

IMPACT OF REWARD PHILOSOPHY ON CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP PERFORMANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF THE FOOD AND BEVERAGES INDUSTRY

¹Adeoti, Johnson Olabode, ¹Isiaka, Sulu Babaita, ²Lawal, Adedoyin Isola, ¹Olawale, Yinusa Alabi and
¹Adeyemi, Emmanuel Adewale

¹Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin

²Department of Business Administration, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State

ABSTRACT

This study examined the impact of reward philosophy on corporate entrepreneurship performance for sustainability of the food and beverage industry. The food and beverage companies selected were those that fall among the top 20 companies with the highest market value quoted in the Nigerian Stock Exchange. Thus, six companies located in the Southwest Nigeria were selected, involving 338 respondents, differed in their hierarchical and functional positions to capture various staff viewpoints across a variety of management and employee grades, as well as across different teams and departments. The study uses four explanatory variables (Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOp] and Allowance [Alw] for the purpose of predicting corporate entrepreneurship performance [CoEp] for sustainability in Food and Beverage Industry. Multiple regression analysis was employed to examine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. The findings of the study revealed that the reward philosophy is crucial to corporate entrepreneurship performance which is required for sustainable development of the Nigerian economy with calculated p-value of 0.000 which is less than the tabulated p-value of 0.05 at 95% level of confidence.

Keywords: Reward, Philosophy, Corporate Entrepreneurship, Performance, Sustainability, Food And Beverage Industry, Promotion Opportunity

INTRODUCTION

Dynamic global competition, technological advancement, economic factors and social network are essential for sustainable development. Today's managers seek for innovative methods and practices that could make a difference in the ways business is being planned, employees and resources organized, co-ordinated and controlled, with the aim of ensuring organization's healthiness and survival. Tough business environment and growing global competition is pushing businesses to re-think on their existing strategies and introduce policies and practices that could help them stay competitive (Wonglimpiyarat, 2005). Achua (2008) identified three broad components of sustainability, they are; people, planet and prosperity. This study focuses on the people aspect of sustainability. In other words, if employees are aware of reward philosophy of the organization, it has a capacity to ginger them to a better performance. Moghaddam, Khorakian and Maharati (2015) asserted that the future belongs to the organizations that can swiftly respond to environmental changes and have the essential flexibility in implementation of changes. Thus, for a company to be successful in the face of global competition and business complexity, it needs a team of employee that can act strongly for the achievement of the company's goals and also have an unalloyed commitment to upholding organization's core values and promoting innovativeness and dynamism. This is because organizations quality, effectiveness and competitiveness greatly depend on the quality of its employees (Crossman & Abou-Zaki, 2003). These call for organization to put in place a reward philosophy that promotes employees' wellbeing and satisfaction.

To attain and sustain competitive advantage, organizations are more concerned with the skills and the quality of their employees to ensure sustained performance (Harvey, 2009) and retaining capable and quality employees are becoming the top strategic policy issue for many organizations (Holbeche, 2009). Organization's reward philosophy and practices would greatly influence managers in attracting, retaining and developing employees toward attaining organizational effectiveness, efficiency and competitiveness in the globalized world (Adeoye, Elegunde, Tijani & Oyedele, 2012). It has been proven time and again that one of the ways to get the best performance out of employees is to make them comfortable and happy (Emmanuel, 2014). Therefore, it can be argued that organization that has a viable reward philosophy, which depicts an equitable balance between an employees' contribution to it and its contributions to the employees would not only benefit the employees but the organization as well. This is obvious because most organisations now realised that employees contributions to the organisation is one of the most essential parts in many companies' success stories (Millan, Hessels, Jolanda & Aguado, 2011).

The idea of corporate entrepreneurship has been receiving increasing prominence over the past years (Kuratko, Hornsby & Covin, 2014) as it encourages organizations to understand the importance of developing entrepreneurial mindset of employees and motivate them to engage in entrepreneurial practices within the organization. To fulfill their missions and goals, organizations need to be innovative and proactive, which point to the practice of corporate entrepreneurship (Moghaddam, et. al., 2015). Corporate entrepreneurship entails new entrepreneurial ventures or activities that occur within the confines of an existing organisation. It is about starting new ventures, products or services within a corporate firm. In this case, the team of employees within organization is given freedom to come up with ideas about new products or to improve an

existing products or services or to start a new venture within the organization. It implies that corporate entrepreneurship makes use of employees in the organization. Employees are usually encouraged to participate in value creation by creating an understanding of the importance of innovation within the organization, which implies that all employees have the potential to contribute to organizational innovativeness and corporate entrepreneurship performance.

