



DEMOCRATIC VS. AUTHORITARIAN: WHICH LEADERSHIP STYLE DRIVES
MOTIVATION? A CORRELATIONAL, PREDICTIVE, AND COMPARATIVE STUDY IN
GUJRAT, PAKISTAN

Ayesha Rani ¹, Mishaal Fatima ², Anam Zafar ³, Laiba Amjad ⁴

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63544/jbii.v5i8.162>

Affiliations:

^{1, 2, 3, 4} Department of Psychology,
University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan

¹Email: ayesharani0130@gmail.com

² Email: fatimamishaal1230@gmail.com

³ Email: zafaranam30@gmail.com /
4492@uog.edu.pk

⁴ Email: amjadlaiba335@gmail.com

Corresponding Author's Email:

³ zafaranam30@gmail.com /
4492@uog.edu.pk

Copyright:

Author/s

License:



Article History:

Received: 17.07.2026

Accepted: 06.08.2026

Published: 18.08.2026

Abstract

This research study aimed at establishing the relation, prediction, and comparison of the democratic and authoritarian leadership styles with regard to employee work motivation among 200 employees located in Gujrat, Pakistan. It utilized Leadership Style Questionnaire and the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale in collecting the data. Pearson correlation showed that there was a significant, positive correlation between democratic leadership and intrinsic motivation ($r = .45, p < .01$), whereas there was a negative correlation between authoritarian leadership and intrinsic motivation ($r = -0.34, p < .01$), and there was a positive correlation between authoritarian leadership and extrinsic motivation ($r = .41, p < .01$). The regression analysis revealed that intrinsic motivation was significantly forecasted by democratic leadership ($R^2 = .20, \beta = .45, p = .001$), but extrinsic motivation was significantly forecasted by authoritarian leadership ($R^2 = .17, \beta = .41, p = .001$). The independent samples t -test showed that employees with democratic management had a much higher intrinsic motivation ($M = 4.02$) than the employees with authoritarian management ($M = 3.42$) $t(198) = 7.34, p = .001$. On the other hand, the high extrinsic motivation was significantly higher among employees who were under authoritarian leadership (M avg. 3.58) than among employees who were under the democratic leadership (M avg. 3.25), $t(198) = -4.22, p = .001$. The results have reached a conclusion that democratic leadership and authoritarian leadership have intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation respectively. The research has practical implications to the organization leaders and policymakers in Gujrat.

Keywords: Democratic Leadership, Authoritarian Leadership, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Gujrat, Pakistan

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

There is no disagreement that leadership is one of the pillars of organizational success and it drives employees' attitudes, behaviors, and performance outcomes (Northouse, 2021; Yukl, 2013). Two Propositions of people management There are two approaches to this type of subject matter that are known as democratic and authoritarian leadership style, among the myriads of leadership styles. Democratic leadership style involves participation, shared decision making and empowerment, centralization and leading but strictness in involving compliance in work is the aspect of authoritarian leadership style (Avolio and Bass, 2004; House and Howell, 1992).

Leadership environment has a potent impact on employee motivation which is a critical factor in determining the productivity and commitment of the organizations (Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Latham, 2012). Motivation is further classified into two broad categories; intrinsic motivation that are as a result of the feeling of satisfaction and fulfillment inside the body and extrinsic motivation which are motivated by outside rewards and the need to avoid negative repercussions (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The type of motivation



that flourishes at the workplace is highly dependent on the management style that managers adopt (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Van den Broeck et al., 2016).

Within the Pakistani culture, especially Gujrat district, academic and governmental organizations work within a hierarchical structure, and leaders practice differently in the district (Sadaqat et al., 2024). Although the concept of participative management has gained increased relevance, most leaders still use authoritarian management styles without considering the difference it makes with regard to employee motivation (Quadri et al., 2024). The paper aims at giving empirical clarification by exploring the relationship between democratic and authoritarian leadership styles with environmental effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in employees in Gujrat, and their predictivity and difference.

