

USE OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN EU LAW

Ingrida Veiksa

Faculty of Law, Turība University
Graudu 68, Rīga, LV-1058, Latvia

E-mail address: ingrida.veiksa@turiba.lv

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8253-1926>

ABSTRACT

Aim. This research aims to analyse the legal framework governing the use of copyrighted works for educational and research purposes within the European Union (EU). It focuses on the balance between authors' rights and public interest, emphasising exceptions codified in the *InfoSoc Directive* (2001/29/EC) and the *CDSM Directive* (2019/790), with comparative insights from selected EU Member States.

Methods. The research employs a comparative legal analysis of EU directives and national legislation across Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, France, Germany, Spain, Poland, Slovenia, Finland, and Switzerland.

Results. Findings reveal significant divergence in national implementation. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, France, and Switzerland offer full exceptions without remuneration. Finland uses extended collective licensing, while countries like Slovenia, Poland, Spain, and Germany adopt hybrid models requiring partial compensation. The CDSM Directive enhances digital and cross-border educational use, but national discretion leads to uneven application.

Conclusions. EU copyright law provides a structured yet flexible framework for educational use, but harmonisation remains incomplete. Clearer guidelines and broader awareness are needed to ensure lawful use of copyrighted materials in academia while safeguarding creators' rights. Early intellectual property education and simplified licensing systems could further support compliance and innovation.

Originality. This research contributes original insights by evaluating the implementation practice of EU directives in the laws of different countries, revealing the interplay between harmonised legal norms and national educational practices. It advances cognitive understanding by identifying four core criteria - educational institution, non-commercial purpose, secure electronic environment, and illustrative purpose as the pillars of lawful educational use.

Keywords: education, copyright exception, secure electronic environment, illustrative purpose, harmonisation of rights

INTRODUCTION

Copyright law remains a cornerstone for safeguarding authors' rights, ensuring fair remuneration for their creative contributions. International instruments, including the *Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works* (World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO], 1886) and the *WIPO Copyright Treaty* (WIPO, 1996), reinforce the author's entitlement to control the use of their works, an entitlement embedded in the legal systems of most jurisdictions, including Latvia. Latvian Copyright Law (Latvijas Republikas Saeima, 2000), aligned with EU regulations, recognises both economic and moral rights. It grants authors exclusive control over the reproduction, distribution, and modification of their works (Latvian Copyright Law, 2000, Article 15), while also prohibiting unauthorised use, subject to defined legal exceptions (Latvian Copyright Law, 2000, Article 40).

Copyright is a monopoly right for a certain period granted by national laws to the creator of a work. However, the rights granted to the copyright owner are not absolute, as they also include conditions for the fair use of the work for the promotion of knowledge and the development of society, which is neither an infringement of copyright nor plagiarism (Stewart, 1983).

Freedom of expression is a fundamental right protected by various international and national laws. It allows individuals to express their thoughts, opinions, and creativity without undue interference. But limitations on rights are as old as the copyright system as a whole. They appeared in European copyright law in the 19th century. The *Berne Convention* of 1886, the oldest convention in the world, already defines these concepts. The traditional limitations of the *Berne Convention* (WIPO, 1886) exist in various formats, applying them to political speech, quotations and use for educational purposes, media works, allowing borrowing from each other, etc (Cohen, 2005). As these rights continue to evolve, most copyright systems have adopted limitations that promote educational and research-related use.

This article builds on the author's previous research by exploring the development of legal exceptions for educational and research purposes. It places particular emphasis on the Latvian legal framework and its alignment with the European Union (EU) Directives. Through a comparative legal analysis, the article examines how EU Member States manage the lawful use of protected content, addressing the complexities of balancing copyright enforcement with access to knowledge in the digital era.

The author's prior work has involved the legal analysis of several national jurisdictions. Key findings have been presented at international conferences and published in academic journals. For instance, the report "Use of author's works in educational materials" was presented at the XX International Scientific Conference of Turība University and published in the conference proceedings. More recently, in 2023, the author shared perspectives on this topic at a conference hosted by the Italian Institute of Technology in Florence, presenting the paper "The use of copyrighted works for educational

and research purposes in the digital age”. This article continues that research trajectory, focusing on a critical limitation of copyright: the exception for educational and research purposes. By analysing how education functions as a lawful exception across various jurisdictions, with special attention to Latvian law and recent EU jurisprudence, the study offers a comprehensive view of regulatory approaches across Europe. It also investigates the potential for harmonising legal norms governing such exceptions.

