Winter 6-14-2022

Exploring Copyright Compliance in Self-Archiving of Scholarly Works: Nigerian Librarians' Perspectives

Iskil Arisekola Bolaji Mr.
Federal School Surveying, Oyo, bolajiiskil@gmail.com

Exploring Copyright Compliance in Self-Archiving of Scholarly Works: Nigerian Librarians' Perspectives

Abstract

Purpose: Low understanding and comprehension of copyright compliance have been established in the body of literature. However, there is no study to indicate the understanding of Nigerian scholars on copyright compliance in self-archiving. This study explored copyright compliance of scholarly authors in self-archiving using the perspectives of Nigerian librarians.

Design/methodology/approach: The study adopts a qualitative approach, using the semi-structured interviews to collect data from a total of twenty-one (21) participants. The interview sessions were carried out using the Zoom application, and the interview transcript was analysed using thematic analysis.

Findings: Findings showed that most of the scholarly authors view self-archiving platforms as media for sharing and distributing scholarly works. Results showed that while many of the librarians complied with copyright in self-archiving, there are some that still flout copyright agreement with publishers. Results show that majority of the librarians do not have knowledge of the copyright policies of the journal outlets where they published.

Originality: This study is novel as it provides librarians' knowledge and regard for copyright compliance in self-archiving of scholarly works. It presents the understanding of Nigerian librarians on the appropriate copyright practices in complying with the sharing of published academic works.

Research limitations/Implications: The study will provide the necessary guide on how to address ever-present issue of copyright compliance between authors and publishers.

Keywords: Copyright compliance, Self-archiving, Scholarly works, Scholarly authors, ResearchGate, Academia.edu

Introduction

Academic publishing comes with associated ethical guidelines to be followed in order to entrench scientific communication. It can be argued that from the point of ideation till publishing, every scholarly publisher prepares to address all the probable ethical issues that may arise in the process of publishing scholarly research works. Moreover, it is also important not to

disregard ethical issue after publishing. Ethical issues concern the suitable and acceptable practices that are expected of every author. Copyright compliance concerns ethics of adhering strictly to the signed copyright agreements between authors and publishers. It was noted that these agreements are not readily understood by scholarly authors (Jamali, 2017; Lovett *et al.*, 2017). Hence, this often leads to copyright violation by authors. It has been shown that copyright compliance and ethical use of research report is an integral part of scholarly publishing (Adeyemi, 2020). This is because copyright violation is assumed to be unacceptable practice in scholarly communication.

Scholarly authors are bestowed with the responsibility of enhancing the visibility of their study and as such adopt different approaches to enhance the visibility of their work. One of these techniques that authors may adopt is the use of self-archiving to further improve their works visibility (Ale-Ebrahiml *et al.*, 2014). Benson (2018) noted that scholarly authors are free to share copies of their scholarly works provided it is within copyright compliance agreement. Carroll (2013) buttressed that authors have the freedom to share their works when it is within the copyright agreement of any of the six types of Creative Commons (CC). It was stressed further that the types of CC include "attribution" (CC-BY), "attribution-share alike" (CCBY-SA), "attribution-no derivatives" (CC BY-ND), "attribution- noncommercial" (CC BY-NC), "attribution – noncommercial – share alike" (CC BY-NC-SA), and "attribution – noncommercial – no derivatives" (CC BY-NC-ND). These CC types have varying degrees of open access permission but CC-BY is the friendliest. Aside all of these, there are other copyright agreements that may vary across different scholarly publishers in either being open access or with paywall. For the purpose of this study, the focus is on scholarly works published behind paywall with limitation as to distributing, translating, revising, and building on an original work.

Kohn and Lange (2018) advised that authors of scholarly works must be aware of every detail of the copyright agreement with respect to which version of paper may be self-archived and where. More importantly, authors need to have understanding of when and where they have to seek for the publisher's approval for reproduction of original work in such a way that will make the distribution and subsequent use acceptable. It has however been shown that authors perceived seeking permission from a publisher as time-consuming and requires steep learning curve. It has been established that some publishers also allow some form of self-archiving due to the rise in open access publishing and institutional repository (Archambault *et al.*, 2014). Gadd

and Covey (2019) however noted that this may be one of the reasons why there is exponential increase in the volume of restrictions as to self-archiving practices. This means that as much as some journals are relaxing the copyright policies with respect to self-archiving of scholarly works, there is ever-growing corresponding increase in restrictions of the copyright policies in some journals. This suggests that authors are increasingly being constrained in self-archiving their works with the prevailing copyright policies of different journals. Meanwhile, librarians' perceptions and practices of copyright compliance in self-archiving are important as it is believed that librarians are invested or active in the sharing of scholarly articles.

