CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF SELETED FOODS AND BEVERAGE COMPANIES IN NIGERIA

Agranpe, Semako Michael[1] Omotoso, Kazeem Adekunle[2]

[1&2]*Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos State*

Abstract

Corporate entrepreneurship has emerged as a critical driver of competitiveness in dynamic industries such as food and beverages. This study investigates the impact of innovation and proactiveness, two key dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, on non-financial performance outcomes, specifically corporate image and organisational effectiveness, in selected Nigerian food and beverage companies (Dangote Sugar plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc). Using a quantitative survey design and stratified random sampling of 361 managers, supervisors, and senior staff, data were analysed through reliability tests and regression models. Results revealed that innovation significantly enhances corporate image, while proactiveness positively influences organisational effectiveness. Furthermore, the combined effect of innovation and proactiveness explained 40% of the variance in corporate image and 34% in organisational effectiveness, underscoring their joint importance in sustaining competitiveness. The findings align with the Resource-Based View and Entrepreneurial Orientation theory, confirming that entrepreneurial behaviors are strategic resources that strengthen both reputation and adaptability. This study contributes to the literature by highlighting the role of corporate entrepreneurship in driving non-financial performance outcomes, offering practical insights for Nigerian firms seeking sustainable growth in volatile markets.

Key words: *Corporate Entrepreneurship, Corporate Image Innovation, Organisational Effectiveness, Proactiveness, Foods and Beverage Companies*

Introduction

Corporate entrepreneurship, encompassing innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking, has become a key driver of competitiveness in dynamic industries like food and beverages (Kosile, Alabi & Ajayi, 2024). In Nigeria, firms such as Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc face intense competition, shifting consumer preferences, and global pressures (Olayinka-Agboola, Eke & Ismail, 2025). Innovation enables differentiation through new products, processes, and services, enhancing adaptability and customer satisfaction (Bature et al., 2018). Proactiveness strengthens resilience by anticipating market demands and acting ahead of rivals (Bature et al., 2018). Yet

Nigerian firms still grapple with reputational pressures, rising expectations, and operational inefficiencies that undermine effectiveness (Olayinka-Agboola et al., 2025).

Traditionally, performance has been measured financially, profitability, sales growth, market share (Kosile et al., 2024). However, non-financial indicators such as corporate image (public perception, reputation, brand equity) and organisational effectiveness (goal attainment, adaptability, stakeholder satisfaction) are increasingly vital (Riordan et al., 1997; Cameron & Whetten, 1983). Although corporate entrepreneurship enhances competitiveness (Bierwerth et al., 2015), many Nigerian firms struggle to translate initiatives into improved non-financial outcomes. Existing studies emphasize financial metrics, neglecting intangible assets that drive resilience and sustainability. This creates a research gap: financial measures capture short-term success, but corporate image and organisational effectiveness provide a fuller picture of long-term competitiveness and stakeholder trust.

In particular, there is limited empirical evidence on how innovation and proactiveness, as dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship, directly shape corporate image and organisational effectiveness in Nigeria's food and beverage sector. Addressing this gap is essential, as firms like Dangote and Honeywell must not only achieve financial growth but also cultivate strong reputations and effective organisational systems to thrive in an increasingly globalised and consumer-driven marketplace.

Objectives

The main objective of this study is to investigate the impact of corporate entrepreneurship on organisational performance in selected Nigerian food and beverage companies. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. examine the effect of innovation on the corporate image of Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc,
2. identify the impact of proactiveness on organisational effectiveness in these firms.

Accordingly, the research is guided by the following questions:

a. How does innovation influence the corporate image of Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc?

b. What is the impact of proactiveness on organisational effectiveness in Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc?

To provide empirical answers, the study tests two hypotheses:

H_{o2}: Innovation does not affect corporate image in Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc.

H_{o2}: Proactiveness does not significantly affect organisational effectiveness in Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc.

Literature Review

Corporate Entrepreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship involves established firms engaging in entrepreneurial activities, innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking, to sustain competitiveness (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). It is increasingly recognized as a strategic mechanism for adapting to dynamic environments and achieving long-term sustainability.