Involving as many employees as possible means that different perspectives can be incorporated into the organization value and different professional and social backgrounds can lead to the creation of new, unique ideas, that would have been inconceivable otherwise, which invariably have the potential to lead to better corporate performance. To motivate and sustain sound employees' engagement in promoting corporate entrepreneurship activities, there is need to have in place an attractive reward philosophy, which can greatly increase the quality of employee innovation output.

Organization's reward philosophy should be primarily design to potentially attract a quality work force, maintain the satisfaction of existing employees, keep quality employees from leaving and motivate them in the workplace. For organization that seeks better corporate entrepreneurship performance, it is therefore essential to find means of keeping employees happy at work. It should be noted that performance of corporate entrepreneurship is determined by a wide set of sociological, psychological, and business management factors (Ruiz, Ribeiro & Coduras, 2016). Monsen, et al. (2007) postulate that while a fair amount about what motivates an entrepreneur to start a new independent business is known, we know relatively little about what motivates individual employees to act entrepreneurially on behalf of their corporate organization. Against this background, this study aims to determine the impact of reward philosophy reward philosophy on corporate entrepreneurship performance. The study contributes to the existing empirical literature because the data collected allows us to test whether or not reward philosophy would significantly influence corporate entrepreneurship performance in the Nigerian business context, providing an opportunity to create practicable knowledge that may benefit practitioners and academics alike. This is imperative because despite many studies that have been undertaken in corporate entrepreneurship, there has been very little empirical research that directly examines the impact that reward philosophy has on corporate entrepreneurship performance in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate Entrepreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship (CE) refers to a process that goes on inside an existing firm, regardless of its size, and leads to new business ventures, other innovative activities and orientations such as development of new products, services, technologies, administrative techniques, strategies, and competitive postures (Antoncic, 2001). The primary focus of CE is performance, which can be characterised by the company size (turnover, added value, market share, and volume), profitability of the company, the value of the company (shareholder value), competitive position, product quality and customer service (Zahra and Garvis, 2000).

Corporate entrepreneurship has been acknowledged as a valuable organizational resource that can give business organizations competitive edges over competitors (Pratono and Mahmood, 2015). Organisations that pursue CE strategies are likely to exhibit a set of entrepreneurial activities at the top, middle and lower levels of management, with managers at the different levels sharing joint responsibility for their organisations' entrepreneurial activities (Hornsby et al., 2009). The combination of knowledge, skills and judgments of interested and committed employees and managers ensures the success of CE initiatives and performance (Allen, Lucero & Van Norman, 1997). Encouraging risk-taking and innovative behaviours must be consistent with individualised performance assessment and compensation (Kuratko, Morris & Covin, 2011). However, Allen et al. (1997) suggest that organisations should not encourage people to participate in CE programmes unless their involvement meets their intrinsic needs and interests. If employees cannot see a clear link between effort and performance, and between performance and reward, they may remain unwilling to participate in CE initiatives (Kuratko et al., 2011).

Corporate entrepreneurial activities contribute significantly to superior business performance (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001), and is therefore could be considered as a source of competitive advantage and growth strategies. It could rejuvenate and ensures continued existence of an organization (Otachea and Mahmood, 2015). According to Echols and Neck (1998), CE means applying entrepreneurial behavior in a stable organization. Companies that embrace CE tend toward competitive advantage than those that do not (Antoncic & Hisrich 2001). Moghaddam, et. al., (2015) asserted that innovation and organizational performance are key outputs of CE and the most important element of success in business competition. Otachea and Mahmood (2015) stressed that the expanded scope of competition, which is creating a lot of challenges for business organizations and managers, make it becomes vital for business organizations to exhibit entrepreneurial behaviour and develop supportive organizational culture so as to survive, gain a competitive advantage over competitors, and achieve superior performance. This is obvious because corporate entrepreneurship, which is entrepreneurial activities within existing business organizations are a source of vitality and competitive advantage, which lead to superior business performance (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2004; Mohamad, Ramayah, & Puspowersito, 2011).

