

LEGAL PERSPECTIVES ON STUDENT REPROGRAPHIC PRACTICES AND COPYRIGHT COMPLIANCE IN MALAYSIAN SCHOOLS

Umi Hasheida Hussain*

Zinatul Ashiqin Zainol**

Safinaz Mohd Hussein***

ABSTRACT

The lack of access to quality educational resources and the financial burden of reproducing materials pose significant challenges for Malaysian students and educators. These issues are compounded by limited copyright literacy, resulting in widespread reliance on reprographic practices that raise concerns about compliance and the sustainability of the publishing industry. Legally, these practices sit within Malaysia's hybrid fair dealing/fair use framework under the Copyright Act 1987, which since 2012 requires the weighing of four fairness factors when assessing fair dealing (s.13(2A)), alongside specific allowances for research, private study, criticism and review, and reporting current events (s.13(2)(a)-(b)). Institutional licensing via a recognised Reproduction Rights Organisation (RRO) supports lawful classroom copying within agreed limits. As highlighted during WIPO's 45th Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR) in April 2024, limitations and exceptions are vital to support education, research and access to knowledge globally. This article interrogates how Malaysia's domestic law aligns with those objectives through an

*PhD Candidate, Faculty of Law, National University of Malaysia. 43600, UKM Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. Email: p117174@siswa.ukm.edu.my (Corresponding Author)

**Professor, Faculty of Law, National University of Malaysia. 43600, UKM Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. Email: shiqin@ukm.edu.my

***Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, National University of Malaysia. 43600, UKM Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. Email: finaz@ukm.edu.my

[Received: 03 March 2025, Accepted: 16 November 2025, Published: 30 November 2025]



empirical study of students' access to resources, copying behaviours and copyright awareness. The findings emphasise the need to (i) clarify the contours of educational fair dealing, (ii) expand affordable licensing schemes for schools and (iii) strengthen copyright literacy, thereby ensuring equitable access while respecting intellectual property. Policy-relevant recommendations are offered for lawmakers, education authorities and rights-holders.

Keywords: Copyright Law, Balance of Interest, Reprographic Rights, Fair Dealing, Reprographic Rights Organisations (RROs).

PERSPEKTIF UNDANG-UNDANG TERHADAP AMALAN REPROGRAFI PELAJAR DAN PEMATUHAN HAK CIPTA DI SEKOLAH-SEKOLAH MALAYSIA

ABSTRAK

Kekurangan akses kepada sumber pendidikan yang berkualiti dan beban kewangan untuk menghasilkan semula bahan menimbulkan cabaran besar kepada pelajar dan pendidik Malaysia. Isu-isu ini ditambah lagi dengan kesedaran hak cipta yang terhad, kesedaran tentang undang-undang harta intelek, mengakibatkan kebergantungan yang meluas pada amalan reprografi yang menimbulkan kebimbangan tentang pematuhan hak cipta dan kemampuan industri penerbitan. Dari segi undang-undang, amalan ini berada dalam rangka kerja urusan wajar/penggunaan wajar Malaysia di bawah Akta Hak Cipta 1987, yang sejak 2012 memerlukan penimbangan empat faktor keadilan apabila menilai urusan wajar (s.13(2A)), bersama-sama elauan khusus untuk penyelidikan, kajian persendirian, kritikan dan semakan, dan melaporkan peristiwa semasa (s.13(2)(a)(2)(a)). Pelesenan institusi melalui Organisasi Hak Reprografik (RRO) yang diiktiraf menyokong penyalinan bilik darjah yang sah dalam had yang dipersetujui. Seperti yang ditekankan semasa Jawatankuasa Tetap Hak Cipta dan Hak Berkaitan (SCCR) ke-45 WIPO pada April 2024, penghadan dan pengecualian adalah penting untuk menyokong pendidikan, penyelidikan dan akses kepada pengetahuan secara global. Artikel ini menyoal siasat cara undang-undang domestik Malaysia sejajar dengan objektif tersebut melalui kajian empirikal tentang akses pelajar kepada sumber, tingkah laku penyalinan dan kesedaran hak cipta. Penemuan ini menekankan keperluan untuk (i) menjelaskan batas penggunaan wajar bagi tujuan pendidikan, (ii) memperluaskan skim pelesenan yang mampu milik untuk sekolah, dan (iii) memperkukuhkan literasi hak cipta, sekali gus memastikan akses yang wajar dengan menghormati hak harta intelek. Cadangan dasar yang

relevan dikemukakan untuk penggubal undang-undang, pihak berkuasa pendidikan dan pemegang hak.

Kata Kunci: Undang-Undang Hak Cipta, Keseimbangan Kepentingan, Hak Reprografi, Penggunaan Adil, Organisasi Hak Reprografi (RROs).

INTRODUCTION

Access to educational resources is fundamental to academic success and equitable learning opportunities.¹ However, this access is often influenced by socioeconomic and geographical disparities, with students in urban areas generally having more resources at their disposal than their rural counterparts.² Such inequities are not just logistical challenges but raise broader questions about fairness in education and the responsibilities of institutions to provide adequate learning materials.³ In this context, copyright laws and reprographic rights play a crucial role in shaping how educational content is distributed and reproduced.⁴ At WIPO's 45th Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR) in April 2024, Member States reiterated the importance of clear, well-calibrated limitations and exceptions (L&E) for education and research including in digital and cross-border contexts while recognising the complementary role of licensing to sustain creation and access.⁵

¹Maria Wanti, Robbert Wesselink, Harm Biemans, and Perry den Brok, "Determining Factors of Access and Equity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review," *Equity in Education & Society* 1, no. 2 (2022): 279–96, <https://doi.org/10.1177/27526461221092429>

²Todd H. Sundeen and Dee M. Sundeen, "Instructional Technology for Rural Schools: Access and Acquisition," in *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2 (2013), 8, SAGE Publishing.

³Charles W. Fluharty and Brett Scaggs, "The Rural Differential: Bridging the Resource Gap," in *New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 137 (2007), 19, Wiley.

⁴William McGeeveran and William W. Fisher, *The Digital Learning Challenge: Obstacles to Educational Uses of Copyrighted Material in the Digital Age*, *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2006), RELX Group (Netherlands).

⁵World Intellectual Property Organization, "SCCR/45: Summary by the Chair," Geneva, 19 April 2024.

Copyright laws are legal frameworks established to protect the intellectual property of authors, publishers, and other content creators.⁶ These laws grant creators exclusive rights over their work, including the right to reproduce, distribute, and display it.⁷ Copyright protection is essential for ensuring that creators receive fair compensation for their intellectual contributions, which incentivises the continued production of educational content.⁸ However, copyright laws also include limitations and exceptions, such as "fair use" or "fair dealing" provisions, which permit limited copying of copyrighted material for purposes like teaching, research, and private study.⁹ The scope of these exceptions varies by country and is subject to strict guidelines, creating potential legal and ethical dilemmas in educational settings.¹⁰

Within this legal framework, reprographic rights refer specifically to the right to reproduce copyrighted material through means like photocopying, scanning, and digital copying.¹¹ These rights are managed by reprographic rights organisations (RROs), which license the reproduction of works and distribute royalties to content owners.¹² Educational institutions often purchase licenses from RROs

⁶Bill Anderson, "A Primer on Copyright Law and the DMCA," in *The Reference Librarian*, vol. 45, no. 93 (2006), 59, Taylor & Francis.

⁷Simone Schroff, "The Purpose of Copyright—Moving Beyond the Theory," *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice* 16, no. 11 (2021): 1262–72, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpab130>

⁸William McGeveran and William W. Fisher, *The Digital Learning Challenge: Obstacles to Educational Uses of Copyrighted Material in the Digital Age*, *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2006).

⁹Pennsylvania State University, *Policy Governing Copyright Clearance (IP05)*, University Policy Manual, 2013, <https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ip05>

¹⁰Tova Fineberg, "Copyright and Course Management Systems: Educational Use of Copyrighted Materials in the United States and the United Kingdom," in *Libri*, vol. 59, no. 4 (2009), De Gruyter.

