

Novelty at Work: The lived experience of Faculty Researchers in Intellectual Property Licensing

Jenina V. Tolentino
Laguna State Polytechnic University
Santa Cruz Campus
Santa Cruz Laguna Philippines

Abstract

This phenomenological study sought to uncover the lived experience of faculty researchers in Intellectual Property Licensing at the different campuses of the Laguna State Polytechnic University, the participants of which were purposively selected. As to the lived experiences of faculty researchers in Intellectual Property Licensing, it branched out to four thematic concepts of their shared reality. They are highlighted in the following: Theme 1: Protection of novelty; Theme 2: Technical and scientific writing as delayers; Theme 3: Budgetary requirements; and Theme 4: Tedious loops in procedure are all suggestive of the participants' subsisting challenges in securing patent license and rights. These emergent themes touch on concepts of balance and improvement in research work specific to patent licensing. The participants believe that there are still a number of issues that need to be addressed in order for the patent licensing culture in their institutions to be fully recognized. As to how the faculty researchers cope up with the challenges and demands in Intellectual Property Licensing, two insightful themes emerged. Theme 5: Strategic partnerships and Theme 6: Personal badge of recognition implicate the participants' innovative ways of complying with the stringent requirements of patent licensing. These themes suggest personal concepts of worth and professional growth and continuing cooperation with external parties in order to improve their own patent work. In view of these, it is highly recommended that the internal auditing of faculty researchers' patent work be revisited. Procedural requirements should be reviewed as to address the need for faster reviewing of patent work and also to check on budgetary deficiencies that may arise from the coursework. Furthermore, extension services and collaboration with high-budget parties are encouraged to ease the burden of worrying for budgetary requirements. Mutual partnerships with organizations with similar interests in the researchers' patent work are seen to boost not only the visibility of the academic institution but also the availability of resources which are needed to improve the patent work of the faculty researchers.

Keywords: work motivation, organizational commitment, pedagogical competency, Cavite State University

1. Introduction

The mandate of Philippine Technology Transfer Act of 2009 (Republic Act No. 10055) requires the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) and Intellectual Property (IP) were to issue guidelines in intellectual valuation, commercialization and information sharing both in public and private Higher Institutions (HEI) and adopt the technology.

The intellectual property code of the Philippines recognizes that an effective intellectual and industrial property is vital to the development of the domestic and creative activity, facilitates the transfer of Technology, attracts foreign industries and ensures market access for markets.

In the academe, the works of faculty become more valuable commercially; thus produce enormous profits from the faculty researchers and inventors with industrial and commercial values.

Based on converting the Intellectual property as an organizational asset for institutional performance indicator in Globalization. Creating and maintaining intellectual property is a challenge to HEIs. To surpass the challenge for innovation and research the faculty researcher has to contribute to producing patentable and publishable research so for them not to "perish."

It is for this reason that the researcher wanted to probe on factors which may intermingle with each other as the teacher stays longer within an institution. Motivation, commitment, and pedagogical competency are three of the main factors which are well-researched on but the relationships that may exist among the three are rarely visited. Hence, the researcher was driven to conduct this study.

2. Methods

The study employed a phenomenological qualitative research approach. According to Creswell (2013) decision to apply a qualitative research design is when we want to empower individually to share their stories, understand the context or settings in which participants in the study address a problem on an issue.

The population of the study is composed of faculty with Intellectual Property License from the different campuses of the Laguna State Polytechnic University; to wit: Siniloan campus with five (5) including the ITSO manager and coordinator; San Pablo campus with two (2); with the ITSO coordinator; Los Baños campus with four and ITSO coordinator (4) and Santa Cruz campus with five (5) participants and ITSO coordinator, due to the depth of qualitative data was provided.

As for the format of the interview, the research implemented a semi-structured interview approach Kvale (2007). Semi-structured interview protocols consist of an outline guide questions to be discussed. Kvale (2007) designed with the goal of eliciting a detailed understanding of the study's research questions. Evaluation of questions

were done by experts in the field of research, language, and the topical inquiry.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 As to the lived experiences of faculty researchers in Intellectual Property licensing

As to the lived experiences of faculty researchers in Intellectual Property Licensing, it branched out to four thematic concepts of their shared reality. They are highlighted in the following: Theme 1: Protection of novelty; Theme 2: Technical and scientific writing as delayers; Theme 3: Budgetary requirements; and Theme 4: Tedious loops in procedure are all suggestive of the participants' subsisting challenges in securing patent license and rights. These emergent themes touch on concepts of balance and improvement in research work specific to patent licensing. The participants believe that there are still a number of issues that need to be addressed in order for the patent licensing culture in their institutions to be fully recognized.

