

## THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Gülden Bozat  
Akdeniz Karpaz University

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azmiye Yinal  
Akdeniz Karpaz University  
azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of leadership structure on employee performance in banks. The study was conducted using the survey technique, which is one of the quantitative research methods. The population of the study consisted of employees working in banks in TRNC and the sample consisted of 247 employees. Data were collected through a scale. The scale used consists of 3 parts. In the first part, personal information form prepared by the researcher, in the second part, Perceived Leadership Style Scale developed by House and Dessler (1974) and in the last part, job performance scale developed by Darwish (2000) were used.

According to the findings of the study, it was observed that men scored higher in the participative leadership dimension and individuals who worked longer in the directive leadership dimension. In addition, it was determined that certain age groups and married individuals obtained higher scores in participative leadership. A significant relationship was found between professional seniority and leadership style. It was observed that participants with less professional seniority achieved higher scores in certain leadership styles. In terms of job performance, it is noteworthy that certain demographic groups have higher scores. In addition, while participative leadership had a significant effect on job performance, directive leadership and perceived leadership style had no significant effect on job performance. As a result, it was determined that demographic factors and leadership styles, especially participative leadership, and professional seniority influence job performance. According to the results, there is a negative relationship between participative leadership and job performance. On the other hand, no relationship was found between perceived leadership style and job performance.

**Key Words:** Leader, Leadership, Business performance.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Problem Status

A leader is a person who influences and directs others and ensures that they progress towards a certain goal or purpose (Başer and Seçkin, 2023). Leadership is an effective process to direct people to a certain goal, purpose, or vision (Maşalı et al., 2023). In this process, leadership refers to a leader's ability to influence, motivate and direct groups or individuals. Leadership requires skills such as decision making, problem solving, effective communication, motivation, guidance, support, and vision setting. Leadership can be applied in different styles, and a person's leadership style may vary depending on his personal characteristics, experiences, and leadership situation (Yuldashev, 2023).

Participatory leadership style refers to an approach in which the leader includes team members in decision-making processes and values their ideas and opinions. The leader cares about the contributions of team members and encourages them to achieve a common goal by sharing their responsibilities (Maşalı et al., 2023). Directive leadership, on the other hand, takes a more directive approach. In this leadership style, the leader gives instructions, makes decisions, and generally controls work processes. Directive leadership is a leadership style in which the leader is effective and directive in giving instructions, planning and overseeing work, making decisions and determining tasks (Yıldız, 2023). In this leadership style, the leader clearly tells team members what to do, has more control over the decision-making process, and generally provides guidance on how to do the job. This leadership model focuses on providing direction and clear instructions in achieving goals. Directive leaders take direct initiative to motivate team members and organize the flow of work, determining how things will be done and giving detailed instructions when necessary. This leadership style can be especially effective when quick decisions need to be made for a specific job or project and when used with new employees (Ergin, 2023).

Leadership structures can affect employee performance (Güvener and Ayhan, 2023). Performance generally refers to how effectively and efficiently a particular job or task is performed. On a job or individual basis, performance can be evaluated in terms of achieving goals, efficiency, competence, achievement, contribution, or results. Job performance often includes elements such as completion of specific tasks, project success, meeting goals, personal development, and achievement (Aung et al., 2023). Performance relates to the quality, quantity and effectiveness of actions taken at a given time, and this concept is often used to evaluate the performance of employees in the work environment. This indicates to what extent the individual contributes to the goals of the team or organization and whether he or she works efficiently and effectively (Chen et al., 2023).

Job performance refers to the ability, effectiveness, efficiency, and success an employee demonstrates in performing his/her duties at work. This performance is a measure used to evaluate the quality, quantity, and

effectiveness of an employee's work over a specific period in a specific work environment. Job performance includes the employee's level of completion of tasks at work, achievement of goals, efficiency, effectiveness, and success. Employees' performance is evaluated by several factors such as their ability to perform their duties, work ethics, work discipline, achievement of goals, their contribution, and their overall impact in the workplace. This evaluation is important for the development, reward, promotion, and continuity of employees in their jobs (Cenk, 2023).

Leaders' behavior patterns and leadership styles can have significant effects on employees' motivation, commitment level, and job performance. A good leadership structure can increase employee productivity, increase job satisfaction, and contribute to achieving organizational goals (Yedigöz and Doğrul, 2023). Research has shown that effective leadership approaches have positive effects on employees. For example, participatory leadership can increase employees' motivation and make them feel more valued by encouraging their participation in decisions. Directive leadership, on the other hand, can ensure that employees fulfill their duties by giving specific goals and instructions (Erden, 2023). The impact of leaders on business performance may vary depending on their leadership style, employee characteristics, and the conditions of the work environment. Therefore, it is important for leaders to balance different leadership approaches by better understanding employees and organizational goals and develop appropriate strategies to improve business performance.

