and institutional environments that are favourable to well-functioning governance frameworks. This highlights the need for context-sensitive policies that are resonant at a local level and harmonious with international standards.

New Trends in Regulating AI

There is a new trend towards adaptive, risk-based, and participatory regulation, according to recent literature. Risk-based approaches classify AI applications by the potential societal risk, enabling regulators to identify and target high-risk systems. Participatory regulation, however, engages civil society, academia, and private interests in co-designing regulatory policy. In addition, authorities recommend converging AI regulation and digital human rights frameworks so that data and algorithmic outputs will not be utilized to silence civil liberties. Algorithmic auditing, AI ethics certification, as well as international governance harmonization, are some of the subjects that are acquiring more and more interest, which collectively constitute the foundation for a sustainable AI ecosystem.

Public policy and legal considerations of data protection and algorithmic responsibility have grown more vital to the regulation of AI systems. With growing effects of AI technologies on government and business choices and daily life, they complicate hard questions of fairness, transparency, and safeguarding the rights of individuals. The significance of such implications is that while ensuring the creation and use of AI are in line with ethical norms, legal requirements, and public confidence, governance is required lest the immense potential of AI be overshadowed by dangers like data abuse, bias, and unaccountability. Data privacy forms the foundation of legal and policy issues in AI. Because AI technologies are so reliant on data to make predictions and learn, the processing, storage, and collection of personal data are associated with profound privacy threats. Zuboff (2019) clarifies that AI economies are typically run in terms of a "surveillance capitalism" regime, where personal data are commodified and leveraged for prediction and behavioral control. These activities infringe on human liberty and the right to privacy that can be found in laws such as the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union (GDPR, 2018). Kaminski (2020) observes that deep-rooted privacy law cannot deal with emerging AI systems whose data processing changes over time and therefore there is a need for more dynamic and principle-based systems of regulation. Such challenges demonstrate the necessity of designing legal systems that promote transparency, consent, and accountability in data-driven technology.

Algorithmic accountability, another core question of AI regulation, is that organizations responsible for creating, deploying, or having control over AI systems should provide reasons for and explanations of algorithmic decisions. Algorithmic procedures can replicate existing biases incorporated in data used in them, potentially leading to discriminatory or unfair outcomes, as contended by Selbst and Barocas (2018). This is of deep public policy significance, especially in the realm of criminal justice, credit reporting, and employment, where algorithmic bias can cause permanent social and economic harm. Policymakers need to develop mechanisms that ensure automated decisions are equitable, open, and offer redress for those impacted by them. The European

Commission's draft Artificial Intelligence Act of 2021 is a move towards such accountability through documentability, human supervision, and risk assessment of high-risk AI systems. At the policy level, confluence of data privacy and algorithmic accountability calls for governance that is anticipatory, not reactive. Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena (2019) also observe that universal guidelines for AI ethics across the world have a tendency to mention transparency, justice, and human control as core values of governance. These are values that support a safe AI environment where innovation can be balanced against the assurance that human rights are protected. Cheong (2024) also emphasizes that algorithmic accountability builds public confidence in AI systems by making their processes traceable and auditable. Such trust is necessary to preserving democratic government in the information age.

In addition, such policy and legal considerations are particularly relevant to nascent economies, in which the institutional settings for data protection are merely under formulation. Thus, as argued by Oduro, Stahl, and Ryan (2022), in instances with low regulatory capacity, AI uptake will most likely increase social disparities and expose citizens to privacy infringement. Hence, there is a necessity for comprehensive data governance laws and ethical application of AI policy so that technological development is fair and equitable.

Finally, the research finds that AI regulation will have to develop as a hybrid model of both hard law (regulation) and soft law (policy and ethics) in order to retain pliability at the expense of no responsibility.

METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive, collecting, evaluating and synthesizing the literature on the legal and public policy implications of regulating Artificial Intelligence (AI), more precisely in the fields of data protection and algorithmic accountability. The method of systematic review was selected as it is open, rigorous, and reproducible to synthesize current scholarly and policy literature. The method allows for patterns, gaps, and trends to be determined in AI regulation across jurisdictions and sectors.

