

ANALYSIS OF FACTORS THAT MOTIVATE INTRAPRENEURIAL INTENTION OF EMPLOYEES IN FAST FOOD FIRMS

GUNU, UMAR (Ph. D.)¹

TSADO, EMMANUEL (Ph. D.)²

¹Professor, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Ilorin, E-mail: umargunu@gmail.com Phone: +2348055912617

² Department of Human Resources, Central Bank of Nigeria, Abuja - Nigeria,
E-mail: nueltsado@yahoo.com Phone: +2348072521901

Abstract

Scholars in the field of entrepreneurship have long emphasized the role of motivation in determining intrapreneurial intention. However, most of them focused on personality approach and have treated motivation as a unitary concept. Therefore this study was designed to examine the effect of different types of motivation as explained by Self Determination Theory (SDT) on intrapreneurial intention of employees in selected fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis. Primary data were obtained through the use of questionnaire. Simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 169 respondents. Binary logistic regression analysis was used to analyse the data. The results of the test of hypotheses indicated that only external regulation has significant effect on intrapreneurial intention (p value = .019). The study therefore, concluded that employees in fast food firms are not adequately motivated towards having intrapreneurial intention. The study also recommended that fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis should provide work environment that will grant employees better intrinsic and extrinsic reward in order to boost their intrapreneurial intentions.

Key words: Determination; Extrinsic; Intrinsic; Motivation; Reward

Introduction

Globalisation, competition, rapid technological changes and economic recession are among the major challenges confronting business organisations in the present century (Dierkes, Hofmann & Marz, 1998; Dollinger, 2008; Maier & Pop Zenovia, 2011; McMahon, Barkhuizen & Schutte, 2014). As a result, business organisations are striving for relevance in order to gain competitive advantage and remain profitable. However, one of the important tools that can be used in addressing these challenges by business organisation is intrapreneurship (Klippel, Petter & Antunes Jr. in Leyerer, 2012).

However, from the perspective of behavioural theory, intrapreneurial intention is largely influenced by personal motivations (i.e it is an internal disposition), which is a result of some factors within both the organisation and the general environment (Bandura, 1989). Similarly, according to Ajzen (1991), human intention is determined by an individual's attitude such as beliefs and values about the outcome of the behaviour, which also depends on perceived desirability of the outcome. This outcome of action as explained by motivational theories (SDT) could be in terms of either extrinsic, intrinsic result or de-motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Although, monetary reward is presupposed by research to be a strong motivator for the potential intrapreneur, this claim has resulted in confusing findings regarding the motivation of innovation behaviour among employees. Many literatures have argued that intrapreneurs desire both monetary (extrinsic) and nonmonetary (intrinsic) compensation (Aamo, 2005). But the question of which motivation factor (extrinsic or intrinsic) plays an important role in determining intrapreneurial intention is relative to country and culture (Robbins & Judge, 2008).

In addition, many early and contemporary theories of motivation (such as Maslow, 1948) have treated motivation primarily as a unitary concept by focusing on the overall amount of motivation that people have for particular behaviours or activities (Deci & Ryan, 2008). While some others focused mainly on personality and non-psychological factors as motivation regarding entrepreneurial intention. Hence, generally, there is knowledge gap regarding what employees find as motivating regarding participation in innovation in an organisation.

In Nigeria, fast food firms are springing up every day, despite the dwindling situation of the country's economy. As a result, competition among fast food firms is on the increase. The firms have to compete among themselves, with local restaurants, confectionaries firms (bakeries), and even with the multinational companies that offer close substitutes to their products. Thus, it has become necessary for them to continuously seek for innovations in all aspects.

However, giving the Nigerian socio – cultural situation, it is not certain which of the motivational factors: extrinsic, intrinsic or de-motivation would lead to employees having interest in intrapreneurial activities. Furthermore, giving the nature of the fast food firms in Nigeria where there are no opportunities for carrier advancement, it is not certain whether or not employees in this

type of firms will have intrapreneurial intention. In addition, most people work for money in Nigeria, and generally they want rapid progress in their carrier (promotions) – perhaps in order to meet their basic needs. Most people also take jobs – such as working for a single private firm as not having job security, as a result they consider it as a casual job pending when they will get government job. On the side of the employers, most private organisations in Nigeria especially firms like fast food firms do not pay their employees well, and they do not give much freedom or autonomy regarding their duties. Thus, they usually employ cheap labour - people with low level of education.

As a result, most employees may not be willing to participate in the intrapreneurial processes. Therefore, there exist a vacuum of knowledge as to whether or not employees in this type of firm in Nigeria have intrapreneurial intention, and if they have, the relationship between the motivating factors: extrinsic (integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation and identified regulation), intrinsic and de-motivation, and their interest in intrapreneurship remain unknown. Thus, the study was designed to fill this gap. The study was concerned with the following basic research questions:

- i. What effect does intrinsic motivation have on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis?
- ii. Which of the extrinsic motivation variables influence intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis?
- iii. What is the effect of de – motivation on intrapreneurial Intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis?

