

ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF GAZA

Entrepreneurs Awareness of IPRs in Gaza strip

4/1/2015

Researchers:

Dr. Wael Al Daya

Eng. Amani AL mqadma

Mrs. Haya AL Agaha

Abstract

This study aimed to :Measuring the incubated entrepreneurs in Gaza strip awareness of IPRs laws, Identifying the extent to which incubated entrepreneurs think they need the application of IPRs on their projects, Understanding if the local environment spread and support the IPRs concept and Identifying if the incubated entrepreneurs think that IPRs are innovation drivers.

To fulfill the aim of the study, the researchers followed the descriptive analytical approach. They used a questionnaire as a data collection tool. The study population was (150) entrepreneurs. (50) questionnaires were recollected out of (150) questionnaires distributed. The collected questionnaires were analyzed by SPSS program for statistical analysis.

The study results revealed that Entrepreneurs do not have the needed knowledge about IPR. In addition, it was found that entrepreneurs think they need to apply the IPR on their projects. Moreover, the legal and economical environment in Gaza strip do not promotes awareness towards understanding IPR. And finally, the Entrepreneurs think that IPRs are innovation drivers.

The study ended with four main recommendations for the universities, incubators and the donors of the entrepreneurs programme in Gaza strip.

الوعي بحقوق الملكية لدى ريادةي الأعمال في قطاع غزة.

المخلص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى قياس مدى وعي ريادةي الأعمال المحتضنين في قطاع غزة بقوانين وأنظمة حقوق الملكية المعمول بها، وتحديد إلى أي مدى يشعر هؤلاء الرياديين بأنهم بحاجة إلى تطبيق قوانين وأنظمة حقوق الملكية على مشاريعهم الخاصة، وقياس مدى دعم ونشر المؤسسات المختلفة لمفهوم حقوق الملكية بين الرياديين واخيرا تحديد إمكانية اعتبار حقوق الملكية كدافع للإبداع لدى الرياديين.

لتحقيق أهداف الدراسة فقد اتبع الباحثون أسلوب الباحثين المنهج التحليلي الوصفي وتم استخدام الإستبانة كأداة لجمع المعلومات من مجتمع الدراسة الذي يتكون من 150 ريادةي اعمال محتضن، وقد تم تجميع 50 إستبانة وقد تم تحليلها باستخدام برنامج التحليل الإحصائي (SPSS).

لقد بينت نتائج التحليل أن ريادةي الأعمال المحتضنين في قطاع غزة لا يوجد لديهم الوعي الكافي بقوانين وأنظمة حقوق الملكية المعمول بها في قطاع غزة، كما أظهر التحليل أن الرياديين محل الدراسة يشعرون أنهم بحاجة إلى تطبيق قوانين وأنظمة حقوق الملكية على مشاريعهم الخاصة، من جهة اخرى فقط أوضح التحليل أن المؤسسات المختلفة لا تدعم

او تنشر مفهوم حقوق الملكية بين الرياديين، وقد أظهر الرياديون محل الدراسة أنهم يعتقدون بأن حقوق الملكية تعتبر دافع للإبداع.

وقد خرجت الدراسة بأربع توصيات رئيسية للجامعات والحاضنات والمؤسسات الداعمة للبرامج الريادية في قطاع غزة.

Table of Contents

1.INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1.Introduction.....	5
2.2.IPRs as driver of innovation.....	5
2.3.IPRs as innovation barrier.....	6
2.4.Studies on intellectual property protection and entrepreneurship in Palestine (in chronological order).....	6
2.5.IPR and Entrepreneurship Programmes.....	7
2.6.The Palestinian IPRs.....	7
3.STUDY HYPOTHESIS.....	8
4.METHOD, DATA AND SAMPLES.....	8
4.1.Data.....	8
4.2.Population and study sample.....	8
4.3.Participants and Response Rate.....	9
5.Findings and Discussion.....	10
5.1.Demographic questions.....	10
5.2.First group of questions: Knowledge of IPRs concept and types (Q1- Q13).....	12
5.3.Second group of questions Need of project/ organization to register IPRs (Q14- Q20).....	13
5.4.Third group of questions collaborative awareness environment of IPR(Q21- Q32).....	14
5.5.Fourth group of questions IPR and Entrepreneurial projects(Q33- Q38).....	15
5.6.Testing the Hypotheses.....	16
6.Conclusion.....	18
7.Recommendations.....	19
8.Bibliography.....	20