Zahra and Garvis (2000) defines CE as the sum of a company's venturing and innovation activities, which can help the firm acquire new capabilities, improve its performance, enter new business and develop new revenue streams in both domestic and foreign markets. Adapting Kaufmann and Dant (1998) definition of entrepreneurship, this current study view CE as the process of maximizing profit from new, unique and valuable combinations of resources within an existing organization, in an uncertain and ambiguous environment. It is the purposeful activity to initiate, maintain and develop a profit-oriented business within an existing organization. It may be presumed that organizations that engage in CE would outperform those that do not.

Reward Philosophy

Reward philosophy is acknowledged as valuable mechanism to transform entrepreneurial resources into firm performance (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). In the context of entrepreneur approach, reward philosophy allows employee compensation to lay emphasis on innovation (Bradley, Wiklund, & Shepherd, 2011), and organizations would gain remarkable profits when appropriate reward philosophy is in place (Zhou, et. al., 2009). Nazir1, Shah and Zaman (2012) states that the effectiveness

of the reward systems being used depends upon the circumstances in which they are being used and there is no one best possible way of making them effective.

Reward philosophy is one of the most critical issues for competitive advantage of the firm, because it primarily lays emphasis on innovation. Organisations are increasingly taking a more serious approach to reward philosophy (Nazir1, et. al., 2012). In an increasingly volatile talent market, where some skills are in short supply, organizations must put in place a reward philosophy that would not only attract best talents but that will keep on motivating and sustaining employees towards attainment of organisational goals and objections. Firms provide greater reward for innovative employees, which becomes direction of strategic of the firm (Puranam, Alexy, &Reitzig, 2013).

Rewards philosophy is a primary means of generating desired performance in the employees, value oriented behaviour, productivity and motivations up to the levels essential for a company's success (Nazir1, et. al., 2012). However, we argue that reward philosophy that would stimulates better corporate entrepreneurship performance must corresponded to work ethic and expectations of employees, and must depicts the importance of relationship between what the employees would perceived as fair reward and relative performance.

It is quite importance to equally communicate the elements of the reward philosophy to employees. High performing organizations clearly articulate their compensation philosophy (Amstrong, 2009). This is because there is added value in communicating explicitly to the employees the total compensation package including the non-monetary rewards. Thus, organisations must put in place a sound reward philosophy statement, with the primary intention of increasing awareness among employees about the real value and significant of the company's pursuits. Rewards philosophy statement refers to the statement indicating all the organizational reward tools; monetary and nonmonetary, available for the organization to use to help attract, motivate and retain employees (Amstrong, 2009). It specifies what an organization provides to employees in exchange for their time, talents, efforts and the results to be achieved with it. Its elements may include programs, policies, and other elements that collectively define the organisation's strategy to demonstrate how important employees are to the ongoing success of the organization. It was asserted that firms with a greater reward philosophy tend to set compensation with strong intention to promote innovativeness (Bradley, Wiklund, & Shepherd, 2011). Therefore, we affirmed that sound reward philosophy statement and equitable compensation practices facilitate employees to be more engaged and productive and to significantly contribute to corporate entrepreneurial performance and organisation's outcomes and value.

However, while rewards are important in corporate entrepreneurship, only very few studies have address the empirical impact of reward philosophy on corporate entrepreneurship performance, particularly from African perspectives. Although employees' creativity is a precursor for organisation's innovation and entrepreneurship, little is known about how reward philosophy may increase employees' motivation to implement creative ideas including new venture development (Nazir1, et. al., 2012).

Reward philosophy has been identified in literatures as critical dimensions of CE activity (Monsen, Saxton and Patzelt, 2007). Common survey measures, such as the Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessment Inventory (Hornsby, Kuratko, &

Zahra, 2002) and Entrepreneurial Management (Brown, Davidsson, & Wiklund, 2001) respectively include reward philosophy as a factor influencing corporate entrepreneurship performance. It could be argued that the prospect of higher reward would be a prime motivator for employees' participation in CE activities (Fehr & Schmidt, 2007). On this note, Urban & Nikolov (2013) argued that future applications of CE participation need to concern themselves with the perception of managers and employees about reward and risk attributes that precipitate CE activities; and the characteristics of people who are likely to influence decisions to participate in CE activities. In studies related to entrepreneurship, the question that what is the necessity of corporate entrepreneurship and how it is possible to institutionalize it in organizations is usually proposed (Pratono and Mahmood, 2015). Therefore, conducting a survey about the impact of reward philosophy on corporate entrepreneurship performance has much importance in the context of the Nigerian business environment.

