UTISGAD
International Journal of Commerce, Industry and Entrepreneurship Studies
ISSN: 2791-6987

Article ID:	UTISGAD-2025-5-2-0610	pp. 21-34
Article Type:	Research Article	
Received:	06.10.2025	
Accepted:	30.12.2025	
Copyright: CC BY-NC 4.0 | Checked by: iThenticate		
Open-Access Policy: BOAI has been applied.		
www.utisgad.org |DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18093447		

THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION: EVIDENCE FROM THE TURKISH BANKING SECTOR[1]

Zehra ÖZTÜRK[2] SENEM GÖL BEŞER[3] HANDE KARADAĞ[4]

ABSTRACT

Employee motivation critically influences organizational performance in service industries. This study examines how transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles affect work motivation in the Turkish banking sector, extending existing leadership-motivation frameworks by addressing cultural and institutional factors unique to Türkiye's collectivistic and hierarchical organizational context. Data from 120 employees at a major private bank were analyzed using correlation, regression, and ANOVA. Results demonstrate that transformational leadership significantly predicts employee motivation ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .42$), while transactional and laissez-faire styles show no significant effects. Age and tenure positively influence motivation, whereas gender does not. These findings contribute to leadership theory by demonstrating how Self-Determination Theory's autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs are satisfied through transformational leadership in high power-distance contexts. Practical implications include developing culturally-adapted leadership training programs for Turkish banking institutions.

Keywords: Leadership styles, Employee motivation, Banking sector, Transformational leadership, Turkish context

JEL Codes: M12, M54, L21

[1] Earlier version of this study was presented at the 6th Leadership Academy and Management Congress, 3–5 October 2025, Ulu Resort Hotel, Mersin, Türkiye.

[2] *MBA Graduate, Yeditepe University, zehraoztuurk@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0007-1751-5528*
[3] *Professor, Yeditepe University, senemgol@yeditepe.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-9631-6752*
[4] *Professor, MEF University, karadagh@mef.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5388-807X*

1. INTRODUCTION

Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail."
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Leadership profoundly shapes organizational culture, performance, and employee satisfaction. Since House's (1971) path-goal theory, research has established that effective leaders clarify goal paths while making the journey rewarding for followers. In service sectors like banking, leadership quality directly impacts employee effectiveness, as employee perceptions of management significantly influence service quality and customer satisfaction (Schneider & Bowen, 1985).

Modern workplaces require leaders who inspire teams to exceed expectations. This understanding transcends cultural boundaries, as demonstrated by the GLOBE study across 62 societies identifying universal and culture-specific leadership attributes (House et al., 2004). However, the Turkish banking sector presents unique challenges—economic volatility, technological disruption, and distinct cultural characteristics including higher power distance and collectivistic tendencies (Aycan, 2001). These factors shape how leadership styles influence employee motivation.

While transformational leadership has been extensively studied in Western contexts, limited research examines its effectiveness within Türkiye's unique institutional and cultural environment. This study extends existing leadership-motivation frameworks by: (1) examining how Self-Determination Theory's basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness) are satisfied through transformational leadership in high power-distance, collectivistic contexts; (2) exploring why transactional leadership may fail in hierarchical banking systems where employee autonomy is constrained; and (3) investigating how paternalistic cultural expectations interact with Western leadership models. This contextualized analysis addresses a significant gap in cross-cultural leadership research.

This study investigates how transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles influence employee motivation among 120 employees from a major Turkish private bank. Data were collected using validated instruments—the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Work Motivation Scale (WMS)—and analyzed through correlation, regression, and ANOVA.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews theoretical and empirical literature, Section 3 describes the methodology including ethics procedures, Section 4 presents findings with tables and figures, Section 5 discusses results within theoretical frameworks, and Section 6 concludes with implications and limitations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Leadership Theories and Styles

Leadership development traces to Lewin, Lippitt, and White's (1939) experimental study identifying democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire approaches. Their work demonstrated that leadership style significantly affects group dynamics, establishing foundations for subsequent research showing democratic leadership fosters sustained motivation compared to autocratic or laissez-faire approaches.

Leadership thinking evolved from trait-based to behavior- and context-based models. Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid balanced people concern with production concern. Contingency theories further advanced understanding—Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) Situational Leadership Theory proposed that effective leaders adapt based on follower readiness, while Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Model emphasized leader-situation interaction.