THE NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCEPTION

The Berne Convention grants authors of literary and artistic works the exclusive right to authorise adaptations, arrangements, and other modifications of their works (Berne Convention, 1886, Article 12). Quotations from lawfully disclosed works are permissible, provided they comply with fair practice and do not exceed the extent justified by their purpose, including excerpts from newspapers and periodicals in the form of press summaries (Berne Convention, 1886, Article 10). Additionally, national legislation may permit reproduction of such works in specific cases, if the reproduction does not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work or unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author (Berne Convention, 1886, Article 9(2)).

Educational activity is fundamentally rooted in the acquisition and application of existing cultural, artistic, and scientific values. The use of authors' works within the educational process is critical for both students and educators. In higher education, students derive knowledge from the works of writers, artists, scientists, and other creative professionals. It is crucial that they produce original work based on their intellectual efforts. However, misrepresenting another author's work without attribution or commissioning others to produce assignments constitutes plagiarism and breaches academic integrity. To prepare effectively, teachers must develop instructional resources that convey complex knowledge and skills in accessible ways. These materials often incorporate the work of other authors, previously published or publicly available, within the boundaries of educational-use limitations. Technological developments have made copyrighted content more accessible, engaging, and readily shareable and everyone seeks to view, listen to and share it with friends and relatives, taking advantage of the advantages provided by new technologies (Veiksa & Kisinica, 2016). Modern teaching practices frequently involve sharing teaching materials digitally via the internet. While modernisation of education is essential, it is equally important to protect the rights of the authors whose works are used. This ease of access underscores the necessity for carefully defined legal exceptions pertaining to specific types of works and usage contexts.

There remains insufficient public understanding of the need for legal protection of intellectual works. As younger generations increasingly engage with digital media, intellectual property education must begin in early childhood. It should be

a continuous thread throughout the entire educational journey, from kindergarten to university. School curricula should include fundamental principles of intellectual property, an introduction to piracy, and an overview of its associated risks. At the tertiary level, these competencies ought to be embedded within core undergraduate coursework. Furthermore, teacher training programmes should be expanded to include education on intellectual property rights. Public awareness campaigns, while currently implemented, require broader reach and stronger emphasis. The importance of intellectual property awareness should be instilled from early education. Yet in Latvia, intellectual property education is confined to the secondary school curriculum. The Conceptual Report *Par intelektuālā īpašuma aizsardzības un pārvaldības sistēmu Latvijas Republikā* [Conceptual Report “On Intellectual Property Protection and Management System in the Republic of Latvia”] highlights the need to incorporate intellectual property topics into primary, lower secondary, and higher education curricula, and to integrate them into university study programmes (Latvijas Republikas Ministru kabinets, 2017).

Not all aspects of copyright apply to commercial exploitation of works. Copyright (to exploit the work) is also the right of the author (as a creative personality) to transfer the work as one’s own (without attribution) infringes the author’s copyright (the right to be identified as the author) as well as the right to property (the right to claim that his/her name is duly indicated in all copies and in any public event) (Torremans & Holyoak, 1998). By not respecting the author’s moral rights and copying their work, the author’s economic rights to reproduce the work are also violated. However, the rights granted to the copyright owner are not absolute, as they include the fair use of the work for the advancement of knowledge and lawful use that is not copyright infringement or plagiarism (Satija & Martínez-Ávila, 2019). Within the European Union (EU), the use of copyrighted works for educational and research purposes is regulated through well-defined exceptions and limitations.

REGULATION IN EU

EU copyright directives lay out specific criteria governing the lawful use of protected works in education and research. These include four key elements: educational institution, non-commercial purpose, secure electronic environment, and illustrative purpose. Together, these criteria determine the legitimacy of copyright exceptions for pedagogical activities under the Directive 2001/29/EC on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society (*InfoSoc Directive*) (European Parliament & Council, 2001) and *Copyright in the Digital Single Market Directive 2019/790 (CDSM Directive)* (European Parliament & Council, 2019).

