LINKING INTRAPRENEURSHIP TO CORPORATE TRANSFORMATION: A STUDY OF SAHARA GROUP

Adesina, S.K. [1]
Sulaimon, A.A.[2]
Adebisi, S.A.[3]
[1, 2, 3] Faculty of Management Sciences,
Department of Business Administration,
University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos state, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: Kola_sina@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.57233/ijamer.v2i2.51

Article History: Received: 13 June 2026 | **Revised:** 18 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 21 June 2026 | **Published:** 25 June 2026

How to Cite This Article:
Adesina, S. K., Sulaimon, A. A., & Adebisi, S. A. (2026). Linking intrapreneurship to corporate transformation: A study of Sahara Group. *International Journal of Accounting, Management and Economic Review, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.57233/ijamer.v2i2.51

Abstract
The growing complications and persistent failure of corporate transformation initiatives necessitates investigating intrapreneurship as a strategic capability to cope with changing business landscape. The relevance of intrapreneurship in navigating corporate transformation cannot be over emphasis. Guided by Self Determination Theory and Schumpeter's Innovation Theory, this study investigated the relationship between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation in Sahara Group. The study adopted cross sectional survey research design, using quantitative approach. Primary data were collected with the aid of electronic survey (Google Forms) from 207 junior, middle and senior level employees of the company, using multistage sampling techniques, consisting of purposive, stratified, and convenience sampling. Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypothesised relationship. Results of the analysis revealed that all the five dimensions of intrapreneurship consisting of innovation, proactiveness, risk taking, self-renewal, and networking have significant positive relationship with one another and corporate transformation. Specifically, innovation and corporate transformation ($r = .737^{**}$, $p < .001$), proactiveness and corporate transformation ($r = 610^{**}$, $p < .001$), self-renewal and corporate transformation, ($r = .441$, $p < .001$), risk taking and corporate transformation ($r = 709$, $p < .001$), and networking and corporate transformation ($r = 893$, $p < .001$). In term of prediction, all the dimensions predicted corporate transformation; innovation and corporate transformation ($\beta = .613$, $t = 15.745$, $p \leq 0.01$), proactiveness and corporate transformation ($\beta = .544$, $t = 9.777$, $p \leq 0.01$), self-renewal and corporate transformation ($\beta = -.328$, $t = -4.891$, $p \leq 0.01$), risk taking and corporate transformation ($\beta = .511$, $t = 7.263$, $p \leq 0.01$), and networking and corporate transformation ($\beta = .416$, $t = 6.440$, $p \leq 0.01$). The study concludes that intrapreneurship is very critical and represent adaptive approach to corporate transformation. On the basis of the findings and conclusion, the study recommends that business organizations should develop strategies to consistently nurture entrepreneurial mindset through coaching, mentorship, and capacity development to promote intrapreneurial spirit, and effort should be made to provide managerial support for intrapreneurial initiatives within an organization.

Keywords: Corporate transformation, innovation, networking, proactiveness, risk taking, self-renewal.

1.0 Introduction

The contemporary business landscape is becoming challenging and complicated for business organizations across industry due to growing globalisation, competition, and technological advancement to mention but a few. Organizational complication further influences corporate progression, making internal innovation and strategic collaboration indispensable (Aina et al., 2025). For instance, roughly 89% of the Fortune 500 companies in 1995 no longer existed by the

year 2020, due to lack of abortive capability and agility to cope with changing market and competitive dynamics (Perry, 2020). In contemporary business environment, change implies an inevitable development of transformation from conventional to modern structure that is adaptive and innovative. Nevertheless, under today's swiftly changing circumstances, corporate transformation is no longer a one-off practice, it has become a means of constant adaptation (Hubbart, 2023). Amidst this backdrop, intrapreneurship has appeared as an extremely sought-after tactic that brings an entrepreneurial competences and mindset to the internal workings of an existing company, safeguarding innovation and effective accomplishment of strategic objectives (Guo et al., 2023; Sanga, 2026).

Over the past decades, many corporate organizations such as Ford, General Motors, Bristol-Myers Squibb and Landmark Communications in United States of America, and British Airways in United Kingdom to mention a few have seek to remake themselves into significantly better companies. These efforts have gone under numerous narratives such as corporate restructuring, corporate transformation, business reengineering, and business turnaround. But, in almost all of these instances, the underlying objective has been the same: to make fundamental and structural changes in how business activities are carried out in order to help cope with emerging and more complicated business environment. A few of these corporate transformation efforts have been very successful, while a few have been a total failure. One of the potent approaches to corporate transformation is 'intrapreneurship'- a strategic framework contemplated to reshape the process, strategies and corporate practices for improve business performance and success. Intrapreneurship can be defined as employee-driven innovation within an existing firm to offer a major structure for fostering corporate transformation (Batista-Canino et al., 2025).

Companies that promote intrapreneurial undertakings are expected to accomplish improve business growth and profitability than those that do not (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001; Rahim, 2019). Traditionally, business executives have been the sole drivers of corporate transformation; however, the focus of attention is shifting to employees that are entrepreneurially inclined within the organisations (Deprez & Euwema, 2017). Google for instance, inspires its staffs to document their innovative ideas, by providing require funding and technical support, permitting employees to commit 20% of their working hours to execute innovative ideas; leading to groundbreaking initiatives such as Gmail and AdSense (He, 2019). This method not only meets the individual employee desires, but also improves the firm's internal innovation capability. Similarly, Huawei provides helpful policies and privileged treatment for entrepreneurial staff through equipment provision and promise to reassign such employees to other positions within the company if their entrepreneurial undertakings fail within six months. Likewise, Philips adopted an open innovation framework named '*High Tech Campus Eindhoven'*, as a form benchmark for corporate entrepreneurship.

Intrapreneurship is broadly defined as entrepreneurial activities of employees within existing organisation (Atonicic & Hisrich, 2003). Intrapreneurship predisposition of employees is critical to organisational performance, growth and corporate renewal (Neessen et al., 2019). According to Birkinshaw & Gibson (2004) and Binns (2023), business organizations, particularly large corporations have long faced complications connected to balancing exploration and exploitation. As such they often struggle to innovate while sustaining efficiency in their core operations (Christensen et al., 2015; Kiljander et al., 2016). Arising from the above, intrapreneurship has

emerged as a major corporate response to resolve the tension, offering a mechanism through which firms can pursue corporate transformation more effectively (Kola-Nystrom, 2007; Hill & Birkinshaw, 2008). Nevertheless, as intrapreneurship remain entrenched in the parent organisation; they are predisposed to shared assets, corporate infrastructure, procedures and governance framework, all of which are issues that enterprise architecture characteristically governs (Tamm et al., 2011; The Open Group, 2022). In response to contemporary corporate disruptions, firms embark on innovative transformation journeys (Schumpeter, 1942). When corporate transformations thrive, they essentially boost a number of important business outcomes, such as improve profitability, corporate agility and business sustainability among others. Nevertheless, research shows that most firms fail to survive such journeys (Pengcheng et al., 2024).

