



Effect of Intrapreneurship on Product Sales of Manufacturing Companies in North Central Nigeria

Ekeh, Ojotu Loveday,¹ Nongo, S.E.(PhD)² and Aloh, P.K.³

¹Department of Business Management, School of Business Management, Benue State Polytechnic, P.M.B. 01, Ugbokolo, Benue State, Nigeria

²Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Benue State University, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria

³Department of Business Administration, College of Management Sciences, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria

Abstract: *The main objective of this study was to analyze the effect of intrapreneurship on product sales of manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria. Since the selected population of the study is not too much; the whole population size was used as sample size which is 165 respondents. The coefficient of multiple correlation (R) for the study is 0.831. This indicates that there is a strong relationship between the variables of intrapreneurship and product sales. The coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) on the other hand is 0.691, indicating that 69% of products sales were caused by variation of corporate culture, corporate entrepreneurship and reengineering corporate thinking. Most importantly, the study found out that if intrapreneurship variable items are absent from the equation, product sales of the studied organizations will still increase by 0.129 units which needs to be improved upon. However, corporate culture will improve products sales by 0.239, corporate entrepreneurship by 0.195, and reengineering corporate thinking by 0.148. This indicates from our findings that intrapreneurship can improve product sales of the study area; but if absent at all, the studied manufacturing companies, will appreciably improve product sales from other variables outside the intrapreneurship dimension. The study concluded that intrapreneurship will therefore, influence product sales of companies of North Central Nigeria. Management should encourage intrapreneurship and enable innovative employees, especially those within the marketing department to carry out research so as to bring about new ways of improving product sales. Products should be designed to meet the tastes and satisfaction of customers before they are mass produced.*

Key words: *intrapreneurship, North Central Nigeria, product sales, productivity*

1. Introduction

The current economic environment is getting progressively more competitive, demanding and challenging for most organizations. Organizations are currently witnessing significant rise in globalization trends and revolutionary changes in technology (Mokaya, 2012). Baruah and Ward (2014) posits that the revolutionary changes in technology give rise to several organizational complexities and in order to survive and be successful, organizations need to tackle them by constantly working on their products, sales, services and business models to maintain a competitive advantage.

There is an increasing interest in doing one's own talents and doing it one's own terms (Covin and Slevin, 1991). Individuals who believe strongly in their own talents frequently desire to create something of their own. They want responsibility and have a strong need for individual expression and more freedom in their present organizational structure. When this freedom is not forthcoming, frustration can cause that individual to become less productive or even leave the organization to attain self-actualization elsewhere. This new search for meaning, and the impatience involved, has recently caused more discontent in structured organizations than ever before. When meaning is not provided within the organization, individuals often search for an institution that will provide it. Intrapreneurship is one method of stimulating, and then capitalizing on, individuals in an organization who think that something can be done differently and better (Mokaya, 2012). Internal factors that stimulate intrapreneurship in large corporations are rarely studied, rather, much attention is given to the daily operations of the mother organization itself. Higher budgets for Research and Development are unavailable in large organizations because most times, such firms want to cut down on their budget expenses.

1.1. Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study is to determine the effect of intrapreneurship on product sales of manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria.

1.2. Research Question

What is the effect of intrapreneurship on product sales of manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria?

1.3. Statement of Hypothesis

H0: There is no significant relationship between intrapreneurship and product sales of manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Concept of intrapreneurship

Zahra (1993: 148) 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 a 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.

This term is attributed to Pinchot (1985: 64) who used it in his book, "Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur." He gave the term

intrapreneur regular meanings; “a person who concentrates on creativity, originality and innovation and who transforms a vision or an idea into a gainful undertaking, by operating within the organizational environ (Ottih, 2014).

In practice, the term intrapreneur means an individual who has entrepreneurial skills and uses them within an organization innovatively (Pinchot, 1985). Authors, like Kuratko and Hodgetts (1990); have given more elaborated descriptions of this term. They view intrapreneurship as “a way of exciting innovation within the company using the creative talent of the workforce by providing them needed wherewithal and freedom to act within the organization” (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2004: 63).

