



Impact of Intrapreneurship on the Corporate Goal Achievement of Selected Food and Beverage Firms in Lagos State, Nigeria.

JOHNSON ADEOTI, YINUSA OLAWALE
University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

OLUDELE ASABI
Osun State College of Technology, Esa-Oke, Nigeria

Abstract. Globalization has changed the world's economic order, bringing with it new challenges and opportunities. Food and beverage firms cannot compete in this new environment unless it becomes more innovative and responds more effectively to consumers' needs and preferences. This study examines the impact of intrapreneurship on the corporate goal achievement of food and beverage firms in Lagos state, Nigeria. The specific objectives of this study are to investigate the impact of management support for intrapreneurial dimension on corporate goals achievement of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state; and to assess the organizational factors for intrapreneurship that affect innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state. The study develops and tests a theoretical research model where the management support for intrapreneurial dimensions and organizational factors for intrapreneurship are the independent variables; corporate goal achievement and innovative performance are the dependent variable via a questionnaire study covering 361 respondents from five (4) food and beverage firms in Lagos State in Nigeria, using purposive sampling techniques. The study therefore revealed that management support for intrapreneurship contribute significantly to corporate goal achievement, and this contribution is captured under the paradigm of three dimensions: innovativeness (beta =.253, t=2.246, p<0.05), risk-taking (beta =.794, t=6.296, p<0.05), and proactiveness (beta =.211, t=1.932, p>0.05). The study also shows that internal supportive environment especially management support for innovation (beta =.358, t=5.352, p>0.05), tolerance for risk taking (beta =.149, t=2.246, p>0.05), performance-based reward system (beta =.382, t=15.752, p>0.05), allocation of free time (beta =.284, t=4.226, p>0.05) and work discretion to their intrapreneurs (beta =.329, t=4.835, p>0.05), have positive impact on innovative performance. The study therefore recommended that management should be cognizant of the fact that they should concentrate more on empowerment, flexibility in drafting organizational policies, provide necessary support and act positively to the

innovative activities by encouraging risk taking initiatives among the employees and also management should design appropriate reward system such as financial reward, recognition and appraisal on significant achievements and organization should ensure the availability of resources such as time, materials and funds in supporting new ideas.

1. Introduction

The recent scenario in the commercial landscape (such as globalization, digital revolution, tight regulation, stiff competition, shift in customer needs) has witnessed the increasing pressure on organization to compete towards organizational sustainability (Ahmed, Nasirudeen and Zainal, 2012; Boston Consulting Group, 2015). In today's rapidly changing environment organizations permanently must be innovative to acquire and sustain the competitive advantage. The importance of intrapreneurship applications are growing as a method of improving innovative practices in the organizations. Some predictors of the successful intrapreneurial implementations in the organizational context are communication quality and quantity, formal controls, organizational support, the support of top management, employee training, and organizational values (Zahra, 1991; Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001; Demirbag, Tatoglu, Tekinkus&Zaim, 2006; Guth and Ginsberg, 1990). For instance, open communication as a means of information sharing and empowerment, the characteristics and visions of strategic leaders or attitudes of individuals can be considered some critical factors for the innovation when attempting to achieve organizational goals.

Gibb (2000) argues that the turbulence of modern business environment manifests in great intensity changes in technological, economic, legal and regulatory environment, and the labour and resource markets. New business conditions demand fundamental and constant transformation of the way in which companies function in order to find new paths and sources of sustainable competitive advantage, whose principal support is the development of internal capacity for continuous innovation of products, services, technologies, organization, markets, and processes. Abilities of adaptation, creativity, flexibility, aggressiveness, speed and innovativeness are the characteristics of entrepreneurial activity, which must be applied at the individual, organizational and societal level, as the response to the increasing level of uncertainty and complexity of the environment we live in (Gibb, 2000). At the organizational level – entrepreneurial behaviour is needed in non-profit and profit oriented organizations, small and large companies, and in the context of large companies, entrepreneurial activity is described through the term corporate entrepreneurship (Morris, Kuratko&Covin, 2008).

In today's globalized economy system, food and beverages firms in Nigeria are facing a deteriorating position in terms of trade, as the Nigeria economy faces competitive pressures from international fronts (Hawash, 2007). Food and

beverages organizations, as one of the engines of growth in Nigeria economy, have crucial need to continue to be major stakeholders in the domestic market, increase their global competitiveness and contribute to the Nigerian economy (Adebayo, 2013). However, emerging global markets and rapid entrepreneurial innovations make strong demands on the ability of food and beverages firms to develop and utilize their resources. In order to survive in business, food and beverages firms need to strengthen their businesses by being involved in intrapreneurship to absorb these pressures, produce high quality products at a low cost, improve organizational performances and achieve their corporate goals (Alpkan, Bulut, GundayUlusoy&Kilic, 2010). The acquirement of a new paradigm for upgrading organizational performance and improving product quality is necessary.

