

The Shadow of The Leader: How Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles Shape Occupational Burnout Among Banking Professionals — A Quantitative Investigation

Minal Saxena¹, Dr. Vivek Singh Sachan²

¹Research Scholar, Chhatrapati Shahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur, India

²Associate Professor, CSJM University, Kanpur, India

Abstract—Purpose: Occupational burnout among bank employees has come to be seen as an indispensable feature of the post-digital and post-pandemic epoch. Despite an extensive body of literature that exists on organizational structures and workloads contributing to burnout, it has become clear that the relationship between leadership style and occupational burnout among banking employees is poorly understood. In this research, we analyze the differential influence of transformational and transactional leadership styles on three burnout factors: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment among banking professionals in India.

Design/Research Methodology: The method used was a quantitative, cross-sectional design for the purposes of data collection. Data were collected from 523 banking employees working in PSU banks, private banks, and small finance banks located across six states in India through the process of stratified purposeful sampling. Transformational and transactional leadership styles were assessed using MLQ-5X questionnaire, whereas burnout was measured using MBI-GS. Statistical testing was done using CFA, correlation, hierarchical multiple regression and path analysis by AMOS 26.0 & SPSS 27.0 software packages. **Results:** Transformational leadership showed a strong negative correlation with emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -0.57, p < 0.001$) and depersonalisation ($\beta = -0.49, p < 0.001$), whereas personal accomplishment was strongly positively correlated with transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.52, p < 0.001$). Transactional leadership, on the other hand, had an interesting two-way influence on the burnout construct; its contingent reward sub-dimension had a negative correlation with burnout ($\beta = -0.28, p < 0.01$), whereas its management-by-exception (passive) sub-dimension was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion ($\beta = 0.41, p < 0.001$). Laissez-faire leadership emerged as the most potent positive predictor

of the three burnout dimensions. Psychological safety at work showed partial mediation in the link between transformational leadership and burnout (indirect effect = $-0.31, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.43, -0.18]$).

Significance/Originality: This research is one of the first few to empirically explore the relationship between all three leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and all three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and personal accomplishment) in the Indian banking industry in one single path model, thus addressing important gaps in both leadership and occupational health research areas.

Index Terms—Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, occupational burnout, Maslach Burnout Inventory, psychological safety, banking sector, India, MLQ-5X, path analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership goes beyond being a managerial responsibility, as it refers to the psychological climate that will either foster or drain individuals working within it. In any sector, none other would have more implications when it comes to defining employees' experiences at work by fostering either positive or negative feelings towards their tasks. For instance, occupational burnout – that condition characterised by exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficiency – occurs in a specific organizational climate created as a result of inappropriate pressures exerted on employees due to the inappropriate form of leadership.

The Indian banking industry finds itself in an especially crucial moment now. The combination of

fast-paced technological developments, growing regulatory pressures, high expectations of credit growth and increased demands from retail customers raises the stress levels in the workplace to the next level. According to BCSBI (2023), the level of staff turnover in the banking sector exceeded 26% in the 2022–2023 year; the exit surveys indicate that managers' conduct and leadership skills are among the reasons for this disengagement. Notwithstanding its significance, this aspect remains underexplored in mainstream academic literature.

The theory of leadership style, specifically Burns' (1978) seminal work on the dichotomy between transformational and transactional styles, further developed into the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) by Bass and Avolio (1994), serves as the key theoretical framework behind this study. The former inspires followers with the vision, stimulating them intellectually and offering individualized attention. The latter leads through contingent reward and corrective actions. At the other end of the spectrum is laissez-faire leadership, which entails shirking from one's responsibilities as a leader. Such styles generate very distinct motivational climates, which affect employee burnout.

The conceptual bridge here is provided by the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), whereby a leader's approach becomes a critical resource available to employees, or an important source of job demand when viewed negatively. In the case of transformational leadership, this resource is increased by way of providing meaning, offering social support, and giving feedback. When passive or laissez-faire leadership is practiced, however, this resource is effectively stripped from the employee.