There is a growing acceptance and use of self-archiving in sharing and distributing scholarly works by authors (Ortega, 2017). More specifically, it has been shown that Nigerian librarians are aware and use different self-archiving options to propagate their research reports and increase visibility (Okeji *et al*., 2018). Propagation and visibility of scholarly works is quite critical to how scholarly works will perform among other similar works in the body of literature (Peroni *et al.*, 2015). Understandably, it is argued that every published Nigerian librarian would make effort to increase the promotion and visibility of their scholarly works by using the available self-archiving options. However, in the process of this, there is need to understand that the copyright compliance with the publisher's copyright policies is an ethical issue that should be guard jealously by all authors. This is because Jamali (2017) has shown that many scholarly authors often end up self-archiving wrongly on ResearchGate, which is one of the numerous self-archiving options available to authors. Based on the foregoing, this study seeks to explore the perspectives of Nigerian librarians as to the copyright compliance in self-archiving their published scholarly works.

Statement of the Problem

As stated in the background, copyright compliance simply involves the guiding use of published scholarly works based on the agreements reached between authors and publishers. Authors that voluntarily to be bounded by publisher's copyright policies should not be found wanting in disregard for same. In some journals, during submission or after acceptance of manuscript for publication, authors are free to choose between publishing in green open access or behind paywall. Publishing in open access and paywall may come in different nomenclature in different journals. In the contextual problem of published Nigerian librarians, understanding that green open access publishing come with financial implications in some journals, there is a very

high chance of publishing behind paywall owing to the financial constraints faced by different authors (Adeyemi *et al*., 2021). This is in addition to the perceived inadequate research funding from various levels of government in Nigeria. Meanwhile, having scholarly works behind paywall may reduce the chances of high citations (Dawson and Yang, 2016; Peroni *et al.*, 2015) and this may motivate Nigerian librarians to share or distribute their works on various self-archiving platforms without complying with copyright agreement.

Moreover, Jamali (2017) found that more than half of authors of non-open access articles did not comply with journal's copyright policies and most authors of journals that provide some form of self-archiving have inadequate knowledge of how to self-archive properly as they self-archived wrongly. This suggests that there is an underlying problem as to the self-archiving practices of authors and regard for copyright compliance. Hence, this study seeks to extend the earlier study by adopting qualitative approach to have in-depth understanding of whether these prevailing wrong self-archiving practices were done intentionally and to show whether scholarly authors have knowledge of the copyright policies of journals they publish with. Okeji *et al*., (2018) carried out a quantitative study to elicit the awareness and use of self-archiving by Nigerian librarians and it was found that most of the librarians use self-archiving platforms. However, there are no indications as to the perceptions of Nigerian librarians on self-archiving or whether they consider copyright compliance in self-archiving. Therefore, this study seeks to fill that gap to provide a comprehensive It is premised on this that this study seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the perceptions of Nigerian librarians about using self-archiving platforms for sharing their scholarly works?
- Do scholarly authors regard copyright compliance when self-archiving published works?
- Do scholarly authors have knowledge of copyright policies of the journal they publish?

Review of Related Literature

This section presents the review of literature as it concerns the major themes of the study. However, there has been little study carried out on scholarly authors' copyright compliance in self-archiving. Charbonneau and Priehs (2014) noted that there is a disturbing lack of awareness of copyright laws and fair use in academic environment generally. The author feared that the knowledge of fair use guidelines is lacking and this brings about neglect of copyright

compliance. It was argued that the pressing issues that caused such disregard include inadequate funding, lack of knowledge on the economic implications of copyright violation, and low awareness of the guidelines for fair use (Napper, 2003). It is my understanding that self-archiving aids mass distribution of scholarly communication and has been proliferated by the Internet as it is a virtual world that can be accessed with little or no difficulty. This brought about more knotty situation with respect to addressing copyright violations. Kozumplik and Kreutziger (2010) agreed that the Internet has entrenched people's misunderstanding of copyright. The author further argued that what many conceptualize as "fair use" may actually not be copyright compliant depending on copyright laws and agreements.