2. Statement of Research Problem

Organization support for intrapreneurial activities has been recognized as an effective strategy used to improve organization performance and achieve corporate goals (Alabeigi, 2012), and as a result, corporate managers are unanimous in making their employees and organizations more entrepreneurial. The major challenges organizations face is how to create supportive environment that attracts, motivates and retains intrapreneurs, instil a culture of innovation where employees are empowered to pursue dreams and to fail without retribution (Samuel, 2013). However, problems such as the challenge of survival in a stiff competitive environment, high labour mobility, technological revolution that rendered existing technology obsolete, increased expenditure on human capital, inadequate resources for employees to work with, and inability of organizations to reward risk taking and improvement in activities warranted intrapreneurship in food and beverage firms in Nigeria. There is adequate empirical literature linking intrapreneurship to corporate goal achievement. Alpkan et al., (2010) emphasized that the dimensions of organizational support, management support for idea development and tolerance for risk taking are found to exert positive effects on innovative goals.

Khan and Budhwa (2011) posited that organizations are changing rapidly; hence it is very essential that managers welcome new ideas and approaches. Sustainable competitive advantage and innovative goals can only be achieved if organizations focus on innovation within their various departments. Likewise Totterdil (2009) argued that competitive success in globalizing environments will be determined by the rate at which companies translate this creativity, experience and tacit knowledge of employees at all levels into a shared resource for innovation.

In contrary, Blanchard (2008) argued that even for organizations where intrapreneurs can be a vital creative force to enter new markets, invent new products, strike new partnerships, and test new marketing approaches, it is not always easy to manage intrapreneurs. Intrapreneurship can be a poor fit in organizations whose resources are already committed to a single strategy; intrapreneurs can be disruptive as well as challenging to manage.

3. Research Questions

This study examines the impact of intrapreneurship on the corporate goal achievement of selected food and beverage firms in Lagos State, Nigeria. To achieve the aforementioned goal, this study addresses two research questions:

- (i) Does management support for intrapreneurial dimensions affect corporate goals achievement in the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state?
- (ii) How do organizational factors for intrapreneurship affect innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state?

4. Research Objectives

- i. To examine the impact of management support for intrapreneurial dimension on corporate goals achievement of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state; and
- ii. To assess the organizational factors for intrapreneurship that affect innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

5. Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: Management support for intrapreneurial dimension does not have significant impact corporate goals achievement of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

H₀₂: There are no organizational factors for intrapreneurship affecting innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

6. Literature Review

6.1 Conceptual Clarification

Pinchot and Pinchot (1978) coined the term intrapreneurship and referred to it as “intra-corporate entrepreneurs” or “intrapreneurs”. Previous to this phenomenon, it was common practice that entrepreneurs leave their large firms and create small firms to exploit the technology that they created while they were at the large firm (Pinchot III, 1985). This is because these large firms were not equipped to incentivize innovation within their organization and often had policies that constrained further development (Meng & Roberts 2006). However, large companies soon realized the benefits of harnessing the entrepreneurial spirit within their organization and began to maximize the potential of their human capital.

American Heritage Dictionary of The English Language, 3rd Edition defines intrapreneur as "a person within a large corporation who takes direct responsibility for turning an idea into a profitable finished product through assertive risk-taking and innovation. The term intrapreneurship is derivative of an amalgamation of "intra" and "entrepreneurship" – describing the practice of entrepreneurship within organizations. Today, this term has become a synonym for organizations that foster innovative culture to avail opportunities, implement actions and produce new innovative products and services.

In practice, the term intrapreneur means an individual who has entrepreneurial skills and uses them within an organization innovatively (Pinchot 1985). Authors, like Chisholm (1987); McGinnis and (1987); Kuratko, Montagnon & Hornsby (1990); and Carrier (1996), have given more elaborated descriptions of defining this term. They view intrapreneurship as "a way of promoting innovation within the company using the creative talent of the workforce by providing them needed wherewithal and freedom to act within the organization" (cited in Khan & Budhwa, 2011)).

Put more comprehensively, intrapreneurship is entrepreneurship within an existing organization (Stanworth & Curran 1999). Also termed as corporate venturing, it refers to the application of entrepreneurial principles within existing organizations and is cited as particularly important in the development of innovative marketing strategies at the firm level; (Khan & Budhwa, 2011). Put in another way, it may be defined as a process whereby the employees within the organizations track opportunities improvising with the resources currently available to them (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). It involves looking for creative answers to problems the organizations are facing, like designing new products, development of new approaches and policies, and designing and redesigning organizational structures and systems etc. (Khan, Budhwani & Shaikh, 2011).