With the advent of globalisation, numerous firms have established subsidiaries, offices and branches across the world in a bid to launch themselves in the global marketplace. Some have achieved the aforementioned goal successfully, but countless have not, with gainful growth hindered by poor digital readiness, poor management support, weak corporate culture, absence of cohesive transformational plan, fragmented practices and insufficient cross-organizational communication. The simple deduction is that corporate transformation – is easy to say but not quite so easy to carry out and achieve. Fruitful corporate transformation even in a single-entity organization brings numerous complications, owing to scope and scale of innovation. Most corporate transformations have been reinforced by investing in Industry 4.0 to enhance firm adaptive behavior (Jabbour et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020). The reality is that businesses spend trillions of funds on corporate transformations and yet very few succeed. For instance, in the Nigerian oil and gas sector, where Sahara Group operate, most companies in the last two decades, have experienced diverse transformation of their core operations, comprising product planning and development, supply chain management, and marketing, all of which necessitate innovative idea to cope with emerging business landscape.

Notwithstanding growing attention to entrepreneurial behaviors within established companies, numerous related notions remain poorly defined, resulting to substantial confusion (Woo, 2025, Rrzon, 2026). Overall, the domain of intrapreneurship is still far from being consolidated (Berisha et al., 2024), which give rise to persistent measurement complications. Thus, there is a considerable need for theoretical support in this field (Galvan-Vela et al., 2021; Farrukh & Ghazzawi, 2025).The complex nature of intrapreneurial behavior also suggests that there could be numerous factors that motivate employees to behave intrapreneurially (Mustafa, Gavin, & Hughes, 2018). Report published by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) documented that very few percentages of employees between 5-15% demonstrate intrapreneurial predisposition and is significantly higher in developed and high-income nations, compare to developing countries (Bosma et al., 2013; Shim, & Davidsson, 2015). In addition, intrapreneurship is not a pathway that is chosen by the vast majority of employees in any workplace since this path encompasses a lot more of the individual than would be the situation for a person operating with a ‘worker mindset.

Consequently, the country context for intrapreneurship and corporate transformation differs. For example, intrapreneurship has had a vibrant and long history in the United States of America (USA), and it was the dominant mechanism for the development of technology-based

innovations (Shah et al., 2014). Many organisations in the USA are now making intrapreneurship a core component of their organizational culture and have promoted employee intrapreneurrial behaviour (Prieto et al., 2020). The relevance and associated benefits of intrapreneurship are not in doubt. Nevertheless, the tendency of employees' demonstrating intrapreneurial behavior does not always happen as anticipated by business executives, as not all workforces respond to a firm's call or opportunities to engage in internal entrepreneurship. As a result, employees who lack the relevant traits or environmental inducements may not display entrepreneurial behavior (Fischer, 2011).

According to Soto-Simeone & Biniari (2024), intrapreneurial undertakings generates both liabilities (i.e., absence of competence, doubt) and assets (i.e., self-esteem, genius) for an intrapreneur's sense of accomplishment. While much about the components and outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship has been established (Urbano et al., 2022), little about the human elements is known (Soltanifar et al., 2023; Tunstall et al.,2024). Similarly, the central role of intrapreneurship in propelling innovation have rarely been the focus of the innovation literature (Frederic-Alexander et al., 2026). This oversight hinders understanding of the individual-level practices that manifest during the pursuit of innovation within the workplace.

More often than not, organizational, operational, and psychological discrepancies between activities in well-established corporations versus new venture idea, may also pose problems for both the company and the executing intrapreneur, which may be further aggravated in the absence of enabling corporate climate and organizational support. Furthermore, transition between roles may propels cognitive strain on the part of employee pursuing intrapreneurial dream (Mistry et al., 2022), in addition to associated stress from role ambiguity (Monsen & Boss, 2009). While the phenomenon of intrapreneurship is formally documented as a strategy corporate regeneration and transformation, its adoption and applications are relatively new in a number of companies in Nigeria. Furthermore, most established companies are progressively paying attention to internalizing the entrepreneurial behaviors characteristically connected with the founder(s) of the company, because the practices are anticipated to help them stunned environmental challenges and accomplish easier approval (Jahanshahi et al.,2021) Most large business entities, particularly the Public Quoted Companies in Nigeria have formal guidelines and procedure to sustain corporate transformation, instances of such strategic drive among unquoted firms, like Sahara Group are yet to be formerly documented. Therefore, corporate transformation practices in Sahara Group may be perceived to be less apparent. The aforementioned research gaps inspired the primary objective of this study: to investigate the the linkage between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed for empirical testing;

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation in Sahara Group.
H_{02}: Intrapreneurship will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.
Hypothesis two is further broken down into five sub-hypotheses:
H_{02a}: Innovation will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.
H_{02b}: Proactiveness will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.
H_{02c}: Self-renewal will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.
H_{02d}: Risk-taking will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.

H_{02e}: Networking will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.

2.0 Literature Review

Intrapreneurship and Dimensions

Intrapreneurship, is a concept promoted by Pinchot in the 1980s, and refers to the practice of nurturing entrepreneurial behavior within existing organizations (Pinchot 1985). Intrapreneurship has become a sanctified grail of sorts for businesses that aim for renewal and corporate transformation. Notwithstanding the recent surge in admiration of the concept and the momentum corporate transformation has gathered, its meaning somewhat remains indefinable, with a notable absence of clarity (Grebica et al., 2025). Intrapreneurship is an entrepreneurial endeavor occurring in the corporate context and being steered in an agile manner, (Guo et al., 2023; Uslu, 2016). Therefore, intrapreneurship can be contemplated as a phenomenon that arises when entrepreneurship occurs in corporate contexts (Huang et al., 2021) and is closely connected not only to worker commitment to learning and innovation but also to general employee internal motivation and satisfaction (Antoncic & Antoncic, 2011). Intrapreneurship is defined as a phenomenon entrenched organizational-wide, with individuals situated at the centre of analysis as the main source of innovation and development within established companies (Skade et al.,2024). According to Batista-Canino et al. (2025), intrapreneurship is an employee-driven innovation within workplace and it offer a major framework for fostering corporate transformation.

Nowadays, intrapreneurship is contemplated as a compulsory component for sustainable growth and profitability for all forms of businesses, irrespective of its size and industry (Pinchot, 1985; Amo, 2010). Intrapreneurial behavior transpires when an individual within an organization makes a personal business decision in a way that influence corporate performance (Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). It is characteristically not an assigned undertakings or tasks, rather, intrapreneurs take their own personal initiatives within the corporation and may even work on initiatives that not everyone knows about (Pinchot, 1985). Even though intrapreneurship is ingrained in entrepreneurship (Antoncic, 2001), there are numerous dissimilarities between the two notions. According to Antoncic & Hisrich (2003), while intrapreneurs make risky decisions by deploying the resources of the firm, the entrepreneurs make risky decisions using their own resources. Research on intrapreneurship is separated into three areas: i) the intrapreneur as an individual, concentrating on his characteristics as well as his acknowledgement and support in the organization, ii) the creation of new ventures from within the company, which focus on the diverse forms of ventures and their positioning in the corporate structure, and iii) the entrepreneurial company, highlighting its main features of risk taking (Antoncic & Hirsrich, 2003).

