THE ROLE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP STRATEGY IN PROMOTING ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY: A DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL STUDY

Akram Salim Hasan Al-Janabi [*], Sahraa Anwer Hussein [**], Hussam Ali Mhaibes [***], Hakeem Hammood Flayyih [***]

[*] *Corresponding author*, Department of Business Administration, Dijlah University College, Baghdad, Iraq
Contact details: Department of Business Administration, Dijlah University College, AlMasafi Street, 10022 Baghdad, Iraq
[**] Department of Health Administration, Institute of Medical Technology Al-Mansur, Middle Technical University, Baghdad, Iraq
[***] College of Administration and Economics, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

How to cite this paper: Al-Janabi, A. S., Hussein, S. A., Mhaibes, H. A., & Flayyih, H. H. (2024). The role of entrepreneurial leadership strategy in promoting organizational sustainability: A descriptive and analytical study. *Corporate & Business Strategy Review, 5*(3), 62–71.
https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv5i3art6

ISSN Online: 2708-4965
ISSN Print: 2708-9924

Received: 28.10.2023
Accepted: 20.06.2024

JEL Classification: M10, M12, M15, M19
DOI: 10.22495/cbsrv5i3art6

Abstract

The paper aims to build a model that supports organizational sustainability by analyzing the correlations and revealing the impact between the two main variables (entrepreneurial leadership) with its dimensions of proactive outlook, risk, and creativity (Van Zyl & Mathur-Helm, 2007), and (organizational sustainability) with its economic, environmental, and societal dimensions (Hansmann et al., 2012). As well as identifying the level of awareness and informing managers in the General Company for the Automotive and Equipment Industry, of the theoretical implications and performance, and its vital importance to society and the surrounding ecological environment, and drawing attention to that and improving performance, and indicating the important leadership role in activating and supporting organizational sustainability. The questionnaire was used and distributed to a random sample of 58 managers, following the analytical descriptive approach to accomplish the research purposes. The study came out with important conclusions, including that the tangible role of entrepreneurial leadership in supporting and promoting sustainability is reflected in deepening the approach and dimensions of sustainability and its environmental-ecological, vital, economic and social necessities on the basis and directions affecting the strategic success of organizations and their continuity in the business world.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Leadership, Organizational Sustainability, Proactive View, Creativity

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — A.S.H.A.-J.; Methodology — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.; Formal Analysis — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.A.M.; Investigation — A.S.H.A.-J. and S.A.H.; Data Curation — A.S.H.A.-J.; Writing — Original Draft — A.S.H.A.-J.; Writing — Review & Editing — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.; Visualization — A.S.H.A.-J.; Supervision — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.; Project Administration — A.S.H.A.-J. and S.A.H.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational sustainability is increasingly gaining significant importance, making it a vital concern of the current era. It is essential for the survival and success of organizations, as well as for the effective development of their performance (Flayyih & Khiari, 2023; Abdulzahra et al., 2023). This extends beyond economic considerations and mere financial gains. It encompasses a sense of social and environmental responsibility, guiding organizations towards making the right strategic decisions to preserve the rights and resources of future generations in a balanced and equitable manner. Theories and activities of organizational sustainability have crystallized based on the deep-rooted affiliation of business organizations to the societal and ecological fabric based on the principle of organizational citizenship represented in being an integral part of society and the environment (Hasan et al., 2023; Maseer et al., 2022). Therefore, it must assume full responsibility in directing its activities and outputs in a way that serves, and coexists with society and the environment and preserves It is free from pollution and harmful waste and works diligently to sustain its vital resources for current and future generations and to provide it with the means of decent living and well-being and to improve the standard of living and the quality of life. Foundations of empowerment, collective participation, continuous improvement and investment of opportunities in an entrepreneur and proactive manner, while avoiding threats and building a sustainable competitive advantage (Abdullah & Bin Mansor, 2018). In the light of the foregoing and the extreme importance of organizational sustainability and its necessity for the survival of organizations and the perpetuation of their success in synergy with the environmental community fabric system, and the extreme importance of entrepreneurial leadership and its dimensions. This study addressed its pivotal problem represented in the framework of these questions:

RQ1: What is the nature of the role of entrepreneurial leadership in supporting organizational sustainability?

RQ2: What is the understanding and adoption of the firm for the entrepreneurial leadership and organizational sustainability?

RQ3: What is the extent of the impact of the independent variable (entrepreneurial leadership) on the responding variable (organizational sustainability)?