In recent years the subject of intrapreneurship has become quite popular, though very few people thoroughly understand the concept; most researchers agree that the term refers to entrepreneurial activities that receive organizational sanction and resource commitments for the purpose of innovative results (Burgelman, 1984; Kuratko and Hodgelts, 1998). Researcher Shaker A. Zahra observed that “corporate entrepreneurship may be formal or informal activities aimed at creating new businesses in established companies through product and process innovations and market developments; these activities may take place at the corporate, division (business), functional, or project levels, with the unifying objective of improving a company’s competitive position and financial performance” (Zahra, 1991). According to Chang (1999) corporate entrepreneurship encompasses two major phenomena: new venture creation within existing organizations and the transformation of organizations through strategic renewal (Christensen, 2004).

a) Corporate culture

The typical corporate culture has a climate and reward system that favor conservative decision making; risky decision are often postponed until enough hard facts can be gathered or a consultant hired to “illuminate the unknown;” frequently, there are so many sigh-offs and approvals required for a large-scale project that no individual feels personally responsible (Martin and Terblanche, 2003).

b) Corporate entrepreneuring

Many companies today are realizing the need for corporate entrepreneuring. Articles in popular business magazines are reporting the infusion of entrepreneurial thinking into large bureaucratic structures; in fact, in many books has devoted entire sections to innovation in the corporation (Sharma and Chrisma, 1999). The modern corporation, then, is faced into seeking avenues for developing in-house entrepreneuring. To do otherwise is to wait for stagnation, loss of personnel, and decline. This “corporate revolution” represents and appreciation for and a desire to develop entrepreneurs within the corporate structure.

c) Reengineering Corporate Thinking

To establish corporate entrepreneuring, companies need to provide the freedom and encouragement intrapreneurs require to develop their ideas (Covin, and Slevin, 1991; Lumpkin, Dess and Covin 2004). This is often a problem in enterprises because many top managers do not believe entrepreneurial ideas can be nurtured and developed in their environment. Doing old tasks more efficiently is not the answer to new challenges; a new culture with new values has to be developed (Sathe, 1985).

d) Innovation

Innovation is the specific tool of the entrepreneur, therefore, corporations must understand and develop innovation as the key element in their strategy. Numerous researchers have examined the importance of innovation within corporate environment (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Zahra, 1995). Innovation is described as chaotic and unplanned by some authors (Vesper, 1990), while other researchers insist it is a systematic discipline (Drucker, 1985). Both of these positions can be true depending on the innovation. One way to understand this concept is to focus on two different types of innovation: radical and incremental (Knight, 1997):

i) Radical innovation: is the launching of inaugural breakthroughs such as personal computers, Post-it Notes, disposable diapers, and overnight mail delivery. These innovations take experimentation and determined vision, which is not necessarily managed but must be recognized and nurtured.

ii) Incremental innovation: refers to the systematic evolution of a product or service into newer or larger markets. Examples include microwave popcorn, popcorn used for packaging (to replace Styrofoam), frozen yogurt, and so forth.

e) Intrapreneurial Climate

This concept, when coupled with the other elements of an innovation strategy, can enhance the potential for employees to become venture developer; to develop employees as a source of innovations for corporations, companies need to provide more nurturing and information-sharing activities (Covin and Milles, 2002). The importance of an organizational climate for Intrapreneurship is further emphasized by researcher Debora V. Brazeal's model for internally developed ventures (Herbert and Brazeal, 1998).

2.2. Concept of Product Sales

This refers to the rate at which a particular product is able to serve the purpose for which it is made for; also, the number of purposes a particular product serves. When a product is able to serve the purpose or purposes it is made for, the organization sees every reason to increase their productivity. Also, when it is unable to serve the purpose, it is seen as not being of value and so, an organization reduces or stops its productivity out rightly. In line with this, product service is used in measuring an organization's productivity for an increase in product service triggers an increase in an organization's productivity and vice versa.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research used in this study is cross sectional because the observation was done at one point in time. Cross sectional research design involves short time observation of sample subjects done at different points in a short period of time (Oche, 2015). This entails the administration of questionnaires to respondents. The study is a correlational study because it involves the examination of the effect of independent variables on dependent variables.