6.2 Two phases of intrapreneurship

Analytically, this distinction formalizes the sequential nature of the various intrapreneurial activities. Empirically, it helps in assembling relevant items for measuring intrapreneurship. In practice, these stages may overlap and occur in cycles, as the perception of an opportunity sometimes follows various preparatory activities such as product design or networking (see Gartner & Carter, 2003). The two core elements of intrapreneurship are also strongly linked as imagination includes exploring possible barriers and problems facing the project and figuring out various solutions.

6.3 The scope of intrapreneurship

As there is a large conceptual diversity in the literature with respect to the relevant scope of entrepreneurial behavior this also reflects on any intrapreneurship concept.

There are at least three alternative conceptual approaches. The first is ‘pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunity’ (Shane, 2003). This includes developing a new product or service, a new geographical market or a new production process in the widest sense. This view probably represents the most encompassing view of entrepreneurship, as it acknowledges both the Kirznerian and the Schumpeterian perspective of entrepreneurial opportunities (Shane, 2003). The second view may be labeled ‘new entry’ (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Lumpkin, 2007). New entry includes entering new markets with new products, entering established markets with new products or entering new markets with established goods or services. In the latter case, the venture may be characterized as replicative rather than innovative. This concept is particularly relevant for intrapreneurship. Finally, ‘new organization creation’ (Gartner, 1989) offers a behavioral view of entrepreneurship as the process by which new organizations are created. Following this specific view intrapreneurship could be either innovative or replicative but should always be linked to some sort of ‘internal start-up’ (such as establishing a joint venture, a new subsidiary, a new outlet or a new business unit).

6.4 Barriers to Intrapreneurship

There are some barriers in the way of creating intrapreneurship in any organization and these cultivate such an environment which is not conducive to intrapreneurship. Large and growing organizations need to take advantage of synergies, economies of scale and shared risk taking for its success (Thornberry, 2003). Therefore intrapreneurship is difficult to implement in large bureaucratic organizations where cost controls, policies and guidelines are rigid and prevalent. Most firms drive in defined boundaries with defined framework and risk parameters (Timmons & Spinelli 2004), and there is scarcity of people who are brave enough to take on the intrapreneurial role and break the boundary. Therefore organizations can hire and train them to become future intrapreneurs. Eesley & Longenecker (2006) very correctly describe barriers to intrapreneurship saying these barriers are useful to know about before discussing gateways to improving organizational intrapreneurship:

- (i) When organizations punish risk taking and the mistakes associated with new ideas or innovation, intrapreneurship is stifled and will disappear with time.
- (ii) When organizations do not listen to their members' input about how to make things better and there is no follow up on improvement ideas, they discourage the very things needed for organizational improvement to flourish.
- (iii) When an organization fails to sanction, promote, and encourage risk taking, empowerment, and improvement actions, it greatly reduces the likelihood of creating an environment of better performance.
- (iv) Organizations that are replete with unhealthy political activity, infighting, and uncooperative organizational members have a very

- difficult time bringing out the best in people to create better business performance.
- (vi) When organizations are characterized by poor communication and structural silos that prevent the flow of useful information, intrapreneurship suffers greatly.
 - (vii) When organizations do not encourage and empower the employees to look for ways to improve an organization's performance; there is unclear organizational direction, priorities, and objectives; and there is lack of top management support in risk taking and improvement initiatives.
 - (viii) Finally, when risk taking and improvement activities are not rewarded and when employees have inadequate resources and time, intrapreneurship will either die never gain enough momentum to become a competitive advantage.

7. Theoretical Review

The theory adopted for this study which will guide the adoption of intrapreneurship and the achievement of innovation goals is Individual/Opportunity Nexus Theory

Individual/Opportunity Nexus Theory

The theoretical work in the discovery theory which is typically called the individual/opportunity nexus view has focused on the existence, discovery, and exploitation of opportunities and the influence of individuals and opportunities ((Kirzner, 1973; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000; Shane, 2003). The individual/opportunity nexus suggests that opportunities are objective, individuals are unique, and third that entrepreneurs are risk bearing.