¹¹Abubakar S. Sambo, Aondover O. Ahutu, and Nafisat Rabiu, "A Study of Photocopying Practice and Copyright Law in Nigeria Libraries: Librarians' Perspectives," [*Journal/Publisher not provided*] 1, no. 1 (2016): 35.

¹²Kwasi Agyen-Gyasi, "An Evaluation of the Reprographic Services at the KNUST Library, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana," *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve* 19, no. 1 (2008): 7, Taylor & Francis.

to legally reproduce educational materials.¹³ However, the extent of permitted copying remains limited, and students who exceed these limits may unknowingly infringe on copyright laws, raising complex questions about how to balance the rights of content owners with the practical needs of students.¹⁴

These legal and ethical challenges are particularly pronounced in environments where access to educational resources is inconsistent.¹⁵ In many schools, especially in rural areas or underfunded institutions, students often face a shortage of textbooks and other learning materials.¹⁶ To overcome these barriers, students and educators frequently engage in reprographic practices, such as photocopying chapters of books, modules or scanning articles.¹⁷ Although these practices are sometimes necessary to ensure students have the resources they need, they can infringe on the copyright protections that support content creators.¹⁸

Compounding the issue is the low level of awareness among students regarding copyright laws and reprographic rights.¹⁹ Many students are unaware of what constitutes permissible copying, and even fewer understand the legal and ethical implications of exceeding those limits.²⁰ This lack of awareness not only exposes students and institutions to potential legal risks but also highlights the need for

¹³International Publishers Association, "Reproduction Rights Organisations (RROs)," accessed January 17, 2025, <https://www.internationalpublishers.org/our-industry-menu/rros>

¹⁴McGeveran and Fisher, *Digital Learning Challenge*.

¹⁵M. Susan McIsaac and Jim Rowe, "Ownership and Access: Copyright and Intellectual Property in the On-Line Environment," *New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 99 (1997): 83–92.

¹⁶Sundeen and Sundeen, "Instructional Technology for Rural Schools," 8.

¹⁷Sambo, Ahutu, and Rabi, "Photocopying Practice and Copyright Law," 35.

¹⁸Jane Secker and Chris Morrison, "Digitizing Text-Based Content for Delivery in a VLE," in *Facet eBooks* (2018), 47.

¹⁹Hung-Jen Wu, Chih-Ming Chou, Hung-Jen Ke, and Mei-Hwa Wang, "College Students' Misunderstandings About Copyright Laws for Digital Library Resources," *The Electronic Library* 28, no. 2 (2010): 197, Emerald Publishing.

²⁰Erin J. Kelly, "Rights Instruction for Undergraduate Students: Needs, Trends, and Resources," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 25, no. 1 (2017): 1, Taylor & Francis.

education on responsible content use and copyright compliance.²¹

Despite these challenges, the rights of content owners must also be respected. Publishers and authors argue that unregulated reproduction of their work undermines their financial and creative investments, impacting their ability to produce high-quality educational content.²² Thus, a delicate balance must be struck: one that protects intellectual property rights while ensuring students have the resources necessary for academic success.²³

This study aims to explore the complex interplay between students' perceptions of resource adequacy, their reprographic practices, and their awareness of copyright laws. Specifically, it addresses three main research questions:

- 1) How do students perceive the sufficiency of educational resources provided by their schools, and how does this influence their reliance on reprographic practices?
- 2) What is the level of awareness and understanding of copyright laws and reprographic rights among students, and how does this affect their copying behaviours?
- 3) What are the broader implications of these findings for balancing the interests of content owners with the educational needs of students, and what policy recommendations can be made?

By investigating these questions, the study seeks to inform policies and educational strategies that promote both equitable resource access and respect for copyright laws. Ultimately, this research contributes to the broader discourse on how educational institutions can

²¹Thomas H. P. Gould, Tomas A. Lipinski, and Elizabeth Buchanan, "Copyright Policies and the Deciphering of Fair Use in the Creation of Reserves at University Libraries," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, no. 3 (2005): 182, Elsevier.

²²Ann Okerson and Steve Sully, "The Digital Dilemma: Intellectual Property in the Information Age," *Choice Reviews Online* 38, no. 2 (2000): 38, Association of College and Research Libraries.

²³Victoria Longfield, "What Copyright? Whose Intellectual Property?: College Student Intellectual Property Rights and Anti-Plagiarism Software," *Journal of Information Policy* 12 (2022): 73, <https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.12.2022.0002>

navigate the complexities of reprographic rights in a way that benefits both content users and content creators.

Reprographic rights are a subset of copyright law designed to regulate the reproduction of copyrighted works through methods like photocopying and scanning.²⁴ These rights are vital in balancing the interests of content owners ensuring they receive fair compensation and users, particularly in educational contexts.²⁵ Legal frameworks like the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the TRIPS Agreement provide the foundation for reprographic rights on a global scale.²⁶ They establish minimum standards for copyright protection, including provisions for fair use or fair dealing in education.²⁷ Despite these allowances, disputes often arise over the extent to which copying should be permissible in academic environments without infringing on copyright.²⁸

Globally, reprographic rights are managed through RROs which license institutions for copying activities and distribute royalties to content creators.²⁹ In different regions, copyright laws address educational needs through various frameworks, balancing the rights of creators with access for learning. In the United States, fair use provisions permit limited copying for educational purposes, though the extent is determined by case law interpretations.³⁰ Similarly, the

²⁴Columbia University Libraries, *Understanding Reprographic Rights*, Copyright Advisory Services, 2023, <https://copyright.columbia.edu/>, accessed January 17, 2025.

²⁵Viktoriiia Filinovych, "Violation of Copyright and Related Rights on the Internet: How to Protect Yourself and Your Creation," *Scientific Works of National Aviation University. Series: Law Journal 'Air and Space Law'* 4, no. 61 (2021): 144–50.

²⁶International Publishers Association. *Our Industry: Reproduction Rights Organisations (RROs)*. 2023. <https://www.internationalpublishers.org/our-industry-menu/rros>. Accessed January 18, 2025.

²⁷Creative Commons. Global Aspects of Copyright. Certificate Curriculum, 2018.<https://certificates.creativecommons.org/cccertedu/chapter/2-2-global-aspects-of-copyright/>. Accessed January 18, 2025.

²⁸*York University v Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency ("Access Copyright")*, 2021 SCC 32 (CanLII).

²⁹International Publishers Association, Reproduction Rights Organisations.

³⁰University of Chicago Libraries, "Fair Use and Other Educational Uses," *Copyright Information Center*, accessed January 17, 2025, <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/copyrightinfo/fairuse.html>.

European Union's Information Society Directive establishes copyright regulations that allow for educational exceptions while ensuring fair compensation for rightsholders.³¹ Australia adopts a statutory licensing system, enabling educational institutions to copy and share content within predefined limits, ensuring fair remuneration for rightsholders.³²

In Malaysia, reprographic rights are regulated under the Copyright Act 1987, as most recently amended by the Copyright (Amendment) Act 2022, which strengthened enforcement measures, recognised digital licensing frameworks and clarified exceptions relevant to education and research. The Act also incorporates international principles established by the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.³³ Specifically, the Act provides for educational reproduction within its fair dealing provision, allowing limited copying for research, private study, and instructional purposes.³⁴ Given the absence of a Malaysian appellate authority directly addressing course-pack photocopying, this article relies on persuasive Commonwealth guidance, notably *Alberta (Education) v. Access Copyright*³⁵ and *CCH v. Law Society*,³⁶ which define the fairness factors commonly applied to educational contexts. Comparatively, in Singapore, the courts in *Asia Pacific Publishing Pte Ltd v. Pioneers & Leaders (Publishers) Pte Ltd*³⁷ and *Global Yellow*

³¹Martin Senftleben, "Comparative Approaches to Fair Use: An Important Impulse for Reforms in EU Copyright Law," in *Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks* (2013), Edward Elgar Publishing.