1. List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of literature on intellectual property protection and entrepreneurship in Palestine (in chronological order)	7
Table 2 Demographic information	11
Table 3 One-Sample Test 1st Group of the Questions	13
Table 4 One Sample Test 2nd Group the Questions	14
Table 5 One Sample Test 3rd Group the Questions	15
Table 6 One Sample Test 4th Group the Questions	16
Table 7: measuring the interest of the respondent in having training courses in IPRs	16
Table 8 Hypotheses Test	17

2. INTRODUCTION

Intellectual property rights (IPR) systems are very crucial and essential pillar to convert innovation potential and creativity into market value and competitiveness. The Intellectual property rights (IPR) support entrepreneurs to protect their innovation nationally and internationally and helping them to earn a return on their innovations (Simcoe, Graham, & Feldman, 2009). In the performance report of the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme published by the EU commission (2012) it was found that IP systems stimulate creativity and innovation research by small and medium enterprises. Even for developing countries, enforcement and development of IP systems encourage innovation which as a result leads to economic development (Chen & Puttitanun, Intellectual property rights and innovation in developing countries, 2005). Thus and under the political and economical pressure of USA, many developing countries including China, India, Argentine since 1980 have begun enhancing and reforming their IPRs laws in order to cope with the globalization demands and international trends (Correa, 2000). Several trade agreements have been developed and enforced by developed countries on developing countries that regulates and define standards for IPRs systems. But, the most important shifts happened after signing the Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement in 1994, which sets up minimum standards of IPRs to be adopted and respected by all the World Trade Organization (WTO) members (Correa, 2000).

As one of the developing countries, the Palestinian Authority during the first decade of 2000, was studying the enhancement of the IPRs and to sign the TRIPS agreement. Joining the TRIPS will as some researchers argue help the developed countries for more monopolization to the inventions (IT, Pharmaceutical Sectors and etc..) (Boldrin & Levine, 2013) but it may also drive innovation and help our entrepreneurs to protect their inventions and produce economical impact on the Palestinian society.

Thus for a country like Palestine where youth entrepreneurs are the future of this country, a critical point here is to understand if our entrepreneurs aware of the concept and importance of IPRs or not?

Therefore the study objectives are:

1. Measuring the incubated entrepreneurs in Gaza strip awareness of IPRs laws
2. Identifying the extent to which incubated entrepreneurs think they need the application of IPRs on their projects
3. Understanding if the local environment spread and support the IPRs concept
4. Identifying if the incubated entrepreneurs think that IPRs are innovation drivers

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Introduction

Schumpeter (1934) defines innovation as a new combination of resources of production. But a more technical and clearer definition was developed by the OECD(1994) as it interprets that innovation is the transformation of an idea:

1. into a new or an improved product introduced on the market;
2. or into a new or an improved operational process used in industry or commerce;
3. or into a new approach of a social service

innovation can occur in any field of industry including universities, government and hospitals whereas entrepreneurship drives innovation, competitiveness, job creation and economic growth. Entrepreneurs are developing new and innovative ideas and turn them into new products, thus enabling the people who may be disadvantaged or from bad economical situation to create their own jobs. We can conclude that entrepreneurs and innovation relationship is as causes and result. To have more effective innovation we have to encourage entrepreneurs to create new ideas by creating the suitable environment that support the innovation. The environment includes political, economical and legal environment. [source](#)

One important aspect of the legal environment is the IPRs enforced by the country, but studying the impact of IPRs protection on innovation reveal controversial results. To explain this ambiguity Combe & Pfister (2001) argue that innovation depends on several determinant factors (the firm size, financial capabilities, the market concentration and opportunities , etc..). Thus it will be difficult to isolate the effect of the IPRs on innovation knowing that it is very recently adopted by developing countries.

Whereas other studies have tackle the impact of IPRs on innovation in isolation with other factors, some these studies have resulted in enforcement and development of IPRs was an innovation driver and other studies indicated that IPRs were innovation barrier. The following two sections present these studies.