Table 7.1: Individual/Opportunity Nexus Theory

| <i>Discovery view</i> | <i>Creative view</i> | <i>Individual view</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Opportunities already exist and are seen by alert individuals | Opportunities are socially enacted by sense-making of embedded individuals | Opportunities are created by autonomous individuals |

In general, studies within the *discovery view* argue that opportunities exist “Out there” independently of the individual as every price, every invention, every bit of information engenders within itself opportunities (e.g. Shane 2000, 2003; Venkataraman 2003). As the objective opportunities lack agency, specific individuals with creativity are required in order to bring the objective opportunity to life. It is basically asymmetric information waiting to be observed by individuals. Hence, in this view, individuals may not know what the specific opportunity is, but

know what an opportunity is in general and be able to identify an opportunity if they see one (Sarasvathy 2001, 2002). The individual thus has to recognize, identify or discover the opportunity. To do that, it is necessary to analyze the environment where the opportunity is supposed to present itself.

Another group of studies sees opportunities as emerging from within the individual (e.g. Gaglio& Katz, 2001; Baron 2004) what we might call the *individual view*. If the opportunity is “in here”, individual creativity is necessary in order to express the opportunity. The phrase „opportunity creation“ is an example of such ontology. By way of mental simulation or contra-factual thinking (Gaglio& Katz, 2001; Baron 2000), the individual can imagine new combinations of his own and other actors’ resources (Schumpeter, 1934) that can establish a new supply which the market will demand. Opportunity creation thus seems to be based on particular cognitive characteristics within the individual, and entrepreneurs are characterized by having different mental models than non-entrepreneurs (Ward, 2004; Gaglio& Katz, 2001).

The *creative view* or the enactment and sense-making view of the individual/opportunity nexus sees opportunities as coming into existence in a mutual process between the environment and the individual (e.g. Gartner et al. 1992; Sarasvathy et al., 2002; Gartner et al. 2003). Hence, contrary to the discovery and the individual view, the creative view does not assume that given ends exist before action is taken (Sarasvathy 2001; Sarasvathy et al. 2002). As an alternative, Sarasvathy presents a creative view working under the logic of effectuation, where neither end nor opportunities exist in advance. Instead opportunities are created in a process where values, ends and meanings emerge. The perspective holds both an internal reflexive element of standing back and evaluating new observations in the light of past experiences in a way that makes sense - and an element of active experimental action, where new experiences are incorporated into new actions - resulting in new observations to be made sense of. Opportunity is thus conceptualized as something that is given existence when the entrepreneur is thrown into a sense making process (Weick 1995, Gartner et al. 2003; Weick et al, 2005) and emerges out of the imagination of individuals by their actions and their interaction with others.

8. Empirical Review

According to Morris, Kuratko and Covin (2007) the world experiences an entrepreneurial revolution. The research in the field of entrepreneurship in the last decade has increasingly focused on entrepreneurship within the boundaries of existing organizations. This subfield of entrepreneurship research is known as ‘intrapreneurship’ or. The phenomenon is important for organizations as implementing it accelerates organizational growth, profitability and renewal as well as it helps secure the organizations survival in the business (Zahra, 1991).

Davis (2009) conducted a study regarding the criteria that is associated with intrapreneurial success. The goal was to lay an empirical foundation for future research focusing on that matter. The research objective to identify the criteria managers attribute to successful intrapreneurs is highly appealing to this paper and the main focus in the review of Davis' study. The sample used for this study consists of 7 groups with a varying level of intrapreneurial expertise. While for example expert intrapreneurs participated, so did non-business major undergraduate students. Davis found a total of 19 characteristics attributed to intrapreneurs. One is to assume that all 19 attributes are also statistically significant judging by the fact that statistical significance is unfortunately not discussed throughout the study. The attributes associated with intrapreneurs are Creative/ innovative, Ambitious/ aggressive/ a go-getter, enthusiastic/ excited, resilient able to deal with setbacks and rejection, intuitive, tenacious/ persistent, enterprising, visionary, bored with repetition/ likes variety, inspires others/ inspirational, assertive/ take charge-type, driven/ sense of urgency/ intense, a hands-on manager/"rolled-up-sleeves"-type, desire to own own business, history of experimentation and discovery, non-conformist/ unconventional, history of innovativeness/ prior inventions, prior business failure, attempted outside venture in past.

Martiarena (2011) analyzed the determinants of becoming an intrapreneur in comparison to becoming an entrepreneur. Her main focus lies on the comparison between intrapreneurs and wage workers and whether intrapreneurs are more similar to entrepreneurs or paid employees. In the analysis she combines previous theories about attitudes towards risk (Monsen et al., 2010), entrepreneurial talent (Parker, 2004) and expected income (Douglas & Shepherd, 2000, 2002) into an occupational choice model. Furthermore the author claims to make two distinct contributions to the literature. For one, she makes a distinction within the concept of intrapreneurship by taking into account the level and timing of engagement of individuals in intrapreneurial activities. She thereby splits up intrapreneurs and engaged intrapreneurs, individuals who expect to acquire part of the ownership in the business. Secondly, she provides empirical evidence to previously only theoretical studies.

