

Intellectual Property Governance in Flux: Cross-case Patterns and Strategic Imperatives for Philippine HEIs

Jefferson E. Flores^a, Dennis G. Caballes^b

^a Jefferson.flores@lnu.edu.ph

^a*Leyte Normal University, Philippines, The National Teachers College, Philippines*

^b*Dennis G. Caballes, The National Teachers College, Philippines*

Abstract

As higher education institutions (HEIs) are increasingly positioned at the forefront of national innovation systems, effective intellectual property (IP) governance has emerged as a strategic imperative. In the Philippines, national policies and institutional programs such as the Innovation and Technology Support Office (ITSO) initiative have encouraged HEIs to formalize IP management structures. Yet questions remain about how public universities, particularly in resource-constrained regions, are translating these mandates into routinized practice. This study presents a cross-case synthesis of IP governance in four public HEIs in Eastern Visayas, using the Resource-Based View (RBV) to examine institutional capabilities and strategic alignment. Findings show that while all four institutions have made meaningful progress in formalizing IP systems, the depth of routinization and strategic integration varies significantly. Cases with embedded leadership structures, budgetary autonomy, and faculty-centered engagement strategies demonstrate more mature and inimitable governance capabilities. The study contributes to the emerging literature on university IP systems in developing contexts and proposes actionable recommendations to support institutional learning and innovation resilience. By framing IP governance as a dynamic capability, the research offers new insights into how HEIs can convert policy frameworks into strategic assets that support both academic excellence and societal impact.

Keywords: Intellectual property management; resource-based view; management in higher education institutions.

1. Introduction

(Knowledge-driven growth has pushed universities to the center of national innovation systems. Recent findings from the World Intellectual Property Report (World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO], 2024) emphasize that countries able to mobilize university-generated IP alongside public-private R&D partnerships are more likely to sustain dynamic, resilient innovation ecosystems. Likewise, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2019) notes that governments increasingly evaluate higher education performance not only through publication metrics but also by the degree to which research outputs are translated into societal and commercial value. Against this backdrop, intellectual property (IP) governance has emerged as a strategic capability—one that can no longer remain a marginal concern for higher education institutions (HEIs).

This imperative is particularly pronounced in emerging economies like the Philippines, where IP policy is increasingly framed as a lever for national development. Through the Innovation and Technology Support Office (ITSO) program launched in 2010, the Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL, n.d.) has expanded IP support infrastructure to over 100 academic and research institutions nationwide. These efforts reflect a growing policy commitment to capacitate HEIs in IP generation, protection, and commercialization. However, significant implementation gaps persist. In 2023, the Bureau of Customs seized ₱27 billion worth of counterfeit goods—an all-time high that highlights the country's continued struggle with enforcement and institutional uptake (Department of Trade and Industry [DTI], 2023). At the same time, modest increases in copyright registrations and patent filings (IPOPHL, 2024) suggest a gradual, if uneven, rise in IP awareness across academic institutions. Yet rising awareness alone does not translate into effective governance, and questions remain about how universities are building the institutional muscle to manage IP portfolios.

Despite the policy momentum, empirical studies on IP management in Philippine HEIs remain limited. Much of the literature either documents isolated best practices, focuses on IP education initiatives, or outlines the status of policy adoption (Tinao et al., 2018; Amparado & Miro, 2019). What is missing is a systematic and comparative analysis of how public HEIs implement IP governance—how they structure their IP offices, routinize disclosure processes, engage faculty, and allocate strategic resources. Moreover, although international studies have begun applying the Resource-Based View (RBV) to analyze university-industry linkages (Holgersson & Aaboén, 2019; Kattel & Mazzucato, 2018).), this theoretical perspective is seldom used in lower-middle-income settings where institutional environments are markedly different. Whether the same VRIN (valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable) attributes apply to HEI governance practices in resource-constrained contexts remains an open question.

This study addresses this empirical and theoretical gap by presenting a cross-case synthesis of IP governance across four public HEIs in Eastern Visayas, a region undergoing significant transitions in research policy and innovation capacity. Drawing from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis, the study examines how institutional routines, leadership configurations, and faculty cultures shape IP governance. The findings are interpreted through the RBV lens to identify which institutional capabilities generate VRIN-like advantages and which fall short under structural constraints.

