

# **The Relationship Between Leadership Styles And Employee Motivation: Evidence From A Family Business In Patos, Brazil**

Débora Karyne Da Silva Abrantes, Bruna Cordeiro De Sousa,  
Murilo Gabriel Da Costa Silva, Polyanna Torres Pinheiro,  
Ernanda Gabrielly Da Silva Vasconcelos  
(CCSA, Universidade Federal Da Paraíba, Brazil)

---

## **Abstract:**

**Background:** This study discusses the relationship between leadership and motivation in the organizational environment, focusing on the influence of leadership styles on employee motivation. The objective was to analyze the influence of leadership styles on employee motivation in a family-owned business located in Patos, Brazil. The study sought to provide an understanding of the relationship between leadership and motivation while emphasizing the relevance of effective leadership styles for creating a work environment aligned with organizational goals.

**Materials and Methods:** The research employed a quantitative methodology with a sample of 94 employees. Data analysis included internal consistency testing, descriptive statistics, and Pearson's correlation. For reliability testing, Cronbach's Alpha was calculated using the alpha function in the R software.

**Results:** The results indicated a positive perception of transformational leadership, while transactional leadership was moderately appreciated. Conversely, laissez-faire leadership was disapproved of and perceived as ineffective.

**Conclusion:** The study concludes that, although leadership has advantages, it is essential to improve clarity in the application of rewards to enhance motivation and effectiveness. Elements such as job satisfaction, employee appreciation, and leadership style are essential for motivating employees. Transformational leadership stands out for its ability to engage and inspire, while transactional leadership improves the work environment through rewards. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership negatively affects motivation due to the absence of direction.

**Key Word:** Leadership; Motivation; Motivational factors.

---

Date of Submission: 01-09-2025

Date of Acceptance: 11-09-2025

---

## **I. Introduction**

Motivation plays an essential and central role in the workplace, functioning as one of the main drivers of employee productivity and satisfaction. Motivated employees are more likely to proactively engage in assigned tasks, maintain focus, and persist in the face of challenges, directly contributing to the achievement of organizational goals. Furthermore, workplace motivation is closely linked to employee well-being, influencing attitudes, behaviors, and commitment to the organization. Although the importance of motivation is widely recognized, throughout history leaders have not always given it due attention in team management.

According to Voigtlaender (2018), the study of workplace motivation is relatively recent, considering that before the Industrial Revolution leadership practices were predominantly based on coercive methods, such as punishments and excessive control. This model generated a work environment characterized by fear, where workers were treated as mere parts of a machine, lacking autonomy or decision-making power. Orders were issued rigidly, leaving no room for questioning or suggestions. Employees' creativity and ideas were completely ignored, and decisions were made solely from the perspective of hierarchical superiors. In this context, motivation was considered secondary, as the priority was mechanical task execution, without workers' emotional involvement.

However, the Industrial Revolution represented a significant shift in how motivation was addressed. Voigtlaender (2018) highlights that, although employees continued to be largely controlled, the introduction of reward and incentive systems came to be seen as an effective way of stimulating productivity and performance. Companies began to realize that human nature is more complex than previously assumed, and therefore adopted approaches more focused on employee well-being and appreciation. From this new perspective, it became clear that a good salary alone was no longer sufficient to keep employees motivated and engaged. It was necessary to go beyond simple remuneration, providing a work environment that encouraged participation, recognition, and personal and professional development.

This transformation in the understanding of motivation became even more evident with the advancement of leadership theories. The role of the leader came to be recognized as fundamental in promoting motivation, both in organizational decision-making and in daily team dynamics. According to Sousa (2022), it is the responsibility of leadership to guide, stimulate, mobilize, and convey messages to employees, since the leader serves as the driving force behind organizational management. Likewise, leaders must know how to direct employees while remaining receptive to suggestions, opinions, dialogue, feedback, or criticism, so that everyone within the organization can contribute and collectively achieve common goals.