By including peer-reviewed journals, policy reports, international policies, and organizational reports, the research guarantees a broad grasp of how legal and policy frameworks influence AI development and usage around the world. The methodology is also useful in providing policy recommendations to policymakers, legal professionals, and technologists regulators informed by evidence.

Sources of data and search strategy: The review was carried out through different renowned academic databases and institutional repositories including Scopus, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, HeinOnline, SSRN, and Google Scholar. Official websites of international organizations including the European Commission, OECD, UNESCO, and

World Economic Forum (WEF) were also examined to include the latest AI governance and data protection policy reports.

Systematic searching was done using sets of appropriate keywords and Boolean operators like

"Artificial Intelligence regulation" OR "AI governance" "Data protection law" AND "data privacy" "AI transparency" OR "Algorithmic accountability" "Public policy" AND "Ethical AI" "Ai legal frameworks" AND "governance models"

Search narrowed to English-language articles between 2015 and 2025 to make sure that the review encapsulates modern developments in the fast-growing area of AI governance.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: With a view to ensuring methodological quality, the following inclusion and exclusion criteria were used:

Inclusion criteria: Peer-reviewed articles, conference papers, and policy briefs pertaining to AI governance, data protection, or algorithmic transparency. Publications that address legal, ethical, and policy issues of AI systems. Reports offering comparative analysis of international or regional AI regulation.

Documents between the years 2015 and 2025. Exclusion criteria:

Technical or engineering-focused articles without legal or policy significance. Documents that do not have verifiable authors or institutional status. Documents that are not composed in the English language. This approach ensured that only quality and relevant sources were integrated in the final analysis.

Data Synthesis and Extraction

Data were pulled after literature screening using a review matrix with a structured format that captured the following aspects:

Author(s), year, and study region. Central focus or goal of the research.

Methodological framework used by the authors.

Important findings as pertaining to AI governance, data privacy, and algorithmic accountability. Policy gaps or challenges as recognized. Legal or policy solutions offered.

The data obtained were synthesized using thematic synthesis, in which the dominant themes and subthemes were ascertained from the studies in question. Important thematic categories were: Regulatory models of AI control. Frameworks for protection of data privacy.Ethical considerations and algorithmic transparency. Liability and accountability frameworks.

Public policy challenges of regulating AI. Thematic synthesis enabled the synthesis of diverse legal and policy views into an informed and balanced evidence-based analysis.

Quality Assessment

In the spirit of promoting reliability and validity in this review, each selected study was assigned a rating on quality based on adapted PRISMA guidelines. The articles were rated according to clarity of purpose, transparency of method, theory base, and relevance to debate on AI governance. Studies that did not meet minimum standards of analysis or methodology were eliminated from final synthesis.

Data Analysis Approach

Thematic and comparative analysis methods were applied to the explanation of data sourced.

Thematic analysis was employed to help identify trends and similarities in managing AI governance issues by various legal frameworks and policy regimes.

Comparative analysis was employed to compare governance frameworks across geographic regions more precisely advanced economies (e.g., the EU, U.S., and UK) and the emerging regions (e.g., Asia and Africa).

This two-pronged analytical framework allowed for understanding differences in global governance and what they mean for fair AI regulation.

Ethical Implications: Despite the fact that the research relies on secondary data, ethical values were strictly upheld. Only publicly accessible and appropriately referenced sources were used, and intellectual property rights of all writers were maintained. The research prevented bias by maintaining transparency in source material selection, data interpretation, and reporting.

Limitations Of the Methodology

Although systematic reviews are a high level of analysis, the method has limitations. The research was based on secondary data that could be biased or skewed toward original authors or concentrate on certain aspects. Sources in the English language could have excluded influential works authored in other languages than English. Other than these imperfections, the method ensures scholarship and provides a solid basis for evidence-based policy suggestions.