³²Australian Law Reform Commission, Fair Remuneration for Rightsholders, 2013, <https://www.alrc.gov.au/publication/copyright-and-the-digital-economy-dp-79/6-statutory-licences/fair-remuneration-for-rights-holders/>.

³³World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), Guide to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Geneva: WIPO, 2012).

³⁴Ida Madiha Abdul Ghani Azmi, *Copyright Law in Malaysia: Cases and Commentary* (Kuala Lumpur: Sweet & Maxwell, 2018)

³⁵Alberta (Education) v. Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency (Access Copyright), 2012 SCC 37 (Supreme Court of Canada), <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/9997/index.do>

³⁶CCH Canadian Ltd. v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2004 SCC 13, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 339, <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2125/index.do>

³⁷Asia Pacific Publishing Pte Ltd v. Pioneers & Leaders (Publishers) Pte Ltd [2011] SGCA 37, https://www.elitigation.sg/gdviewer/s/2011_SGCA_37

*Pages Ltd v. Promedia Directories Pte Ltd*³⁸ have refined the test of originality and fair use in compilations and educational materials. Collectively, these cases inform Malaysia's hybrid fair dealing interpretation under s.13(2A) of the Copyright Act 1987 and demonstrate its alignment with international norms.

However, compliance remains a persistent issue, particularly in schools, where resource constraints often lead educators and students to depend heavily on photocopying, occasionally exceeding permitted limits.³⁹ In Malaysia, the management of reprographic rights licensing is entrusted to the Malaysia Reprographic Rights Centre (MARC), a collective management organisation responsible for licensing reprographic rights and ensuring compliance.⁴⁰

A combination of resource access, awareness of copyright laws, and perceived necessity often shapes student's reprographic practices,⁴¹ with many students forgoing required materials because of cost and resorting to coping strategies such as borrowing, sharing or scanning,⁴² while uneven copyright literacy blurs the boundaries of lawful educational copying⁴³, and the adoption of open educational resources (OER) alleviates access pressures while maintaining or improving academic outcomes.⁴⁴ The Theory of Planned Behaviour

³⁸Global Yellow Pages Ltd v. Promedia Directories Pte Ltd [2017] SGCA 28, https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2017_SGCA_28

³⁹Yasmeen Rumi and Graham, "Recalibrating Some Copyright Conceptions: Toward a Shared and Balanced Approach to Educational Copying," *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research* 9, no. 2 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v9i2.3127>

⁴⁰Malaysia Reprographic Rights Centre, *About MARC*, accessed August 16, 2025, <https://mymarc.org/about-marc>.

⁴¹Craig B. Little and Fred S. Halley, "Photocopying and the New Copyright Law," *Teaching Sociology* 7, no. 4 (1979): 417–36.

⁴²Florida Virtual Campus, 2022 Student Textbook and Instructional Materials Survey: Results & Findings (Tallahassee, 2023), evidence of students skipping purchases and using cost-mitigation strategies.

⁴³Md. Rahman, "Social Media-Based Copyright Awareness and Knowledge-Sharing among University Students," *Information Services & Use* (2024), showing uneven student copyright awareness.

⁴⁴K. W. Cho and V. Perzmadian, "The Impact of Open Educational Resources on Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis," *International Journal of Educational Research* 126 (2024): 102365.

(TPB) provides a strong framework for understanding copyright compliance among students.⁴⁵ According to TPB, individuals' intentions to perform a specific behaviour are influenced by their attitudes, perceived social norms, and perceived behavioural control.⁴⁶ In the context of reprographic practices, students may view photocopying as a necessary solution due to resource limitations, reflecting a positive attitude toward the behaviour.⁴⁷

Furthermore, subjective norms, such as observing peers and institutional practices that normalise copying can reinforce the perception that such practices are acceptable.⁴⁸ However, perceived behavioural control, or the belief in one's ability to access legal alternatives, often acts as a critical determinant of compliance.⁴⁹ For example, if students feel that accessing legal resources is challenging or costly, their likelihood of complying with copyright laws diminishes.⁵⁰ Interventions that address these factors, such as improving access to affordable resources and fostering social norms that respect intellectual property, can significantly enhance compliance.⁵¹

Another pertinent framework is the digital commons concept, which explores the balance between protecting intellectual property

⁴⁵Carolyn Yoon, "Theory of Planned Behavior and Ethics Theory in Digital Piracy: An Integrated Model," *Journal of Business Ethics* 100 (2011): 405–17.

⁴⁶Dario, Miočević. (2022). Consumers' responses to opposing copyright enforcement regimes: When cognitive appraisal leads to compliance vs reactance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2022.107380

⁴⁷Lynette Theresa, Thompson Adu, and Andries van der Walt, "Copyright Law and Academic Libraries: From Theory to Practice," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 22, no. 7 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2022.0029>

⁴⁸Schultz, *Copynorms*.

⁴⁹Licht, Amir N. "Social Norms and the Law: Why Peoples Obey the Law" *Review of Law & Economics*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2008, pp. 715-750.

⁵⁰EUIPO, *Intellectual Property and Youth Scoreboard 2022* (qualitative analysis): price and availability remain the main factors for digital piracy; social and peer influence is also increasingly important.

⁵¹EUIPO, *European Citizens and Intellectual Property: Perception, Awareness and Behaviour* (2023). Highlights the role of awareness and attitudes in respecting IP and the need to strengthen pro-compliance social norms

rights and promoting the free flow of information in the digital age.⁵² This theory advocates for the creation of shared digital spaces where information and creative works can be accessed and utilised legally, thereby reducing the incentive for copyright infringement. It suggests that by expanding legal access to digital resources, compliance can be improved without stifling creativity and innovation.⁵³ This theory emphasises the importance of accessible educational resources to mitigate financial burdens on families, particularly those from low-income backgrounds.⁵⁴

These emerging theories underscore the evolving nature of copyright compliance in the digital era.⁵⁵ They highlight the need for interdisciplinary approaches that integrate technological innovation with legal and ethical considerations to effectively address the challenges posed by new forms of content creation and distribution.⁵⁶

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to investigate students' perceptions and practices related to reprographic rights. The design is suitable for estimating prevalence (e.g., copying frequency), describing associations among legal awareness, access constraint and behaviour and comparing patterns across school contexts (urban vs. rural). Guided by the Theory of Planned Behaviour

⁵²Janis Wong, Tristan Henderson, and Kirstie Ball, "Data Protection for the Common Good: Developing a Framework for a Data Protection-Focused Data Commons," *Data & Policy* 4 (2022): Article e3, <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.40>.

⁵³WIPO, SCCR/45 – Summary by the Chair (April 19, 2024). Reaffirms that well-calibrated limitations and exceptions for education, alongside licensing, support lawful access and a balanced system that promotes creativity.

⁵⁴Syafaruddin, Syafaruddin., Amiruddin, Amiruddin., Andi, Ibbar. (2024). 5. Challenges and Strategies for Effective Resource Utilization in Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities*, doi: 10.59024/ijellacush.v2i2.803

⁵⁵Jane C. Ginsburg, "The Author's Place in the Future of Copyright," *Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts* 39, no. 3 (2016): 329–50.

⁵⁶Alain Strowel and Charlotte Waelde, *Copyright Law: A Handbook for the Digital Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

(TPB), we conceptualise copying behaviour as a function of attitudes (e.g., perceived necessity), subjective norms (peer/teacher practices) and perceived behavioural control (access to lawful alternatives).⁵⁷

Setting and Sampling

The study was conducted in public schools drawn both urban and rural districts. Ten schools (five urban; five rural) were selected in consultation with education officials to reflect variation in resource provision. Within each school, a systematic random sample of students was generated from class lists. In total, 210 students participated (approximately 20-22 per school), providing adequate statistical power for group comparisons and multivariable models at the study's planned effect sizes.⁵⁸

Data Collection

Structured questionnaires were the primary tool for data collection, administered to a sample of 210 students from selected urban and rural schools. The questionnaires were designed to capture quantitative data on:

- **Demographic Information:** Age, gender, school location (urban or rural), and grade level.
- **Reprographic Practices:** Frequency and types of copying activities (e.g., photocopying textbook chapters, downloading materials), sources of reproduced materials, and reasons for engaging in these practices.
- **Awareness of Copyright Laws:** Understanding of reprographic rights, awareness of copyright restrictions, and perceptions of copyright infringement.