Contemporary frameworks—transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership—offer contrasting perspectives on motivational mechanisms. House's (1977) charismatic leadership theory explored how leaders inspire exceptional performance through emotional appeals. Burns (1978) distinguished transforming from transactional leadership. Bass (1990) operationalized this concept, identifying four components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Transactional leadership emphasizes leader-follower exchanges through rewards and punishments (Bass, 1990), operating via contingent reward and management-by-exception. While effective in certain contexts, it generally proves less effective at fostering intrinsic motivation. Laissez-faire leadership involves minimal supervision, avoiding decision-making and providing minimal guidance, often resulting in lower motivation (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

2.2. Employee Motivation Theories

Motivation theories provide frameworks for understanding workplace behavior. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943) identified progression from physiological to self-actualization needs. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1966) distinguished hygiene factors from motivators. McClelland's Theory of Needs (1961) identified achievement, affiliation, and power as central drivers.

Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory proposed that motivation functions through expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Adams' (1963) Equity Theory suggested employees are motivated by fairness perceptions. Locke and Latham's (1990) Goal-Setting Theory demonstrated that specific, challenging goals enhance performance.

Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory distinguished intrinsic from extrinsic motivation, proposing that intrinsic motivation leads to superior outcomes. Ryan and Deci (2000) identified three basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—essential for optimal motivation. This theory is particularly relevant for understanding how transformational leadership influences motivation, as transformational behaviors often support these basic needs. In Turkish organizational contexts characterized by higher power distance, the satisfaction of autonomy needs through transformational leadership represents a significant cultural adaptation of Western leadership models.

2.3. Leadership and Motivation in Banking

Research consistently demonstrates transformational leadership predicts employee outcomes beyond transactional leadership (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Wang et al.'s (2011) meta-analysis of 113 samples confirmed transformational leadership consistently predicts performance, particularly in contexts requiring adaptability and innovation—characteristics highly relevant to banking.

Service sector research provides additional insights. Hartline and Ferrell (1996) found leadership behaviors significantly influence employee performance and customer satisfaction. Liao and Chuang (2007) demonstrated transformational leadership creates positive service climates enhancing customer relationships.

Aycan (2001) identified cultural factors influencing Turkish employee expectations. Turkish organizations exhibit higher power distance and collectivistic orientations compared to Western contexts, moderating leadership style effectiveness. Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) examined paternalistic leadership—combining strong authority with benevolent concern—noting its cultural congruence in collectivistic societies. The GLOBE study (House et al., 2004) identified universal leadership attributes (integrity, visionary behavior) and culturally contingent aspects, providing frameworks for understanding effectiveness variations. This cultural dimension is critical for interpreting why certain leadership styles succeed or fail in Turkish banking contexts, where hierarchical structures and paternalistic expectations may constrain the autonomy-enhancing potential of transformational leadership.

Despite extensive Western validation, limited research examines transformational leadership effectiveness in Turkish banking—a sector with unique regulatory, technological, and cultural challenges. Understanding how leadership styles influence motivation has theoretical and practical implications for leadership development in Turkish financial services.

3. HYPOTHESES

H1: There is a significant relationship between leadership styles and employee motivation.

Leadership drives employee motivation across organizational contexts (Yukl, 2013; House, 1971). Meta-analytic and sector-specific studies consistently show leadership style influences motivation, especially in service-intensive industries (Wang et al., 2011; Liao & Chuang, 2007).

H1a: There is a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership and employee motivation.

Transformational leadership's four components address core psychological needs in Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Empirical findings confirm strong positive effects on motivation through fostering intrinsic engagement (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Wang et al., 2011).

H1b: There is a negative relationship between transactional leadership and employee motivation.

Transactional leadership's contingent rewards and management-by-exception satisfy only lower-level needs (Maslow, 1943) and fail to sustain intrinsic motivation (Herzberg, 1966). In hierarchical Turkish banking systems with constrained employee autonomy, transactional leadership's rigid exchange focus may prove particularly ineffective, as it reinforces existing power distance rather than empowering employees.

H1c: There is a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and employee motivation.

Laissez-faire leadership's avoidance of decision-making and minimal guidance undermines Goal-Setting Theory mechanisms (Locke & Latham, 1990) and Self-Determination Theory. Studies show correlation with low motivation and poor performance (Khan & Nawaz, 2016; Al-Altheeb, 2020).

H2: There is no difference between men and women in perceived leadership styles and motivation.

While cultural norms shape leadership expectations in Türkiye (Aycan, 2001), motivation is driven by leadership behavior and work context rather than gender. The GLOBE study suggests core leadership attributes are universally valued, reducing gender-based perception differences.

H3: There is a difference in age regarding employee motivation.