## 1.2. Purpose and Importance of the Research

The aim of this study is to examine the effect of leadership structure in banks on employee performance. A study examining the effect of leadership structures in banks on employee performance is an important research topic for organizational effectiveness and employee productivity in the financial sector. Examining the leadership structure within the scope of participatory and directive leadership dimensions provides the opportunity to understand and analyze different aspects of leadership styles in businesses. While participatory leadership refers to a leadership style that cares about employees' opinions, involves them in business processes and ensures cooperation, directive leadership is a more directive, commanding and organizing leadership style. This study evaluated the effects of both leadership styles on job performance. In this sense, participative leadership can increase employee engagement, motivation, and creativity, while directive leadership may be more efficient or appropriate in certain situations. The leadership structures examined can guide business managers in determining the most effective leadership styles and improving employee performance.

### 1.2. hypotheses

The hypotheses of this research are given below:

- H<sub>1</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to gender.
- H<sub>2</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to age.
- H<sub>3</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to marital status.
- H<sub>4</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to the length of time working in the institution.
- H<sub>5</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to professional seniority.
- H<sub>6</sub> = Job performance differs according to demographic variables.
- H<sub>7</sub> = There is a relationship between leadership structure and performance.
- H<sub>8</sub> = Leadership structure has an effect on performance.

### 1.3. Assumptions

It is assumed that research participants give their answers to the survey questions sincerely.

### 1.4. Limitations

Research:

- With research participants,
- With the scale questions used in the research,
- It is limited to the sources used in the research.

### 1.5. Definitions

**Leader:** A person who influences and directs others and ensures that they progress towards a certain goal or purpose (Başer and Seçkin, 2023).

**Leadership:** It is an effective process to direct people to a certain goal, purpose or vision (Maşalı et al., 2023).

**Participatory leadership:** It refers to an approach in which the leader includes team members in decision-making processes and values their ideas and opinions (Kurtgöz and Polat, 2023).

**Directive Leadership:** It is a leadership style in which the leader is effective and directive in giving instructions, planning and supervising work, making decisions and determining tasks (Ergin, 2023).

**Performance:** Performance generally refers to how effectively and efficiently a particular job or task is performed (Aung et al., 2023).

**Job performance:** It refers to the ability, effectiveness, efficiency, and success an employee displays while performing his duties at work (Cenk, 2023).

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1. Leader and Leadership Concepts

Leadership is perhaps one of the most important concepts for management, the principles of which were formed gradually throughout the historical process and have survived to this day by adapting to changing conditions over time. Leadership, which begins with treating management as a science and has vital importance in the executive function of management, plays an important role in helping organizations achieve their goals (Şahne and Şar, 2015). The root of the word "Leadership" dates to Latin and later to English. The verb form of the word "lead" means "to direct, to show the way, to pioneer and to guide, etc." It has meaning. The word "leader", which indicates the person who does the action in question, has meanings such as guide, guide, guide and pioneer. Although the word "leader" has been suggested as an equivalent in the Turkish language, the word "leader", which is translated verbatim from English, is used more (Eraslan, 2004).

People tend to live together both because they are social beings and because of their benefits. Leadership emerged from the need to manage groups and communities because of individuals living together. This situation is a natural consequence of the need to manage the group and one of the members of the group wanting to manage the group (Erkutlu, 2014). Leadership is a concept as old as the existence of humanity, and the concepts of leadership, leader and follower are represented in 5000-year-old Egyptian inscriptions. It is stated that Caesar expressed his thoughts about leaders and leadership in his speech in front of the Roman Senate, in Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, and in the works written by Plato and Aristotle (Aslan, 2013).

Leadership is a subject that has excited people since ancient times. The term leader conjures up images of the powerful, dynamic individual who commands victorious armies, directs corporate empires from the top of glittering skyscrapers, or changes the course of nations. Leadership's widespread admiration in this way may be because it touches the lives of all people, as well as becoming a mysterious process (Yukl, 2011).

Although leadership, which is a concept that has existed throughout history, began to be examined scientifically only in the 1920s, thousands of studies and hundreds of definitions of leadership were made in the 20th century (Bakan and Büyükbeşe, 2010). Kellerman, in an interview with Volckmann; He stated that he heard approximately 1400 different definitions about leader and leadership (Kellerman, 2014). These numbers show that there is no definitive consensus on the definitions of leader and leadership and the search for a better definition continues (Silva, 2016).

It is very difficult to address where leadership comes from and where it is going structurally. Leadership above all else depicts an enlightened mind. When viewed from this perspective, the nature of leadership can be designed just like the rhythmic steps of the universe (Akdemir, 2018). It is difficult to define leadership precisely. Considering the complex nature of leadership, there is no general and widely accepted definition of leadership (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2018). The concept of leadership is fully mastered. The concept reappears in different forms due to its complexity. Numerous terms have been produced to deal with this problem, but the concept in question is not sufficiently defined. Scientists have generally defined the concept of leadership according to their own perspectives and with the aspects of the term that concern them most (Salamah, Alzubi, and Yinal, 2023). Dozens of books and thousands of articles about leaders and leadership are published every year, and institutions invest millions of dollars to develop their future leaders (Volckmann, 2012).