Studies confirm its impact: Bierwerth et al. (2015) showed that corporate entrepreneurship builds unique capabilities, while Bature et al. (2018) demonstrated that innovation and proactiveness improve adaptability and customer satisfaction. In Nigeria, Ogaga-Oghene et al. (2025) found organisational capabilities drive product innovation, and Okusanya et al. (2024) highlighted that lack of proactiveness hampers growth and market share. Thus, innovation and proactiveness are critical behavioural dimensions through which firms like Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc sustain corporate image, organisational effectiveness, and competitiveness in a rapidly evolving industry.

Innovation

Innovation is a strategic resource under the Resource-Based View (RBV), enabling firms to differentiate through new products, processes, and systems (Bierwerth et al., 2015). In Nigeria's food and beverage sector, it appears in product diversification, packaging, digital supply chains, and sustainability practices. Studies confirm its central role: Ogaga-Oghene et al. (2025) found organisational capabilities drive product innovation, while Asabi et al. (2022) showed innovation underpins corporate entrepreneurship at Unilever Nigeria Plc. Globally, Bature et al. (2018) and Gunday et al. (2011) demonstrated that innovation enhances adaptability, efficiency, reputation, and customer satisfaction.

Innovation also strengthens corporate image and sustainability. Olayinka-Agboola et al. (2025) noted that innovative packaging and production improve public perception and trust, aligning with Crossan & Apaydin (2010), who view innovation as a strategic capability shaping identity and long-term effectiveness. Thus, innovation is not just

short-term differentiation but a driver of corporate image, organisational effectiveness, and competitiveness, making it vital for Nigerian food and beverage firms like Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc.

Proactiveness

Proactiveness reflects a firm's forward-looking posture, anticipating market demands and acting ahead of competitors (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). In Nigeria's food and beverage sector, this includes early adoption of consumer trends, market expansion, and preemptive regulatory responses. Recent studies stress its importance: Okusanya et al. (2024) found that lack of proactiveness hampers growth and market share, while Umrani et al. (2018) showed it strengthens organisational capability and stakeholder confidence when supported by culture. Globally, Bature et al. (2018) confirmed proactive firms better anticipate customer needs, adapt to change, and achieve superior outcomes. Thus, proactiveness is about shaping the competitive landscape. For firms like Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc, strategies such as diversifying products, investing in sustainability, and anticipating regulation are essential for resilience, corporate image, and organisational effectiveness.

Organisational Performance

Organisational performance is multidimensional, encompassing both financial outcomes (profitability, sales growth, market share) and non-financial measures such as corporate image and organisational effectiveness (Richard et al., 2009). In competitive industries, non-financial dimensions often prove more decisive for sustaining trust and advantage.

Recent studies highlight this shift: Kosile, Alabi & Ajayi (2024) argue that Nigerian firms must integrate non-financial indicators to remain resilient, while Olayinka-Agboola, Eke & Ismail (2025) show that corporate image and effectiveness are vital for food and beverage companies facing reputational pressures. Globally, Gunday et al. (2011) confirm that innovation-driven strategies enhance both financial and non-financial outcomes, including efficiency, adaptability, and reputation. Thus, organisational performance cannot be fully understood through financial metrics alone; intangible outcomes provide a more holistic view of sustainability and long-term competitiveness.

Corporate Image

Corporate image reflects how stakeholders perceive a firm, shaped by innovation, product quality, CSR, and communication. A strong image enhances brand equity, loyalty, and trust (Riordan, Gatewood & Barnes, 1997), making it a vital non-financial performance measure in competitive sectors like food and beverages.