Oyebanji (2013) analyzed the concept of entrepreneurship as human resources quality that may be exercised for job creation and economic development in or out of formal organizations in the form of intrapreneurial activities. This human quality (resources) has been expressed in this paper as a continuum of worker quality which is subject to the influence of human resource management interventions/tools such as training, experience, motivation, performance appraisal/management, and so on. The practical implication of the worker/entrepreneur continuum construct advanced in this paper is that, contrary to common belief, an employee does not need to be self-employed or leave his employment to be an entrepreneur. This could therefore refocus policy and programme and school curricula to reviving

organizations to play its role in employment generation and economic development as it ought and used to be when employers go to institutions to recruit young graduates. Theoretically, this paper has contributed to conceptual clarity and enlarged application of entrepreneurship beyond the common understanding and usage and is likely to provoke spirited reactions.

9. Methodology

9.1 Research Design

This study examines the impact of intrapreneurship on the corporate goal achievement of selected food and beverages firms in Lagos State, Nigeria; with Cadbury Nigeria Plc., Honeywell Flour Mills of Nigeria Plc., Nestle Food Plc. and Unilever Nigeria Plc. as case study. An explanatory research design was chosen for this study because it affords the researcher the opportunity of discovering a complete description of the impact of intrapreneurship on the corporate goal achievement of selected food and beverages firms in Lagos State, Nigeria and provides objectivity and in-depth study within a limited time frame. Hence explanatory study design was used to determine and explain the relationship between the dependent variable – corporate goal achievement and independent variables – intrapreneurship.

9.2 Population of the Study

The targeted population for this study includes all the level staff of the selected Food and Beverages Firms located in Lagos State. The organizations selected for this study were the food and beverages firms among the 20 most valuable companies with the highest market value quoted in Nigerian Stock Exchange (Nigeria Bulletin, 2014). Lagos was chosen for this study in view of highest concentration of the headquarters of food and beverages firms around Lagos metropolis. The list of these companies are stated below:

- Cadbury Nigeria Plc – Market Value: 150.3billion NGN
- Union Bank of Nigeria Plc – Market Value:168.9 billion NGN
- Flour Mills of Nigeria Plc – Market Value:186.1 billion NGN
- TranscorpNigPlc– Market Value: 195.5billion NGN
- Unilever Nigeria Plc – Market Value: 204.3billion NGN
- Access Bank Plc – Market Value: 218.5billion NGN
- Forte Oil – Market Value: 222.9 billion NGN
- UBA Group – Market Value: 253.9 billionNGN
- OANDO – Market Value: 259.4 billion NGN
- Stanbic IBTC Holdings Plc– Market Value:260 billion NGN
- Ecobank Transnational Incorporated–Market Value: 269.4 billion NGN

- Guinness Nigeria– Market Value: 301.8billion NGN
- LAFARGE WAPCO– Market Value: 333.2billion NGN
- SEPLAT Petroleum– Market Value: 387.3billion NGN
- First Bank Plc– Market Value: 509.1 billionNGN
- Zenith Bank– Market Value: 786.5 billionNGN
- Guaranty Trust Bank Plc.– Market Value:852 billion NGN
- Nestle Plc.– Market Value: 911.6 billion NGN
- Nigerian Breweries– Market Value: 1,300.7billion NGN
- Dangote Cement – Market Value: 4,089.7billion NGN

The total numbers of the population are shown in table 9.2.

Table 9.2: Staff Strengths of the Selected Food and Beverages Companies

| Companies | Staff Strengths | Source |
|--|-----------------|---|
| Cadbury Nigeria Plc. | 1,797 | www.moneyhub.net, 2015 |
| Nestle Food Plc. | 2,294 | www.nestle-cwa.com, 2015 |
| Flour Mills Plc. (Honeywell Flour Mills) | 880 | www.honeywellflour.com/2013_annualreport/ |
| Unilever Nigeria Plc | 944 | (www.unilevernigeria.com/aboutus/,2014) |
| Total | 5,915 | |