Objective(s) of the Study:

The main objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between motivating factors and intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis in Nigeria. Specific objectives include to:

- i. examine relationship between intrinsic motivation and intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis;
- ii. investigate the relationship between extrinsic motivations (integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation and identified

- regulation) and intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis; and
- iii. assess the relationship between intrapreneurial intention and de – motivation of employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarifications/Framework: *Intrapreneurship, Motivation and Intrapreneurial Intention*

Intrapreneurship

Intrapreneurship is an emerging area in the field of entrepreneurship. Thus, like its mother field, the ambiguity of the various concepts and constructs used to describe intrapreneurship has continued to thwart attempts to clearly give it a conceptual definition (Davis, 2006; Belousova, Gailly & Basso, 2010). Intrapreneurship is also referred to as '*Corporate Entrepreneurship*' (Antoncic, & Hisrich, 2001; Davis, 2006; Belousova et al., 2010) or Intra-Corporate Entrepreneurship (Schollhamer in Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001) or Internal Corporate Entrepreneurship (Jones & Butler, 1992).

A scan of existing literatures indicates that the concept of intrapreneurship is defined along two major dimensions: organisation characteristics and the human characteristics. While some authors (Sathe, 2003; Burgelman, 1983; Guth & Ginsberge, 1990) define it based on single dimension, some (Wolcott & Lippitz, 2007) defined it based on the two dimensions. Those authors that defined intrapreneurship based on organisational characteristics frequently used different terms such as birth of a new business (Schendel, 1990), corporate renewal or rebirth or organisational transformation (Guth & Ginsberge, 1990), diversification (Burgelman, 1983) and new product development (Schollhamer, in Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001).

According to Sathe (2003) intrapreneurship is as an effort by an organization to generate new business. Similarly, Bulgerman (cited in Adonisi, 2003) describes it as a process whereby firms seek diversification through internal development. Kuratkto, et al. (2005) in their view describe intrapreneurship as a process of re-energising and enhancing the organisation's ability to develop the skills through which innovations can take place.

On the other hand, those authors that defined intrapreneurship through human characteristics focused on individuals and groups or teams. For example, Wolcott and Lippitz (2007) define intrapreneurship as 'the process by which teams within an established company conceive, foster, launch and manage a new business that is distinct from the parent company but leverage the parent's assets, market position, capabilities or other resources'.

Although various dimensions have been included by the authors to articulate the concept of intrapreneurship as presented above, Lau, Chan, Tai and Ng (2010) posit that 'innovation' and 'creativity' remain the central idea in most of these definitions. Charlotte (2008) also argues that intrapreneurship is not a one dimensional concept, but rather a complex concept with dimensions including individual as well as organisational characteristics. Belousova et al. (2010) further note that this diversity of dimensions in defining intrapreneurship has brought confusion about the level of entrepreneurial initiatives within organisations.

Motivation

Research has achieved considerable success in the development of the concept of motivation. According to Bhadoriya and Chauhan (2013), motivation can be seen as a set of reasons such as needs or expectations that determines a person's willingness to engage in a particular behaviour. These reasons have been described in Tella, Oyenl and Popoola (2007) as a form of physiological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive which is goal – incentive oriented.

Motivation requires a force either internal or external that can cause or move a person to do something. These external and internal forces in a work and other context are being described as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In broader terms, motivation generates the mental effort that drives individuals to apply their knowledge and skills (Clark, 2003), and remains the singular reason why people would want to do something or why they do things of their interest. It spurs one to convert intention into action and start doing something new.

Motivation has been widely studied across the field of organizational behaviour – especially in relation to employees' performance at work, job satisfaction, job commitment and intentions (turnover and intrapreneurial) (see for example the work of Bhadoriya & Chauhan, 2013; Edrak, Yin-Fah,

Gharleghi & Seng, 2013; Akwara, Abutu, Akwara, & Okwelume, 2014). In most of these studies, the aims were to find ways of influencing work performance in order to contribute positively toward continuous existence of organisations.

Thus, according to Clark (cited in Clark, 2003),

motivational gaps exist in an organisation whenever people avoid starting something new, resist doing something familiar, stop doing something important and switch their attention to a less valued task, or refuse to work on a new challenge and instead use old, familiar but inadequate solutions to solve a new problem. (p. 2)

Generally, employees' motivation varies with culture of the work environment. A recent study as reported by Robbins and Judge (2008) examined employees' motivation from three different cultures – North America, Latin America and Asia. It was found out that employees in North America are motivated more by extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors. Latin American employees on the contrary are motivated more by intrinsic factors than extrinsic factors. While in Asia, employees are motivated by both extrinsic and intrinsic factors. In line with the report of Robbins and Judge (2008), Maslow (1943) in his opinion argues that in any particular culture an individual's conscious motivational content will usually be extremely different from the conscious motivational content of an individual in another society.

Regarding motivation and intrapreneurship, Ken Blanchard Companies (2008) posits that employees' motivation for innovation is not necessarily to increase tenure with the organization, or even to get rich (extrinsic reward), but rather their desire to leave a mark and to make a difference. On the contrary, existing literature has argued that creative actions will only emerge in organisation if there are possibilities of reward that is perceived more relatively desirable than familiar behaviour (Hisrich et al., 2009). However, there is a general assumption that intrinsically motivated individuals consistently display higher levels of creativity, spontaneity and concentration on task (Watanabe & Kanazawa, 2009).