The *InfoSoc Directive* serves as the cornerstone of these provisions. Its goal is to strike a balance between the protection of copyright holders and the practical needs of educators, researchers, and students. It permits the use of copyrighted works

for teaching in secure environments, such as classrooms or online platforms, provided the use is limited to what is necessary to achieve the educational objective. For researchers, particularly in the field of scientific innovation and text or data mining, the *InfoSoc Directive* ensures legal pathways to use protected materials for non-commercial purposes. Importantly, it fosters cross-border collaboration among EU-based educational and research institutions. The EU employs a specific and exhaustive list of exceptions under the *InfoSoc Directive*. These are tightly regulated and apply only when certain conditions are met: the use must occur within an educational institution, for non-commercial purposes, in a secure digital environment, and solely for illustrative purposes. Exceptions must also conform to the *three-step test*, which requires that use does not conflict with normal exploitation of the work or unreasonably prejudice the interests of the rights holder. While EU Member States must respect uniform provisions, they retain discretion to introduce additional national requirements. Article 5(3)(a) of the *InfoSoc Directive* allows member states to provide exceptions for education and research. Member States may provide exceptions for the sole purpose of illustration for teaching or scientific research, provided the source and author's name are cited, unless impossible, and the use is justified by the non-commercial nature of the activity. It emphasises support for learning and culture through exceptions serving public interest in education (InfoSoc Directive, 2001, Recital 14); permits exceptions for educational and scientific use, benefiting institutions such as libraries and archives, and covering other contexts like news reporting, quoting, and public security (InfoSoc Directive, 2001, Recital 34) and clarifies that the non-commercial nature of educational activity should be determined by its function, not its funding model or institutional structure (InfoSoc Directive, 2001, Recital 42).

With the advent of digital technology, the scope and impact of educational use of copyrighted works have become increasingly significant. The rapid proliferation of digital content and its accessibility have raised legal and practical questions. In response, the EU enacted the *CDSM Directive* in 2019, aiming to modernise copyright regulation and promote access to knowledge in the digital era. The *CDSM Directive* seeks to harmonise copyright laws across the EU and respond to the evolving challenges of the digital environment. It mandates that Member States implement exceptions tailored to digital and cross-border education. This results in greater flexibility for educational institutions, allowing for lawful digital reproduction and presentation of copyright-protected materials, for instance, in online courses or classroom presentations. According to the Article 5 of the *CDSM Directive*, educational institutions may use works digitally and across borders for illustrative, non-commercial teaching purposes, provided that the activity is under the responsibility of the institution and occurs in a secure electronic environment and proper attribution is given to the source and author. Member States may exclude certain uses (e.g., sheet music or education-specific materials) from exceptions if suitable licenses are readily available. In such

cases, visibility and availability of these licenses must be ensured. And Member States may offer fair compensation to rights holders for uses under Article 5.

Whereas the *InfoSoc Directive* laid the groundwork for educational exceptions (Veiksa & Bordans, 2019), the *CDSM Directive* extends these principles more explicitly into the digital realm. Its provisions highlight the importance of maintaining balance: protecting creators' rights while enabling educational access and innovation. Every use must be properly attributed, including the work's title, author, and source (e.g., publisher or website). But exceptions do not permit resale or distribution of materials outside the educational context, for instance, selling textbooks created from third-party content.