The student sample was drawn from multiple grade levels, ensuring a diverse representation of experiences with educational resource access and reprographic behaviour.

⁵⁷Icek Ajzen, "The Theory of Planned Behaviour," *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 50 (1991): 179–211.

⁵⁸Jacob Cohen, *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988).

A systematic random sampling technique was used to select participants from a list of eligible students at each participating school. Each student was assigned a unique identification number, and a Random Sequence Generator was used to select 20 students from each of the 10 urban and rural schools, ensuring an unbiased and representative sample.

The final sample consisted of 210 students, with an even distribution between urban and rural schools. This method of randomisation ensured that the selection process was fair and minimised selection bias.

The student questionnaire consisted of closed-ended questions and Likert-scale items designed to facilitate quantitative analysis. Key areas covered in the questionnaire included:

- **Resource Availability:** Students were asked about the sufficiency of school-provided materials and whether they needed to rely on reproducing content for academic purposes.
- **Reprographic Behaviour:** Questions measured the frequency of copying activities, the types of materials most often reproduced (e.g., worksheets, textbook excerpts), and the typical locations where copying occurred.
- **Copyright Awareness:** Students were asked about their knowledge of copyright laws, their understanding of what constitutes legal and illegal copying, and their views on the importance of respecting copyright.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods with the aid of statistical software such as SPSS. Descriptive statistics, including means, frequencies, and percentages, were calculated to summarise demographic information and highlight key trends in reprographic practices and copyright awareness. Inferential statistical techniques, such as chi-square tests, were employed to explore differences between urban and rural students regarding their reprographic behaviours and levels of awareness about copyright laws.

Ensuring Data Reliability and Validity

To ensure the reliability and validity of the data collected, several measures were implemented. A pilot study involving a small group of five students was conducted to test the clarity and relevance of the questionnaire items. Feedback from this process was used to make necessary adjustments, improving the survey's overall reliability. To establish content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in education and copyright law to ensure it effectively measured the intended constructs. Additionally, a systematic random sampling approach was employed to minimise selection bias and enhance the generalizability of the study findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

Table 1: Demographic profile of student respondents (N=210)

Demographic Profile of Students	n	%
Gender		
Female	102	48.6
Male	108	51.4
School		
Urban	154	73.3
Rural	56	26.7
Form:		
1	33	15.7
2	55	26.2
3	39	18.6
4	47	22.4
5	36	17.1

The demographic profile of the student respondents (N = 210), as presented in Table 1, offers valuable insights into the diversity of the sample population. Gender distribution reveals a slight predominance of male students (51.4%) compared to female students (48.6%),

ensuring that perspectives from both genders are well-represented without significant bias.

In terms of school location, the majority of respondents (73.3%) were from urban schools, while 26.7% were from rural schools. This urban predominance may reflect logistical and population factors, such as the higher density of schools and students in urban areas. However, the inclusion of rural students ensures that the study captures the unique challenges and differences in educational contexts across geographical regions.

The distribution of students across grade levels (Forms) shows notable variation. Students from Form 2 classes represented the largest proportion of the sample (26.2%), followed by Forms 4 (22.4%) and 3 (18.6%). Form 1 and Form 5 students were less represented, accounting for 15.7% and 17.1% of the sample, respectively. This disparity can be attributed to practical considerations during data collection. Form 5 students were likely occupied with their Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) examination, while Form 1 classes are typically focused on transition activities for new secondary school students. As a result, Forms 2, 3, and 4 were prioritised for this study due to their accessibility and alignment with the research objectives. These demographic insights provide a comprehensive understanding of the student sample and its relevance to the study's focus.

Reprographic Practices

Table 2: Reprographic practices and copying behaviour among students (Section B)

Section B: COPY MADE BY STUDENTS	n	%
How would you rate the availability of teaching materials in your school?		
Very Sufficient	22	10.5
Sufficient	74	35.2
Neutral	64	30.5
Insufficient	38	18.1
Very Insufficient	12	5.7
What is the primary source of teaching and student texts in your school?		
Provided by the school	98	46.7
Purchased by students	10	4.8

Both: The school provides some texts, while students purchase others.	102	48.6
Does your school have enough resources to purchase educational materials?		
Yes	198	94.3
No	12	5.7
If yes, how are these supplemental materials provided? (You can select more than one option.)		
Downloadable online resources	22	10.5
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class	23	11.0
Recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase	10	4.8
Workshops (bengkel)	1	0.5
Others:	2	1.0
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class	16	7.6
Downloadable online resources, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase	2	1.0
Downloadable online resources, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	3	1.4
Downloadable online resources, Workshops	4	1.9
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase	12	5.7
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	6	2.9
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Workshops	4	1.9
Recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	2	1.0
Recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Workshops	1	0.5

Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase	5	2.4
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	10	4.8
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Workshops	9	4.3
Downloadable online resources, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	12	5.7
Downloadable online resources, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Workshops	7	3.3
Downloadable online resources, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops	1	0.5
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	9	4.3
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops	4	1.9
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content	6	2.9
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Workshops	4	1.9
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class,	8	3.8

Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops		
Downloadable online resources, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops	6	2.9
Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops	1	0.5
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, recommended list of books or resources for students to purchase, Access to online platforms or databases with educational content, Workshops	7	3.3
Downloadable online resources, Physical handouts or booklets distributed in class, Others	1	0.5
How often do your teachers make copies of learning materials such as worksheets, articles, or study notes?		
Most days	60	28.6
Some days	85	40.5
Rarely	49	23.3
Never	1	0.5
No Answers	15	7.1
Have you, yourself made any copies of materials this term of school?		
Yes	159	75.7
No	51	24.3
I buy original books to make copies for my friends		
Never (0 times)	121	57.6
Rarely (Less than 2 times/day)	83	39.5
Frequently (4 - 5 times/day)	6	2.9
How often do you make copies for yourself?		
Daily	21	10.0
Weekly	56	26.7

Monthly	62	29.5
Rarely	62	29.5
Never	9	4.3
Did you make any copies in the last 7 days?		
Yes	100	47.6
No	110	52.4
<i>If YES go to Q10, If NO go to Q14</i>		
What type of copy did you make in the last 7 days? (You can select more than one option.)		
Photocopy	9	4.3
Printout	17	8.1
Scan	3	1.4
Digital copy from internet	9	4.3
Other	15	7.1
Photocopy, Printout	3	1.4
Photocopy, Digital copy from internet	4	1.9
Photocopy, Other	2	1.0
Printout, Digital copy from internet	9	4.3
Scan, Digital copy from internet	1	0.5
Scan, other	1	0.5
Digital copy from internet, other	3	1.4
Photocopy, Printout, Scan	1	0.5
Photocopy, Printout, Digital copy from internet	8	3.8
Photocopy, Scan, Digital copy from internet	2	1.0
Photocopy, Digital copy from internet, other	2	1.0
Printout, Scan, Digital copy from internet	6	2.9
Printout, Digital copy from internet, other	1	0.5
Photocopy, Printout, Scan, Digital copy from internet	1	0.5
Photocopy, Printout, Digital copy from internet, other	1	0.5
Printout, Scan, Digital copy from internet, other	1	0.5
Photocopy, Printout, Scan, Digital copy from internet, other	1	0.5