Intrapreneurial motivation can be examined from two theoretical contexts: individual domain such as demographic, personal traits, psychological

characteristics, individual skills and experience and social ties and network, and organizational domain which include environmental influence and organizational factor (Fini, Grimaldi, Marzocchi & Sobero, 2009).

Intrapreneurial Intention

Literature on entrepreneurial intention has focused almost exclusively on the individual's intention to become a self-employed owner-manager of a new business venture (Lucas & Cooper, nd; Davidsson, 1995), with many directed toward students (Mazzarol, 2007) and women (Ismail, Ahmad & Yunus, 2012) entrepreneurial intention.

Although, there is no much evidence by literature and empirical investigations concerning the distinction between intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial intention, however Douglas and Fitzsimmons (nd) argue that entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship offer distinctly different benefits, cost and outcomes, and since individuals are likely to differ with respect to their attitudes toward these outcomes, it is expected that individuals will form a preference for one over the other based on their personal attitudes towards the salient outcomes.

Examining empirically the differences between intrapreneurial intention and entrepreneurial intention, Douglas and Fitzsimmons (2008) reported that while attitude towards ownership and income have positive relationship with entrepreneurial intention, they both have negative relationship with intrapreneurial intention. However, tolerance for risk has negative relationship with both entrepreneurial intention and intrapreneurial intention (Douglas & Fitzsimmons, 2008). In essence, there are no much differences between entrepreneurial intention and intrapreneurial intention. Therefore, the two terms may be used interchangeably in some cases in this study; although the main emphasis is on 'intrapreneurship' as explained in the earlier section.

Thus, entrepreneurial/ intrapreneurial intention refers to the 'motivational factors that influence individual to pursue entrepreneurial outcomes either as an independent or organizational entrepreneur' (Hisrich, Peters & Shepherd, 2009). Although intention is different from the act itself (i.e. entrepreneurial behaviour), Ajzen (1991) argues that intentions signify how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behaviour, and generally as a rule, the stronger the intention to engage in a behaviour, the more likely the act will be

performed. Generally, intention is a response to a perceived situation – a need gap, new or unsatisfied.

Theoretical Framework

Generally, the field of entrepreneurship draws on a number of theories, particularly behavioural - motivational theories. Focusing on motivation, early theories of motivation are classified into two different perspectives: Content and Process Theories.

While content theories deal with the issue of what motivates (arouses, sustains and regulates) people, and they are basically concerned with individual needs and goals. Process theories on the other hand, mainly deal with the entire process of motivation, and are concerned with how motivation occurs in individuals. In other words, how people start, sustain and direct behaviour which is aimed at the satisfaction of their needs or the reduction of inner tension. Major contributors of content theory include (see International Research Centre on Organisations (IRCO), nd): Maslow, (1943); Alderfer, (1972); Herzberg (1959); McClelland (1962), and those of process theory include (see IRCO, nd): Vroom (1964); Porter and Lawler (1968); Adams (1965); Locke (1968). The focus of process theory is on reward/incentive, drive, reinforcement and expectancy.

Process theories have been widely criticized by many scholars for being narrow. For example, Reinforcement Theory, one of the classes of process theories argues that behaviour is only caused by environment. It ignores the fact that the inner state of an individual has a role to play (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Similarly, equity theory claims that individual actions are based on the comparison of their job inputs and outcomes with those of others. However, Robbins and Judge (2008) argue that employees that only spent short time in their respective organizations may have no or little information about others to compare.

However, it is important to note that the central issue behind the two classifications of theory of motivation is 'need'- unsatisfied human needs. As argued by Robbins and Judge (2008), most employees in single firms like fast food firms usually spent short time working within their organisations, therefore their intrapreneurial intention cannot be judged based on equity theory.

Many early and contemporary theorists of motivation (such as Maslow, 1943) have treated motivation primarily as a unitary concept by focusing on the overall amount of motivation that people have for particular behaviours or activities (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Ryan and Deci (2000) in a different study argue that motivation is hardly a unitary phenomenon.

people have not only different amounts, but also different kinds of motivation. That is, they vary not only in *level* of motivation (i.e., how much motivation), but also in the orientation of that motivation (i.e., what type of motivation). (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54)

Ryan (2009) and Deci and Ryan (2008) argue through a theory they propounded called Self-Determination Theory (SDT) that extrinsic motivation is broken down into four types: integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation. In addition, there is also an 'a-motivation' or de-motivation which is characterised by a lack of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Leal, Miranda & Carmo, 2012). Therefore, based on the argument presented by SDT, human motivation is categorised into six different kinds as opposed to the earlier theories that treated motivation as a single concept.

Although the authors (Ryan, 2009 and Deci & Ryan, 2008) focus on human wellbeing (health), many authors have applied SDT in the field of motivation with respect to education (see for example Leal et al., 2012). It has also been widely discussed and applied in the field of organisational behaviour particularly intrapreneurship (see Gagne & Forest, 2011; Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier & Villeneuve, 2009). Since the present study is concerned with behaviour of employees with regards to SDT and intrapreneurial intention within an existing organisation, the following propositions were therefore made:

Ho₁: Intrinsic motivation has no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms;

Ho₂: Extrinsic motivations: integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation have no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms; and

Ho₃: De- motivation has no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms.

