Intrapreneurial Leadership and Sustainability of Federal Universities in South-South Region Nigeria

Alfred JM Edema (PhD)
Usoro Abosede A. (PhD)
Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2018.v14n4p272 URL:http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n4p272

Abstract

The study surveys contributions of intrapreneurial leadership to institutional sustainability particularly, federal universities in the south-south region, Nigeria. Institutional leadership and visionary leadership are both consonant to this study. Descriptive statistics and multiple regressions were used in analyzing the data obtained, aided with statistical package for social science. Obviously, federal universities with more academic programmes enjoyed increase in internally generated revenue (IGR) through fee and other charges. There appeared clear indications that universities with some unique programmes are favoured by donators and sponsors. Internally generated revenues by the universities do not necessarily result from so much diversified investments even though those ventures have their revenue contributions. Federal government should inject more funds into infrastructural development in both physical and human forms with more programmes introduced into universities to achieve the objectives, which gave birth to them. The various ventures entered into by the leadership (intrapreneurship) of the universities should be devoid of personal and political sentiments both in the appointment of management teams and financial prudency. Consequently, succeeding administrations should make effort to improve on the vision of inherited venture projects. University managers and administrators should work harder in sourcing for more funds through donors and collaborations while they remain resolutely focused without getting funds diverted.

Keywords: Sustainability, intrapreneurial leadership, institutional sustainability, institutional leadership, visionary leadership, federal universities, university manager, vice chancellors

Introduction

One common contending issue to the sustainability of the Nigerian university community has been intrapreneurial leadership. Managing and maintaining the university relative to the heights it was established to attain cannot be an easy experience. Various scholars have looked at the issue of sustainability dimensionally. Here, we describe sustainability as the concern for how to at least uphold, if not surpass such heights. The heights an institution or organization desires to attain are measured and expressed in its statements of vision and mission, thus, reflecting its values and the virtue it holds in the eyes of its numerous stakeholders world over. Through the statement of vision an organization looks into the far, unending future for itself and the various stakeholders whose interests it carries. Thus, the organization devises means of delivering on its mandates through its vision and statement of mission, which implicitly chart its journey roaster, and cascading same into specific measurable milestones descriptively termed as objectives. Such objectives crafted, should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound, adjustable, evaluable, and reviewable (SMARTAER). All these build into the organization's shared lifestyle, culture and admirable unique status, setting it apart from others.

Public knowledge has shown that most chief executives, especially Vice Chancellors of Nigerian universities are on the continuous stride of how to sustain their respective institutions. This situation is not exemptible of the federal universities, particularly those operating in the South-South region of Nigeria. Perhaps, not because they want to avert administrative failure but essentially, they are challenged by funding due perhaps, to the growing need for the state of the art infrastructural and technological facilities to enable them provide qualitative education on one hand, and on the other, to earn relevancy in the face of tensed competition. Although, universities, particularly those owned by the federal government, are not established for commerciality, today, it is obvious that a number of them have become the hub of organized commercial ventures. Again, the universities no longer only compete among themselves on the basis of the quality of graduates that they produce but also, the number of various business ventures owned under different names including the consultancy units. This effort, as it were, has been customarily accepted by some stakeholders as one quick way of raking in and increasing their internally generated revenue (IGR). What is not very clear, however, is whether the IGRs from the various investment units resulting from intrapreneurial leadership, are really contributory to the sustainability of the universities?

Statement of the problem

Federal universities are not established for commerciality but today, it is obvious that a number of them have become the hub of organized commercial ventures. Again, the universities no longer only compete among themselves on basis of the quality of graduates produced but also, the number of various business ventures owned under different names including the consultancy units and community banks. This effort, as it were, has been customarily accepted by stakeholders as one quick way of creating and increasing internally generated revenue (IGR). The essence of internally generated revenue is to keep existing infrastructure in human, intellectual and physical terms going, while making effort to create new ones. It is sometimes baffling, however, to note that some of the universities, despite the huge IGR accruals earned through involvement in various different commercial businesses, there appear to be infrastructural decay instead of infrastructural development either in the humans, intellectuality, or physical structures or even some combination of these. The situation has become of great concern to both internal and external stakeholders of the Nigerian university system, to the extent that it can be argued to have been one factor responsible for the outcry of poor quality education.