### 2.2. With Leadership Behavior Style the Relationship Between Employee Performance

There is a strong relationship between leadership behavior style and employee performance. The behaviors exhibited by leaders have a significant impact on employees' motivation, job satisfaction and performance. To understand this relationship, some basic leadership styles, and the effects of these styles on employee performance can be taken into consideration (Saritaş and Myrvang, 2023):

- **Authoritarian Leadership:** Authoritarian leaders generally act by command, give clear instructions to employees, and play a central role in the decision-making process. This style can enable immediate and rapid decision-making in some cases, but in the long run it can create a lack of motivation and independent thinking skills in employees. Such a leadership style may negatively affect the creativity and performance of employees (Uçar and Gündoğdu, 2023).
- **Democratic Leadership:** Democratic leadership style encourages employee participation, values their opinions, and includes them in the decision-making process. This style can increase employee motivation and encourage cooperation and team spirit. Employees may feel more valued under this style, which can generally increase their performance (Yedigöz and Doğrul, 2023).
- **Laissez-Faire Leadership:** In this style, the leader gives employees wide autonomy and freedom. Employees make their own decisions and manage their own tasks. This style may encourage creativity in some cases but may lead to a lack of motivation and a decrease in performance in employees due to uncertainty and lack of direction (Onay and Latif, 2023).

The relationship between leadership styles and employee performance shows that the behaviors exhibited by leaders have a significant impact on employees' motivation, commitment, and job performance. Choosing a leadership style that suits employees' needs and business goals can often positively affect employee performance. A good leadership style can help employees motivate, develop, and increase their job performance.

### 2.3. Related Research

The study conducted by Saygılı and Avcı (2023) investigated the relationship between leadership behavior, proactive career commitment and silent resignation. According to the research results: It was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between people-oriented leadership style and proactive career commitment. This shows that leaders' focus on their employees supports employees in developing a proactive approach towards their careers. A negative and significant relationship was found between task-oriented leadership style and silent resignation. This shows that leaders' focus only on tasks has a negative impact on employees' silent resignation, that is, silently quitting their jobs. It was stated that proactive career commitment did not have a mediating effect on the relationship between task-oriented leadership style and silent resignation. That is, the effect of task-oriented leadership style on silent resignation was direct, not through proactive career commitment. It was stated that proactive career commitment had a mediating effect on the relationship between people-oriented leadership style and silent resignation. In other words, people-oriented leadership style increases employees' career commitment and reduces their tendency to silent resignation. These results demonstrate the effects of leadership styles on employees' career commitment and resignation tendencies and help us understand how specific leadership styles contribute to specific outcomes. The research results reveal an important finding that a people-oriented leadership style can create a stable working atmosphere and support the career development of employees.

The study conducted by Erkal (2023) concluded that inclusive leadership affects the level of job embeddedness of employees. Additionally, it was determined that leader-member interaction had a significant effect on job embeddedness. According to the results of the study, it was determined that leader-member interaction played a mediating role in the effect of inclusive leadership on job embeddedness. The results of this research show that leaders in organizations being inclusive, that is, being open, accessible, and interacting with employees, can contribute to employees' levels of job embeddedness. Leaders interacting with their employees and being open and communicative can increase employees' commitment to their jobs and the organization. Additionally, the finding that leader-member interaction plays a mediating role in the effect of inclusive leadership on job embeddedness emphasizes the importance of leaders' effective communication and interaction skills.

Günaydın et al. (2023) showed that perceived transformational leadership has a positive effect on job performance and that this effect plays a full mediating role through flow at work. However, the study also found that the positive effect of perceived transformational leadership on job performance disappeared when academics experienced flow at work. Research results highlight the importance of experiencing flow at work. In other words, the flow experience at work has obscured the positive impact of perceived transformational leadership on job performance among academics. This suggests that the effect of flow experience on job performance overshadows the effect of transformational leadership.

According to the results of Taşkın's (2023) research, it was determined that there is a strong and positive relationship between the perception of authentic leadership and trust in the manager. It has been stated that the perception of authentic leadership explains the level of trust in the manager by 53%. This result is consistent with other studies in the literature. In the analysis conducted across institution types, it was determined that association employees with more flexible legal regulations had a higher level of authentic leadership perception compared to employees with foundation status. Another finding of the research is that the perceptions of volunteer employees in the dimensions of authentic leadership, trust in the manager and job performance are significantly higher than those of full-time employees. However, research results indicate that there is no significant relationship between the perception of authentic leadership, trust in the manager and job performance.

## 3. METHOD

### 3.1. Research Method

This study is carried out using the survey technique, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Survey research is usually conducted with larger samples and provides a broad perspective on the general views, interests, skills, abilities, or attitudes of participants. This type of research usually aims to collect information about a large population and generally uses techniques such as surveys or interviews in the data collection process. Participants are generally selected to create a representative sample that allows generalizations to be made about the population. Survey studies are a useful research method to understand general trends and the general situation on a subject. Such studies generally aim to obtain large data sets and make generalizations ( Karasar , 2008).