Sustainable Development

According to Barbier (1987), the adjective "sustainable" is sometimes used instead of "successful". For instance: "for economic development to be truly 'sustainable' requires 'tailoring' the design and implementation of projects to the needs and capabilities of people who are supposed to benefit from them".

Development is not purely an economic phenomenon but rather a multi-dimensional process involving reorganization and reorientation of entire economic AND social system. Development is the process of improving the quality of all human lives (Todaro, 1981).

From the views of Barbier (1987) and Todaro (1981), sustainable development must be people-oriented programmes aimed at transforming the economic and social lives of the beneficiaries. Hence, since the engine of growth and development of any nation resides in small and medium scale enterprises, if the people that are charged with the responsibility of production in food and beverage industry are adequately rewarded, and there is a reward philosophy in an organization, it will contribute significantly to corporate entrepreneurship performance.

Theoretical Review

The theories review in relation to this study includes agency theory, expectancy theory and equity theory. These theories provide theoretical view points for the study.

Agency Theory

The agency theory states that the manager acting as the principal must have a contracting scheme that could help align the interests of employees acting as agents with that of the organisation's interests. The central focus of agency theory is on how reward could be used to align the various interests and goals of the organization's stakeholders (Carrasco-Hernandez & Sanchez-Marin, 2007). This becomes necessary because of the divergent interests between the organisation management and that of the employees which could lead to agency costs (Tangthong, 2014). Many studies adapt agency theory for theoretical framework, in order to characterised the compensation processes in organisations (Gomez-Mejia, Larraza & Makri, 2003). Thompson (2002) states that the agency theory has become the most important framework informing the design of executive

compensation reward schemes, but the general principles can be applied to any situation in which delegation of decision-making occurs, and is therefore relevant to the design of reward systems in general.

Expectancy Theory

Expectancy theory concentrates on the expectations which employees bring with them to work place and the context and manner in which these expectations are satisfied (Vroom, 1964). According to expectancy theory, employees' motivation is the product of valence, instrumentality and expectancy (Vroom, 1964). The expectancy theory has motivation as a function of two other factors, which are expectancy and valence (Tangthong, 2014). Expectancy is the perceived link between effort and performance. Valence is the expected value of outcomes (Vroom, 1964). Compensation systems vary according to their impact on these two factors. In relation to expectancy, pay systems differ most in their impact on the perceived link between behaviours and pay, whereas the valence of pay outcomes remain the same under different pay systems (Perkins & White, 2008; Tangthong, 2014). The underlying assumption of the theory is that 'appropriate levels of effort and productivity, will only be extended if employees expectations are fulfilled' (Muguongo, et al., 2015). The theory holds that employees would put in greater work effort if they have reason to expect that it will result in a reward that is valuable (Tangthong, 2014; Muguongo, et al., 2015). Expectancy theory provides a sound theoretical basis for this study because it establishes a link between rewards and employees' work performance (Muguongo, et al., 2015). It could be inferred that employees have expectations that need to be fulfilled by the organisation in response to their contributions to corporate entrepreneurship performance.

Equity Theory

Equity theory as propounded by Adams (1965) explains that once an individual has chosen an action that is expected to satisfy his or her needs, the individual assesses the equity or fairness of the outcome (Adams, 1965). Three attitudes are possible; an individual may feel equitably rewarded, under rewarded, or over rewarded. When individuals feel under rewarded or over rewarded, they will do something to reduce the inequity. The theory probably came as a result of continuous agitation for fair and equitable wages for all workers could be seen from two perspectives, which suggests that people evaluate the fairness of their situations by comparing them with those of other people (Odunlade, 2012; Gogia, 2010). The theory explains the perceptions of employees in respect of what they contribute to the organization, what they get in return and how their contribution-return ratio compares to others inside and outside the organization affect their performance. This will determine how employees perceive fairness in relation to their contributions to the organization. Any perceptions of inequity will cause employees to take actions and restore equity (Tangthong, 2010; Redmond, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact that reward philosophy has on corporate entrepreneurship performance. The study is exploratory in nature which made use of the survey design to investigate whether the independent variable (reward philosophy) have significant influence on the dependent variable (corporate entrepreneurship performance). The survey research method was considered appropriate for the study because it is suitable in measuring respondents' opinions

and attitudes towards reward philosophy and corporate entrepreneurship performance. The targeted population for the study comprises of the staff of selected Food and Beverages Industry located in Southwest Nigeria. The food and beverage companies selected were those that fall among the top 20 companies with the highest market value quoted in the Nigerian Stock Exchange (Nigeria Bulletin, 2017). The selected companies, with their respective staff strength and market value are shown in table 1 below:

Table 1: Staff Strength and Market Value of Selected Food and Beverages Companies

Companies	Staff Strengths	Market Value ₦Billion
Cadbury Nigeria Plc.	1,797	150.3
Flour Mills Nigeria Plc. (Honeywell Flour Mills)	880	186.1
Unilever Nigeria Plc.	944	204.3
Guinness Nigeria Plc.	1,433	301.8
Nestle Plc.	2,294	911.6
Nigeria Breweries	3,195	1,300.7
Total	10,543	3054.8 Billion NGN

Source: Pre-field Survey, 2018

Respondents from particular company differed in their hierarchical and functional positions. This approach was used to capture employee viewpoints across a variety of management and employee grades, as well as across different teams and departments. This offered a broad insight and scope necessary to generate findings from across many levels of the organizations as it exists within this sample set. In selecting the sample size and securing representative responses, Krejcie and Morgan sample size formula was employed. The formula was given as:

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

Where, n=sample size; X²= Chi-square table value @ d.f = 1for 0.05 level of confidence; (X²= 3.84); N= Population size (10, 543); P = Population proportion (assumed to be 0.5) and d= degree of accuracy (usually expressed as 5%)

$$\text{Thus, } n = \frac{(3.84)(10.543)(0.5)(1 - 0.5)}{(0.05)^2 (10.543 - 1) + (3.84)(0.5)(1 - 0.5)}$$

n= 371

Simple random sampling technique was employed in selecting the participants from the selected companies, to enable each staff of having equal chance of being selected. Primary data were sourced for the study through questionnaire, which was structured to focus on questions related to reward philosophy and corporate entrepreneurship performance. Likert rating scale of five points which range from strongly agreed (5 points) to strongly disagree (1) was constructed to enable the respondents give their opinions to items in the questionnaire. The data generated were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis, with the aid of SPSS Statistics 19.0.

The variables adopted for the study are mathematically expressed as:

$$\text{COEP} = f[\text{RewPh (Sa, Recg, PrOp, LeaBo)}]$$

$$COEP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Sa_{it} + \beta_2 Recg_{it} + \beta_3 PrOp_{it} + \beta_4 Alw_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$$

Where:

CoEp= Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance(market value of the company)

RewPh =Reward Philosophy

Sa= Salary

Recg=Recognition

PrOp = Promotion Opportunity

Alw= Allowances

β_0 = Intercept of the model.

β_1 = Estimate of the parameter of the independent variable in the model of the slope.

ϵ = Error term.

Findings and Discussions

The data gathered from the field were analysed to test whether or not reward philosophy has impact on corporate entrepreneurship performance using multiple regression analysis with the aid of SPSS 20.0. The responses to the questionnaires administered (appendix 1) revealed that a total of three hundred and seventy one copies of questionnaire were administered out of which three hundred and thirty eight copies of the questionnaire representing 91.10% were returned and considered fit for the study. This implies that majority of the respondents positively responded to the questionnaire, making it relevant for the study. The study uses four explanatory variables (Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw] for the purpose of predicting corporate entrepreneurship performance [CoEp] for sustainability of the food and beverage industry. The regression results to examine whether or not reward philosophy has impact on corporate entrepreneurship performance were presented in table 2.1-2.3.