Source: Pre-field Survey, 2015

9.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Since it is practically impossible to study the whole population, for the purpose of this study, three hundred and sixty one (361) respondents are selected for this study. The formula used to arrive at this figure is Krejcie and Morgan formula, given thus:

$$n = \frac{X^2NP (1 - P)}{d^2 (N - 1) + X^2P (1 - P)}$$

Where

n = sample size

X² = table value of Chi-Square @ d.f = 1 for 0.05 confidence level

X² = 3.84

N = population size which is 5,915

P = population proportion (assumed to be .50)

d = degree of accuracy (expressed as 5%)

$$n = \frac{(3.84) (5,915) (0.5) (1 - 0.5)}{(0.05)^2 (5,915 - 1) + (3.84)(0.5) (1 - 0.5)}$$

n = 360.64

n ≈ 361

The non-probability sampling technique was employed in this study and to be specific the purposive sampling techniques was the most appropriate for case study research. When developing a purposive sample, researchers use their special knowledge about some group to select participants who represent their population. The researcher selects samples from the groups in order to ensure that certain types of respondents give their opinion on the impact of intrapreneurship on the corporate goals achievement.

9.4 Methods of Data Collection

Data for this study were obtained through primary sources i.e. questionnaire administration. The questionnaire design is made of two (2) sections. The Section A is designed to collect the Personal Data (gender, age, marital status, educational qualification and department) of the respondents while Section B seeks to gather information to evaluate intrapreneurship and corporate goal achievement. The statements in the section B were framed using 5 Likert scale to show the degree of agreement or disagreement of respondents to questionnaire items as regard to intrapreneurship(i.e. respondents opinions on management support for intrapreneurship and factors that affect the practice of intrapreneurship in the organization and organizational performance (i.e. respondents' opinion on innovative performance and sustaining competitive advantage).

10. Result and Discussion

Regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between management support for intrapreneurship and corporate goal achievement. The regression analysis identifies the most contributory explanatory variables among the set of independent variables that best predict corporate goal achievement. The result is shown in the table below:

Table 10.1: Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .945 ^a | .893 | .885 | .29310 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), innovation, risk-taking, pro-activeness
(Source: Author's Computation, 2015)

For the first hypothesis, the study observed that the value of r^2 is 0.893 (Table 5). This explains that corporate goal achievement amounted to 89.3%. It means that management support for intrapreneurship is actually contributing to corporate goal achievement. 361

Table 10.2: ANOVA^a

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 26.578 | 3 | 8.859 | 103.124 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 3.179 | 357 | .086 | | |
| Total | 29.756 | 360 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: corporate goal achievement

b. Predictors: (Constant), innovation, risk-taking, pro-activeness

(source: Author's Computation, 2015)

The ANOVA results as presented in table 6 shows that the value of F cal. is 103.124 with significant value of 0.000. Since the significant value is less than 0.05 or 5%, it means that management support for intrapreneurship has impact on the corporate goal achievement which can be seen as a high level of survival in the economy.

Table 10.3: Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 (Constant) | .610 | .244 | | 2.501 | .017 |
| Innovation | .186 | .120 | .253 | 2.246 | .021 |
| Risk-taking | .745 | .119 | .794 | 6.269 | .000 |
| Pro-activeness | .314 | .163 | .211 | 1.932 | .061 |

a. Dependent Variable: corporate goal achievement

(source: Author's Computation, 2015)

The coefficient table was used to test whether the three independent variables contributed information to the predictor of the dependent variable 'corporate goal achievement'. The t value in this study was found to be significant at 0.05 levels. The three factors emerged to be significant (Sig. T <0.05) independent variables in the regression model.

The result of the coefficient table implies that for one additional unit of 'management support for Innovativeness', the gross performance, which is the proxy for corporate goal achievement, increased by 25.3%. This implies that fostering employee innovation in the organization helps to achieve corporate goals.

The result on “risk-taking” also shows a positive correlation between management support for risk-taking and corporate goal achievement. The magnitude of beta coefficient for risk-taking is statistically significant at 5% for the sampled food and beverages firms. The result shows that risk taking enhances business performance by 79.4% for the total sample.

It is also found that the result on “proactiveness” to be positively correlated with corporate goal achievement. The result revealed that an increase in pro-activeness will bring about 21.1% increases in corporate goals achievement. This is not statistically significant at 5%.

The result of this analysis empirically confirmed the study conducted by Morris et al (2004) that in achieving innovative performance, entrepreneurs function within a paradigm of three dimensions: innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness (Morris et al., 2004).

This is supported by Holt, Rutherford and Clohessy (2007) findings that management support explained significant variations in fostering intrapreneurshipbehaviour.

H₀₂: There are no organizational factors for intrapreneurship affecting innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

In order to analyze organizational factors for intrapreneurship affecting innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state, multiple regressions analysis was conducted. The following tables show the results revealed from the regression analysis.