3.2. Population and Sample Size of the Study

The chosen population for this study comprises of three (3) selected manufacturing companies – one each from Benue State (Consolidated Breweries Ltd), Nassarawa State (FeedTech Nigeria Ltd) and Plateau State (NASCO). The respondents' population consists of 1 General Manager, 1

Operations Manager, 1 Quality Control Manager, 26 Production Staff and 26 Marketing Staff from each of the selected corporate organization. These respondents were chosen for the study because they are directly involved in the companies' products and services. They have also spent about 25 years and above in their various manufacturing companies. Thus, the total respondent population from the 3 companies was 165. However, 55 respondents were chosen from each of the three companies from the three states.

A sample size is a limited number of elements selected from the population which is representative of that population (Oche, 2015). That is a sample must be representative of the whole population. A representative sample size with known confidence and risk levels was selected. Since the selected population of the study is not too much; the whole population size was used as sample size which is 165 respondents.

3.3. Methods of Data Analysis

The data for the study was collected, coded and analyzed using computer-based Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 18 for Windows). Multiple Regression and Correlation Analysis were used to assess the relationship between the dependent variables and a set of independent variables.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Corporate Culture

1) The company's corporate culture has a climate and reward system

Majority of the respondents (42.7%) are neutral that the company's corporate culture has a climate and reward system. A certain percentage (18.3%) of the respondents agreed to this fact, while 15.4% disagreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (9.8%) strongly disagreed.

2) The company's culture favors conservative decision making

Majority of the respondents (37.8%) are neutral that the company's culture favors conservative decision making. A certain percentage (20.7%) of the respondents agreed to this fact, while 18.3% disagreed. A lesser percentage (15.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (7.3%) strongly disagreed.

3) Risky decisions are often postponed until enough hard facts can be gathered or a consultant hired

Majority of the respondents (34.1%) are neutral that risky decisions are often postponed until enough hard facts can be gathered or a consultant hired. A certain percentage (22.0%) of the respondents agreed to this fact, while 18.3% strongly agreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (12.2%) disagreed.

4) There are so many sigh-offs and approvals required for a large-scale project that no individual feels personally responsible

Majority of the respondents (43.9%) are neutral that there are so many sigh-offs and approvals required for a large-scale project that no individual feels personally responsible. A certain

percentage (18.3%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 13.4% strongly disagreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (12.2%) agreed and strongly agreed.

4.2. Corporate Entrepreneurship

1). Many manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria are realized the need for corporate entrepreneuring

Majority of the respondents (39.1%) are neutral that many companies in North Central Nigeria are realized the need for corporate entrepreneuring. A certain percentage (23.2%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 19.5% strongly disagreed. A lesser percentage (17.1%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (11.0%) strongly agreed.

2). Companies try to infuse entrepreneurial thinking into large bureaucratic structures

Majority of the respondents (34.1%) are neutral that companies try to infuse entrepreneurial thinking into large bureaucratic structures. A certain percentage (22.0%) of the respondents agreed to this fact, while 18.3% strongly agreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (12.2%) disagreed.

3). The modern corporation is faced into seeking avenues for developing in-house entrepreneuring

Majority of the respondents (23.2%) strongly disagreed that the modern corporation is faced into seeking avenues for developing in-house entrepreneuring. A certain percentage (18.3%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 15.9% are neutral. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (9.8%) strongly agreed.

4). Intrapreneurship also referred to as corporate revolution represents the desire to develop entrepreneurs within the corporate structure

Majority of the respondents (37.8%) are strongly disagreed that intrapreneurship also referred to as corporate revolution represents the desire to develop entrepreneurs within the corporate structure. A certain percentage (22.0%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 17.1% are neutral. A lesser percentage (15.9%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (7.3%) strongly agreed.

4.3. Reengineering corporate thinking

1). To establish corporate entrepreneuring, companies need to provide the freedom and encouragement intrapreneurship require to develop their ideas

Majority of the respondents (26.8%) disagreed that tasks improved performance significantly. A certain percentage (25.6%) of the respondents is neutral to this fact, while 19.5% strongly disagreed. A lesser percentage (17.1%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (11.0%) agreed.

2). Reengineering corporate thinking is often a problem in enterprises because top managers do not believe entrepreneurial ideas can be nurtured and developed in their environment

Majority of the respondents (26.8%) disagreed that tasks are very relevant in their work. A certain percentage (25.6%) of the respondents is neutral to this fact, while 19.5% strongly agreed. A lesser percentage (15.9%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (12.2%) strongly agreed.