Jamali (2017) carried out a bibliometric analysis of copyright compliance and infringement in ResearchGate full-text journal articles. ResearchGate is one of the different options of self-archiving that are used by scholarly authors. The study findings showed that more than half of the authors of the sampled journal articles of non-open access did not comply with journal's copyright policies in self-archiving. For those journals that allowed some form of self-archiving, it was shown that majority of the authors did not comply with journal's copyright policy by self-archiving the final published version of their works. The findings may be as a result of authors' lack of understanding of the copyright agreement. It is unclear whether this is as a result of confusion with the publisher's copyright policies, authors' negligence, or intentional disregard for publisher's copyright policies. Okeji, Eze, and Chibueze (2018) studied the awareness and use of self-archiving among Nigerian academic librarians and found that some of the motivations for using self-archiving is to increase exposure of published works, broadens dissemination of scholarly works, and increase visibility of authors' institutions.

Kohn and Lange (2018) assessed researchers' understanding of Copyright Transfer Agreement (CTA). In this context, CTA simply means the concession of the copyright of a contribution by authors to a journal. The experimental study by Kohn and Lange (2018) was carried out by distributing copies of CTAs to corresponding authors of academic research articles in the Scopus database. It was found in their study that the researchers have low understanding of the terms and conditions in the CTAs they read. It was further shown in the study that the low comprehension rate did not vary across discipline, years of service in academia, years of experience in publishing, or whether they have previously read the CTA before as a published author of the journal. Creaser et al. (2010) explored authors' awareness and attitudes towards

open access repositories and it was found that authors' doubt about copyright embargo period and fear of flouting copyright terms and conditions are the most significant concerns about self-archiving. This suggests that authors do not have adequate understanding of the publisher's copyright policies. Interestingly, Creaser et al.'s (2010) showed that authors' underestimate their rights to make 'fair use' of their scholarly works.

Lovett *et al.* (2017) examined open access policy compliance and the participation of University of Rhode Island faculty on ResearchGate. It was shown that most of the faculty members that participate in ResearchGate are more probable to share articles via open access policy than faculty who do not participate. Results also showed that faculty's main motivation to self-archive is for the purpose of visibility and impact. This is usually intended towards improving the impact of authors' works, which is most popularly in the form of high citation. Lastly, results of the study showed that more than half of the faculty members were unclear about what constitutes copyright compliant with respect to publisher's copyright policies of self-archiving scholarly works on ResearchGate. The consequences of this uncertainty may lead to the non-compliance to copyright agreement and that may attract the publisher's attention and lead to warning of take down or, at the extreme, issue of litigation (Chawla, 2017; Else, 2018). These are issues that may come with disrepute and may portray bad image of the author to prospective publisher, hence it is advised to guide against such.

A cross-disciplinary study by Spezi *et al.* (2013) on researchers' practices of green open access showed that more than half of the published authors reported that rights to self-archiving was the most difficult part for them. This further buttressed the gap that exists in authors' understanding of what should and how to self-archive scholarly works. Some studies (Hansen, 2012; Laakso, 2014) have shown that this gap exists owing to authors' misunderstanding and misinterpretation of what scholarly works can be self-archived, when they can be self-archived, and where they can be self-archived. This could be owing to the findings that only few authors' read the Copyright Transfer Agreement properly (Bakos *et al*., 2014) and the incorporation of Copyright Transfer Agreement into the manuscript submission system which makes authors checkbox consent to CTA without proper perusal (Kohn and Lange, 2018). Contrary to Bakos *et al.*'s (2014) claim, it was shown in different studies (Berquist, 2009; Moore, 2011) that most scholarly authors read and digest CTAs before consent.

Dawson and Yang (2016) explored the practices of institutional repositories within the provision of copyright agreement that may restrict open access. The study showed that copyright compliance is a challenge to ensuring open access initiative through institutional repository. It was shown that this challenge is usually in the area of seeking publisher's permission and the embargo periods imposed on journal articles. Kim (2010) examined the motivations and barriers to faculty members' self-archiving practices. Results show that motivations for can be enhanced by peer pressure in discipline where self-archiving practice is prevalent. It was shown that the motivational factors include perceived benefits of open access, perceived self-archiving culture in faculty's discipline, and the lack of effect on tenure or promotion. The study findings show that barriers to faculty members' self-archiving practices include age, copyright concerns, additional time and efforts, and technical ability. It was concluded that proper self-archiving can be encouraged with the provision of both technical assistance and copyright management.

Kim (2011) analyzed the motivations of faculty members' self-archiving and found that the motivations for self-archiving are copyright condition and preservation. The study also showed that copyright concerns were found to be positively associated with self-archiving. Xia (2008) found that faculty members are faced with two challenges, which include copyright concerns as to and indifferent attitude towards self-archiving. The study also revealed that they are sometimes faced with from affiliated institution to self-archive owing to institutional requirements. Coleman (2007) examined the views of publishers of Thomson-Scientific ISI ranked Library and Information Science journals with respect to Copyright Transfer Agreements (CTAs). The findings showed that more than half (62%) of the publishers did not make CTAs available to the open Web. This indicates that the CTAs were not freely available to authors. Out of the 62% that did not make CTAs available, less than half (40%) of the journals were silent about self-archiving. It was also shown that about 38% of the journals' CTAs that were available were unclear. It was also shown that only 10% of the journals prohibit self-archiving by the authors.