Age influences motivational drivers through changing career stages, accumulated experience, and evolving priorities (Herzberg, 1966). Banking sector studies suggest older employees may report higher motivation due to stronger organizational identification (Avolio et al., 2004).

H4: There is a difference in seniority regarding employee motivation.

Seniority brings job stability, professional autonomy, and value alignment—factors positively linked to motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Evidence shows longer-tenured employees benefit more from quality leader-member exchanges, enhancing motivation (Wang et al., 2005).

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Research Design and Sample

This quantitative study investigates leadership style-motivation relationships within a large Turkish private bank. Data were collected through convenience sampling from 120 employees across customer service, operations, and middle management departments.

Sample Demographics: Gender: 55% male, 45% female; Age: 25-34 years (40%), 35-44 years (35%), 45+ years (25%); Average experience: 7.2 years (SD = 3.4). Table 1 summarizes demographic characteristics.

Table 1. Sample Demographics (N=120)

Demographic Variable	Category	Percentage
Gender	Male	55%
	Female	45%
Age Group	25-34 years	40%
	35-44 years	35%
	45+ years	25%
Average Experience	Mean (SD)	7.2 (3.4) years

4.2. Instruments

4.2.1. Leadership Styles: Measured using the Turkish-adapted Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Turkish adaptation: Acar, 2004). The MLQ assesses transformational leadership (20 items, e.g., "My manager inspires me to perform beyond expectations"), transactional leadership (12 items, e.g., "My manager rewards me when I do a good job"), and laissez-faire leadership (5 items, e.g., "My manager avoids making decisions"). Items used 5-point Likert scales (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

4.2.2. Work Motivation: Assessed using the Work Motivation Scale (WMS; Selesho & Naile, 2014; Turkish translation: A. Çivilidağ, Akdeniz University). The WMS measures

intrinsic and extrinsic motivation using 5-point Likert scales (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

4.3. Data Collection

Questionnaires were distributed online and in paper form during working hours over four weeks. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. From 130 collected responses, 120 valid responses were included after removing incomplete surveys.

4.4. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS v25. Analyses included: (1) Descriptive statistics, (2) Reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha), (3) Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), (4) Pearson correlation, (5) Multiple linear regression with assumption testing, and (6) ANOVA for demographic moderators. Regression assumptions were verified: normality (Shapiro-Wilk test, $p > .05$; skewness and kurtosis within ±2), linearity (scatterplot inspection), homoscedasticity (residual plots), independence (Durbin-Watson statistic = 1.94), and multicollinearity (VIF < 3, tolerance > .30).

5. FINDINGS

5.1. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

The MLQ and WMS demonstrated high reliability (Cronbach's alpha > .80 for all scales). Table 2 presents descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients

Variable	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α
Transformational Leadership	3.68	0.72	.89
Transactional Leadership	3.12	0.68	.82
Laissez-faire Leadership	2.24	0.84	.81
Employee Motivation	3.54	0.79	.87

5.2. Factor Analysis

EFA confirmed three distinct leadership factors (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire) explaining 62% of total variance. The motivation scale showed single-factor structure explaining 55% of variance. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (.87) and Bartlett's test ($p < .001$) confirmed sampling adequacy.

5.3. Correlation Analysis

Transformational leadership correlated positively and significantly with employee motivation ($r = .65$, $p < .01$). Transactional leadership showed weak negative correlation

(r = -.12, p > .05), and laissez-faire leadership showed no significant correlation (r = -.08, p > .05). Table 3 presents the correlation matrix.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix (* p < .05, ** p < .01)

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Transformational Leadership	1			
2. Transactional Leadership	.24*	1		
3. Laissez-faire Leadership	-.42**	-.18	1	
4. Employee Motivation	.65**	-.12	-.08	1

5.4. Regression Analysis

Multiple regression indicated transformational leadership significantly predicts motivation (β = .58, t = 7.82, p < .001), explaining 42% of variance (R^2 = .42, adjusted R^2 = .41). Transactional (β = -.08, p = .143) and laissez-faire (β = -.06, p = .153) styles did not significantly predict motivation. Regression assumptions were satisfied: residuals normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk p = .082), no multicollinearity detected (VIF values: 1.12-1.38; tolerance: .72-.89), independence confirmed (Durbin-Watson = 1.94), and homoscedasticity verified through residual plot inspection**.** Table 4 presents regression results.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Results (R^2 = .42, Adjusted R^2 = .41, F(3,116) = 28.14, p < .001)

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	VIF
Constant	0.87	0.31	—	2.81	.006	—
Transformational Leadership	0.64	0.08	.58	7.82	<.001	1.23
Transactional Leadership	-0.09	0.06	-.08	-1.48	.143	1.12
Laissez-faire Leadership	-0.06	0.04	-.06	-1.44	.153	1.38

5.5. Demographic Moderators

ANOVA revealed age significantly affects motivation, F(2,117) = 4.35, p = .015, with older employees reporting higher motivation. Seniority positively correlated with motivation (r = .28, p < .01). Gender showed no significant differences, t(118) = 1.12, p = .26. Table 5 summarizes demographic analyses.