### 3.2. Population and Sample

The population of the research consists of employees in banks in TRNC. The sample of the study was selected by quota sampling method. Quota sampling is a sampling technique in which the researcher includes a certain

proportion of individuals or items that must meet a certain criterion. In this method, a certain quota in sample selection is determined based on demographic or certain characteristics such as gender, age, professional seniority (Karasar , 2008). The scales distributed and collected via Google Forms between 01.09.2023 and 02.10.2022 were delivered to 350 employees. On the other hand, the forms were received back from 298 people; Due to missing data, 247 of these forms could be included in the study. In this context, the sample of the study consisted of 247 employees.

**3.3. Data Collection Tools**

In the research, data was collected through a scale. The scale used consists of 3 parts. In the first part, there are questions prepared by the researcher to determine the socio -demographic characteristics of the participants.

To evaluate leadership styles, the Perceived Leadership Style Scale, a 15-item Likert- type scale developed by House and Dessler (1974), was used. This scale is designed to examine participatory and directive leadership styles emphasized in the Path-Goal Model of leadership. In the scale, statements are scored between "1: I never agree" and "5: I always agree". The overall  $\alpha$  reliability value of this 15-item scale was calculated as 0.90 by Sari (2022). A scale with a total of 13 items was created, including 8 statements to examine the participatory leadership dimension and 5 statements to evaluate the directive leadership dimension. The  $\alpha$  reliability value of this new 13-item scale was calculated as 0.89. The obtained  $\alpha$  reliability value is higher than 0.70, indicating that the reliability level of the scale is acceptable (Sari, 2022).

In the third section, there are five questions to determine employees' job performance. The self- appraisal method developed by Darwish (2000) (The job performance of employees was measured using approach). Questions were ranked using a scale from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). In the first scale, the reliability coefficient alpha value was calculated as 0.60. However, after removing the third question, which reduced the reliability of the scale, the reliability level of the scale consisting of four questions was calculated as alpha 0.70 (Tutar, 2008).

**Table 1.** Reliability Analyzes for Scales

	Cronbach's Alpha	Article
Perceived Leadership Style Scale	0.80	15
Job Performance Scale	0.77	5

the Cronbach's Alpha value of the perceived leadership style scale is .80; Cronbach's Alpha value of the job performance scale was determined as .77.

**3.4. Analysis of Data**

SPSS 28 program was used to analyze the data collected in the study and was examined at the reliability level. T -Test, ANOVA and ANOVA Tukey tests were used to examine whether the scale scores differ according to socio -demographic characteristics. T-Test is used to compare means between two groups, while ANOVA is used to compare multiple groups means, and the ANOVA Tukey test specifically identifies differences between these group means. These statistical methods are widely used to identify significant differences between groups in research or survey data.

**4. RESULTS**

**4.1. Demographic features**

Demographic variables of the participants are given in Table 2:

**Table 2.** Demographic Information of Participants

		N	%
Gender	Woman	141	57.1
	Male	106	42.9
Age	30 years and under	35	14.2
	31-40 years old	131	53.0



	41-50 years old	81	32.8
marital status	Married	140	56.7
	Single	107	43.3
Working time in the institution	less than 1 year	47	19.0
	1-5 years	106	42.9
	6-10 years	70	28.3
	11-15 years	24	9.7
professional seniority	less than 1 year	35	14.2
	1-5 years	92	37.2
	6-10 years	84	34.0
	11-15 years	36	14.6
	Total	247	100.0

Looking at Table 2, 57.1% of the participants are female and 42.9% are male; 53% were 31-40 years old, 32.8% were 41-50 years old and 14.2% were 30 years old and under; 56.7% were married and 43.3% were single; The working period in the institution is 42.9% between 1-5 years, 28.3% between 6-10 years, 19% less than 1 year and 9.7% between 11-15 years and the distribution of professional seniority is also It is seen that 37.2% are 1-5 years, 34% are 6-10 years, 14.6% are 11-15 years and 14.2% are less than 1 year.

#### 4.2. Findings Regarding the Descriptive Analysis of the Scales

Table 3 shows the descriptive analysis results of the scales.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Analysis of Scales

	Minimum	Maximum	$\bar{X}$	SS
participatory leadership	28.00	36.00	31,42	2,008
Directive leadership	12.00	18.00	15.63	1,835
Leadership style scale general	50.00	61.00	55.87	3,403
Performance	19.00	21.00	20.00	0.624

According to the results of the analysis, the general average of the leadership style scale ( $\bar{X}$ ) is 55.87 ( Sd . 3.40 ); The average performance scale ( $\bar{X}$ ) was found to be 20 ( Sd . 0, 62). Participative leadership ( $\bar{X}$ =31.42; Sd . 2.00) has the highest mean among the sub-dimensions of the leadership style scale. This shows that participative leadership is more prominent and higher than directive leadership in the leadership style scale. Measurements indicate that leadership style is high, but performance is lower. This may indicate that although the leadership style is effective, performance is below expectations.