The study makes three key contributions. First, it offers the a multi-institutional, empirically grounded analysis of IP governance in Philippine public HEIs, illuminating not just formal structures but operational practices. Second, by applying the RBV in an emerging economy context, it refines the theory's explanatory power by highlighting how value, rarity, and inimitability manifest under constrained organizational conditions. Third, the study proposes a set of strategic imperatives that institutions can adopt to improve their governance frameworks.

2. Literature Review

For Governance of IP has become an area of concern within higher education. Universities are increasingly being asked to participate in the generation of knowledge but also to innovation and economic development. Recognition of the role played by the university in the management of intellectual assets has been increasing internationally in the last two decades; that is universities do not only carry out research but also ensure that these resources are protected, transferred and, where appropriate, commercialized (WIPO, 2024; OECD, 2019). While this change is seen from country to country, there is a diversity in the way HEIs organize their IP systems. Some have developed mature structures such as technology transfer offices (TTOs) and clear benefit-sharing protocols, while others are still battling fragmented policies alongside limited administrative support (Holgersson & Aaboén, 2019; Lie et al., 2024).

Also, the literature indicates that an IP policy is not enough. It can be successful or effective governance mode taking into account many interdependent factors such as leadership support, faculty participation, and organizational readiness. Several authors note that university culture, availability of resources, and strategic alignment play significant roles in how IP is managed or valued in the institution (Gargate & Momaya, 2018; Bader & Süzeroğlu-Melchior, 2023). Such factors fall outside those that are typically used in the models concentrating on technology licensing or patent output, which have turned IP management into thinking or exercising capacity in terms of legal or technical process rather than strategic. Coming forth also, emerging work stresses the routine practices as extremely important components of effective systems in IP—for instance: disclosure mechanisms, internal review protocols, and awareness building (Spirou, 2021; Tinao et al., 2018).

To make sense of these organizational differences, some studies have begun using the RBV as a theoretical lens. Originally developed in strategic management, RBV focuses on how organizations derive competitive advantage from internal capabilities and resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991; Helfat et al., 2023). In the context of higher education, this approach invites a closer look at how universities mobilize their people, processes, and institutional memory to build robust IP governance. Although RBV has been applied in some university innovation studies, it is still underused in research focused on public HEIs in developing countries, where institutional conditions can differ significantly from those in high-income settings (Kattel & Mazzucato, 2018; Maritz et al., 2024).

In the Philippines, government-led initiatives such as ITSO program have aimed to formalize IP management across universities and colleges. Still, little is known about how these systems really work in use. Most current research concentrate on faculty awareness of IP rights, policy acceptance, or capacity-building needs (Amparo & Miro, 2019; Tinao et al., 2018). Especially rare is comparative study across institutions to look for trends, gaps, and institutional strategies. Likewise, few studies examine how institutional structures, leadership decisions, or budget restrictions affect IP governance results in public institutions using a theoretical framework such as RBV.

This paper addresses the dearth of comparative, theory-based examination of IP governance in the Philippine higher education environment, therefore augmenting the body of work already in publication. Looking at four public HEIs and using the RBV as an interpretive lens provides a realistic perspective of how institutions negotiate the difficult issues of IP management and what elements support more strategic, successful systems.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study used a qualitative multiple-case study design to examine how public HEIs in the Philippines govern IP and respond to current national innovation imperatives. A multiple-case approach was chosen to allow in-depth exploration of variations and patterns across institutions, as recommended by Yin (2018) for research aimed at identifying cross-contextual insights and theoretical refinements. Each HEI stands as a bounded case and was analyzed individually before being synthesized using a cross-case comparison. The RBV was used as the analytical lens for the study. Specifically, RBV's VRIN criteria (value, rarity, inimitability, and non-substitutability) were used to make sense of how institutional resources, routines, and leadership commitments influence IP governance. The study's theory-driven framing supported the identification of organizational capabilities that may serve as sources of strategic advantage in the area of IP management.