Methodology

This study is an exploratory study that seeks to provide a new thinking and further entrench the theories in the area of copyright compliance in self-archiving by authors (Flick, 2017). It adopts qualitative research method owing to the intention of providing in-depth

understanding of copyright compliance in self-archiving among published librarians in Nigeria. The choice of qualitative research approach is to provide more insights as to the major themes of this study, which can further entrench the theoretical framework in scholarly communication. Learning the complex process of the social world requires comprehensive interpretation. Interpretivism has been recommended as suitable for studies with little or no theoretical basis and where opinions of participants are collected (Cohen *et al*., 2018). The case study was adopted in this study as it permits the in-depth exploration of a phenomenon in a group of people (Yin, 2009). In this case, this study seeks to explore copyright compliance in self-archiving among Nigerian librarians. The purposive sampling technique was adopted for the study as the participants were sampled on the ground of being scholarly authors and Nigerian librarians.

The participants recruited for the study were purposively selected. Only twenty-one (21) out of the thirty (30) that were sent introductory messages to voluntarily participate in the study agreed to take part. The inclusion criteria include status of being a librarian practicing in Nigeria and user of any popular self-archiving platforms; while the exclusion criteria include inactivity on self-archiving platforms and non-professional librarian. All of the twenty-one participants had self-archiving platforms and were professional librarians. The semi-structured interview was used to collect data via Zoom application on the convenient time of the participants. The interview sessions were recorded and transcribed using the Microsoft Word application, with a total of 15,316 words. After this, Microsoft Excel application was used to code the transcripts. To ensure credibility and trustworthiness, which are the validity and reliability of qualitative data, the codes were sent to the participants to ensure that there is no form of misinterpretation or misconstrued words or phrases emanating from the transcribed interview (Birt *et al.*, 2016). One of the participants could not participate in the member check as continuous reminder for the response was to no avail. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the final version of the interview transcript. Only five themes were developed from the codes.

Results

Collected data were qualitative in nature, hence thematic analysis was used in the analysis. Transcription was done on Microsoft Excel with each sheet contains responses of each participant. Since the participants were twenty-one (21), this means that there were 21 sheets on the Microsoft Excel coding sheet.

Perceptions of Nigerian Librarians on Using Self-Archiving Platforms

It was shown in the extracted codes that the most prevalent of the participants' perceptions is the fact that self-archiving platforms help in the sharing and promotion of their works for colleagues locally and internationally. It was shown that it supports the visibility of some journals on the web and enhances the performance of the participants' research works among other similar works in the body of literature. Some of the participants' opinions are quoted below:

Participant 4:

> "I think self-archiving platforms are very good innovations for academics. I am accustomed to the use of ResearchGate and I can say it is a great platform in my view. I have all of my works saved on my profile. Even my pre-prints and other projects I am working on. This is to introduce people to my research interests and perhaps attract likeminded colleagues that we share the same research interest".

Participant 7:

> "The idea of self-archiving is basically to enhance the views of my research works by my colleagues."

Participant 9:

> "Self-archiving is ever becoming a mainstay among scholars that are published and even those that are not yet published. Take ResearchGate for instance, it is becoming bigger everyday with different opportunities. It is especially important to me because I always keep tab of my weekly statistics as to the views of my works. I use this to judge how my works are performing on a weekly basis, and it gives me inkling on what works would likely have citations in the nearest future".

On self-archiving platforms complimenting some journals articles visibility, Participant 15 stated that:

> "I perceive self-archiving websites as very beneficial to scholarly authors. My experience has shown that some of my works that I

posted on, let us say, ResearchGate gets countless views and I am of the thought that there are some works on the page that I believe would not have had the citations it had already if it had not been posted on my profile for public view. If it were left to be on the publishing journal website, I am afraid the work might have not performed as much as it has".

In similar vein, it was revealed that some of the participants view self-archiving platforms as media for boosting academic profile. This is usually in the effort to of be "seen" and "heard" by other colleagues. It was found that the self-archiving platforms should not be platforms where any kind of articles/manuscripts can be posted. This is suggestive of some kind of control in what is shared on self-archiving platforms.

