

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION OF SCIENTIFIC WORKS IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING AND AUTHORSHIP SYSTEMS

**Didit Darmawan, Sephia Karunia Eriyoko, Muhammad Fatahillah Almahi, Putra
Mangihut Tua Sinaga, Wahyu Agung Pratomo**

Correspondence: dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

ABSTRACT

Copyright protection for scientific works requires a balance between authors' exclusive rights and the cumulative nature of knowledge production. This article examines the scope of copyright protection for scientific works and the mechanisms through which such protection can be managed and enforced. The study employs doctrinal legal research combined with an academic literature review, focusing on copyright norms, scholarly authorship, licensing, publication agreements, and infringement. The synthesis indicates that copyright protects the expression embodied in scientific works rather than ideas, facts, methods, theories, or scientific knowledge as such. Copyright infringement must also be distinguished from plagiarism because academic misappropriation may involve materials that fall outside copyright exclusivity. Protection further depends on clear identification of authors and right holders, management of joint authorship, careful publication agreements, appropriate licensing, and documentation of rights. Educational and research uses may receive legal accommodation but remain subject to statutory conditions. Effective protection therefore requires both enforceable authorial rights and clear mechanisms that permit legitimate circulation, reuse, and development of scientific knowledge.

Keywords: Copyright, scientific works, authorship, intellectual property, scholarly publishing, licensing, copyright infringement.

INTRODUCTION

Scientific works serve a primary function as a medium for communicating knowledge, documenting findings, exchanging ideas, and recognizing the intellectual activities of researchers. Journal articles, academic books, conference papers, research reports, and other forms of scientific writing contain expressions arising from the intellectual capacity of the author and circulate through the academic publishing system. Mabe (2009) explains that scientific publishing constitutes a formal mechanism for communication among researchers while simultaneously relating to the recognition of individual contributions and the dissemination of knowledge. Developments in electronic publishing increase the speed and reach of work distribution, yet the ease of digital reproduction also enables copies to be made, modified, and distributed in large

quantities (Rao, 2022). This situation positions copyright law as a relevant tool for protecting the interests of creators without removing the function of scientific works as a vehicle for the growth of science (Kurniawan et al., 2024).

The protection of scientific works shares a special relationship with the nature of academic activities, which encourage the utilization of prior reasoning. Scientific authors construct arguments through reading, testing, criticizing, developing theories, and using published findings. This cumulative nature implies that copyright protection in the scientific field cannot be understood as granting absolute control over all knowledge contained within a work (Billah & Al-Barashdi, 2018). Suber (2012) demonstrates that the dissemination of academic publications presents a relationship among the interests of authors, readers, publishers, and public access to research. Open access has consequently developed as a distribution model that operates through the consent of rightsholders and licensing mechanisms. The legal problem that arises lies in how to preserve the author's rights over their work while maintaining sufficient space for the use of knowledge for education, research, criticism, and the advancement of science (Hidayat et al., 2024).

The character of scientific works gives rise to issues because academic recognition and copyright protection do not possess identical scopes. Taking ideas, data, methods, or findings without attribution can create academic ethics issues, but not every violation of attribution standards automatically satisfies the elements of copyright infringement (Adeney, 2015). Biagioli (2012) demonstrates that plagiarism in science exhibits characteristics that can transcend the copying of copyright-protected material. Certain forms of appropriating scientific credit pertain to ideas, information, priority of discovery, or intellectual labor that do not necessarily fall within the exclusive domain of copyright. This distinction is critical because legal responses to copyright infringement cannot be entirely replaced by ethical mechanisms, while the enforcement of academic ethics also occupies a broader scope than merely assessing the copying of a work's expression.

Digital technology developments accentuate the significance of this separation. Scientific manuscripts can now be stored in repositories, distributed through electronic journals, transmitted via communication platforms, ingested into databases, and reproduced at negligible cost (Negara & Darmawan, 2023). The technical capability to copy is not always identical to possessing a legal right to do so (Reichman & Okediji, 2012). At the same time, overly broad restrictions on the use of scientific works can impede educational activities and knowledge communication. Legal issues subsequently shift toward several fundamental questions: what objects obtain protection, when rights arise, who constitutes the author or rightsholder, what acts require permission, and what uses remain justifiable. Establishing these boundaries is necessary so that protection does not degenerate into a monopoly over facts, theories, methods, or knowledge that must remain open for development through scientific endeavor.