Therefore, the paper aims to prove the role of entrepreneurial leadership in enhancing organizational sustainability in this company, and to explain the relationship and influence between entrepreneurial leadership and its dimensions on the one hand, and organizational sustainability with its dimensions on the other hand, and to reveal the extent of managers' understanding and awareness of each of them. Then answering it with the necessary statistical operations that are based on field data and advanced statistical programs and discussing the results in an analytical manner to come up with inferences and conclusions. The paper was based on building its model, creating a questionnaire, and determining the dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership on a model (Hansmann et al., 2012) to identify the dimensions of organizational sustainability: economic, environmental, and societal. While the model of Van Zyl and Mathur-Helm (2007) was adopted to determine the dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership represented in proactivity, risk-taking, and creativity. The research was conducted at the General Company for the Automotive and Equipment Industry in Baghdad for the period from July 1, 2023, to July 30, 2023. This company is one of the important large industrial companies that manufacture various cars, trucks, mechanisms, bodies, heavy equipment and batteries of all kinds, liquid and dry, and due to its great importance and vital function for the various industrial, agricultural, service, production, and transportation sectors in Iraq, which organically affects the issue of sustainability and urgent environmental and social affairs as well. The questionnaire has been distributed to a random sample of managers to draw their attention and interest in this economic, environmental, and social axis. The need to understand its dimensions, implications, and the interrelationships between them, to enhance the role of the company, leadership and senior management is in accordance with the perspective of entrepreneurial leadership and the foundations of accounting principles.

This contributes to narrowing and bridging the knowledge gap between the strategic directions and modern perspectives of the research variables and their theoretical implications, on the one hand, and its practical and performance field aspects in this company, on the other hand.

The paper consists of six sections, Section 2 is the literature review, Section 3 is the methodology, Section 4 is the calculations and results, Section 5 is the discussion, and Section 6 is the conclusions and limitations with future research proposals.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review examines studies on entrepreneurial leadership. Paudel (2019) explores its impact on business performance, emphasizing the role of organizational innovation. Walker (2021) studies entrepreneurial leadership in the public sector, highlighting transformative effects. Ximenes et al. (2019) focus on its mediating role in high-performance work systems. Sari and Ahmad (2022) assess its influence on strategic agility in Indonesian companies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hoang et al. (2023) emphasize entrepreneurial leadership's role in enhancing performance and competitiveness in Vietnamese hospitality. Phonthanukitithaworn et al. (2023) demonstrate intellectual capital's impact on open innovation in Thai companies. Tasleem et al. (2019) study technology management's impact on sustainable performance. Dabbas and Muhemmed (2018) explore the impact of strategic physiognomy on organizational sustainability in higher education. Chaniago (2023) notes the constructive role of entrepreneurial leadership in business success and digital transformation. Joshi et al. (2023) stress the link between organizational culture and sustainability. Nassir and Uthman (2020) urge sustainable planning for Karbala neighbourhoods.

Noor et al. (2022) gauge awareness of sustainability values among students and teachers. Dawood and Salman (2016) evaluate the environmental performance in the Iraqi drilling company. Chitheer and Al-Shaikhli (2019) link knowledge economics to sustainable development. However, some small projects can survive and thrive, especially through entrepreneurial leadership, which plays a constructive role in business success and the digital transformation of companies (Chaniago, 2023). Entrepreneurial leadership has been a vital focus of exceptional importance and is more widespread in China in the context of COVID-19 to limit the negative effects and repercussions on economic growth (Mendo et al., 2023). Organizational sustainability is gaining increasing importance for organizations around the world and involves managing resources to ensure economic, social and environmental sustainability over the strategic term (Joshi et al., 2023). There is a strong organic relationship between organizational culture and the company's sustainability principles and practices, leading to clean production (Assoratgoon & Kantabutra, 2023). Digital marketing has witnessed a major qualitative shift and an important, positive transformation of the Internet towards the formation of an attractive, interactive, participatory network. Electronic marketing has now enabled organizations to achieve growth, development, flexibility, and organizational sustainability, in addition to competitiveness, through the development of an operational strategy. Ahmad et al.'s (2009) study, which is a Master's thesis submitted to the Bleking Institute of Technology in Sweden, aims to demonstrate the relationship of strategic leadership with sustainability. The case study approach was adopted by conducting interviews in order to clarify the reality of senior management in some of the companies included in the questionnaire and conduct the necessary analyzes to form models for sustainable development and manage the cycle of life in the organization, and giving directions within the framework of the continuous improvement of environmental management systems through the linkage of the dimensions of organizational sustainability with environmental management. The study of Hansmann et al. (2012) emphasized the synergy of the three environmental, social, and economic dimensions. It tested the 542 graduates of the environmental sciences program at the Technical Institute in Zurich have the best practical contributions to sustainable development, and how ecological innovation and modernization can generate social and economic advantages and benefits while facilitating the reduction of the use of natural resources while adhering to responsible use. Our study relied on this model and its dimensions in forming a scale. The questionnaire and the construction of the paper's model. The study of Noor et al. (2022) aims to demonstrate the level of acceptance and awareness of the values of sustainability among students and teachers in the College of Education for Sciences, Ibn Al-Haytham University of Baghdad. In the research community of this college. The study by Dawood and Salman (2016) aims to evaluate the environmental performance by diagnosing the performance gap of the Iraqi drilling company, the application levels of the international standard ISO 1400, the requirements of environmental comprehensive quality and identifying the causes of that environmental gap. The study finds that there are serious efforts by the drilling company to improve the environmental performance of the company. The study by Chitheer and Al-Shaikhli (2019) aims to demonstrate the impact of knowledge economics on sustainable development. It is an exploratory and analytical study of a random sample of employees of the College of Administration and Economics at the University of Baghdad. It concluded that there is an impact and relationship between the basic variables involved in sustainability and that knowledge economics has a role. It is clear to achieve sustainable development and its dimensions. The study by Nassir and Uthman (2020) aims to study the planning treatment for the neighbourhoods of Karbala on the basis and principles of sustainability, through the comparative descriptive analytical approach with conducting interviews for the purpose of collecting data and identifying the gap between current planning on the one hand and sustainable planning on the other hand to reduce the urban gap. One of the most prominent conclusions the study reached is that the planning of most residential neighbourhoods in the city conflicts with the elements of sustainability, and it is necessary to follow sustainable strategic planning in the plans, designs and implementation of the city's neighbourhoods.

