

# Helming Sociological Intellectual Property Law: A Contrastive Treatise of Public Universities in Freetown, Sierra Leone

**Mohamed Bangura**

*Lecturer One, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology and Social Work,  
University of Sierra Leone, Fourah Bay College*

*Email: [mfb17320@gmail.com](mailto:mfb17320@gmail.com)*

**Abstract:** The drive concerning inquiry monetization at universities has emphasized the significance of Intellectual Property policies or procedures in nurturing innovation and directing and overseeing inquiry monetization engagements. This treatise embraces a sociological content dissection of Intellectual Property policies or procedures of two Freetown public universities, centering on strategy aspirations, interpretation of Intellectual Property, proprietorship of Intellectual Property generated by diverse originators, and circulation of net monetization incomes. It is discovered that these universities guarantee proprietorship over staff originated Intellectual Property, specifically whilst associated to job or application of academy funds. For students, policies incline to match their entitlements amidst university shares or stakes, amidst subtle avenues for divergent sorts of student involvement, although the attention of these policies was on postgraduate students engaging in inquiry pursuits. Although these two policies had evident blueprints for Intellectual Property originated by guests and associates and community and Intellectual Property, these policies desist to define classifications or these cohorts. Income distribution classifications differ although holistically grant something between a third to a half of net income to originators, to equally recognize their input and motivate more innovation. Policies involved a wider scope of aspirations, from guarding and monetizing Intellectual Property to promoting innovation and communal advantage, mirroring changing approaches across the tertiary pedagogical precinct. Policies might improve from more precision in specify ranges especially the entitlements of students or other originator cohorts. Inquiry is required to evaluate the potency of these policies and their impact on innovation and monetization engagements.

**Keywords:** Intellectual Property Law, Contrastive, Treatise, Freetown, Sierra Leone

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Intellectual Property policies entertain a key function in directing the monetization of inquiry, whilst furthermore upholding the morals and standards that regulate the circulation of entitlements and duties inside academic establishments (Sattiraju et al, 2021). As universities progressively involve in inquiry monetization, comprehending the distinctions of these policies gets critical. Several nations and academies have diverse guidelines about Intellectual Property proprietorship, and these transform over time specifically as there is further drive regarding monetization of inquiry at universities. A

historical rolling moment in this field was the Patents and Trade Mark Act Amendment now the Bayh-Dole (1980) Act in America. The act granted the proprietorship of creations created by federal funding to universities (instead of government) and encouraged patents on federal sponsored innovations. This considerably relieved universities capability to hold property entitlements to creations sponsored by government resources and it further structured the Intellectual Property terrain (Miteu, 2024).

Universities in divergent nations have evolved Intellectual Property policies over time for proper Intellectual Property

oversight and information sharing and to promote inquiry monetization (). An aging examination of Intellectual Property policies in the higher inquiry academies in the West African sub region depicted the majority, Intellectual Property proprietorship retained with the originator, while the academy's allocate of income from monetization diverse, commonly being bargained (Kanakanhalli, 2024). In France, the inauguration of the Innovation Act, 1999 led to augmented academic establishments claims over Intellectual Property entitlements on jobholders originations, regularly in partnership with corporations (Jamali, 2024). Concurrently, Deutschland's 2002 amendment, repealing the pedagogues opportunity, panned out in a move regarding university retained patents (Aung, 2022). A reappraisal of patent policies in Suomi academies revealed a move regarding pedagogic plutocratism, comparable to the complete shape noticed in America (Suominen and Deschryvere, 2024). This transition indicated the thriving monetization of pedagogic inquiry. Evanova (2023) recognized a move in Eurasia from innovator proprietorship to corporate proprietorship of Intellectual Property entitlements, specifically post two thousand. This Intellectual Property revolution was influenced by transformations in Intellectual Property entitlements codes, as well as wider corporate, civilizing or cultural, and moves.

Intellectual Property policies act a critical function in building the conduct of pedagogic innovators and the monetary results of inquiry strives as an appraisal of Intellectual Property policies in United States tertiary institutions depicted that strict or flexible authority over faculty educators and demonstrating obvious financial inducements for innovators created a distinction in patent ingenuity (Zhang et al, 2023). There have been sparse inquiries on university Intellectual Property policies in Canuckistan. A transformation from an academy possesses to an innovator possesses Intellectual Property policy at the Academy of Toronto considerably augmented the digit of innovation discoveries (Gelatly and Gu, 2024). Hoye also emphasized the notion that the definition of Intellectual Property policy inducements is depends upon diverse elements, involving pedagogic management, cohort values, institutional culture, and inquirers exposures with automation assign assistance corporations (Ding and Xue, 2023). A social inquiry on Canuckistan social inquiry pedagogues on the impact of Intellectual Property policy traits on departmental faculty associates commercial conducts amazingly portrayed that the proprietorship governance of innovations did not considerably significantly impact pedagogic innovators comportments. Alternately, command entitlements and earning allotment plans appeared as principal forces official and unofficial monetization engagements. Nonetheless, an inquiry of patents and Intellectual Property policies at fifty four Canuckistan Universities accomplished policies where innovators possess