Scientific works also frequently originate through more complex relationships than simple individual creations. Research may be conducted collaboratively by multiple authors, involve students and lecturers, utilize institutional funding, and be published under contracts with publishers. Such relationships can raise questions regarding authorship, economic rights ownership, moral rights, division of authority among co-authors, and the consequences of publishing agreements (Resnik & Smith, 2023). The issue grows more complex when an article

undergoes multiple stages of existence, ranging from early preprints and peer-reviewed manuscripts to the publisher's version. Legal protection of scientific works is therefore concerned with identifying the creator as well as managing rights after creation. Without proper understanding, creators may assign broader rights than necessary for publication or inadvertently use works whose management rights have been transferred without understanding the contractual limits.

A scientific problem requiring clarification lies in the relationship between creator protection and the freedom to use knowledge. Discussions of copyright in scientific works often stop at the assertion that writing constitutes a copyright object, making unauthorized copying an infringement. That formulation fails to elucidate the boundaries of protection regarding idea and expression, the relationship between copyright and plagiarism, the standing of moral rights and economic rights, and usage for research and education. Another problem resides in rights management post-publication. Authors may be creators, yet specific economic rights can be assigned or licensed to third parties. This gap in understanding impacts a researcher's capacity to determine permissible actions toward their own works as well as the scientific works of others (Hardyansah et al., 2021).

This study aims to explain the legal construction of copyright protection for scientific works by reviewing protected objects, authorship, moral rights, economic rights, limits of use, ownership, licensing, and dispute resolution. Its academic value resides in making a clear distinction between the protection of expression under copyright law and the recognition of authorship under academic norms. The discussion is also directed toward evaluating the relationship between a creator's exclusive interests and the necessity for knowledge distribution. Practically, the outcomes can serve as a foundation for researchers, students, lecturers, journal managers, and universities to manage scientific works more meticulously (Huda et al., 2023). This focus allows copyright to be understood as a mechanism that grants creators specific controls while containing boundaries that safeguard educational, research, and scientific communication activities. The research problems in this study are: how is the scope of legal copyright protection for scientific works framed when evaluated from protected objects, author rights, and the boundary between scientific expression and knowledge that remains usable? Additionally, how can copyright protection mechanisms for scientific works be executed through ownership management, licensing, infringement prevention, and dispute resolution.

METHODS

This study employs doctrinal legal research integrated with an academic literature review. The doctrinal approach is used to identify norms, concepts, rights, obligations, limitations, and dispute resolution mechanisms concerning copyright in scientific works. Hutchinson and Duncan (2012) explain that doctrinal research operates through the tracing and synthesis of legal materials to yield a structured understanding of legal provisions and inter-normative relationships. Primary legal materials were selected based on their direct relevance to the protection of works, authors' rights, work usage, rights transfers, licensing, and enforcement. These documents are read alongside academic materials that explain the nature of scientific authorship and publishing.

Bowen's (2009) document analysis principles are applied to evaluate document origins, original purposes, normative contents, and relevance to the research questions.

The search for academic sources was directed toward literature addressing copyright theory, the idea-expression dichotomy, academic plagiarism, co-authorship, academic publishing, open access, and rights management for research publications. Sources were included provided their bibliographic identity could be verified, their substance directly addressed the research questions, and their publication met verifiable academic standards. Popular writings and sources lacking adequate bibliographic foundations were excluded as primary sources. Literature was compared according to the issues analyzed, then synthesized with legal materials to construct an interpretation of protective boundaries and rights management mechanisms. Snyder (2019) notes that a literature review can serve as a methodology to organize dispersed knowledge and construct conceptual syntheses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Scope of Copyright Protection for Scientific Works and Limits of Protected Objects

Copyright protection for scientific works stems from the recognition that the results of intellectual activity obtain legal rights when expressed in a recognizable form as a creation. The international framework of the Berne Convention positions written works within literary and artistic works under copyright law, encompassing various forms of written expression. Such protection targets the work as an expression rather than the entire substance of knowledge contained within it. The Berne Convention also establishes the principle of protection without formalities as a cornerstone of the international copyright system (Barg, 2018). For scientific works, this structure means that articles, books, reports, and academic manuscripts gain protection over their expressive form once eligibility requirements are met, without treating administrative registration as the primary source of rights.