#### 4.3. Descriptive Analyzes Between Demographic Variables and Perceived Leadership Style Scale

The T-Test results conducted in the study to test the hypothesis "  $H_1$  = Perceived leadership style differs according to gender " are given below.

**Table 4.** Comparison of Perceived Leadership Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores by Gender

	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.	
participatory leadership	Woman	141	31,41	1,817	7,201	<b>0.008</b>
	Male	106	31.44	2,247		

Directive leadership	Woman	141	15.43	2,061	29,028	<b>0.000</b>
	Male	106	15.89	1,453		
Perceived leadership style scale general	Woman	141	55.53	3,723	10,491	<b>0.001</b>
	Male	106	56.33	2,878		

p <0.05

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that perceived leadership style differs significantly according to gender (p <0.05). Accordingly, it was determined that male participants received higher scores than female participants in the participatory, directive dimensions and the perceived leadership scale. The finding of a difference in the measurements shows that gender is effective in the perception of leadership style. This indicates that gender may be a determining factor in the way one perceives leadership style.

of the ANOVA conducted to test the hypothesis "H2 = Perceived leadership style differs according to age" and the ANOVA Tukey test results to determine which groups the differences are between are given below.

**Table 5.** Comparison of Perceived Leadership Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores by Age

		N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.	Difference
participatory leadership	30 years and under	35	32.65	0,481	20,877	<b>0.000</b>	30 years and below > 31-40 years old > 31-40 years old
	31-40 years old	131	30.73	1,722			
	41-50 years old	81	32.02	2,382			
Directive leadership	30 years and under	35	15.28	2,407	5,649	<b>0.004</b>	41-50 years old > 30 years old and below, 31-40 years old
	31-40 years old	131	15.38	1,761			
	41-50 years old	81	16,18	1,550			
Perceived leadership style scale general	30 years and under	35	57.31	2,564	14,147	<b>0.000</b>	30 years and below > 31-40 years old > 31-40 years old
	31-40 years old	131	54.85	3,565			
	41-50 years old	81	56.91	2,912			

p <0.05

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that there are significant differences between perceived leadership style and age (p <0.05). Accordingly, the general scores of the participatory leadership dimension and the perceived leadership scale were found to be higher for participants aged 30 and under than for participants aged 31-40, and for participants aged 41-50 than for participants aged 31-40. In the directive leadership dimension, it was determined that participants between the ages of 41-50 received higher scores than both participants aged 30 and under and participants between the ages of 31-40.

The results of the T-Test conducted in the research to test the hypothesis "H 3 = Perceived leadership style differs according to marital status" are given below.

**Table 6.** Comparison of Perceived Leadership Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores According to Marital Status

		N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.
participatory leadership	Married	140	31.49	1,732	14,917	<b>0.000</b>
	Single	107	31,34	2,327		

Directive leadership	Married	140	15.75	1,798	3,335	<b>0.069</b>
	Single	107	15.47	1,880		
Perceived leadership style scale general	Married	140	56.25	2,968	14,698	<b>0.000</b>
	Single	107	55.38	3,859		

p < 0.05

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that there are significant differences between perceived leadership style and marital status (p < 0.05). Accordingly, married participants received higher scores than single participants in the participatory and directive leadership dimensions and the perceived leadership style scale. In this case, it seems that marriage status affects the perception of leadership style.

, the ANOVA performed to test the hypothesis "H<sub>4</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to the duration of employment in the institution" and the ANOVA Tukey test results to determine which groups the differences are between are given below.

**Table 7.** Comparison of Perceived Leadership Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores According to Duration of Working in the Institution

		N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.	Difference
participatory leadership	less than 1 year	47	31.7660	0.42798	1,934	0.125	No difference
	1-5 years	106	31.0849	2.09815			
	6-10 years	70	31.7000	2.53869			
	11-15 years	24	31.5000	1.53226			
Directive leadership	less than 1 year	47	15.2766	2.42901	2,975	<b>0.032</b>	11-15 years > Less than 1 year
	1-5 years	106	15.7547	1.63189			
	6-10 years	70	15.4000	1.87586			
	11-15 years	24	16.5000	0.51075			
Perceived leadership style scale general	less than 1 year	47	56.0426	2.14636	1,118	0.343	No difference
	1-5 years	106	55.7264	4.11625			
	6-10 years	70	55.6143	3.39775			
	11-15 years	24	57.0000	1.02151			

p < 0.05

When Table 7 is examined, no relationship was found between participatory leadership and the overall perceived leadership scale and the length of time working in the institution (p > 0.05). On the other hand, it was observed that there was a significant relationship between directive leadership and working time in the institution (p < 0.05). Participants who have worked in the organization for 11-15 years have higher directive leadership scores than those who have worked for less than 1 year.