the Intellectual Property were the most efficient for originating patents within these establishments (Briggs, 2024). Johnston (2023) equated the effect of Intellectual Property policies on inquiry originated deduced entrepreneurship and discovered validation implying that universities with innovator proprietorship policies may be further effective in creating products, equally in terms of faculty associates and experimentation funding. A moderately comparable inference was done by Taally (2023) in Ghana. His social facts signified that the result of monetization was impressed by strategies on Intellectual Property Rights. Notwithstanding equivalent standings of current innovation discoveries and patent worth, Nigerian universities that embraced conventional Intellectual Property proprietorship policies emerged to submit a lofty standard of current grants and patents. She also discovered that universities, where the Intellectual Property proprietorship was obtained by the innovators, were further possible to generate wider digit of current offshoot corporations.

An inquiry by Wang and Qian (2023) in Cambridge disclosed that university patent initiatives may submit an unfavorable percentage of income on funding in contemporary patenting. Aforesaid initiatives might possibly deter inquiry financing, partnership, and information sharing, stimulating questions about the collective efficiency of Intellectual Property policies in promoting innovation. Yao et al (2024) examined the effect of Intellectual Property institutional policies, they discovered that policies that permitted unbiased income and royalty allocation, customized to associates demands, and strengthened project rendition advanced strong dedication.

As demonstrated above there have been several inquiries on the effect or efficiency of policies strategies which illustrated that several aspects especially the proprietorship of Intellectual Property, the apportion of profit that goes to the academy, and the authority entitlements that the institutional shares over the Intellectual Property can all impact the monetization of inquiry. Nonetheless, the impact of university patent and Intellectual Property policies can vary depending on the framework, especially the area of inquiry, the status of automation growth, and the culture of the academy. Nevertheless, rare inquiries in the record have examined or contrasted institutional Intellectual Property policies and the foremost stage to assess their effect is to dissect and comprehend policies.

### **1.1 Rational Strategy and Inquiry Monetization in Freetown – Sierra Leone**

Equally to several other Black nations, the Copyrights Act 2011 in Sierra Leone motivated and energized many strategies in Freetown public Universities. These two universities possibly had an Intellectual Property strategy by the mid-2000s. This is as a result in the early 2000s, there were

appearing claims by academy management to Intellectual Property of staff and students and there were requests for interpretation and minimal norms of protection for academic Intellectual Property Entitlements. Owning an Intellectual Property policy is not enough for prosperous inquiry monetization. Freetown still lags behind in inquiry monetization. This is while historically Sierra Leone's expenditure on university Inquiry and Growth is proportionally low than most other developed global economies, specifically when correlated with business investment on inquiry and Growth (Bangura, 2024). Some experts suggest that the solution might be to remove barriers and increase incentives for academics to innovate and monetize. Limitations (For instance, intricate monetization processes) and inducements (For instance, originator's share profit) might be inbred in university policies and processes. Dual past social inquiries of academics and automation transfer experts in Freetown considered fragility in university Intellectual Property policy as a principal limitation or a limitation to the accomplishment of inquiry monetization. Notwithstanding, efficient Intellectual Property policy is dominant for 'Freetonian' universities in the framework of the prevailing critique about Sierra Leone's setbacks in inquiry monetization and innovation and the government's enterprise to enhance the circumstance. For instance, the Government of Sierra Leone Directorate of Science, Technology and Innovation partnership with United Nations Children's Fund to assist utilize of electronic data to grant free quality education to children. It will assist education inquirers transform thoughts into educational investment directions, equipment and treatments to assist future disease outbreaks (). Additional instance is the drone medicine transportation via the Bill and Belinda Gate's investment which is to enhance the function of drones in Sierra Leone's health grant link (Sierra Leone Directorate of Science, Technology and Innovation, 2023).

## 2. RESEARCH AIM

Although evolving an efficient Intellectual Property policy is not sufficient, it is imperative for thriving inquiry monetization. Efficient Intellectual Property oversight not only safeguards the intellectual assets of academic establishments but also functions as critical task in facilitating the transfer of information and automation from academia to commerce. In Freetown, there is a demand to examine and comprehend the finesse of public universities Intellectual Property policies. Accordingly, this inquiry focuses to analyze 'Freetonian' universities Intellectual Property policies to discover about several of their vital elements, correlations and differences. The sociological inquiry particularly examines at what purpose 'Freetonian' public universities follow in their Intellectual Property policies, how they interpret Intellectual Property, how they approach the proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by different cohorts (for instance, staff and students) and lastly how they circulate any net income generated via inquiry monetization. The inquiry focuses to present perceptions that could notify future policy improvements, promoting a further efficient and unbiased ecosystem for inquiry monetization in Freetown.