According to Guay, Vallerand and Blanchard, (2000) 'self-determination involves a true sense of choice, a sense of feeling free in doing what one has chosen to do'. The basic principle or assumption underlying SDT is that individual motivations differs, and is determined and driven by contexts that support psychological needs that manifest themselves in different ways.

However, it is also important to note that Ryan and Deci (2008) and Ryan (2009) did not propound a new theory per se, but they rather re – organised some of the existing theories in order to capture motivation as a multi-dimensional concept. The argument presented by this study is, giving the peculiarity of Nigerian business environment, can any of these form of motivations as contained in SDT lead an employee to have an intrapreneurial intention in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis?

Methodology

This study focused on the employees in fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis in Nigeria. However, there were five major fast food firms in Minna as at the time of this study, and these include: Mr Biggs, Land Mark Bakery, Safara Foods, Bilkeba, and Candy bite. The study selected only six top fast food firms from Abuja, which include: MR BIGGS, Gwarinpa, JAYBLINK Wuse II, Chicken Republic Wuse II, KILMANJARO, Gwarimpa 3rd Avenue, MAMA'S POT, Garki 2, and DRUMS STICK, Gwarimpa. The choice of Abuja and Minna was based on geographical location – the two cities are in the same north central area of Nigeria and share boundaries. Thus, the fast food firms in these cities may have similar culture. The organisational scope covered all the employees in the respective units of these organisations – operations/production, sales/marketing, account/finance, customer care and other units.

This study adopted a survey research design, therefore it made use of primary data which were obtained through the administration of questionnaire. The population of the study was 294 employees of the selected fast food firms. The sample size of the study was calculated to be 169 using Rakesh (2013) formula for estimating sample size:

$$SS = PS / [1 + (PS \times PE^2)]$$

Where SS = Sample size

PS = Population size

P_E = Precision of error (0.05)

Furthermore, respondents were selected using simple random sampling techniques.

Measurement of Variables:

Dependent Variable: The dependent variable for the study is intrapreneurial intention - The study adopted some items from Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) in the work of Liñán, and Chen (2006) to measure intrapreneurial intention. The item was scored as Yes or No.

Independent Variables: The independent variables include: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and de-motivation - Through review of literature, the study adopted some items from the work of various authors to measure the independent variables. These include the work of Watanambe and Kanazawa (2009); Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) by Deci & Ryan in Tremblay et al. (2009) and the work of Guay et al. (2000). All items in the questionnaire were measured on a 5 – point likert's scale as follow: 1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Control Variables: The control variables were employees' academic qualification, work experience, and functional area, and these were measured using ordinal scale.

Techniques of Data Analysis:

Frequency table was used to present the demographic data, after which factor analysis was used to group and reduce the variables. In addition, correlation analysis was used as a pre analysis to examine the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. Furthermore, binary logistic regression was used to analyse the data on research objectives and for the test of hypotheses.

Results and Discussion

A total of 169 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, but only 131 were returned. More so, out of the 131 that were returned, only 118 were filled correctly and were used for the analysis (this represents 69.82%).

Table 1: Demographic Pattern of Respondents

Items	Frequency	Percentage
a. Gender		
1. Male	71	60.2
2. Female	47	39.8
Total	118	100
b. Age		
1. 18 – 23 years	19	16.1
2. 24 – 29 years	31	26.3
3. 30 – 35 years	46	39.0
4. 36 – above	22	18.6
Total	118	100
c. Marital Status		
1. Single	83	70.3
2. Married	35	29.7
Total	118	100
d. Academic Qualification		
1. SSCE	27	22.9
2. ND/NCE	48	40.7
3. HND/B. Sc or Equivalent	43	36.4
Total	118	100
e. Year(s) of Experience		
1. 0 – 05 years	82	69.5
2. 06 – 10 years	29	24.6
3. 11 – above	7	5.9
Total	118	100
f. Functional Area		
1. Sales/ Marketing	35	29.7
2. Production/ Operations	38	32.2
3. Customer Care	11	9.3
4. Finance/ Account	16	13.6
5. Others	18	15.2
Total	118	100

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Six items were used to examine the demographic pattern of respondents as shown in table 1. Analysis of the result shows that 47 female participated in the study, while the remaining 71 respondents were male. The legal minimum working age in Nigeria is 18, thus it forms the minimum cut off age for the study. The age distribution in table 1 shows that majority of the respondents are within the age bracket of 24 – 29 years and 30 – 35 years.

This is because the larger percentage of active population falls within these two age brackets. Nineteen (19) respondents are within the age bracket of 18 – 23 year, and 22 of the respondents are 36 years and above. The result also indicated that a total of 83 respondents were single while the remaining 35 were married.

Furthermore, only 29 respondents have SSCE; 46 of them have ND/NCE and 43 of them have HND/ B. Sc or equivalent. The result shows that majority of the respondents have not spent a long time working with their firms as only 7 of them have spent 11 years and above; 83 of them have just 0 -5 years of work experience, and 28 of them have between 6 – 10 years work experience in their respective firms. Lastly, the results in table 1 reveals that 35 of the respondents are in sales/marketing department, 38 in production/ operations department, 11 in customer care department, 16 in finance/account department, and 18 in other departments.