Zhong and Wu (2015) argue that sustainability is summed up in a tripartite group that includes an integrated and comprehensive approach to economic, environmental and social elements. Sustainability also means caring for economic, environmental and societal performance simultaneously. It is also how to deal with change and adaptation strategies by investing opportunities and avoiding threats according to the perspective of the economic, social and environmental pillars (Lopes et al., 2017). And managers and society without compromising the needs and resources of future generations. Caiado et al. (2017) indicate that the indicators that support organizational sustainability are internal organizational factors, competition, customer perceptions and expectations, supply chain integration, in addition to ISO 14001 certification. With regard to organizational sustainability goals, it was determined by maintaining the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization, generating development opportunities through education and work, while enhancing creativity and innovation, supporting the infrastructure and its flexibility (Sandra Marcelline et al., 2022). In addition to increasing trust relationships with customers, achieving social equality, preserving the strategic resources and capabilities of the organization now and in the future, and emphasizing shared responsibility for all workers in investing in human, informational and material capabilities to reach the desired goals and maintain the survival and continuity of the organization. With regard to the requirements necessary to achieve organizational sustainability, it was summarized by the need for organizations to adhere to a clear vision, innovation processes, knowledge development and human resources development,

while working to change the culture of workers and the optimal balanced investment of resources as well as adherence to ethical standards and strengthening cooperation relations with various stakeholders, especially representatives of society and the surrounding ecological environment (Mowforth & Munt, 2015). As for the most prominent obstacles and challenges facing organizational sustainability, it can be referred to as lack of support from senior management, lack of information, financial constraints, outdated technologies, shallow stakeholder awareness, communication gap, lack of employee care, and backward waste management (Orji, 2019). Sustainability in relation to cities means renewal, adaptation, and keeping pace with the changes that make them vital, constantly enjoying the means of life, and meeting the requirements of housing and living (Jaafar, 2013). In relation to entrepreneurial leadership, it is a non-stereotypical leadership and is not based on the traditional hierarchy, but depends on individual capabilities and skills to achieve goals in an innovative way (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). And the ability to influence others in the pursuit of advantages and seizing opportunities within the framework of organizing and coordinating resources (Doran et al., 2018). It is also a creative leadership that generates opportunities according to the perspective of wisdom, intuition, and leadership charisma (Rahim & Mohtar, 2015). Among its most prominent characteristics, according to Britchenko et al. (2018), are the reputation of leadership, commitment to goals and priorities beneficial to society, teamwork, sensitivity to variables, and the ability to innovate, and anticipate opportunities. The importance of entrepreneurial leadership lies in enhancing creativity and innovation, motivating workers, investing in opportunities, and enhancing the performance of the organization (Akbari et al., 2021). The concept of entrepreneurial leadership appeared recently in the writings by McGrath and MacMillan (2000), as it confirmed the need for a leadership category that depends on creativity, leadership, and sensing the market and the competitive environment (Bolden, 2011), where the need for a style of leadership with an insight into the future that raises entrepreneurial performance was confirmed (Renko et al., 2015), as well as the high ability to achieve innovation and seize opportunities (Kuratko, 2017), and is distinguished in its directions by emphasizing the future orientation and encouraging teamwork teams to work synergistically in the complex environment to maintain the competitive advantage (Dabić et al., 2021), as it expresses in its movement and choices the high ability to determine the direction and success in adapting. In an environment of uncertainty and this type of leadership is viewed from the perspective of mixing and convergence between the two dimensions of leadership and leadership that is able to motivate followers and sharpen their creative interest towards the future (Roomi & Harrison, 2011). This leadership is characterized by proactivity as an important dimension of entrepreneurial leadership. Lumpkin and Dess (2015) referred to proactive action as the high ability to adapt and take responsibility for failure and failure with experimentation and continuous research in response to possible future environmental changes. Likewise, proactivity interferes with the strategic procedures and their contemporary options today to restructure the operations and business models of the organizations and the mechanisms of their rapid steps continuously (Ireland & Webb, 2007). Entrepreneurial leadership is a creative leadership that generates useful ideas, adopts their promotion and structure, and the ability to identify entrepreneurial opportunities (Bledow et al., 2013). And improving its performance in proactive, innovative, rapid-changing contexts that take risks in order to deal quickly and seize opportunities (Al-Janabi & Mhaibes, 2019). The cognitive literature review contributed to enriching the theoretical contents of this study, as most of these studies, especially Hansmann et al. (2012), contributed significantly to the formation of the study model. The paper dealt with the models and the basic normative dimensions of the two variables: independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) and the respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) have been used in this paper within the resolution scale in a descriptive and analytical manner. Contemporary, especially in the interdependence of physical, social, and environmental economic dimensions directly related to the sustainability of natural and other resources and their balanced investment to ensure the entitlements of future generations and to preserve the ecological environment from pollution and damage.