What type of materials did you reproduce most in the last 7 days? (You can select more than one option.)		
Worksheet	22	10.5
Text book	21	10.0
Activity Book	3	1.4
Magazine	1	0.5
Other Material, specify	7	3.3
Newspaper, Magazine	1	0.5
Worksheet, Text book	4	1.9
Worksheet, Activity Book	14	6.7
Text book, Activity Book	8	3.8
Newspaper, Worksheet, Text book	1	0.5
Newspaper, Text book, Activity Book	1	0.5
Worksheet, Text book, Activity Book	10	4.8
Newspaper, Worksheet, Text book, Activity Book, Magazine, Other Material; specify:	1	0.5
Worksheet, Activity Book, Other Material; specify:	1	0.5
Worksheet, Other Material; specify:	2	1.0
Text book, Other Material; specify:	1	0.5
Text book, Activity Book, Other Material; specify:	1	0.5
Activity Book, Other Material; specify:	1	0.5
Where did you make the copy? (You can select more than one option.)		
School	44	21.0
Home	22	10.5
Internet Café	2	1.0
Other specify	6	2.9
School, Home	16	7.6
School, Internet Café	3	1.4
School, Other specify	3	1.4
Home, Internet Café	1	0.5
Internet Café, Other specify	2	1.0
School, Internet Café, Other specify	1	0.5

On average, how much do you spend on these items each term?		
RM10 - RM30	62	29.5
RM30 - RM50	20	9.5
RM50 - RM100	8	3.8
Above RM100	10	4.8
If there are insufficient textbooks for everyone in class, what does your teacher usually do?		
My teacher provides photocopies of selected sections or chapters from the textbook	77	36.7
My teacher distributes photocopies of the entire textbook.	24	11.4
My teacher directs us to available online resources or suggests alternative materials.	48	22.9
My teacher uses other methods.	49	23.3
No Answers	12	5.7

Copying Behaviours and Reprographic Practices

The study also highlights the prevalence and frequency of reprographic activities among students, as summarised in Table 2. A substantial 75.7% of respondents engaged in copying practices, employing methods such as photocopying (4.3%), printing (8.1%), and downloading digital copies (4.3%), with physical reproductions dominating. These activities occurred across various intervals, with 10.0% copying daily, 26.7% weekly, and 29.5% monthly. Such frequent engagement underscores the systemic dependency on reprographic activities, driven by resource insufficiencies and the need for immediate access to learning materials. Teachers often facilitate these practices, with 36.7% providing photocopies of selected sections of textbooks and 11.4% distributing entire textbooks. This highlights a collaborative effort between teachers and students to overcome resource shortages, albeit one that risks infringing copyright laws.

The types of materials reproduced further illustrate the centrality of reprographic practices in addressing educational needs. Worksheets (10.5%), textbooks (10.0%), and activity books (6.7%) were the most commonly copied materials, emphasising their essential role in academic success. However, the frequent reproduction of these materials raises questions about the legality of such practices under

copyright laws. As noted by Longfield⁵⁹ systemic inadequacies often compel students and educators to engage in unauthorised copying, blurring the line between necessity and infringement. These findings suggest the need for clearer guidelines and licensing models that balance accessibility with intellectual property protection.

The financial implications of reprographic activities further compound the challenges faced by students. While 29.5% of students spent RM10–RM30 per term on copying, 4.8% reported spending more than RM100. These costs disproportionately impact low-income students, exacerbating existing educational inequalities. Financial barriers often compel students to engage in reprographic practices, underscoring the urgent need for more affordable and accessible resources in schools. This reinforces the importance of adopting systemic reforms to ensure equitable access to learning materials.

Teachers, too, play a pivotal role in managing resource shortages. Their strategies include photocopying selected textbook sections (36.7%), directing students to online resources (22.9%), and employing alternative teaching methods (23.3%). While these practices demonstrate ingenuity and adaptability, they also underscore the systemic dependencies on reprographic activities that may conflict with copyright regulations. Using the Theory of Planned Behaviour⁶⁰ as a framework, these actions can be understood as responses to perceived constraints and a lack of viable alternatives, highlighting the need for systemic interventions to reduce reliance on reprographic practices.

Thus, the findings in Table 2 highlight critical challenges and opportunities for improving resource access and compliance with copyright laws. While students and teachers navigate resource shortages through reprographic practices, these behaviours expose systemic gaps in material distribution and copyright awareness. Addressing these challenges requires a multipronged approach that includes expanding legal access to digital resources, providing clearer copyright guidelines, and fostering awareness through targeted education initiatives. Such measures will not only promote compliance but also create a more equitable and sustainable educational ecosystem.

⁵⁹Longfield, “What Copyright? Whose Intellectual Property?” 76.

⁶⁰Ajzen, “The Theory of Planned Behaviour,” 185.

Perceptions and Views on Reprography

Table 3: Student's perceptions and views on reproduction of materials (Section C)

Section C: Use and Views on Reproduction of Materials	n	%
Do you know if there any limits on people making copies of published materials like books?		
Yes	16	7.6
No	62	29.5
Unsure	132	62.9
If yes, please specify the limits you are aware of:		
Copyrighted books	2	1.0
10	1	0.5
Unlimited	1	0.5
Not Sure	12	5.7
What difficulties do you encounter when the study materials provided to you are not of good quality?		
I struggle to understand complex concepts.	56	26.7
I spend more time looking for additional resources on my own	87	41.4
I find it hard to stay engaged and interested in the topic.	26	12.4
I feel unprepared for assessments or exams.	13	6.2
I am unsure if I am learning the right content.	25	11.9
Others:	3	1.4
How crucial do you think it is to encourage and support Malaysian authors in producing new educational books and works?		
Not important at all	2	1.0
Slightly important	42	20.0
Moderately important	42	20.0
Very important	67	31.9
Extremely important	57	27.1
Do you believe that authors and publishers should be compensated when their works are reproduced (e.g., photocopied or scanned) for educational purposes?		

Yes, they should always be compensated.	61	29.0
Yes, but only beyond certain limits of reproduction.	73	34.8
No, educational purposes should be an exception.	46	21.9
Unsure/No opinion	30	14.3

The findings in Table 3 reveal a significant gap in students' understanding of reprographic rights. When asked about the existence of limits on copying published materials, only 7.6% of respondents indicated they were aware of such limits, while 29.5% believed there were no restrictions, and a substantial 62.9% were unsure. Among those who acknowledged limits, specific responses included mentions of "Copyrighted books" (1.0%), a numeric limit of "10" copies (0.5%), and "Unlimited" (0.5%), while 5.7% were uncertain about the specific limits. This overwhelming lack of awareness indicates a critical need for targeted education on copyright laws within the educational sector. Without clear knowledge of reprographic limits, students may inadvertently violate intellectual property laws, putting themselves and their schools at legal risk.⁶¹ This finding underscores the necessity of integrating intellectual property education into the curriculum to ensure compliance and promote ethical use of educational resources.⁶²

The study highlights the detrimental effects of poor-quality study materials on students' learning experiences. As shown in Table 3, the most commonly reported challenge was the need to spend additional time searching for supplementary resources (41.4%), followed by difficulties in understanding complex concepts (26.7%). Other notable issues included a lack of engagement with the material (12.4%), feeling unprepared for assessments or exams (6.2%), and uncertainty about whether they were learning the correct content (11.9%). These challenges indicate that inadequate materials disrupt the learning process, forcing students to compensate by seeking

⁶¹Zakir Hossain et al., *Academic Integrity and Copyright Literacy Policy and Instruction in K–12 Schools: A Global Study from the Perspective of School Library Professionals*, *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 20 (2024): Article 4, accessed August 16, 2025, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40979-024-00150-x>

⁶²Tracey Bretag, ed., *Academic Integrity in the 21st Century: A Teaching and Learning Imperative* (Cham: Springer, 2016).

alternative resources, often through reprographic practices such as photocopying or downloading materials. The reliance on reproductions, particularly when original resources are of poor quality, further complicates the issue of compliance with copyright laws.⁶³ Poor-quality materials not only hinder academic performance but also highlight systemic inefficiencies in resource provision that must be addressed to enhance the educational experience.⁶⁴

Respondents overwhelmingly recognised the importance of encouraging and supporting Malaysian authors in producing new educational books and works. Most students rated this as either "Very important" (31.9%) or "Extremely important" (27.1%), while 20% considered it "Moderately important." Only a small percentage viewed this as "Slightly important" (20%) or "Not important at all" (1.0%). As reflected in Table 3, these findings highlight a strong sentiment among students for fostering local authorship, which could help address the gaps in resource quality and accessibility. Supporting Malaysian authors through incentives, grants, and copyright protections could lead to the development of high-quality materials tailored to the local curriculum and cultural context. However, the prevalence of reprographic practices poses a challenge to the economic sustainability of authorship. Authors and publishers may lose significant revenue if their works are widely reproduced without adequate compensation, undermining efforts to encourage the creation of new educational resources.