Pereira (2009) complements this perspective by defining motivation as a dynamic process that drives human action. It is understood as a force that guides behavior and decision-making, acting as an impulse toward achieving a goal. Motivation, therefore, is the force that determines how a person acts in pursuit of specific objectives, sustaining persistence until the goal is accomplished. In this sense, motivation is not limited to the desire to achieve something; it is also linked to how individuals perceive their role within the organization and their capacity to contribute to desired outcomes.

The interaction between leadership and motivation is a central theme in organizational studies. Several factors can influence employee motivation, but one of the most relevant is the leadership style adopted by managers. This study is based on the premise that leadership has a direct impact on how employees perceive their work, their value, and their contribution to organizational objectives, while employee motivation, in turn, has a significant effect on performance and job satisfaction, directly affecting productivity and the quality of work delivered.

Thus, this study aims to analyze the influence of leadership styles on employee motivation in a family-owned business located in Patos, Brazil, and to answer the following research question: *How do leadership styles influence employee motivation?*

This study seeks to provide a meaningful contribution to understanding the dynamics between leadership and motivation, emphasizing the importance of effective leadership styles for developing a more motivated workforce aligned with organizational goals. Accordingly, the paper is structured as follows: in addition to this introductory section, the second section presents the theoretical framework that underpins the analyses, focusing on leadership and motivation; the third section describes the methodological choices; the fourth section presents the results and discussion; and finally, the last section outlines the study's concluding remarks.

## **II. Material And Methods**

To analyze the influence of leadership styles on employee motivation in a family-owned company in Patos, Brazil, an applied study with a quantitative approach was conducted. The choice of quantitative methods is justified by the study's objective of measuring employees' perceptions of leadership styles and their impact on motivation. According to Mussi et al. (2019), the goal of quantitative research is to identify indicators and trends present in reality, producing representative and concrete data.

In terms of objectives, the study is classified as exploratory and descriptive, as it aims to explore and describe the characteristics of leadership styles present in the workplace and employees' perceptions of their motivation levels. Zikmund (2000) states that exploratory studies are carried out to address specific open questions, making them crucial for achieving deeper understanding. Furthermore, the study is classified as descriptive, since the description of the characteristics of a population or phenomenon defines descriptive research (Gil, 2019).

Data collection was carried out through structured questionnaires, consisting of scales assessing leadership styles and employee motivation. Three instruments were employed:

1. For leadership styles, the MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) was used to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles.
2. To assess employees' perceptions of leadership's impact on motivation and the work environment, a questionnaire with adapted scales was applied to measure motivation levels, commitment, and goal clarity.
3. To specifically evaluate motivation, the EMT scale was used, measuring intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation, including items related to job satisfaction, recognition, feedback, and commitment to results.

The sample consisted of 94 employees, considering a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. This sample size was based on statistical calculations to ensure representativeness of the total population of 123 employees. Random sampling was used, ensuring that all employees had an equal probability of being selected, thereby allowing results to be generalized to the company's population with statistically significant confidence. Questionnaires were administered online via Google Forms, providing participants with a practical and efficient means of response.

The company's history is marked by the persistence of its founder, who came from a rural area and began modestly by selling grains in a local market. Over time, the small business evolved into a supermarket, becoming a regional landmark. Currently, the company remains under family management and continues to serve as an

important hub for local development, offering a wide variety of services, retail, and leisure. Its mission is to consolidate the group's businesses in order to provide the city and surrounding areas with the best possible shopping, services, and entertainment experience, standing out for excellence in management and guided by principles of dedication, integrity, ethics, availability, and customer respect.

Data analysis was performed using descriptive statistics such as means, medians, modes, and standard deviations to understand overall perceptions of leadership styles and employee motivation. Subsequently, correlation analysis between variables was conducted using Pearson's correlation coefficient to verify the existence of significant relationships between leadership styles and motivation levels. The analysis was carried out in **RStudio**, using the following packages: (1) *psych*, (2) *ggplot2*, (3) *Hmisc*, (4) *dplyr*, and (5) *car*.