3.2. IPRs as driver of innovation

Cao & Zhao (2013) in their study of investigating the link between patent management and technological innovation performance in Chinese high-tech enterprises, they found that patent acquisition has **appositive** effect on the technological performance of the high-tech enterprises. In their study, (Chin & Grossman, 1988) they found that if we have a big innovation (not a small one) IPRs will enhance economic efficiency. Whereas the study of Scotchmer & Green (1990) shed the light on the licensing importance for patenting, and they concluded that it support innovation and does not have any negative effect on the firms' profit. In 2005, Chen and Puttitanun and by using panel data for 64 developing countries since 1975

to 2000, the results revealed that IPRs can stimulate innovation even in developing countries. Whereas Ács & Sanders (2008) in their working paper found that there is relation between IPRs and innovation which can be represented in an inverted U-shaped function. Such that the stronger IPRs enforcement, the more innovation and economic growth we will have. This relation continue till some point at which the more stronger the IPRs, the less returns to entrepreneurship that will sufficiently reduce the economic growth that has been achieved at the previous points.

3.3. IPRs as innovation barrier

Other studies contradict the positive impact of IPRs on innovation, (Lerner, 2009) in his study of examining the impact of patent policies on innovation activities for 177 patent policy across sixty countries and 150 years; he found that the impact is negative and the more intellectual property rights are imposed the less innovation activities will results. Whereas Gangopadhyay & Mondal (2012) in their study of investigating whether stronger IPRs stimulate or hamper innovation, they found that IPRs may hamper the dissemination of scientific knowledge and make it monopolized to specific portion of people; thus as a result hamper innovation and knowledge sharing. Some other researchers concentrated only on Paten registration to study the impact of IPRs on the innovation; Helpman (1993) in his study revealed that patent protection has a negative effect on innovation in developed countries; he argue that the northern countries will be the only ones who can invest in innovation because they have the patent rights, and as the patent rights imposed the southern countries will not be able to compete them and benefit from the registered patents. Thus the northern countries will be affected by the overinvestment which will cause the inflation in production rate. As a result innovation process even in these northern countries will degradate.

In general, we can understand that the effect of the IPRs on innovation may vary according to the country, level of GDPA and many other factors.

3.4. Studies on intellectual property protection and entrepreneurship in Palestine (in chronological order)

While a lot of studies examining the impact of intellectual property systems on innovation have been carried out worldwide and specially in developed countries; in Palestine, most of studies concentrated on either the entrepreneurship strengthening and its impact on the economic development in Palestine or on studying and analyzing the Palestinian intellectual property rights law, most recent studies in these two fields are tabulated below:

Article	Main Goal
(Samaan, 2003) A Historical View of Intellectual Property Rights in the Palestinian Territories	Tracing the development of IP laws in Palestine since the end of the Ottoman era until the Palestinian Authority assumed responsibilities in certain parts of the west Bank and Gaza Strip.
(Hashweh, 2012) Entrepreneurship Education in the Occupied Palestinian Territory: An	Investigate the actual and potential contribution of the formal school educational system in the Occupied

Exploratory Study	Palestinian Territory to the development of entrepreneurship.
(Sabella, Farraj, Burbar, & Qaimary, 2014) Entrepreneurship and economic growth in west bank, Palestine.	Examining the nature of the relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth in the West Bank of the Palestinian territories
(Sultan, 2014) Understanding women entrepreneurs working in a conflict region.	Getting a thorough and deep understanding of women entrepreneurship working in an Arab and conflict country such as Palestine.
(Abdullah, Al-Natsheh, & Hattawy, 2014) Policies for Scaling up Youth Entrepreneurship in the State of Palestine	Examining the characteristics of entrepreneurship among young Palestinians, aged 18-34 years.
(Studies and Research Center, 2014) Obstacles Facing entrepreneurship in Palestine.	Identifying current obstacles facing the entrepreneurship in Palestine and specially the youth sector

Table 1: Summary of literature on intellectual property protection and entrepreneurship in Palestine (in chronological order)

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, no study has tackle the IPRs and entrepreneurs all together in one study and this is the uniqueness of the current study.