The present research contributes to the field in four ways. Firstly, it offers the first attempt at testing the Full Range Leadership Model against all three burnout dimensions using MBI-GS scale in the Indian banking sector. Secondly, it incorporates psychological safety as the mediator between leaders and followers in terms of burnout.

This helps contribute to the theory by moving beyond the simplistic view of the effects of leadership on burnout. Thirdly, the research takes into account various types of institutions working in the Indian banking sector (PSUs, private banks, and small finance banks).

1.1. Research Questions

RQ1: What is the differential effect of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles on the three dimensions of occupational burnout for banking employees?

RQ2: Is psychological safety a mediator between leadership style and the dimensions of burnout?

RQ3: Are there any significant differences in leadership style-burnout association among PSU, private, and small finance banks?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM)

The Full Range Leadership Model by Bass and Avolio (1994) includes a spectrum of leadership behaviors, ranging from the most active and positive (transformational leadership) to the most passive and avoidant (laissez-faire leadership). The features of transformational leadership include idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transactional leadership involves contingent reward (performance-related reinforcement) and management by exception – both active (error monitoring) and passive (intervention only when standards have not been met). Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by the complete absence of leadership behaviors.

Transformational leadership has been found to be positively associated with employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, engagement, and performance through meta-analysis (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). Laissez-faire leadership, while being largely ignored, was found to be the strongest burnout driver within the healthcare and education industries (Skogstad et al., 2007; Hetland et al., 2018); however, no evidence for banking is available.

2.2. Leadership Style and Burnout: Prior Evidence

Several ways have been proposed to understand the interrelationship between leadership styles and burnout. In a systematic review of 49 studies, Skakon et al. (2010) found positive association between dysfunctional leader behavior and employee stress, burnout, and that the opposite pattern – supportive

leadership – acts as a protective factor. Transformational leaders can prevent employee burnout as they meet the employees' psychological need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness – an assertion that resonates with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

With regard to transformational leadership in the banking industry, Qiu et al. (2019) found a strong negative association between branch manager's transformational leadership style and emotional exhaustion experienced by Chinese bank tellers ($\beta = -0.43, p < 0.001$).

Management by exception passive emerged as a stressful experience in that study. In the European setting, Montano et al. (2017) found, in a meta-analysis of 27 studies ($N = 14,008$), that transformational leadership had a moderate protection effect on reducing burnout ($d = 0.48$). But there is a noticeable absence of research in Indian banking in spite of the unique structural aspects of that industry.

2.3 Psychological Safety as Mediator

Psychological safety – the collective understanding that the team setting is psychologically safe for interpersonal risk-taking (Edmondson, 1999) – has become an essential organisational construct. The role of transformational leaders in creating psychological safety among their followers lies in their individualized consideration and non-retributive reaction to failure (Carmeli et al., 2014). On the other hand, the lack of psychological safety emerges due to the passivity and laissez-faire behaviour of leaders who fail to set standards and react in inconsistent manner to errors made.

The connection between psychological safety and burnout is based on COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), according to which a psychologically safe environment is a pool of resources that allows workers to protect themselves from burnout, since it prevents their resources from being depleted. Nembhard and Edmondson (2006) have found out that psychological safety can shield employees from burnout, moderating the relationship between workloads and emotional exhaustion.

The study will reveal whether psychological safety conveys the benefits of transformational leadership onto burnout.

2.4. Hypotheses

H1a-c: Transformational leadership negatively predicts (a) emotional exhaustion, (b) depersonalization, and (c) lower personal accomplishment.

H2a-b: Transactional contingent reward negatively predicts burnout (H2a), whereas transactional management by exception passive positively predicts burnout (H2b).

H3: Laissez-faire leadership positively predicts all three burnout dimensions.