Students held mixed views on whether authors and publishers should be compensated when their works are reproduced for educational purposes. While 29.0% believed authors should always be compensated, the largest group (34.8%) supported compensation only beyond certain limits of reproduction. Interestingly, 21.9% felt that educational purposes should be an exception to copyright rules, and 14.3% were unsure or held no opinion. These responses reflect the complex tension between ensuring affordable access to educational materials and protecting the intellectual property rights of creators. The

⁶³Yeongha Kim et al., "A Dual-Module System for Copyright-Free Image Recommendation and Infringement Detection in Educational Materials," *Journal of Imaging* 10, no. 11 (2024): 277, <https://doi.org/10.3390/jimaging10110277>.

⁶⁴Syafaruddin, Amiruddin, and Ibbat, "Challenges and Strategies for Effective Resource Utilization."

largest group's support for conditional compensation suggests that students recognise the need for a balanced approach that respects both educational needs and copyright laws. This highlights the importance of establishing clear limits for fair use in education and developing mechanisms to compensate authors and publishers for large-scale or commercial reproductions. Licensing schemes managed by collective management organisations (CMOs) could serve as an effective solution, allowing schools to reproduce materials legally while ensuring fair remuneration for rightsholders.

Plagiarism Concerns

Table 4: Students' experiences and perceptions of plagiarism (Section D)

Section D: PLAGIARISM	n	%
As a student, how often do you come across or hear about instances of plagiarism among your peers?		
Very frequently	26	12.4
Occasionally	56	26.7
Rarely	95	45.2
Never	18	8.6
Unsure/No opinion	15	7.1
How seriously do you perceive the consequences of plagiarism to be for your students?		
Very Serious	18	13.2
Moderately Serious	83	61.0
Slightly Serious	58	42.6
Not Serious	29	21.3
Not Sure	22	16.2

This section explores the link between reprographic practices and academic integrity. As outlined in Table 4, the findings reveal that instances of plagiarism are a recurring issue among students, with varying levels of frequency. A minority of students (12.4%) reported encountering plagiarism "Very frequently," while 26.7% observed it "Occasionally," and 45.2% stated they "Rarely" come across such instances. A smaller group (8.6%) reported "Never" witnessing

plagiarism, while 7.1% were "Unsure/No opinion." These findings suggest that while plagiarism is not rampant, it is a persistent issue within the student community. The high proportion of respondents who encounter plagiarism either occasionally or rarely (72%) reflects the need to address this concern systematically.

Plagiarism among peers could stem from several factors, such as limited understanding of academic integrity, pressure to meet academic demands, or the easy accessibility of digital resources. Addressing this issue requires a proactive approach, including awareness programs and stricter enforcement of academic integrity policies.

When asked how they perceived the seriousness of plagiarism, the majority of students (61.0%) considered them "Moderately Serious." A smaller proportion (13.2%) viewed plagiarism as "Very Serious," while 42.6% deemed it "Slightly Serious." However, 21.3% felt plagiarism was "Not Serious," and 16.2% were "Not Sure."

The high percentage of students who see plagiarism as "Moderately Serious" reflects an awareness of the potential repercussions, yet it may also indicate that students do not fully comprehend the long-term consequences of academic dishonesty. On the other hand, the 21.3% who consider it "Not Serious" and the 16.2% who are unsure highlight a lack of clarity or concern about the importance of academic integrity. As indicated in Table 4, this finding underscores the need for stronger messaging and education around plagiarism and its consequences.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN REPROGRAPHIC PRACTICES AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The findings summarised in Table 1-4 reveal a complex landscape of challenges and opportunities related to reprographic practices, resource provision, and academic integrity in the educational system. These issues have significant implications for students, educators, policymakers, and the publishing industry.

Challenges

Inadequate Access to Educational Materials - One of the most significant challenges highlighted is the insufficient availability of teaching materials in schools. While 35.2% of students rated resource

availability as "Sufficient," 23.8% felt that it was "Insufficient" or "Very Insufficient." This inadequacy forces both students and teachers to rely on reprographic practices such as photocopying, scanning, or downloading digital copies to meet learning needs. These practices, while necessary, often raise questions about compliance with reprographic rights and intellectual property laws.

Furthermore, the cost of reproducing materials places an additional financial burden on students, particularly those from lower-income families. For example, 4.8% of students reported spending over RM100 per term on reproducing educational materials, a figure that highlights the potential for financial strain. This expense can disproportionately affect economically disadvantaged students, thereby exacerbating inequities in access to education.⁶⁵ Addressing this issue requires systemic reforms, including subsidies for learning resources or the implementation of affordable licensed agreements that enable equitable access while maintaining copyright compliance. As noted by Wiley and Hilton,⁶⁶ integrating openly licensed educational materials into curricula can alleviate financial burdens and promote inclusive learning environments.

Poor-Quality Study Materials - The reliance on subpar materials presents another significant challenge. Poor-quality resources result in students struggling to understand complex concepts (26.7%), spending additional time searching for supplementary resources (41.4%), and feeling unprepared for assessments (6.2%). These issues disrupt the learning process and increase academic stress, pushing students to engage in widespread copying practices to bridge these gaps.

Lack of Awareness of Reprographic and Copyright Limits - A staggering 92.4% of students were unaware or unsure of the legal limits on reproducing copyrighted materials. This lack of awareness increases the risk of unintentional violations of copyright laws and highlights the

⁶⁵Hassan H., Mohamad R., Raja Mohd Ali R. H., Abdul Talib Y. Y., and Mohamad HsBollah H., "Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance in Higher Education: Evidence from Accountancy Degree Programme," *International Business Education Journal* 13, no. 1 (2020): 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ibej.vol13.1.1.2020>

⁶⁶David Wiley and John Hilton III, "Defining OER-Enabled Pedagogy," *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning* 19, no. 4 (2018): 133-147, <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601>

absence of systematic education on intellectual property rights. The lack of clarity on what constitutes fair dealing for educational purposes complicates compliance further.

Prevalence of Plagiarism - Although plagiarism was reported as "Very frequent" by only 12.4% of respondents, the fact that 26.7% observed it "Occasionally" and 45.2% "Rarely" underscores its persistence in academic environments. This behaviour reflects not only an ethical issue but also systemic gaps in fostering academic integrity. A lack of understanding of plagiarism consequences, as evidenced by the 21.3% who believed it was "Not Serious," further compounds the challenge.

Economic Impact on Authors and Publishers - The widespread use of reprographic practices, often without proper compensation to authors and publishers, poses a challenge to the sustainability of the publishing industry. While 63.8% of students believed that authors should be compensated in some capacity, the lack of structured agreements limits the financial returns for content creators, particularly Malaysian authors.

Opportunities

Improving Access Through Licensing and Subsidies - The challenges of insufficient materials and high reprographic costs present an opportunity to introduce affordable license models that allow schools to legally reproduce copyrighted materials within defined limits. Subsidised educational resources, funded by government initiatives or partnerships with publishers, could alleviate the financial burden on students and ensure equitable access to high-quality materials.

Promoting Digital Resources and Infrastructure - The increasing adoption of downloadable online resources (10.5%) and access to educational platforms offers a significant opportunity to modernise resource provision. By investing in digital infrastructure, schools can reduce dependence on physical reproductions while providing students with better-quality, easily accessible materials. Such initiatives could also address the issue of poor-quality photocopies and incomplete reproductions.