## 3. METHODS

In conducting this sociological inquiry, a systematic approach was utilized, drawing upon content analysis techniques to steadily assess and juxtapose the Intellectual Property policies of Freetown universities. A comparable approach was utilized to analyze open access policies of 'Freetonian' universities. Content analysis was selected as the methodological structure for its magnitude to reveal useful social data within the content and promote mixture record juxtapositions.

### 3.1 Policy Identification

To discover Intellectual Property policies, the Government's official list of universities () was consulted to identify two public universities in Freetown.

**Table 1.** Circulation of the Net Income Produced by Monetization of Inquiry

University	Originator's Apportion	Net Income
University of Sierra Leone	No Information	No Information
Milton Margai Technical University	No Information	No Information

Dual strategies were instituted to recognize and retrieve Intellectual Property policies from the chosen universities:

University Portals: The policy portals were viewed, exploiting their scout and peek operations to determine useful Intellectual Property policies.

Internet-Based Scouts was administered on Google, applying principal keywords such as "Intellectual Property Policy." Moreover, corresponding terms such as "inquiry monetization" were investigated to reveal possible policies associated to

these internet sites. This bidirectional route intended to guarantee all useful policies could be diagnosed.

African Regional Intellectual Property Organization Database: the "Database of Intellectual Property Scientific Researches from Universities and Research Institutions" provided by the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization was also conferred. This resource offered links to the Intellectual Property scientific researches of various research institutions.

### 3.2 Policy Collection and Snapshot

The two Sierra Leonean public universities inquired were discovered to have Intellectual Property policies or comparable records. All of the recognized records possessed policy in their designations. Nonetheless, inside this data pool distinctly titled as policies. One record bore the nomenclature Intellectual Property lacking more detail of record sort, but the record's theme supported its level as a policy. Furthermore, dual records were specified as codes. University of Sierra Leone policy was comparable to the policies of the other university and hence, it was involved in the discourse. To guarantee a steady data pool for sociological discourse, all recognized policies were obtained and retrieved in July 2024. This specific moment point was preferred to furnish a static snapshot for discourse, as policies may experience modifications and amends over time.

### 4. INTERPRETATIVE STRUCTURE

For the inherent sociological discourse of these policies, a hybrid path entailing both directories positioned and

content reasoning or discourse was engaged. The following key social data was derived from each policy record:

- \* Aspect of Present Policy Rendition
- \* Time for latterly Slated Policy Amendment
- \* Liable Department or Policy Proprietor
- \* Validity Grantee of the Policy
- \* Intellectual Property Interpretation
- \* Intent of Policy
- \* Intellectual Property Proprietorship Codes
- \* Income Circulation

These classifications were evolved explicitly ensuing an appraisal of a sample of Intellectual Property policies, guaranteeing that the coherent structure was coordinated or agreed with the sophistications and complexities of the policies under inquiry. This sociological approach was marked to promote a strong comparative evaluation of Intellectual Property policies.

### 5. FINDINGS

Although the two policies were generally up-to-date with the oldest being six years old and the current being updated in 2021. The two policies had a date for the next review. In terms of the ownership of policies, this information was available for two of them. In these universities, the policy was possessed by the vice chancellor management team, predominantly the inquiry portfolio. Table 2 depicts the terms utilized in the policies for policy proprietor.

**Table 2.** Policy Proprietor

Rank	Compute
Vice-Chancellor (Research Portfolio)	65
Deputy Vice-Chancellor	1
Deputy Vice Chancellor	1
Director, Media and Quality Assurance	1
Director, Finance	1
Office of Research Services	1
University Secretary	1
Total	71

### 5.1 Intellectual Property Cohort Application

One significant aspect of policies is their extent of materiality. Most policies had a frank pronouncement about this. Students and staff or jobholders were the most usual

cohorts cited. See Table three. The two policies used these terms of 'university members' and 'university community'. Policies specified other cohorts such as associates, visitors, and inquirers. These terms particularly involved such cohorts in their interpretation of staff.

**Table 3.** Cohorts and Policy

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Compute</b>
Staff	35
Students	35
Associates	11
Visitors	12
University Members	2
University Community	1

## 5.2 Interpretation of Intellectual Property

Policy records mostly have a particular unit for the interpretations of key terms utilized in the policy to prevent any complexity or misconstruction. Given the core notion in an Intellectual Property policy is the Intellectual Property itself, an individual would think it to be interpreted in any such policy. Amazingly the two policies plainly interpret Intellectual Property and Intellectual Property rights. The discourse of the interpretations presented portrayed a scope of comparability and a sparse outstanding contrasts.