1.2 Problem Statement

Companies in Pakistan have a consistent problem of finding part of the leadership practices that ideally boost the motivation of employees. Although democratic and other leadership forms are strongly promoted in the literature of management, authoritarian leadership is deeply rooted in many institutional cultures especially the hierarchies and collectivistic society. Nonetheless, the particular effects of these leadership styles on different kinds of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic has not been sufficiently tested, in particular, in the Pakistani context. This is especially stark in the case of Gujrat district where there is, little empirical study, which has examined the relationship between democratic and authoritarian approaches to leadership, predicting the different consequences as well as contrasting their impacts on employee motivation. This gap will be filled by conducting the study to examine the connection, predictive ability, and the relative strength of democratic and authoritarian styles of leadership on employee work motivation on 200 employees in Gujrat.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between democratic and authoritarian leadership styles and employee work motivation?
2. Which leadership style significantly predicts employee work motivation?
3. Is there a significant difference in motivation levels between employees under democratic versus authoritarian leadership?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The present study offers empirical data about how democratic and authoritarian leadership affects intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in Pakistan differently. The results can provide useful advice to organizational managers on how they can use leadership strategies that will help motivate employees. The study is relevant to inform leadership development programs and performance management systems by human resource practitioners. To the policy makers in the academic and government side of Gujrat, the results espouse participative leadership policies. The research also adds to the overall scholarly discussion on the efficacy of leadership in Pakistan.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework: Self-Determination Theory

To conduct this study, Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan and Deci, 2000) is employed as one of the theoretical frameworks of explaining human motivation. SDT is the theory that suggests that all people have three psychological needs autonomy (volitional action), competence (effectiveness), and relatedness (social connection). When such needs are satisfied, they build intrinsic motivation and psychological well-being, and frustration produces controlled and extrinsic motivation and disengagement.

Leadership behaviors are important environmental factors in an organization that facilitate or frustrate these needs. Autonomy and competence needs are met through the democratic leaders who consult employees, empower employees as democratic leaders and consider perspectives, which breed intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, totalitarian leaders who dictate, limit contributions and control, stage-manage frustrate these needs and support extrinsic motivation based on external pressure and contingency.

SDT offers a theoretically sound second prism by which the expected positive effect of democratic leadership on intrinsic motivation and authoritarian leadership on extrinsic motivation can be explained.



2.2 Democratic Leadership and Intrinsic Motivation

Democratic leadership who is stated by sharing the decision, open communication and participation of the employee has been widely researched as having a positive influence in intrinsic motivation.

In a longitudinal study of European healthcare workers, participative leadership emerged as the most effective leadership type to promote the intrinsic motivation of the employees, which was mediated by the psychological empowerment linked with perceived autonomy, and improved personnel well-being and decreased burnout (Magnet4Europe, 2025). A study of European European technology companies found that participative leadership behaviors had a positive impact on the intrinsic motivation of employees and that job autonomy had a significant positive impact on civic engagement and work satisfaction (Lopes et al., 2014).

In a study on Japanese manufacturing workers, these employees reportedly the participative leadership was full of positivity on subordinate morale, but the impact was practically moderate based on job characteristics and subordinate authoritarianism (Kageyama, 1988). A study of Chinese employees in Taiwan showed that authentic leadership was a strong predictor of work engagement, and there was a strong moderator of intrinsic motivation (Shu, 2015).

In Pakistani context, the studies on banking staff in Karachi have shown that democratic leadership style contributes greatly to the motivation and job satisfaction of the workers (Zareen et al., 2015). Likewise, the study on the organizations of the public sector in Pakistan provided additional evidence that transformational leadership, as well as transactional leadership, has a strong positive effect on job satisfaction and engagement of the employees, and the employee engagement is a form of mediation (Khan et al., 2023).