3.2. Case selection and context

Four state universities in the Eastern Visayas region were purposively selected based on: recognized participation in the ITSO program of IPOPHL; the presence of formal or emerging IP policy; and engagement in research-for-innovation relevant to their mandates as institutions. The cases were selected on the basis of their varying stages of maturity of the IP system, which makes them suitable for comparative analysis.

3.3. Data Collection

Section headings should be left justified, with the first letter capitalized and numbered consecutively, starting with the Introduction. Sub-section headings should be in capital and lower-case italic letters, numbered 1.1, 1.2, etc, and left justified, with second and subsequent lines indented. You may need to insert a page break to keep a heading with its text.

3.4. Data collection

Data were gathered using three primary sources: semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis. Key informants were interviewed across the four case institutions. All interviews and FGDs were conducted either face-to-face or via secure video conferencing platforms, recorded with participants' consent, and transcribed verbatim. To supplement these accounts, institutional documents were reviewed, including IP policies and manuals, invention disclosure forms, organizational charts, internal memoranda, and other materials that reflected governance structures and operational procedures related to IP. These multiple data sources were recorded with consent, transcribed verbatim, and anonymized to protect participants' identities.

3.5. Data analysis

Analysis followed a two-stage process. First, within-case analysis was conducted for each HEI, identifying themes related to strategic orientation, policy maturity, leadership commitment, resource allocation, faculty engagement, and commercialization practices. These themes were derived both deductively (guided by the VRIN model) and inductively from the data. Second, a cross-case synthesis was performed to identify recurring patterns, divergences, and typologies of governance. Findings were interpreted through the RBV lens to determine how institutional arrangements contributed to—or constrained—the development of VRIN-aligned capabilities.

4. Findings and Discussion

To gain a deeper exploration of how IP governance is constituted within Philippine public higher education institutions, the analysis in this section synthesizes thematic findings across the four cases. Data for this analysis surfaced through triangulation from various sources of interviews, focus group discussions, and institutional documents so as to focus on recurrent patterns in contrast with institutional nuances. From the comparative analysis, four broad themes became apparent: strategic orientation toward IP management; maturity of IP policy and routinization of procedures; leadership commitment and control of resources; and faculty engagement and cultural preparedness. These contingent factors reflect not only arrangements of structural imports but also institutional logics that internally traverse such behaviors of governance.

4.1. Strategic orientation toward IP management

Strategic orientation refers to the degree to which IP governance is embedded within an institution's broader research and innovation agenda, whether it functions as a reactive administrative requirement or as a proactive, strategic capability aligned with long-term institutional goals. Across the participating higher education institutions, the findings revealed marked variation in how strategic intent was defined, communicated, and operationalized.

In some institutions, IP governance had become an integral component of research planning and proposal evaluation. The use of technology readiness level (TRL) screening tools during proposal review and pre-publication stages ensured that innovation outputs were systematically assessed for patentability and technology transfer potential. As one administrator noted, "Outputs must undergo review for patentability. It's embedded in our proposal screening process." This institutionalization of IP checkpoints illustrates the transition described by Holgersson and Aabo (2019)—from reactive protection to proactive valuation—demonstrating a mature alignment between IP governance and research strategy.

Other institutions exhibited a similarly deliberate orientation, though driven by developmental and public-accountability motives rather than commercialization. Here, IP protection was seen less as a vehicle for profit and more as a safeguard for institutional reputation and responsible technology dissemination. One IP officer explained, "Our goal is to ensure technologies are useful for our communities. We file IP mainly to protect our name and ensure safe transfer." This approach echoes Kattel and Mazzucato's (2018) concept of mission-driven innovation governance, where the value of IP lies in its contribution to societal relevance and credibility rather than economic return.

However, some institutions displayed only partial integration of IP governance into their strategic frameworks. While structures such as IP policies and innovation centers were in place, linkages with academic units and research workflows remained weak. As a result, many research outputs bypassed IP review altogether, reflecting a gap in strategic communication and procedural coherence. In these contexts, IP governance tended to function more as a compliance mechanism than as a driver of innovation strategy.

The comparative evidence thus highlights a continuum of strategic orientations from institutions where IP is embedded as a proactive, value-creating capability to those where it remains a reactive or symbolic activity. Viewed through the Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984), the differences demonstrate how strategic orientation can transform routine governance into an institutional capability. When IP processes are routinized, valued, and embedded within leadership and research systems, they become valuable, rare, and inimitable assets. Conversely, where strategic embedding is absent,

governance structures exist but remain under-leveraged signaling latent potential rather than realized capability.