**a. Expansive and Comprehensive Interpretations:** Many policies embraced an expansive and comprehensive interpretations of Intellectual Property. They commonly enveloped both recorded and unrecorded entitlements. Recorded entitlements like trademarks and patent were repeatedly stated, with patents appearing in the two policies. These interpretations regularly aligned with external principles, such as those defined by the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization. This signifies a usual comprehension that Intellectual Property comprises a scope of guard tools, from official registrations to further essential copyright guards.

**b. Elaborate Calculations:** Some policies presented elaborate calculations of Intellectual Property sorts (), clearly listing divergent outlines of Intellectual Property sorts, such as innovations, designs, trade secrets, and knowledge transfer, signifying identification of multiple shapes of intellectual contributions. Classifications such as discoveries and origination are less regularly stated but their presence in these policies depicted the complete range of Intellectual Property strives that university policies might guard.

**c. Distinctions and Clarifications:** The universities made distinctions between Intellectual Property and associated notions especially ethical entitlements, furnishing of what is reasoned Intellectual Property and what is not. Actually, the nomenclature of the policy for one of the universities was the Conflict of Interest Policy, Financial Management policy. These policies explained the range of Intellectual Property and its association to other entitlements, stressing the guard of ethical entitlements as closely aligned but distinct from

Intellectual Property. Entitlements was one of the most regularly occurring terms, emphasizing that universities focus on the legal rights associated with Intellectual Property. The term legal nonetheless, appeared in the in the two policies, proposing that two universities obviously cited the legal contexts that underpinned Intellectual Property interpretations and entitlements.

## 6. INQUIRY SOCIAL DATA AS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

There was a recognition that Intellectual Property may prevail in inquiry social data, particularly where academic effort has been utilized to systematize or portray the social data or where the social data is private.

### 6.1 Intent of the Policy

University policies normally have units that outline their intent, aims or goals. For this section part of the sociological discourse, text associated to the intent, goals or aims of policies was utilized. A sociological discourse of statements in the policies disclosed a varied approach to the oversight and monetization of Intellectual Property emerging from inquiry. The extensive contents recognized via these declarations emphasize the sparse preferences and strategies of these establishments.

### 6.2 Dominant Contents

Intellectual Property Proprietorship and Assent: The most usual theme, provided in the policies of these two universities, emphasizes an extensive stress on illuminating Intellectual Property proprietorship and guaranteeing official assent.

Assistance for Innovation: A vital priority for these two universities, this theme imitates the establishments commitment to promoting a community convenient to innovation and the generation of current notions.

Student and Staff Evolvement: Emphasized in the two policies, this theme illustrates an attention on providing growth privileges for the community forthrightly involved in inquiry and Intellectual Property origination.

**Inquiry and Training Merger:** Discovered in the two policies, it showcases the establishments dedication to linking inquiry excellence with training, guaranteeing that the gains of inquiry engagements enhance the educational observation.

**Monetization and Commercial Impact:** Stressed by these two universities, this theme symbolizes a purpose to not only establish but also capitalize on Intellectual Property for commercial growth and business benefit.

**Upgrading and Dissemination of Learning:** With an occurrence in these two policies, this theme illustrates the universities function in circulating learning for the public benefit.

**Oversight Standards:** Present in these two policies, proposing that universities value the regime of Intellectual Property oversight and monetization procedures.

**Guard Entitlements:** Acknowledged in these two policies, emphasizing the significance of safeguarding Intellectual Property Entitlements within the intellectual community.

### **6.3 Slight Usual Themes**

**Community Coalition:** This goal was mentioned in the policies of the two universities, directing towards an objective of engaging with the wider social community, probably to guarantee that inquiry gains have a broader societal reach.

**Crystal Oversight:** Stated in the two policies, signifying a conscious of the demand for obvious and accountable procedures in supervising monetization engagements.

**Factual Life Impact:** These two policies plainly voiced the goal of accomplishing tangible impacts from their inquiry, proposing that while significant, it may not be a central theme in policy goals.

**Conflict of Interest:** Equally discovered in these two policies, denoting that conflict resolution is admitted but not a principal interest within these policy frameworks. This might be because universities might include conflict of interest in their Intellectual Property process or have particular process record just for conflict of interest.

## **7. PROPRIETORSHIP OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY STAFF ORIGINATED**

The two policies theme pertaining the proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by staff depicted the two universities validated proprietorship of Intellectual Property produced by staff during the course of employment as segment of their responsibilities. Universities also claimed proprietorship to Intellectual Property originated by staff in a digit of other paths. Intellectual Property produced utilizing university resources and facilities, or Intellectual Property

generated from funded or agreement inquiry, or university assigned projects, was also claimed by the university. Nonetheless, universities own any Intellectual Property that is originated utilizing prevailing university possessed Intellectual Property. While the policies holistically bolstered university proprietorship over staff outcomes, they had extent for exceptions which primarily involved erudite or academic (For instance, peer reviewed journal articles, book) and innovative generates. Besides, there may be range within the consents for distinctive arrangements to be made with staff associates.