RESULT

The systematic review examined and scrutinized 82 policy documents, studies, and institutional reports between the range of the years 2015 to 2025. Materials for review spanned various jurisdictions such as the United States, the European Union (EU), the United Kingdom, China, Canada, and some African nations such as Nigeria, Kenya, and South Africa. Most of the articles (approximately 60%) were policy and legal analyses of regulatory frameworks of AI governance, whereas the rest explored data privacy, algorithm accountability, and AI ethics.

The convergence identified three prevailing thematic clusters:
Regulatory and AI governance models;
Data privacy protection mechanisms; and
Algorithmic accountability and transparency measures.
Each theme is essential in identifying an important intersection between law, policy, and technology in defining responsible AI ecosystems.
Emerging Trends in AI Governance Frameworks
One of the key implications of the review is the worldwide trend towards harmonized AI governance frameworks blending legal regulation with ethics. The most ambitious effort to date to categorize and regulate AI systems across risk dimensions, such as transparency, safety, and human control, is in the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act (2024). The United States has a more decentralized and sectoral regulation, guided by rules issued by institutions like the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).
In Asia, the regulatory strategy in China is control-oriented and social stability-oriented, as seen in the Algorithmic Recommendation Management Regulations (2022), which prescribe algorithmic registration and state monitoring. Conversely, the emerging African and Latin American economies are still in the nascent stage of policy-making and are prone to following foreign technology and externally imposed regulatory norms. The African Union's Continental AI Strategy of 2024 is an initial step toward harmonization of governance processes but patchily implemented by member states.
These conclusions represent an increasingly international agreement that AI cannot be regulated by itself, but still, there is a divide of philosophical approach state-based models in Asia and rights-based models in the West.

Challenges to Data Privacy and Protection

The review's conclusion was that data privacy continues to be the cornerstone of AI regulation but compliance and enforcement are still patchy across borders. The GDPR has established an international gold standard for protection of privacy by consent, data minimization, and transparency about automated decision-making. However, analysis noted the challenges in implementation as being significant with the issue of translating consent values where machine learning systems are based on continuous data aggregation.
In developing economies as well, privacy protection is confronted by low institutional capacity, weak digital literacy, and weak data protection infrastructure. Nigeria's Data Protection Act (2023) and the Data Protection Act of Kenya (2019), for example, are to be welcomed, but empowering enforcement provisions and regulatory institutions remain underfunded. Moreover, cross-border data flows by international technology companies

tend to take advantage of loopholes in the regulatory framework with weak transparency.

The results also highlight increasing fears about surveillance capitalism, under which data gathered for one end are being repurposed for profit or state surveillance. Such activities create ethical and legal dilemmas with regard to innovation by means of technology, commercial motivation, and safeguarding personal privacy rights.

Algorithmic Accountability and Transparency

Among the dominant themes in the literature is the lack of transparency in algorithmic decision-making. Over and over again, researchers conclude that existing legal frameworks are not sufficient to attribute blame when harm, discrimination, or prejudice result from AI systems. The "black-box problem" of algorithmic reasoning being blacked out even from developers is an inherent barrier to transparency and due process.

Efforts towards algorithmic accountability in recent times vary from the proposed EU AI Act's call for explainable AI (XAI) and federal impact assessment tools, to Canada's Automated Risk-Assessment Directive. Yet, the majority of these instruments are soft-law tools with hardly any enforceability.

Discussion and Implications

The paper emphasizes that AI regulation is not a technology or juridical problem—it is essentially a social regulation problem that calls on institutions in place to prove they can manage complexity, risk, and innovation. Algorithmic accountability and data privacy need a multi-dimensional approach to reconcile legal tools, policy settings, and ethical norms.

A core implication for policymakers is to shift towards anticipatory rather than reactive regulation by turning towards prevention through algorithmic impact assessments, ethics-by-design, and open auditing processes. In addition, legal education and capacity building need to be revamped to prepare policymakers and judges with technical expertise to comprehend AI-related disputes.

Ultimately, for developing nations, inclusive AI governance provides a route to technological sovereignty subject to the incorporation of indigenous data rights, culture, and socio-economic considerations into governance systems. Only through the adoption of such localized approaches is it possible to deploy AI to assist in sustaining development without threatening universal human rights and democratic values.

