Abstract

The aim of this research was to evaluate the relationship between leadership styles and job self-efficacy with organizational entrepreneurship among the employees of Khouzestan water and power authority. The sample included 400 people among the Employees of Khuzestan Water and Power Authority that were selected randomly via stratified sampling. The instruments for gathering data were: Leadership Style Questionnaire, Job self-efficacy Questionnaire and Entrepreneurial Behaviors Questionnaire. The research was a correlative study. For analyzing data correlation coefficient and multivariate regressions were used. The results showed that there was simple and multiple relations between the supportive leadership styles and organizer and job self-efficacy with organizational entrepreneurship while organizational entrepreneurship could be predicted by job self-efficacy stronger rather than leadership styles in of the employees.
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**Introduction**

Obviously, because the organizations are becoming more complex and due to the growth of technology and new and innovative knowledge, organizations and managers are increasingly trying to find out how to make their organizations, entrepreneurial and creative and make the growth and success of their organizations (Hisrich & Michael, 2005). In fact, for today's organizations innovation and entrepreneurship are as the steps of the development ladder which should be climbed with full awareness and successfully (Saedikia, 1989). Entrepreneurship is now the most effective communication method between science and the market (Feizbaksh 2004).

This concept can also occur when a person or group of people start an economic activity and also within an active organization, where the latter type is called corporate entrepreneurship (Moghimi 2005). Corporate entrepreneurship is based on an organization's ability to learn through discovery of new knowledge and the use of current knowledge and is rapidly becoming a weapon of choice for many organizations, especially large ones (Baron & Jeffrey, 2010). Corporate entrepreneurship is also an attempt to create an entrepreneurial mindset and skills (Antonic & Prodan, 2008). However, integrating these features into the culture and mentality and the activities of the public sector is no exception to this rule (Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2007). Since leadership is one of the main processes of each organization, the organizational efficiency also depends on the organization's leadership practices (Shekarkan et al., 2002).

Today, as many experts have suggested, the fundamental requirement of leadership in organizations, is to specify the direction for collective efforts for the advance of the organization (Farhangi & Safarzadeh, 2008). Although we all agree that leadership requires effectiveness and influence, but the dispute revolves around the view that the leadership should be without coercion or not (which means influencing followers without organizational authority and regardless of reward or punishment,), and whether or not it is different from management or not (Yukl 2001). Several studies have reported a positive relationship between specific leadership behaviors (creative actions, ideas and performance) or leadership style and organizational entrepreneurship (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange, 2002). As New Era requires knowledge and new skills, it also needs new leadership style. Styles that, in today's turbulent world, can help managers lead and guide human resources and define a new relation between leaders and followers so that the organization and staff can achieve their goals. Another factor which has relationship with entrepreneurship and creative activities in an organization is job self-efficacy. Bandura defines self-efficacy as the personal belief in one's capabilities and abilities to perform a task successfully (Bandura, 1993).

With respect to the goals that people define for themselves, self-efficacy is a strong motivational prediction of how an individual performs his/her task (Zajacova, Lynch, & Espenshade, 2005). An individual’s self-efficacy is an important determiner of his/her efforts, persistence and perseverance, planning and problem solving, as well as further education and his job performance. In addition to its high predictive power, self-efficacy can be developed so that the benefits of its improved performance are brought under control (Cherry, 2008). Mashayekhi (2012) in a study entitled, showed that different styles of leadership and organizational culture have a significant relationship with organizational creativity. A Research done by Sharifi (2011) on the impact of corporate communications on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the results obtained showed that corporate communications, management style and
organizational culture, affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment and innovative trends of the staff (quoted by Hadi Shahni, 2011).

Wang and Rode (2012) conducted a study, in a mixed sample of 212 employees and their immediate supervisors in 71 working groups representing 55 organizations. Results of multilevel linear analysis showed that the three-way interaction between combinational leadership, employee identification and innovative climate with creativity was correlated. The results of this study indicated a significant relationship between management methods and tendency to innovative behaviors in the organization. Longo & Thean (2011) carried out a study entitled showed that employees whose boss used a participative leadership style showed significantly higher rates of job satisfaction and innovative practices than employees whose boss had authoritarian style. Leon (2010) in a study entitled, the leadership style in an organizational competition culture showed the relationship between specific types of leadership styles and organizational culture. And both are mutually involved in the effectiveness and the development of innovative development. The results of the research done by Yitshaki & Rothstein (2010) shows that not only emotional intelligence of managers but their management styles, plays a decisive role in the corporate entrepreneurship. Demirbag & Etal identified the management support of the staff as a key factor in the development of entrepreneurship in government agencies. They believe that the leadership style of a manager and ease of communication between management and employees of an organization plays an important role in this regard.