The results of the ANOVA Test conducted in the research to test the hypothesis "H<sub>5</sub> = Perceived leadership style differs according to professional seniority" are given below.

**Table 8.** Comparison of Perceived Leadership Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores According to Professional Seniority

		N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.	Difference
participatory leadership	less than 1 year	35	31.71	1,250	22,788	<b>0.000</b>	1 year > 6-10 years
	1-5 years	92	32.14	0.932			



	6-10 years	84	30,14	1,736		1-5 years > 6-10 years
	11-15 years	36	32,33	3,346		
	less than 1 year	35	15.42	2,500		1 year > 6-10 years
router leadership	1-5 years	92	16.28	1,385	30,981	<b>0.000</b>
	6-10 years	84	14.42	1,507		
	11-15 years	36	17.00	0.828		
	less than 1 year	35	56.17	4,239		1 year > 6-10 years
Leadership style scale general	1-5 years	92	57.04	2,449	34,360	<b>0.000</b>
	6-10 years	84	53.42	2,786		
	11-15 years	36	58.33	2,390		
						1-5 years > 6-10 years

p < 0.05

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference between participatory leadership, directive leadership dimensions and perceived leadership style between general and professional seniority (p < 0.05). Accordingly, it was determined that, in terms of participatory leadership and perceived leadership style, those with less than 1 year of professional seniority received higher scores than those with 6-10 years of professional seniority, and those with 1-5 years of professional seniority than those with 6-10 years of professional seniority. Similarly, in the directive leadership dimension, it was determined that those with less than 1 year of professional seniority received higher scores than those with 6-10 years of professional seniority, and those with 1-5 years of professional seniority scored higher than those with both less than 1 year and 6-10 years of professional seniority.

#### 4.4. Descriptive Analyzes Between Demographic Variables and Performance Scale

The results of the analysis conducted to test the hypothesis "H<sub>6</sub> = Job performance differs according to demographic variables" are given below.

**Table 9.** Comparison of Performance Scale Scores According to Demographic Variables

	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	f	p.	Difference
<b>Gender</b>						
Woman	141	20.08	0.499	30,241	<b>0.000</b>	Female > Male
Male	106	19.88	0.747			
<b>Age</b>						
30 years and under	35	20.34	0.481	7,006	<b>0.001</b>	30 years old > 31-40 years old; 41 -50 years old
31-40 years old	131	19.9	0.673			
41-50 years old	81	20	0.547			
<b>marital status</b>						
Married	140	20.25	0.604	3,462	0.64	No difference
Single	107	19.66	0.474			
<b>Working time in the institution</b>						
less than 1 year	47	20	0	15,701	<b>0.000</b>	1 year > 11-15
1-5 years	106	19.88	0.747			1-5 years > 11-15 years
6-10 years	70	20.34	0.478			6-10 years > less than 1 year; 1-5 years; 11-15 years
11-15 years	24	19.5	0.51			
<b>professional seniority</b>						

less than 1 year	35	20.34	0.481			1 year > 1-5 years, 6- 10 years
1-5 years	92	19.86	0.338	34,263	<b>0.000</b>	
6-10 years	84	19.71	0.704			11-15 years > less than 1 year; 1-5 years; 6-10 years
11-15 years	36	20.66	0.478			

p < 0.05

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference between performance and gender, age, working time in the institution and professional seniority (p < 0.05). Accordingly, in terms of job performance.

- Female participants differ from men.
- Participants under the age of 30 are divided into participants between the ages of 31-40 and 41-50.
- Those who have worked in the institution for less than 1 year are those who have worked between 11-15 years; Those who have been working in the institution for 1-5 years are separated from those who have been working in the institution for 11-15 years, and those who have been working in the institution for 6-10 years are less than 1 year.
- one year of professional seniority are those with 1-5 years of professional seniority and those with 6-10 years of professional seniority; Those with 11-15 years of professional seniority are less than 1 year, 1-5 years and 6-10 years of professional seniority.

higher scores.

#### 4.5. The Relationship Between Leadership Structure and Performance

The results of the correlation analysis conducted to test the hypothesis "H<sub>7</sub> = There is a relationship between leadership structure and performance" are given below.

**Table 10.** Correlation Analysis on the Relationship Between Leadership Structure and Employee Performance

		Performance Scale
participatory leadership	r	-.194 **
	p.	0.002
Directive leadership	r	.128 *
	p.	0.045
Leadership style scale general	r	-0.023
	p.	0.720

\*\* . The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.  
\* . The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

When Table 10 is examined, there is a weak and negative relationship between participatory leadership and performance (r=-.194; p=0.002); While there was a weak and positive relationship (r=.128; p=0.045) between directive leadership and performance; It was observed that there was no relationship between perceived leadership style and job performance.

#### 4.6. The Effect of Leadership Structure on Employee Performance

the regression analysis conducted to test the hypothesis "H<sub>8</sub> = Leadership structure has an effect on performance" are given below.