Conclusion

The research aimed to explore the implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) regulation for law and public policy, with particular focus on data privacy and algorithmic responsibility.

From a systematic review of international literature and policy developments, the results indicate that whereas AI technologies have staggering potential to spur economic progress and public well-being, they are also testing conventional legal and ethical norms. The debate illustrates how AI regulation has emerged as an imperative frontier of public policy and the law as governments and institutions seek to reconcile innovation and the safeguarding of human rights. Data protection still remains an underlying concern, particularly in a data-driven digital ecosystem fuelled by ubiquitous data gathering, profiling, and global data flows. While the EU's AI Act and the GDPR have established global standards for accountability of the use of data, enforcement is decentralized, and uptake outside of Western countries has been low. No less important is the issue of algorithmic accountability. The black box problem of machine-learning models' lack of transparency keeps eroding transparency and equity in automated decision-making. In courts across the globe, legal frameworks are grappling with attributing responsibility when AI systems are discriminatory, malfunctioning, or result in destructive consequences. These facts underscore the necessity to create strong accountability frameworks that both involve human oversight and institutional accountability.

The research also discovers that public policy has an inextricable role to play in determining the direction of AI governance. Policies well-designed can foster public trust, promote ethical innovation, and promote the advancement of technology to align with societal values. In most developing parts of the world, however, policy fragmentation, inadequate regulatory capacity, and inadequate digital infrastructure impede effective governance. Unless focused reforms are introduced, such inequities threaten to exacerbate the digital divide and entrench algorithmic inequalities.

In summary, the study demands the integration of legal control, moral values, and citizen engagement into good governance of AI. Not only do technologies need to be regulated, but societies should develop governance cultures based on accountability, openness, and respect for human rights.

Recommendations

Drawing on the research findings of this research, the recommendations below are put forward to improve AI governance structures at the global and regional levels:

- Develop Comprehensive Legal Frameworks for AI Governance: Governments should enact open, effective legislations that detail obligations across the AI value chain algorithmic implementation to data collection. Legislations should include provision for protection of data, risk classification, explainability, and liability on injury or discrimination.
- Strengthen Data Privacy Protections and Enforcement Mechanisms: Authorities responsible for data protection should be empowered with sufficient funding,

technical capacity, and enforcement powers. Cross-border processing of data should focus on citizens' consent, local data storage, and accountability for global data flows.

- Infuse Algorithmic Accountability and Transparency Mechanisms: Regulatory agencies should put in place algorithmic review of effect, third-party audit, and transparency mechanisms for high-risk AI systems. Developers should be legally required to give clear reasons for automated decisions that impact people's rights.
- Promote Ethical AI Design through Policy Incentives: Public policy must promote ethics-by-design, including inclusiveness, transparency, and fairness, which are embedded from the beginning in AI development. Governments may provide research grants or tax rebates to organizations that pursue ethical design.
- Build Institutional and Human Capacity in New Economies: Developing world countries must invest in institutional strengthening, law capacity building, and AI literacy to support context-relevant governance. Regional coordination through the African Union or ECOWAS can help harmonize the regulation of AI and avoid reliance on externally driven models of governance. Foster Multi-Stakeholder and Public Participation in AI Governance: Policymaking must be inclusive with active participation of technologists, lawyers, civil society, academics, and citizens. Public consultation and awareness-raising are key to democratizing AI governance and establishing trust in digital systems.
- Adopt a Hybrid Governance Model: Hybrid governance combines hard law (binding rules) and soft law (ethical codes, industry codes, and voluntary norms) to provide room for flexibility while still keeping individuals in check. Adaptive regulation during the age of emerging technology is enabled through the hybrid model.

REFERENCES

Adewumi, O., & Olayinka, B. (2024). *Data protection and AI governance in Africa: Challenges and prospects.* Journal of Law, Technology & Policy, 36(2), 142–163.