Besides, a research on non-banking financial entities in Karachi determined that leadership styles considerably mediate the connection between working environment variables and employee motivation with differences in impacts among public- and privately-based organizations (Khan and Siddiqui, 2021). Together, these Pakistani studies attest to the fact that both democratic and participative leadership style is effective in improving employee motivation in various sectors although this effect may depend on contextual factors like role clarity and sector-specific affects.

2.3 Authoritarian Leadership and Extrinsic Motivation

Authoritarian leadership, which is characterized by a centralized level of leadership, high level of supervision and minimum level of employee input, has been correlated with extrinsic motivation and compliance based performance.

In a research of German workers, motivation to lead was discovered to have a relationship with team results, and various forms of motivation produced varied influences in accordance with culture and viewpoint (Braun et al., 2025). Moreover, studies on German workers have shown that health-oriented leadership has an impact on intrinsic motivation by satisfying basic psychological needs, though the mediating variable between the two variables is employee self-care (Kowalski and von Gehlen, 2026).

A Chinese worker study in Taiwan revealed negative relationship between authoritarian leadership and work engagement of subordinates and positive relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement with intrinsic motivation mediating the relationships (Shu, 2015). Studies on the Thai hotel staff have found that autocratic leadership was strongly associated with, high turnover intention and low job satisfaction, and democratic leadership had a positive impact on job satisfaction and low turnover intentions (Wongsunopparat and Jaroensuk, 2021).

In the Pakistani setting, the works led to a study of employees in Lahore and Multan revealed that autocratic leadership is strongly negatively related to perceived work motivation, which undermines intrinsic engagement (Durrani et al., 2015). Equally, a Karachi-based study on non-banking financial firms determined that authoritarian leadership as the moderating force can have a profound influence on employee performances, especially in government sector organizations, and strengthens extrinsic compliance and may weaken intrinsic motivation (Khan & Siddiqui, 2021).

2.4 Comparative Studies on Democratic and Authoritarian Leadership

Comparative studies have always shown that democratic leadership style is better at creating intrinsic motivation and creating positive outcomes in employees.



Through an in-depth understanding of organizational behavior in Canada, it emerged that participative management and inclusive leadership style positively influences employee engagement and organizational culture in the workplace across sectors (Anderson, 2025). A comparative survey conducted on the South African mining sector revealed that the Ubuntu leadership principles as a culturally-based approach to leadership with a great emphasis on empathy, respect, interconnectedness, and inclusivity were found to be statistically significant in positive correlation with employee involvement, which is in favour of the democracy as a leadership style in collectivist workplaces (Nelwamondo and Price, 2025).

According to a study of the banking professionals in the UAE that was carried out in the Middle East, leadership style significantly impacts the motivation and satisfaction of employees, in which the strategy leaders contribute to gaining confidence towards them and desire to talk about good opinions (Alyileili, 2021). The studies of Egyptian pharmaceutical workers also provided them with the same results as good leadership was positively related to innovation management among the employees of the state business (Mohammed & El-Ashram, 2025).

With regard to the Pakistani environment, a study about the workers in the private and government sectors in Karachi discovered that the leadership quality of authoritarianism as a moderating factor plays a key role in the performance of employees, especially within a government-owned organization, and helps enhance compliance externally and reduce employee motivation internally (Khan and Siddiqui, 2021). In the same line, the effects of leadership styles in Pakistan have indicated that autocratic leadership is negatively correlated to employee motivation, but participative and democratic are positively correlated with motivation and satisfaction (Asrar-ul-Haq and Kuchinke, 2016).

2.5 Gap in Literature

Although substantial research on leadership/motivation has been done in the world literature, little has been done in Pakistan to concurrently investigate the correlational, predictive and comparative facets of democratic and authoritarian leadership on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Majority of the research studies in Pakistan have been based on motivation, but little has been done to identify the particular dimension of motivation and very few have differentiated between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Durrani et al., 2015; Zareen et al., 2015). In addition, although researchers have investigated the types of leadership in the Pakistani organizations, they have mainly focused on the transformational and transactional leadership, and little has been done on the democratic and authoritarian leadership (Asrar-ul-Haq and Kuchinke, 2016). Moreover, there is no known research that has particularly studied the Gujrat district and provided a comparison between the academic and government sector employees in this region in the domain of styles of leadership and motivation. The above research gaps are fulfilled in the current study by offering a multi-analytical research on the relationship, prediction, and comparison of democratic and authoritarian leadership styles to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of 200 employees in the university and district level in Gujrat.