Leame et all (2007) found that self-efficacy has a direct impact on deep learning and achieving the desired job outcomes (quoted from Khayat-Zadeh, 2011). Barrett, Plotnikoff &Raome Bart (2007) in a study showed that there is a significant relationship between the components of leadership style in today's organizations and the creation of favorable organizational climate in the direction of the corporate entrepreneurship (quoted from Hadi Shahni, 2011). Luthans, Olive, AVI and Norman (2007) in a study have enumerated self-efficacy as the strongest predictor of entrepreneurial behavior and best distinguisher between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Therefore, using training to increase self-efficacy, can cause an increase in entrepreneurial behavior (Avey, Patera & West). Given that the organizations have a great need for technological innovation to achieve their goals in such a complex, dynamic and uncertain competitive and corporate environment, which can be achieved through entrepreneurial strategies (Seifi Saldhy, 2010). Organizational effectiveness lies not only in the processes and styles of leadership of managers, but it is related to the efficacy of the staff in doing their tasks. Self-efficacy is not related to skill or skills, but it refers to having faith in the ability to work on different job conditions (Pajares, 2002). Performing tasks by different people with similar skills in different situations, weakly, moderately or strongly, or by a person in different situations is related to the difference in their efficacy beliefs (Myers, Feltz & Short, 2004). Therefore the aim of this study was to examine the relationship between job self-efficacy and corporate entrepreneurship, in employees of Khuzestan Water and Power Organization.

Method

Society, samples and research method
The study population consisted of Khuzestan Water and Power employees who were working in the organization in 2012-13. According to the previous researches and also in accordance with
the Mourgan table, a population of 400 people was randomly selected from various organizational units.

**Research tools**

**Leader behavior description questionnaire (LBDQ)**
This questionnaire originally was developed by the Ohio State University, which was prepared by Hmfyl and Coons and later by Halpin & Weiner and Stagdil (1975). It contains 30 questions. 15 questions were related to supportive leadership style (conservative) and 15 others were related to organizing leadership style (imperative) of managers. In the present study, the final coefficients of this questionnaire were calculated using Cronbach's alpha and split-half methods that for supportive style, the coefficients were 0.76 and 0.60 and for organizing style they were 0.88 and 0.85 (Teyebnejad, 2003). In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha and split-half coefficients of the questionnaire were calculated that for supportive style these coefficients were 0.76 and 0.60 respectively and for organizing style they were 0.88 and 0.85 respectively.

**Self-employment questionnaire**
This questionnaire, made by Riggs and Knight (1994), with 31 articles and four groups is used to evaluate individual beliefs of self-efficacy, individual personal consequences expectancy, collective efficacy beliefs and collective consequences expectancy and it was for the first time translated and validated by Saee and Noamee (2009). In the present study, the reliability coefficients of this questionnaire were calculated using Cronbach's alpha and split-half methods which were 0.53 and 0.57 respectively.

**Entrepreneurial behaviors questionnaire**
This questionnaire made by Pierce, Kramer and Robin (1997) has 6 articles. The test is scored for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Zmptakys et al (2009) using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient to assess the reliability of the questionnaire have reported the coefficient 0.71. In the present study to determine the reliability of this questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha and split-half, the coefficients were obtained 0.86 and 0.73 respectively.

**Finding**

**The descriptive findings**

Descriptive findings including the average and the standard deviation are reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Leadership Style</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Leadership Style</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Leadership Style</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>126.14</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate entrepreneurship</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, analyzing the responses of leadership style, average and standard deviation of supportive leadership style, are 51.06 and 9.94 respectively, for organizing leadership style they
are 55.60 and 8 respectively and for participative leadership style they are 3.21 and 1.24 respectively. Also, the average and standard deviation of the job self-efficacy variable are 126.14 and 16.06 respectively and for entrepreneurship they are 20.57 and 3.25 respectively.

The findings of the research hypotheses

First hypothesis: there is a relationship between the supportive leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship.

Second hypothesis: there is a relationship between organizing leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship.