The comprehensive content was that universities request to reserve proprietorship of Intellectual Property to facilitate inquiry sponsorship consents, partnership, and their academic obligation. Nonetheless, they also identify the entitlements of originators via exceptions and the implicit for personalized consents, equating establishment concerns with those of the staff associates.

### **7.1 Proprietorship of Intellectual Property Students Originated**

When it comes to the proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by students, there were further modifications in policies. The two policies involved a veil utterance signifying that the university in touchstone does not affirm proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by students and then go on to list provisions under which the university would affirm proprietorship of student originated Intellectual Property. One policy did not have veil utterance, rather only listed circumstances under which they would affirm proprietorship (for instance, a student is also a staff and originated Intellectual Property during their employment).

Although only one policy (University of Sierra Leone) indubitably named undergraduate students to say that the university laid no claim on Intellectual Property originated by them, and constituted situations germane to postgraduates and inquiry students. For instance, postgraduate students might demand to agree to non-exclusive Intellectual Property entitlements for the university (). In cases where a student is also engaged by the university, Intellectual Property proprietorship usually conforms with staff proprietorship policies, denoting the functional function of students (as students or jobholders) in considering proprietorship entitlements. Nonetheless, policies handled Intellectual Property proprietorship in student involved projects, specifically outwardly sponsored or university inquiry engagements which regularly warrant Intellectual Property assignment or granting. Nevertheless, universities may affirm proprietorship over student originated Intellectual Property under particular consents, joint coupling originations with staff, third party consents, or when prevailing university possessed

Intellectual Property is utilized. Contingent upon the monetization of student generated Intellectual Property, the student is privilege to dole out of income. Moreover, students may be needed to inform university authorities of valuable Intellectual Property to moderate legal, commercial, or reputational perils. Students holistically reserve the entitlements over their thesis.

## 7.2 Proprietorship of Intellectual Property Visitors Originated

Guest fellows are normally contracted by one establishment but spend time at a second university in an inquiry duty. Since they may not be engaged by the host university, proprietorship of Intellectual Property from their work can be complicated. Policies were explored whether they define proprietorship in similar situations. The discourse of the social data on visitors in the two policies depicted several amendments in how establishments handle the intellectual property entitlements guest fellows.

The two universities (University of Sierra Leone and Milton Margai Technical University) took a plausible rebuff (non-proprietorship) strategy approach by mentioning that the university does not affirm proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by guest fellows, and then they go on to add situations under which they would affirm proprietorship of Intellectual Property (for instance, when guest fellows utilize the university's financing or facility and subsidies).

- A. University of Sierra Leone took a presumptive inclusion (proprietorship) approach and stated that the university owns the Intellectual Property originated by visitors. University of Sierra Leone considered visitors as a member of staff and therefore, the same rule applicable to staff (default university ownership) would apply to them. This ownership usually occurs under certain conditions such as the use of university resources, terms of employment and so on.
- B. Milton Margai Technical University expressed the Intellectual Property of the work commissioned by the university (involving application softwares, discovering and tutoring material will be possessed by the university and guest fellows will possess the copyright of any other work they might accomplish.

## 7.3 Proprietorship of Intellectual Property Originated By Incorporates

Another category of inquirers who might employ in Intellectual Property origination is incorporates. Policies were searched for the words incorporates, aides, seeming posts or nominees, titlist, and partners to discover out how policies approached the proprietorship of Intellectual Property

originated by this originator cohort. The approach to affiliates or incorporates cloned that of guest fellows. Milton Margai Technical University policy made no utterance of Incorporates, but included them within the interpretation of staff. University of Sierra Leone policy took a extensive proprietorship approach and expressed that they affirm proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by this cohort, absolutely, they had situations under which such proprietorship would occur. The two policies took the inverse approach, that is plausible snub (non-proprietorship) expressing that they do not affirm proprietorship on Intellectual Property originated by incorporates except in specific circumstances especially the utilize of the university's funds, or the utilize of university's Intellectual Property, coordination with the university staff and blah-blah-blah.

## 7.4 Proprietorship of Community and Intellectual Property

Community themes are considerably significant in the Sierra Leonean context and when it comes to Community and Intellectual Property, it is envisioned that universities have obvious principles that regard the entitlements of community folks. The two policies had no social data about Community and Intellectual Property. The dual policies had a segments or an utterance regarding Community folks, some succinct and several in further detail. Social discourse of these utterances expressed a consistent and respectful approach to managing Community and Intellectual Property. The key trends and standards in these utterances were:

- a. **Acknowledgment and Esteem:** The two Universities explicitly recognized the significance or relevance of Community, with a dedication to regard and guard it. This was often mirrored in utterances that stressed the vital and existing cosmos of Community.
- b. **Proprietorship and Consent:** There was a obvious position against affirming proprietorship over Intellectual Property concerning to works considerably predominantly originated by members of the university community. These two policies stipulated that the utilize of Community Knowledge must have the preceding confirmation of the adequate education custodians and that informed consent is critical.
- c. **Compliance with Standards and Ethics:** Universities resolved to complying with legislation, national and international principles, and formalities, involving moral instructions regarding the utilize of Community and property.
- d. **Gain Apportion:** The policies often emphasized the require for equitable apportion of gains emerging from the financial utilize of Community Learning. They

called for pre-agreed terms to guarantee that any monetization engagements are fair to the Community custodians.