The TRIPS Agreement strengthens this framework by establishing minimum standards for intellectual property protection among World Trade Organization members. Its copyright provisions link TRIPS to key Berne Convention principles while reiterating the protection of expression (Rizky & Darmawan, 2021). TRIPS explicitly distinguishes the protection of expression from ideas, procedures, methods of operation, and mathematical concepts as substances not granted a copyright monopoly. This separation carries great significance in scientific writing because science progresses through the use of existing theories, facts, methods, conceptual models, and knowledge. Extending copyright to encompass all ideas behind a text would prevent other researchers from testing, refuting, expanding, or applying that knowledge. Copyright grants control over a specific creative embodiment, not exclusive ownership of scientific truth.

The distinction between idea and expression can be further elaborated through the

perspective of Drassinower (2003), who positions the idea-expression dichotomy as part of the normative structure of authorship. An individual who extracts an idea from a prior work and re-expresses it through their own expression engages in an act of authorship distinct from copying the original creator's expression. This understanding helps define the protective boundaries of scientific works. Two researchers may discuss the same theory, subject matter, or problem without automatically committing copyright infringement. The legal problem changes when one party appropriates sentence structures, distinctive expressive arrangements, illustrations, tables, or substantial portions of another work's embodiment without a justified basis for use.

The implications of this separation are evident in the use of facts and scientific findings. Facts regarding nature, empirical data, mathematical concepts, data collection methods, or research concepts basically receive no copyright monopoly as expression merely because they were previously explained by an author. Protection may arise for the specific form used to arrange, explain, illustrate, or present such material when copyright criteria are fulfilled. A researcher may utilize a published research method and write it in their own words, whereas copying verbatim descriptions of a method raises distinct legal issues (Salitskaya, 2019). This boundary preserves the creator's rights over the expressive mode of a work while maintaining the scientific community's ability to utilize available knowledge.

The distinction between copyright and plagiarism becomes clearer upon examining authorship. Plagiarism relates to academic attribution regarding the origin of ideas, words, data, or intellectual output. Copyright deals with legal rights over objects satisfying protection criteria and specific actions within the authority of the creator or rightsholder (Arjuman & Chakraborty, 2024). Biagioli (2012) demonstrates that scientific plagiarism can involve the appropriation of credit falling outside the conventional scope of copyright infringement. An individual can commit plagiarism by claiming another's idea as their own, even if that idea is not a copyright object. Conversely, using copyrighted material under a valid license avoids copyright infringement, yet specific presentation styles may still raise ethical concerns if the original source is not acknowledged according to academic standards.

This separation carries consequences for how universities and researchers handle alleged misuses of scientific works (Apriyanto & Hardyansah, 2024). Text-matching checks serve as tools to identify similarities, but similarity percentages do not inherently determine the existence of copyright infringement or plagiarism. Assessments must evaluate the portions used, the nature of the material, attribution methods, purpose of use, available licenses, and relevant legal rules. Lengthy quotations may be justified under specific circumstances if they satisfy valid use grounds, whereas appropriating ideas without attribution can remain academically problematic despite the absence of expression copying. Delineating evaluation domains prevents the label of copyright infringement from being misapplied to all forms of academic dishonesty and helps yield responses

appropriate to the nature of the conduct.

Protection of scientific works also encompasses interests linked to the author's identity. An author's name holds immense value in academic life because publications relate directly to recognition of intellectual contributions, professional reputation, and research records. Protecting the personal bond between a creator and their work carries a distinct meaning from the right to economic exploitation (Resnik & Smith, 2023). In scientific practice, omitting names, adding unauthorized names, or altering works in ways that distort the relationship between the author and their intellectual output can cause harm that cannot be measured by financial metrics alone. The copyright framework provides a basis to recognize the connection between creator and creation, while academic authorship ethics supply additional standards regarding who qualifies as an author of a publication.

Economic rights govern forms of use that carry consequences for the control and commercial exploitation of a work. Reproduction, publication, distribution, adaptation, or communication of a work fall under exclusive authority unless limitations, licenses, or other legal grounds permit such usage (Sanusi et al., 2024). In digital scientific works, this domain becomes highly relevant because a single file can be copied across platforms, republished on other websites, translated, compiled, or disseminated to a broad audience. Technical ease does not eliminate the necessity to identify the rightsholder and the terms governing such use. TRIPS principles on copyright and IP enforcement demonstrate that rights protection must be accompanied by legal instruments available to rightsholders when unauthorized exploitation occurs.