EU copyright directives lay out specific criteria governing the lawful use of protected works in education and research. These include four key elements: educational institution, non-commercial purpose, secure electronic environment, and illustrative purpose. Together, these criteria determine the legitimacy of copyright exceptions for pedagogical activities under the *InfoSoc* and *CDSM Directives*:

- Educational institution. Use of protected works is permitted solely within educational institutions and strictly for direct instructional purposes. While the *InfoSoc Directive* authorises certain reproductions, it does not define “education” itself. Interpretation should therefore follow Article 10(2) of the Berne Convention, which affirms that education encompasses all formal levels, excluding informal or non-institutional instruction. Moreover, the term applies to both publicly funded and private educational institutions if they are licensed or registered by the state (Gulbis & Tomson, 2013,). The *InfoSoc Directive* (*InfoSoc Directive*, 2001, Recital 42) confirms the applicability of exceptions across all forms of education, including distance learning;
- Non-commercial purpose. Copyright exceptions are only valid when the intended use is non-commercial. According to Recital 42 of the *InfoSoc Directive*, the non-commercial nature is judged by the purpose and nature of the activity itself, not by the institution's structure or funding model. As use is permitted only for non-commercial purposes, the user may not derive direct or indirect profit from it. The term non-commercial refers to the learning process itself, not to the organisational structure or the means of financing the institution (Eversheds Bitāns, 2010) - institutions that charge tuition fees may still qualify as non-commercial;
- Secure electronic environment. A crucial distinction exists between access to materials via protected internal networks (e.g., password-protected platforms for students and staff), which qualifies as lawful educational use, and access via publicly available websites, which typically disqualifies the use from copyright exceptions. If in the first case it will be recognised as use for educational and research purposes, then in the second case it will not be possible to invoke this restriction. Thus, for digital use content must be available only to authorised participants within the educational process, and platforms must be secure and restricted, in line with Article 5(1) of the *CDSM Directive*;

- Illustrative purpose. Under both EU Directives, educational use must serve an illustrative purpose, meaning the work must support, enrich, or complement the teaching material. When determining the permissible scope of use of a work, there are two fundamentally different approaches. Legal certainty can be more effectively ensured if the work to be used is assessed against a specific threshold value, for example, the maximum number of pages, or, if it is a fragment of the work, in relation to the total work expressed as a percentage (Gulbis & Tomsone, 2013).

REGULATION IN EU MEMBER STATES

This study evaluates national copyright legislation across various European jurisdictions, beginning with Latvia, the author's home country, and its neighbouring Baltic states, Lithuania and Estonia. It then reviews selected post-socialist countries: Poland, Slovenia, and Hungary. The comparative scope further includes leading Western European nations such as France, Germany, and Spain, along with Finland from the Nordic region, and Switzerland as a non-EU reference point.

Exceptions for education and research have been implemented in all EU Member States, often preceding the adoption of the *InfoSoc Directive*. However, the methods of implementation differ. In some jurisdictions, the exception allows use without author consent or remuneration. Others permit use only if compensation is provided, with some adopting hybrid models that apply partial payment obligations.

In Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, France, and Switzerland, national laws provide for a full exception: authorship may be used for educational and research purposes without prior consent or financial compensation, so long as the author's name and work title are indicated, and the three-step test is satisfied. Latvia, an EU member since 2004, adheres to EU copyright rules, including those governing educational and research use. Latvian Copyright Law (2000), permits the use of copyrighted works in education without the author's consent or payment, provided the use occurs within an educational institution or a secure digital environment where learners and educators are authenticated. Slovenia, Poland, Spain, and Germany have adopted hybrid models where educational use is sometimes a full exception, while in others it is only a limitation and requires payment of compensation. Finland takes a different approach - it employs an extended collective licensing system that permits the public availability and reproduction of works for teaching and scientific research. In educational settings, teachers and students may record performances of publicly available works for temporary use. Detailed regulations set out in the copyright laws of the Member States are attached in Annex – Table No. 1.

Although this study does not analyse copyright restrictions on education and research in all EU Member States, two main trends are clearly visible. EU Member States follow two different models:

- restrictions-based system - as used in Latvia, allowing education-based use without licensing,
- licensing-based system - where exceptions are replaced by simplified license schemes ensuring fair remuneration.

This process should not involve complex procedures that could hinder the acquisition of education or the conduct of research. Therefore, the *CDSM Directive* encourages licensing frameworks that do not impose administrative burdens and ensure transparency and accessibility for educational institutions. However, it would be much easier and more convenient for both students and lecturers to understand the system and use copyright works in education and research, while not infringing on the rights of authors, if the rules were harmonised at least within the EU.