Third hypothesis: there is a relationship between participative leadership styles and corporate entrepreneurship.

Fourth hypothesis: there is a relationship between self-efficacy and corporate entrepreneurship.

Fifth hypothesis: there is a multiple relationship among leadership styles (supportive, organizing and participative), job self-efficacy and corporate entrepreneurship.

Table 2: Results of simple correlation coefficient between predictor variables and entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The criterion variable</th>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Supportive leadership style</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing Leadership Style</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participative Leadership Style</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 2, there is a significant relationship between the supportive leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship (P =0.001 and r=0.22). Also there is a significant relationship between organizing leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship (P =0.001 and r =0.167), as well as a significant relationship between job self-efficacy and entrepreneurship (P =0.001 and r =0.337). So first, second and fourth research hypothesis is confirmed. But with respect to the obtained coefficient r=0.049 at the level of significance of P=0.001, there is no significant relationship between participative leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship and therefore the third hypothesis is not confirmed.

Table 3: multiple correlation coefficient of corporate culture, emotional intelligence and corporate entrepreneurship using stepwise method (Stepwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Statistical Index</th>
<th>The R S coefficient of determination</th>
<th>Ratio F</th>
<th>Probability P</th>
<th>Regression coefficients (β) and (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MR 0.337</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>F=50.84 P=0.001</td>
<td>B=0.060 β=0.294 P=0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MR 0.354</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>F=28.48 P=0.001</td>
<td>B=0.069 β=0.33 P=0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B=0.039 β=0.118 P=0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results can be seen in Table 3 that (MR =0.337 and RS =0.113) with P<0.0001 it becomes clear that among leadership styles and job self-efficacy as predictor variables, job self-efficacy is more predictable.

**Conclusion**

This study was aimed to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and self-employment on one hand and corporate entrepreneurship in Khuzestan Water and Power organization staff on the other hand and some results were obtained from the analysis of the data using multivariate regression that in the following in addition to enumerating the results related to hypotheses of current study, they will be discussed.

Among the findings of this study was the relationship between leadership styles and corporate entrepreneurship, among the staff. Based on the results of Table 2 it was shown that there is a relationship between the supportive leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship and also between organizing leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship in the staff, but there wasn’t any relationship between supportive leadership style and corporate entrepreneurship among the staff. There the first and second hypotheses of this study are confirmed but not the third one. The findings based on this hypothesis are consistent with the results of the Presbyterians (2012), Honor (2011), Sharafi (2007), Wang and Rode (2012), Lyon (2010), Yitshaki & Rothstein (2010) and Barrett (2003) but they are antithetic with the findings of Lank and Tian (2011).

Although the results of the third hypothesis is antithetic with some previous studies, but to explain these three hypotheses it can be said that the leadership of an organization beside planning, organization and control, is one of the most important and essential tasks of the manager and plays an important role in the management of the organization and its importance is so great that managers are mostly considered as the leaders of the organization and with respect to the significance of the relationship of supportive and organizing leadership styles with corporate entrepreneurship it can be said that in order to create corporate entrepreneurship and develop it , the rule of all or any meaning that the organization manager be relation-oriented or generally job-oriented, (spontaneous or not spontaneous)??, may be more effective.

From the organizational point of view, leadership is of critical importance because the leadership has a powerful influence on the behavior of individuals and groups. In addition, another reason of the importance of leadership is that the leader leads the efforts of the group to a goal that is his goal also, and this goal may have been coordinated or not coordinated with organizational goals. Without leadership the link between individual and organizational objectives, may be poor or ruptured (Robbins, 1998; translated by Parsaeian and Arabs, 2005).