Copyright in scientific works remains subject to limitations because scientific activity depends on reading and utilizing prior works. Such limitations are necessary to prevent exclusive rights from halting education, research, criticism, or knowledge dissemination (Esteve, 2024). The international copyright structure recognizes specific exceptions to reproduction rights under conditions limiting exploitation so it does not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work and does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author. This principle shows that protection and permitted uses form integral parts of the same system. In academic environments, educational or research purposes do not automatically render every reproduction exempt from rules. The nature of use, portion used, purpose, and rightsholder interests still require evaluation.

The existence of limitations bears a direct relationship to quotation practices. Quotations allow authors to evaluate prior arguments, indicate theoretical sources, compare perspectives, and provide evidence for readers (Eddine & Darmawan, 2022). Copyright should not be interpreted so broadly that reasonable quotation becomes impossible. At the same time, citing a source does not constitute an unlimited license to appropriate an entire work or a substantial part thereof. Attribution addresses source origin, whereas authority to use material constitutes a separate legal matter. This separation explains why citing references may satisfy academic standards yet fail to resolve copyright issues if the

volume or form of reproduction exceeds permissible statutory exceptions. The principle of balancing rights and exceptions in international instruments supports this reading.

The boundaries of scientific work protection must ultimately balance two equally grounded interests (Prabowo et al., 2024). Creators require certainty that their intellectual expression will not be arbitrarily taken and exploited. The scientific community requires space to study facts, theories, methods, and ideas, and to develop them into new works (Silva & Vance, 2017). The idea-expression dichotomy provides the basis for separating these two interests. This principle also explains why copyright protection is not identical to protecting all academic values embedded in research. Recognizing discovery priority, citation appropriateness, and scientific credit allocation may require ethical rules operating alongside copyright law.

Copyright protects the tangible expression of scientific works as intellectual output, whereas underlying ideas, facts, methods, principles, and knowledge remain open for use and development. Protection encompasses the author's personal interests and specific economic rights over work utilization, but those rights are limited by education, research, criticism, quotation, and public interest needs under legal requirements. Plagiarism and copyright infringement must be separated as they possess distinct objects of evaluation, even if co-occurring within a single act. These boundaries lead to questions regarding rightsholders post-creation, how rights are transferred or licensed, and mechanisms available when work utilization exceeds granted authority.

Ownership, Licensing, and Dispute Resolution in Scientific Work Copyright

The national legal framework supplies a more operational foundation for protecting scientific works. Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright defines copyright as an exclusive right of the author arising automatically based on the declarative principle once a work is manifested in tangible form. The statute also defines a creation as any produced work in science, art, and literature expressed in tangible form. This construction affirms that protection does not depend on registration as a constitutive requirement (Yuwono, 2025). For scientific authors, basic protection arises through the creation and tangible embodiment of the work, whereas registration serves administrative or evidentiary functions as needed.

The Copyright Law divides exclusive rights into moral rights and economic rights. Moral rights include the author's right to be named or not named and to object to any distortion, mutilation, modification, or other derogatory action prejudicial to their honor or reputation. This structure is highly relevant for scientific authors, as the link between name and work holds substantial academic value. The transfer of economic rights to third parties does not automatically sever the author's personal connection to the work (Madar, 2025). An author may grant publishing authority to another party while retaining legal interests regarding attribution and work integrity under applicable rules. This distinction must be maintained when drafting or approving publishing contracts.

Objects protected under the Copyright Law include books, pamphlets, published typographical arrangements, and other written works. This provision offers a broad basis for protecting diverse academic writings (Aloun, 2024). The scope encompasses scientific articles, monographs, course materials, or other written formats fulfilling statutory requirements for creations. Protection for written works carries specific economic rights terms. The law establishes protection for books and specific written works during the author's lifetime and continues for a designated term post-mortem. Duration provisions indicate that economic authority is not indefinite, whereas certain moral rights possess different durational characteristics.

Ownership issues become more intricate in collaborative works. Modern research articles frequently feature multiple authors, each contributing to research and writing. Phillips (2008), in discussing authorship and ownership in collaborative works, shows that creations formed by multiple contributors raise questions regarding author identification, rights allocation, and consent for work usage. This issue is relevant to scientific publishing because listing multiple names should not be treated as a mere formality. Co-authoring teams must understand who holds copyright interests, who is authorized to grant licenses, and whether all rightsholders have consented to actions requiring joint approval.