Accordingly, and in light of it, the paper proceeds from the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a role of entrepreneurial leadership in promoting organizational sustainability.

H2: There is a significant correlation between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational sustainability.

H3: There is a statistically significant effect of entrepreneurial leadership with its dimensions on organizational sustainability with its dimensions.

The following sub-hypotheses branch out from the hypothesis (*H3*):

H3a: The proactivity dimension has a significant effect on organizational sustainability.

H3b: The creativity dimension has a significant effect on organizational sustainability.

H3c: The risk dimension has a significant effect on organizational sustainability.

3. METHODOLOGY

The analytical descriptive approach was adopted to complete the research using the questionnaire tool to collect information from the research community, and according to the scientific models and their dimensions that have been referred to related to the two main variables: independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) based on the source Van Zyl and Mathur-Helm (2007) and the respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) based on Hansmann et al. (2012), the necessary interviews were conducted to fill out the questionnaire with a random sample of managers in the company. 65 questionnaires were distributed, of which 58 questionnaires were retrieved valid for statistical analysis. Calculations were conducted using the statistical program SPSS in addition to statistical tools such as frequency distributions, arithmetic

averages, weighted arithmetic averages, and standard deviation, the coefficient of variance, the correlation coefficient, the Pearson coefficient, and the simple linear regression coefficient to detect the effect or the coefficient of determination R^2. The field work was conducted in the General Company for the Automotive and Equipment Industry in Baghdad, for the period from July 1, 2023, to July 30, 2023. One of the most prominent alternative methods that can be used in this study is to study the existing case in this company in the field and follow up on its records and document data in time and place. The questionnaire used as a measurement tool for this purpose can be detailed and dealt with the independent and respondent variables and their dimensions in the following Table 1.

Table 1. Questionnaire, variables and dimensions

Variable			*Dimension*	*Reference*
Variable *X*	*Entrepreneurial leadership*	*x1*	Proactivity	Van Zyl and Mathur-Helm (2007)
		x2	Risk	
		x3	Creativity	
Variable *Y*	*Organizational sustainability*	*y1*	Economic dimension	Hansmann et al. (2012)
		y2	Environmental dimension	
		y3	Societal dimension	

4. RESULTS

This section includes a detailed explanation of the research sample response in relation to the main variables and the dimensions deriving from them.

4.1. Independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*)

Table 2 includes descriptive statistics that include the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and variance of the independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) and its three dimensions: 1) *proactivity*, 2) *creativity*, and 3) *risk*.

It appears from Table 2 that the total arithmetic mean for the independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) was 3.795, which is very high relative to the median 3 out of 5 on the Likert scale, with a standard deviation of 0.923 and a variance of 0.859. This indicates a very high agreement, great interest and good consistency in the sample's answers, including related to *entrepreneurial leadership*. The arithmetic mean of the three dimensions was as follows: 1) *proactivity* reached 3.729, 2) *creativity* reached 3.827, and 3) *risk* reached 3.827 with standard deviations, respectively: 0.964, 0.854 and 0.950, which indicates the high agreement and great interest of the sample and the consistency of its answers with regard to proactivity, creativity and risk.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) and its dimensions

Descriptive statistics	*Mean*		*Std. dev. statistic*	*Variance statistic*
	Statistic	*Std. error*		
x1	3.6724	0.13559	1.03259	1.066
x2	3.8276	0.11831	0.90103	0.812
x3	3.6897	0.12591	0.95893	0.920
Proactivity	3.7299	0.1266	0.9641	0.9327
x4	3.8103	0.09670	0.73644	0.542
x5	3.8448	0.12969	0.98767	0.975
x6	3.8276	0.11038	0.84059	0.707
Creativity	3.8276	0.1123	0.8549	0.7413
x7	3.8103	0.12888	0.98153	0.963
x8	3.7931	0.11989	0.91304	0.834
x9	3.8793	0.12560	0.95656	0.915
Risk	3.8276	0.1247	0.95038	0.904
X entrepreneurial leadership	3.7950	0.1212	0.9232	0.8593

4.2. Dependent variable (organizational sustainability)

Table 3 includes descriptive statistics that include the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and variance of the respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) and its three dimensions: 1) *economic sustainability*, 2) *environmental sustainability*, and 3) *social sustainability*.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the responding variable (*organizational sustainability*) and its dimensions

Descriptive statistics	*Mean*		*Std. dev. statistic*	*Variance statistic*
	Statistic	*Std. error*		
y1	3.8793	0.11292	0.85998	0.740
y2	3.8103	0.13574	1.03376	1.069
y3	3.7241	0.11482	0.87445	0.765
Economic sustainability	3.805	0.1211	0.9227	0.858
y4	3.6379	0.12469	0.94958	0.902
y5	3.7931	0.10933	0.83264	0.693
y6	3.4655	0.13520	1.02966	1.060
Environmental sustainability	3.632	0.123	0.937	0.885
y7	3.9310	0.12748	0.97084	0.943
y8	3.7069	0.12300	0.93675	0.877
y9	3.7586	0.12374	0.94238	0.888
Social sustainability	3.799	0.1247	0.9499	0.90
Y organizational sustainability	3.745	0.123	0.937	0.882