A reliability test was also conducted using Cronbach's Alpha to assess the internal consistency of the measurement instruments. This test verifies whether questionnaire items consistently measure the same construct. The *alpha()* function in R was used to calculate Cronbach's Alpha, in addition to providing other reliability indicators, such as the G6(smc) coefficient, the average correlation among items (*average\_r*), the standard error (*ase*), and the mean and standard deviation of responses.

The results indicated a Cronbach's Alpha value of **0.95**, reflecting excellent internal consistency of the instrument. The confidence interval for Cronbach's Alpha was calculated using two methods: Feldt's method, which yielded an interval between 0.93 and 0.96, and Duhachek's method, which produced the same interval. These results confirm the instrument's high reliability and its adequacy for use in this study.

### III. Result

This study uses the MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) to assess employees' perceived leadership styles. The MLQ is an internationally recognized instrument that quantifies and standardizes the evaluation of three leadership styles: Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire. It is widely employed in the scientific literature, enabling comparisons across studies and offering quantifiable, statistically analyzable data, thus providing a clear, organized picture of leadership style relative to global benchmarks.

As shown in Table 1, the means obtained in the study allow identification of three perception bands: (1) high means (4–5) signal a strongly positive perception of leadership behaviors or high motivation; (2) moderate means (3–4) indicate a moderate view or average motivation; and (3) low means (1–3) suggest unfavorable perceptions or low motivation. Standard deviations indicate response uniformity: lower SDs reflect greater consistency, while higher SDs reflect more dispersion.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of leadership styles (MLQ items)

Transformational Leadership	Mean	Mode	Median	SD
1 – My manager inspires confidence and optimism in the team.	3.66	4.00	4.00	0.84
2 – My manager encourages new ways of addressing problems.	3.53	4.00	4.00	0.98
3 – My manager articulates a compelling vision for the future.	3.52	4.00	4.00	0.95
4 – My manager shows concern for team members' personal development.	3.55	4.00	4.00	1.00
5 – My manager leads with enthusiasm and conveys passion for the work.	3.67	4.00	4.00	0.95
Transactional Leadership	Mean	Mode	Median	SD
6 – My manager makes team goals and expectations clear.	3.60	4.00	4.00	1.05
7 – My manager recognizes and rewards good performance.	3.35	4.00	4.00	1.06
8 – My manager corrects mistakes as soon as they occur.	3.53	4.00	4.00	0.98
9 – My manager consistently offers incentives based on goal achievement.	3.29	4.00	4.00	1.04
10 – My manager makes clear agreements about tasks and associated rewards.	3.33	4.00	4.00	1.05
Laissez-faire Leadership	Mean	Mode	Median	SD
11 – My manager avoids making important decisions.	2.40	2.00	2.00	1.02
12 – My manager often postpones problem resolution.	2.47	2.00	2.00	1.08
13 – My manager does not intervene in team activities even amid conflict.	2.46	2.00	2.00	1.01
14 – My manager is absent when the team needs guidance.	2.38	2.00	2.00	1.03
15 – My manager lets employees solve problems without providing guidance.	2.38	2.00	2.00	1.00

**Source:** Authors' elaboration (2024).

Overall, employees express a predominantly positive—though moderate—view of transformational leadership (means 3.52–3.67). Mode and median = 4 across items indicate broad agreement, and SDs 0.84–1.00 suggest notable response consistency. Transactional leadership shows slightly lower but still positive means (3.29–3.60), with small dispersion (SDs 0.98–1.06) and consistent medians/modes of 4—suggesting appreciation for clarity, goal-setting, and rewards, albeit with minor discrepancies regarding implementation. Laissez-faire receives markedly negative perceptions (means 2.38–2.47; median/mode = 2), consistent with an ineffective, hands-off approach.

Beyond the MLQ, the study also developed a Leadership Perception Scale to capture how employees experience leaders' day-to-day behaviors. Unlike the MLQ's typology focus, this instrument emphasizes perceived effects on motivation, performance, and well-being.