From the result of the factor analysis (see appendix i, table 1 - 4), the Kaiser – Mayer - Olkin measure of sample adequacy gives a value of 0.657. It indicates that the value of KMO is close to 1 which shows a perfectly adequate sample. Similarly, the Bartlett's test shows a chi-square of 642.470 at a significance level of 1% i.e. .000. This is an indication of the adequacy of the sample. The values in the communality table are highly close to 1, indicating that the communality common factor extracted explained all the variance in the variables. The total variance explained shows that a maximum of seven factors could be obtained. The factors as contained in the Rotated Component Matrix were named as follow: intrapreneurial intention, demotivation, integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. These were used for the correlation analysis as given in the table below:

Table 2: Correlations

Control Variables			Intrapreneu rial Intention	Intrinsic Motivati on	Integrate d Regulatio n	External Regulatio n	Introjecte d Regulatio n	Identified Regulatio n	De motivation
Academic Qualification & Work Experience Functional Area	Intrapreneurial Intention	Correlation	1.000	-.264	.215	.348	.072	-.131	-.062
		Significance (1-tailed)	.	.023	.052	.004	.296	.164	.322
		Df	0	56	56	56	56	56	56
	Intrinsic Motivation	Correlation	-.264	1.000	.067	-.019	.140	.071	-.219
		Significance (1-tailed)	.023	.	.308	.443	.135	.298	.050
		Df	56	0	56	56	56	56	56
	Integrated Regulation	Correlation	.215	.067	1.000	.144	.079	.143	.040
		Significance (1-tailed)	.052	.308	.	.141	.217	.104	.381
		Df	56	56	0	56	56	56	56
	External Regulation	Correlation	.348	-.019	.144	1.000	.196	.154	-.019
		Significance (1-tailed)	.004	.443	.141	.	.070	.124	.443
		Df	56	56	56	0	56	56	56
	Introjected Regulation	Correlation	.072	.140	.079	.196	1.000	.086	.076
		Significance (1-tailed)	.296	.135	.217	.070	.	.315	.285
		Df	56	56	56	56	0	56	56
	Identified Regulation	Correlation	-.131	.071	.143	.154	.086	1.000	.140
		Significance (1-tailed)	.164	.298	.104	.124	.315	.	.135
		Df	56	56	56	56	56	0	56
	De motivation	Correlation	-.062	-.219	.040	-.019	.076	.140	1.000
		Significance (1-tailed)	.322	.050	.381	.443	.285	.135	.
		Df	56	56	56	56	56	56	0

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

The result as presented in Table 2 shows that there is significant relationship between intrapreneurial intention and intrinsic motivation, the relationship is however a negative one ($r = -0.264$ with significant value = 0.023) at 5% level of significance. Among the extrinsic motivation variables, integrated regulation has a moderate positive relationship with intrapreneurial intention, however the relationship is not significant ($r = 0.215$, and significant value = 0.052). External regulation on the other hand correlates positively and moderately with intrapreneurial intention ($r = 0.348$ and significant value = 0.004) being significant at 5% level of significance. However, introjected regulation and identified regulation do not have significant relationship with intrapreneurial intention ($r = 0.072$ and -0.131 respectively). The result further indicates that de-motivation correlate negatively with intrapreneurial intention ($r = -0.062$), and the relationship is not significant.

Research Question One: What effect does intrinsic motivation have on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms in Nigeria?

Table 3: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1 Step	3.684	1	.055
Block	3.684	1	.055
Model	3.684	1	.055

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 3 presents the results of the omnibus test of model coefficients. It shows how well the model performs with the independent variable entered into the model. However, analysis of the data shows that the results are not significant, the values in the sig. column are slightly greater than the p value ($0.055 > 0.05$). The analysis further indicates low chi-square values are recorded: 9.745 with degree of freedom = 1.

Table 4: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	43.720 ^a	.059	.108

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 4 contains the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square values which show the amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by the predictors. Table 4 gives information about the usefulness of the model. Base on this model, the values of the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square are 5.9% and 10.8% respectively. This means that the independent variable only explains about 5.9% to 10.8% variation in the dependent variable.

Table 5: Variables in the Equation

								95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Intrinsic Motivation	-1.318	.725	3.310	1	.069	.268	.065	1.107
	Constant	7.553	3.240	5.433	1	.020	1905.993		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Intrinsic Motivation.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

The analysis of the result presented in table 5 indicates that the independent variable was not found to be significant predictor of intrapreneurial intention. This is due to the fact that its p-values in the sig. column (0.069) is greater than 0.05. Since the result presented in table 5 is not significant, the first null hypothesis which states that intrinsic motivation has no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms is accepted and the alternative is rejected.

Research Question Two: Which of the extrinsic motivation variables influence Intrapreneurial Intention of employees in fast food firms?

Table 6: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	11.650	4	.020
	Block	11.650	4	.020
	Model	11.650	4	.020

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 6 presents the results of the 'goodness of fit' test which shows how well the model performs when all the independent variables are entered. The independent variables loaded in this model include: integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation. Analysis of the data shows that the results are significant; because the values in the sig. column are less than the p value ($0.020 < 0.05$). The analysis further indicates that chi-square values are also moderately high: 11.650 with degree of freedom (df) = 4.

Table 7: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	35.754 ^a	.174	.322

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 7 shows information about the usefulness of the model. It contains the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square values which show the amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by the predictors. Base on this model, the values of the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square are 17.4% and 32.2% respectively. This means that the independent variables explain about 17.4% to 32.2% variation in the dependent variable (intrapreneurial intention).