It appears in Table 3 that the total arithmetic mean for the respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) amounted to 3.745, which is a very high mean from the median 3 out of 5 on the five-point Likert scale, with a standard deviation of 0.937 and a variance of 0.882, which indicates a good harmony in the sample's answers and their agreement on the main variable (*organizational sustainability*). The arithmetic mean of the three dimensions was as follows: 1) *economic sustainability* was 3.805, 2) *environmental sustainability* was 3.632, and 3) *social sustainability* was 3.799, with standard deviations respectively: 0.922, 0.937, and 0.949, and this indicates the consistency of the sample's answers, its high agreement, and its great interest with regard to the economic, environmental, and societal dimensions.

4.3. Main hypothesis testing (*H1*)

We conducted a t-test to verify the validity of the main hypothesis (*H1*) according to the graphic data of Table 4 as follows:

Table 4. T-test of validity of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables

Model N = 58		*Unstandardized coefficients*		*Standardized coefficients*	*t*	*Sig.*
		B	*Std. error*	*Beta*		
1	(Constant)	1.231	0.402		3.063	0.003
	X	0.663	0.104	0.647	6.358	0.000

Note: Dependent variable: Y (organizational sustainability).

Table 4 shows that the value of t is equal to 6.358 in the N sample of 58 individuals, and the significance is 0.000, which is smaller than the level of significance 0.01, as it falls within the confidence interval of 0.99. Therefore, we accept the validity of the *H1*.

4.4. Correlation hypothesis testing (*H2*)

Table 5 related to testing the correlation between the independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) with its dimensions and the respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) with its dimensions, as follows.

Table 5. Correlation between the variables *entrepreneurial leadership* and *organizational sustainability*

Correlations		*Economic sustainability*	*Environmental sustainability*	*Social sustainability*	*Organizational sustainability*
Proactivity	Pearson correlation	0.544**	0.603**	0.484**	0.613**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	58	58	58	58
Creativity	Pearson correlation	0.468**	0.470**	0.597**	0.578**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	58	58	58	58
Risk	Pearson correlation	0.342**	0.459**	0.536**	0.505**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	58	58	58	58
Entrepreneurial leadership	Pearson correlation	0.518**	0.587**	0.615**	0.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	58	58	58	58

*Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 5 presents the correlation coefficient test between the *entrepreneurial leadership* and the *organizational sustainability*, and it turns out that it is equal to 0.647, which is a high correlation value with a statistical significance level of 0.01. And the high correlation values of the sub-dimensions of the independent variable, on the one hand, and the sub-dimensions of the respondent variable appear in the Table 5, on the other hand.

4.5. Impact hypothesis testing (*H3*)

Table 6 shows the impact of *entrepreneurial leadership* with its dimensions on *organizational sustainability*.

Table 6. The impact of *entrepreneurial leadership* with its dimensions on *organizational sustainability*

Dimensions	*R^2*	*Sign.*	*F*	*α*	*β*	*t*
Proactivity	0.344	0.000	9.446	1.550	0.447	3.193
Creativity	0.387	0.000	11.372	1.025	0.482	3.563
Risk	0.389	0.000	11.479	0.998	0.182	1.346
Entrepreneurial leadership	0.419	0.000	40.421	1.231	0.647	6.358

It is shown in Table 6 that the model of the effect of the main independent variable (*entrepreneurial leadership*) X on the main respondent variable (*organizational sustainability*) Y at the level of 0.01 with a calculated F-value of 40.421, which is higher than the tabular F of 7.06 with a significant level of 0.01 and the coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.419$, which means that *entrepreneurial leadership* explains the value of 41.9% of *organizational sustainability*, and the value of β is 0.647. That is, the change in one unit of *entrepreneurial leadership* causes a change of 64.7% of the *organizational sustainability*. This result allows support for accepting the *H2*. The model of

the effect of the sub-variable *x1* (*proactivity*) on *organizational sustainability* is at a level of 0.01 with a calculated F-value of 9.446, which is higher than the tabular F-value of 7.06 at a significant level of 0.01, and the value of the determination coefficient R^2 was 0.344, which means that the *proactivity* dimension explains 34.4% of *organizational sustainability*, and the value of $\beta = 0.447$ means that the change in one unit of *proactivity* causes a change of 44.7% of the *organizational sustainability*. This result supports the acceptance of the *H3a*. The model of the impact of the sub-variable *x2* (*creativity*) on *organizational sustainability* is at the level of 0.01, with a calculated F-value equal to 11.372, which is higher than the tabular F of 7.06 with a significant level of 0.01 and the coefficient of determination R^2 0.387, which means that the *creativity* dimension explains 38.7% of *organizational sustainability* and that the value of $\beta = 0.482$. That is, the change in one unit of *creativity* causes a change of 48.2% of the *organizational sustainability*. This result allows support for accepting the *H3b*. The model of the impact of the sub-variable *x3* (*risk*) on *organizational sustainability* is at the level of 0.01, with a calculated F-value equal to 40.421, which is higher than the tabular F of 7.06 with a significant level of 0.01 and the coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.419$, which means that the *risk* dimension explains 41.9% of *organizational sustainability* and that the value of $\beta = 0.182$. That is, the change in one unit of *risk* causes a change of 18.2% of *organizational sustainability*, and this result allows support for accepting *H3c*. These results mean accepting the *H3* the study.