Recent studies highlight its strategic importance: Kosile, Alabi & Ajayi (2024) describe corporate image as an intangible asset driving loyalty and competitiveness in Nigerian firms, while Olayinka-Agboola, Eke & Ismail (2025) show that investments in packaging, sustainability, and stakeholder engagement improve reputation. Globally, Nguyen & Leblanc (2001) link corporate image to satisfaction and loyalty, and Ali, Khan & Rehman (2016) confirm its role in legitimacy and stakeholder confidence. Thus, corporate image is both an external perception and a strategic performance dimension. For firms like Dangote Group and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc, cultivating innovation and proactiveness is essential to sustain competitiveness, build trust, and strengthen organisational effectiveness.

Organisational Effectiveness

Organisational effectiveness reflects a firm's ability to achieve goals, adapt to change, and satisfy stakeholders, extending beyond financial outcomes to include adaptability, efficiency, and stakeholder satisfaction (Cameron & Whetten, 1983). In Nigeria's food and beverage sector, it is seen in operational efficiency, responsiveness to consumer needs, and sustainability alignment.

Recent studies confirm its link to entrepreneurial behaviours: Kosile, Alabi & Ajayi (2024) found that innovation and proactiveness enhance resilience in volatile markets, while Ogaga-Oghene, Yalokwu & Omankhanlen (2025) showed that combining capabilities with innovation improves adaptability and competitiveness. Globally, Gunday et al. (2011) highlighted innovation's role in efficiency and reputation, and Umrani et al. (2018) emphasized proactiveness in fostering learning and responsiveness. Thus, organisational effectiveness reflects how firms like Dangote Group and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc leverage entrepreneurial orientation, particularly innovation and proactiveness, to sustain performance and stakeholder satisfaction.

Conceptual framework



Source: Researcher's Efforts

Theoretical Review

Resource-Based View

The Resource-Based View (RBV), introduced by Wernerfelt (1984), shifted strategic management focus from external market forces to internal firm resources. He argued that sustainable advantage stems from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN). Barney (1991) refined this into the widely cited VRIN framework, emphasizing that firms must nurture such resources to achieve superior performance.

Later contributions expanded RBV: Peteraf (1993) stressed resource heterogeneity and immobility, while Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) developed dynamic capabilities, explaining how firms adapt and reconfigure resources in volatile environments. This evolution made RBV especially relevant to innovation-driven sectors like food and beverages, where adaptability and resource renewal are critical.

Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) Theory

The Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) Theory was introduced by Miller (1983), who defined EO as a firm-level strategic posture characterized by innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking. His work shifted entrepreneurship research from individual traits to organisational strategy. Covin and Slevin (1989) later expanded and empirically validated EO across diverse contexts, showing that firms with strong EO consistently achieve superior performance, especially in competitive and dynamic environments. This positioned EO as a practical, measurable construct in strategic management.

Empirical Review

Bature, Sallehuddin, Rosli and Saad (2018), examined the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance, with market orientation as a moderating factor. Their findings revealed that firms that adopt strong entrepreneurial postures, particularly innovation and proactiveness, achieve superior adaptability and customer satisfaction. This study provides robust empirical evidence that entrepreneurial behaviors are strategic resources that enhance competitiveness across industries.

Umrani, Kura and Ahmed (2018), investigated the impact of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance, with organisational culture as a mediating variable. Their results confirmed that innovation and proactiveness positively influence performance

outcomes, but the strength of this relationship depends on the presence of supportive organisational culture. This highlights the importance of embedding entrepreneurial behaviors within organisational values to achieve sustainable effectiveness.

Gunday, Ulusoy, Kilic and Alpkan (2011), analysed the effects of different innovation types, product, process, organisational, and marketing, on firm performance. Their empirical evidence demonstrated that innovation significantly improves efficiency, flexibility, and competitiveness. The study underscores that innovation is not only a driver of financial outcomes but also a key determinant of organizational effectiveness.

Nguyen and Leblanc (2001), explored the role of corporate image and reputation in customer retention decisions within service industries. Their findings revealed that a positive corporate image strongly influences customer satisfaction and loyalty, thereby enhancing long-term organisational performance. This study emphasizes the non-financial value of corporate image as a strategic intangible asset.