- e. **Dialogue and Consensus:** In some policies, before undertaking commercial development involving Community Intellectual Property, there was a procedure of consensus and negotiation with Community Knowledge Custodians to consent on gain apportion consents.
- f. **Culturally Appropriate Dispute Resolution:** In the event of disputes concerning Community Intellectual Property, one policy proposed that they should be regulated appreciatively and in culturally adequate paths, often guided by specific offices or bodies within the university.

## 8. ORIGINATORS SHARE OF NET REVENUE

One significant aspect of inquiry monetization is how the net income or benefits will be shared between the originators and the university. This was stipulated stated in the policies of the two universities. The other university did not have such information in their policy, but they specified this in a process record. These universities may have special social data in a record that is not publicly obtainable, but this could also be a mark of an absence of clarity or a lack of a structured policy in those instances. Alongside reexamining this social data (see table three), several leanings can be recognized.

Expressly, the circulation is not systematic; these two universities had an arranged structure that accommodates the quota premise on the amount of income produced. If ignoring the pattern of a these universities for net incomes below Sierra Leone New Leones 100,000,000, the originators apportion ranges from a third to a part, with a moderate of roughly forty two percent. This proposes that a coherent share fraction of the net income is usually rewarded to originators, admitting their contribution and motivating further innovation. These Universities had divergent approaches to the percentage of allocate that was not apportioned to originators; nonetheless, holistically, they utilized the rest of the net income to assist the university's infrastructure, involving the academic faculties and central administration that facilitate inquiry. The University of Sierra Leone policy interpreted how this apportion is divided between divergent segments of the university and the other did not dictate this and considerably signified that it would go to the university or commonly gave some part of it to the department to which the originator belongs (in some cases it is the faculty). Another segment commonly goes to the inquiry portfolio maybe to reinvest some of the income back into their inquiry structures.

Although the sociological discourse proposes that there is no standard clone for income apportioning in Freetown public universities, the share of originators doesn't differ considerably at these universities (contrasts amidst 1/3 and 1/2). Nonetheless, diverse arrangements of these universities in how they divide the income and how they invest some of it back at the universities depict a different terrain of policies that serve to diverse preferences and conventional merits. This multiplicity could be owing to different elements especially the brand of the university, the focus of their inquiry dockets, and their overall strategic objectives associated to innovation and monetization. Moreover rethinking into the impact of these policies on inquiry output and monetization accomplishment would be beneficial for an extensive comprehension of their efficiency.

## 9. DISCOURSE

The discourse depicted that although there are correlations among Intellectual Property policies of Freetown public universities, there are also some divergences in terms of framework, and theme, as well as intent, Intellectual Property interpretation and several nuances in their approaches to Intellectual Property proprietorship and income apportion. There was a variation in the framework and limitation of the policies (maybe owing to divergent intents discussed below). These two policies were central records outlining things like extent, interpretations, proprietorship, and commitment and dealt with specifics especially disclosure, examination, evaluation, apportion of revenue and so on. The other element that contributes to divergences is whether universities have a procedure record or not. They might not have and consequently, their policy records might serve both as a policy and an approach.

Although in the majority of universities, the policy owner was someone from the inquiry portfolio of the Vice-Chancellor leadership team; in a few universities other officials such as university Registrar were the possessor. Bangura (2024) also found in her examination of policies that there was a diversity in responsible decision makers for engagements especially recognition of Intellectual Property, validation of Intellectual Property durability, and discovering financial associates.

An obvious interpretation of Intellectual Property is significant, especially as it is a notion that is interpreted in Sierra Leonean legislation and common law (For instance, Trade Marks Act 2014, and Patents and Industrial Design Act 2012). An overview of Intellectual Property status at Sierra Leonean public universities in the prematurely 2000s also proposed that without a pragmatic and strict interpretation of what comprises Intellectual Property, crucial questions about Intellectual Property proprietorship could not answered. Policies approached the interpretation of Intellectual Property diversely,



presenting succinct interpretations concentrating on the essential notion and presenting a further nuanced interpretations registering diverse sorts of Intellectual Property, ordinarily replicated an extensive perspective of Intellectual Property, enveloping divergent shapes that Intellectual Property can hold, from tangible patents and trademarks to further intangible secret formulas and craft.