Objective of the study

The study is mainly interested in measuring the extent to which intrapreneurial leadership has contributed to the sustainability of institutions particularly, federal universities in the south-south region of Nigeria. However, a number of issues, which have been raised both at the introductory part and in the statement of problem, which no doubt, are copiously thought-provoking, are argumentative and open to further research interests.

Theoretical explorations

Institutional, environmental, entrepreneurial, positioning, portfolio, and distinctive competence schools and theories, among others, are all considered as the foundation for visionary leadership. Institutional leadership and visionary leadership are both consonant to this study. Institutional leadership is the key to improving quality (Goetsch and Davis, 2006; Evans, 2011). Visionary leadership concerns with "the establishment of goals and objectives for individual and group actions, which define not what we are but rather what we seek to be or do" (Colton, 1985). It is said to stand apart from other forms of leadership behaviour in inspiring vision and communicating that vision among organizational members, so that the organization moves from good to better (Jul-Chan and Colin, 2004).

Leadership holds an important place in the success of educational institutions (Murphy, 2005) and is a critical factor in sustaining and improving

the quality and performance of universities. There have been substantive arguments that university leaders must understand new challenges that affect quality education delivery including new regulatory demands by quality assurance agencies and be able to adjust accordingly to ensure that standards and quality of educational provisions are being maintained.

To achieve survival and continuous development of institutions, university leaders should also, continuously, improve their competencies (Shahmandi, Silong, Ismail, Samah and Ot Qhman, 2011). These competencies include interpersonal and human relations skills, communication skills, persuasive skills, consultative skills, strategic planning skills and core managerial skills among others. Yang (2005) identified four categories of leadership competencies namely: personality and disposition, personal knowledge and skill, administrative competency and social responsibility competency. Important too, is emotional intelligence competency. However, Bargh, Scott and Smith (1996) and Rowley (1997) observed that university Vice Chancellors that were appointed were usually prominent academics who did not possess any formal training beyond their academic credentials, achievements and experiences in the academia. In the light of challenges facing university education today, there is need for a paradigm shift, appointing a new breed of university leaders capable of navigating the new complex environment. Futuristic thinking, foresightedness, enthusiasm, and many more are encomiums for describing visionary leadership acumen, strategy, or style, which believes in making an organization or institution attain a lifelong status, by inspiring people to seek continuously for new opportunities; expand the scope of operation; fit the institution to the environment; improve various arms of the business; and making the institution distinguished and competitively unique from others of its type, while adding value for its various stakeholders. The visionary leadership approach accepts forcefulness, turnaround, stretch, and push strategies as part of the means by which organizations/ institutions pursue the achievement of their goals and objectives.

Concepts and Literature

Giving birth to a new venture or an enterprise within an existing institution or organization (Burgelman 1983; Burgelman 1984) = intraprenuership - otherwise called corporate entrepreneurship and corporate venturing to exploit a new opportunity and create economic value (Pinchot 1985) is no longer a new thinking. The novelty is in what form of new business is being parented by the old organization and the methods and leadership techniques by which the new baby enterprise is nursed and nurtured as well as the value it adds for both the parent body and stakeholders. However, there can be a foreseeable disadvantage, since redeploying

resources from their current uses can cause inefficiencies as managers of existing administrative structure strive to retain those resources to support the projects for which they are responsible. The implication is that intrapreneurial leaders tend to exploit profitable (though possibly short-lived) niches (Audretsch and Thurik 2001; Freeman and Engel 2007). This informs a conceptual exploration of relevant literature on intrapreneurial leadership and institutional sustainability.