Ali, Khan and Rehman (2016) examined the impact of corporate image on customer loyalty and organizational performance. Their results demonstrated that firms with strong corporate images enjoy higher levels of customer trust and repeat patronage, which translate into improved performance outcomes. This study confirms that corporate image is a critical determinant of competitiveness in both local and global markets.

Richard, Devinney, Yip and Johnson (2009), addressed methodological approaches to measuring organisational performance. They argued that performance should be assessed beyond financial indicators, incorporating dimensions such as organisational effectiveness, corporate image, and stakeholder satisfaction. Their work provides a strong theoretical and empirical foundation for evaluating non-financial outcomes in strategic management research.

Ogaga-Oghene, Yalokwu and Omankhanlen (2025) examined the mediatory role of entrepreneurial orientation capability in the relationship between knowledge management and product innovation among Nigerian food and beverage companies. Drawing on data from six quoted firms in Lagos, the authors found that innovation significantly enhances product performance and competitiveness. Their findings confirm that innovation is not only a driver of financial outcomes but also a strategic resource that strengthens organisational effectiveness in volatile markets.

Ojelade, Inegbedion and Aransiola (2023), investigated how innovation strategies contribute to sustainable entrepreneurship development in the Nigerian food and beverage industry. Using firms in Ibadan, Oyo State as their sample, the study revealed that proactive innovation practices improve competitiveness and long-term survival. The authors emphasized that innovation strategies are essential for firms seeking to achieve sustainability in highly competitive and dynamic environments.

Asenge and Dewua (2023), explored the relationship between innovation capabilities and performance in Nigerian food processing companies. Surveying 406 managers across 15 firms, their study confirmed that innovation capabilities are key triggers of competitiveness and organisational effectiveness. Firms with strong innovation practices were found to achieve higher adaptability, efficiency, and resilience, underscoring the importance of innovation as a non-financial performance driver.

Methodology

The study adopts a quantitative survey research design, which is appropriate for examining relationships among variables in a structured and measurable way. Quantitative methods allow for the collection of numerical data that can be statistically analysed to test hypotheses about the effects of innovation and proactiveness on corporate image and organizational effectiveness. This design is particularly suitable because it enables the researcher to establish relationships/associations and predictive effects. By focusing on two leading Nigerian food and beverage firms, Dangote Group (Dangote Sugar Plc) and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc, the study ensures that findings are both contextually relevant to the Nigerian business environment and generalizable within the sector. These firms are industry leaders, making them ideal case organizations for assessing how entrepreneurial behaviors influence performance outcomes.

The research is structured as a cross-sectional study, meaning that data were collected at a single point in time. This approach is efficient for capturing current organisational practices and outcomes without the need for prolonged observation. A cross-sectional design is also appropriate for comparing departments and roles within the selected firms, providing a snapshot of how innovation and proactiveness are currently shaping corporate image and organisational effectiveness.

The target population for this study comprises managers, supervisors, and senior staff of Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Flour Mills Plc. These organisations are selected because they are among the largest and most influential players in Nigeria's food and beverage sector, with extensive operations and strategic importance in the national economy. A stratified random sampling method was employed to ensure fair representation across key departments, thereby minimizing sampling bias and capturing perspectives from diverse functional areas. The overall sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula (1967),

$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$ with a margin of error of 0.05 at a 95% confidence level. Given a total population of 3,704 employees (2,988 from Dangote Sugar and 716 from Honeywell Flour Mills), the formula yielded a sample size of approximately 361 respondents.

Proportional allocation was then applied to distribute the sample across the two organisations: Dangote Sugar received 291 respondents, while Honeywell Flour Mills received 70 respondents. Within each organisation, the sample was further proportionally allocated across staff categories, resulting in 44 managers, 102 supervisors, and 145 senior staff for Dangote Sugar, and 14 managers, 21 supervisors, and 35 senior staff for Honeywell Flour Mills. This stratified proportional allocation ensured that each subgroup was adequately represented in line with its share of the population. Final Proportional Sample Allocation

Table 1 Population

Organization	Population	Proportion (%)	Sample Size
Dangote Sugar	2,988	80.7%	291
Honeywell Flour Mills	716	19.3%	70
Total	3,704	100%	361

Step 2: Stratified Random Sampling by Staff Category.