**Table 2.** Employees' perceptions of their leaders' styles (Perception Scale)

Item	Mean	Mode	Median	SD
16 – My leader motivates the team to achieve long-term goals.	3.34	4.00	3.00	0.94
17 – My leader supports my personal and professional development.	3.45	4.00	4.00	0.98
18 – My leader promotes an environment where new ideas are encouraged.	3.40	4.00	4.00	1.05
19 – My leader often communicates a clear vision for the team's future.	3.36	4.00	4.00	0.98
20 – I feel my leader inspires me to give my best at work.	3.35	4.00	4.00	1.07
21 – My leader sets clear goals for my work.	3.46	4.00	4.00	0.98
22 – I receive clear rewards when I achieve my goals.	2.91	4.00	3.00	1.13
23 – My leader quickly corrects me when I am making mistakes.	3.58	4.00	4.00	0.84
24 – Expectations for my work are always well defined.	3.36	4.00	4.00	0.99
25 – I receive immediate feedback when I achieve expected results.	3.08	4.00	3.00	1.05
26 – My leader avoids getting involved in important decisions.	2.66	2.00	3.00	1.06
27 – My leader rarely intervenes in problems that arise in the team.	2.59	2.00	2.00	1.10
28 – My leader lets me handle work problems on my own.	2.54	2.00	2.00	1.08
29 – When difficulties arise, my leader prefers not to make decisions.	2.48	2.00	2.00	1.08
30 – My leader is absent when I need guidance or feedback.	2.53	2.00	2.00	1.14

**Source:** Authors' elaboration (2024).

Perceptions about motivation and development support (Items 16–21) are predominantly positive (means 3.34–3.46), though not uniformly high—suggesting room for deeper involvement and more consistent recognition. Notably, rewards clarity (Item 22) shows the lowest mean (2.91), indicating a salient improvement opportunity in reward transparency and alignment. Items 23–25 reinforce the role of timely correction and feedback, while Items 26–30 reflect negative views of laissez-faire behaviors. Overall, findings endorse leadership that balances inspiration, clarity of goals, and consistent rewards, avoiding non-involvement.

### Motivation

The Work Motivation Scale (EMT) - grounded in Self-Determination Theory - was used to assess intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation. Results appear in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Work Motivation Scale (EMT)

Item	Mean	Mode	Median	SD
31 – I take pleasure in performing my job tasks.	3.50	4.00	4.00	1.05
32 – I feel motivated to work when my effort is recognized.	3.95	4.00	4.00	0.98
33 – Receiving positive feedback from my manager increases my motivation.	3.76	4.00	4.00	1.08
34 – Learning opportunities at work motivate me to develop.	3.84	4.00	4.00	0.99
35 – I work because I feel fulfilled by what I do.	3.34	4.00	4.00	1.17
36 – Autonomy in my work makes me feel more engaged.	3.70	4.00	4.00	0.86
37 – My manager's leadership style makes me feel more committed to my results.	3.45	4.00	4.00	1.01
38 – I believe my work has value and contributes to company objectives.	3.80	4.00	4.00	0.96
39 – My work goals are clear and motivate me to achieve them.	3.51	4.00	4.00	0.94
40 – My manager's leadership contributes to a positive work environment.	3.38	4.00	4.00	1.10

**Source:** Authors' elaboration (2024).

Intrinsic satisfaction/fulfillment (Items 31, 35) shows predominantly positive means (3.34–3.50), with some dispersion (SD up to 1.17), suggesting heterogeneity in personal satisfaction. Recognition and positive feedback (Items 32–33) and learning opportunities (Item 34) yield higher means (3.76–3.95) with modest dispersion, underscoring their salience as motivational drivers. Items 37–40 indicate that leadership generally exerts a positive effect on motivation and commitment (means 3.38–3.80; medians/modes = 4), though variability (SD 0.86–1.10) suggests perceptions may differ by manager.