3). Doing old tasks more efficiently is not the answer to new challenges

Majority of the respondents (25.6%) are neutral that doing old tasks more efficiently is not the answer to new challenges. A certain percentage (23.2%) of the respondents disagreed and another also strongly disagreed to this fact, while 14.6% agreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed.

4). A new culture with new ideas is often developed in the company

Majority of the respondents (37.8%) are strongly disagreed that a new culture with new ideas is often developed in the company. A certain percentage (22.0%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 17.1% are neutral. A lesser percentage (15.9%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (7.3%) strongly agreed.

Table 1: Respondents Perception on Intrapreneurship (n=164)

Intrapreneurship	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Weighted Average
Corporate culture							
<i>The company's corporate culture has a climate and reward system</i>	22 (13.4)	30 (18.3)	70 (42.7)	26 (15.9)	16 (9.8)	164 (100)	2.13
<i>The company's culture favors conservative decision making</i>	26 (15.9)	34 (20.7)	62 (37.8)	30 (18.3)	12 (7.3)	164 (100)	2.30
<i>Risky decisions are often postponed until enough hard facts can be gathered or a consultant hired</i>	30 (18.3)	36 (22.0)	56 (34.1)	20 (12.2)	22 (13.4)	164 (100)	2.30
<i>There are so many sigh-offs and approvals required for a large-scale project that no individual feels personally responsible</i>	20 (12.2)	20 (12.2)	72 (43.9)	30 (18.3)	22 (13.4)	164 (100)	2.4
Corporate entrepreneurship							
<i>Many manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria are realized the need for corporate entrepreneuring</i>	18 (11.0)	28 (17.1)	64 (39.0)	38 (23.2)	16 (9.5)	164 (100)	1.99
<i>Companies try to infuse entrepreneurial thinking</i>	30	36	56	20	22	164	2.30

Effect of Intrapreneurship on Product Sales of Manufacturing Companies in North Central Nigeria

<i>into large bureaucratic structures</i>	(18.3)	(22.0)	(34.1)	(12.2)	(13.4)	(100)	
<i>The modern corporation is faced into seeking avenues for developing in-house entrepreneuring</i>	16 (9.8)	22 (13.4)	26 (15.9)	30 (18.3)	70 (23.2)	164 (100)	2.00
<i>Intrapreneurship also referred to as corporate revolution represents the desire to develop entrepreneurs within the corporate structure</i>	12 (7.3)	26 (15.9)	28 (17.1)	36 (22.0)	62 (37.8)	164 (100)	1.96
Reengineering corporate thinking							
<i>To establish corporate entrepreneuring, companies need to provide the freedom and encouragement intrapreneurship require to develop their ideas</i>	28 (17.1)	18 (11.0)	42 (25.6)	44 (26.8)	32 (19.5)	164 (100)	1.99
<i>Reengineering corporate thinking is often a problem in enterprises because top managers do not believe entrepreneurial ideas can be nurtured and developed in their environment</i>	20 (12.2)	26 (15.9)	42 (25.6)	44 (26.8)	32 (19.5)	164 (100)	1.97
<i>Doing old tasks more efficiently is not the answer to new challenges</i>	22 (13.4)	24 (14.6)	42 (25.6)	38 (23.2)	38 (23.2)	164 (100)	1.96
<i>A new culture with new ideas is often developed in the company</i>	12 (7.3)	26 (15.9)	28 (17.1)	36 (22.0)	62 (37.8)	164 (100)	1.96

Note: Strongly Agree = SA, Agree = A, Neutral = N, Disagree = D, Strongly Disagree = SD, values in parenthesis are in percentages

Source: Field Survey, 2015

4.4. Product Sales

1) Product service has improved drastically due to intrapreneurship of employees

Majority of the respondents (29.3%) are neutral that product service has improved drastically due to intrapreneurship of employees. A certain percentage (23.2%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 19.5% strongly disagreed. A lesser percentage (17.1%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (11.0%) strongly agreed.

2) Service delivery to customers has deviated from the old methods

Majority of the respondents (37.8%) are neutral that service delivery to customers has deviated from the old methods. A certain percentage (19.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed to this fact, while 18.3% disagreed. A lesser percentage (11.0%) of the respondents agreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (6.1%) strongly agreed.