Participant 18:

"Signing up on self-archiving platforms is, in my opinion, for building academic profile. I believe that academic prominence requires a lot of factors working in your favour. However, I have a very strong belief that two of these factors are having high-performing research works and being seen and heard by other professional colleagues. Self-archiving platforms may not be enough to achieve these two factors, but they will be of great assistance to anyone that wants to achieve those factors. Meanwhile, I belief that there is a need to have, or the intention to have, good scholarly works published before signing up for any self-archiving platform. Self-archiving platforms should not just be a dumping ground".

The findings of the study showed that some of the participants viewed self-archiving platforms as platforms to share their scholarly works that are only available in paper copy. This may be research works with publishers with no Internet presence. It was noted by two of the participants as follow:

Participant 4:

"The (self-archiving) platforms are good for curating one's research works and it can help aid visibility. I have had experience where the work I posted on my ResearchGate profile does not have online presence but it got cited. And I am very sure it is because of the fact that I posted it on ResearchGate. This is because three of the four citations are from international authors".

Nigerian Librarians' Regard for Copyright Compliance in Self-Archiving Published Works

The study findings show that more than half of the participants complied with copyright in uploading their published works on self-archiving platforms. Some of the comments that buttressed this are below:

Participant 8:

"I am usually copyright compliant when I upload new scholarly works on self-archiving platforms"

Participant 12:

"Firstly, I barely publish with journals that you have to have some subscription to access. It is not my thing because I know that put restrictions on scholarly works affect the citation performance. That aside, I am a firm advocate of open access. So, it does not always interest me. I can only publish with any of the subscription-based journal only if I have the money (APC)".

Participant 18:

"In self-archiving research papers on different platforms, I ensure that it is copyright compliant. I share open access works which often come with Creative Commons stamp. Meanwhile, I do not share works published with subscription publishing houses to the general public in self-archiving. What I do is that I will self-archive it and it will be private. I however share with any user who request for the work".

The study further revealed that some of the participants do not know about copyright compliance in self-archiving as to the works they upload on self-archiving platforms. It was shown that they have their preconceived notions and habits about uploading works from different publishing houses. It was observed that some of the participants do not make public their scholarly works with supposedly "big" publishing houses when self-archiving. Some robust explanations from some of the participants are the following:

Participant 13:

> "Honestly, I don't consider copyright compliance when self-archiving research works. I just have this mindset that if the work is not published in publishing houses like Taylor and Francis, Emerald, IGI Global, and some others, I have the privilege of sharing to the public on self-archiving platforms. The thing is, whenever I publish with these people (publishers), I don't consider paying for the APC as it is relatively expensive for me and I understand their business model. So, I don't even bother posting the article to the general public".

Participant 17:

> "…..I have two journal articles on Taylor and Francis and I didn't bother to make them public when I put them up on my ResearchGate. Interestingly, it took me over two weeks to observe that one of the two works was made open access by the publisher I guess because it has to do with COVID-19 research. Even after that, I didn't bother changing the public or private setting of the article on my ResearchGate. For Academia.edu, I don't bother uploading private works on the site".

Participant 21:

> "I don't really pay attention whether I was copyright compliant or not in uploading research works on my RearchGate. However, I don't bother to make open my research with some publishing houses known for hybrid publications".

Interestingly, it was revealed that some of the participants do not have the knowledge of sharing or uploading the resources to either public or private views. About five (5) of the twenty-one (21) participants were of this opinion. A couple of the responses are found below:

Participant 2:

"Honestly, I have no idea of the private or public settings in uploading of documents on ResearchGate. I just upload without much setting or whatever. I have been a user only less than one year".

Participant 5:

"…….As I said earlier, I have faint idea of uploading work to the public or to (sic) private. And in all honesty, I have never gotten any warning or whatever as you have said. I don't know much about these details".

It was also shown that majority of the participants do not consider copyright issue when sharing or distributing their published scholarly works with colleagues and other users on self-archiving platforms. It was revealed that almost all of the participants believed they have the "right" to share their work with whomever they want. Some of the participants' responses are below:

Participants 8:

"I share my works with everyone in need freely. I guess it is my research and effort (laughs)… I really don't have an idea if that is against copyright or whatever, but I do it".

Participant 9:

"Yes, I share my research works with people without any form of restrictions. I believe that should be within the ambit of copyright agreement with the publisher".

Librarians' Knowledge of Copyright Policies of Journals in Self-Archiving

The study findings revealed that majority of the participants did not have knowledge of the copyright policies of the journal outlets they published their scholarly works in respect of

self-archiving specifically. The results showed that some authors do not read the copyright transfer agreement as they accent to the check box. Some selected responses can be found below:

Participants 2:

"I don't have knowledge of the copyright policies of journals. I don't keep that to head. I just archive my works on self-archiving platforms".