Scholars have proposed numerous dimensions of intraprenurship, consisting of innovation, self-renewal, risk taking, proactiveness and networking among others. For example, in a progressively competitive and complicated business environments, companies must foster innovation (Zhao, 2005). Therefore, innovation is not just a form of benefits but an inevitability for corporate organizations to survive and thrive (Shah et al., 2014). Nevertheless, their success depends on innovators—individuals who grip risk to exploit opportunities and craft innovative ideas (Badoiu et al., 2020). According to Hernandez-Perlines et al. (2022), pro-activeness refers

to initiative-taking, anticipating, and significant disposition toward a dire situation, as well as early preparation against risk and taking the first step ahead of rivals. Risk-taking in business pertains to a firm's preparedness to pursue opportunities despite uncertainty regarding their eventual success. Intrapreneurship manifest in two prominent ways: the creation of new ventures within an existing firm, or the revitalization of an existing company through strategic renewal (Guth & Ginsberg, 1990). Self-renewal offers support mechanisms such as tailored expertise, and intellectual capital to support employee during complications. According to Gould and Penley (1984), networking can be view as the act of cultivating a network of contacts both within and outside the company, with the intent of seeking valuable resources from those contacts. Networking represents complex social ecosystem that offer critical support and resources for business growth. Therefore, improve understanding of diverse forms of networks becomes crucial for strategic business development and opportunity creation (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011). According to Covin & Slevin (1991), all the aforementioned dimensions serve as corollaries influence on intrapreneurial outcomes.

Corporate Transformation

Corporate transformation is perhaps one of the most used buzz words in business context. Business leaders possess four projectiles, namely: incubation, intrapreneurship, investments, and involvement when it comes to corporate transformation (Borchers et al., 2023). All the four approaches have the potential for enabling corporate capabilities to sense and seize business opportunities needed to transform the company. Notwithstanding the recent surge in admiration of the term and the impetus corporate transformation has gathered, its meaning somewhat remains indefinable, with obvious absence of clarity (Uhl & Gollenia, 2012). There are numerous varieties of corporate transformation – consisting of digital, sustainable, agile, social, and lean, etc., but essentially, corporate transformation refers to a procedure that every company will, or at least should, undergo during its lifetime, irrespective of its domain of operation, in order to bring about needed changes, exploit new opportunities, and address complications (Uhl & Gollenia, 2012).

Research over the past decades have consistently called on corporations on the need to adapt, fine-tune, change, or redefine themselves through innovation at a much faster pace than before in order to remain competitive (Bierwerth et al., 2015). Most lately, high intensity of global conflict Russia-Ukraini war, Isreal-Palestine war, Sudan and Myanmar war and most recent USA and Iran Conflict have generated new complications and opportunities for established corporations (Zahra, 2021). Digitalization has also appeared as a vital circumstance for competitiveness, and also the development of innovative technologies is occurring at a faster pace than before ((Berger et al., 2021). In addition, new forms of businesses and corporations with radically new business models and relationships are appearing (Zahra, 2021). Overall, all the aforementioned complications have compelled corporations to invest in building competencies or proficiencies, effectively diversify risk to lessen operational costs, and develop innovative business models. One reoccurring approach to effectively cope with the aforementioned complications is corporate transformation. Corporate transformation can be defined as an improvement initiatives design to deliver strategic business outcomes. It entails a breadth of activities that primarily focus on significant areas that can improve performance across the entire organisation. Corporate transformation can be contemplated as the procedure of organizational and economic

transformation, in which the structure and composition of business entities changes (Aroles et al., 2021).

Theoretical Review

This study is underpinned by self-determination theory and Schumpeter's innovation theory

Self Determination Theory (SDT)

Edward and Richard promoted Self-determination Theory-SDT in 1973. The theory examines the degree to which an individual's behaviour is predisposed, self-inspired and self-determined (Broeck, Ferris, Chang & Rosen, 2016). According to the theory, degrees of inspiration differ on a continuum characterized along three motivational states (Deci et al., 2020). One end of the band embodies a motivation, which is defined as a presence or absence of enthusiasm for an activity. The other end of the continuum signifies essentially motivated behaviours. When people are intrinsically or internally motivated, they engage in activities because doing so is stimulating and extemporaneously satisfying for the person doing the activity. At the centre of the continuum mendacities is extrinsic motivation or external motivation, which refers to performing an activities because it will result in some consequences that is distinct from the activity itself, such as getting a reward or avoiding sanction. SDT divides extrinsic motivation into four forms, namely external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation. External regulation refers to performing the behaviour because one is seduced, or compelled by external influences. Introjected regulation consists of reason for performing the activity which has been partly internalized by the person (Deci et al., 2020). Identified regulation implies behaviour that is more congruent with personal desires, values and identity such that the individual experiences a larger sense of autonomy or choice (Daniel & Pelletier, 2020). The fourth is integrated regulation, an activity that is perceived as not only personally expressive to the individual, but has become an essential element of his/ her values and convictions (Lam & Gurland, 2008). This theory is relevant to this study because intrapreneurship is concerned with the inspiration and enthusiasm behind choices individual make without external compulsion, influence and interference.

Schumpeter's Innovation Theory

According to Schumpeter, innovation technological and corporate innovation is driven by entrepreneurs which is the prime engine of long-term economic growth, thus instead of focusing on price competition, attention should be on "creative destruction", where novel innovations uninterruptedly revolutionize industries by rendering old know-hows, business practices, and outdated business models (Schumpeter, 1943). Schumpeter categorized innovation process into four elements: invention, innovation, diffusion and imitation (Burton-Jones, 1999). According to Schumpeter (1934), the role of entrepreneurship is to seek out opportunities for novel and value-generating engagements. Thus, innovation is contemplated as "creative destruction" that develops the economy while the entrepreneur performs the role of the change creator (Schumpeter, 1912). Creative destruction arises when a novelty radically changes all competitors and the way the agents in the market behave. The theory is a foremost theory that put human agent at the centre of economic productivity and prosperity, through innovation. Schumpeter labelled development in economic as historical procedure of structural changes, which is considerably driven by innovation (Schumpeter, 1943). Therefore, corporate innovation takes stationary economy to new level of development, because any company seeking profits must innovate (Schumpeter, 1943).

3.0 Methodology

This study adopted cross sectional survey research design using quantitative research approach. The research philosophy is founded on positivism perspective using deductive strategy to test hypothesis. The target population for this study comprised 1,274 employees in Sahara group cutting across its major subsidiaries, including energy, power, infrastructures and trading units. This study adopts the sample size computation formula proposed by Yemane (1967) to draw sample size.

The formula is: $n = N/1+n)e^2$

Where:

n = Sample size. N = Population size, and e = Level of precision. Therefore, using the formula, effective sample size is computed as:

$1,274/1+1274X0.5^2$

n = 400

Three stage sampling techniques was used to select the participants for this study. In the first phase, purposive sampling approach was used to select participants who are executive (management), senior and middle level employees. In the second phase, stratified random sampling technique was used to select respondents from senior (executive or management), middle level and junior staff in Sahara Group. In the third and final stage, convenience sampling technique was used to survey respondents that are accessible and willing to participate in the survey. Measures for the variables (intrapreneurship and corporate transformation) were adapted from previous validated studies. Online survey (Google Forms) was used to collect data from the respondents. Prior to the main survey, the survey instrument (questionnaire) was evaluated for validity and reliability assessments. Academic experts perused the instrument for face and content validity. Afterwards, pilot study was carried out using Cronbach alpha. The reliability of the instrument's - Cronbach's alpha values for the two variables and dimensions exceeded 0.7 and above, showing that the instrument is reliable and suitable for conducting the research (Saunder et al., 2016). To analyze the data collected from the respondents, descriptive statistics such as frequency, and percentage was run. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis. The alpha level of significance is set at .05 and .10, implying p-value >.05 or >.10 (indicates that the association between variables is not significant) and overall p-value < .05 or < .10 (showing that the association is significant). Preliminary data analysis was run to check all the assumptions guiding the use of multiple regression analysis, consisting of independence of residuals, linear relationships, homogeneity, and multicollinearity, and were found to be satisfactory.