EFFORTS FOR THE HARMONISATION OF LEGAL NORMS

Harmonising copyright exceptions across jurisdictions remains critical in ensuring consistency, especially within the EU digital and educational landscape. The *CDSM Directive* explicitly mandates that Member States enable users to rely on existing exceptions and limitations when uploading or sharing user-generated content on online platforms. This includes use for quotation, criticism, review, caricature, parody, or pastiche (*CDSM Directive, 2019, Article 17[7]*). Recital 70 of the Directive underscores that such exceptions are essential to balance fundamental rights, notably freedom of expression and artistic freedom, with property rights, including intellectual property. To guarantee equal protection across the Union, these exceptions must be mandatory and uniformly applied.

The International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI – *Association Internationale pour la Protection de la Propriété Intellectuelle*) plays a global role in advancing harmonisation of regulation in different jurisdictions. As the world’s leading non-profit focused on developing and improving IP laws, AIPPI hosts a World Congress annually (AIPPI, 2025), convening legal experts, attorneys, and stakeholders from over 40 national and regional groups, including the Latvian National Group - a voluntary union (society) of Latvian individuals and legal entities, that unites patent and trademark attorneys, attorneys at law and lawyers practicing in the field of intellectual property law (AIPPI LNG, 2025). At the AIPPI World Congress in Rio de Janeiro, delegates explored the study question: “*Exceptions and limitations to copyright protection for libraries, archives and educational and research institutions*”. This culminated in the adoption of a Congress Resolution (AIPPI, 2015), informed by a comprehensive collection of reports compiled from over 40 national and regional groups. The Latvian report offered detailed insights into domestic legal frameworks and exceptions available to education and research institutions (Kalnaja-Zelca et al., 2015). All reports were reviewed by the Reporter General Team of AIP-

PI and distilled into a Summary Report (AIPPI, 2015). The Resolution summarised the most important demands of national groups that should be included in national laws regarding exceptions and limitations for education and research.

Although this Resolution was adopted more than a decade ago, its principles continue to influence international legal discourse and the evolution of educational copyright frameworks. It provides a foundational reference for shaping future legislative reforms that reflect digital realities while preserving authors' rights. The work of AIPPI further amplifies this harmonising effort in EU and beyond the European context. Its resolutions, grounded in extensive comparative legal studies and shaped through diverse national contributions, promote adaptable copyright frameworks that strike a fair balance between protecting creators and empowering educators and researchers. Recommendations for equitable remuneration, safeguards against misuse, and digital adaptability remain crucial guideposts for national lawmakers.

CONCLUSIONS

EU copyright law provides a structured yet flexible framework for educational use, but harmonisation remains incomplete.

EU copyright law recognises education and research as legitimate grounds for exceptions, aiming to strike a balance between the rights of authors and the public interest in accessing knowledge. This principle reflects a broader commitment to fostering innovation, academic freedom, and equitable access to learning resources.

The *InfoSoc Directive* (2001/29/EC) outlines specific cases in which copyright limitations are permitted. Among these is the use of protected works for educational and research purposes. Notably, the directive's list of exceptions is exhaustive and cannot be expanded. Building on this foundation, the *CDSM Directive* (2019/790) modernises copyright legislation for the digital era by introducing harmonised exceptions across all EU Member States, including provisions for digital and cross-border educational use. Latvia has fully transposed these exceptions into national law, allowing non-commercial educational use free of charge, provided that proper attribution is given, and the use occurs within an educational institution or a secure electronic environment.

A comparative analysis reveals significant variation in national implementation. While some countries permit free use of works for educational purposes, others require partial or full remuneration, and licensing models differ widely. Central to all approaches is the concept of "illustrative purpose", the use must enhance or support the learning process, rather than substitute or exploit the original work. Harmonisation efforts, such as those led by AIPPI, advocate for consistent, fair, and adaptable copyright exceptions that uphold both innovation and academic integrity.

Despite these legal frameworks, challenges persist, particularly in the context of digital education. Many institutions lack clear, practical guidance on how to com-

ply with copyright rules. It would therefore be beneficial to develop comprehensive and user-friendly guidelines for educational institutions, outlining lawful uses of copyrighted materials. These could include concrete examples relevant to student-created work and distance learning assessments, helping educators navigate complex legal terrain with confidence.