4.2. IP Policy Maturity and Procedural Routinization

All participating institutions have invested in formal intellectual property (IP) policies and supporting documentation. However, the extent to which these frameworks have moved from policy to practice varies significantly, reflecting different levels of institutional maturity and procedural routinization.

In some institutions, IP governance has evolved beyond documentation into an embedded organizational practice. IP policies are not only formally approved but also systematically integrated into research workflows. Invention disclosure forms are required at the proposal stage, and technology readiness level (TRL) screening serves as a standard checkpoint prior to any form of public dissemination. As one participant explained, “The policy is very specific. Before anything is presented publicly or exhibited externally, it has to undergo IP screening, or at least the TRL screening form.” Such institutionalization of IP checkpoints exemplifies what Bader and Süzeroğlu-Melchioris (2023) describe as *operationalized IP governance*—where policies shift from being static documents to dynamic behavioral norms that guide decision-making.

Other institutions demonstrate similarly structured governance, marked by revised IP policies accompanied by comprehensive technology transfer protocols. Disclosure forms are now required during proposal evaluation, with compliance increasingly monitored by research unit heads. While some satellite campuses are still transitioning toward full adherence, the practice of disclosure before proposal approval is gradually being normalized, indicating a growing institutional familiarity with formal IP procedures.

In several universities, the policy environment remains in an emergent phase. Although IP policies are still in draft form, these documents already exert influence on daily operations within innovation and technology support offices (ITSOs). As one participant shared, “The draft exists... so mostly the ITSO knows how to handle disclosures,” suggesting that even provisional frameworks can catalyze procedural learning and early-stage routinization. This alignment between evolving policy and emergent practice signals a positive trajectory toward institutional coherence and strategic maturity.

Meanwhile, other institutions exhibit foundational readiness rather than full routinization. Formal IP manuals outlining disclosure and screening procedures are in place, and faculty awareness of these documents is increasing. However, procedural application remains uneven, and habitual enforcement is still developing. One faculty member noted, “We have an IP manual...,” indicating that while infrastructure exists, behavioral integration and faculty engagement are still in progress. The presence of templates, orientation programs, and procedural guides reflects an early but promising stage of consolidation.

Taken together, these findings reveal a **policy-to-practice continuum**—ranging from full procedural internalization to nascent operationalization. Through the lens of the Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991; Gargate & Momaya, 2018), the routinization of disclosure, triage, and screening practices constitutes a dynamic institutional capability. When IP policies become ingrained in everyday academic practice, they cease to be compliance tools and instead evolve into strategic assets—valuable, rare, and inimitable forms of institutional capital that underpin innovation ecosystems.

For higher education institutions, the strategic challenge lies in deepening this transformation. Embedding disclosure checkpoints within standard research milestones, expanding faculty and staff orientation on IP procedures, and institutionalizing monitoring mechanisms—such as audits and feedback loops—can accelerate policy internalization. As these practices become habitual, universities cultivate organizational memory and governance resilience that strengthen their competitive advantage in an increasingly innovation-driven environment.

4.3. Leadership Commitment and Resource Control

Leadership commitment consistently emerged as a foundational pillar of effective intellectual property (IP) governance in higher education institutions. Yet, support in principle alone does not suffice. What distinguishes mature governance systems is the presence of structural backing, leadership that is not only visible but operationally embedded through defined authority, personnel assignment, and dedicated

resource flows. Across institutions, varying degrees of leadership embeddedness and resource control were observed, each shaping the routinization and sustainability of IP operations.

In the most mature institutional contexts, executive leadership was deeply involved in IP governance. Senior administrators—often at the vice-presidential or equivalent level—directly supervised disclosure reviews and chaired internal screening committees. This high-level engagement was complemented by dedicated budget lines for activities such as patent drafting and technology transfer support. As one participant emphasized, “The VP is involved in every step. We also have budget lines for patent drafting.” Such arrangements illustrate what Spirou (2021) describes as institutionalized advocacy: leadership that is functionally enmeshed in IP processes rather than symbolically supportive. By converging budget planning, disclosure triage, and policy enforcement under unified administrative oversight, institutions achieve greater coherence, continuity, and accountability in IP operations.