Table 5. Demographic Variables and Employee Motivation

Variable	Test	Statistic	p-value	Result
Age	ANOVA	F(2,117) = 4.35	.015	Significant
Seniority	Correlation	r = .28	.003	Significant
Gender	t-test	t(118) = 1.12	.26	Not Significant

5.6. Hypothesis Testing Summary

H1 (Supported): Leadership styles significantly relate to employee motivation ($R^2 = .42$, $p < .001$).

H1a (Supported): Transformational leadership positively affects motivation ($\beta = .58$, $p < .001$).

H1b (Not Supported): Transactional leadership showed no significant relationship with motivation ($p = .143$).

H1c (Not Supported): Laissez-faire leadership showed no significant impact on motivation ($p = .153$).

H2 (Supported): No gender differences in leadership perception and motivation ($p = .26$).

H3 (Supported): Age significantly affects motivation ($p = .015$).

H4 (Supported): Seniority positively correlates with motivation ($p = .003$).

6. DISCUSSION

This study's findings align with leadership-motivation literature while providing important insights into the Turkish banking context. As hypothesized (H1a), transformational leadership significantly and positively predicts employee motivation, confirming that leaders who inspire shared vision, stimulate intellectual curiosity, and attend to individual needs effectively cultivate motivation. This is particularly critical in banking—characterized by rapid change and high regulatory demands—where motivated employees sustain service quality and organizational resilience.

The strong effect of transformational leadership can be understood through Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Transformational leaders satisfy three basic psychological needs: *autonomy* (through individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation), *competence* (through setting challenging expectations and providing feedback), and *relatedness* (through idealized influence and inspirational motivation). In Turkish organizational contexts characterized by higher power distance (Aycan, 2001), transformational leadership provides a culturally-adapted mechanism for satisfying autonomy needs without directly challenging hierarchical structures. The leader's inspirational vision and individualized attention allow employees to experience self-direction within the existing authority framework, representing a synthesis of Western leadership approaches with Turkish cultural expectations.

Contrary to H1b, transactional leadership showed no significant effect on motivation. This finding requires theoretical interpretation beyond simple null results. In hierarchical Turkish banking systems, transactional leadership's contingent reward focus may fail for several reasons. First, Turkish organizational culture already embodies high power distance and formal authority structures (Hofstede, 2001), making transactional exchanges redundant rather than motivating—employees already expect hierarchical direction and formal rewards. Second, banking's constrained autonomy environment means transactional leadership reinforces existing limitations rather than addressing intrinsic motivation needs. Third, paternalistic cultural expectations (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008) create preferences for benevolent, relationship-focused leadership over transactional exchanges. Employees in collectivistic cultures value relational bonds with leaders more than contractual exchanges, suggesting transactional leadership is culturally incongruent with Turkish employees' motivational expectations.

The rejection of H1c—laissez-faire leadership showing no significant negative effect—may reflect measurement limitations or restricted variance in this leadership style among participants' managers. Alternatively, in highly structured banking environments with extensive procedures, laissez-faire leadership may have minimal impact because organizational systems provide structure that compensates for leadership absence.

Although H1b and H1c hypothesized negative relationships, the empirical results did not show significant effects rather than demonstrating the expected negative direction. In other words, transformational leadership emerged as the only meaningful predictor, while both transactional and laissez-faire leadership exhibited statistically non-significant coefficients despite their theoretically anticipated negative influence. Therefore, the rejection of H1b and H1c should be interpreted as an absence of meaningful impact rather than evidence of a negative effect. This distinction is important, as it suggests that in this sample, these leadership styles may simply be neutral—or irrelevant—drivers of motivation rather than detrimental ones.

Supporting H3 and H4, age and seniority significantly influence motivation. Older and more experienced employees reported higher motivation, attributable to deeper organizational knowledge, stronger goal alignment, and enhanced role mastery. This pattern aligns with career stage theories suggesting that as employees accumulate experience, they develop greater organizational identification and derive more intrinsic satisfaction from work (Super, 1980). Additionally, tenure-based adaptation means longer-serving employees have established stronger leader-member exchange relationships (Wang et al., 2005), benefiting more from transformational leadership's individualized consideration. The lack of gender effects (H2) indicates motivational dynamics transcend gender in this sector, consistent with the GLOBE study's findings that core leadership attributes are universally valued across genders.