2.6 Hypotheses

2.6.1 Correlation

H1a: Democratic leadership is significantly positively correlated with intrinsic motivation.

H1b: Authoritarian leadership is significantly negatively correlated with intrinsic motivation.

H1c: Authoritarian leadership is significantly positively correlated with extrinsic motivation.

2.6.2 Prediction

H2a: Democratic leadership significantly predicts intrinsic motivation.

H2b: Authoritarian leadership significantly predicts extrinsic motivation.

2.6.3 Comparison

H3a: Employees under Democratic leadership have significantly higher intrinsic motivation than those under Authoritarian leadership.

H3b: Employees under Authoritarian leadership have significantly higher extrinsic motivation than those under Democratic leadership.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design



In this study, the research design used was quantitative, cross-sectional research design to investigate the relationship, predict and compare democratic leader style and authoritarian leader style to employee work motivation. The cross-sectional design was found to be suitable since it is the form that provides the possibility to gather data at one point in time and examine correlations and predictive relationships as well as group differences between variables.

3.2 Population and Sample

All the workers in the academic and government departments of Gujrat district in Punjab, Pakistan became the target population of this study. The population comprised of 200 employees who were chosen by convenience sampling, the non probability technique sampling method that is common in social scientific studies where there is a big population and is readily available. The samples were also allocated in the following way: 100 employees (University of Gujrat) and 100 employees (different government offices in the District Gujrat). This allocation had both government and academic representation. Participation criteria included that they have to be full-time employees, working in the selected organizations and have at least one year of work experience with their current supervisor and volunteer to take part. The study did not include part-time workers, contract workers, those who had worked less than one year, and those on long leave.

3.3 Instruments

Two standardized questionnaires were used to collect data for this study.

The initial tool was Leadership Style Questionnaire, initially created by Northouse (2013), a 18 item questionnaire with two subscales, with 9 questions relating to democratic and 9 questions relating to authoritarian leadership behaviors. The items will be rated in terms of 5-Likert scale of Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. A higher score on democratic subscale will show a more democratic leadership style and a higher score on authoritarian subscale will show a more authoritarian leadership style. In past researches, the scale has proved to have good psychometric characteristics and reliability coefficients have been found to be between 78 and 85.

The second tool was the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) created by Tremblay et al. (2009) that includes 18 items that address 6 dimensions of motivation, including intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation and amotivation. Items are measured on 7 Likert scale where 1 = Does not correspond at all to 7 = Corresponds exactly. In the current study, the six subscales have been grouped into two composite measures; intrinsic motivation (including intrinsic motivation, identified regulation and integrated regulation) and extrinsic motivation (including introjected regulation and external regulation). In earlier studies, the psychometric properties of the WEIMS have been found to be quite good with the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the scale varying between 0.76 and .89. Besides the two standardized questionnaires, a demographic information form was made to gather some background information of the participants such as gender, age, education, and sector.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Data gathering was done in accordance with a systematic process, to achieve compliance to ethics and quality of data. Formal permission was obtained from the University of Gujrat and the respective District Government Offices. The employees were also approached at the normal working hours and the nature of the study, the goals and the methodology were explained to all the potential participants. Each participant signed an informed consent prior to the data collection. The questionnaires took around 15-20 minutes to complete and the researcher was also available to explain the questionnaire and any ambiguities that might have arisen. Data were taken in the three weeks period in order to guarantee sufficient sample size and response level. Questionnaires completed were returned and reviewed to see their completeness and out of the questionnaires that were distributed, 200 participants returned fully-filled questionnaires were analyzed and those who did not had their questionnaires returned.