### Relationship between leadership styles and motivation

We examined relationships between leadership variables (MLQ items X1–X15) and motivation variables (EMT items X31–X40) using Pearson correlations. Interpretation bands: strong (0.7–0.9), moderate (0.5–0.7), weak (0.3–0.5), very weak/none (0.0–0.3); negative values indicate inverse relationships.

**Table 4.** Correlations between leadership styles (MLQ) and motivation (EMT) (Pearson's r)

	X31	X32	X33	X34	X35	X36	X37	X38	X39	X40
X1	0.25	0.15	0.16	0.25	0.15	0.10	0.54	0.27	0.36	0.67
X2	0.36	0.21	0.28	0.34	0.24	0.34	0.59	0.35	0.44	0.66
X3	0.31	0.17	0.25	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.62	0.36	0.53	0.58
X4	0.34	0.16	0.26	0.28	0.20	0.35	0.67	0.37	0.51	0.66
X5	0.44	0.29	0.39	0.41	0.32	0.36	0.54	0.45	0.53	0.63
X6	0.39	0.31	0.35	0.42	0.22	0.40	0.63	0.45	0.58	0.64
X7	0.30	0.15	0.29	0.27	0.23	0.33	0.58	0.34	0.45	0.64

<b>X8</b>	0.34	0.23	0.42	0.41	0.19	0.39	0.44	0.37	0.35	0.57
<b>X9</b>	0.30	0.18	0.34	0.35	0.22	0.36	0.63	0.40	0.49	0.62
<b>X10</b>	0.29	0.16	0.38	0.33	0.20	0.34	0.60	0.37	0.51	0.62
<b>X11</b>	-0.11	-0.01	-0.13	-0.05	-0.02	-0.12	-0.13	-0.05	0.08	-0.10
<b>X12</b>	-0.04	0.02	-0.06	0.01	-0.03	-0.09	-0.24	-0.06	0.03	-0.24
<b>X13</b>	-0.13	-0.11	-0.07	-0.13	-0.01	-0.07	-0.27	-0.09	0.02	-0.17
<b>X14</b>	-0.11	-0.04	-0.10	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	-0.29	-0.10	-0.04	-0.28
<b>X15</b>	-0.06	0.05	-0.07	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	-0.15	-0.08	0.02	-0.11

### **Transformational Leadership (MLQ: X1–X5)**

Transformational behaviors are positively associated with motivation and climate. Notably, X1 (inspiring confidence/optimism) shows  $r = 0.67$  with X40 (positive work environment) and  $r = 0.36$  with X39 (goal clarity/motivation); X4 (concern for development) relates moderately-strongly to commitment (X37:  $r = 0.67$ ) and environment (X40:  $r = 0.66$ ); X3 (compelling vision) correlates with commitment (X37:  $r = 0.62$ ) and contribution to organizational objectives (X38:  $r = 0.36$ ). Enthusiasm/passion (X5) shows moderate links with pleasure in tasks (X31:  $r = 0.44$ ) and growth opportunities (X34:  $r = 0.41$ ). Overall, transformational leadership strengthens engagement, autonomy, and a positive climate.

### **Transactional Leadership (MLQ: X6–X10)**

Clarifying expectations and ensuring consistent rewards are positively related to motivation and climate. X6 (clear goals/expectations) correlates with commitment (X37:  $r = 0.63$ ) and positive environment (X40:  $r = 0.64$ ). X7 (recognition/rewards) is also associated with X40 ( $r = 0.64$ ). X8 (prompt correction) shows moderate links to positive feedback (X33:  $r = 0.42$ ) and growth opportunities (X34:  $r = 0.41$ ). X9–X10 (consistency, clear agreements) correlate with commitment (X37: up to  $r = 0.60$ – $0.63$ ) and positive environment (X40: up to  $r = 0.62$ – $0.64$ ). In short, transactional practices enhance clarity and reinforce performance, fostering a more motivating climate.