In order to ensure representativeness in the study, proportional sample allocation was applied across staff categories in both Dangote Sugar and Honeywell Flour Mills. For Dangote Sugar, with a total workforce of 2,988 and a sample size of 291, the distribution yielded 44 managers, 102 supervisors, and 145 senior staff. Similarly, for Honeywell Flour Mills, with a workforce of 716 and a sample size of 70, the allocation produced 14 managers, 21 supervisors, and 35 senior staff. This proportional approach guarantees that each staff category is adequately represented in the sample in line with its share of the population. Final Stratified Sample Allocation

Table 2 Sample Size

Organization	Managers	Supervisors	Senior Staff	Total Sample
Dangote Sugar	44	102	145	291
Honeywell Flour Mills	14	21	35	70
Total	58	123	180	361

Meanwhile, out of 361 instruments distributed, 330 were retrieved but only 302 were properly filled and found usable for the work.

The study utilized a structured questionnaire as the primary instrument for data collection. The questionnaire comprised four sections: (1) Demographics, capturing respondents' age, gender, role, and years of experience; (2) Innovation and Proactiveness, adapted from Covin & Slevin (1989) and Lumpkin & Dess (1996); (3) Corporate Image, adapted from Nguyen & Leblanc (2001) and Ali et al. (2016); and (4) Organisational Effectiveness, adapted from Cameron & Whetten (1983) and Richard et al. (2009). Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), which is appropriate for capturing the intensity of perceptions

and enabling statistical analysis of relationships among variables.

Table 3 Reliability Test (Cronbach's Alpha)

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Innovation	5	0.84	Reliable ($\alpha > 0.7$)
Proactiveness	5	0.81	Reliable ($\alpha > 0.7$)
Corporate Image	5	0.87	Highly Reliable ($\alpha > 0.8$)
Organizational Effectiveness	5	0.85	Reliable ($\alpha > 0.7$)

Note: Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the constructs. Values above 0.7 are generally considered acceptable, indicating that the items reliably measure the same underlying construct. Values above 0.8 reflect strong internal consistency, suggesting that the items are highly correlated and provide stable measurement. In this study, most constructs recorded Cronbach's Alpha values above 0.8, confirming that the scales for Innovation, Proactiveness, Corporate Image, and Organisational Effectiveness are robust and dependable. This demonstrates that the instrument is reliable and suitable for empirical testing

Table 4 Validity Test (KMO and Bartlett's Test)

Construct	KMO Value	Bartlett's Test (Sig.)	Interpretation
Innovation	0.79	0.000	Sampling adequacy confirmed
Proactiveness	0.76	0.000	Sampling adequacy confirmed
Corporate Image	0.82	0.000	Sampling adequacy confirmed
Organizational Effectiveness	0.80	0.000	Sampling adequacy confirmed

Note: Validity (KMO and Bartlett's Test)

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) values for all constructs ranged between 0.76 and 0.82, which are well above the minimum acceptable value of 0.60. This demonstrates that the sample data is adequate for factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant ($p = 0.000$) across all constructs, confirming that correlations among items are sufficient and that the instrument is valid for measuring the intended variables.

Data Analysis

Simple Regression: Innovation and Corporate Image

$$\text{CI} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{INN}) + \varepsilon$$

Table 5 Model Summary

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error
1	.52	.27	.26	0.61

Source: Author's Computation (SPSS)

Table 6 ANOVA

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Regression	35.9	1	35.9	96.8	.000
Residual	95.1	300	0.32		
Total	131.0	301			

Source: Author's Computation (SPSS)

Table 7 Coefficients

Predictor	B	Std. Error	B	T	Sig.
Constant	1.82	0.15	–	12.1	.000
Innovation	0.46	0.05	.52	9.84	.000

Source: Author's Computation (SPSS)

A simple linear regression was conducted to examine the effect of innovation on corporate image. The analysis revealed that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 300) = 96.8$, $p < .001$, indicating that innovation is a meaningful predictor of corporate image. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .27$) shows that innovation alone explains 27% of the variance in corporate image, which is a substantial contribution for a single predictor. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = .52$, $p < .001$) further confirms that innovation has a strong positive effect, suggesting that as innovation practices increase, perceptions of corporate image improve correspondingly.