Table 8: Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Integrated Regulation	1.126	.574	3.853	1	.050	3.085	1.002	9.498
	External Regulation	.896	.383	5.473	1	.019	2.450	1.156	5.191
	Introjected Regulation	.098	.345	.081	1	.776	1.103	.561	2.168
	Identified Regulation	-.573	.363	2.490	1	.115	.564	.277	1.149
	Constant	-4.171	2.613	2.548	1	.110	.015		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Integrated Regulation, External Regulation, Introjected Regulation, Identified Regulation.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 8 presents the results of the variables in the equation. Four predictors representing extrinsic motivation were regressed on intrapreneurial intention. The results show that for integrated regulation, the odd ratio (OR) = 3.085 and the wald = 3.853 with p. value = 0.50 which is significant because, p. value = 0.05. However, for external regulation, the OR = 2.450 and the wald = 5.437 being significant with p value = 0.019 which is < 0.05. The result further indicates that for introjected regulation, the value of OR = 1.103 and the wald = 0.081 with p value = 0.776, since p. value is > 0.05 the

result is not significant. While for Identified Regulation, the value of OR = 0.564 and the wald = 2.490 is not significant with p value = 0.115 which is > 0.05.

Since the result indicates that external regulation has significant effect on intrapreneurial intention, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative which stated that extrinsic motivations have significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms is accepted.

Research Question Three: What is the effect of de – motivation on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms?

Table 9: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1 Step	.155	1	.694
Block	.155	1	.694
Model	.155	1	.694

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

The result of the omnibus test of model coefficients is presented in Table 9. The result shows how well the model performs with the independent variable entered into the model. In other words, it shows how fit the model is. However, analysis of the data shows that the results are not significant, the values in the sig. column are greater than the p value ($0.694 > 0.05$). In addition, analysis of the result indicates that chi-square values are also low: 0.155 with degree of freedom = 1.

Table 10: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	47.249 ^a	.003	.005

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

Table 10 provides information about the usefulness of the model. It contains the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square values which show the amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by the predictor

(de-motivation). Base on this model, the result reveals that the values of the Cox and Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square are 0.3% and 0.5% respectively. This means that the independent variable only explains about 0.3% to 0.5% variation in the dependent variable (intrapreneurial intention).

Table 11: Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a								
De-motivation	-.135	.345	.154	1	.694	.873	.444	1.717
Constant	2.388	1.341	3.172	1	.075	10.889		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: De-motivation.

Source: Authors' Computation, 2020

The analysis of the result presented in table 11 indicates that the independent variable (de-motivation) was not found to be significant predictor of intrapreneurial intention. This is due to the fact that its p-values in the sig. column (0.694) is greater than 0.05. Since the result presented in table 11 is not significant, the null hypothesis which states that de-motivation has no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms is accepted and the alternative is rejected.

Discussion of Findings

An attempt was made to investigate motivational factors that influence Intrapreneurial intention in fast food firms using binary logistic regression. The paper examined the effect of each demographic variable on intrapreneurial intention of the employees. The logistic regression model used did not however give statistically significant results. In general, the results showed that first, intrinsic motivation and de-motivation do not influence intrapreneurial intention of the employees in fast food firms. Second, even among the categories of extrinsic motivation, only external regulation was found to serve as predictor of intrapreneurial intention of employees in fast food firms.

Interestingly, it was reported that de-motivation had no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention. Ordinarily, one would not expect that. It was a surprise however; as it was reported that intrinsic motivation had no significant effect on intrapreneurial intention. Quite a number of respondents were females and one would expect that they would find such work interesting. The reason for this finding may be as a result of the fact that most people work for these organisations like fast food firms in Nigeria in order to meet their basic needs; they feel such jobs have no security, so they may not really have interest in doing the job. In addition, as reported by Douglas and Fitzsimmons (2008), attitude towards ownership and income may be another factor limiting their motivation towards having intrapreneurial intention.

Findings of this study reinforce the content theories of motivation (IRCO, nd) and SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan, 2009). Our study found that most employees will have intrapreneurial intention because of perceived need which SDT classified as external regulation. Such behaviours are performed to satisfy an external demand for example, basic physiological needs as explained by Maslow (1943) and being elaborated by Ryan and Deci, (2000) in their work on SDT. Employees will no doubt perceive external regulation when their income is low and they know that their job lack security which is the case with most organizations like fast food firms in Nigeria. Lea et al (2012) describes external regulation as the least autonomous form of motivation. According to Lea et al (2012), it is as if the person is acting in order not to suffer some losses, being deprived of some benefits or faced some difficulties. That is to say that such behaviour or actions are done as a result of externally perceived locus of causalities (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study made effort to establish relationship between intrapreneurial intention and Self Determination Theory. SDT classified human motivation for a particular behaviour into six: intrinsic motivation, (integrated regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation) as extrinsic motivation, and de-motivation (Ryan, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2008). It was found out that out of these six classifications of motivation given by SDT, only one of extrinsic motivation variables (identified regulation) has significant effect on intrapreneurial intention. The study therefore concluded that employees in fast food firms are not adequately motivated towards having intrapreneurial intention.