### **Laissez-faire Leadership (MLQ: X11–X15)**

Laissez-faire behaviors show negative associations with motivation and climate, albeit of small magnitude (e.g., decision avoidance X11 with X31:  $r = -0.11$ , X40:  $r = -0.10$ ; delaying problem-solving X12 with commitment X37:  $r = -0.24$ ; absence when guidance is needed X14 with X40:  $r = -0.28$ ). Lack of intervention during conflict (X13) relates negatively to commitment (X37:  $r = -0.27$ ) and climate (X40:  $r = -0.17$ ). Overall, laissez-faire dampens motivation and undermines the work environment.

Synthesis (Table-style summary of main relationships)

- Transformational: Inspiration (X1), innovation (X2), vision (X3), and development support (X4) associate with commitment (X37), positive environment (X40), autonomy (X36), and goal motivation (X39) → greater engagement and involvement.
- Transactional: Clear goals (X6) and recognition (X7) link to positive climate (X40) and commitment (X37); correction (X8) and consistent incentives (X9–X10) show moderate ties to motivation and climate → structure + reinforcement promote motivation.
- Laissez-faire: Absence of decisions/guidance (X11–X15) correlates negatively with task satisfaction and positive climate → reduced motivation and less favorable environment.

Conclusion of this section. Transformational behaviors are strongly connected to employees' motivation; transactional practices also matter, especially via clarity and recognition; laissez-faire is detrimental. Leaders should prioritize strategies that inspire, clarify goals, and communicate rewards transparently, avoiding non-involvement.

## **IV. Discussion**

This study examined how leadership styles relate to employee motivation in a Brazilian family-owned firm. Three consistent patterns emerged. First, transformational leadership was perceived positively and showed moderate associations with key motivational outcomes—commitment to results, clarity of goals, and a positive work climate. Second, transactional leadership related positively but somewhat less strongly to motivation, particularly when expectations and rewards were communicated clearly and applied consistently. Third, laissez-faire leadership correlated negatively—albeit weakly—with motivational indicators and climate, signaling the costs of non-involvement. A salient cross-cutting result was the low clarity of rewards, which appears to constrain the motivational benefits otherwise produced by transformational and transactional practices.

Our results align with the broader organizational behavior literature in which transformational behaviors (inspiring vision, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation) are linked to higher engagement and intrinsic motivation. In our data, leaders who conveyed confidence and optimism and supported employees'

development showed stronger ties to commitment and climate. From a self-determination perspective, these behaviors likely satisfy employees' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, fostering more autonomous forms of motivation.

Transactional practices (goal clarity, contingent rewards, timely correction) also contributed, especially through structure and reinforcement. Clear expectations help employees see how effort translates into performance and outcomes, which can bolster instrumental expectancy and short-term engagement. However, the weakest mean in the entire dataset concerned clarity of rewards. This suggests that the transactional "contract" is incompletely specified in practice: employees perceive goals, but do not consistently perceive transparent contingencies between performance and rewards. Without that clarity, transactional leadership cannot fully realize its motivational potential and may even crowd out intrinsic drivers if employees experience the system as ambiguous or unfair.

By contrast, laissez-faire indicators (avoidance of decisions, delayed problem solving, absence when guidance is needed) related negatively to motivation and climate. Even small negative correlations can be consequential in day-to-day operations: ambiguity accumulates, conflicts linger, and employees infer low support, which undermines both role clarity and psychological safety.

These dynamics are particularly meaningful in a family-owned, locally embedded organization. In such settings, founders' legacies and kinship ties often shape norms and informal governance. Transformational behaviors may resonate strongly because they connect day-to-day work to a shared, place-based mission, while individualized consideration honors long-tenured relationships. At the same time, formalization of rewards can lag in family firms—where recognition is sometimes tacit or personalized—thereby explaining the observed reward-clarity gap. Addressing this gap does not require abandoning relational strengths; rather, it calls for codifying what is already valued (e.g., criteria, frequency, and forms of recognition) so that it becomes predictable and equitable.