3.5. IPR and Entrepreneurship Programmes

Believing in the importance of having knowledge about IPRs for entrepreneurs, most entrepreneurs education and orientation programmes provide modules to introduce the concept for the entrepreneurs. In his report Chiu (2012) revealed that one of the important practices of Norway in the field of Entrepreneurship education, was the funding provided to the educational institution to perform research on the IPRs to increase the awareness of the importance of the IPRs for entrepreneurs. Moreover, in the first issue paper presented by OECD (2010) during the working party on SMEs and entrepreneurship, it was pointed at week knowledge among entrepreneurs and the lack of strategies of managing IPRs causes the loss of profits. Thus, it was one of the recommendation to increase awareness of IPRs and how to manage it to achieve economic growth.

3.6. The Palestinian IPRs

The Palestinian ministry of national economy has divided Intellectual property into two types: the first one is industrial property and includes brands, patents, industrial designs and geographical indications and designs of integrated circuits and plant works and commercial names whereas the second type is the copyright (Ministry of National Economy, 2012). According to the 2014 Investment Climate Statement prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs (2014), the Protection of Property Rights in Palestine (west bank and Gaza strip) is not sufficient and followed a very old laws. The property rights are governed by the Civil Claims Law of 1933 and the Palestinian Trademark and Patent Laws of 1938 in Gaza, and the Commercial Law No. (19) of 1953 and the Patent Law No. (22) of 1953 in the West Bank.

4. STUDY HYPOTHESIS

H01: Palestinian incubated entrepreneurs are not aware of the concept and the types of IPR at $\alpha= 0.05$

H02: Palestinian incubated entrepreneurs do not need the application of IPRs on their projects at $\alpha= 0.05$

H03: Palestinian incubated entrepreneurs do not think that local environment spread and support the IPRs concept at $\alpha= 0.05$.

H04: Palestinian incubated entrepreneurs do not think that IPRs are innovation drivers at $\alpha= 0.05$.

5. METHOD, DATA AND SAMPLES

This study follows the analytical descriptive approach, which is considered as the most used in business and social studies.

5.1. Data

The researchers used plenty of secondary data resources to justify the problem and gain maximum information regarding IP as a driver for innovation and entrepreneurship such as Scientific journals and academic magazines, research papers

Whereas Primary Data are information collected through questionnaire survey.

5.2. Population and study sample

The study population consists from all entrepreneurs who are incubated at Gaza business incubators which are: IUG business incubator, PICTI, UCAS business incubator. The total number of the incubated entrepreneurs according to the incubators statistics March, 2015 equals 150. [source](#)

For large population, Cochran (1963, p. 75) developed the Equation 1 to yield a representative sample for proportions as following:

$$n_0 = \left\{ \frac{Z}{2m} \right\}^2$$

Equation 1: Formula for Calculating a Sample for Proportions

Where:

Z: The abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area α at the tails (i.e. $Z= 1.96$ at $\alpha =0.05$)

m: is the desired level of precision (i.e. 0.05)

According to equation 1,
$$n_0 = \left\{ \frac{1.96}{2 \times 0.05} \right\}^2 \cong 384$$

Finite Population Correction for Proportions

Since the population of the study is relatively small then the sample size can be reduced slightly. The sample size (n_0) can be adjusted using the following formula (Israel, 2012):

$$n = \frac{n_0 \times N}{n_0 + N - 1}$$

Equation 2: Finite Population Correction for Proportions

Where n is the sample size and N is the population size.

Substituting with $N= 150$ and $n_0 = 384$ (Equation 2), the sample size of the study (n) is:

$$n = \frac{384 \times 150}{384 + 150 - 1} = 108$$

Thus the representative sample of the study population equals 108 incubated entrepreneurs in Gaza strip.

5.3. Participants and Response Rate

The online questionnaire was developed using Google Docs facility (Al-Mqadma, 2015). The questionnaire was distributed to 150 incubated entrepreneurs.

The total collected questionnaires were 50. The total response rate was as following:

$\begin{aligned} \text{Response rate} &= \text{Collected questionnaires} / \text{distributed questionnaires} \\ &= 50/150 = 30\% \end{aligned}$

It's worth mentioning that this response rate is representing 50% of the study sample.

نسبة الاستجابة ضعيفة

6. Findings and Discussion

6.1. Demographic questions

Demographic results of the study respondents includes eight items: gender, age, degree, Specialization, experience, project, ownership, project life. They were analyzed separately.