Intrapreneurial Leadership Thinking

Unlike the natural human who believes that death will occur one day but does not know, and cannot tell when and how this will happen, and therefore, cannot seek for absolute prevention or devise a means of running away from it, institutions and organizations are consciously capable of predicting their death and the probable situations that could lead to it, therefore, they keep striving for preventive measures; hence, they outlive their founders. The probability that institutions and organizations can measure or predict their death circumstances calls for a strategic analysis of trends in the business environment to find out the factors that could tantamount to weaknesses and threats, while seeking for how best to exploit and improve on their strengths and opportunities. This philosophy gives rise to the drive for institutional or organizational sustainability, which naturally simply, is the effort or strategy of looking for means of achieving everlasting existence, where possible, hence, the institution remains a going concern. Accordingly, institutions exist for generations unborn. It beholds that both the employer and employee are naturally obligated to the future generations. Thus, they both become committed to the guiding maxim of continuous improvement founded on the Japanese premise of maintenance culture known as "Kaizen" or "kai – gradual and orderly change, zen – for the better". The kaizen principle involves everyone in the institution or organization and encourages initiatives, creative and innovative ideas that can move the institution further for the better, hence, intrapreneurship.

Intrapreneurship refers to employee initiatives in organizations to undertake something new, without being asked to do so. This is achieved through personal creativity, and innovative ideas sold to the management, thereby making the employee an institutional / organizational growth partner. Thus, when the leadership and or management of an institution or organization buys into the creative, innovative, initiatives or ideas they themselves get involved in and become institutional and or organizational entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs (Maier and Pop Zenovia, 2011). Implication is that both management and employee are conscious and have agreed that they are collectively responsible for the sustainability or long life of the institution. Furthermore, it means that the management is decisively set for a new

investment within the existing outfit using resources that were not been fully utilized or have entirely been idle (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2003). Creative employees explore and exploit opportunities resulting from idle resources in all ramifications. When this is achieved, not only the organization or institution expands and gets competitively stronger, employees are better off in new career development and personal growth.

Methodology

The study surveys contributions of intrapreneurial leadership to institutional sustainability particularly, federal universities in the south-south region, Nigeria, consisting of University of Calabar, University of Uyo, University of Port Harcout, Federal University, Otueke, and Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Effurun. However, the population sample was drawn from among senior teaching and non-teaching staff of University of Calabar and University of Uyo, to whom questionnaires were administered. Descriptive statistics and multiple regressions were used in analyzing the data obtained, aided with statistical package for social science (SPSS version 20).

Hypothesis one

H_O: There is no significant relationship between programmes run and internally generated revenue through fee/charges in federal universities in the South-South.

Table 1. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.796[a]	.633	.605	478.28034

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

In the model summary table 1, the R value of .796 shows that there is a strong correlation between programmes run and revenue generated through fee/charges, making the model a good fit. The R square of .633 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation, which shows that 63.3% of the revenue generated through fee/charges can be explained by the programmes run in the institutions.

Table 2. ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5139320.625	1	5139320.625	22.467	.000[b]
	Residual	2973777.108	13	228752.085		
	Total	8113097.733	14			

Source: Authors' computation, 2017

In the Anova table 2, F value of 22.467 at P<.001 shows that the test is highly significant, which means that programmes run can be used in explaining the revenue generated in the institutions. Therefore, there is a significant effect between programmes run and revenue generated.

Table 3. Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-135.233	476.085		-.284	.781
	Programme run	375.753	79.274	.796	4.740	.000

Coefficient table 3, shows the linear regression function to be y=135.233+375.753x and the t value of 4.740 at P<001 indicated the linear regression equation is statistically significant. Hence, we accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between programmes run and revenue generated through fee/charges in Universities

Hypothesis two

H_o: There is no significant relationship between programmes run and money grants/donations in the federal universities in south-sought, Nigeria.