The study recommended based on the findings that fast food firms in Minna and Abuja metropolis should provide work environment that will grant employees better intrinsic reward. Fast food firms should as well provide a better extrinsic reward packages for their employees. Extrinsic reward packages should be performance based rewards. This will increase workers motivation toward having intrapreneurial intention, and with these, fast food firms can launch intrapreneurial strategy.

References

- Aamo, B. W. (2005). *Employee innovation behaviour*. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis of Bodø Graduate School of Business, Norway.
- Adonisi, M. (2003). *The relationship between CE, market orientation, organisational flexibility and job satisfaction*. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Gordon Institute of Business Science, University of Pretoria.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Akwara, A. F., Abutu, G., Akwara, N. F., & Okwelum, R. (2014). Motivation as a tool for enhancing productivity in the organised private sector of the Nigerian economy: A case study of the tourism and hospitality industry in Nigeria. *International Journal of Democratic and Development Studies*, 2(1), 17-25.
- Amabile, M. T., Hill, G. K., Hennessey, A. B., & Tighe, M. E. (1994). The work preference inventory: Assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950-967.
- Antoncic, J. A., & Antoncic, B. (2011). Employee satisfaction, intrapreneurship and firm growth: A model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 111(4), 589 - 607.
- Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2000). An empirical investigation of impacts of corporate entrepreneurship-related contingencies on organizational wealth creation.
- Baba, R., & Hamid, R. A. (2011). *Corporate entrepreneurship among the public sector organisations in labuan*. Faculty of Economics and Business Working Paper, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Six theories of child development* (pp. 1- 60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Belousova, O., Gailly, B., & Basso, O. (2010). A conceptual model of corporate entrepreneurial behaviour. Paper presented at the Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference, Lausanne, Switzerland.

- Bhadoriya, S., & Chauhan, S. S. (2013). A critical analysis on intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivation. *International Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(3), 20-26.
- Clark, R. E. (2003). Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams. *Performance Improvement*, 42(3), 21-29.
- COMM GAP (nd). Theory of Behavioural Change. Washinton: World Bank
- Davis, T. M. (2006). *Corporate entrepreneurship assessment instrument (CEAI): Systematic validation of a measure*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Systems and Engineering Management, Graduate School of Engineering and Management, Air Force Institute of Technology, Air University, Ohio. USA.
- Davidsson, P. (1995). Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions. *Paper prepared for the RENT IX Workshop, Piacenza, Italy*,
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-Determination Theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182–185.
- Douglas, E., & Fitzsimmons, J. (2008). Individual intentions towards entrepreneurship vs intrapreneurship. *AGSE*, 937 – 951.
- Douglas, J. E., & Fitzsimmons, R. J. (2013). Intrapreneurial intentions vs. entrepreneurial intentions: Distinct constructs with different antecedents. *Small Business Economics*, 41, 115 – 132.
- Edrak, B. B., Yin-Fah, B. C., Gharlegghi, B., & Seng, T. K. (2013). The effectiveness of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: A study of malaysian amway company's direct sales forces. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(9), 96 – 103.
- Fini, R., Grimaldi, R., Marzocchi, G. L., & Sobrero, M. (2009). The foundation of entrepreneurial intention. Paper to be presented at the Summer Conference on CBS - Copenhagen Business School, Solbjerg Plads 3 DK2000 Frederiksberg DENMARK
- Gagne, M., & Forest, J. (2011). The study of compensation system through the lens of self determination theory: Reconciling 35 years of debate. *Scientific Series*, 54, Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The situational motivation scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3), 175 – 213.
- Guth, W., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest editor's introduction: Corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(13), 5-13.
- Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & 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.

- Ismail, K. Ahmad, A. R., & Yunus, N. K. Y., (2012). Stimulating factors on women entrepreneurial intention. *Business Management Dynamics*, 2(6), 20 – 28.
- IRCO (nd). Cross-cultural management network. Universidad de Navarra.
- Jones, G. R., & Butler, J. E. (1992). Managing internal corporate entrepreneurship: Agency theory perspective. *Journal of Management*, 18.
- Ken Blanchard Companies, (2008). Managing and motivating intrapreneurs. UCBC.
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Bishop, J. W. (2005). Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions and job satisfaction. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1, 275–291.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 13(4), 1-11.
- Lau, T., Chan, K. F., Tai, S. H. C., & Ng, D. K. C. (2010). Corporate entrepreneurship of IJVs in china. *Management Research Review*, 33(1), 6-22.
- Leal, E. A., Miranda, G. J., & Carmo, C. R. S. (2012). Self-determination theory: An analysis of student motivation in an accounting degree program. *São Paulo*, 24(62), 162-173.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. (2006). Testing the entrepreneurial intention model on a two-country sample. A Working Paper Departament d'Economia de l'Empresa, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Lin, H. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intention. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2), 135 – 149.
- Lucas, W. A., & Cooper, S. Y. (nd). Theories of entrepreneurial intention and the role of necessity.
- Marvel, M. R., Griffin, A., Hebda, J., & Vojak, B. (2007). Examining the technical corporate entrepreneurs' motivation: Voices from the field. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Baylor University.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). Theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396
- Mazzarol , T. (2007). Awakening the entrepreneur: an examination of entrepreneurial orientation among MBA students. Paper presented at the EFMD 37th Entrepreneurship, Innovation & Small Business (EISB) Annual Conference, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- Monsen, E. W., Saxton, T., & Patzelt, H. (2007). Motivation and participation in corporate entrepreneurship: The moderating effects of risk, effort and reward. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* 27(21).