**Table 11.** Regression Analysis on the Effect of Leadership Structure on Employee Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	S. Error	β	t	p.
(Still)	20,876	0.687		30,395	0.000
participatory leadership	-0.184	0.055	-0.591	-3.315	<b>0.001</b>

Directive leadership	-0.021	0.055	-0.061	-0.377	0.706
Leadership style scale general	0.094	0.049	0.510	1,914	0.057

a. Dependent variable: Performance Scale

When Table 11 is examined, it is seen that participatory leadership influences business performance ( $\beta = -0.591$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). In other words, participative leadership has been identified as an important factor on business performance. On the other hand, it was observed that directive leadership and perceived leadership style had no effect on job performance.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Examining the effect of leadership structure in banks on employee performance are summarized below.

As a result of the analysis, it was found that the leadership style among the participants varied depending on gender. When the participatory and directive leadership dimensions and the general leadership scale were examined, it was observed that male participants received higher scores than female participants.

It has also been determined that there are certain differences between age and perceived leadership style. Significant differences were determined in the participatory leadership dimension and general leadership scale scores between participants aged 30 and under, 31-40 years and 41-50 years of age. Similarly, participants between the ages of 41-50 received higher scores in the directive leadership dimension than participants in other age groups. Married individuals received higher scores than single individuals in the participatory and directive leadership dimensions. In this case, it seems that marriage status affects the perception of leadership style. Marriage can lead to an increase in individuals' life experience and responsibilities, which can lead to differences in their perception of leadership style. The fact that married individuals score higher may indicate that leadership style may change in relation to marital status.

In the study, it was determined that there was a relationship between directive leadership and working time. Participants who worked in the organization for 11-15 years received higher directive leadership scores compared to those who worked for less than 1 year. This may indicate that working time has an impact, especially on directive leadership.

A significant relationship was found between participatory leadership, directive leadership dimensions, general leadership perception and professional seniority. The findings showed that individuals with less than 1 year of seniority had higher scores on both participatory leadership and general leadership perception than those with a tenure of 6-10 years. In the directive leadership dimension, individuals with less than 1 year of seniority have higher scores than those with 6-10 years of seniority, and individuals with 1-5 years of seniority have higher scores than individuals with less than 1 year of seniority but also have 6-10 years of seniority. It was determined that he got points.

Significant differences are observed between job performance and gender, age, working time in the institution and professional seniority. In terms of business performance, female participants received higher scores than men, participants under the age of 30 received higher scores than participants between the ages of 31-40 and 41-50, those who worked in the institution for less than 1 year than those who worked in the institution for 11-15 years, and those who worked in the institution for 1-5 years than those who worked in the institution for 11-15 years. In addition, those who have worked in the institution for 6-10 years are less than 1 year, those who have worked for 1-5 years and 11-15 years; those with less than 1.5 years of professional seniority are compared to those with 1-5 years and 6-10 years of professional seniority; Those with 11-15 years of professional seniority also received higher scores than those with less than 1 year, 1-5 years and 6-10 years of professional seniority.

In the study, a negative and weak relationship was found between participatory leadership and performance, and a positive and weak relationship was observed between directive leadership and performance. However, no relationship has been identified between perceived leadership style and job performance. It has also been observed that participatory leadership has a significant effect on business performance. On the other hand, it was determined that directive leadership and perceived leadership style had no effect on job performance.

At the end of the study, the following recommendations were developed.

- Giving More Weight to Leadership Training in Training Programs: More emphasis can be given to training programs aimed at improving leadership skills, especially in the participatory leadership dimension. Training can help effectively develop leadership styles by emphasizing participatory leadership competencies.
- Opportunities for Employee Development: Longer working hours are associated with higher scores on the directive leadership dimension. This indicates that employees can develop directive leadership skills later in their careers. In this context, training and opportunities that support the leadership skills of employees can be offered in parallel with their professional seniority.

- Greater Sensitivity to Diversity and Equity: The impact of demographic factors such as gender and age on leadership styles should be considered. For example, special support programs can be created to improve the participatory leadership skills of women leaders. Diversity and equality can be achieved by organizing trainings focusing on different leadership skills across age groups.
- In-Depth Investigations to Understand the Relationship between Leadership and Performance: A more comprehensive analysis of the research can be done to understand the relationship between job performance and leadership styles. More detailed studies that consider other factors affecting performance may be important to understand the relationship between leadership and performance in a more holistic way.

These suggestions can be basic steps for developing leadership skills, providing supports appropriate to employees' needs, and establishing an equitable environment in terms of diversity.