3.5 Ethical Considerations

Informed consent before all the participants gave informed consent, and the consent form elaborated the objective of the study, volunteering nature of participation and the right to skip the study any time without any repercussion. The participants were guaranteed anonymity and no information was sought which could identify them. All data were retained in confidence and the data was used solely on the basis of research. Participation was entirely optional and the participants were told that they could not answer any question or drop out of the study without penalties.

3.6 Data Analysis Plan

Data collected were analyzed by the version of SPSS 27.0. The descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated on the demographics as well as all the variables discussed in the study. The relationships between democratic leadership, authoritarian leadership, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation were analyzed using the Pearson correlation analysis at a significant level of $p < .05$. Simple linear regression was run to find out whether democratic leadership was a significant predictor of intrinsic motivation and whether authoritarian leadership was a significant predictor of extrinsic motivation and unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients, standard errors, t-values, p-values, R^2 and F were reported. The independent samples t-test was used to compare motivation scores in employees in democratic and authoritarian leadership and the means, standard deviation, t-value, degrees of freedom, p-value, and Cohen d were reported to establish the degree of difference. The statistical assumptions such as normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance were verified and confirmed before doing the major analyzes and parametric statistical tests could be used accordingly.

4. Results

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

Table 1

Demographics Characteristics of Participants (N = 200)

Characteristics	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	108	54.0
	Female	92	46.0
Age	20-30 years	86	43.0
	31-40 years	70	35.0
	41 and above	44	22.0
Education	Graduate	78	39.0
	Postgraduate	122	61.0
Sector	University	100	50.0
	District	100	50.0

There were 200 employees in this research. Table 1 shows the demographic data on the sample. The sample consisted of 108 males (54.0%) and 92 females (46.0%). The majority of participants were aged 20–30 years ($n = 86$, 43.0%), followed by 31–40 years ($n = 70$, 35.0%) and 41 years and above ($n = 44$, 22.0%). Education wise, 122 (61.0) out of the 200 participants were postgraduates and 78 (39.0) were graduates. The University sector ($n = 100$, 50.0%) and the District sector ($n = 100$, 50.0%), yielded equal representation.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations Among Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Democratic Leadership	3.48	0.61	-			
2. Authoritarian Leadership	2.91	0.67	-.18*	-		
3. Intrinsic Motivation	3.72	0.58	.45**	-.34**	-	
4. Extrinsic Motivation	3.41	0.63	.08	.41**	.30**	-

Note: $N = 200$. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation. ** $p < .01$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed).



The median score of Democratic Leadership was 3.48 (SD = 0.61) whereas Authoritarian Leadership was 2.91 (SD = 0.67) as shown in Table 2. Mean Intrinsic Motivation had the greatest value due to the highest degree of mean of 3.72 with SD = 0.58 then Extrinsic Motivation with a mean of 3.41 and SD = 0.63.

The Pearson correlation analysis identified a statistically significant positive correlation between Democratic Leadership and Intrinsic Motivation ($r = .45, p < .01$), and statistically significant negative correlation between democratic Leadership and Authoritarian Leadership ($r = -.18, p < .05$). Authoritarian Leadership had a large negative relationship with Intrinsic Motivation ($r = -.34, p < .01$) and a large positive relationship with Extrinsic Motivation ($r = .41, p < .01$). There was also a positive correlation between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation ($r = .30, p < .01$).

4.3 Regression Analysis

Table 3

Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Employee Motivation (N = 200)

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	F
Democratic Leadership	0.43	0.07	.45	6.14	<.001	.20	37.70***
Authoritarian Leadership	0.39	0.07	.41	5.80	<.001	.17	33.64***

*Note: N = 200. B = Unstandardized Coefficient; SE = Standard Error; β = Standardized Coefficient; R² = Coefficient of Determination. **p < .001.*

Simple linear regression was carried out to establish whether or not the leadership styles played a key role in predicting the motivation of employees. As shown in Table 3, Democratic Leadership significantly predicted Intrinsic Motivation, accounting for 20% of the variance ($R^2 = .20, F(1, 198) = 37.70, p < .001$), with $\beta = .45$ ($t = 6.14, p < .001$). Similarly, Authoritarian Leadership significantly predicted Extrinsic Motivation, explaining 17% of the variance ($R^2 = .17, F(1, 198) = 33.64, p < .001$), with $\beta = .41$ ($t = 5.80, p < .001$).