These findings advocate targeted leadership development in Turkish banks emphasizing transformational capabilities. Programs fostering inspirational communication, intellectual engagement, and personalized support can enhance motivation across diverse employee groups. Recognizing demographic factors enables nuanced approaches optimizing motivational outcomes for varying employee segments.

A key limitation of this study is that the sample was drawn from a single large private bank, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Therefore, the leadership–motivation patterns identified here may partly reflect organizational norms, managerial practices, or cultural characteristics specific to this institution rather than the broader Turkish banking sector. Caution is therefore warranted when interpreting the results as representative of the entire industry, particularly given the substantial variation in leadership climate and organizational culture across banks in Türkiye. Future research involving multiple institutions with diverse organizational structures would be essential for validating whether these patterns hold across the sector.

6. CONCLUSION

This study enriches leadership-motivation literature by providing empirical evidence from Turkish banking, affirming transformational leadership's efficacy in fostering employee motivation within Türkiye's unique cultural and institutional context. The research demonstrates that transformational leadership satisfies Self-Determination Theory's basic psychological needs even in high power-distance environments, while transactional and laissez-faire styles prove ineffective, prompting leadership practice reevaluation.

This research extends leadership theory by demonstrating how universal leadership principles adapt to specific cultural contexts. The findings show that transformational leadership operates effectively in collectivistic, high power-distance cultures by providing autonomy within hierarchical structures, while transactional leadership fails due to cultural incongruence with paternalistic expectations. This contributes to understanding leadership effectiveness as a function of cultural fit rather than universal application.

Turkish banks should invest in leadership development programs centered on transformational principles, tailored to employee demographics. Training should emphasize inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration while respecting cultural norms around authority and hierarchy. Organizations should prioritize selecting and developing leaders who demonstrate transformational capabilities rather than relying on transactional management systems.

The study has limitations. The sample of 120 employees from a single institution limits generalizability. The cross-sectional design restricts causal inferences regarding

leadership style effects over time. Common method bias may affect results as all measures were self-reported.

As a result, the findings may reflect organizational characteristics unique to the participating bank rather than patterns generalizable to the entire Turkish banking industry. Thus, the conclusions drawn here should be interpreted with caution, particularly in terms of sector-wide implications.

Future research should expand to multiple banking institutions and employ longitudinal designs to capture evolving leadership effects. Incorporating qualitative methods could deepen understanding of mechanisms through which leadership influences motivation in Turkish cultural contexts. Cross-cultural comparative studies examining leadership effectiveness across different cultural clusters would further illuminate the boundary conditions of transformational leadership theory. Research examining paternalistic leadership alongside Western leadership styles would provide comprehensive understanding of effective leadership in Turkish organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article draws upon thesis research conducted by Zehra Öztürk under the supervision of Prof. Dr. H. Senem Göl Beşer. Advanced AI tools were employed to improve manuscript clarity, coherence, and presentation. The authors maintain full academic responsibility for the work.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARD

Conflict of Interests: There is no conflict of interest between the authors or any third party individuals or institutions.

Ethics Committee Approval: This research has been approved by the ethics committee of Yeditepe University.

Funding Disclosure: This research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

Acar, A. Z. (2004). Öğrenmeyi ve müşteriyi önemseyen toplam kalite liderliği. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(1), 30-51.

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422-436.

Al-Altheeb, S. A. (2020). The impact of laissez-faire leadership on employee performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 8(4), 1-14.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), 9-16.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951-968.

Aycan, Z. (2001). Human resource management in Turkey: Current issues and future challenges. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(3), 252-260.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence*. Gulf Publishing.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.

Hartline, M. D., & Ferrell, O. C. (1996). The management of customer-contact service employees: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(4), 52-70.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development Journal*, 23(5), 26-34.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing Company.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321-339.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.

Khan, N., & Nawaz, M. (2016). Impact of laissez-faire leadership style on employee's motivation and performance. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 8(1), 56-70.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 269-299.

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel examination of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1006-1019.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Prentice-Hall.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Van Nostrand.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 566-593.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.

Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1985). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 423-433.

Selesho, J. M., & Naile, E. (2014). Development of work motivation scale for South African employees. *Journal of Psychology*, 5(1), 43-52.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16(3), 282-298.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.

Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2), 223-270.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 420-432.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.