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.567[a]	.321	.269	618.95212

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

In the model summary table 4, the R value of .567 shows that there is a strong correlation between programmes run and money grant/donation (the model is a good fit). The R square of .321 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation, this value shows that 32.1% of money grant /donation can be explained by the programmes run in the institutions, however this value makes the linear regression model not reliable.

Table 5. ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2358655.210	1	2358655.210	6.157	.028[b]
	Residual	4980322.390	13	383101.722		
	Total	7338977.600	14			

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

In the Anova table 5, F value of 6.157 at P<.005 shows that the test is statistically significant, which means there is a significant effect between money grant/donation and programmes run.

Table 6. Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	597.181	616.112		.969	.350
	Programmerun	254.555	102.590	.567	2.481	.028

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

Coefficient table 6, shows the linear regression function to be y=597.181+254.55x and the t value of 2.481 at P<.05 indicated the linear regression equation is statistically significant. Hence, we accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between programmes run and money grant/donation in universities.

Hypothesis three

H_o: There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial outfit and internally generated revenue in Universities.

Table 7. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.095[a]	.009	-.067	586.22615

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

In the model summary table 7, the R value of .095 shows that there is a weak negative correlation between entrepreneurial outfit (leadership) and internally generated revenue (the model is not a good fit). The R square of .009 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation, which value, shows that 9% of internally generated revenue can be explained by the entrepreneurial outfit (leadership) in the institution, however this value makes the linear regression model very weak and not reliable.

Table 8. ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40533.478	1	40533.478	.118	.737[b]
	Residual	4467594.255	13	343661.097		
	Total	4508127.733	14			

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

In the Anova table 8, F value of .118 at P=.737 shows that the test is not statistically significant, which means there is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial outfit and internally generated revenue.

Table 9. Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1700.289	801.825		2.121	.054
	Entrepreneurial ventures established by institution	-31.940	93.001	-.095	-.343	.737

Source: Authors' computation, 2017.

Coefficient table 9, shows the linear regression function to be y=1700.289+-31.940x and the t value of -343 at P=.737. This indicates that the linear regression equation is not statistically significant. Hence, we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial outfit and internally generated revenue in the institutions.

Findings

Hypothesis one: the R value of .796 in table 1 shows that there is a strong correlation between programmes run and revenue generated through fees/charges (the model is a good fit). The R square of .633 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation, this value shows that 63.3% of the revenue generated through fees/charges can be explained by the programmes run in the institutions, which makes the linear regression model reliable. F value of 22.467 in table 2, at P<.001 shows that the test is highly significant, which means programmes run contributed differently to the revenue generated in the institutions. Unstandardized Coefficients value, table 3, shows the linear regression function to be y=-135.233+375.753x and the t value of 4.740 at P<001 indicating that the linear regression equation is statistically significant. Hence, we accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between programmes run and revenue generated through fees/charges in Universities.

Hypothesis two: the R value of .567 in table 4, shows that there is a strong correlation between programme run and money grant/donation (the model is a good fit). The R square of .321 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation, this value shows that 32.1% of money grants /donations can be explained by the programmes run in the institutions. However, this value makes the linear regression model not reliable. F value of 6.157 in table 5, at P<.005 shows that the test is statistically significant, which means there is a significant relationship between money grants/donations and programmes run. Unstandardized Coefficients value table 6, shows the linear regression function to be y = 597.181+254.55x, while the t value of 2.481 at P<.05 indicated that the linear regression equation is statistically significant. Hence, we accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between programmes run and money grant/donation in universities.