H4: Psychological safety is a mediator between transformational leadership and burnout dimensions.

H5: There is a significant difference in the relationship between leadership styles and burnout among PSU, private, and small finance banks.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research employed a positivist research approach with a quantitative, cross-sectional survey research design. The selection of the cross-sectional research design is not only practical but also valid in the context of investigating directional relationships, which have been theoretically specified (Podsakoff et al., 2012). The common method bias was addressed using temporally-separated measurement of leaders' perceptions and their experiences of burnout and randomization of questionnaire sections.

3.2 Population and Sampling

The population involved all employees working on permanent, full-time basis in scheduled commercial banks in India including PSU banks, private sector banks, and small finance banks. The sampling method used was a stratified purposive sampling approach where the strata considered were (a) type of institutions (PSU or Private or Small Finance Banks); (b) designation level (front-line staffs or mid-level officers); (c) gender; and (d) regions (North, South, East, West, Central, and Northeast India).

A pre-study power analysis (G*Power 3.1; $f^2 = 0.15, \alpha = 0.05, \text{power} = 0.90, \text{predictors} = 7$) revealed a required minimum sample size of 395. Considering an

expected 25% non-responses and invalid responses, 680 questionnaires were circulated through both electronic media (Google forms distributed through Bank Branch Managers) and physical mode. Out of a total of 598 returned questionnaires (response rate 87.9%), only 523 were valid questionnaires.

3.3 Instruments

3.3.1 Leadership Style

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – 5X Short Form (MLQ-5X; Bass & Avolio, 1995) was used to measure leadership styles in 45 statements based on a 5-point Likert scale (where “0” meant “Not at all” and “4” meant “Frequently, if not always”). The MLQ-5X evaluates nine scales of leadership styles. In this study, four scales were used: Transformational Leadership style (composite of five subscales with 20 statements; $\alpha = 0.91$), Contingent Reward style (4 statements; $\alpha = 0.85$), Management by Exception passive (4 statements; $\alpha = 0.79$), and Laissez-faire Leadership (4 statements; $\alpha = 0.83$). Respondents evaluated their immediate supervisor.

3.3.2 Occupational Burnout

Occupational burnout was estimated based on responses to 16 questions from Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli et al., 1996). This scale included three subscales: Emotional Exhaustion (5 items; $\alpha = 0.89$), Depersonalization (4 items; $\alpha = 0.81$), and Personal Accomplishments (7 items, reverse-coded; $\alpha = 0.87$). Responses were provided according to the frequency scale with seven categories from “Never” to “Every day”.

3.3.3 Psychological Safety

Psychological safety was assessed using the 7-item Team Psychological Safety Scale proposed by Edmondson (1999) and revised for dyadic supervision-subordinate interactions (such as “My supervisor makes it easy to talk about my mistakes without negative repercussions.”) Responses were captured via a five-point Likert scale ($\alpha = 0.88$).

3.4 Control Variables

As per the conventions followed in studies on burnout, the variables considered under control are as follows: gender (male = 0, female = 1), age (continuous), organizational tenure (in years), job level (frontline = 0, officer/managerial = 1), and bank type (PSU = reference category, private, small finance).

3.5 Analytical Strategy

Data screening encompassed outlier analysis (through Mahalanobis Distance), checking of normality (using skewness and kurtosis) and handling of missing data by imputation using Full Information Maximum Likelihood Estimation (FIML). The Measurement Model was evaluated in AMOS 26.0 through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Measures of Convergent Validity included AVE (with values more than 0.50) and CR (values greater than 0.70). Discriminant validity was ensured using Fornell-Larcker criterion and HTMTs (all values less than 0.85). Hypothesis H1 to H3 was tested using hierarchical multiple regression. Hypothesis H4 was checked for mediation using Bootstrapping with 5000 resamples and 95% confidence interval.