3.2 As to how the faculty researchers cope up with the challenges and demands in Intellectual Property Licensing

As to how the faculty researchers cope up with the challenges and demands in Intellectual Property Licensing, two insightful themes emerged. Theme 5: Strategic partnerships and Theme 6: Personal badge of recognition implicate the participants' innovative ways of complying with the stringent requirements of patent licensing. These themes suggest personal concepts of worth and professional growth and continuing cooperation with external parties in order to improve their own patent work.

4. Conclusions

Faculty researchers with Intellectual Property License constantly deal with administrative challenges in the form of budgetary and procedural requirements. These requirements take time away from the faculty researchers which would have been dedicated in improving their patent work. Similarly, faculty researchers desire highly comprehensive training on technical and scientific writing; as technical writing for international accrediting organizations like the IPO demand stringent technical paper in highly technical language. Patent work is done not only because it is a requirement for the faculty researchers but also because it widens their network and enables them to establish partnerships which address their need for facility and mass production of their output. The novelty of their work also relies on the proficiency of these partners and the community engagement that these entail.

References

1. Aithal,P. (2018). Primary Organizational Recruitment Sources. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 37-58.
2. Aquinas University of Legazpi, (2019). Enrollment Requirements/Procedures. Retrieved from (<http://www.aq.edu.ph/index.php?p=main&s=res&taskId=frdp>)
3. Aydin, M. &Gurol, M. (2015). Evaluating ICT Integration in Turkish K-12 Schools through Teachers' Views. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 12(4), 747-766
4. Blum D.J.(2012) *Qualitative Research in Management: A Decade of Progress* SAGE Publication Inc.
5. Carnegie Mellon University, (2019). University Policies. Appointments - Research Faculty. Retrieved from <https://www.cmu.edu/policies/faculty/appointments-research-faculty.html>
6. Cornell Univeristy Policy Library, (2019). Inventions and Related Property Rights. Retrieved from https://www.dfa.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/policy/vol_1_5.pdf
7. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

8. Faley T.F.& Sharer M.(2008). *The Strategic Management of the Technology Transfer Function*
9. Federal Council for Science and Technology (1978.) *Annual Report ON Government*
10. Feldman M. and J. Bercovitz. (2010). *Managing University Intellectual Property in the Public Interest*
11. Griffin, P., McGaw, B., & Care, E. (Eds.), (2012). *Assessment and teaching of 21s century skills*. Dordrecht, Holland: Springer.
12. HigherEdJobs, (2019). *Faculty Researcher Adjunct Assistant Professor*. Retrieved from <https://www.higheredjobs.com/admin/details.cfm?JobCode=176808436>
13. Intellectual Property office. (2017) *IPOPHL Manual*
14. Intellectual Property Philippines (IPOB-IPRS5-14-2010)
15. Kvale ,(2007). *Doing Interviews Qualitative Research* .SAGE Publication Inc.
16. Machajewski, S. (2019). *Patterns in Faculty Learning Management System Use*. Association for Educational Communications & Technology. Retrieved from (<http://www.usfca.edu/academics/faculty-research>)
17. Moustakas, W. & Creswell, H. (2013). *Student teacher experiences in a service-learning project for children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder*. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*.
18. Sharer M.andFaley F.L.(2008.) *Managing University Intellectual Property in the Public Interest* . National Academies Press
19. Siliman University (2004) *Manual of Research Policies and Procedures*
20. Smith E.R.et., al (2000). *Social Psychology: Fourth Edition*
21. Symon G.,Cassell, Catherine (2012). *QualiativeOraganizational Research* .SAGE Publication Inc.
22. Univerity of Buffalo, (2019). *New York State Center of Excellence Bioinformatics & Life Sciences*. Faculty Researchers.
23. Retrieved from University of Helsinki, (2019). *Faculty of Medicine*. Retrieved from <https://www.helsinki.fi/en/faculty-of-medicine/research>
24. University of the Philippines (2002) . *University of the Philippines Research Manual*. University of the Philippines Los Banos Publication.
25. University of Santa Tomas (2018) . *University Of Santo Tomas Research Manual*.University of Santo Tomas Publications.