Early intellectual property education and simplified licensing systems could further support compliance and innovation. Raising awareness and providing training on copyright rules is equally essential. Intellectual property education should be embedded across all levels of the school curriculum, from primary through higher education. Teachers should also be offered professional development opportunities, such as seminars and workshops, focused on the lawful use of copyrighted content and best practices for attribution.

Clearer guidelines and broader awareness are needed to ensure lawful use of copyrighted materials in academia while safeguarding creators' rights. A review of the Latvian Copyright Law may be warranted to clarify the scope of "illustrative purpose" and define permissible use more precisely. This could involve setting quantitative thresholds, such as a percentage of a work or a fixed number of pages, as seen in the legislation of several EU Member States.

Finally, Latvia should consider initiating a public dialogue on the adoption of flexible licensing models tailored to educational needs. Drawing inspiration from systems already in place in countries like Germany, Finland, and Italy, the long-term objective would be to establish a collective licensing framework that facilitates access to educational content while ensuring fair remuneration for rights holders.

REFERENCES

- Cohen J. H. (2005). Restrictions on copyright and their abuse. *European Intellectual Property Review*, 27(10), 359-364.
- European Parliament and Council. (2001, May). *Directive 2001/29/EC on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society. OJ L 167, 22.6.2001 (InfoSoc Directive)*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001L0029>
- European Parliament and Council. (2019, April). *Directive (EU) 2019/790 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC (CDSM Directive)*. *OJ L 130, 17.5.2019*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32019L0790>
- Eversheds Bitāns. (2010). *Skaidrojums par autortiesību un blakustiesību objektu izmantošanu mācību procesā* [Explanation on the use of copyright and related rights objects in the educational process]. https://www.tip.edu.lv/media/files/2015_%20PII_skaidrojums_par_autortiesibam.pdf
- Gulbis, R., & Tomsone, I. (2013). Autortiesību ierobežošana izglītības un zinātniskās pētniecības mērķiem [Copyright restrictions for educational and scientific research purposes]. *Journal of the University of Latvia. Law*, 4, 26-39. <https://journal.lu.lv/jull/article/view/229>
- International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property. (2015). *Study Question Q246 "Exceptions and limitations to copyright protection for libraries, archives and educational and research institutions"*. <https://aiippi.soutron.net/Portal/Default/en-GB/DownloadImageFile.ashx?objectId=7544&ownerType=0&ownerId=844>

- International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property Latvian National Group. (2025). *AIPPI is the leading non-governmental organization dedicated to the development and improvement of laws for the protection of in*. <http://www.aippi.lv/en/>
- Kalnaja-Zelca, I., Bitans, A., & Veiksa, I. (2015). *Exceptions and limitations to copyright protection for libraries, archives and educational and research institutions*. National and Regional Group Report. <https://aippi.soutron.net/Portal/Default/en-GB/RecordView/Index/1456>
- Latvijas Republikas Ministru kabinets. (2017, September). *Konceptuālais ziņojums "Par intelektuālā īpašuma aizsardzības un pārvaldības sistēmu Latvijas Republikā* [Conceptual report "on intellectual property protection and management system in the Republic of Latvia"]. <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/293578>
- Latvijas Republikas Saeima. (1998, October). *Izglītības likums* [Education law]. <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/50759>
- Latvijas Republikas Saeima. (2000, May). *Autortiesību likums* [Copyright law]. <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/5138>
- Matheson, S., Osha, J., Verschuur, A. M., Inui, Y., Laakkonen, A., & Nack, R. (2015). *Study Question. Q246 "Exceptions and limitations to copyright protection for libraries, archives and educational and research institutions"*. International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property. <https://aippi.soutron.net/Portal/Default/en-GB/RecordView/Index/1022>
- Satija, M. P. & Martínez-Ávila, D. (2019). Plagiarism an essay in terminology. *Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 39(2), 87-93. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.39.2.13937>
- Stewart, M. S. (1983). *International copyright and neighbouring rights*. Butterworths.
- Torremans, P., & Holyoak, J. (1998). *Intellectual property law*. Butterworths.
- Veiksa I., & Kisnica, I. (2016). Consumer friendly access to digital content by ensuring fair remuneration of creators: Latvia example. *Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property*, 6(3), 358–369. <https://doi.org/10.4337/qmjip.2016.03.05>
- Veiksa, I., & Bordans, J. (2019). Critical review of the implementation of the EC Directive on Copyright in the Information Society (2001/29/EC) in Latvia. In B. Lindner, & T. Shapiro (Ed.), *Copyright in the information society. A guide to national implementation of the European directive* (2nd ed., pp. 535-562). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (1886, September). *Berne convention for the protection of literary and artistic works*. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/283698>
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (1996, December). *Copyright treaty*. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/295166>