4.4 Comparison of Motivation Scores

Table 4

Comparison of Motivation Scores Between Democratic and Authoritarian Leadership Styles (N = 200)

Motivation Type	Leadership Style	n	M	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Intrinsic	Democratic	100	4.02	0.49	7.34	198	<.001	1.04
	Authoritarian	100	3.42	0.66				
Extrinsic	Democratic	100	3.25	0.62	-4.22	198	<.001	0.60
	Authoritarian	100	3.58	0.49				

Note: N = 200. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; df = Degrees of Freedom; Cohen's d = Effect Size (0.20 = small, 0.50 = medium, 0.80 = large).

There was an independent samples t-test to compare the scores of motivations between employees of Democratic style of leadership and Authoritarian style of leadership. The results are in Table 4. In the case of Intrinsic Motivation, the employees under the Democratic leadership ($M = 4.02, SD = 0.49$) recorded a significant score as compared to the Authoritarian leadership ($M = 3.42, SD = 0.66$), $t(198) = 7.34, p < .001$, Cohen $d = 1.04$ a large effect size represents a large effect. In the case of Extrinsic Motivation, Authoritarian employees ($M = 3.58, SD = 0.49$) scored much higher compared to Democratic employees ($M = 3.25, SD = 0.62$), $t(198) = -4.22, p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.60$, which is the medium effect size.

5. Discussion

The current research paper analyzed the association, forecast, and contrast of both democratic and authoritarian types of leadership towards employee work motivation among 200 employees in the state of Gujarat. The results can be largely associated with Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci and Ryan, 1985; Ryan and Deci, 2000), which assumes that leadership practices can affect the motivation of employees by satisfying basic psychological needs that play a role in autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Gagné and Deci, 2005; Ryan and Deci, 2017). Based on SDT, autonomous motivation, especially intrinsic motivation is encouraged when leaders accommodate the need of employees to self-direction and volition (Van den Broeck and Slemp, 2023). Democratic leadership, which implies the joint decision-making process, openness, and



delegation of power, seems to meet these psychological needs, thus boosting intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, authoritarian leadership that is characterized by control, directive leadership and minimal employee contributions can play down these needs thereby fathering autonomous motivation and propagating extrinsic, compliance directed motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The correlation analysis displayed that the democratic leadership was significantly positively related to intrinsic motivation ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), but authoritarian leadership also displayed a significant negative relationship with intrinsic motivation ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$). The results are consistent with the data gathered in earlier studies with Indonesian workers who discovered a positive correlation between the use of democratic leadership and intrinsic motivation ($r = 0.378$, $p < .001$; Khan and Siddiqui, 2021). In the same way, an Armenian study revealed that teachers with a democratic leader had a greater creative drive, and those with an authoritarian leader had a lesser intrinsic drive (Stepanyan and Geghamyan, 2025).

The regression analysis also ensured that the intrinsic motivation was immensely predicted based on democratic leadership and explained 20% of the variance ($R^2 = .20$, $\beta = .45$, $p = .001$). This predictive correlation is in line with studies in the Turkish banking industry that revealed that leadership styles are a significant predictor of employee motivation (Öztürk et al., 2025). The result that authoritarian leadership was a predictor of extrinsic motivation ($R^2 = .17$, $\beta = .41$, $p < .001$) is also found in literature. In a study of Indian professionals in the public sector, autocratic leadership was strongly and significantly associated with the demotivation of employees, and dissatisfaction of the primary psychological needs (Khan and Siddiqui, 2021). The focus on extrinsic rewards and conformity with authoritarian leaders may fit the employees to invest their efforts in the extrinsic results of achievement instead of personal involvement.