4.0 Presentation of Results and Discussions

Table 1:

Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Characteristicsof Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	124	59.9
Female	83	40.1
Age Group		
Less than 30 years	11	5.3
31 – 40 years	42	20.1
41 – 50 years	56	27.1
51 – 60 years	41	19.8

61 years and above	57	27.5
Educational Qualification		
Bachelor's Degree or equivalent	148	71.5
M.Sc./MBA or equivalent	57	27.5
Doctorate Degree	2	0.9
Job Category		
Junior staff	52	25.1
Middle level staff	74	35.7
Senior staff	81	39.1
Year(s) of Experience on the Job		1.1
Less than 3 years	68	32.9
4 – 5 years	91	44.0
7 years and above	48	23.2

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Minimal demographics information consisting of gender, age, educational qualification, and years on the current employment was collected. As shown in Table 1, participants were 207 employees in Sahara Group. There were 124 (59.9%) male and 83 (40.1%) female. Concerning their age, 11(5.3%) were between less than 30 years old, 42 (20.1%) were between 31 and 40 years, 56 (27.1%) were between 41 and 50 years, 41 (19.8%) were between 51 and 60 years, and 57 (27.5%) were between 61 years and above. Regarding their educational level, 121 (58.5%) were university graduates or equivalent, 84(40.6%) holds a Master's degree or equivalent, and 2(1.0%) holds Doctorate degree. Regarding their job level, 52(25.1%) were junior staff, 74(35.7%) were middle level employees and the remaining 81(39.1%) were senior staff occupying executive or management position. Concerning years in the current working place, 68 (32.9%) were less than 3 years on the job, 91 (44.0%) were between 4 and 6 years, and 48 (23.2%) were 7 years and above.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H_{01}*:* There is no significant relationship between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation in Sahara Group.

Table 2:
Correlations Matrix of Intrapreneurship and Corporate Transformation

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
Innovation	1					
Proactiveness	.772**	1				
Self-renewal	.605**	.579**	1			
Risk-taking	.625**	.564**	.552**	1		
Networking	.597**	.506**	.377**	.736**	1	
Corporate Transformation	.737**	.610**	.441**	.709**	.893**	1

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

To assess whether significant relationship exist between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted. The results in Table 2 depicts the relationship among the five dimensions of intrapreneurship comprising innovation, proactiveness, self-renewal, risk-taking, and networking. As depicted in Table 2 inter-correlations among the five dimensions revealed low, moderate and high significant positive and

statistically significant correlations. Table 2 also revealed that all the dimensions of intrapreneurship have moderate and high positive statistically significant correlations with corporate transformation. Specifically, innovation and corporate transformation (r=.737, p<0.01), proactiveness and corporate transformation (r=.610, p<0.01), self-renewal and corporate transformation (r=.441, p<0.01), risk-taking and corporate transformation (r=.709, p<0.01), and networking and corporate transformation (r=.893, p<0.01). The finding of this study is similar with existing literature that documented strong influence of intrapreneurship and corporate transformation (Anu, 2007; Aina & Solikin, 2020; Piecuch & Szczygiel, 2021; Agbaje et al., 2025; Bojan, et al., 2025). On the contrary, scholars such as Samah, & Shafig (2022) and Grebica et al. (2025) reported no significance relationship between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation.

Hypothesis Two

Ho_2: Intrapreneurship will not significantly influence corporate transformation in Sahara Group.

Table 3:

Regression model of Intrapreneurship will not significantly influence corporate transformation

Model			Analysis of Variance		Regression Coefficients			
R	R^2	Adj. R^2	F	Sig. F	Predictors	β	t	Sig.
.929	.863	.859	252.851	.000	Constant		4.209	.000
					Innovation	.613	15.745	.000
					Proactiveness	.544	9.777	.000
					Self-renewal	-.328	-4.891	.000
					Risk taking	.511	7.263	.000
					Networking	.416	6.440	.000

Source: Field Survey, 2026: Note: Statistically significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$; statistically significant at $\alpha \leq 0.01$.

As depictedin Table3,theregression model idemonstrates goodness of fit at 5% and 10% significant level (F-statistics, 252.851, indicating that intrapreneurship significantly predicted corporate transformation. The R2 value of .863 shows that roughly 86% variance or change in corporate transformation in Sahara Group could be attributed to intrapreneurship undertakings. In term relative contribution or prediction to the regression model, the contribution of each of the predictor are: innovation (β= .613, t= 15.745, $p \leq 0.01$), proactiveness β= .544, t= 9.777, $p \leq 0.01$), self-renewal β= -.328, t=- 4.891, $p \leq 0.01$), risk taking β= .511, t= 7.263, $p \leq 0.01$), and networking (β= .416, t= 6.440, $p \leq 0.01$). Innovation dimension of intrapreneurship contributed most to the model 61%, while self-renewal contributed the least 33%. Based on the above results, all the five sub-hypotheses (HO_{2a} to HO_{2e}) are not supported and the alternate hypothesis indicating positive significant relationship of all the five intrapreneurship dimensions consisting of innovation, proactiveness, self-renewal, risk taking and networking and corporate transformation is supported and accepted Previous related empirical research unambiguously

stated positive and statistical influence of innovation, proactiveness, self-renewal, risk taking and networking on corporate transformation (Coleman, & Adim, 2019; Iborra et al., 2020; Choong et al., 2022; Yaser, & Mohammad, 2022; Hansen, & Ida, 2022; Meiyu et al., 2023; Elena et al., 2023; Pengcheng et al., 2024; Xiaolin et al., 2025).

On the other hand, some scholars reported that the linkage between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation is context dependent of inherent uncertainty and complexity (Teresa, &Elzbieta, 2021; Samah, & Shafig, 2022; Grebica et al., 2025). According to Tsoukas (2017), innovation which is the driving force of intrapreneurship unfolds through complex, dynamic processes that encompass multiple actors across diverse organizational levels and temporal horizons and to a large extent may limit its impact on corporate transformation. Grebica, et al. (2025) stated that the literature still lacks comprehensive findings that connect business transformation with intrapreneurship. In line with the profound changes that intrapreneurship aims to prompt, the task of scaling depend on the size, desires, and objectives of the company may present considerable and diverse complications (Grebica et al., 2025). In a nutshell, literature provides mixed evidence on this relationship and influence of intrapreneurship on corporate transformation, with many academics concluding that intrapreneurship and corporate transformation are isolated phenomena. In other words, more often than not, business organizations possess intrapreneurial competences but lack the corporate infrastructure, enabling environment and organizational support to translate localized innovation into structural transformation (Adolfo, 2025).