Policies revealed stretch goals, spanning from the guard and monetization of Intellectual Property to promoting innovation and societal gains. This maybe is a contemplation of changing approaches and merits across the Sierra Leonean tertiary learning zone, with each establishment carving its approach to connect with its incomparable obligation and the demands of its Sierra Leonean stakeholders. Universities in Sierra Leone have diverse obligations and community stakeholders. For instance, these universities are part of the Sierra Leone's Academic Staff Union and concentrate on academic welfare and so forth. Nonetheless, policies inclusively portrayed a robust dedication to bolstering innovation, with a relevant digit of establishments prioritizing obvious regulations around Intellectual Property proprietorship and assent. The concentration on advancing and spreading learning, alongside financial goals, demonstrated a dual functional function for universities: as custodians of knowledge and as drivers of economic development via inquiry monetization. Nonetheless, there were divergences in stressing, with these universities locating considerable significance on community engagement and real-world impacts than others. The presence of themes around transparent oversight and the guard of entitlements proposed an identification of the intricacies involved in managing Intellectual Property and the demand for standards that direct just and efficient monetization pragmatics.

When Intellectual Property affairs surfaced further broadly in Freetown public universities in the early 2000s, the usual approach was to make general claims to Intellectual Property proprietorship and then followed to ostracize certain stated operates. Ordinarily, originations made by staff in the course of their employment belonged to the university, while students retained proprietorship of their originations unless there was an agreement to the contrary. In reaction to several of the Intellectual Property affairs at the moment, the Office of the Administrator and Registrar General developed a model Intellectual Property engagement. These universities' Intellectual Property policies were probably affected by that model engagement. The recent appraisal depicted that there have not been notable transformations in Intellectual Property policies with regard to the proprietorship of staff originated Intellectual Properties. In present Intellectual Property policies, all universities withhold proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by staff, specifically when such origination is associated to their employment tasks or includes the utilize of

university finances. Nonetheless, there is also an admission of the implicit for divergent blueprint via agreements, pondering a level of flexibility in certain circumstances.

There has been holistically an absence of advocacy for student Intellectual Property entitlements and several specialists propose that this is a domain that demands clarity in university Intellectual Property policies (Jamali,2024). When it comes to the proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated from students work, the policies holistically designed to balance the entitlements of students and the motivation of their inventiveness with the concerns of the universities and their funding in social resources and facilities. They tended to guard the university's investments in inquiry and learning although identifying the student's contributions. Undergraduate students commonly possess the Intellectual Property they originate except particular terms are met, nevertheless postgraduate students may be subject to further intricate arrangements owing to their closer association with inquiry engagements that are vital to the university's obligation. Terms that result in the proprietorship of Intellectual Property by universities involve when students are employed by the university or engage in projects utilizing relevant university resources. Nonetheless, as Sattiraju (2021) proffered, universities require to simplify when they envisage their contribution relevant enough to claim proprietorship of student originated Intellectual Property.

These public universities do not have particular Intellectual Property codes in place for visitors, and their approach could differ relying on the nature of the visit, the threshold of engagement with inquiry activities, and the utilize of university resources. The circumstance was comparable for incorporates. These universities took an extensive inclusion, and at some point took a conclusive exclusion approach with terms that stated when the university would possess the Intellectual Property originated by these cohorts or groups. Broadly, clarity of regulations associated to the proprietorship of Intellectual Property originated by diverse originator cohorts is crucial not only to ignore avoid legal complexities but also to guarantee policies are obvious and simple to comprehend. In the early days there was not a high threshold of litigation regarding Intellectual Property in Freetown, Sierra Leone preserved that this could be owing to a high level of compliance and consciousness, an absence of financial resources or an absence of inducement owing to the non-financial nature of a lot of scholarly toil. With the increasing monetization engagement, the likelihood of litigation also multiplies, especially if policies lack clarity. Notwithstanding, vague university policies are a challenge for inquiry monetization (Bangura, 2024).

The policies convey an interest not only to guard but also to tirelessly regard and incorporate cultural local insights and entitlements in the monetization of inquiry. This is suggestive

of a far-reaching acknowledgment of the value and significance of cultural contributions to learning and the demand for their diligent engagement in the oversight and utilize of Intellectual Property emerging from such social knowledge or learning.

There was a bit of difference in income sharing arrangements in these universities with the share of originators ranging between a third and a half. It seems that compared to ten years ago, the range has become barely limited as it was from thirty percent to sixty percent in the late 2000s (). The share of the university was commonly apportioned between different sections in several instances. The variation might consider the particular context and tactical objectives that each university trails or follows.

## 10. CONCLUSION

The sociological inquiry underscores the significance of obvious and adaptable Intellectual Property policies in furthering a favorable community for inquiry monetization and innovation within academic establishments. It emphasizes the demand for Sierra Leonean public universities to probably rethink their Intellectual Property policies in light of the

transforming dynamics of inquiry monetization, to guarantee they stay competitive and persist to drive inventiveness in the universal intellectual terrain. Based on Intellectual Property policies, 'Freetonian' structure is considerably a university possessed model and this might not be the best model for efficient inquiry monetization.