APPENDIX

Table 1

Legal Regulation of the Use of Copyrighted Works in the Educational Process in EU Countries

Country (in alpha- betical order)	Legal regulation	Title of Law, Year, Article
<i>Italy</i>	In Italy summarising, quoting, or reproducing parts of a work is permitted for teaching or research, provided the use is illustrative and non-commercial. Digital use is also allowed under these conditions. However, this exception does not apply to educational market materials or sheet music if suitable voluntary licenses are available and accessible to educational institutions	Law on Copyright and Related Rights, Italy, 1941, Articles 70, 70-bis

Country (in alpha- betical order)	Legal regulation	Title of Law, Year, Article
<i>Switzerland</i>	Although Switzerland is not an EU Member State, its copyright law reflects similar principles. Use of a work by a teacher and class for educational purposes is classified as private use. For the purposes of scientific research, it is permissible to reproduce a work if the copying is due to the use of a technical process and if the works to be copied can be lawfully accessed	Federal Act on Copyright and Related Rights. Switzerland, 1992, Article 19, 24d
<i>Estonia</i>	In Estonia law permits use of published works for illustrative educational purposes in print, broadcasting, and audio/video recording, provided the author's name, title of work, and source of publication are indicated. Reprographic reproduction of short works or excerpts is allowed in non-commercial educational and research institutions, provided the use is clearly tied to pedagogical or scientific aims (Copyright Act, Estonia, 1992, Article 19(2), (3)).	Copyright Act, Estonia, 1992, Article 19(2), (3)
<i>Finland</i>	Finland employs an extended collective licensing system that permits the public availability and reproduction of works for teaching and scientific research. In educational settings, teachers and students may record performances of publicly available works for temporary use. These recordings must not be repurposed. Additionally, excerpts, or entire short literary works, may be included in standardised exams such as the matriculation examination	Copyright Act, Finland, 1961, Article 14
<i>France</i>	In France law provides robust exceptions for educational and scientific use. Once a work is disclosed, analyses and short quotations are permissible without author approval, provided the author's name and the source are indicated, and the use is justified by the educational, critical, polemic, scientific, or informational nature of the new work	Intellectual Property Code, France, 2003, Articles L122-5, L211-3
<i>Germany</i>	Germany allows use of works in educational institutions, including preschools, schools, universities, and vocational training centres, for illustrative purposes. Teachers, students, and examiners may use up to 15% of a published work for non-commercial teaching, presentation, or learning outcomes. While most uses are royalty-free, online availability requires fair compensation via collective management organisations, either through flat-rate or usage-based remuneration	Act on Copyright and Related Rights, Germany, 1965, Articles 60a–60h