Table 10.4: Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .752 ^a | .566 | .545 | .03732 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Management support for innovation, Tolerance for risk taking, Performance-based reward system, Allocation of free time, Work discretion

(Source: Author’s computation, 2016)

From table 4.3.3.1, it has been seen that R value is 0.752. Therefore, R value (.752) for the overall organizational factors for intrapreneurship namely Management support for innovation, Tolerance for risk taking, Performance-based reward system, Allocation of free time and Work discretion suggested that there is a strong effect of these five independent variables on innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state. From the table 4.4.4 it can also be observed that the coefficient of determination i.e. the R-square (R²) value is 0.566, which representing that 56.6% variation of the dependent variable (innovative performance) is due to the

independent variables (organizational factors for intrapreneurship), which in fact, is a strong explanatory power of regression.

Table 10.5: ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 519.911 | 5 | 103.982 | 801.288 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 51.129 | 394 | .130 | | |
| | Total | 571.040 | 399 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: innovative performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Management support for innovation, Tolerance for risk taking,

Performance-based reward system, Allocation of free time, Work discretion

(Source: Author's computation, 2016)

From the table 4.3.3.2, it is identified that the value of F-stat is 801.288 and it is significant as the level of significance is less than 5% ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that the overall model was reasonable fit and there was a statistically significant association between organizational factors for intrapreneurship and innovative performance. Additionally, this also indicated that the **null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted**. Hence it can be concluded that organizational factors for intrapreneurship affect innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

Table 10.6: Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. | |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | |
| | (Constant) | .622 | .138 | | | |
| 1 | MSI | .202 | .038 | .358 | 5.352 | .000 |
| | TRT | .075 | .033 | .149 | 2.246 | .027 |
| | PRS | .208 | .036 | .382 | 5.752 | .000 |
| | AFT | .178 | .042 | .284 | 4.226 | .000 |
| | WD | .184 | .038 | .329 | 4.835 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: innovative performance

(Source: Author's computation, 2016)

In the table 4.3.3.3, Unstandardized coefficients indicated how much the dependent variable varies with an independent variable, when all other independent variables are held constant. The beta coefficients indicated that how and to what extent

service quality factors such as Management support for innovation, Tolerance for risk taking, Performance-based reward system, Allocation of free time, Work discretion affect innovative performance. It has been found that, Management support for innovation (beta =.358, t=5.352, p<0.05), Tolerance for risk taking (beta=.149, t=2.246, p<0.05), Performance based reward system (beta =.382, t=5.752, p<0.05), Allocation of free time (beta=.284, t=4.226, p<0.05) and Work discretion (beta =.329, t=4.835, p<0.05), have significant impact on innovative performance of the selected food and beverages firms in Lagos state.

11. Conclusion and Recommendation

The claim that the success of leading intrapreneurial organizations is dependent on a portfolio has been substantiated by the wealth of academic research of different innovative strategies all catered to improving intrapreneurship within the firm. What's more important is the ability to adapt to changing trends. Firms fail not because they did not innovate, but because firms couldn't incorporate adaptive strategies fast enough to capture the market quickly. However, findings from this study indicate that management support for intrapreneurship contribute significantly to corporate goal achievement, and this contribution is captured under the paradigm of three dimensions: innovativeness, risk-taking, and pro-activeness. It is up to the top level managers to recognize these dimensions and ensure that the companies incorporate them effectively for corporate goal achievement. The study also shows that internal supportive environment especially management support for innovation, tolerance for risk taking, performance-based reward system, allocation of free time and work discretion to their intrapreneurs, have positive impact on innovative performance. The study therefore concludes that intrapreneurship has significant impact on corporate goal achievement.

Based on this, the following recommendations are given:

- (i) Top level management should be cognizant of the fact that they should concentrate more on empowerment, flexibility in drafting organizational policies, provide necessary support and act positively to the innovative activities by encouraging risk taking initiatives among the employees.
- (ii) The management should design appropriate reward system such as financial reward, recognition and appraisal on significant achievements.
- (iii) The organization should also ensure the availability of resources such as time, materials and funds in supporting new ideas.

In short, it can be summarized that the main focus is to structure intrapreneurship organizational architecture by taking into considerations the factors that could invigorate such behaviours. Forming an internal ecosystem that is conducive for the workforce to behave intrapreneurially within an organization is a wise step to foster innovativeness culture that could subsequently be translated into long term growth and sustainability of the respective organization.