Table 2.1 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.874 ^a	.763	.760	.591

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alw, Sa, PrOp, Recg

Source: SPSS Printout, 2018

The model summary depicted in table 2.1 depicts that reward philosophy has significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship performance. The multiple correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.874 (87.4%) indicates a significant and strong relationship between reward philosophy, proxied by components of Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw] and corporate entrepreneurship performance. This means that the cumulative effect of the independent variables (Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw]) combined together is able to explain the dependent variable (Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance [CoEp]) up to 0.874 (87.4%). The R-square value of 0.763 (76.3%) signifies that the independent variables (Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg],

Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw]) have a combine effect of 0.763 (76.3%) on the dependent variable (Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance [CoEp]) in the selected companies. The adjusted R² explains the actual effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The adjusted R² value of 0.760 (76.0%) depicts that reward philosophy in relation to Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw] [independent variables] actually contribute to variation in the level of Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance [CoEp]). Hence, allowance to employees, salary, promotion opportunity and recognition can all serve as a fillip for corporate entrepreneurship which can have a salutary effect on sustainable development. This is good enough in determining the goodness of fit for the model (regression equation). The regression model proved to be very useful for making predictions since the value of R² is close to 1

Table 2.2 ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	374.553	4	93.638	268.465	.000 ^b
	Residual	116.148	333	.349		
	Total	490.701	337			

a. Dependent Variable: CoEp

b. Predictors: (Constant), Alw, Sa, PrOp, Recg

Source: SPSS Printout, 2018

Table 2.2 revealed that the calculated P-value is 0.000 (positive) is less than the tabulated P-value of 0.05 at 95% level of confidence. The F-statistic value of 268.465 indicates that the model of the study is well fitted. This indicates that reward philosophy has significant impact on Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance and that the model is statistically significant.

Table 2.3 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.501	.094		15.965	.000
	Sa	.059	.055	.067	1.065	.002
	Recg	.726	.115	.873	6.326	.000
	PrOp	.054	.101	.064	.533	.000
	Alw	.002	.028	.003	.081	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CoEp

Source: SPSS Printout, 2018

The estimated equation of the model is expressed as $COEP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Sa_{it} + \beta_2 Recg_{it} + \beta_3 PrOp_{it} + \beta_4 Alw_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$

As shown in table 2.3, Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance would be equal to 1.501 when all other variables are held to zero. However, it would increase by 0.059, 0.726, 0.054 and 0.002 when there is a unit increase in Salary [Sa], Recognition [Recg], Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] and Allowance [Alw], while other variables remain constant. As depicted in the table, the beta coefficient in respect to Salary [Sa] is 0.059 with t-test value of 1.065 at 5% level of significant. This signifies that salary as a component of reward philosophy is a positive predictor of Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance. The beta coefficient in respect to Recognition [Recg] is 0.726, with t-test value of 6.326 at 5% level of significant. This means that recognition is significantly relevant in predicting Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance. The beta coefficient in respect to Promotion Opportunity [PrOP] depicts that the beta coefficient is 0.054, with t-test value of .533 at 5% level of significant. This indicates that promotion opportunity is also a positive predictor of Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance. The beta coefficient of Allowance [Alw] is 0.002, with t-test value of .081 at 5% significant level. This signifies that allowance is statistically significant to determine corporate entrepreneurship performance. The summary of the regression analysis results indicate that the calculated p-values is less than the critical/tabulated p-values of 0.05, therefore it could be established that reward philosophy in respect to salary, recognition, promotion opportunity and allowance has significant impact on effect on corporate entrepreneurship performance.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to examine whether or not reward philosophy has significant impact on corporate entrepreneurship performance for sustainable development. Reward is one of the major issues of human resource management, because it plays key roles in both the organizational life and the personal lives of the employees working in the organization. It therefore follows that any organization that fails to recognize the importance of reward would usually face severe consequences of such a failure in terms of strikes, lockouts, sit-in, etc that characterize labour union action. The result of the findings indicated that organization reward philosophy have significant impact on the corporate entrepreneurship performance. The four reward components as specified in the model were found to explain significant proportion in the level of corporate entrepreneurship performance. From findings, the study concludes that reward philosophy, as measured by salary, recognition, promotion opportunity and allowance have significant impact on corporate entrepreneurship performance. This implies that organizations that put in place and practice sound reward philosophy of recognition of employees' performance, salary system, promotion opportunity particularly chance for advancement and allowance might outperform those that do not. Therefore, it is recommended that management should communicate in clear terms to employees, the basic reward philosophies and recognized their performance, since recognition ranked higher than other variables of reward philosophy.