Participant 3:

"I have no knowledge of that (copyright policies of journals)".

Participant 16:

"I don't see the need for that. I have only one article on Emerald and IGI Global apiece. I am not sure I have ever even read it before. I just breeze through and click the box for approval".

Participant 18:

"Is it safe to just say the truth? (laughs)…. I don't know a single thing about their (journals) copyright policies when it comes to self-archiving".

Meanwhile, few of the participants that claimed to have knowledge of the copyright policies were probed further but they could not provide any significant information except that they are not allowed to share their published works with some journals publicly. Find some of the comments below:

Participant 10:

"I know that they have policy of not sharing their research works with the general public in self-archiving".

Participant 14:

"There may be a lot of guidelines in the (journal) policies but I know that the issue of public view of research works sits well on top of all".

Discussion

The study revealed that most of the participants perceived self-archiving platforms as an avenue for sharing and distributing their research articles, promotion of their research works,

enhance visibility of their works, build academic profile, and making available scholarly works published in hard copy to prospective users. These perceptions may be what lead to the reasons faculty self-archived their scholarly works improve their visibility and enhance their citations (Lovett *et al.*, 2017). Also, Okeji *et al.*, (2018) revealed that self-archiving enhances dissemination of scholarly works. Meanwhile, Kim (2010) showed that faculty perceived self-archiving platforms as open access options and they are only motivated to self-archive their works based on the perceptions of the platforms by colleagues in their disciplines. It was also shown that some of the participants viewed that self-archiving platforms should not be an avenue to upload scholarly works without credibility or verifiability. This finding indicates the experience of some of the librarians with respect to self-archiving works that are not of quality. It was found that some of the authors' believe that self-archiving platforms buttress the visibility of some research works. This support the evidence of Okeji *et al.*, (2018) that academic librarians in Nigeria are motivated to self-archive so as to increase the publicity of their scholarly works.

Results of the study showed that more than half of the participants complied with copyright in uploading their published works on self-archiving platforms. This is different from the findings of Jamali (2017) that more than half of the published authors of the sampled English discipline journal of non-open access did not comply with journal's copyright policies in self-archiving. Results however showed that some of the participants do not bother about copyright compliance in self-archiving with respect to the scholarly works they uploaded on self-archiving platforms. This may be as a result of their intention to broaden dissemination of their scholarly works (Okeji *et al*., 2018). The findings showed that some of the participants do not make public upload of their scholarly works with supposedly "big" publishing houses. It was also shown that some of the participants do not have the knowledge of sharing or uploading their scholarly works to either public or private views. Also, the results revealed that majority of the participants do not consider copyright issues when sharing or distributing their scholarly work with colleagues or other users on self-archiving platforms. This may be as a result of authors' low comprehension of the copyright terms and conditions (Kohn and Lange, 2018). Lastly, the findings showed that majority of the participants believed that they have the right to share their works with whomever they want to share them with. The majority of the participants stated that they complied with copyright but did not consider copyright in sharing their scholarly works with colleagues on self-

archiving platforms. This may be the reason why faculty members that use ResearchGate are more likely to use open access policy than faculty members that do not (Lovett *et al.*, 2017).

The study findings show that the majority of the participants did not have knowledge of the copyright policies of the journals they published with in respect of self-archiving. It was shown that some of the authors check the copyright transfer agreement check box without reading the agreement. This may be the reason why majority of the scholarly authors that published with journals that allows some form of self-archiving did not comply with the journal's copyright policy by self-archiving the wrong version of their research works (Jamali, 2017). The findings of this study showed that the wrong posting by the scholarly authors may be because of their lack of knowledge of the journal's copyright policies. Kohn and Lange (2018) found that corresponding authors of academic research articles on Scopus database had low understanding and comprehension of the copyright agreement, whether they were reading it for the first time or they have read it before. It has also been established in prior study that self-archiving part is difficult for scholarly to comprehend (Spezi *et al.*, 2013). With this study therefore showing that the lack of knowledge about the copyright compliance is premised on the authors not reading the copyright transfer agreement. It was also revealed that some of the participants that claimed they have knowledge of the copyright policies only have knowledge of whether they have the "right" to share their scholarly publicly or not.