3) Product differentiation is largely due to intrapreneurship venturing

Majority of the respondents (30.5%) are neutral that product differentiation is largely due to intrapreneurship venturing. A certain percentage (26.8%) of the respondents disagreed to this fact, while 17.1% strongly agreed. A lesser percentage (14.6%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, while, an uninspiring percentage (11.0%) agreed.

4) Revenue from products has increased compared to past years due to efforts from intrapreneurship

Majority of the respondents (25.6%) are neutral that revenue from products has increased compared to past years due to efforts from intrapreneurship. A certain percentage (23.2%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed to this fact, while 14.6% agreed. A lesser percentage (13.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed.

Table 2: Respondents Perception on Productivity of Companies (n=164)

Productivity of Companies	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Weighted Average
Product sales							
Product service has improved drastically due to intrapreneurship of employees	18 (11.0)	28 (17.1)	48 (29.3)	38 (23.2)	32 (19.5)	164 (100)	1.65
Service delivery to customers has deviated from the old methods	10 (6.1)	18 (11.0)	74 (37.8)	30 (18.3)	32 (19.5)	164 (100)	2.10
Product differentiation is largely due to intrapreneurship venturing	28 (17.1)	18 (11.0)	50 (30.5)	44 (26.8)	24 (14.6)	164 (100)	2.08
Revenue from products has increased compared to past years due to efforts from intrapreneurship	22 (13.4)	24 (14.6)	42 (25.6)	38 (23.2)	38 (23.2)	164 (100)	1.96

Note: Strongly Agree = SA, Agree = A, Neutral = N, Disagree = D, Strongly Disagree = SD

Source: Field Survey, 2015

4.5. Results of Hypothesis Testing

The t calculated values: 3.541, 2.715 and 2.578 for the three intrapreneurship variables all showed significant values, because they are greater than the t-tabulated value (2.000) as indicated in Table 3. The F calculated value is 4.382, which is greater than the F tabulated value indicating significance between intrapreneurship variables and product sales. The null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative hypothesis (**H1**) is accepted, which states that, *“there is significant relationship between intrapreneurship and product sales of manufacturing*

companies in North Central Nigeria". However, according to our model in chapter three, the outcome of the model designed for hypothesis one is represented below:

$$\text{Product sales} = 0.129 + 0.239\text{CC} + 0.195\text{CE} + 0.148\text{RCT} + e \dots\dots\dots \text{ (Equation)}$$

Table 3: Effect of Intrapreneurship on Product Sales (n=164)

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.129	0.246		0.522	0.603
Corporate culture	0.239	0.067	0.278	3.541**	0.000
Corporate Entrepreneurship	0.195	0.076	0.207	2.715*	0.012
Reengineering Corporate Thinking	0.148	0.045	0.183	2.578*	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Product Sales, *, ** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level & 0.01 level (2-tailed), F Calculated value = 4.382, R = 0.831, R² = 0.691.

Source: Computed with the aid of computer based software SPSS Version 21 for Windows

4.6. Discussion of Findings

From model 1, the coefficient of correlation (R) is 0.831; meaning that there is a strong relationship between the variables of intrapreneurship and product sales. The coefficient of determination (R²) on the other hand is 0.691 indicating that 69% of products sales were caused by variation of corporate culture, corporate entrepreneurship and reengineering corporate thinking. Most importantly, the study found out that if intrapreneurship variable items of model 1 (i.e. hypothesis 1) are absent from the equation, product sales of the studied organizations will still increase by 0.129 units which needs to be improved upon. However, for hypothesis one, corporate culture will improve products sales by 0.239, corporate entrepreneurship by 0.195, and reengineering corporate thinking by 0.148. This indicates from our findings that intrapreneurship can improve product sales of the study area; but if absent at all, the studied companies, will appreciably improve product sales from other variables outside the intrapreneurship dimension. Thus, we conclude that intrapreneurship will therefore, influence products sales of manufacturing companies of North Central Nigeria. This is in accordance with psychological ownership theory. According to Pierce *at al.* (2001),

psychological ownership promotes self-initiated, evolutionary and additive change, but it produces resistance to imposed, revolutionary and subtractive change. Although we have found no cross references between the literatures of intrapreneurship and psychological ownership, these two phenomena seem related. The typical corporate culture has a climate and reward system that favor conservative decision making; risky decision are often postponed until enough hard facts can be gathered or a consultant hired to “illuminate the unknown;” frequently, there are so many sigh-offs and approvals required for a large-scale project that no individual feels personally responsible (Martin and Terblanche, 2003).

5. Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to analyze the effect of intrapreneurship on product sales of manufacturing companies in North Central Nigeria. The study indicates that corporate culture improved products sales by 0.239, corporate entrepreneurship by 0.195, and reengineering corporate thinking by 0.148. This indicates from our findings that intrapreneurship can improve product sales of the study area. Thus, the study concludes that intrapreneurship therefore, influenced product sales of manufacturing companies of North Central Nigeria.

6. Recommendations

From our conclusion, the study came to the following recommendations for stakeholders:

- i. Management should encourage intrapreneurship and enable innovative employees, especially those within the marketing department to carry out research so as to bring about new ways of improving product sales.
- ii. Products should be designed to meet the taste and satisfaction of customers before they are mass produced.
- iii. Teams of innovative employees should be allowed to create products that would challenge competitors.

References

- Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of business venturing*, 16(5): 495-527.
- Antoncinc, B. & Zorn, O. (2004). The Mediating Role of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Organizational-Support-Performance Relationship: An Empirical Examination. In *Managing Global Transition*, 2(1): 58-69.
- Antoncinc, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2000). Intrapreneurship modeling in transition economies: A comparison of Slovenia and the United States. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 5(4): 72-91.
- Baruah, B. & Ward, A. (2014) Metamorphosis of Intrapreneurship as effective Organizational Strategy .*International Entrepreneurship and Management Journals*, 17(6)
- Burgelman, R. A. (1984). Designs for corporate entrepreneurship in established firms. *California Management Review*, 16(3), 154-166.

- Chang, J. (1999). Model of Corporate Entrepreneurship: Intrapreneurship and Exopreneurship. *In Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(1): 47-59.
- Christensen, K. S. (2004). A classification of the corporate entrepreneurship umbrella: Labels and perspectives. *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, 1(4): 94-119.
- Covin, J. G. & Miles, M. P. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*, 23 (4): 47-63.
- Covin, J. G. & Slevin, D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as a firm behaviour. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*, 16 (1): 7-25.
- Drucker, P.F. (1985), *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: practice and principles*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Herbert, T. T. & Brazeal, D. V. (1998). *The Future of the Corporation: Corporate Entrepreneurship on the Fly*. Discussion Paper, California.
- Knight, R. M. (1997). Cross-cultural reliability and validity of a scale to measure firm entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12: 213 – 225.
- Kuratko, D. F. & Hodgetts, R. M. (1998). *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach* (4th Ed.). Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Martin, E. C. & Terblanche, F. (2003) Building organizational Culture that stimulate creativity and innovation. *European journals . innovation management* 6(1) 67-74.
- Mokaya, D. (2012). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Organizational Performance. *Journal of Policy*, 15(14): 120-137 Retrieved on the 15th February, 2014 from www.ietr.org/9jr3oojo/p0iwr0pkw
- Oche, N . A. (2015). *Business Rearch Methods*. Makurdi: Midan Business and Publishing Enterprises.
- Ottih, L.O. (2014). *Entrepreneurship: Personality, Process and Enterprise*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Ottih, L. O. (2006). *General Management: Strategy, Implementation and Control (Text and Cases)* Port Harcourt. Pearl Publishers.
- Pierce, J.L., Kovosta, T. & Dirks, K.T. (2001). Toward a Theory of Psychological Ownership in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (2): 298-311.
- Pinchot, G. (1985). Intrapreneuring. New York: Harper and Row. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 1(4): 55-67.
- Sharma, P. & Chrisman, J.J. (1999). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* xxx.
- Sathe, V. (2003). *Corporate eEntrepreneurship: Top Managers and New Business Creation*. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.
- Stevenson, H. H. & Jarillo, C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic management Journal*, 2: 17 – 27.
- Zahra, S. A. (1993). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as a firm behaviour: A critique and extension. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*, 17: 5-21.