Other universities exhibited clear leadership endorsement but struggled with sustainability. Frequent turnover in administrative positions often disrupted institutional momentum, revealing a reliance on individual champions rather than embedded organizational roles. As one IP officer observed, “Every time there’s a leadership change, we lose momentum.” This reflects the fragility of systems that depend on personal advocacy instead of structural anchoring—a challenge noted in the broader literature on academic change management (Vlachopoulos, 2021). Where leadership commitment is not codified into formal routines or job descriptions, institutional memory erodes, and the continuity of governance initiatives becomes vulnerable to leadership transitions.

Several institutions are currently navigating transitional phases in leadership and resource structuring. IP management is frequently handled through innovation and technology support offices (ITSOs), yet the personnel assigned to these offices often hold concurrent teaching or administrative responsibilities. As one participant noted, “IP is an extra duty—we don’t have full-time staff.” Despite these limitations, such units continue to provide disclosure support, conduct patent landscape searches, and coordinate faculty engagement. This pattern aligns with what Wolters (2021) terms a bootstrap phase—a developmental stage in which institutions sustain hybrid staffing models while incrementally building toward dedicated, professionalized governance structures.

At the emerging end of the spectrum, financial and administrative support for IP remains fluid rather than formalized. Some institutions rely on flexible arrangements, drawing on general research and development (R&D) funds to support IP activities when needed. As one participant acknowledged, “There’s no budget line for IP. We borrow from R&D when needed.” While this approach allows short-term adaptability, it limits long-term strategic planning and exposes IP operations to broader fluctuations in institutional funding priorities. Nonetheless, it signals a pragmatic step toward eventual formalization of dedicated budget allocations for IP functions.

Viewed through the lens of the Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991; Maritz et al., 2024), these differences in leadership structure and resource control determine whether IP governance evolves into a non-substitutable and inimitable organizational capability. Leadership becomes strategically potent only when it controls the key levers of sustainability—policy authority, dedicated funding, and trained personnel—that collectively enable continuous learning, coordination, and innovation scaling. Institutions where these levers are structurally embedded are better positioned to routinize disclosure practices, maintain continuity amid leadership transitions, and sustain governance innovation.

The emerging strategic imperative for higher education institutions, therefore, is twofold: (1) to institutionalize leadership roles in IP governance by embedding them in formal organizational structures and job descriptions; and (2) to secure predictable operational resources—both human and financial—to stabilize and grow IP portfolios. By moving beyond ad hoc arrangements, universities can develop durable governance systems capable of withstanding leadership changes, policy shifts, and external pressures within an increasingly competitive innovation landscape.

4.4. Leadership Commitment and Resource Control

Faculty engagement emerged as a decisive factor in the operational success of intellectual property (IP) governance across the participating higher education institutions. Variations in engagement were

reflected in differing levels of procedural familiarity, institutional alignment, and cultural readiness. These differences were shaped not only by the maturity of policy implementation but also by how IP was framed and valued within each institution's academic culture.

In several universities, faculty participation in the disclosure process was already well established. Consistent orientation programs, administrative encouragement, and an enabling institutional narrative had fostered a growing culture of awareness and compliance. One faculty member reflected, "The orientation helped. I didn't understand IP before, but now I disclose my outputs early." Such initiatives exemplify the mechanisms described by Jain et al. (2009), who emphasize that orientations, incentives, and institutional storytelling are critical to shifting faculty behavior toward proactive disclosure. These environments illustrate how universities can cultivate *valuable and inimitable capabilities* by embedding IP literacy into faculty onboarding, aligning professional norms with institutional goals for knowledge protection and innovation (Holgersson & Aaboén, 2019).

In other institutions, faculty engagement was strong but uneven across disciplines. Units producing applied or patentable research demonstrated consistent participation, while others—particularly those focused on theoretical or non-commercial fields—showed less familiarity with IP processes. One participant noted, "There are departments with good IP output, but some are still unaware of the process." This reflects the findings of Thursby et al. (2009), who observed that disciplinary variation often drives uneven engagement with IP procedures. Here, the challenge lies in diffusing engagement beyond early adopters to achieve full cultural normalization—a shift from isolated practice to institution-wide habit, transforming a *rare capability* into one that is *non-substitutable* (Barney, 1991).