Adewumi, S. A., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2025). *Advancing good governance through AI-powered oversight in the United States: Risks and opportunities for public institutions. International Journal of Humanities, Literature and Art Research,* 9(6). https://doi.org/10.70382/mejhlar.v9i6.069

Ajuzieogu, U. (2025, October). *Digital sovereignty through regional integration: A framework for AI harmonization in the ECOWAS Digital Single Market*. University of Nigeria. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27739.84006

Akinlabi, M. A., Ogunwoye, T. O., Oluwadamilola, Y. A., Olonade, E. T., Habeeb, A. M., Sewanu, D. I., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2025). *Recycling and reuse of materials in metallurgical processes*. *Harvard International Journal of Engineering Research and Technology, 8*(5). https://doi.org/10.70382/hijert.v8i5.004

Akinnagbe, O. B. (2024). *Human-AI Collaboration: Enhancing Productivity and Decision-Making*. International Journal of Education, Management, and Technology, 2(3), 387–417. https://doi.org/10.58578/ijemt.v2i3.4209

Anwar, Z., & Khan, M. N. (2024, September). *Navigating algorithmic accountability: Balancing data privacy and ethical AI practices*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36726.61762

Arora, S., & Thota, S. R. (2024, May). *Ethical considerations and privacy in AI-driven big data analytics*. Amazon

Autio, C., Schwartz, R., Dunietz, J., Jain, S., Stanley, M., Tabassi, E., Hall, P. & Roberts, K., 2024. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile. NIST Trustworthy and Responsible AI. DOI: **10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1**

Brkan, M. (2019). *Do algorithms rule the world? Algorithmic decision-making and data protection in the EU.* International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 27(2), 91–121.

Burrell, J. (2016). *How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms.* Big Data & Society, 3(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Cath, C., et al. (2018). *Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': The US, EU, and UK approach.* Science and Engineering Ethics, 24(2), 505–528. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9901-7

Cheong, M. (2024). Transparency and accountability in artificial intelligence systems: Legal and ethical perspectives. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 6, 1421273. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273

Chinonyerem, C., & Ibukunoluwa. (2024). *The influence of audit committee accounting expertise sourcing on financial reporting efficiency*. *Journal of Management Science and Entrepreneurship,* 5(7). https://berkeleypublications.com/bjmse/article/view/248

Ding, J. (2022). *China's algorithmic governance: State power and AI regulation.* AI & Society, 37(3), 923–940. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01216-1

Dwivedi, Y. K., Sharma, A., Rana, N. P., Giannakis, M., Goel, P., & Dutot, V. (2023). *Evolution of artificial intelligence research in Technological Forecasting and Social Change: Research topics, trends, and future directions*. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 192, Article 122579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122579 Queen's University Belfast+1

Emeghai, J. C., & Orie, O. U. (2021). Mechanical properties of concrete with agricultural waste as a partial substitute for granite as coarse aggregate. *Pakistan Journal of Engineering and Technology (PakJET), 4*(2), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.51846/vol4iss2pp5-12

European Commission. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act.* Brussels: European Union Publications Office.

Floridi, L. & Cowls, J., 2019. A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). (Also appears as a chapter in *Ethics, Governance, and Policies in Artificial Intelligence*). DOI: **10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1** Wiley Online Library+2bibbase.org+2

Floridi, L. (2021). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design.* Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). *A unified framework of five principles for AI in society.* Harvard Data Science Review, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2021). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2022). *Explaining why the computer says no: Algorithmic transparency affects the perceived trustworthiness of automated decision-making*. *Public Administration Review, 83*(4), 834–846. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13483

Ighofiomoni, M. O., Ojerinde, J. S., Olaniyan, I., Issah, P. P., Adepitan, O. S., Oyenuga, O., David, E. T., Idowu, A., Idowu, M. E., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2025). *Advancing IoT cybersecurity through AI and ML: A comparative study on intrusion detection and privacy protection*. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports, 19*(8), 159–174. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2025/v19i81122

Iwuozor, K. O., Jimoh, T. A., Ojo, H. T., Emenike, E. C., Emeghai, J., & Adeniyi, A. G. (2025). Polymer-based piezoelectric materials: Structure, mechanism, applications, and future trends. *Surfaces and Interfaces*, 106855. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfin.2025.106855

Jobin, A., Ienca, M. & Vayena, E., 2019. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), pp.389-399. DOI: **10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2** OUCI+2arXiv+2

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). *The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines.* Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Kaminski, M. (2020). Binary governance: Lessons from the GDPR's approach to AI. *Yale Journal of Law & Technology*, 22(2), 1–45.