5. DISCUSSION

The data provided by the results in the previous section, which dealt with practical procedures and their calculations, statistically confirmed the validity of the hypothesis *H1* that there is a clear role for entrepreneurial leadership in promoting organizational sustainability. The correlation confirmed the strong link between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational sustainability. These results clarify and crystallize the study model in highlighting the features and pillars of organizational sustainability and its vital importance represented in the importance and vitality of its economic, environmental, ecological and societal dimensions, through the effectiveness of entrepreneurial leadership that bears its responsibilities in facing risks and its proactive view towards the future and its variables and towards investing resources and disposing of them wisely and creatively, and in all its forms. Especially the depleted natural resources to remain within the renewable entitlements of future generations and for everyone with justice and fairness, as well as the results and their moral data, came to confirm the directions of the entrepreneurial leadership and its responsible behaviour in facing environmental changes and protecting its vital ecological elements surrounding human society and protecting it from pollution, carbon emissions, desertification and drought.

6. CONCLUSION

The study came out, through its data and results, which were built, calculated and discussed on the basis of field procedural steps and theoretical frameworks, to important conclusions, the most important of which are the significant and tangible role of entrepreneurial leadership in supporting and promoting organizational sustainability is reflected in deepening the issue of sustainability and its great importance and vital necessities ecologically, economically and socially on contemporary foundations and trends that affect the strategic success of various organizations, institutions and companies, and their continuity and survival in the business world, since these organizations are an integral part of the local and international community fabric. Therefore, it must be affected by what befalls and is happening to organizations all over the world in terms of repercussions and repercussions. And that the strong link between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational sustainability clearly expresses the urgent need for the axis of sustainability and its dimensions, and in order to achieve its economic, environmental and social goals and objectives, to creative leadership with high capabilities to adapt and change to keep pace with emerging contexts and rapid developments at all levels, especially the ecological and environmental levels surrounding human societies and affecting them. in an organic manner on his/her livelihood, his/her necessities of living and his/her well-being. As the clear impact of entrepreneurial leadership on the axis and the issue of organizational sustainability means a lot to public and private organizations that bear responsibilities. Great in facing risks and preparing for crises and threats in order to reduce, cross and overcome them and reach strategic goals, the most prominent of which is achieving sustainability and its requirements by all standards, especially environmental and ecological, and securing resources for all current and future generations, and preserving them in an equitable and wise manner and rationalizing their uses. What was stated in the results confirms the validity of the study's starting points and basic hypotheses, and it is an unambiguous indication that the issue of sustainability is the central issue of the current era, to which the international community has taken an accelerating pace towards achieving its tasks and standards, especially in avoiding environmental pollution and avoiding the emission of carbon and nitrogen gases and their harmful compounds and avoiding The programmed gradual abandonment of the uses of petroleum, hydrocarbon and fossil fuels in order to move towards clean green energy alternatives, all of which require proactive, creative leadership that takes risks to achieve these strategic goals. The briefing and realization of the leaders of the organizations and their departments of these vital matters and drawing the necessary attention and attention to them and the requirements to accompany them and achieve them is a critical strategic issue that does not accept delay or procrastination because it affects the present and future of society and its decent living, safety and well-being. The study faced difficulties and limitations, the most important of which is the difficulty of distributing the questionnaire in

light of the hot climate and high temperatures in our country and the world during its conduct from July 1, 2023, to July 30, 2023 in the city of Baghdad and its outskirts, and the sensitivity of workers in general in public institutions and companies towards distributing an information questionnaire that requires them to be questioned and answered, and this may be due to routine and bureaucratic formulas usually prevailing in such institutions, except for the difficulties and obstacles of financing activities and the effort exerted for the purpose of completing the study and its requirements, distributing the questionnaire, transportation, and others. With regard to the proposed future studies, we consider it appropriate to conduct the following: 1) the trend towards green energy alternatives is an approach that enhances the orientation of sustainability, 2) the use of solar panel technologies contributes to the advancement towards sustainability, and 3) entrepreneurial leadership is a vital necessity to keep pace with environmental changes and achieve sustainable development.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Y. A., & Bin Mansor, M. N. (2018). The moderating effect of business environment on the relationship between entrepreneurial skills and small business performance in Iraq. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 22*(special issue). http://surl.li/sctmq

Abdulzahra, A. N., Al-Shiblawi, G. A. K., Flayyih, H. H., Elaigwu, M., Abdulmalik, S. O., Talab, H. R., & Audu, F. (2023). Corporate governance towards sustainability performance quality: A case of listed firms in Malaysia. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management, 8*(4), Article 22882. https://doi.org/10.55267/iadt.07.14051

Ahmad, S. S., Saha, P. K., Abbasi, A., & Khan, M. (2009). *Environmental management systems and sustainability: Integrating sustainability in environmental management systems* [Master's thesis, Blekinge Institute of Technology]. Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A830529&dswid=2098