In several institutions, faculty attitudes toward IP governance remain formative. Researchers generally expressed openness to disclosure mechanisms, yet many questioned the relevance of IP protection to their academic work. As one faculty member shared, "We still ask, do we even need this [IP] when we're not commercializing?" This perspective echoes Markman et al. (2005), who argue that faculty alignment with IP processes depends on whether institutions successfully frame IP as complementary to, rather than competitive with, academic identity. Within the Resource-Based View, such conditions represent *valuable but latent resources*—potential capabilities that require stronger institutional framing and cultural integration to become operationalized.

In early-stage institutional environments, awareness and engagement remained limited. While formal IP manuals and policies were already in place, many faculty continued to rely on traditional publishing as their primary form of knowledge dissemination. "No one has ever told us what an invention disclosure is. We just publish as usual," shared one participant. This condition aligns with the observations of Siegel and Phan (2005), who found that in nascent IP ecosystems, structural reforms often outpace cultural adaptation. Nonetheless, the presence of formal documentation and participation in national IP networks indicates that institutional foundations for engagement are steadily developing.

These patterns reveal that faculty engagement is not merely procedural—it is *cultural and strategic*. Institutions that successfully embed IP awareness and disclosure habits into the research lifecycle develop *intangible, path-dependent capabilities* that are difficult for others to replicate (Wernerfelt, 1984). Engagement thus becomes a form of social capital that enhances institutional learning, innovation continuity, and competitive advantage. As Berman and Paradeise (2016) note, a supportive institutional culture is vital to sustaining disclosure behavior, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

The strategic imperative for higher education institutions, therefore, is to position faculty engagement as a central element of IP governance, not merely as a compliance requirement. This includes integrating IP literacy into academic development programs, simplifying disclosure procedures, and institutionalizing recognition mechanisms for translational and innovative outcomes. Building an IP-engaged culture may be a gradual process, but it yields *VRIN-aligned capabilities*—valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources—that anchor innovation resilience and leadership in an increasingly competitive higher education landscape.

5. Conclusion and recommendations

This study explored the conceptualization, operationalization, and institutionalization of intellectual property (IP) governance within four public higher education institutions in the Philippines. Through a comparative, resource-based lens, the cross-case synthesis revealed that while all institutions have made substantial progress in formalizing IP management, they occupy distinct positions along the governance

maturity continuum. These differences manifest in the depth of strategic alignment, the routinization of processes, the extent of leadership engagement, and the level of faculty participation—all of which shape the emergence of valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) capabilities essential to institutional competitiveness.

Across the cases, two broad configurations emerged. Some institutions displayed mature governance ecosystems where IP considerations are systematically embedded in research workflows, backed by structured leadership and stable procedural infrastructures. In these contexts, IP governance transcends administrative compliance and becomes a strategic enabler that drives innovation valorization, enhances institutional reputation, and supports mission-driven knowledge dissemination. Other institutions, meanwhile, remain in transitional phases, characterized by evolving policy frameworks, reactive disclosure practices, and limited resources. Nonetheless, their ongoing reforms and policy developments demonstrate growing institutional commitment and readiness to advance toward greater maturity.

Anchored in the Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984), the study contributes to literature that positions IP governance as a dynamic institutional capability rather than a static policy requirement. HEIs derive advantage not simply from possessing formal IP frameworks but from embedding them into the organizational fabric through leadership routinization, procedural standardization, and cultural internalization. This finding echoes the perspectives of Holgersson and Aaboen (2019) and Berman and Paradeise (2016), who advocate for IP governance as a core dimension of institutional strategy and innovation management.