Managing joint works must be distinguished from allocating academic credit. Author order, corresponding author designation, and contribution statements may be governed by publishing norms or academic disciplines, whereas copyright ownership is determined by applicable law and contracts (Adeney, 2016). These two systems may overlap, but they do not always yield identical divisions. An individual receiving academic recognition does not automatically hold all economic authority over a publication. Conversely, a party receiving a transfer of economic rights does not thereby become the author. This distinction reduces the risk of treating scientific authorship, administrative status in research, and rights ownership as an identical concept. Rights allocation is best established at the inception of collaboration or prior to signing publication agreements.

Publishing agreements represent a primary point for transferring or granting authority over scientific works. Authors submitting articles to journals may be requested to grant specific licenses or transfer economic rights depending on the publisher's model (Quaia et al., 2024). Bowrey, Cochrane, Hadley, McKeough, Pappalardo, and Weatherall (2024) demonstrate that copyright management in research publications is closely linked to publishing contracts, university policies, and research dissemination goals. Broad transfers can lead to authors losing the ability to distribute specific versions of their work, reuse content, or deposit manuscripts into repositories (Darmawan & Fajar, 2024). This underscores the need to review the scope of rights granted to publishers and distinguish between ownership assignment and licensing for publication purposes.

Copyright is structured to allow usage authority to be divided through licenses. Rightsholders can grant limited permissions based on use type, duration, territory, media,

or distribution formats without surrendering total ownership (Okediji, 2018). Bowrey et al. (2024) emphasize that research publication rights can be managed through authority division, enabling publisher needs and academic interests to be regulated in a more measured manner. For researchers, this model opens possibilities to retain specific rights—such as teaching use or repository self-archiving—while granting publishers the authority needed to publish and distribute the article. Written agreements serve the primary function of reducing uncertainty regarding who may execute specific acts post-publication.

The use of scientific works for education and research receives specific accommodation under the Copyright Law. Article 44 provides that the use, citation, reproduction, or alteration of a work under specified conditions shall not be deemed an infringement, provided the source is fully cited for purposes such as education, research, scientific writing, reporting, criticism, or reviews, so long as it does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author or rightsholder. This provision demonstrates that source attribution is a relevant element, but usage remains bound by conditions regarding the rightsholder's legitimate interests. This norm cannot be read as a general license to duplicate entire publications whenever educational or research aims are invoked. Usage type, portion copied, purpose, and rightsholder interests still require assessment.

Infringement prevention begins with rights documentation management. Authors should retain manuscript versions, authorship records, research agreements, acceptance letters, licensing or assignment contracts, and proof of publication timing. Such documentation helps distinguish between manuscripts remaining fully within author control and versions bound by publishing terms (Somisetti, 2022). Bowrey et al. (2024) show that academic publications can exist in several versions with differing rights post-publication. Document management becomes increasingly relevant when authors seek to deposit works in repositories, republish sections, produce translations, or grant third-party permissions. Rights certainty reduces potential infringements arising from unfamiliarity with one's own contracts.

When infringements occur, the copyright system offers several resolution pathways. Law Number 28 of 2014 states that copyright disputes may be resolved through alternative dispute resolution, arbitration, or court proceedings. Creators or rightsholders also possess legal grounds to file claims for damages under conditions satisfying legal criteria. Path options allow dispute characteristics to be evaluated. A co-author licensing dispute carries a different character from unauthorized commercial reproduction by an unrelated third party. Selecting a mechanism should consider rightsholder objectives, needs to cease usage, academic reputation interests, resolution costs, and the viability of maintaining collaborative relationships.

Protection through legal enforcement is best coupled with license management practices supporting knowledge dissemination. Open-access works remain protected under copyright. Open licenses allow rightsholders to specify advance usage permissions so the

public need not seek individual approval for every permitted act. This management style differs from relinquishing all rights in a work. Protection continues through attribution requirements and usage boundaries specified within the license. This management model is relevant for academic institutions aiming to enhance research dissemination without creating ambiguity around publication legal status. Bowrey et al. (2024) show that ownership and licensing choices bear direct consequences for the ability of universities and researchers to disseminate research findings.