Hypothesis three: the R value of .095 in table 7 shows that there is a weak negative correlation between entrepreneurial outfit (leadership) and internally generated revenue (the model is not a good fit). The R square of .009 is the coefficient of determination or the power of explanation. This value shows that 9% of internally generated revenue can be explained by the entrepreneurial outfit (leadership) in the institutions. However, this value makes the linear regression model very weak and not reliable. F value of .118

at P=.737, table 8 shows that the test is not statistically significant, which means there is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial outfit and internal generated revenue. Coefficient table 9, shows the linear regression function to be y=1700.289+-31.940x and the t value of -343 at P=.737, indicating that the linear regression equation is not statistically significant. Hence, we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial outfit and internally generated revenue in the universities.

Conclusion

Obviously, the federal universities with more academic programmes enjoyed increased internally generated revenue through fees and other charges. This could be occasioned by the huge student population, informed again, by the slightly lower fees/ charges by federal institutions compared to state owned and private universities. There appeared clear indications that universities with some unique programmes are favoured by donations and grants from different sponsor philanthropists and organizations. Internally generated revenues by the institutions do not necessarily result from so much diversified investments even though those ventures have their revenue contributions. Some of the ventures die off naturally because of inability to sustain them due to some or a combination of leadership administrative tenure, overspending and financial recklessness, subjective decisions in constituting managerial positions for the venture and sabotage.

Recommendations

With more academic programmes being introduced by federal universities, the government should inject more funds into infrastructural development in both physical and human forms to achieve the objectives, which gave birth to them. The various ventures entered into by the leadership (intrapreneurship) of the universities should be devoid of personal or political sentiments both in the appointment of managerial teams and financial prudency. Again, this suggests that succeeding administrations should buy into and even seek to improve on the vision of inherited venture projects. University managers and administrators should work harder in sourcing for more funds through donors and collaborations while they remain resolutely focused without getting funds diverted.

References:

1. Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). "Clarifying the Intrapreneurship Concept ", Journal of Smal Business & Enterprise Development, pp. 7-24.

2. Audretsch, D.B., R. T. (2001). Linking Entrepreneurship to Growth, STI Working Paper 2081/2, OECD, Paris.
3. Bargh, C., Scott, P. & Smith, D. (1996). Governing Universities: Changing the Culture? Buckingham:SRHE/OU.
4. Burgelman, R.A. (1983). Corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management: insight from a process study. Man. Sci. 29(12) 1349.1365.
5. Burgelman, R.A. (1984). Designs for Corporate Entrepreneurship in Established RMS. California Man. Rev. 26(3) 155. 166.
6. Colton, D. L., (1985). Vision *National Forum,* 65(2), pp. 33-35.
7. Evans, J.R. 2011. Quality Management, Organization and Strategy. 6th edition. Cincinnati: South-Western.
8. Freeman, J., J.S. Engel. (2007). Models of Innovation: Startups and Mature Corporations. California Man. Rev. 50(1) 94.119.
9. Goetsch, D.L. & Davis, S.B. (2006). Quality Management: Introduction to Total Quality Management for Production, Processing, and Services. 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
10. Jul-Chan, C. & Colin, S. (2004). Leadership Effectiveness, Leadership Style and Employee Readiness. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal,* 26(4), pp. 280-288.
11. Maier, V. & Pop Zenovia C. (2011). Entrepreneurship versus Intrapreneurship.
12. Review of International Comparative Management Volume 12, Issue 5 pp 971–976.
13. Murphy, L. (2005). Transformational leadership: A Cascading Chain Reaction. *Journal of Nursing Management* 13 (2) pp 128-136.
14. Pinchot, G. (1985). Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur. Harper & Row, New York.
15. Rowley, J. (1997). Academic leaders: Made or born? Industrial and Commercial Training, 29(3) pp 78-84.
16. Shahmandi, E., Silong, A.D., Ismail, I.A., Samah, B.B.A. & Othman, J. (2011). Competencies, Roles and Effective Academic Leadership in World Class University. *International Journal of Business Administration* 2 (1).
17. Yang, X. (2005). Institutional Challenges and Leadership Competencies in Chinese Ministry of Education Directed Universities in Implementing the 1999 Chinese Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century. A Doctoral Dissertation Texas A&M University.