If managers are to increase the effectiveness of their organization's activities, they should attempt to create an entrepreneurial structure in their organizations. Such a structure with specific components that provide the high adaptability to the changing conditions of the environment for the organization gives the necessary capabilities to the organization to meet changing and diverse needs of customers and audience and satisfy them and increases the effectiveness of the organization's activities and provides the benefit of its achievements. The creation of such a structure depends on the characteristics of a manager, including responsibility, efficacy and risk
taking. Managing the ever-changing, vague, unpredictable and stressful situations requires multiple skills. Previous skills to respond to various demands of different situations often have to be organized using new methods. Therefore, exchanges and interactions of an individual with the environment, is partly under the influence of his judgments about his/her capabilities. As a result, managers with high self-efficacy who mind creativity and innovation in the organizations can provide a good climate for innovative behaviors. According to Wang (1993) managers can affect the innovative organizational climate through targeted design of the incentives to strengthen entrepreneurship factors such as risk-taking and embracing change as well as information sharing with employees. The role of other managers and supervisors is development of corporate entrepreneurship by providing the necessary resources such as time, materials and information needed for creative behavior (Baron and Jeffrey, 2010). Support from the organization or a powerful person in the organization (e.g. supervisor), makes the employees have a sense of commitment and thus help the organization to achieve its goals. This strong commitment in turn can lead to an increase innovative activities and the internal and external performance lead role (Becker Vkrnan, 2003, Banton and Naveen, 2003; Ryads, Shank and Eisenberg, 2006; Tepper and Taylor, 2003; to quotes Ashlmn, 2011). The supervisor’s support is essential for creating corporate entrepreneurship to motivate employees to make progress. Supervisor’s assessment is considered as an effective factor on assessment of official policies of the organization such as rewards, perceived interests and the amount of compensation perceived due to leaving the organization, and unofficial policies such as controls on group decision makings for working hours. In general, perception of the supervisor’s support is effective on whether employees shirk their responsibilities or they are quite active in the scheduled time, (Kelly McCullough, 2006; Kelly and Moon, 2007; Kvsk, Latchi and Eaton, 2005 quoted by Block, 2012).

On the other hand, according to study results presented in Table 2, it was observed that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and entrepreneurship of the staff, so the fourth hypothesis was confirmed. The results of this hypothesis is consistent with the results of Nahid (2008), Lim et al. (2007), Luthans (2000) and AVI (2006). Self-efficacy is the belief of a person in his ability to succeed in a specified position. Based on the definition of Albert Bandura self-efficacy can play a role in the perspective and view an individual of his/her objectives, tasks and have challenges in the workplace. According to Bandura’s theory, people with high self-efficacy, in other words those who believe that van do their job well, view their tasks as a problem that should be overcome rather than a problem they should avoid. In order to explain this finding, people with high self-efficacy look at challenging problem as a task of learning and skill and have a strong commitment to their activities and very soon will overcome their failure and therefore have an important role in the creation and development of innovative climate in their organizations. They believe that their abilities are far beyond their difficult tasks and situations, and have confidence in their capabilities. When they encounter an obstacle they use their cognitive and metacognitive strategies and show greater endurance than other people. That's why they are more successful to reach a proper corporate entrepreneurship compared to those with low self-efficacy are more successful.

In addition to the above, another result of current study is multiple relationship of leadership styles and job self-efficacy with corporate entrepreneurship of the staff. But among them, job self-efficacy has more power to predict corporate. Fifth hypothesis is thus confirmed. With
respect to the purposes that people determine for themselves, self-efficacy is a strong predictor of strong motivation that determines how an individual performs his/her task. An individual’s self-efficacy is an important determinant of his/her effort, persistence and perseverance, planning and problem-solving as well as further training and his job performance (Shen, 2010). Self-efficacy influences on trying to do a task. People who believe in their effectiveness regardless of specific leadership style and method try more to overcome the obstacles and difficulties, in an organization. Of course, It is possible that the organizational culture or a particular management style motivates them more, but in general, people with high self-efficacy believe that they can do things well. In contrast, people who doubt their own competence or believe poor performance, when faced with difficulties, obstacles and failures do less effort or are deterred or offer lower than usual solutions and these people ascribe their failure to their disability. At the time, instead of solving the problem, they focus on their lack of competence. But people with high efficiency consider their failure due to the low effort.

The management of an organization can’t be bound to traditional methods, but a style of leadership must be selected that is perfect for innovative organizations and leads to the creation of an environment where a spirit of innovation and creative is dominant. In line with the results of this study, previous studies show that there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and organizational entrepreneurship development (Smith, Strachan and Bvchvald, 2009). In general, to explain this finding, we can say that individuals with efficiency have a firm belief in their capabilities which causes the union of motivation, cognitive resources and a series of actions necessary for performing a specific task, successfully. They also believe that they can cope with different situations. They expect success and are often successful. Before choosing a job and beginning their efforts for that job, they evaluate and sum up their potentials and capabilities in that field. That is why efficacy compared to the leadership style is a stronger predictor for creation and development of corporate entrepreneurship.
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