Demographic Analysis		
	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	18	36.7
Male	31	63.3
Age		
From 26 to 35	13	26.5
From 36 to 45	13	26.5
Less than 25	22	44.9
More than 46	1	2.0
Degree		
Bachelor	36	73.5
Higher Studies	13	26.5
Specialization		
Commerce	16	32.7
Engineering	20	40.8
Others	8	16.3
Science	5	10.2
Experience		
From 10 to 15	6	12.2
From 5 to 10	19	38.8
Less than 5 Y	24	49.0
Project		
Commercial	11	22.4
Service	38	77.6
Ownership		
Employee	9	18.4
Manager	10	20.4
Owner	30	61.2
Project life		
Closed	15	30.6
Present	34	69.4

Table 2 Demographic information

As shown in Table 2, gender distribution of respondents, 36.7% of the respondents are female, while the highest portion goes for male as they are 63.3% of total respondents. This can be interpreted as the female entrepreneurs are constituting very small portion of the total entrepreneurs in Palestine in addition to the socioeconomic situation that encourage male to search for a source of income through these entrepreneurial projects.

The result of this field agrees with the results from Sultan (2014) study, that reveals that women entrepreneurs constitute small portion of the total entrepreneurs in Palestine and they need special programmes to support them.

Age distribution of respondents; the youth – less than 25 years dominate the respondents with a 44.9%, the elderly has the least dominance 2% while 26.5% goes for both age areas from 26 to 35 and from 36 to 45. This indicates that most of entrepreneurs are youth who have innovative ideas and enthusiasm to try new things and believe in the power of youth.

The result agrees with the results of Abdullah, Al-Natsheh, & Hattawy (2014) study where their study found that most of entrepreneurs are youth as they are willing to have better economic situation.

Degree and qualifications of respondents; None of the respondents holds lower degree than bachelor, majority of them 73.5% holds a bachelor degree, and 26.5% have postgraduate studies. This expected result came as a result of age distribution as most of respondents are youth and start their own project, or work in similar one after graduating and holding a degree.

Specialization of respondents: 40.8% of respondents were engineers, this is a normal result for the target group, entrepreneurs in IT fields. 32.7% are specialized in one of commerce majors, this came with project nature as accountants acquire positions in most of the projects. 16.3% have different specializations other than engineering, commerce and science. The least percentage of respondents were science specialized entrepreneurs with 10.2%, this low percentage is normal due to high expected costs of establishing projects in their specialization.

Experience of respondents: Majority of respondents (49%) have less than 5 years of experience, this will appear later in the results, as they don't have enough information about IPR. 38.8% have from 5 to 10 years and 12.2% have from 10 to 15 years, which is in accordance with age of respondents.

Nature of project: None of the respondents have industrial project, this is normal due to sample characteristics, as these projects need high establishment costs. 77.6% of respondents have projects with a service nature, which is compatible with the sample. 22.4% of respondents have commercial entrepreneurial projects.

Ownership of project: 61.2% of respondents were owners of their project, while 20.4% were managers and 18.4% were employees. This indicates the nature of addressed projects, entrepreneurs prefer individual projects that they can handle easily.

Project life: 69.4% of respondents had ongoing projects while 30.6% had closed one, this is a normal consequence of economic condition and absence of IPR which appears later on in the analysis.

6.2. First group of questions: Knowledge of IPRs concept and types (Q1- Q13)

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 5.5		
	t	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q1	.563	5.69	.576
Q2	3.425	6.38	.001
Q3	12.179	7.75	.000
Q4	13.581	7.96	.000
Q5	15.828	7.71	.000
Q6	4.008	6.25	.000
Q7	-8.533	3.92	.000
Q8	-31.170	2.35	.000
Q9	-15.157	3.40	.000
Q10	-15.157	3.40	.000
Q11	-15.157	3.40	.000
Q12	-15.157	3.40	.000
Q13	-22.360	1.83	.000

Table 3 One-Sample Test 1st Group of the Questions

Table 3: Means and Test values of each item of First group of questions (Q1- Q13) , shows the following results:

- The means of Q3(Knowledge of patent concept) , Q4(knowledge of trade mark concept) and Q5(knowledge of brand name concept) equals 7.75, 7.96 and 7.71 respectively and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive for each question, so the means of Q3, Q4 and Q5 are significantly greater than the hypothesized value 5.5. It is concluded that the respondents agreed that they know the patent, trade mark, and brand name concepts by percentage of 77.5%, 79.6% and 77.1 respectively.
- The means of the questions Q7-Q13 are less than 6 and the smallest one of them is the mean of Q13(embezzlement sanctions or bypass or an assault on property) which equals 1.8 and the Test-value = -22.36, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is negative for all questions, so the means of these questions are significantly smaller than the hypothesized value 5.5. It is concluded that the respondents disagreed with knowledge of concepts of design registration, secret combination, transparency Agreement, copyright, literary right of the author, financial right of the author and inventor the right to franchise.