Discussion of Results

This study examined the relationship between intrapreneurship and corporate transformation. Findings of the study revealed that intrapreneurship is strongly related to and predicted corporate transformation. Findings of this study underscore the significant positive relationship and influence of intrapreneurship on the effective implementation and success of corporate transformation, accentuating the imperative of adapting to change to safeguard enduring business growth (Grebica et al., 2025). Employee's intrapreneurship is characterized by proactivity, innovation self-renewal and risk-taking, and has progressively become a dynamic tactics for companies to cope with numerous complications of the contemporary business environment (Meiyu et al., 2023). Remarkably different from the previous corporate entrepreneurship, employees who demonstrate intrapreneurial behavior are keen to take risks and they transform from inert recipients of entrepreneurship knowledge into active change-seekers, having high degree of autonomy, social capital and inspiration to promote innovative business ideas (Xin, 2014; Usman et al., 2021).

Under growing business complications and rapid changing internal and external situation, the risks and uncertainties faced by business organizations are soaring, threatening their performance, success, and sustainability. The unceasing evolution of industry regulations and compliance necessities further increases the complexity; impacting how businesses are transforming their portfolios, divesting old business model, investing in growth, and discovering innovative business models. The consequential distruption has propelled corporate organizations to reconstructs their enterprise process, business model, management system, and governance architecture, and practices. While corporate transformation generates uncertainty, it offers innovative solutions for enterprise risk prevention and crisis governance (Pengcheng et al.,

2024). Intrapreneurship is also vital to corporate transformation development and act as the driving force to enhance business competitiveness. Nevertheless, innovation does not come from progress in the context of core business domains, it requires agile and creative workforce within the existing business ecosystem to generate innovative ideas for new venture creation, calculated risk, proactiveness, self-renewal and networking (Hung et al., 2011; Xiaolin et al., 2020; Elena et al., 2023; Meiyu et al., 2023).

Employees with intrapreneurship predisposition helps kickstart and maintain a start-up framework that fosters and propel new initiatives, technological advancement, and business models through adaptive behaviour and social capital (Aidoo et al., 2020). Thus, as corporate transformation progresses, intrapreneurshipis needed to impact how companies operate within their corporate landscape. Nonetheless, whether and how this impact corporate positioning is context dependent and rely on a number of issues such as management ethos, corporate support, organizational culture and climate to mention a few.

5.0 Conclusion

This study established strong relationship and influence of intrapreneurship on corporate transformation. The overarching goal of intrapreneurship is to build competences which facilitate corporate renewal, thus, intrapreneurs are the catalyst for this change (Lages et al., 2017).The notion of intrapreneurshiphas attracted growing scholar and practitioners' attention (Gawke et al., 2017; Perlines et al., 2022). Its relevance and significance stems from its positive association with corporate performance, improve profitability, growth and firm survival (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). Because of its strategic standing and importance, intrapreneurship has been widely recognized as a comprehensive idea that condenses diverse sub-dimensions, consisting of innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking, and social capital among others (Antoncic & Hisrich 2003). Intrapreneurshipis important not only for large firms but also for small and medium-sized companies (Badoiu et al., 2020). The rapid progression of technological advances and complicated business environment, necessitate the need for corporate renewal to aid in generating innovative business idea and opportunities. In this context, intrapreneurship has become more vital than ever. Though traditional intrapreneurial creativities usually result in substantial corporate performance improvements, nevertheless, employee with with strong spirit of intrapreneurship opens new horizons and offshoots innovativeness, risk-taking tendency, proactiveness, self-renewal, and social capital or networking to generate ideas with whole new impressive height. With agility, strong desire for achievement, intrapreneurship prioritizes individuals and interactions over procedures and ttechniques as well as responding to change, thus permitting intrapreneurs to self-organize and proactively deliver value envisioned. While the situation and context in which manifestation of intrapreneurship behaviour is demonstrated may vary (i.e., government establishments, public sector entities, private sector, non-governmental organization to mention a few), the central fibre of the person who chooses this path is fundamentally similar. Thus, intrapreneurship share numerous similarities, mainly in terms of nurturing a mindset and culture that inspire workers to demonstrate intrapreneurial behaviours (Brattstrom & Faems, 2024)

The prevailing business environment, within and outside the organization play a major role in driving intrapreneurship and corporate transformation, impacting both individual behaviors and corporate strategies. Thus, by improving awareness of environmental factors, individuals are

more likely to engage in business decisions or innovations that align with environmental reality, by adopting business models that lessen waste and optimize resource consumption (Godinho et al., 2024; Wardani et al., 2025). Intrapreneurship also flourishes on employee innate motivation, autonomy and corporate support, enabling workers to experiment with innovative solutions without the restraints of rigid corporate structures. According to the proactive motivation theory, the connection between intrapreneurship and innovative behaviors can be described by the workers' desire to demonstrate innovative behavior, which is largely propel by internal motivation (Gorgievski et al., 2023; Mustafa et al., 2026). Therefore, employees that are intrapreneurially inclined tend to demonstrate their innovative behaviors willingly, and they perform these acts in accordance with their internal motivation, not as a compulsory response (Vargas-Halabı et al., 2017). In particular, effective execution of intrapreneurial tendency within the workplace is intimately linked with leadership since it encompasses seeking support, approval and mobilizing teams towards such cause. According to Woo (2025), academics have recognized that the top management has a substantial role in fashioning an atmosphere wherein workers are encouraged to engage in innovative ideas. The support and sense of autonomy to innovate enables companies to adapt rapidly to changing environmental guidelines and market potentials, thus ensuring long-term business competitiveness (Hernández-Perlines et al., 2022; Aina et al., 2025). As a further step, positive assessment and reward of this behaviour impacts individual perceptions and results to increased engagement and commitment in intrapreneurship tendency. Consequently, the role of business executives is critical in instituting corporate culture and organizational climate to inspire operational-level workers to undertake and also promotes intrapreneurial initiatives organizational wide.

Implications and Recommendations

Conventional basis of accomplishing improved performance and competitive advantages obtained from economies of scale, channel strength and brand loyalty are becoming less potent than what it used to be. Therefore, firms need vibrant employees that possesses entrepreneurial mindset. This view is reinforced by Elena et al. (2023) that stated that corporate organizations must aggressively search for employees who continuously adapt to change by innovating to align learning and development with corporate strategy. It is generally documented that the pace of change is growing, with increasing demands on corporate organisations to adapt and transform. As a result, proactive business executives have recognized the relevance of transforming their firms; nevertheless, achieving productive corporate transformation presents a number of complications (Iborra et al., 2020). Intrapreneurship engenders innovation and corporate transformation by enabling innovativeness through products, and processes), demonstration of courageous risk-taking proactiveness, corporate agility, building of social capital and new businesses formation (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001), all of which enforce intrapreneurship as a multifaceted tactic for corporations to thrive in highly competitive business environments (Wunderer, 2001).