Originality

There has been prior study on the awareness and use of self-archiving platforms among librarians. However, there has been none that has treated librarians' perspectives of copyright compliance in self-archiving scholarly works. This study finding is novel as it provides understanding of librarians' perceptions, knowledge, and regard for copyright compliance in self-archiving their published scholarly works. The relevance of the study findings is premised on the assumption that librarians are pivotal in promoting and entrenching copyright compliance of self-archiving among scholarly authors. Therefore, their perceptions, knowledge, and regard for complying with copyright transfer agreement is very crucial for ethical practices in sharing of scholarly works.

Conclusion

The study concludes that Nigerian librarians consider self-archiving as avenues to engage with other colleagues, probably on their professional issues or research methods. The study established that most scholarly authors view self-archiving platforms as academic social media. It was also established in the study that majority of the scholarly authors share and distribute their scholarly works on self-archiving platforms. It was settled in the study that ResearchGate is the most popular self-archiving platforms among the participants and they use self-archiving platforms daily. The study concludes that more than half of the participants complied with copyright policies in self-archiving their scholarly works. It was however established that majority of the scholarly authors did not have the adequate knowledge of copyright policies of the journal outlets where they are published. Lastly, the study concludes that adequate knowledge of journal's copyright policies may not translate to copyright compliance.

Research Limitations/Implications

This study provides the understanding of Nigerian librarians with respect to copyright compliance in self-archiving. It is considered from the findings that enhancing copyright compliance among librarians in Nigeria can be possible with adequate training and enlightenment on the need for published librarians to read and understand the copyright policies of the journals they published with. This will help them not to unknowingly flout copyright agreement they must have signed with the journals. Improved knowledge of Nigerian librarians with respect to copyright compliance in self-archiving may be of benefit to other scholarly authors from different fields. This is so because, it is believed that scholarly scholars often learn copyright issues with respect to their published work from librarians. This can help reduce the concern of flouting copyright transfer agreement. More importantly, it was observed that there has been some recurring complaints and, in fact, lawsuits between publishers such as Elsevier and American Chemical Society (ACS) with ResearchGate. It is believed that with the findings of this study, Nigerian librarians should advocate the need to ensure copyright compliance in self-archiving their scholarly works in a bid to avoid being found in the copyright agree,emt dilemma.

Practical Implications

The study findings showed that majority of the librarian do not read the copyright policies of the journals they published with they often ensure they comply with copyright in self-archiving their works. This suggests that most Nigerian librarians have understanding of copyright. However, it is advisable that journals should ensure making their copyright transfer agreements succinct for prospective authors. It is recommended that librarians should encourage themselves and other scholarly authors to always read and understand copyright transfer agreements before they check the box. Lastly, journals should endeavour working towards relaxing their open access policy so as to encourage and enhance equitable access to information.

Disclosure Statements

The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests in the study.

REFERENCE

Adeyemi, I.O. (2020), Copyright issues in Nigeria: Analysis of Nigerian Copyright Commission cases between the years 2008-2018, *International Journal of Knowledge Content Technology & Development*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 71-82. doi: 10.5865/IJKCT.2020.10.1.071

Adeyemi, I.O., Sulaiman, K.A., and Temim F. (2021), Factors and considerations influencing faculty members' decision to publish with journals: A Nigerian university experience, *Mousaion: South African Journal of Information Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 1-17. doi: 10.25159/2663-659X/8180

Ale-Ebrahiml, N., Salehi, H., Embi, M.A., Tanha, H.F., Gholizadeh, H., and Motahar, S.M. (2014), Visibility and citation impact, *International Education Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 317-327.

Archambault, E., Amyot, D., Deschamps, P., Nicol, A., Provencher, F., Rebout, L., and Roberge, G. (2014), Proportion of open access papers published in peer-reviewed journals at the European and world levels – 1996-2013, *Copyright, Fair Use, Scholarly Communication etc.* 8. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=scholcom

Bakos, Y., Marotta-Wurgler, F., and Trossen, D. R. (2014), Does anyone read the fine print? Consumer attention to standard-form contracts, *Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 1-35. doi: 10.1086/674424

Benson, S.R. (2018), "I own it, don't I?" The rules of academic copyright ownership and you, *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 317-327. doi: 10.1080/10691316.2018.1533201

Berquist, T.H. (2009), The copyright transfer agreement: We sign it, but do we understand it?, *American Journal of Roentgenology*, Vol. 192 No. 4, pp. 849-851. doi: 10.2214/AJR.09.2655

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., and Walter, F. (2016), Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation?, *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 26 No. 13, pp.1802-1811. doi: 10.1177/1049732316654870

Carroll, M. (2013), Creative commons and the openness of open access, *The New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 368 No. 9, pp. 789-791. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1300040

Charbonneau, D.H., and Priehs, M. (2014), Copyright awareness, partnerships, and training issues in academic libraries, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 40 No. 2-3, pp. 228-233.