يلزم الربط بالدراسات السابقة في كل المحاور

6.3. Second group of questions Need of project/ organization to register IPRs (Q14- Q20)

One-Sample Test			
	Test Value = 5.5		
	t	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q14	7.125	6.25	.000
Q15	29.786	9.73	.000
Q16	25.384	9.04	.000
Q17	25.503	8.17	.000
Q18	24.347	8.21	.000

Q19	4.769	6.75	.000
Q20	-4.692	4.77	.000

Table 4 One Sample Test 2nd Group the Questions

Table 4: Means and Test values of each item of Second group of questions (Q14-Q20), shows the following results:

- The means of Q14- Q19 are significantly greater than the hypothesized value 5.5. and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive for each question, so it is concluded that the respondents agreed that they believe that their project/ the organization they're working in needs to register the patent and trademark, copyright, drawings and models, trade name, signing agreements on transparency.
- The mean of the question 20 (registering copyrights) is less than 6 and the Test-value = -4.692, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is negative for this question, so the mean of this question is smaller than the hypothesized value 5.5. It is concluded that the respondents disagreed with the project/ organization need to register copyrights.

6.4. Third group of questions collaborative awareness environment of IPR(Q21- Q32)

One-Sample Test			
	Test Value = 5.5		
	t	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q21	36.605	9.81	.000
Q22	-1.231	5.31	.224
Q23	-22.738	1.83	.000
Q24	-22.738	1.83	.000
Q25	-26.017	1.71	.000
Q26	-26.017	1.71	.000
Q27	-26.099	1.67	.000
Q28	-26.099	1.67	.000
Q29	-26.099	1.67	.000

Q30	-26.099	1.67	.000
Q31	-26.099	1.67	.000
Q32	-7.197	3.85	.000

Table 5 One Sample Test 3rd Group the Questions

Table 5: Means and Test values of each item of First group of questions (Q21- Q32) , shows the following results:

- The mean of Q21 (interesting level in knowledge of IPR) is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 5.5. and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive for the question, so it is concluded that the respondents agreed that they are interested in knowing IPR.
- The means of the questions Q22-Q32 are less than 6 and most of them have a mean revolving around 1.67 and the Test-value = - 26.099 and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is negative for all questions, so the means of these questions are significantly smaller than the hypothesized value 5.5. It is concluded that the respondents disagreed with the questions, they did not participate in IPR related activities, they also think that the environment did not encourage IPR knowledge, they believe that curriculums did not concern about IPR, as well as academics, training courses, local media, government, NGOs, associations, syndicates and organization. In addition the applied laws do not encourage IPR, and the access to these laws is not easy.

6.5. Fourth group of questions IPR and Entrepreneurial projects(Q33- Q38)

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 5.5		
	T	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q33	8.590	7.69	.000
Q34	19.888	8.46	.000
Q35	10.458	7.65	.000

Q36	5.585	6.75	.000
Q37	24.434	8.06	.000
Q38	7.190	6.77	.000

Table 6 One Sample Test 4th Group the Questions

Table 6: Means and Test values of each item of First group of questions (Q33- Q38) , shows the following results:

- The means of Q33- Q38 all are significantly greater than the hypothesized value 5.5. and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive for each question, so it is concluded that the respondents agreed that there is a positive relationship between applying IPR and entrepreneurial projects, creativity and investment, revenues. As well as applying IPR protects entrepreneurial projects, in addition to its importance on the national economy.

Q39			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	No	1	2.0
	Yes	48	98.0
	Total	49	100.0
Q40			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	NO	1	2.0
	Yes	48	98.0
	Total	49	100.0
Table 7: measuring the interest of the respondent in having training courses in IPRs			

Table 7 shows that 98% of respondents thinks that they need a training course in IPR and advice others to have it.