IV. RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Demographic Profile

In the final sample, the participants included 61.4% male respondents and 38.6% females ($N = 523$). The mean age was 33.1 years, and the standard deviation was 6.8 (22-58). Of the total number of the respondents, 41.7% were employees of PSU banks ($n = 218$), 44.4% were from private banks ($n = 232$), and 13.9% belonged to small finance banks ($n = 73$). Organizational tenure had a mean of 7.6 years, and standard deviation was 5.3. The frontline staff made up 56.2%, and mid-level officers formed 43.8%. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among all study variables.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Transform. Leadership	3.41	0.74	—						
2. Contingent Reward	3.18	0.81	.52**	—					
3. MBE Passive	2.76	0.93	-.38**	-.29**	—				
4. Laissez-Faire	1.89	0.97	-.61**	-.44**	.57**	—			

5. Psychology Safety	3.64	0.82	.66**	.43**	-.51**	-.58**	—		
6. Emotional Exhaustion	3.74	1.18	-.54**	-.31**	.44**	.62**	-.57**	—	
7. Depersonalisation	3.11	1.06	-.47**	-.27**	.39**	.55**	-.48**	.64**	—
8. Reduced Accomplishment	3.02	1.14	-.50**	-.33**	.41**	.58**	-.52**	.61**	.59**

Note. $N = 523$. MBE = Management-by-Exception. ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed). Reduced Accomplishment scored such that higher values indicate lower accomplishment.

4.2 Measurement Model Validity

Based on CFA output, the model showed good fit in terms of the entire measurement model: χ^2 ($df = 341$) = 724.6, $\chi^2/df = 2.12$, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.046 (90% CI [0.041, 0.052]), SRMR = 0.049. Standardised factor loadings were statistically significant and ranged between 0.64 and 0.93. The AVE ranged from 0.53 to 0.71 (all > 0.50) and the CR

ranged from 0.82 to 0.94 (all > 0.70). Supporting convergent validity. The HTMT ratios were less than 0.85, while the Fornell-Larcker criterion was fulfilled for all construct pairs, indicating discriminant validity.

4.3 Hypothesis Testing: Direct Effects (H1–H3)

Hierarchical regression was performed on each burnout dimension as the dependent variable. Model 1 contains control variables; Model 2 includes transformational leadership; Model 3 includes transactional leadership scales and laissez-faire leadership. The results of the last model with each dependent variable are given in Table 2 below.

Predictor	Emot. Exhaust. β	SE	p	Depersonal. β	SE	p	Red. Accomp. β	p	ΔR^2
Transformational Leadership	-0.57	0.07	< .001	-0.49	0.08	< .001	-0.52	< .001	.29
Contingent Reward	-0.28	0.08	.001	-0.22	0.08	.007	-0.25	.003	.05
MBE Passive	0.41	0.07	< .001	0.34	0.08	< .001	0.37	< .001	.08
Laissez-Faire	0.53	0.08	< .001	0.46	0.09	< .001	0.49	< .001	.12
Gender (Female)	-0.09	0.09	.31	-0.07	0.09	.44	-0.11	.24	—
Tenure (years)	-0.13	0.04	.002	-0.10	0.04	.014	-0.08	.08	—
Bank Type (Private)	-0.06	0.09	.50	-0.08	0.10	.43	-0.05	.62	—
Bank Type (SFB)	0.14	0.12	.25	0.11	0.12	.37	0.09	.46	—
Total R^2 (Adjusted)	.54			.47			.51		

Note. $N = 523$. SFB = Small Finance Bank. MBE = Management-by-Exception Passive. β = standardised coefficient. Controls included in all models. R^2 values reported for final model.