Therefore, to promote intrapreneurship and facilitate corporate transformation, top management must inspire autonomous intrapreneurship behavior by making it less complicated for employees to acquire resources to deploy innovations that do not flow from the mandates of top business executives. Corporate organizations with extremely entrenched linear processes and practices must contend with deep-rooted operational practices, investments in relevant infrastructure, and agility to cope with growing organizational change, all of which constrain their capability for

rapid innovation and intrapreneurship (Kirchherr et al., 2023; Truong et al., 2024). It is very doubtful that reinvention at any level can transpire without some form of corporate transformation. Employees with intrapreneurship mindset seek breakthroughs by executing more flexible and aggressive corporate changes by exploring innovative business opportunities and products (Zarkua et al., 2025). Consequently, by probing intrapreneurs' experiences to generate innovative ideas, researchers have advanced academic discourse on the individual-level foundations of corporate entrepreneurship (Soto-Simeone & Biniari 2024; Tunstall et al., 2024). Thus, the major concern is not whether to embark on corporate transformation, but how to assess and redesign it effectively. High-performing companies that can effectively transit emerging complications of contemporary business environment will thrive while lagging firms will cease to exist. Also, organizations that are able to master incessant change are those that are more responsive, and more agile. Therefore, to effectively cope with the complications of the business environment and accomplish improve performance, how to promote employee intrapreneurship has become a major issue faced by business enterprises (Blanka, 2019). This study recommends that:

i. Businesses must develop strategies on how to generate supportive corporate environment and organizational climate that attracts, inspires and retains intrapreneurs, so as to instil a culture of innovation where employees are empowered to pursue innovative dreams.
ii. Developing and implementing corporate transformation is a complex and challenging task, therefore it requires corporate competences and organizational support to orchestrate multiple enormous ideas to developed and sustained workers that keeps each transformation focused on the strategic objectives of the company.
iii. Business organizations should develop policies that will encourage Employee Assistance Programmes-EAP such as mentorship, coaching among others to facilitate learning and support employees with entrepreneurial mindset.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestion for Further Research

Common to most research enquiry, this study has some limitations. Firstly, the study examined intrapreneurship and corporate transformation, focusing on five dimensions of intrapreneurship, namely: innovation, proactiveness, risk taking, self-renewal, and networking¸ signifying that other pertinent intrapreneurship components that may help account for the influence of intrapreneurship on corporate transformation are not accommodated. We recommend the inclusion of other relevant factors of intrapreneurial behavior such as autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness. Secondly, the study sample comprised employees who are senior and middle level business managers in Sahara Group. Although the chosen sample is precise, and representative, empirical generalization of this study is restricted. Therefore, future researchers should replicate the current study to include more oil and gas companies or to other clusters. Thirdly, the nature of the study is cross sectional and rely on self-reported data, making it problematic to infer causality among variables, consequently common method bias may account for the influence of intrapreneurship on corporate transformation. To extend the findings of the study, it may be valuable to conduct quasi-experimental study to deduce causal inferences.

References

Adolfo, M. C. (2025). The Role of Entrepreneurial Culture in Enabling Transformation and Innovation in Organizations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*http://www. 10.2139/ssrn.5759564

Agbaje, F.O., Abdulwaheed A. S., Tina M.A., Ajibola A.L., Eden O. O., & Lawal, A. (2025). Using Intrapreneurship and Innovation to Promote Economic Growth in Nigeria. Cognizance *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *5*(3), 192-203

Aidoo, S.O., Agyapong, A., & Mensah, H.K. (2020). Social capital and performance of SMEs: The role of entrepreneurial orientation and managerial capability. *Africa Journal of Management*, *6*(4), 377-406

Amo, B.W. (2010). Corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship related to innovation behaviour among employees. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing2*(2), 144–158

Antoncic J.A., & Antoncic, B. (2011). Employee satisfaction, intrapreneurship and firm growth: a model. Industrial Management & Data Systems, *111*(4), 589-607.

Aina N.A., Onjaniaina, M.H., Celine, V., & Yana, M. (2025). The circular transformation: How intrapreneurship and innovation ecosystems reshape enterprises.*Journal of Circular Economy*, *3*(3), 132-152

Aina, Q., & Solikin, I. (2020). Entrepreneurship and intrapreneurshop: how supporting corporate performance. *Review of Integrative Business & Economics Research*, *19*(1), 288-298.

Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R.D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*, 495–527.

Antoncic, B. (2001). Organizational processes in intrapreneurship: A conceptual integration". *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, *9*(2), 221-35.

Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R.D. (2003). Privatization, corporate entrepreneurship, and performance: Testing a normative model. *Journal of Development Entrepreneurship*, *8*(3), 197.

Anu, L. (2007). *Fostering intrapreneurship – the new comparative edge*. Conference on Global Competition and Competitiveness of Indian Corporate. Retrieved from dspace.iimk.ac.in/bitstream/2259/471/1/149-156+.pdf

Aroles, J.,D. Cecez-Kecmanovic, K., Dale, S., Kingma, F., & Mitev, N. (2021). New Ways of Working (NWW): Workplace transformation in the digital age. *Information and Organization*, *31*(4), 10.

Badoiu, G.A., Segarra-Cipres, M., & Escrig-Tena, A.B. (2020). Understanding employees' intrapreneurial behavior: A case study. *Personnel Review*, *49*(8), 1677-1694.

Batista-Canino, R.M., Sosa-Cabrera, S., Medina-Brito, P., & Santana-Hernández, L. (2025). Scientific progress on entrepreneurship in the circular economy: A scientometric analysis. *Sustainability*, *17*(2), 777.

Berger, E.S.C., von Briel, F., Davidsson, P., & Kuckertz. A. (2021). Digital or Not – The future of entrepreneurship and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, *125*, 436–442.

Berisha, G., Govori, D., Lajçi, R., Sonta, M., & Rohm, T. (2024) Innovative work behavior of intrapreneurs: a matter of belonging and support? *European Journal of Innovative Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2024-0540

Bierwerth, M., Schwens, C., Isidor, R., & Kabst, R. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small business economics*, *45*(2), 255-278.

Binns, A. (2023). *Enterprise architects: Friend or foe of corporate innovation*? Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewbinns/2023/08/16/enterprise-architects-friend-or-foe-of-corporate-innovation/

Birkinshaw, J., & Gibson, C. (2004). *Building ambidexterity into an organization*. MIT Sloan Management Review. Retrieved from https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/building-ambidexterity-into-an-organization/

Blanka, C. (2019). An individual-level perspective on intrapreneurship: A review and ways forward. *Review of Management Science*, 13(5), 919–961.

Bojan G., Danijela, C.L., Slavica, M.V., Nikola, Z., & Milena, S. (2025). Elevating corporate transformation: The power of agile Intrapreneurship. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, *16* (1), 64-75

Borchers, P., Kevin, K., Niklas, P., & Aurel, S. (2023). *Pathfinder: Treibt Nachhaltigkeit Innnovation*? Exxeta AG Karlsruhe, SINE Foundation e.V. Berlin, TLGG Consulting GmbH Berlin, ESCP Europe Wirtschaftshochschule Berlin e.V. Berlin.Retrieved from https://exxeta.com/blog/pathfinder-treibtnachhaltigkeit-innovation

Bosma, N., Wennekers, S., Guerrero, M., Amorós, J. E., Martiarena, A., & Singer, S. (2013). *Special Report on Entrepreneurial Employee Activity.* (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report) Retrieved from https://www.gemconsortium.org/file

Brattström, A., & Faems. D. (2024). Innovation Theater in corporate venturing units: Cultural design as a (de) legitimizing mechanism. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 41*, 1047–1061.

Broeck, A., Lance D.F., Chu-Hsiang, C., & Christopher, C.R. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, *42* (5), 1195–1229

Burton-Jones, A. (1999). *Knowledge capitalism – Business, work, and learning in the new Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, J., Gao, M., Mangla, S.K., Song, M., Wen, J. (2020). Effects of technological changes on China's carbon emissions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change,153*, 11.