6.6. Testing the Hypotheses

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.5					
t	Mean	Sig.	(2-	Mean	95% Confidence Interval

			tailed)	Difference	of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
H1	-8.981	4.8782	.000	-.62179	-.7611	-.4825
H2	29.980	7.5595	.000	2.05952	1.9213	2.1977
H3	-20.601	2.8663	.000	-2.63368	-2.8909	-2.3765
H4	25.312	7.5625	.000	2.06250	1.8986	2.2264

Table 8 Hypotheses Test

- H01: The mean equals 4.87 which is lower than the test value 5.5, and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is negative.

Entrepreneurs do not have the needed knowledge about IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is accepted.

This result is very acceptable for the researchers and can be expected, as most of entrepreneurs orientation programmes do not include any module to raise awareness of IPRs in Palestine. This is also confirm the results indicated in the 2014 Investment Climate Statement prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs (2014), that highlighted to the fact that the Protection of Property Rights in Palestine (west bank and Gaza strip) is not sufficient and followed a very old laws.

- H02: The mean equals 7.55 which is higher than the test value 5.5, and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive.

Entrepreneurs think they need IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is rejected and H12 is accepted.

- H03: The mean equals 2.86 which is lower than the test value 5.5, and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is negative.

Entrepreneurs do not think that the legal and economical environment in Gaza strip promotes awareness towards understanding IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is accepted.

This result is very acceptable for the researchers and can be expected, as most of entrepreneurs orientation programmes do not include any module to raise

awareness of IPRs in Palestine. This is also confirm the results indicated in the 2014 Investment Climate Statement prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs (2014), that highlighted to the fact that the Protection of Property Rights in Palestine (west bank and Gaza strip) is not sufficient and followed a very old laws.

- H04: The mean equals 7.56 which is higher than the test value 5.5, and the P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The sign of the test is positive.

Entrepreneurs think applying IPRs can be considered as innovation driver at significance level 5% so this hypothesis is rejected and H14 is accepted.

The result agrees the studies in the literature that confirm that IPRs can stimulate the innovation process among entrepreneurs such as Cao & Zhao (2013) study and the study of Chin & Grossman (1988). While the results contradict the results of the studies Lerner (2009) and the study of Helpman (1993).

After all this result is obtained from respondents view of the point, but to actually judge if the application of IPRs can stimulate or hinder innovation is subject to the enforcement of the IPRs and then measuring the situation after the enforcement and comparing it with the situation of before the application.

7. Conclusion

- Respondents agreed that they know the some types of the IPR like patent, trade mark, and brand name concepts, but they do not have knowledge about the concepts of design registration, secret combination, transparency Agreement, copyright, literary right of the author, financial right of the author and inventor the right to franchise.
- Respondents are interested in knowing IPR and presented their willingness in having training course in IPR and advice others to have it.
- Respondents believe that their project/ the organization they're working in needs to register the patent and trademark, copyright, drawings and models, trade name, signing agreements on transparency.
- Respondents did not participate in IPR related activities, they also think that the environment did not encourage IPR knowledge, they believe that

curriculums did not introduce the concept or the types of IPR, as well as academics, training courses, local media, government, NGOs, associations, syndicates and organization even the incubation orientation programmes they are involved in. In addition the applied laws do not encourage IPR, and the access to these laws is not easy.

- Respondents think that applying IPR will promote their entrepreneurial projects, creativity and investment, revenues. As well as protecting entrepreneurial projects, in addition to its importance on the national economy.

Research Hypothesis

- Entrepreneurs do not have the needed knowledge about IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is accepted.
- Entrepreneurs think they need IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is rejected and H12 is accepted.
- Entrepreneurs do not think that the legal and economical environment in Gaza strip promotes awareness towards understanding IPR at significance level 5%, so this hypothesis is accepted.
- Entrepreneurs think that IPRs are innovation drivers at $\alpha= 0.055\%$, so H04 is rejected and H14 is accepted.