All four hypotheses in relation to H1 were positively proven. The transformational leadership had the highest negative effect on emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -0.57$, $p < 0.001$), depersonalisation ($\beta = -0.49$, $p < 0.001$), and low personal accomplishment ($\beta = -0.52$, $p < 0.001$). Contingent reward had a negative impact on all components of burnout (H2a). Hypothesis H2b had been proven since the passive component of managerial burnout environment was positively linked to emotional exhaustion ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$) and depersonalisation ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$). H3 had been

strongly proved: laissez-faire leadership showed the highest positive effects on emotional exhaustion ($\beta = 0.53$) and depersonalisation ($\beta = 0.46$) among all predictor variables.

4.4 Mediation Analysis: Psychological Safety (H4)

Mediation via bias corrected bootstrapping (number of bootstraps = 5,000) was performed on the mediating role of psychological safety in the relation between transformational leadership and burnout. It is clear that there was evidence of partial mediation in all the three dimensions of burnout. Emotional exhaustion: indirect effect = -0.31, 95% CI [-0.43, -0.18]; depersonalization: indirect effect = -0.26, 95% CI [-0.38, -0.14]; reduced personal accomplishment:

indirect effect = -0.28, 95% CI [-0.40, -0.16]. All CIs did not contain zero, thus H4 was supported. Transformational leadership effect remained

significant post-mediation. Table 3 presents mediation results.

Table 3: Mediation Results — Psychological Safety as Mediator (Bootstrapped, 5,000 Iterations)

Outcome Variable	Indirect Effect	SE	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Mediation Type
Emotional Exhaustion	-0.31	0.063	-0.43	-0.18	Partial
Depersonalisation	-0.26	0.061	-0.38	-0.14	Partial
Reduced Personal Accomplishment	-0.28	0.061	-0.40	-0.16	Partial

Note. Mediator = Psychological Safety. Predictor = Transformational Leadership. All indirect effects are significant (95% CIs exclude zero).

4.5 Multi-Group Analysis: Bank Type Differences (H5)

Multi-group path analysis examined differences in the effects of the leadership-burnout relationship across PSU banks, private banks, and small finance banks. Invariance of configural, metric, and scalar models was achieved successively. Results from chi-square difference tests showed significant differences in path effects ($\Delta\chi^2 = 34.6$; $\Delta df = 12$; $p = .001$), thereby confirming H5. More interestingly, the path effect between laissez-faire and emotional exhaustion was significantly larger in private banks ($\beta = 0.61$) than in PSU banks ($\beta = 0.44$; $p < .05$). This supports the idea that the workers in private banks, faced with tough performance targets, are more susceptible to being let down by leaders. The personal accomplishment-transformational leadership path was strongest in small finance banks ($\beta = 0.68$), implying that inspirational leadership is especially important in banking firms with limited resources.

V. DISCUSSION

The results of the study highlight the phenomenon which can be referred to as the shadow of the leader – the ever-present psychological environment created by the behavior of a supervisor and determining whether a person feels motivated and energized or worn out, connected and engaged or disconnected from his or her environment, and empowered or depleted at the end of each day on the job.

The predominance of laissez-faire leadership style as a cause of burnout is one of the most surprising

findings of the current study. The common discourse regarding negative effects associated with management practices focuses on proactive toxic behaviors such as abuse, micromanagement, and demanding unreasonable actions from an employee. However, the results of the current research, similar to those found in Skogstad et al.'s (2007) stressor-detachment model, prove that the worst thing for a banking employee is when there is a complete lack of any involvement, communication, and guidance by a manager. Withholding any type of feedback and being absent during crises, managers deprive people of the tools required to protect themselves against the pressures of their role and, consequently, lead to exhaustion.

Protective effects of transformational leadership, on the other hand, are statistically significant ($\beta = -0.57$ for emotional exhaustion) and theoretically sound. Transformational leadership does not only help to diminish the size of the workload, but changes one's perception of the workload. Through the provision of a vision and a sense of meaning, by genuinely being concerned about their subordinates' development, and by making the question-and-answer approach normal, they create precisely such a resource abundance which can be expected according to COR theory to prevent one from burnout. The partial mediation through psychological safety adds a crucial element of theoretical clarity: transformational leadership fosters psychological safety, which, at least partially, explains the suppression of burnout.