Chawla, D. S. (2017), Publishers take ResearchGate to court, alleging massive copyright infringement, *Science*, October 6, available at: http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/10/publishers-take-researchgate-court-allenging-massive-copyright-infringement (accessed 15 May 2021).

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2018), *Research Methods in Education*. 8th ed. : Routledge, London.

Coleman, A. (2007), Self-archiving and the copyright transfer agreements of ISI-ranked library and information science journals, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 58 No. 2, pp. 286-296. doi: 10.1002/asi.20494

Creaser, C., Fry, J., Greenwood, H., Oppenheim, C., Proberts, S., Spezi, V. and White, S. (2010), Authors' awareness and attitudes towards open access repositories, *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 16 Sup 1, pp. 145-161. doi: 10.1080/13614533.2010.518851

Dawson, P. H. and Yang, S. Q. (2016), Institutional repositories, open access and copyright: What are the practices and implications? *Science & Technology Libraries*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 1-16. doi: 10.1080/0194262X.2016.1224994

Else, H. (2018), Major publishers sue researchgate over copyright infringement, *Nature*, October 5, available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-06945-6 (accessed 15 May 2021).

Flick, U. (2017), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*. SAGE, London.

Gadd, E. and Covey, D. T. (2019), What does "green" open access mean? Tracking twelve years of change to journal publisher self-archiving policies, *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 106-122. doi: 10.1177/0961000616657406

Hansen, D. (2012), Understanding and making use of academic authors' open access right, *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 1-11. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1050

Jamali, H.R. (2017), Copyright compliance and infringement in ResearchGate full-text journal articles, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 112, pp. 241-257. doi: 10.1007/s11192-017-229-4

Kim, J. (2010), Faculty self-archiving: Motivations and barriers, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 61 No. 9, pp. 1909-1922. doi: 10.1002/asi.21336

Kim, J. (2011), Motivations of faculty self-archiving in institutional repositories, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 246-254. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2011.02.017

Kohn, A. and Lange, J. (2018), Confused about copyright? Assessing researchers' comprehension of copyright transfer agreements, *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, Vol. 6, General Issue, pp. 1-26. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.2253

Kozumplik, C. and Kreutziger, J. (2010), Copyright compliance: Conducting a fair use training session, *Community & Junior College Libraries*, Vol. 16, pp. 21-36. doi: 10.1080/02763910903472432

Laakso, M. (2014), Green open access policies of scholarly journal publishers: A study of what, when, and where self-archiving is allowed, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 99 No. 2, pp. 475-494. doi: 10.1007/s11192-01301205-3

Lovett, J., Rathemacher, A., Boukari, D. and Lang, C. (2017), Institutional repositories and academic social networks: Competition or complement? A study of open access policy compliance vs. ResearchGate participation, *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, Vol. 5, General Issue, pp. 1-36. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.2183

Moore, G. (2011), Survey of university of Toronto faculty awareness, attitudes, and practices regarding scholarly communication: A preliminary report, University of Toronto, Toronto, available at: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/26446/3/Preliminary_Report.pdf (accessed 24 April 2021).

Napper, V.S. (2003), Ethical issues in copyright compliance and faire use guidelines in teacher education, *Tech Trends*, Vol. 47 No. 5, pp. 5-8.

Okeji, C.C., Eze, M.E. and Chibueze, N.M. (2018), Awareness and use of self-archiving options among academic librarians in Nigerian universities, *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, Vol. 68 No. 1/2, 2-16. doi: 10.1108/GKMC-12-2017-0109

Ortega, J.L. (2017), Towards a homogenization of academic social sites: A longitudinal study of profiles in academia.edu, google scholar citations and researchgate". *Online Information Review*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 812-825. doi: 10.1108/OIR-01-2016-0012

Peroni, S., Dutton, A. Gray, T. and Shotton, D. (2015), Setting our bibliographic reference free: Towards open citation data". *Records Management Journal*, Vol. 71 No. 2, pp. 253-277. doi: 10.1108/JD-12-2013-0166

Spezi, V., Fry, J., Creaser, C., Probets, S. and White, S. (2013), Researchers' green open access practice: a cross-disciplinary analysis, *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 69 No. 3, pp. 334-359. doi: 10.1108/JD-01-2012-0008

Xia, J. (2008), A comparison of subject and institutional repositories in self-archiving practices, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 489-495. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2008.09.016

Yin, R.K. (2009), *Case Study Research, Design and Method*. 4th ed. Sage Publications Ltd, London.