REFERENCES

- Achua, J. (2008), "Corporate Social Responsibility in Nigerian Banking System", <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1663068&show=abstract>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67: 422-436.
- Adeoye, A. O., Elegunde, A. F., Tijani, A. A. & Oyedele, O. O. (2012) Salary and wages and employee motivation in Nigeria service industry. *Scottish Journal of Arts, Social Sciences and Scientific Studies*, 2(2): 89 – 98.
- Allen, R. E., Lucero, M. A., & Van Norman, K. L., (1997). An Examination of the Individual's Decision to Participate in an Employee Involvement Program. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(1), 117-143.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495-527.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 10(1), 7-24.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2004). Corporate entrepreneurship contingencies and organizational wealth creation. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(6), 518–550.
- Antoncic, B., (2001). Organizational processes in intrapreneurship: a conceptual integration.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (11thed.). London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Barbier, E. B. (1987). The concept of sustainable economic development. *Environmental Conservation*, 14(2): 101-110.
- Bradley, S, Wiklund, J, & Shepherd, D. (2011). Swinging a double-edged sword: the effect of slack on entrepreneurial management and growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(5): 537–554.
- Brown, T.H, Davidsson, P., & Wiklund, J., (2001). An operationlization of Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurship as opportunity-based firm behavior. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 953–968.
- Carrasco-Hernandez, A. & Sanchez-Marin, G. (2007). The Determinants of employee compensation in family firms: Empirical Evidence. *Family Business Review*, 20: 215-232
- Crossman, A., & Abou-Zaki, B. (2003). Job satisfaction and employees' performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(3): 368-376
- Echols, E.A. and Neck, P.C. (1998). The impact of behaviors and structure on corporate entrepreneurial success. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 13, 38-46.
- Emmanuel, E. Y. (2014). Exploratory analysis of compensation and employee job's satisfaction. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(12): 15-31
- Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K.M. (2007). Adding a stick to the carrot? The interaction of bonuses and fines. *American Economic Review*, 97, 177–181.
- Gogia, P., (2010). *Equity theory of motivation*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessihub.com/equity-theory-of-motivation>

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Larraza, M. & Makri, M. (2003). The determination of CEO compensation in family controlled public corporations. *Academic of management journal*, 46: 226-237

Harvey, D., (2009). *Talent Strategy is Vital*. Personnel Today, June 23, 13.

Holbeche, L. (2009). *Aligning Human Resources and Business Strategy*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Elsevier.

Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F. Shepherd, D.A. & Bott, J.P., (2009). Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions: Examining perception and position. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3), 236-247.

Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F., and Zahra. S.A., (2002). Middle managers perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(3), 253–273.

Journal of Enterprising Culture, 9(2), 221-235.

Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S., & Covin, J.G. (2014). Diagnosis a firms internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons*, 57, 37-47.

Kuratko, D.F., Morris, M.H., & Covin, J.C. (2011). *Corporate Innovation and entrepreneurship*. (3rd Edition). South Western. Canada. PMID:21430120

Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G., (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: the moderating role of environment and life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429 – 451.

Milan, J. M.; Hessels, J., Jolanda, T. R. & Aguado, R. (2011). *Determinants of job satisfaction across the EU-15: A comparison of self-employed and paid employees*. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper.

Moghaddam, J. Y., Khorakian, A. and Maharati, Y., (2015). Organizational entrepreneurship and its impact on the performance of governmental organizations in the city of Mashhad. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 169, 75 – 87

Mohamad, O., Ramayah, T., & Puspowarsito, H. (2011). Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: The role of business environment as a moderator. *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, X(3), 7–27.

Monsen, E. W., Saxton, T. and Patzelt, H. (2007). Motivation and Participation in corporate entrepreneurship: the moderating effects of risk, effort, and reward. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 27(21), 1-15

Muguongo, M., Muguna, A. T. & Muriithi, D. K. (2015). Effects of compensation on job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Maara Sub-County of TharakaNithi County, Kenya, *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(6):47-59.

Nazir, T., Shah, F. H., and Zaman, K. (2012). Literature review on total rewards: An international perspective. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(8), 3046-3058.

Odunlade, R. O. (2012). *Managing employee compensation and benefits for job satisfaction in libraries and information centres in Nigeria*. Available <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/>

Onyishi, I.E., & Ogbodo, E. (2012). The contributions of self-efficacy and perceived organizational support when taking charge at work. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 38(1), 1–11.