Simple Regression: Proactiveness and Organisational Effectiveness

$$\text{O E} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{PRO}) + \varepsilon$$

Table 8 Model Summary

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.47	.22	.21	0.64

The regression model indicates that innovation and proactiveness have a moderate positive relationship with corporate image, as shown by the correlation coefficient ($R = .47$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .22$) reveals that 22 percent of the variation in corporate image is explained by these predictors, while the adjusted R^2 (.21)

confirms the model's reliability after accounting for sample size. The standard error of the estimate (.64) suggests a fair level of accuracy in prediction. Overall, these results show that corporate entrepreneurship dimensions contribute meaningfully to corporate image, though a larger portion of the variation is influenced by other factors outside the model.

Table 9 ANOVA

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Regression	29.7	1	29.7	74.3	.000
Residual	120.3	300	0.40		
Total	150.0	301			

The ANOVA results show that proactiveness significantly predicts organizational effectiness. The regression sum of squares (29.7) out of a total of 150.0 indicates that the model explains about 20 percent of the variation in corporate image, while the residual sum of squares (120.3) represents the unexplained portion. The F-value of 74.3, with a p-value of .000, confirms that the relationship is statistically significant. This finding implies that innovation plays an important role in shaping corporate image, though other factors outside the model also contribute to how firms are perceived.

Table 10 Coefficients

Predictor	B	Std. Error	B	T	Sig.
Constant	2.05	0.16	–	12.8	.000
Proactiveness	0.41	0.05	.47	8.62	.000

A simple linear regression was conducted to examine the impact of proactiveness on organisational effectiveness. The analysis revealed that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 300) = 74.3$, $p < .001$, indicating that proactiveness is an important predictor of organisational effectiveness. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .22$) shows that proactiveness alone explains 22% of the variance in organisational effectiveness, which is a meaningful contribution for a single variable. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = .47$, $p < .001$) confirms that proactiveness has a strong positive effect, suggesting that organisations that actively anticipate market changes, respond quickly to customer needs, and take bold competitive actions are more effective in achieving their goals.

Innovation and Proactiveness on Corporate Image

$$\text{CI} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{INN}) + \beta_2(\text{PRO}) + \varepsilon$$

Table 11: Model Summary for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Corporate Image

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.63	.40	.39	0.58

The regression model shows that innovation and proactiveness have a strong positive relationship with corporate image, as indicated by the correlation coefficient (R = .63). The coefficient of determination (R^2 = .40) reveals that 40 percent of the variation in corporate image is explained by these predictors, while the adjusted R^2 (.39) confirms the model's reliability after accounting for sample size. The standard error of the estimate (.58) suggests the model predicts corporate image with good accuracy. Overall, these results demonstrate that corporate entrepreneurship dimensions significantly shape corporate image, though other external factors also contribute to how firms are perceived.

Table 12: ANOVA for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Corporate Image

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	52.4	2	26.2	78.1	.000
Residual	78.6	299	0.26		
Total	131.0	301			

The ANOVA results show that innovation and proactiveness significantly affect corporate image. The regression sum of squares (52.4000) out of a total of 131.0000 indicates the model explains about 40% of the variation, with the remaining 60% due to other factors. The high *F*-value of 78.1000 and $p < .001$ confirm statistical significance. This underscores that entrepreneurial behaviours such as innovating and being proactive are crucial drivers of stakeholder perceptions, while external influences also shape the reputation of firms like Dangote Sugar Plc and Honeywell Plc..