Copyright protection for scientific works requires active management from creation through dispute resolution. Protection begins with identifying creators and rightsholders, followed by arranging co-authorship terms, documenting contractual relations, selecting license formats, and controlling reproduction and distribution (Kullolli, 2024). Publishing agreements must be read as instruments defining the operational scope of authors and publishers, not as administrative formalities after article acceptance. Educational and research uses remain subject to limits evaluated under legal standards. When disputes arise, alternative mechanisms, arbitration, and judicial options may be utilized based on case characteristics. This framework ensures copyright protection safeguards creator recognition while allowing scientific works to circulate through lawful usage channels.

CONCLUSION

Copyright protection for scientific works is built upon the recognition of expressed intellectual works, rather than through granting a monopoly over ideas, facts, methods, theories, or scientific knowledge. Copyright safeguards the creator's personal interests and specific economic rights, while research, education, criticism, and the advancement of science require permissible use governed by statutory limitations. Plagiarism must be distinguished from copyright infringement, as the misappropriation of academic credit can involve materials that do not necessarily fall under copyright protection. Effective protection relies on clear identification of creators, ownership, co-authorship, publishing contracts, licensing, and rights documentation. When the use of a work exceeds lawful authority, disputes can be resolved through available legal mechanisms.

The protection of scientific works should be understood through the relationship between an author's rights and the cumulative nature of scientific progress. Copyright provides control over the specific expressive form without preventing other researchers from utilizing and developing underlying ideas and knowledge. Delineating plagiarism from copyright infringement facilitates a more accurate evaluation of work misuse. Researchers, students, lecturers, journal managers, and higher education institutions must treat publication contracts and licenses as essential components of research governance. Clarity regarding rightsholders, shareable manuscript versions, reuse boundaries, and attribution obligations serves to minimize disputes. Furthermore, a structured protective framework supports knowledge dissemination through clear

permissions while preserving appropriate recognition for creators.

REFERENCES

- Adeney, E. (2015). Medical and Scientific Authorship: A Conflict Between Discipline Rules and The Law. *Journal of Law and Medicine*, 23(2), 413–426.
- Adeney, E. (2016). Research Collaborations and 'Authorship': Differentiating Legal from Management Norms. *Social Science Research Network*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2853222>
- Aloun, D. M. (2024). An analysis of international legal protection of copyright. *International Journal of Space Law and Policy*, 2(1), 12-26.
<https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.25466.09923>
- Apriyanto, R., & Hardyansah, R. (2024). Legal Dynamics and Challenges in Protecting Intellectual Property Rights for Digital Products in the Global Marketplace. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(2), 261-276. <https://jos3journals.id/index.php/jos3/article/view/373>
- Arjuman, A., & Chakraborty, S. (2024). Plagiarism and Authorship Credit. *Indian Journal of Public Health*, 68(2), 318–323. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijph.ijph_1071_23
- Barg, J. (2018). Conventional minimum in copyright protection (the berne convention). *International Journal of Medicine and Medical Research*, 1.
<https://doi.org/10.11603/IJMMR.2413-6077.2018.1.8710>
- Biagioli, M. (2012). Recycling Texts or Stealing Time? Plagiarism, Authorship, And Credit In Science. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 19(3), 453–476.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739112000276>
- Billah, M. M., & Al-Barashdi, S. (2018). Fair or Free Use of Copyrighted Materials in Education and Research and the Limit of Such Use. *The Chicago-Kent Journal of Intellectual Property*, 17(2), 422.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as A Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Bowrey, K., Cochrane, T., Hadley, M., McKeough, J., Pappalardo, K., & Weatherall, K. (2024). Managing Ownership of Copyright in Research Publications To Increase The Public Benefits From Research. *Federal Law Review*, 52(1), 3–33.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X231213676>
- Darmawan, D., & Fajar, A. S. M. (2024). The Role of Social Media in the Distribution and Dissemination of Education Publications in the Digital Age. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(2), 41-58. <https://sisijournals.id/index.php/sisi/article/view/53>
- De Silva, P. U., & K. Vance, C. (2017). Free Flow of Scientific Information Versus Intellectual Property Rights. *Scientific Scholarly Communication: The Changing Landscape*, 57-71.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50627-2_5
- Drassinower, A. (2003). A rights-based view of the idea/expression dichotomy in copyright law. *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence*, 16(1), 3–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0841820900006603>
- Eddine, B. A. S., & Darmawan, D. (2022). Social Construction of Work Life Balance in Cultural and Organizational Norms. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 213-234.