8. Recommendations

The result of this study revealed that incubated entrepreneurs are not aware of the concept or the types of the IPRs in Palestine and the application process. So the study recommendations are as following:

1. Entrepreneurship education and orientation programmes in Gaza strip should add modules to make entrepreneurs aware of the concept and the types of IPRs just like most of the entrepreneurial orientation and education programmes Chiu (2012) and OECD (2010).
2. Universities should adopt and raise awareness among students about the importance of IPRs via including it within the academic curriculum OECD (2010).
3. Universities should direct researchers to conduct studies and provide policy framework for the authorities about the feasibility of enforcing IPRs in Palestine and adopting TRIPS agreement standards keeping in mind our special circumstances that may make other studies not applicable to our context OECD (2010).

9. Bibliography

- Abdullah, S., Al-Natsheh, B., & Hattawy, M. (2014). Policies for Scaling up Youth Entrepreneurship in the State of Palestine. *Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS)*.
- Ács, Z. J., & Sanders, M. (2008). Intellectual property rights and the knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Jena economic research papers 2008,069*.
- Boldrin, & Levine. (2013). What's Intellectual Property Good for? *Revue économique*.
- Cao, Y., & Zhao, L. (2013). Analysis of patent management effects on technological innovation performance. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 8(3), pp. 286 - 305.
- Chen, Y., & Puttitanun, T. (2005, July). Intellectual property rights and innovation in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics*, 78(2), pp. 474–493.
- Chen, Y., & Puttitanun, T. (2005). Intellectual property rights and innovation in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics*.
- Chin, & Grossman. (1988). Intellectual Property Rights and North-South Trade. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
- Chiu, R. (2012). *Entrepreneurship education in the Nordic countries: strategy implementation and good practices*. Norway: Nordic Innovation, Stensberggata 25, NO-0170 Osl.
- Correa, C. M. (2000). *Intellectual Property Rights, the WTO and Developing Countries: The TRIPS agreement and policy option*. Zed Books Ltd. .
- EU commission . (2012). *Enterpreneurship and Innovation Programme Performance report* . EU commission .
- Gangopadhyay, & Mondal. (2012). Does stronger protection of intellectual property stimulate innovation? *Economics Letters*.

- Hashweh, M. (2012). Entrepreneurship Education in the Occupied Palestinian Territory: An Exploratory Study. *The Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS)*.
- Helpman, & E. (1993). Innovation, Imitation and Intellectual Property Rights. *Econometrica*, 61.
- Lerner, J. (2009, May). The Empirical Impact of Intellectual Property Rights on Innovation: Puzzles and Clues. *Papers and Proceedings of the One Hundred Twenty-First Meeting of the American Economic Association*, 99(2), pp. 343-348.
- Ministry of National Economy. (2012). *Intellectual Property*. Retrieved March 2015, from Ministry of National Economy:
<http://www.mne.gov.ps/trademarks/default.aspx>
- OECD. (2010). Innovative SMEs and Entrepreneurship for J. *OECD WPSMEE "BOLOGNA +10" HIGH Level Meeting on LESSONS FROM the Global Crises and the Way Forward To Job Creation and Growth*. Paris: OECD.
- Sabella, A. r., Farraj, W. A., Burbar, M., & Qaimary, D. (2014, March). Entrepreneurship and economic growth in west bank, palestine. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 19(1).
- Samaan, I. G. (2003). A Historical View of Intellectual Property Rights in the Palestinian Territories. *LLM Theses and Essays*.
- Scotchmer, & Green. (1990). Novelty and Disclosure in Patent Law. *RAND Journal of Economics*.
- Silvaa, A., Henriques, E., & Carvalho, A. (2009). Creativity enhancement in a product development course through entrepreneurship learning and intellectual property awareness. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 34(1), pp. 63-75.
- Simcoe, T. S., Graham, S. J., & Feldman, M. P. (2009). Competing on Standards? Entrepreneurship, Intellectual Property, and Platform Technologies. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 18(3), pp. 775–816.
- Studies and Research Center. (2014). *Obstacles Facing entrepreneurship in Palestine*. Palestinian Business Forum.
- Sultan, S. S. (2014). Understanding women entrepreneurs working in a conflict region. *7th Annual Conference of the EuroMed Academy of Business: The Future of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1556-1598). Kristiansand, Norway: EuroMed Press.

U.S. Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. (2014). *Media Note for 2014 Investment Climate Statements*. U.S. Department of State.