The t-test of the means of the independent samples showed that the difference in means of the leadership styles is significant. Intrinsic motivation was also greatly higher among employees in a democratic leadership group ($M = 4.02$) than employees in an authoritarian leadership group ($M = 3.42$) with $t(198) = 7.34$ and Cohen $d = 1.04$ which is a huge effect size. In contrast employees with authoritarian leadership had greatly heightened extrinsic motive ($M = 3.58$) than employees with democratic leadership ($M = 3.25$), $t(198) = -4.22$, $p < .001$, Cohen $d = 0.60$ - a medium effect size. These results are aligned with the studies in the Armenian educational facilities, where the democratic leadership had a positive effect on intrinsic motivation, and the authoritarian leadership promoted compliance (Stepanyan and Geghamyan, 2025). The substantial effect size in intrinsic motivation ($d = 1.04$) indicates that the practice importance of the leadership style on intrinsic motivation is large.

The context of the study between the employees of the university and district in Gujarat, Pakistan, contribute positively to the existing literature. Studies have been carried out on leadership in Pakistan to emphasize the significance of participative and transformational leadership styles in helping to improve employee performance. One of the studies on the topic of public sector organizations in Pakistan concluded that the positive impact of transformational leadership was higher on employee engagement and motivation than transactional leadership (Quadri et al., 2024). Moreover, other studies on the employees of the Pakistani banking sector have found that participative leadership styles have a positive influence on employee motivation and performance (Mir et al., 2019). The current results build on this literature by offering a quantitative measure of such outcomes of democratic and authoritarian leadership on particular categories of motivation in a sample representing both the academic and governmental fields.

5.1 Implications

To maximize the intrinsic motivation, organizations ought to encourage democratic leadership. Leaders need to engage employees in decision making, share power and promote communication. Managers should be trained on participative leadership through the human resource programs. The academic and governmental spheres of Gujrat are supposed to be backed by policy makers with practices boosting autonomy. Although authoritarian leadership can result in short-term compliance, excessive use of it will compromise long-term employee engagement and well-being.



5.2 Limitations and Future Research

This research is limited in three ways. To begin with, the design is cross-sectional, which does not allow making causal statements, a longitudinal study should be further applied in the future. Second, it was restricted to 200 and could not be used to generalize though large and more diverse samples are required. Third, self-report scales can be biased; objective performance indicators need to be included in future research. Also, more studies in the future could consider the moderators, including personality factors, job experience, and industry-based relations between academic and government workers.

5.3 Conclusion

Overall, this paper has shown that a democratic leadership style is more efficient in promoting intrinsic motivation, whereas authoritarian style of leadership is strongly linked to extrinsic motivation. The results of this piece of research help emphasize the relevance of autonomy supportive leadership in the facilitation of self-determined mode of motivation. Investing in the democratic practices of leadership in organizations in Gujrat, among other places, can have great returns, in the employee engagement, satisfaction, and long-term performance.

Contribution of Authors

All the authors participated in the ideation, development, and final approval of the manuscript, making significant contributions to the work reported.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Informed Consent

Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Data Availability

This study relies exclusively on publicly available secondary sources, including corporate disclosures, industry reports, and peer-reviewed literature, all of which are cited in the References section.

References

- Alyileili, S. S. (2021). The impact of strategic leadership on achieving job satisfaction for employees in the UAE Islamic banking sector. *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology*, 7(10), 1–16. <https://www.neliti.com/id/publications/337099/the-impact-of-strategic-leadership-on-achieving-job-satisfaction-for-employees-i>
- Anderson, C. (2025). Canadian organizational behaviour in SMEs. *Canadian OTS Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.58840/17c9ac15>
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani banks. *Future Business Journal*, 2(1), 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbj.2016.05.002>
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
- Braun, S., Semenkova, A., Lalla, J., van Dick, R., & Hernandez Bark, A. S. (2025). The impact of motivation to lead on team outcomes: The mediating role of leaders' role satisfaction in China and Germany. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1605603. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1605603>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.
- Durrani, A. B., Cheema, S., & Pasha, A. T. (2015). Direct and indirect impact of leadership on perceived work motivation and perceived job satisfaction. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(36).
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331–362. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322>
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(2), 81–108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(92\)90028-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(92)90028-E)



- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Kageyama, M. (1988). Effects of subordinate authoritarianism and job characteristics on the relationship between participative leadership and subordinate morale. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28(1), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.2130/jjesp.28.11>
- Khan, D., Saghir, & Muhammad, J. (2023). Organizational citizenship behavior in the context of leadership style: A case of public sector organizations in Balochistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 579–588. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023\(4-II\)52](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023(4-II)52)
- Khan, M. O., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2021). Impact of labor union utility on intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment: The role of union membership and leadership styles in a multi-group analysis of private and government employees of Pakistan. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3943056>
- Kowalski, S., & von Gehlen, J. G. (2026). From self-care to motivation: Health-oriented leadership and basic psychological need satisfaction at work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, Article 1807780. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1807780>
- Latham, G. P. (2012). *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Lopes, H., Lagoa, S., & Calapez, T. (2014). Declining autonomy at work in the EU and its effect on civic behaviour. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 35(2), 341–366.
- Magnet4Europe. (2025). *Magnet4Europe—Empowering nurses at Cork University Hospital*. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/magnet4europe-empowering-nurses-cork-university-hospital>
- Mir, M. M., Khan, S., Tunio, M., Omer, M., Sajid, S., & Hussain, S. (2019). Relationship between leadership styles on talent retention through employee commitment and motivation: Evidence from the banking sectors, Pakistan. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 4(2), 34–53.
- Mohammed, S. M., & El-Ashram, R. E. (2025). The relationship between virtuous leadership and innovation management in the pharmaceutical companies of the public business sector—Egypt. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 17(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-11-2022-0212>
- Nelwamondo, M. B., & Price, G. (2025). Ubuntu leadership and employee engagement in mining: The moderating role of safety culture. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, Article 3065. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v23i0.3065>
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Öztürk, Z., Göl Beşer, S., & Karadağ, H. (2025). The impact of leadership style on employee motivation: Evidence from the Turkish banking sector. *International Journal of Commerce, Industry and Entrepreneurship Studies*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18093447>
- Quadri, S. S. A., Anjum, M. R., & Bangash, S. A. (2024). Impact of leadership styles on employee engagement and performance in the public sector. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 5(4), 343–360.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (Eds.). (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Sadaqat, S., Sharif, S., Junejo, S., & Sharif, S. (2024). Diversified workforce and employees' performance: Moderating effect of bureaucratic leadership in third sector. *Research Journal for Societal Issues*, 6(2), 253–266. <https://doi.org/10.56976/rjsi.v6i2.231>
- Shu, C. (2015). The impact of intrinsic motivation on the effectiveness of leadership style towards on work engagement. *Contemporary Management Research*, 11(4), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.14043>



- Stepanyan, N., & Geghamyan, E. (2025). School principal's management style and teachers' work motivation. *Main Issues of Pedagogy and Psychology*, 12(1), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.24234/miopap.v12i1.81>
- Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 41(4), 213–226.
- Van den Broeck, A., & Slemp, G. R. (2023). Leadership: A self-determination theory perspective. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of self-determination theory* (pp. 920–938). Oxford University Press.
- Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C. H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1195–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316632058>
- Wongsunopparat, S., & Jaroensuk, P. (2021). Suitable leadership style for service industry in Bangkok. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 11(1), 39–61. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v11i1.18144>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Zareen, M., Razzaq, K., & Mujtaba, B. (2015). Impact of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles on motivation: A quantitative study of banking employees in Pakistan. *Public Organization Review*, 15(4), 531–549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-014-0287-6>