Akbari, M., Bagheri, A., Imani, S., & Asadnezhad, M. (2021). Does entrepreneurial leadership encourage innovation work behavior? The mediating role of creative self-efficacy and support for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 24*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-10-2019-0283

Al-Janabi, A. S. H., & Mhaibes, H. A. (2019). Employing marketing information systems for the success of small and medium enterprises: A field study of some Tourism and Travel companies in Baghdad. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *8*(4). https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_65_vol_8_4__2019_iraq.pdf

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *1*(1–2), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.4

Assoratgoon, W., & Kantabutra, S. (2023). Toward a sustainability organizational culture model. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 400*, Article 136666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136666

Bledow, R., Rosing, K., & Frese, M. (2013). A dynamic perspective on affect and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(2), 432–450. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0894

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *13*(3), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x

Britchenko, I., Smerichevskyi, S., & Kryvovyazyuk, I. (2018). Transformation of entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century: Prospects for the future. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social, Economic and Academic Leadership (ICSEAL 2018)* (Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research: Vol. 217). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/icseal-18.2018.17

Caiado, R. G. G., de Freitas Dias, R., Mattos, L. V., Quelhas, O. L. G., & Leal Filho, W. (2017). Towards sustainable development through the perspective of eco-efficiency — A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 165*, 890–904. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.166

Chang, R.-D., Zuo, J., Zhao, Z.-Y., Zillante, G., Gan, X.-L., & Soebarto, V. (2017). Evolving theories of sustainability and firms: History, future directions and implications for renewable energy research. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 72*, 48–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.029

Chaniago, H. (2023). Investigation of entrepreneurial leadership and digital transformation: Achieving business success in uncertain economic conditions. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 18*(2), 18–27. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242023000200018

Chitheer, S. H., & Al-Shaikhly, F. J. (2019). Tathir aiqtisadiaat almaerifat fi tahqiq altanmiat almustadamat: Dirasat aistitlaeiat laeayinat min muazafi kuliyat al'iidarat w alaiqtisadi-jamieat [The impact of knowledge economics in achieving sustainable development: An exploratory study of a sample of employees of the College of Administration and Economics — University of Baghdad]. *Majalat Kuliat Baghdad Lileulum Alaiqtisadiat Aljamiea, 2019*(s), 19–40 https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/b62aaf49fd5e212e

Dabbas, H. F., & Muhemmed, S. T. (2018). Effect of strategic physiognomy on the success of organizational sustainability. *International Journal for Advance Research and Development, 3*(5), 98–105. http://surl.li/sjuur

Dabić, M., Stojčić, N., Simić, M., Potocan, V., Slavković, M., & Nedelko, Z. (2021). Intellectual agility and innovation in micro and small businesses: The mediating role of entrepreneurial leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, *123*, 683–695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.013

Dawood, F. S., & Salman, H. N. (2016) Dawr mutatalibat adarat alshaamilat lilbiyat fi taeziz alastidamat albiyiat tatbiqiun fi sharikat alhafr aleiraqia [The role of comprehensive environmental quality management requirements in enhancing environmental sustainability]. *Majalat Aleulum Aliaiqtisadiat Wal'iidaria, 22*(87), 147–172. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/77b51ea78534debf

Doran, J., McCarthy, N., & O'Connor, M. (2018). The role of entrepreneurship in stimulating economic growth in developed and developing countries. *Cogent Economics & Finance, 6*(1), Article 1442093. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2018.1442093

Flayyih, H. H., & Khiari, W. (2023). Empirically measuring the impact of corporate social responsibility on earnings management in listed banks of the Iraqi Stock Exchange: The mediating role of corporate governance. *Industrial Engineering & Management Systems*, *22*(3), 321–333. https://doi.org/10.7232/iems.2023.22.3.273

Hansmann, R., Mieg, H. A., & Frischknecht, P. (2012). Principal sustainability components: Empirical analysis of synergies between the three pillars of sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 19*(5), 451–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2012.696220

Hansson, F., & Mønsted, M. (2008). Research leadership as entrepreneurial organizing for research. *Higher Education, 55*, 651-670. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9081-5

Hasan, S. I., Saeed, H. S., Al-Abedi, T. K., & Flayyih, H. H. (2023). The role of target cost management approach in reducing costs for the achievement of competitive advantage as a mediator: An applied study of the Iraqi electrical industry. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies*, *15*(2), 214–230. https://sobiad.org/menuscript/index.php/ijefs/article/view/1516/384

Hoang, G., Nguyen, H., Luu, T. T., & Nguyen, T. T. (2023). Linking entrepreneurial leadership and innovation performance in hospitality firms: The roles of innovation strategy and knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice, 33*(4), 511–536. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTP-09-2022-0203

Ireland, R. D., & Webb, J. W. (2007). A multi-theoretic perspective on trust and power in strategic supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management, 25*(2), 482–497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2006.05.004

Jaafar, Z. A. (2013). Iaalstdamt fi alhusul ealaa alkhidamat alhadaria (Halat tatbiqiat ealaa madinat alnajaf aalshraf) [Sustainability in access to urban services (An applied case on the city of Najaf)]. *Majalat Almukhatat Waltanmiat, 2013*(27), 131–139. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/90f80a0b4010f675