Choong Y.O., Seow Ai N., Nur, H. Mohammad, I., Julian, T.H.L., & Peter, T.S.H. (2022). The mediating effect of digital transformation extent on the relationship between managerial proactiveness and business resilience: Government intervention as a moderator. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, *14*(3), 1281-1293

Christensen, C.M., Raynor, M.E., & McDonald, R. (2015). *What is disruptive innovation*? Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2015/12/what-is-disruptive-innovation

Coleman, R.O., & Adim, C.V. (2019). Entrepreneurial proactiveness and organizational resilience in mobile telecommunication firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, *6*(3), 454-465.

Covin, J.G., & Lumpkin, G.T. (2011) Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 35*(5), 855–872.

Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (1991) A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 16*(1), 7–25.

Daniel, B., & Pelletier, L.G. (2020). The roles of motivation and goals on sustainable behaviour in a resource dilemma: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,69*, 10.

Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H.., & Ryan, R.M., (2020). Self-determination theory in work organisations. The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour,7*, 19-43.

Deprez, J., & Euwema, M. (2017). You can't always get what you want? Leadership expectations of intrapreneurs. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 32*(6), 430- 444.

Elena, C., Riccardo, L., Luigi, M., &Sandro, M. (2023). Firms and innovation in the new industrial paradigm of the digital transformation. *Industry and Innovation, 30*(1),7.

Farrukh, M., & Ghazzawi, I. (2025). Intrapreneurship research: What have we learned and where can we go from here? *International Journal of Innovation Science*, *17*(6), 1361–1382.

Fischer, A. (2011). Recognizing opportunities: Initiating service innovation in PSFs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *15*, 915–927.

Frederic-Alexander, S., Slawa, T., Sylvia, H.B., & Rüdiger, K. (2026). The intrapreneur identity illusion: Unraveling the identity work of Intrapreneurs in internal corporate venturing. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 43*, 313–340

Galvan-Vela, E., Arango, E., Sorzano, D. M., & Ravina-Ripoll, R. (2021). State-of-the-art analysis of intrapreneurship: Areview of the theoretical construct and its bibliometrics. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *14*(4), 148.

Gawke, J.C., Gorgievski, M.J., & Bakker, A.B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *100*, 88–100.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, *Global Report (2019-2020, February 25).* Retrieved fromhttps://www.gemconsortium.org/report/gem-2019-2020-global-report

Godinho, M., Gonella, J. D. S.L., Latan, H., & Ganga, G.M.D. (2024). Awareness as a catalyst for sustainable behaviors: A theoretical exploration of planned behavior and value-belief-norms in the circular economy. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *368*, 122181.

Gorgievski, M.J., Bakker, A. B., Petrou, P., & Gawke, J. C. L. (2023). Antecedents of employee intrapreneurship in the public sector: A proactive motivation approach. *InternationalPublic Management Journal*, *26*(6), 852–873.

Gould, S., & Penley, L.E. (1984). Career strategies and salary progression: a study of their relationships in a municipal bureaucracy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*(2), 244-265.

Grebica, B.,Mitrovic, S V., & Savkovica, M. (2025).Elevating corporate transformation: The power of agile intrapreneurship. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*,*16*(1), 64 - 75

Guo, R., Yin, H., & Liu, X. (2023). Coopetition, organizational agility, and innovation performance in digital new ventures. Industrial Marketing Management, *111*, 143-157.

Guth, W.D., & Ginsberg, A., (1990), Guest editors' introduction, corporate entrepreneurship, *Strategic Management Journal*, *11*(Summer), 5-15.

Hansen K., & Ida, P. (2022). The effect of proactive action, innovation and risk taking on business Performance. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, *216*, 284-294

He, L. (2019). *Google's secrets of innovation: Empowering its employees.* Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/laurahe/20 13/03/29/googles-secrets-of-innovation-empowering-its-employees/?sh=477105d57e7b

Hernandez-Perlines, F., Ariza-Montes, A., & Blanco-Gonzalez-Tejero, C. (2022). Intrapreneurship research: A comprehensive literature review. *Journal of business research*, *153*, 428-444.

Hill, S. A., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Strategy–organization configurations in corporate venture units: Impact on performance and survival. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *23*(4), 423–444.

Huang, L.Y. Yang Lin, S.M., & Hsieh, Y.J. (2021). Cultivation of intrapreneurship: A framework and challenges. Frontier of Psychology, *12*, 9.

Hubbart, J.A. (2023). Organizational change: The challenge of change aversion. *Administrative Sciences*, *13*(7), 162.

Hung, D.K.M., Abdullah Effendi, A., Abdul Taib, L.S., & Abdul Rani, N.A. (2011). A preliminary study of top SMEs in Malaysia: Key success factor vs Government Support Program. *Journal of Global Business and Economics*, *2*(1), 48-58.

Iborra, M., Safon, V., & Dolz, C. (2020). What explains the resilience of SMEs? Ambidexterity capability and strategic consistency. *Long Range Planning*, *53*, 101947

Jabbour, C.J.C., de Sousa Jabbour, A.B.L., Sarkis, J., & Godinho F.M. (2019). Unlocking the circular economy through new business models based on large-scale data: An integrative framework and research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *144*, 546-542

Jahanshahi, A.A., Bhattacharjee, A., & Maghsoudi, T. (2021). Internal capabilities as the source of achieving competitive advantage in small-sized businesses. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, *26*(2), 141–162.

Jia, X., Chowdhury, M., Prayag, G., & Chowdhury, M.M.H. (2020). The role of social capital on proactive and reactive resilience of organizations post-disaster. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *48*, 101614

Kiljander, H., Märijärvi, J., Hokkanen, L., Komssi, M., Yueqiang, X., Raatikainen, M., Seppänen, P., Heininen, J., Koivulahti-Ojala, M., Helenius, M., & Järvinen, J. (2016). *The cookbook for successful internal startups*. Retrieved from https://www.dimecc.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/the_cookbook_for_successful_Internal_startups.pdf

Kirchherr, J., Urbinati, A., & Hartley, K. (2023). Circular economy: A new research field? *Journal of industrial ecology*, *27*(5), 1239-1251.

Kola-Nystrom, S.M. (2007). *In search of corporate renewal: How to benefit from corporate venturing*? Retrieved from https://lutpub.lut.fi/handle/10024/31110

Lages, M., Marques, C.S., Ferreira, J.J., & Ferreira, F.A. (2017). Intrapreneurship and firm entrepreneurial orientation: insights from the health care service industry. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 13*(3), 837-854.

Lam, C.F., & Gurland, S.T. (2008). Self-determined work motivation predicts job outcomes, but what predicts self-determined work motivation? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(4), 1109– 1115.

Li, Y., Zahra, S.A., &Lan, S. (2017). Heterogeneity in new venture formation rates across nations-The Schumpeterian and institutional economics views. In N. Dai (Eds.), *World Scientific Reference on Entrepreneurship.* (pp. 1-35).

Meiyu, L., Chengyou, L., Shuo W., & Qinghai, L. (2023). Digital transformation, risk-taking, and innovation: Evidence from dat on listed enterprises in China. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *8*, 1-15

Mistry, S., Kirkman, B.L., Moore, O.A., Hanna, A. A. & Rapp, T. L. (2022). Too many teams? Examining the impact of multiple team memberships and permanent team identification on employees' identity strain, cognitive depletion, and turnover. *PersonnelPsychology 76*, 885–912.