Table 13: Coefficients for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Corporate Image

Predictor	B	Std. Error	β	T	Sig.
Constant	1.65	0.14	–	11.8	.000
Innovation	0.38	0.06	.42	6.33	.000
Proactiveness	0.31	0.07	.35	4.43	.000

The regression model on innovation and proactiveness predicting corporate image was statistically significant, $F(2, 299) = 78.1000$, $p < .001$. The predictors explained 40% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.4000$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.3900$), showing a substantial contribution

to external perception. Innovation (β = 0.4200, $p < .001$) and proactiveness (β = 0.3500, $p < .001$) were both significant positive predictors, indicating that firms introducing new products, adopting technologies, and proactively seeking opportunities are more likely to build a strong corporate image

$$\text{OE} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{INN}) + \beta_2(\text{PRO}) + \varepsilon$$

Table 14: Model Summary for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Organisational Effectiveness

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.58	.34	.33	0.60

The model summary shows that innovation and proactiveness together have a moderate positive relationship with organizational effectiveness, as indicated by the correlation coefficient (R = .58). The coefficient of determination (R^2 = .34) reveals that about 34 percent of the variation in corporate image is explained by these predictors, while the adjusted R^2 (.33) confirms the model's reliability after accounting for sample size. The standard error of the estimate (.60) suggests a reasonably good fit, meaning the model predicts corporate image with acceptable accuracy..

Table 15: ANOVA for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Organisational Effectiveness

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	51.0	2	25.5	70.8	.000
Residual	99.0	299	0.33		
Total	150.0	301			

The ANOVA results show that innovation and proactiveness significantly predict organisational effectiveness. The regression sum of squares (51.0000) out of a total of 150.0000 indicates that the model explains about 34% of the variation in corporate image, while the residual sum of squares (99.0000) reflects the unexplained portion. The F-value of 70.8000 with $p < .001$ confirms statistical significance.

Table 16: Coefficients for Innovation and Proactiveness Predicting Organisational Effectiveness

Predictor	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Constant	1.72	0.15	–	11.5	.000
Innovation	0.29	0.06	.31	4.83	.000
Proactiveness	0.27	0.07	.29	4.12	.000

The regression model examining the joint effect of innovation and proactiveness on organisational effectiveness was statistically significant, $F(2, 299) = 70.8$, $p < .001$. The predictors explained 34% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.3400$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.3300$), showing that entrepreneurial orientation substantially enhances performance outcomes. Both innovation ($\beta = 0.3100$, $p < .001$) and proactiveness ($\beta = 0.2900$, $p < .001$) were significant positive contributors, indicating that organisations fostering creativity and anticipating market changes are more effective in achieving goals, adapting to shifts, and sustaining stakeholder relationships.

Discussion of Findings

The study confirms that innovation and proactiveness are vital drivers of organisational success. Prior evidence (Bature et al., 2018; Umrani et al., 2018; Gunday et al., 2011; Asenge & Dewua, 2023; Ogaga Oghene et al., 2025) consistently shows that firms with strong entrepreneurial postures achieve adaptability, efficiency, competitiveness, and resilience, especially when supported by organisational culture. The present findings align, demonstrating that innovation and proactiveness significantly enhance both corporate image and organisational effectiveness.

Regarding corporate image, results resonate with Nguyen & Leblanc (2001), Ali et al. (2016), and Richard et al. (2009), who emphasized its role in customer loyalty, trust, and broader performance outcomes beyond financial indicators. Similarly, contextual studies in Nigeria (Ojelade et al., 2023; Asenge & Dewua, 2023) reinforce that proactive innovation strategies are essential for competitiveness and survival in dynamic environments.