- Otachea, I. and Mahmood, R., (2015). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Business Performance: The Role of External Environment and Organizational Culture: A Proposed Framework. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4; SE), 524-531
- Perkins, S. J. & White, G. (2008). *Reward management, alternatives, consequences and context* (2nd Ed.). London: CIPD
- Pratono, A. H. and Mahmood, R. J. (2015). Mediating effect of marketing capability and reward philosophy in the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship*, 5(5), 1-12
- Puranam, P, Alexy, O, & Reitzig, M. (2013). What's "new" about new forms of organizing? *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2), 162–180
- Redmond, B. F. (2010). *Lesson 5: equity theory: Is what I get from work fair compared to others? Work attitude and motivation*. The Pennsylvania State University World Campus
- Ruiz, J., Ribeiro, M. J. & Coduras, A., (2016). Measuring readiness for entrepreneurship: An information tool proposal. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 1, 99–108
- Tangthong, S. (2014). A causal model of compensation and benefits and reward management on organizational effectiveness of MNCs. *Asian journal of management research*, 5(1):44-65
- Thompson, P. (2002). *Total Reward*. London: CIPD
- Todaro, M.P. (1981). *Economic Development in the Third World* (2nd ed). Longman.
- Urbano, D., & Turró, D. (2013). Conditioning factors for corporate entrepreneurship: an in(ex)ternal approach, *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, DOI 10.1007/s11365-013-0261-8
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley
- Wonglimpiyarat, J. (2005). *Strategies of competition in the bank card business: Innovation management in a complex economic environment*. Sussex Academic Press.
- Zahra, S.A. & Garvis, D.M., (2000). 'International Corporate Entrepreneurship and Firm Performance: The Moderating Effect of International Environmental Hstility. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 469-492.
- Zhou, J., Qian, X., Henan, Q. & Lei, X. (2009). Total reward strategy: A human resources management strategy going with the trend of the times. *International journal of business and management*, 4(11): 73-97

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Johnson Olabode Adeoti, Associate Professor of Business, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Isiaka Sulu Babaita, Associate Professor of Business, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Lawal Isola Adedoyin, Lecturer I, Department of Business Administration, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Yinusa Alabi Olawale, Lecturer II, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Emmanuel Adewale Adeye, Ph.D. Student, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Appendix 1

Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire

Description	Frequency	Percentage
Administered	351	100
Returned	338	96.30
Not Returned	13	3.70

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Instructions: For each of the following statements in this section, indicate to what degree you agree. Please indicate your answer using the following 5-point scale: SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; NU=Neutral; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree

S/N	STATEMENT	SA	A	NU	D	SD
	Items Related to Corporate Entrepreneurship Performance					
1	Management usually loud the motion “being the highest market share value company in the industry”					
2	Management allows employees to act freely and able to explore new ideas that can create competitive advantage					
3	The direction toward growth is high in this company					
4	In dealing with its competition, my organization has a strong tendency to be ahead of other competitors in introducing novel idea or products					
5	The creation of innovative ideas by employees is a regular occurrence in my company					
	Items Related to Reward Philosophy					
6	The company’s reward philosophy is clear to me					
7	To make reward decisions, management collects information from employees					
8	The management provides the incentives required to undertake innovative projects					
9	The company rewards employees who take calculated risks and innovation					
10	The value of the company’s reward philosophy is fair with work schedule and work done					
	COMPONENTS OF REWARD					
	A: Items Related to Salary as a Component of Reward:					
i)	Salary of the company constitute a good rate for the job done by employee					
ii)	My company clarifies salary decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees					
iii)	The company’s salary package is fair with different level of workers					
	A: Items Related to Recognition as a Component of Reward:					
i)	The management recognizes and gives award to employees based on the value they add to the organization					
ii)	In my organization, employees are given recognition for taking calculated risks with new ideas and innovations					
iii)	The company is eager to use improved work methods developed by employees					
iv)	Employees with good ideas are given resources to develop those ideas					
	Items Related to Promotion Opportunity asa Component of Reward:					
i)	I am happy about the chances for advancement in the company.					
ii)	I seek to be promoted in the company					
iii)	A promotion usually follows for the development of innovative ideas by employee					
	Items Related to Allowances asa Component of Reward:					
i)	The company gives good allowances in recognition of good idea contributed by an employee					
ii)	I can produce extra unit beyond target without extra allowance					
iii)	Basic allowance of the company provide good motivation for employee’s effectiveness					
iv)	I receive allowance whenever I achieved the target set by the company					

Thanks for your cooperation