Joshi, A., Kataria, A., Rastogi, M., Beutell, N. J., Ahmad, S., & Yusoff, Y. M. (2023). Green human resource management in the context of organizational sustainability: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 430*, Article 139713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.139713

Kuratko, D. F. (2017). Corporate entrepreneurship 2.0: Research development and future directions. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, *13*(6), 441–490. https://doi.org/10.1561/0300000082

Lopes, C. M., Scavarda, A., Hofmeister, L. F., Thomé, A. M. T., & Vaccaro, G. L. R. (2017). An analysis of the interplay between organizational sustainability, knowledge management, and open innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 142*, 476–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.083

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2015). Entrepreneurial orientation. In *Wiley encyclopedia of management* (Vol. 3). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom030030

Maseer, R. W., Zghair, N. G., & Flayyih, H. H. (2022). Relationship between cost reduction and reevaluating customers' desires: The mediating role of sustainable development. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies*, *14*(4), 330–344. http://surl.li/sgtpt

McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset: Strategies for continuously creating opportunity in an age of uncertainty* (Vol. 284). Harvard Business Press.

Mendo, A. Y., Singh, S. K., Yantu, I., Hinelo, R., Bokingo, A. H., Dungga, E. F., Juanna, A., Wardhana, A. K., Niroula, B., & Win, T. (2023). Entrepreneurial leadership and global management of COVID-19: A bibliometric study. *F1000Research*, *12*, Article 31. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.109340.1

Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2015). *Tourism and sustainability: Development, globalization and new tourism in the third world* (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315795348

Nassir, E. S. N., & Uthman, A. K. (2020). Planning treatments for the residential neighborhoods in the holy city of Karbala in light of the concepts of sustainability. *Journal of Planner and Development, 25*(3Suppl.), 39–61. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/38dba1fa2e5ce3c2

Noor, T. H. A., Ahmed, B. M., & Ahmed, N. A. A. Q. (2022). Student-teacher environmental sustainability values college of education for pure sciences. *Kut University College Journal for Humanitarian Science*, *3*(2), 72–81. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/8b8e328b7097398c

Orji, I. J. (2019). Examining barriers to organizational change for sustainability and drivers of sustainable performance in the metal manufacturing industry. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 140*, 102–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.08.005

Paudel, S. (2019). Entrepreneurial leadership and business performance: Effect of organizational innovation and environmental dynamism. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 8*(3), 348–369 https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-11-2018-0136

Peng, H., Zhou, C., & Liu, Y. (2020). Entrepreneurial experience and performance: From the aspect of sustainable growth of enterprises. *Sustainability*, *12*(18), Article 7351. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187351

Phonthanukitithaworn, C., Srisathan, W. A., Ketkaew, C., & Naruetharadhol, P. (2023). Sustainable development towards openness SME innovation: Taking advantage of intellectual capital, sustainable initiatives, and open innovation. *Sustainability, 15*(3), Article 2126. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032126

Rahim, H. L., & Mohtar, S. (2015). Social entrepreneurship: A different perspective. *International Academic Research Journal of Business and Technology, 1*(1), 9–15. http://www.iarjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/IARJ-BT-20151-9-15.pdf

Renko, M., El Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A. L., & Brännback, M. (2015). Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership style. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *53*(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12086

Roomi, M. A., & Harrison, P. (2011). Entrepreneurial leadership: What is it and how should it be taught? *Senate Hall*. http://hdl.handle.net/10547/222995

Sandra Marcelline, T. R., Chengang, Y., Ralison Ny Avotra, A. A., Hussain, Z., Zonia, J. E., & Nawaz, A. (2022). Impact of green construction procurement on achieving sustainable economic growth influencing green logistic services management and innovation practices. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 9*, Article 815928. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.815928

Sari, S. A., & Ahmad, N. H. (2022). Connecting the dots: Linking entrepreneurial leadership and strategic agility towards SME competitiveness. *Vision*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221091658

Tasleem, M., Khan, N., & Nisar, A. (2019). Impact of technology management on corporate sustainability performance: The mediating role of TQM. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 36*(9), 1574–1599. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-01-2018-0017

Van Zyl, H. J. C., & Mathur-Helm, B. (2007). Exploring a conceptual model, based on the combined effects of entrepreneurial leadership, market orientation and relationship marketing orientation on South Africa's small tourism business performance. *South African Journal of Business Management, 38*(2), 17–24. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v38i2.580

Walker, D. (2021). *Leading within the public sector: Understanding entrepreneurial leadership and its impact on public service delivery* [Doctoral dissertation, Point Park University]. ProQuest. https://www.proquest.com/openview/412f57c7e9130427f10baaa466261cd6/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Ximenes, M., Supartha, W. G., Manuati Dewi, I. G. A., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2019). Entrepreneurial leadership moderating high performance work system and employee creativity on employee performance. *Cogent Business & Management, 6*(1), Article 1697512. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1697512

Zhong, Y., & Wu, P. (2015). Economic sustainability, environmental sustainability and constructability indicators related to concrete- and steel-projects. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 108*, 748–756. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.095