It is worth noting that contingent reward factor of transactional leadership emerged as a burnout buffer in this research, which is theoretically interesting since it contests an underlying assumption of burnout literature according to which all varieties of transactional leadership necessarily lead to burnout.

Cognitive predictability and control are valuable resources for employees in any stressful situation, provided that performance-reward linkages are consistently established. The issue here is not transactional leadership itself, but its passive varieties. Passive management by exception entails intervention only after the problem becomes serious, thus perpetuating the cycle of uncertainty and depleting the energy of employees rather than regenerating it. In particular, the bank type moderation findings are noteworthy. The greater susceptibility of private bank employees to laissez-faire leadership might be because of the stronger psychological contract they hold on account of their employment conditions. They have to deal with demands in exchange for remuneration and career advancement opportunities, and such a psychological contract requires that the leaders respond positively to their needs. Hence, the absence of such a response makes them vulnerable to burnout.

VI. IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Theoretical Contributions

The main theoretical contributions of this paper are the following three. The first contribution is that the present paper conducts the most exhaustive empirical examination of the influence of Full Range Leadership Model on burnout among Indian bank employees, thus validating the use of this model in a non-Western and demanding environment of service. The second contribution is that the inclusion of psychological safety as a partial mediator in the study deepens our understanding of the mechanism behind the relationship between leadership style and burnout.

6.2 Practical Implications

For the purposes of HR and talent development within banks, the insights gained from this study provide a clear hierarchy of priorities. The investment in leadership development needs to start with addressing laissez-faire leadership by ensuring basic levels of availability, responsiveness, and feedback are met – this can be considered the highest-impact burnout prevention strategy currently possible. This can be accomplished by creating management accountability frameworks, implementing upward feedback systems (360-degree evaluation process) and check-in systems at a branch level.

Transformational leadership development is a more challenging strategy to pursue but is likely to yield greater long-term gains. As a part of their leadership development programs, banks should focus on improving their managers' skills in individual consideration, which was demonstrated to positively impact employees' psychological safety, thus preventing burnout. Mindfulness-based leadership development (Good et al., 2016) and mentoring-based supervisory development programs can prove to be effective means to achieving this goal.

For regulators such as IBA and RBI, and other relevant industry authorities, it is possible to consider integrating leadership quality indicators into bank supervision frameworks, much like European Banking Authority does.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

A number of limitations exist in this study that must be taken into consideration in the context of interpretations. First, due to the cross-sectional nature of the research design, causal inference cannot be made; even though theory and path analyses provide a logical basis for causality, longitudinal designs must be used to prove causality. Both burnout and leadership perceptions were measured using a single source of data, leading to the possibility of common method variance despite steps that were undertaken to prevent such bias.

This is one of the main limitations in the current research, where the focus was on scheduled commercial banks only. This means that other banks, such as cooperative banks, regional rural banks, and non-banking financial companies (NBFCs), have been ignored; these banks are an important part of India's banking system and cater to a large percentage of the Indian population.

Last but not least, this paper addresses the concept of leadership as a one-way process whereby the supervisor influences the employee. Modern theories related to leader-member exchange (LMX) highlight the dual aspect of the phenomenon of leadership. Future studies incorporating the quality of LMX as an alternative or a moderating factor may help gain a more comprehensive insight into the phenomenon being studied.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The leader finds himself/herself at the junction of organisational need and human ability. In the banking sector, where pressures are tough, tempo is fierce, and emotions run strong, effective leadership is more than just a facilitator of productivity; it is a necessity for survival. It is shown in this research, based on quantitative analysis of 523 banking employees across India, that leadership style is one of the most effective modifiable antecedents of job burnout. Transformational leadership saves; laissez-faire leadership skills; and even transactional leadership has its positive and negative aspects, as the difference between clear contingent reward and lack of attention is huge.