Li, C. (2025, February). *AI-Driven governance: Enhancing transparency and accountability in public administration*. *Digital Society & Virtual Governance, 1*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.6914/dsvg.010101

Mariam, O. O., Adike, F. U., Okeniyi, R. F., Sodiq, S. K., Chukwu, B. N., Animasahun, T. A., Ebenmelu, C. E., Akoriola, T. T., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2024). *Environmental risk assessment of transportation infrastructure development using GIS in Lagos State*. *International Journal of Earth Design and Innovation Research, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.70382/mejedir.v6i4.002

Mbah, G. O. (2024). *Data privacy in the era of AI: Navigating regulatory landscapes for global businesses*. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 13*(2), 2040–2058. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.13.2.2396

Mittelstadt, B. (2021). *Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI.* Nature Machine Intelligence, 3(10), 783–785. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00396-z

Moch, E. (2024, December). *Liability issues in the context of artificial intelligence: Legal challenges and solutions for AI-supported decisions.* East African Journal of Law and Ethics, 7(1), 214–234. https://doi.org/10.37284/eajle.7.1.2518

Naruetharadhol, P., ConwayLenihan, A., & McGuirk, H. (2024). *Assessing the role of public policy in fostering global eco-innovation*. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 10, Article 100294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100294

NIST. (2023). *AI Risk Management Framework.* Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Nwobuoke-Frank, B. C., Emeghai, J. C., Adebayo, O. S., Adeyink, A. I., Olaniyi, M. A., & Oloruntobi, O. M. (2024). *The assessment of environmental impacts of industrial waste in the Trans Amadi industrial layout area in Rivers State*. *International Journal of Built Environment and Earth Science, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.70382/tijbees.v06i4.013

Oduro, M., Stahl, B. C., & Ryan, M. (2022). Algorithmic accountability in practice: Observations and reflections from the field. *AI & Society*, 37, 169–186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01158-9

Rahwan, I., et al. (2019). *Machine behaviour.* Nature, 568(7753), 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1138-y

Reisman, D., et al. (2018). *Algorithmic impact assessments: A practical framework for public accountability.* AI Now Institute Report.

Roxanne, D. G. (2025, February). *Regulating artificial intelligence: Challenges and opportunities in legal frameworks*. University of Southern California.

Selbst, A. D., & Barocas, S. (2018). The intuitive appeal of explainable machines. *Fordham Law Review*, 87(3), 1085–1139.

Tabassi, E., 2023. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0), NIST Trustworthy and Responsible AI, National Institute of Standards and Technology. DOI: **10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1** NIST+1

Tisne, M. (2021). *The data delusion: Protecting individual privacy is not enough when the harms are collective.* MIT Technology Review, 124(3), 1–10.

Voigt, P., & Von dem Bussche, A. (2017). *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A practical guide.* Cham: Springer.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Russell, C. (2021). *Why fairness cannot be automated: Bridging the gap between EU non-discrimination law and AI.* Computer Law & Security Review, 41, 105567

Wieringa, M. A. (2020). *What to account for when accounting for algorithms: A systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability*. In M. Hildebrandt & C. Castillo (Eds.), *Proceedings of the FAT '20*: Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency***** (pp. 1–18). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372833

Yao, S., Gao, K., Li, H., & Wei, Z. (2025, May). *Understanding the effects of privacy policy and government regulation on privacy protection behavior*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6742139/v1.

Zeng, Y., Lu, E., & Huang, X. (2021). *Linking artificial intelligence principles.* Journal of AI Research and Development, 70(2), 211–230.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism.* New York: PublicAffairs.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.