- Rakesh, R. P. (2013). Sample size: From formula to concepts – II. *International Journal of Basic and Clinical Pharmacology*, (2), 94-95.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Organisational behaviour* (13th ed.). India, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Ryan, R. (2009). Self – determination theory and wellbeing. *WeD Research Review*, 1, 1 –2.
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
- Sathe, V. (2003). Corporate entrepreneurship: Top managers and new business creation. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheepers, M. J., Hough, J., & Bloom, J. Z. (2008). Nurturing the corporate entrepreneurship capability. *Southern African Business Review*, 1(3), 50 – 75.
- Schendel, D. (1990). Introduction to the special issue on corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 1-3.
- Tella, A., Oyen, C. O., & Popoola, S. O. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in oyo state, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.
- Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L., G. & Villeneuve, M. (2009).
- Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organisational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 41(4), 213–226.
- Wolcott, R. C., & Lippitz, M. J. (2007). The four models of corporate entrepreneurship. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(1), 75-82.
- Watanabe, S., & Kanazawa, Y. (2009). A test of a personality-based view of intrinsic motivation. *Japanese Journal of Administrative Science*, 22(2), 117-130.

Appendix i: Factor Analysis Tables

Table 1:

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.657
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square	642.470
Sphericity Df	210
Sig.	.000

Table 2:
Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Because this is the type of work I chose to do to attain a certain lifestyle.	1.000	.733
For the income it provides me.	1.000	.851
I do this work, but I am not sure if it is worth it.	1.000	.718
Because it has become a fundamental part of whom I am.	1.000	.624
Because it is the type of work I have chosen to attain certain important objectives.	1.000	.682
Because I chose this type of work to attain my career goals.	1.000	.778
Because it allows me to earn money.	1.000	.809
Because it is part of the way in which I have chosen to live my life.	1.000	.777
Because I want to be very good at this work, otherwise I would be very disappointed.	1.000	.644
I do this work, but I am not sure it is a good thing to do it.	1.000	.577
Because I want to be a winner in life.	1.000	.766
Because I want to succeed at this job, if not I would be very ashamed of myself.	1.000	.735
Because this type of work provides me with security.	1.000	.811
There may be good reasons to do this work, but personally I don't see any.	1.000	.778
Because this job is a part of my life.	1.000	.754
I seek to increase my competence through work.	1.000	.775
Because I feel good when doing my work.	1.000	.674
I'm ready to make anything to introduce new \processes for this organization.	1.000	.851
My ultimate goal is to create something new for this organization.	1.000	.859
I will make every effort to suggest new ideas and introduce new things for this organization.	1.000	.828
I'm determined to create a new product for this organization within the next 6 months.	1.000	.704

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3:
Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.809	27.662	27.662	5.809	27.662	27.662	3.269	15.564	15.564
2	2.447	11.654	39.316	2.447	11.654	39.316	2.777	13.224	28.788
3	2.300	10.951	50.268	2.300	10.951	50.268	2.334	11.113	39.901
4	1.652	7.869	58.136	1.652	7.869	58.136	2.145	10.215	50.117
5	1.288	6.135	64.272	1.288	6.135	64.272	2.073	9.869	59.986
6	1.219	5.805	70.077	1.219	5.805	70.077	1.608	7.655	67.641
7	1.014	4.826	74.903	1.014	4.826	74.903	1.525	7.263	74.903
8	.866	4.123	79.027						
9	.733	3.492	82.519						
10	.599	2.854	85.372						
11	.511	2.435	87.807						
12	.458	2.182	89.989						
13	.449	2.137	92.126						
14	.373	1.776	93.902						
15	.295	1.406	95.307						
16	.279	1.328	96.635						
17	.215	1.025	97.660						
18	.168	.801	98.462						
19	.136	.645	99.107						
20	.106	.504	99.611						
21	.082	.389	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4:
Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My ultimate goal is to create something new for this organization.	.898						
I'm ready to make anything to introduce new processes for this organization.	.816						
I will make every effort to suggest new ideas and introduce new things for this organization.	.808						
I'm determined to create a new product for this organization within the next 6 months.	.724						
Because it is part of the way in which I have chosen to live my life.		.789					
Because this job is a part of my life.		.739					
Because this is the type of work I chose to do to attain a certain lifestyle.		.649		.497			
Because this type of work provides me with security.		.519				-.468	
Because it has become a fundamental part of whom I am.		.469					.463
There may be good reasons to do this work, but personally I don't see any.			.857				
I do this work, but I am not sure if it is worth it.			.722				
I do this work, but I am not sure it is a good thing to do it.			.672				
For the income it provides me.				.884			
Because it allows me to earn money.				.798			
Because I want to be a winner in life.					.828		
Because I want to be very good at this work, otherwise I would be very disappointed.					.634		
Because I want to succeed at this job, if not I would be very ashamed of myself.					.551		
Because it is the type of work I have chosen to attain certain important objectives.						.669	
Because I chose this type of work to attain my career goals.		.409	-.424			.613	
I seek to increase my competence through work.							.787
Because I feel good when doing my work.	.420						.508

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 15 iterations.