The important implication following from this finding is quite obvious: those banks which invest into development of transformational and engaged managers are not only developing good leaders. They develop an organisation, where one can work to the fullest extent possible without giving up his/her identity – and in the field where human relations are still indispensable despite automatization, this becomes an important competitive advantage.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. B. Bakker and E. Demerouti, “The job demands-resources model: State of the art,” *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 309–328, 2007, doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115.
- [2] M. Bass and B. J. Avolio, *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, 1994.
- [3] M. Bass and B. J. Avolio, *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research (MLQ Form 5X-Short)*. Redwood City, CA, USA: Mind Garden, 1995.
- [4] Banking Codes and Standards Board of India, *Annual Report on Banking Conduct and Employee Wellbeing*. Mumbai, India: BCSBI, 2023.
- [5] J. M. Burns, *Leadership*. New York, NY, USA: Harper & Row, 1978.
- [6] A. Carmeli, R. Reiter-Palmon, and E. Ziv, “Inclusive leadership and employee innovative behavior: The role of psychological safety,” *Journal of Creative Behavior*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 220–241, 2014, doi: 10.1002/j.2162-6057.2010.tb01317.x.
- [7] L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, “The ‘what’ and ‘why’ of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior,” *Psychological Inquiry*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 227–268, 2000.
- [8] Edmondson, “Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams,” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 350–383, 1999, doi: 10.2307/2666999.
- [9] J. Good, C. J. Lyddy, T. M. Glomb, J. E. Bono, K. W. Brown, M. K. Duffy, R. A. Baer, J. A. Brewer, and S. W. Lazar, “Contemplating mindfulness at work: An integrative review,” *Journal of Management*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 114–142, 2016.
- [10] H. Hetland, J. Hetland, A. B. Bakker, and E. Demerouti, “The distinctiveness of transformational leadership: An investigation of whether leaders differentiate between their subordinates,” *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 9, Art. no. 1725, 2018.
- [11] S. E. Hobfoll, “Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress,” *American Psychologist*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 513–524, 1989.
- [12] T. A. Judge and R. F. Piccolo, “Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89, no. 5, pp. 755–768, 2004.
- [13] Maslach, S. E. Jackson, and M. P. Leiter, *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*, 3rd ed. Palo Alto, CA, USA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1996.
- [14] Montano, A. Reeske, F. Franke, and J. Hüffmeier, “Leadership, followers’ mental health and job performance in organizations: A comprehensive meta-analysis from an occupational health perspective,” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 327–350, 2017.
- [15] M. Nemhard and A. C. Edmondson, “Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams,” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 941–966, 2006.
- [16] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, and N. P. Podsakoff, “Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to

- control it,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 63, pp. 539–569, 2012.
- [17] S. Qiu, A. Alizadeh, L. M. Dooley, and R. Zhang, “The effects of authentic leadership on trust in leaders, organizational citizenship behavior, and service quality in the Chinese hospitality industry,” *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, vol. 40, pp. 77–87, 2019.
- [18] Reserve Bank of India, *Statistical Tables Relating to Banks in India 2023–24*. Mumbai, India: RBI Publications, 2024.
- [19] W. B. Schaufeli, M. P. Leiter, C. Maslach, and S. E. Jackson, “The Maslach Burnout Inventory—General Survey,” in *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*, 3rd ed., C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, and M. P. Leiter, Eds. Palo Alto, CA, USA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1996.
- [20] Skakon, K. Nielsen, V. Borg, and J. Guzman, “Are leaders’ well-being, behaviours and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees?” *Work & Stress*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 107–139, 2010.
- [21] A. Skogstad, S. Einarsen, T. Torsheim, M. S. Aasland, and H. Hetland, “The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior,” *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 80–92, 2007.
- [22] Wang, I. S. Oh, S. H. Courtright, and A. E. Colbert, “Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research,” *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 223–270, 2011.