References

- Adebayo, A.S (2013). Relationship between assets utilization and corporate profitability: A Case Study of Food and Beverage Industry quoted on the Nigerian stock exchange. *Merit Research Journal of Business and Management Vol. 1(1) pp. 001-010.* <http://www.meritresearchjournals.org/bm/index.htm>
- Ahmed, N.H, Nasurdin A.M and Zainal S.R (2012). Nurturing Intrapreneurship to Enhance Job Performance; The role of Pro-intrapreneurship Organizational Architecture, *Journal of Innovation Management in Small & Medium Enterprises*, Malaysia, IBIMA publishing.
- Alpkan, L. Bulut, C. Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G. and Kilic, K. (2013). Organizational Support for Intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Emerald Management Decision Management Decision Vol. 48 No.5, pp. 732-755 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0025-1747*
- Antoncic, B. &Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct Refinement and Crosscultural Validation. *Journal of Business Venturing, 16(5)*, 495–527.
- Bhardwarj, B. R., Sushil. &Momaya, K. (2007). “Corporate Entrepreneurship: Application of Moderator Method,” *Singapore Management Review, 29* (1), 47- 58.
- Blanchard Companies (2008). Managing and Motivating IntrapreneursAre you an intrapreneur? www.kenblanchard.com
- Demirbag, M., Tatoglu, E., Tekinkus, M. &Zaim, S. (2006). An Analysis of the Relationship between Total Quality Management Implementation and Organizational Performance Turkish SMEs. *Journalof Manufacturing Technology Management, 17(6)*, 829–847.
- Eesley. D. T., &Longenecker C.O. (2006). Gateways to intrapreneurship *Industrial Management, 48(1)*, 18-23.
- Gartner, W.B. & Carter, N.M. (2003). Entrepreneurial behaviour and firm organizing processes, in: D.B. Audretsch and Z.J. Acs (eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Boston/Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 195-221.
- Gibb, A.A. (2000). Corporate Restructuring and Entrepreneurship: What can large organisations learn from small? *Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management Studies, 1(1)*.
- Guth, W. & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest Editors’ Introduction: Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 297–308.
- Hawash, R. (2007). Industrialization in Egypt Historical Development and Implications for Economic Policy. Working Paper No.1. *Faculty of Management Technology*, German University in Cairo (GUC).
- Khan, B.A, Budhwani, Z.R and Shaikh, A.H (2011)Practicing the Intrapreneurship: A Case of Service-Sector Firms in Pakistan *.Journal of Management and Social Sciences Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.01-11*

- Kirzner, I.M. (1997), "Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process: An Austrian Approach", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35, 60-85.
- Kuratko, D. F., Ireland, R. D., Covin, J. G. & Hornsby, J. S. (2005). "A Model of Middle-level Managers' Entrepreneurial Behaviour," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, November, 699-716.
- Kuratko, D.F., R.V. Montagno, J.S. Hornsby. (1990). Developing an Intrapreneurial Assessment Instrument for an executive corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strat. Man. J.* 11 49-58.
- Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance, *Academy of Management Review* 21 (1), 135-172.
- Lumpkin, G.T. (2007). Intrapreneurship and innovation, in: J.R. Baum, M. Frese & R. Baron (eds), *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 237-264.
- McMullen, J.S., L.A. Plummer & Z.J. Acs (2007) What is an Entrepreneurial Opportunity, *Small Business Economics*, Vol 28, 273-283.
- Meng, J., & Roberts, E. B. (2006). Understanding barriers to innovation and intrapreneurship in an R&D organization. *MIT Sloan School of Management*
- Morris, M. H., Kuratko, D. F., Covin, J. G. (2008), *Corporate Entrepreneurship & Innovation*. Mason, OH: South-Western College Publishers.
- Nunnally, J. and R. Bernstein, (1994), 'Assessment of reliability', *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc, vol. 38, no 2, pp. 248-292.
- Rutherford, M. W. & Holt, D. T. (2007). "Corporate Entrepreneurship: An Empirical Look at the Innovativeness Dimension and its Antecedents," *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20 (3), 429-446.
- Samuel, G.H, Juan, A.A, Eulogio C.P (2011). Differentiating the effects of the institutional environment on corporate entrepreneurship. *Management Decision* 49:10, 1677-1693.
- Sarasvathy, S.; S. Venkataraman; N. Dew & R. Velamuri (2002), "Three Views of Entrepreneurial Opportunity" in Acs, Z. & D. Audretsch (eds.), "Handbook of Entrepreneurship", Kluwer Academic Publishers. 22
- Sarasvathy, Sa D. (2001), "Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency", *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 2, 243-263.
- Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship; The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Shane, S & S. Venkataraman (2000) The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25
- Thornberry, N.E. (2002). Corporate entrepreneurship: teaching managers to be entrepreneurs, *Journal of Management Development*, 22:4, 329-44.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and Financial Outcomes of Corporate Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.