Monsen, E., & Boss, W.R. (2009). The impact of strategic entrepreneurship inside the organization: Examining job stress and employee retention. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 33*(1), 71–104.

Mustafa A., Nida P., Vurgun, T., Selen, U., Yasxar, S., & Burcu T. (2026). The mediating role of intrapreneurship in the effect of openness to organizational change on innovative behavior. *Sage Open*, April-June 2026, 1–18.

Mustafa, M., Gavin, F., & Hughes, M. (2018). Contextual Determinants of Employee Entrepreneurial Behavior in Support of Corporate Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Enterprising Culture,26*(3), 285-326.

Neessen, P.C.M., Caniels, M.C.J., Vos, B., & de Jong, J.P. (2019). The intrapreneurial employee: Toward an integrated model of intrapreneurship and research agenda. *International Entreprenerurship Management Journal*, *15*(2), 545–571.

Pengcheng, W., Shuo, M., & Songqiang, W. (2024). Digital transformation and corporate risk-taking from the perspective of resilience. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, *292*, 112-121

Perlines, F.H., Ariza-Montes, A., &Blanco-Gonzalez-Tejero, C. (2022). Intrapreneurship research: A comprehensive literature review. *Journal of Business Research*, *153*, 428-444,

Perry, J.M. (2020). *Fortune Global 500*.Retrieved from https://fortune.com/ranking/global500/

Piecuch, T., & Szczygieł, E. (2021). The issue of intrapreneurship development in corporations. *Journal of International Studies*, *14*(3), 235-249.

Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship.

Prieto, L.C., Phipps, S.T.A., & Kungu, K. (2020). Facilitating a culture of intrapreneurship: An employee involvement approach. *Strategic HR Review,19*(2), 93-95.

Rahim, A.G. (2019). Study of the Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on the Business Performance of Auto Artisans Firms within Lagos State Metropolis, Nigeria.*International Journal of Economic Behavior*, *9*(1), 17-37.

Rrezon L. (2026). Measures of individual-level intrapreneurship: A scoping review. *Review of Managerial Science*, *20*, 1717–1749

Rigtering, J., & Weitzel, U. (2013). Work context and employee behaviour as antecedents for intrapreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship andManagement Journal, 9*(3), 337-360.

Samah, T., & Shafig, A. (2022). The impact of intrapreneurship on operators' performance of Jordanian Telecom organizations. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *20*(2), 551-563.

Sanga, D. A. (2026). Adoption of Entrepreneurial Mindsets in Tanzanian Corporations: A Study on Organizational Culture and Innovation. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implication in Education, 10*(1), 314 – 326.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th eds.), Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Schumpeter, J. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy.*London: Harper & Bros.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1943). Capitalism in the postwar world', *in S.E. HARRIS (ed.), Postwar Economic Problems, in Essays*(Schumpeter, 1951)*,*

Schumpeter, J.A. (1912). *The theory of economic development*. New Brunswick, New Jerse: Transaction Publishers

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (originally published in German in 1911; reprinted by Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey in 1997).

Shah, R., Gao, Z., & Mittal, H. (2014). *Innovation, entrepreneurship, and the economy in the US, China, and India: Historical perspectives and future trends*. USA: Academic Press.

Shim, J., & Davidsson, P. (2015, June 10-13). *Cross-country differences in entrepreneurial activity: Adding insight through simulations.* Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference (BCERC).

Skade, L., Wenzel, M., & Koch, J. (2024). Do as we say and you'll be successful: mundane power in corporate entrepreneurship. Journal of Production and Innovative Management, *41*(3), 623–643

Soltanifar, M, Hughes, M., Gina, O., & Jeffrey, G.C. (2023) Unlocking the potential of non managerial employees in corporate entrepreneurship: a systematic review and research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *29*(11), 206-240

Soto-Simeone, A., & Biniari, M.G. (2024). The enactment of a corporate entrepreneurial role: A double-edged sword forged by heart and context. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 48*(6), 1311–1357.

Tamm, T., Seddon, P.B., Shanks, G., & Reynolds, P. (2011). How does enterprise architecture add value to organisations? *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *28*, 141–168.

Teresa, P., &Elzbieta, S. (2021). The issue of intrapreneurship development in corporations. Journal of International Studies, *14*(3), 235-249

The Open Group. (2022). The purpose of enterprise architecture. Retrieved from https://pubs.opengroup.org/togaf-standard/adm-practitioners/adm-practitioners_3.html

Truong, D., Duc, K.N., & Dinh, N.C. (2024). Circular economy essentials. In *Navigating the circular age of a sustainable digital revolution* (pp. 1-26). IGI Global.

Tsoukas, H. (2017). Don't simplify, complexify: From disjunctive to conjunctive theorizing in organization and management studies. *Journal of ManagementStudies*, *54*(2), 132–153

Tunstall, R., Pittaway, L., Van Rensburg, D.J., & Corbett, A.C. (2024). Internal corporate venturing: Riding the relational rollercoaster through sensemaking and sensegiving

reconfiguration. *InternationalJournal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 31*, 1133–1167.

Uhl A., & Gollenia, L.A. (2012). *A handbook of business transformation management methodology*. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Urbano, D., Turro, A., Wright, M., & Zahra, S. (2022). Corporate entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Small Business Economics*, 1–25.

Uslu, T. (2016). *Agile intrapreneurship in volatile business environment: Changing roles of financial managers and risk takers*. New York, NY, USA: Springer.

Usman, M., Ali, M., Ogbonnaya, C., & Babalola, M.T. (2021). Fueling the intrapreneurial spirit: a closer look at how spiritual leadership motivates employee intrapreneurial behaviors. *Tourism Management*, *83*, 1-13.

Vargas-Halabı, T., Mora-Esquivel, R., & Siles, B. (2017). Intrapreneurial competencies: Development and validation of a measurement scale. *European Journal of Management andBusiness Economics*, *26*(1), 86–111

Wardani, D.K., Sabandi, M., Kardiyem, K., & Indira, F.R. (2025). Circular economy awareness of students in higher education: the assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *19*(2), 988-997.

Woo, H.R. (2025). Strategic leadership in SMEs: The mediating roles of corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in organizational performance. *Administrative Sciences*, *15*(4), 151.

Wunderer, R. (2001). Employees as "co-intrapreneurs" – a transformation concept. *Leader and Organisational Development Journal*, *22*(5), 193-211.

Xiaolin, L., Jia, X., Chunyan, L., & Yuqi, L. (2025). *Corporate digital transformation, financing constraints and innovation input*. Proceedings of the 2025 4th International Conference on Big Data Economy and Digital Management (BDEDM 2025), Advances in Intelligent Systems Research 191,

Xin, Y. (2014). Progress and development trend of entrepreneurship research in China based on knowledge graph. *Journal of Zhongnan University of Economics and Law*, *2*, 7-15.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, an introductory analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Yaser, H.A., & Mohammad, A. (2022). Impact of autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness on students' intention to start a new venture. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *7*(4), 1-10

Zahra SA. (2021). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *6*(4), 259-285.

Zarkua, T., Heijman, W., Benesova, I., & Krivko, M. (2025). Entrepreneurship as a driver of economic development. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *13*(1), 61–77.

Zhao, F. (2005). Exploring the synergy between entrepreneurship and innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *11*(1), 25-41