Country (in alpha- betical order)	Legal regulation	Title of Law, Year, Article
<i>Hungary</i>	Copyright law of Hungary recognises “free use” for educational and research purposes, including kindergarten, primary, secondary, vocational, art, and higher education. Use is permitted for publicly disclosed works when it adheres to fairness, does not unreasonably harm the author’s interests, and aligns with the curriculum. The legal test considers whether the purpose is compatible with genuine educational goals. https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/22713	Act on Copy- right, Hungary, 1999, Article 33.
<i>Latvia</i>	Latvian Copyright Law permits the use of copyrighted works in education without the author’s consent or payment, provided the use occurs within an educational institution or a secure digital environment where learners and educators are authenticated. Under Article 19 of the Latvian Education Law (1998), educational institutions include those established by the state, municipalities, universities, or private entities, including commercial companies offering educational programmes. To balance innovation with author rights, Article 21 of the Copyright Law allows students, educators, and researchers to use fragments of published works, provided the author and title are cited. This use must respect the integrity of the original work, and unauthorised reproduction (e.g., distributing copies of textbooks) is prohibited (Article 18). It also limits digital use to illustration in teaching, a principle now embedded in Latvian law (Article 21), which defines illustration as content that supports or enriches the learning process. In Latvia use for educational purposes is considered a rights restriction but could shift to a licensing model if a simple, accessible system were developed. The <i>CDSM Directive</i> encourages such systems, provided they do not burden educational institutions.	Copyright Law, Latvia, Article 21
<i>Lithuania</i>	Lithuania allows non-commercial educational or research use of short works or excerpts from lawfully disclosed works, including caricature, parody, or pastiche, without author consent or remuneration. Such use must be clearly related to study programmes and must not exceed the extent justified by the educational objective	Law on Copy- right and Re- lated Rights, Lithuania, 1999, Articles 211, 58
<i>Poland</i>	In Poland Educational institutions may freely quote fragments or minor works in full for teaching and provide access to disseminated works via on-site It terminals. However, reproducing excerpts or minor works in textbooks, anthologies, or reading materials for teaching or research requires payment.	Act on Copy- right and Re- lated Rights, Poland, 1994, Articles 28, 29

Country (in alphabetical order)	Legal regulation	Title of Law, Year, Article
<i>Slovenia</i>	In Slovenia free use is allowed for public communication of disclosed works for illustration in direct teaching, including exams and school events with free admission, provided performers are unpaid. However, reproduction of works in readers and textbooks, such as photography, fine arts, architecture, applied arts, industrial design, and cartography, requires equitable remuneration	Copyright and Related Rights Act, Slovenia, 1995, Articles 47, 49
<i>Spain</i>	Spanish law permits the use of quotations, reviews, and illustrations for educational or research purposes, provided the works are published and properly cited. This includes written, audio, audiovisual, and visual works. Press reviews are considered quotations, but commercial reproduction of newspaper articles may require fair remuneration if the author has not objected	Law on Intellectual Property, Spain, 1996, Article 32

Source. Own research.

REFERENCES A

- Bundesministerium der Justiz. (1965, September). *Gesetz über Urheberrecht und verwandte Schutzrechte (Urheberrechtsgesetz)*. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/23030>
- Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas. (1999, May). *Autorių teisių ir gretutinių teisių įstatymas* [Law on copyright and related rights]. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/21605>
- L'Assemblée fédérale de la Confédération Suisse. (1992, October). *Loi fédérale sur le droit d'auteur et les droits voisins*. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/23375>
- Magyar Parlament. (2024, September). *1999. évi LXXVI. Törvény* [Act No. LXXVI of 1999 on Copyright]. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/22713>
- Parlement Français. (1992, July). *Code de la propriété intellectuelle*. <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/fr/fr467en.pdf>
- Parlamento Italiano. (1941, April). *Legge a protezione del diritto d'autore e di altri diritti connessi al suo esercizio*. <https://www.altalex.com/documents/codici-altalex/2014/06/26/legge-sul-diritto-d-autore#titolo1>
- Parlamento Español (1996, April). *Ley de propiedad intelectual, regularizando, aclarando y armonizando las disposiciones legales vigentes*. <https://wipolex.wipo.int/en/legislation/details/21371>
- Parlament Jugoslavije. (1995, April). *Zakon o avtorski in sorodnih pravicah* [Copyright and related rights act]. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/21946>
- Riigikogu. (1992, November). *Autoriõiguse seadus* [Copyright act]. <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/32232#>
- Sejm Polski. (1994, February). *Ustawa o prawie autorskim i prawach pokrewnych* [Act on copyrights and related rights]. <http://www.copyright.gov.pl/pages/main-page/law-and-ordinances.php>
- Suomen Eduskunta. (1961, July). *Tekijänoikeuslaki 404/1961* [Copyright Act 404/1961]. <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/22374>