#### Practical implications

1. Codify reward contingencies. Translate targets into explicit, observable criteria; publish a simple matrix linking results to rewards; communicate timelines and eligibility.
2. Sustain transformational routines. Institutionalize practices that convey vision (e.g., quarterly strategy huddles), foster idea generation (innovation hours), and support development (individual growth plans, coaching).
3. Tighten feedback loops. Pair timely correction with feedforward (what to do next), ensuring employees perceive feedback as developmental rather than punitive.
4. Eliminate laissez-faire patterns. Set service-level expectations for managerial responsiveness (e.g., decision lead-times), and assign escalation paths to prevent drift.
5. Align goal clarity with autonomy. Involve teams in co-setting goals to preserve autonomy while maintaining structure—this reinforces both transformational and transactional benefits.

### V. Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze the influence of leadership styles on employee motivation in a family-owned company located in Patos, Brazil, seeking to answer the following research question: *How do leadership styles influence employee motivation?*

The findings indicate that transformational leadership is perceived positively, with mean scores ranging from 3.52 to 3.67. Leaders are viewed as inspiring confidence, fostering innovation, and promoting personal development. Employee perceptions were relatively uniform, reflecting an effective and stimulating leadership style. In contrast, transactional leadership was moderately appreciated, with means between 3.29 and 3.60. It was valued for its clarity in setting goals and rewards, but its emphasis was more on immediate results than on employees' long-term growth.

Conversely, laissez-faire leadership was strongly disapproved, with scores ranging from 2.38 to 2.47, signaling perceived inefficacy. Leaders' lack of active involvement in problem-solving and guidance negatively affected employees' morale and performance. In summary, transformational leadership emerged as the most effective style, while laissez-faire leadership had a detrimental impact on team motivation.

The results also suggest that job satisfaction is closely linked to task fulfillment and recognition. Most employees reported being content with their roles, although individual perceptions varied. Recognition and positive feedback were consistently seen as strong motivators, with leadership overall regarded as essential for engagement and commitment. The key drivers of motivation identified in this study include recognition, job satisfaction, and effective leadership. Leadership that prioritizes team progress and engagement is crucial for sustaining motivation.

The evaluation highlights the organizational consequences of leadership styles:

- Transformational leadership proves highly effective, creating a positive and engaging climate that encourages innovation, personal development, and alignment with organizational goals.
- Transactional leadership, centered on clear incentives and well-defined objectives, also promotes a motivating environment, though to a lesser degree than transformational leadership. Clarity of expectations and timely correction of mistakes were associated with stronger engagement and a more positive work climate.
- Laissez-faire leadership, marked by non-involvement, negatively impacts both motivation and the organizational climate. The absence of action and direction leads to demotivation and a less favorable environment, undermining commitment and group efficiency.

In sum, transformational leadership is the most effective style for building a stimulating work environment, whereas laissez-faire is viewed as inefficient and harmful to motivation and performance.

This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the dynamic relationship between leadership and motivation, underscoring the importance of effective leadership styles in developing a more motivated workforce aligned with organizational objectives. One of the challenges faced during the study was data collection, as many employees were reluctant to respond, citing lack of time and the length of the questionnaire. For future research, it will be essential to explore alternative data collection strategies. In cases where difficulties or lack of respondent engagement arise, other methods should be considered to ensure the reliability and effectiveness of the research.

### **References**

- [1]. Gil, A. C. (2019). Métodos E Técnicas De Pesquisa Social (7ª Ed.). Atlas.
- [2]. Mussi, F. C., Flores, F. F., & Silva, D. A. (2019). Pesquisa Quantitativa: Conceitos E Aplicações Na Área Da Saúde. Revista De Enfermagem Da UFSM, 9(31), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5902/2179769233308>
- [3]. Pereira, M. (2009). Motivação: Fatores Que Influenciam O Comportamento Humano. Atlas.
- [4]. Sousa, M. (2022). Liderança E Gestão De Pessoas Nas Organizações. Editora Vozes.
- [5]. Voigtlaender, R. (2018). História Da Motivação No Trabalho: Da Revolução Industrial Aos Dias Atuais. Saraiva.
- [6]. Zikmund, W. G. (2000). Business Research Methods (6th Ed.). Dryden Press.