The findings point to several interrelated strategic imperatives. Institutions must integrate IP considerations at the earliest stages of research planning to ensure that governance mechanisms align with academic and developmental objectives. Leadership roles should be institutionalized within formal structures, with stable allocations of both financial and human resources to sustain governance operations. Policies need to be operationalized through continuous orientation, integrated workflow checkpoints, and feedback loops that transform policy documents into lived academic routines. Faculty engagement must also be strengthened by embedding IP literacy into academic development and recognizing translational outcomes that align research with societal impact. Finally, deeper collaboration with the Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL) and regional Innovation and Technology Support Offices (ITSOs) can further enhance institutional capacity-building and foster peer-supported governance maturity.

The state of IP governance in public HEIs remains contextually determined by each institution's history, strategic priorities, and organizational capacity. Yet a unifying insight emerges: when effectively designed and implemented, IP governance evolves beyond administrative compliance to become a strategic pillar of research excellence and innovation leadership. Future research may extend this work by examining longitudinal trajectories or including private HEIs, thereby enriching understanding of how institutional logics and strategic trade-offs shape the changing landscape of IP governance in higher education.

References

- Amparado, M. A. P., & Miro, A. C. (2019). Intellectual property: are faculty members aware of their rights?.
- Bader, M. A., & Süzeröglü-Melchior, S. (2023). *Intellectual property management for start-ups: Enhancing value and leveraging the potential*. Springer.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Berman, E. P., & Paradeise, C. (2016). Introduction: The university under pressure. In *The university under pressure* (pp. 1–22). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). (2023). *DTI reports P27 billion worth of counterfeit goods seized in 2023*. <https://www.dti.gov.ph>
- Gargate, S., & Momaya, K. (2018). Technology transfer offices in India: Evaluation of effectiveness. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 132, 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.008>
- Helfat, C. E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D. J., & Winter, S. G. (2023). *Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Holgersson, M., & Aaboen, L. (2019). A literature review of intellectual property management in technology transfer offices: From appropriation to utilization. *Technology in Society*, 59, 101193.
- Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL). (n.d.). *Innovation and Technology Support Office (ITSO) Program*. <https://www.ipophil.gov.ph>
- Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL). (2024). *2023 IPOPHL Annual Report*. <https://www.ipophil.gov.ph>
- Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. (2009). Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists

- involved in commercialization activity. *Research Policy*, 38(6), 922–935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2009.02.007>
- Kattel, R., & Mazzucato, M. (2018). Mission-oriented innovation policy and dynamic capabilities in the public sector. *Industrial and corporate change*, 27(5), 787–801.
- Lie, H. T., Egelie, K. J., Grimpe, C., & Sørheim, R. (2024). Beyond open access: how contractual provisions govern openness and access in publicly-funded research collaborations. *Available at SSRN 4779038*.
- Maritz, A., Nguyen, Q., de Waal, G., & Shrivastava, A. (2024). The entrepreneurial university: a crucial catalyst in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. In *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurial Ecosystems* (pp. 352–369). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Markman, G. D., Gianiodis, P. T., Phan, P. H., & Balkin, D. B. (2005). Innovation speed: Transferring university technology to market. *Research Policy*, 34(7), 1058–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.05.007>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019). *University-industry collaboration: New evidence from OECD countries*. <https://www.oecd.org>
- Siegel, D. S., & Phan, P. H. (2005). Analyzing the effectiveness of university technology transfer: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), 64–85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-4736\(05\)16001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-4736(05)16001-9)
- Spirou, C. (2021). *Anchoring innovation districts: The entrepreneurial university and urban change*. JHU Press.
- Thursby, J. G., Fuller, A. W., & Thursby, M. C. (2009). US faculty patenting: Inside and outside the university. *Research Policy*, 38(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.09.004>
- Tinao, E. S., Ibañez, A. D., Rivera, C. G., Rivera, A. P., Enriquez, C. S., & de Jesus, A. O. (2018). Taking intellectual property rights seriously: are we in or out?(phase 1: intellectual property awareness among students and faculty: tracking changing attitudes and awareness). *KnE Social Sciences*, 325–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i6.2390>
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2021). Organizational change management in higher education through the lens of executive coaches. *Education Sciences*, 11(6), 269.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207>
- Wolters, N. (2021). *Institutional complexity in talent management practices: employee staffing, development, and retention* (Master's thesis, University of Twente).
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2024). *World Intellectual Property Report 2024: Innovation and global value chains*. <https://www.wipo.int>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.