- <https://sisijournals.id/index.php/sisi/article/view/98>
- Esteve, A. (2024). Copyright and Open Access to Scientific Publishing: A. Esteve. *IIC-International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 55(6), 901-926. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-024-01479-z>
- Hardyansah, R., Darmawan, D., & Negara, D. S. (2021). Analysis of Inhibiting Factors in the Filing of Civil Lawsuits by Copyright Holders. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 223-248. <https://sisijournals.id/index.php/sisi/article/view/88>
- Hidayat, W., Darmawan, D., & Hardyansah, R. (2024). Building Business Defense and Value: A Study on Legal Protection of Trademarks, Copyrights, and Industrial Designs for MSMEs. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(2), 381-396. <https://jos3journals.id/index.php/jos3/article/view/381>
- Huda, Z., Dirgantara, F., Khayru, R. K., Saktiawan, P., & Pakpahan, N. H. (2023). Copyright Protection and Law Enforcement Challenges in Supporting the Growth of Creative Industries. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 77-82. <https://jos3journals.id/index.php/jos3/article/view/254>
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17(1), 83-119.
- Kullolli, B. (2024). Legal Liability for Plagiarism of Scientific Works: How Do Major Publishers Protect Their Content. *Social'no-Pravovi Studii*, 7(3), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.32518/sals3.2024.36>
- Kurniawan, D. P., Negara, D. S., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Legal Awareness of MSME Actors on Intellectual Property in Business Governance. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(1), 279-304. <https://sisijournals.id/index.php/sisi/article/view/150>
- Mabe, M. A. (2009). Scholarly publishing. *European Review*, 17(1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798709000532>
- Madar, Y. (2025). Moral Rights in Copyrights: The Theoretical Establishment. *Open J. Legal Stud.*, 8, 71. <https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojls.0802.03071m>
- Negara, D. S., & Darmawan, D. (2023). Digital Empowerment: Ensuring Legal Protections for Online Arisan Engagements. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(2), 13-19
- Okediji, R. L. (2017). Copyright Law in An Age Of Limitations And Exceptions. Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, J. (2008). Authorship, Ownership, Wikiship: Copyright in The Twenty-First Century. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 3(12), 788-798. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpn200>
- Prabowo, J. W., Rachman Putra, A., Khayru, R. K., Negara, D. S., & Wibowo, A. S. (2024). Legal Position of Concurrent Creditors, Rights Protection Constraints, and Curator Responsibilities in the Bankruptcy Asset Management System. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(2), 59-78.
- Quaia, E., Zanon, C., Vieira, A., Loewe, C., & Marti-Bonmatí, L. (2024). Publishing in open access journals. *Insights into Imaging*, 15(1), 212. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13244-024-01794-6>
- Rao, Y. S. (2022). Scientific Publication Process and Its Impact on Growth of Science. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 68(1). <https://doi.org/10.56042/alis.v68i1.31709>

- Reichman, J. H., & Okediji, R. L. (2012). When Copyright Law and Science Collide: Empowering Digitally Integrated Research Methods on a Global Scale. *Minnesota Law Review*, 96(4), 1362–1480.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta.
- Resnik, D. B., & Smith, E. (2023). Should authorship on Scientific Publications Be Treated As A Right?. *Journal of medical ethics*, 49(11), 776-778. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme-2022-108874>
- Rizky, M. C., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Intellectual Property Rights Interest and Legal Protection. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 1-12. <https://sisijournals.id/index.php/sisi/article/view/8>
- Rozi, S. F., & Yuwono, N. K. N. (2025). The Legal Status of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Works in the Indonesian Copyright System Based on Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright. *AMAR*, 3(2), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.62734/amar.v3i2.704>.
- Salitskaya, E. A. (2019). The Problem of Unprotected Content of Scientific Work, Do We Need a “Copyright” on Ideas?. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 89(5), 460-467. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1019331619050095>
- Sanusi, S., Prasetyo, E. H., & Taufik, M. (2024). Implications Of Legal Protection of Intellectual Property Rights for Obtaining Economic Benefits. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 1(3), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.62951/ijls.v1i3.90>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as A Research Methodology: An Overview And Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Somisetti, K. (2022). Violation of publication ethics, authorship and contributorship: rules. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 10(08), 1322–1328. <https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/15302>
- Suber, P. (2012). Open access. MIT Press.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (1979). Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Paris Act of July 24, 1971, as amended on September 28, 1979.
- World Trade Organization. (1994). Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.