Fostering Local Authorship - The strong support for encouraging Malaysian authors to produce educational books (59% rated this as

"Very important" or "Extremely important") highlights an opportunity to develop high-quality, locally relevant resources. By providing grants, subsidies, and enhanced copyright protections, policymakers can incentivise Malaysian authors to create materials tailored to the national curriculum and cultural context.

Enhancing Awareness of Intellectual Property - The significant gap in student's knowledge of copyright limits underscores the need for systematic education on intellectual property rights. Schools and universities could integrate intellectual property modules into their curricula, educating students and teachers on fair dealing, plagiarism, and the ethical use of resources. Awareness campaigns could also promote compliance with reprographic rights, reducing unintentional violations.

Leveraging Technology for Academic Integrity - The prevalence of plagiarism presents an opportunity to leverage plagiarism detection tools and software to enhance academic integrity. Providing access to tools like Turnitin and embedding lessons on proper citation practices into the curriculum can help students understand and uphold ethical academic standards.

Balancing Rights and Accessibility - The data reveals a nuanced understanding among students regarding the need for balance between copyright protection and educational accessibility. While 34.8% supported compensating authors only beyond certain limits, 21.9% believed educational purposes should be exempt from copyright. This presents an opportunity to design policies that accommodate both perspectives, such as fair-dealing provisions that allow limited, non-commercial reproduction of materials for educational purposes while ensuring authors are compensated for large-scale or commercial uses.

Encouraging Creative Teaching Practices - Teachers play a pivotal role in bridging resource gaps, as evidenced by their use of photocopies (36.7%) and alternative online resources (22.9%) when textbooks are insufficient. Providing teachers with additional resources and training on creative teaching methods can further enhance their ability to adapt to resource constraints without over-relying on reprographic practices.

Creating a Culture of Integrity - The varied perceptions of plagiarism seriousness highlight an opportunity to foster a stronger culture of academic integrity. Institutions can achieve this by

implementing stricter policies on plagiarism, rewarding original work, and embedding ethical research practices into educational programs. Celebrating and recognising students' achievements in producing original work can also reinforce positive behaviours.

RECOMMENDATION

The findings from this study highlight several actionable recommendations to address the challenges and opportunities related to reprographic practices, academic integrity, and resource accessibility in education. First, there is a pressing need to improve access to high-quality educational resources. This can be achieved through government subsidies and affordable agreements with publishers, ensuring that students have equitable access to necessary materials while adhering to copyright laws. Developing digital repositories of licensed content can also reduce reliance on physical reproductions and improve the quality of learning materials. Furthermore, efforts should be made to raise awareness of copyright laws and reprographic rights among students and educators. Targeted educational campaigns, intellectual property modules integrated into the curriculum, and workshops for teachers can promote a better understanding of fair use principles and the ethical use of resources.

Supporting local authors and publishers is another critical area that warrants attention. By providing financial incentives, grants, and enhanced copyright protections, Malaysian authors can be encouraged to produce high-quality, culturally relevant educational materials. Strengthening enforcement mechanisms to ensure adequate compensation for authors, even when their works are reproduced for educational purposes, will also contribute to the sustainability of the publishing industry. In addressing academic integrity, institutions should foster a culture of originality by embedding lessons on ethical research practices and proper citation techniques into educational programs. Providing access to plagiarism detection tools and enforcing transparent policies on academic dishonesty will further discourage plagiarism and reinforce the importance of integrity in education.

Technology also presents significant opportunities for improving resource distribution and supporting academic practices. Expanding access to online learning platforms, implementing hybrid

learning models, and partnering with private printing services can reduce the financial burden of reproducing materials while enhancing the availability of legitimate resources. Additionally, copyright policies must strike a balance between protecting intellectual property and accommodating educational needs. Introducing fair-dealing provisions, collaborating with collective management organisations (CMOs) to streamline systems, and monitoring reprographic practices in schools can ensure compliance while supporting educational objectives.

Lastly, empowering teachers through training and professional development is crucial. Equipping educators with the skills to create innovative teaching materials and use licensed resources effectively can reduce dependency on reprographic practices. Regular monitoring and evaluation of these initiatives, coupled with feedback from key stakeholders, will ensure the continuous improvement and sustainability of educational resource practices. By implementing these measures, policymakers and educators can address the systemic challenges identified while fostering a more equitable and ethical educational ecosystem.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study highlights the intertwined challenges and opportunities related to reprographic practices, resource accessibility, and academic integrity within the educational landscape. The reliance on copying practices reflects deeper systemic issues, such as inadequate access to high-quality materials, financial constraints, and a lack of awareness about intellectual property laws. At the same time, these challenges present opportunities to create a more inclusive and equitable system by promoting awareness, supporting local authors, enhancing digital resources, and implementing balanced copyright policies. By fostering a culture of academic integrity and investing in innovative resource distribution strategies, educators and policymakers can ensure that all students have access to the tools they need to succeed while respecting intellectual property rights. Moving forward, a collaborative approach involving students, educators, authors, and policymakers is essential to building a sustainable and fair educational ecosystem that benefits everyone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to express their deepest appreciation to the International Federation of Reproduction Rights Organisations (IFRRO) for providing the financial support that made this study possible. IFRRO's contribution was instrumental in enabling comprehensive data collection and rigorous analysis of student reprographic practices and copyright compliance in Malaysian schools.

The authors also extend sincere gratitude to the Ministry of Education Malaysia, the participating schools, teachers, and students for their invaluable cooperation throughout the research process. Their willingness to share time, perspectives, and experiences greatly enriched the study and contributed meaningfully to its findings.

REFERENCES

- Agyen-Gyasi, Kwasi. "An Evaluation of the Reprographic Services at the KNUST Library, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana." *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve* 19, no. 1 (2008): 7–15. [https://doi.org/10.1080/10723030802533788](https://doi.org/10.1080/10723030802533788Ajzen, Icek.)Ajzen, Icek. "The Theory of Planned Behavior." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50 (1991): 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Anderson, Bill. "A Primer on Copyright Law and the DMCA." *The Reference Librarian* 45, no. 93 (2006): 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1300/J120v45n93_05.Australia. *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), Pt VB (educational statutory licences). Canberra: Federal Register of Legislation, current version.
- Article 4. IFRRO (International Federation of Reproduction Rights Organisations). "What Is a Reproduction Rights Organisation (RRO)?" Accessed 19 September 2025. <https://www.ifro.org/>.
- Australian Law Reform Commission. *Copyright and the Digital Economy*. Discussion Paper 79. Sydney: ALRC, 2013.
- Bennett, Colin J., and Charles D. Raab. *The Governance of Privacy: Policy Instruments in Global Perspective*. Updated ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2018.
- Brake, David R. "Are We All Online Content Creators Now? Web 2.0 and Digital Divides." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19, no. 3 (2013): 591–609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12042>Bretag, Tracey, ed. *Academic Integrity in the 21st Century: A Teaching and Learning Imperative*. Cham: Springer, 2016.
- Cho, Kit W., and Vahe Permzadian. "The Impact of Open Educational Resources on Student Achievement: A Meta-analysis." *International Journal of Educational Research* 126 (2024): 102365.
- CISAC (International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers). *Global Collections Report 2024*. Paris: CISAC, 2024.