Regression analyses show that innovation ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < .001$) and proactiveness ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < .001$) jointly explain 40% of the variance in corporate image, while innovation ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < .001$) and proactiveness ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < .001$) account for 34% of organisational effectiveness. These results highlight entrepreneurial orientation as a strategic capability that strengthens reputation, adaptability, stakeholder relationships, and long-term competitiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study established that innovation and proactiveness significantly and positively influence both corporate image and organisational effectiveness. Regression analyses confirmed that these dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation jointly explained 40% of the variance in corporate image and 34% of the variance in organisational effectiveness. This demonstrates that organisations which embed innovative practices and proactive strategies are more likely to strengthen their external reputation while simultaneously enhancing adaptability, efficiency, and stakeholder satisfaction. The

findings align with prior empirical evidence and reinforce the theoretical foundations of entrepreneurial orientation, underscoring its role as a strategic capability essential for sustainable competitiveness and long-term success.

This work recommends that Dangote Sugar and Honeywell flour should:

a. Institutional innovation, as Bature, Sallehuddin, Rosli & Saad (2018) and Ogaga-Oghene, Yalokwu & Omankhanlen (2025) show, firms that encourage creativity, invest in R&D, and reward novel ideas achieve superior adaptability and competitiveness.

b. Adopt proactive strategies, as Umrani, Kura & Ahmed (2018) and Okusanya, Olatoye, Keinde & Adebayo (2024) confirm that anticipating industry trends and responding swiftly to environmental changes strengthens resilience and market leadership.

c. Leverage innovation and proactiveness, as Nguyen & Leblanc (2001) and Ali, Khan & Rehman (2016) highlight that these entrepreneurial behaviours enhance customer trust, loyalty, and brand reputation, securing long-term stakeholder relationships.

d. Prioritise non-financial outcomes, as Richard et al. (2009) and Kosile, Alabi & Ajayi (2024) argue that beyond profitability, indicators such as adaptability, efficiency, and stakeholder satisfaction are critical for sustainable success.

e. Tailor strategies to local realities as Olayinka-Agboola, Eke & Ismail (2025) emphasize that Nigerian firms must align entrepreneurial practices with local challenges, economic volatility, reputational pressures, and competitive intensity, to remain resilient

References

Ali, A., Khan, M. A., & Rehman, K. (2016). Impact of corporate image on customer loyalty and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 8*(1), 1–10.

Asabi, A., Alabi, O., & Olaoye, O. (2022). Innovation and corporate entrepreneurship development in Unilever Nigeria Plc. *Journal of Business and Management Research, 14*(2), 45–58.

Asenge, E. L., & Dewua, S. (2023). Innovation capabilities and performance in Nigerian food processing companies. *African Journal of Business Studies, 11*(3), 112–130.

Bature, S., Sallehuddin, R., Rosli, M., & Saad, S. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The moderating role of market orientation. *Journal of Business Research, 92*, 1–10.

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

Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1983). *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*. Academic Press.

Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal, 10*(1), 75–87.

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

Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies, 47*(6), 1154–1191.

Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., Kilic, K., & Alpkan, L. (2011). Effects of innovation types on firm performance. *International Journal of Production Economics, 133*(2), 662–676.

Kosile, O., Alabi, O., & Ajayi, T. (2024). Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies, 20*(1), 55–70.

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 135–172.

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

Nguyen, N., & Leblanc, G. (2001). Corporate image and reputation in customer retention decisions in services. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 8*(4), 227–236.

Ogaga-Oghene, J., Yalokwu, P., & Omankhanlen, A. (2025). Entrepreneurial orientation capability and product innovation in Nigerian food and beverage companies. *Journal of African Business, 26*(2), 145–163.

Ojelade, O., Inegbedion, H., & Aransiola, S. (2023). Innovation strategies and sustainable entrepreneurship development in the Nigerian food and beverage industry. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, 11*(1), 88–102.

Olayinka-Agboola, O., Eke, C., & Ismail, A. (2025). Innovation, sustainability, and competitiveness in Nigerian food and beverage firms. *Nigerian Journal of Business and Economics, 15*(2), 77–95.

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal, 14*(3), 179–191.

Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management, 35*(3), 718–804.

Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Barnes, B. (1997). Corporate image: Employee reactions and implications for managing corporate social identity. *Corporate Reputation Review, 1*(1), 51–68.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(2), 171–180.