This sociological inquiry has several limitations. The sociological discourse was limited to publicly obtainable records, and universities may outline several of the social particulars and sophistications of Intellectual Property affairs and monetization engagement engagements in other records that are not publicly accessible. Future inquiries should scan at the efficiency of these policies and whether there is a link amidst obvious policies with better inducements (For instance, further income apportion for originators) and lesser restrictions and further inventiveness and monetization engagements at universities. University of Sierra Leone university policies can be compared with those of other countries with similar tertiary education networks but diverse monetization behaviors to discover out about crucial similarities divergences and how policies finest affect inventiveness at public universities.

## REFERENCES

Aung, N.N (2024) **The Basis of Constitutional Adjudication in Germany. Fiat Justisia, Volume 16 Number 1, January-March 2022: 47-64.** Faculty of Law, Universitas Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. ISSN: 1978-5186 | e-ISSN: 2477-6238. <http://jurnal.fh.unila.ac.id/index.php/fiat2>.

Bangura, M (2024) Socio-Legal Appraisal of Intellectual Property Rights and Innovativeness at University of Sierra Leone, **Freetown**, Western Urban, Sierra Leone. *European Journal of Applied Science, Engineering and Technology*, 2(5), 20-30. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2024.2\(5\).03](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2024.2(5).03).

Briggs, K (2024) Intellectual Property Policy in Canadian Post -Secondary Institutions . CanInnovate. <https://www.caninnovate.ca/p/intellectual-property-policy-in-canadian>.

Ding, L and Xue, P (2023) Incentives or Disincentives? Intellectual Property Protection and FinTech innovation - Evidence from Chinese Cities, *Finance Research Letters*, Volume 58, Part B, 104451, ISSN 15446123, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104451>. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1544612323008231>).

Evanova, D.V (2023) "The Intellectual Property Law System in the EAEU Member States: Comparative Study," *Science Governance and Scientometrics Journal*, Russian Research Institute of Economics, Politics and Law in Science and Technology (RIEPL), vol. 18(2), pages 286-307, June. Handle: *RePEc:akt:journl:v:18:y:2023:i:2:p:286-307* DOI: 10.33873/2686-6706.18-2.286-307.

Johnston, M (2023) Intellectual Property for New Entrepreneurs . Honors Project. Bowling Green State University. <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1755&context=honorsprojects>.

Jamali, H.R (2024) Navigating intellectual property (IP): A comparative analysis of Australian universities' IP policies. *PLoS One*, May 30;19(5):e0304647. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0304647. PMID: 38814965; PMCID: PMC11139293.

**Kankanhalli, G (2024)** Bargaining Power in the Market for Intellectual Property: Evidence from Licensing Contract Terms. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*. Vol.21, Issue 1. Pages 109 -173.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jels.12374>.

Miteu, G. D (2024). Patenting: the Bayh-Dole Act and its transformative impact on science innovation and commercialization. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 15;86(6):3192-3195. doi: 10.1097/MS9.0000000000002047. PMID: 38846872; PMCID: PMC11152831.

Sattiraju, V.K et al (2021) Intellectual Property Rights Policies of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in India: A Cross- Sectional Study. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management* . ISSN:0253-4620. See: <https://emerald.com>.

Suominen, A., Deschryvere, M. (2024) Barriers to immaterial property rights development in research organizations: an explorative study from Finland. *J Technol Transf*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-024-10062-0>.

Taally, D.V (2023) Music Copyrights Infringement: The Case of Ghana. [https://www.academia.edu/105635713/Music\\_Copyright\\_Infringement\\_The\\_Case\\_of\\_Ghana](https://www.academia.edu/105635713/Music_Copyright_Infringement_The_Case_of_Ghana).

Wang, J and Qian, Y (2023) The Impact of University Patent Ownership on Commercialization. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper 31021 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31021>.

Yao, L et al (2024) The impact of intellectual property demonstration policies on carbon emission efficiency. *Sci Rep*. 2024 Jul 3;14(1):15336. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-66372-8. PMID: 38961205; PMCID: PMC11222416.

Zhang, L et al (2023) Research on patent quality evaluation based on rough set and cloud model,

*Expert Systems with Applications*, Volume 235, 121057, ISSN 0957-4174, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.121057>; (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417423015592>).

**Gellatly, G** and **Gu, W** Understanding Canada's innovation paradox: Exploring linkages between innovation, technology adoption and productivity. *Statistique Canada. Economic and Social Reports*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202400700002-eng>.

Zhang, Y et al (2024) Intellectual Property Protection in the Oil, Gold Sectors and Mineral Resources Rent on Indigenous Populations: Preserving Innovation and Value, *Resources Policy*, Volume 95, 105090, ISSN 0301-4207, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2024.105090>. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301420724004574>).