- CISAC. *Private Copying Global Study 2023*. Paris: CISAC, 2023.
- Cohen, Jacob. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988. Columbia University Libraries. "Understanding Reprographic Rights." Copyright Advisory Services, 2023. Accessed 19 September 2025. <https://copyright.columbia.edu/>.
- Creative Commons. "Global Aspects of Copyright." *Certificate Curriculum*, 2018. Accessed 18 January 2025. <https://certificates.creativecommons.org/cccertedu/chapter/2-2-global-aspects-of-copyright/>.
- DeVellis, Robert F., and Carolyn T. Thorpe. *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2021. EUIPO (European Union Intellectual Property Office). *European Citizens and Intellectual Property: Perception, Awareness and Behaviour*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the EU, 2023.
- EUIPO (European Union Intellectual Property Office). *Intellectual Property and Youth Scoreboard 2022*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the EU, 2022.
- Filinovych, Viktoriia. "Violation of Copyright and Related Rights on the Internet: How to Protect Yourself and Your Creation." *Air and Space Law* 4, no. 61 (2021): 144–150. Fineberg, Tova. "Copyright and Course Management Systems: Educational Use of Copyrighted Materials in the United States and the United Kingdom." *Libri* 59, no. 4 (2009): 220–233. Florida Virtual Campus. *2022 Student Textbook and Instructional Materials Survey: Results and Findings*. Tallahassee: Florida Virtual Campus, 2023.
- Fluharty, Charles W., and Brian Scaggs. "The Rural Differential: Bridging the Resource Gap." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 2007, no. 137 (2007): 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.266>.
- Geçer, Ahmet Kenan, and Ahmet Duran Topal. "Academic and Postgraduate Student Awareness of Digital Product Copyright Issues." *Information Development* 37, no. 1 (2019): 90–104.

- Ginsburg, Jane C. "The Author's Place in the Future of Copyright." *Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts* 39, no. 3 (2016): 329–350.
- Gould, Thomas H. P., Tomas A. Lipinski, and Elizabeth Buchanan. "Copyright Policies and the Deciphering of Fair Use in the Creation of Reserves at University Libraries." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, no. 3 (2005): 182–197.
- Hair, Joseph F., William C. Black, Barry J. Babin, and Rolph E. Anderson. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 8th ed. Andover: Cengage, 2019.
- Hassan, Zulkifli, Mohd Ramli, and Norazlin Yusof. "Financial Constraints and Academic Performance Among Malaysian Students." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 9, no. 6 (2019): 323–335.
- Hossain, Zakir, Özgür Çelik, and Corinne Hertel. "Academic Integrity and Copyright Literacy Policy and Instruction in K–12 Schools." *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 20 (2024)
- International Publishers Association. "Our Industry: Reproduction Rights Organisations (RROs)." 2023. Accessed 18 January 2025. <https://www.internationalpublishers.org/our-industry-menu/rros>.
- Janis, Wong, Tristan Henderson, and Kirstie Ball. "Data Protection for the Common Good: Developing a Framework for a Data Protection-Focused Data Common." *Data & Policy* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.40>.
- Kelly, Erin J. "Rights Instruction for Undergraduate Students: Needs, Trends, and Resources." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 25, no. 1 (2017): 1–19.
- Kim, Yeongha, Soyeon Kim, Seonghyun Min, Youngung Han, Ohyoung Lee, and Wongyum Kim. "A Dual-Module System for Copyright-Free Image Recommendation and Infringement Detection in Educational Materials." *Journal of Imaging* 10, no. 11 (2024): 277.

- Levering, Miriam. "What's Right about Fair-Use Guidelines for the Academic Community?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50, no. 14 (1999): 1313–1318.
- Licht, Amir N. "Social Norms and the Law: Why People Obey the Law." *Review of Law & Economics* 4, no. 3 (2008): 715–750.
- Lo, Lee Shun. "Exploring the Impact of Textbook Costs at a Hispanic-Serving Institution." *Open Praxis* 15, no. 2 (2023): 159–173.
- Longfield, Victoria. "What Copyright? Whose Intellectual Property?: College Student Intellectual Property Rights and Anti-plagiarism Software." *Journal of Information Policy* 12 (2022): 73–100. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.12.2022.0002>.
- Malaysia Reprographic Rights Centre (MARC). "About MARC." Accessed 16 January 2025. <https://mymarc.org/about-marc>.
- Malaysia. *Copyright Act 1987 (Act 332)*. Kuala Lumpur: MyIPO (as amended).
- McGeveran, William, and William W. Fisher. "The Digital Learning Challenge: Obstacles to Educational Uses of Copyrighted Material in the Digital Age." *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2006).
- McIsaac, Marina Stock, and Jeremy Rowe. "Ownership and Access: Copyright and Intellectual Property in the On-line Environment." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 25, no. 3 (1997): 83–92.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025*. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, 2013.
- MyIPO (Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia). "Copyright Guidelines." Accessed 19 September 2025. <https://www.myipo.gov.my/>.
- MyIPO (Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia). *Guidelines on Copyright Collective Management Organisations (CMOs)*. Kuala Lumpur: MyIPO, 2025.
- Okerson, Ann, and Susanna Sully. "The Digital Dilemma: Intellectual Property in the Information Age." *Choice Reviews Online* 38, no. 2 (2000): 38. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.38-1184>.Penn

- State University. "Policy Governing Copyright Clearance (IP05)." 2013. <https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ip05>.
- Rivera-Morales, N. Á. "Fair-Use Guidelines." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50, no. 14 (1999): 1353–1357.
- Rumi, Yasmeen, and Graham Long. "Recalibrating Some Copyright Conceptions: Toward a Shared and Balanced Approach to Educational Copying." *Partnership* 9, no. 2 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v9i2.3127>.
- Sambo, Atanda Saliu, Avosuahi Orewa Ahutu, and Nafisat Rabiú. "A Study of Photocopying Practice and Copyright Law in Nigeria Libraries: Librarians Perspectives." *American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 1, no. 1 (2016): 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.801/2016.1.1/801.1.35.45>.
- Schultz, Mark F. *Copynorms: Copyright and Social Norms*. SSRN, 2006.
- Secker, Jane, and Chris Morrison. "Digitizing Text-Based Content for Delivery in a VLE." In *Ebooks in Education*, 47–64. London: Facet, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.29085/9781783301492.005>.
- Senftleben, Martin. *Comparative Approaches to Fair Use*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2013.
- Strowel, Alain, and Charlotte Waelde. *Copyright Law: A Handbook for the Digital Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Sundeen, Todd H., and Donna M. Sundeen. "Instructional Technology for Rural Schools: Access and Acquisition." *Rural Special Education Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2013): 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051303200203>
- Syafaruddin, Syafaruddin, Amiruddin Amiruddin, and Andi Ibbar. "Challenges and Strategies for Effective Resource Utilization in Secondary Schools." *International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities* 2, no. 2 (2024): 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.59024/ijellacush.v2i2.803>. UNESCO. *Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER)*. Paris: UNESCO, 2019.

- United Kingdom. *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988*. London: The National Archives, current version.
- University of Chicago Libraries. “Fair Use and Other Educational Uses.” Copyright Information Center. Accessed 17 January 2025. <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/copyrightinfo/fairuse.html>
- Wahid, Ratnaria, and Ida Madieha Abdul Ghani Azmi. “Comparative Study on Copyright Exception for Teaching Purposes: Australia, Malaysia and the United Kingdom.” *Journal of International Studies* 8 (2012): 31–45.
- Wanti, Maria, Robbert Wesselink, Harm Biemans, and Perry den Brok. “Determining Factors of Access and Equity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review.” *Equity in Education & Society* 1, no. 2 (2022): 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27526461221092429>.
- Wiley, David, and John Hilton III. “Defining OER-Enabled Pedagogy.” *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning* 19, no. 4 (2018): 133–147.
- WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization). “SCCR/45: Summary by the Chair.” Geneva: WIPO, 19 April 2024.
- WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization). *SCCR/45 Documentation on Exceptions and Limitations for Education and Research*. Geneva: WIPO, April 2024.
- Wu, Hung-Jen, Chih-Ming Chou, Hung-Jen Ke, and Mei-Hwa Wang. “College Students’ Misunderstandings about Copyright Laws for Digital Library Resources.” *The Electronic Library* 28, no. 2 (2010): 197–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02640471011033576>.
- Yoon, Cheolho. “Theory of Planned Behavior and Ethics Theory in Digital Piracy: An Integrated Model.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 100 (2011): 405–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0687-7>

York University v. Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency (*Access Copyright*), 2021 SCC 32 (Supreme Court of Canada).