The following suggestions are offered for future studies:

- Studies Examining the Relationship between Leadership and Performance in Depth: Studies using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods can be conducted to understand the relationship between leadership styles and job performance in more detail. More comprehensive results can be obtained by conducting these studies in different sectors and leadership models.
- Diversity and Leadership: Studies focusing on the different leadership styles of leaders with different demographic characteristics can help us better understand the relationship between diversity and leadership. It is especially important to examine female leaders, especially in terms of participatory leadership.
- Studies in Different Industries: Comparative studies in different industries and organizations can be valuable to understand how leadership styles vary in different sectors. For example, comparative research on leadership styles can be conducted between the service sector, the technology sector and the manufacturing sector.

These recommendations can guide future research to better understand the relationship between leadership and performance, examine the relationship between diversity and leadership, understand long-term effects, and understand leadership practices in different sectors.

## REFERENCES

- Akdemir, A. (2018). *Liderlik ve vizyon yönetimi*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık
- Antonakis, J. E., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Sage Publications Inc.
- Aslan, Ş. (2013). *Geçmişten günümüze liderlik kuramları sağlık yönetimi bakış açısıyla*. Ankara: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Aung, Z. M., San Santoso, D., & Dodanwala, T. C. (2023). Effects of demotivational managerial practices on job satisfaction and job performance: Empirical evidence from Myanmar's construction industry. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 67, 101730.
- Bakan, İ., & Büyükbeşe, T. (2010). Liderlik "türleri" ve "güç kaynakları" na ilişkin mevcut-gelecek durum karşılaştırması. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(2), 73-84.
- Başer, S. H., & Seçkin, Z. (2023). Başarıya giden yol: dijitalleşen dünyada bir lider olarak Bill Gates. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33(3), 1313-1324.
- Cenk, T. (2023). Çalışanların KSS algıları, iş becerikliliği ve iş performansı arasındaki ilişkileri anlamaya yönelik ampirik bir araştırma. *İktisadi İdari ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi (İKTISAD)*, 8(20), 69-86.
- Chen, X., Lee, C., Hui, C., Lin, W., Brown, G., & Liu, J. (2023). Feeling possessive, performing well? Effects of job-based psychological ownership on territoriality, information exchange, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(3), 403.
- Eraslan, L. (2004). Liderlik olgusunun tarihsel evrimi, temel kavramlar ve yeni liderlik paradigmasının analizi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 162(3), 69-95
- Erden, N. S. (2023). Liderlikte lider takipçi ilişkisi odaklı yaklaşımlar. In *Örgütsel Davranış Güncel Konular ve Araştırmalar* (pp. 25-56). Ankara: Özgür Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti..
- Ergin, S. (2023). Eğitim yönetiminde liderlik yaklaşımları bağlamında paternalist liderliğin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(30), 104-118.
- Erkal, P. (2023). Kapsayıcı liderliğin işe gömülmüşlük üzerine etkisinde lider üye etkileşiminin aracı rolü. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(58), 361-378.
- Erkutlu, H. V. (2014). *Liderlik, kuramlar ve yeni bakış açıları*. İstanbul: Efil Yayınevi.
- Günaydın, S. C., Ünal, Z. & Koçak, Ö. E. (2023). Algılanan dönüştürücü liderlik tarzının iş performansı üzerindeki etkisinde akış deneyiminin aracılık rolü: Akademisyenler Üzerinde bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(8), 147-176.
- Güvener, H., & Ayhan, E. (2023). Otantik liderlik, kolektif etkinlik ve performans ilişkisi. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(36), 393-415.

- Kellerman, B. (2014). *Hard times: leadership in America*. Stanford University Press
- Kurtgöz, N., & Polat, S. (2023). Öğretmenlerin özel eğitime gereksinimi olan öğrencilere yönelik kapsayıcı liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(11), 42-64.
- Maşalı, N., Yeter, Z., Erdem, E., & Bedir, A. (2023). Okul yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi: literatür taraması. *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(2), 177-199.
- Onay, Ö. A., & Latif, H. (2023). Çalışanlar perspektifinden liderlik stilleri ile narsizizm arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma. *Journal of Business and Trade*, 4(1), 51-62.
- Sarı, S. (2022). *Algılanan liderlik tarzının görev performansı üzerindeki etkisinde işe tutulmanın ve ototelik kişiliğin rolü*, Doktora Tezi, Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Sarıtaş, T. T., & Myrvang, N. A. (2023). Sağlık sektöründe lider-üye etkileşimi ve iş performansı arasındaki ilişkide pelz etkisinin aracı rolü. *Eurasian Academy of Sciences Social Sciences Journal*, 4(46), 1-22.
- Silva, A. (2016). What is leadership? *Journal of business studies quarterly*, 8(1), 1.
- Salamah, E., Alzubi, A., & Yinal, A. (2023). Unveiling the Impact of Digitalization on Supply Chain Performance in the Post-COVID-19 Era: The Mediating Role of Supply Chain Integration and Efficiency. *Sustainability*, 16(1), 304.
- Şahne, B. S. & Şar, S. (2015). Liderlik kavramının tarihçesi ve Türkiye’de ilaç endüstrisinde liderliğin önemi. *Marmara Pharmaceutical Journal*, 19(2), 109- 115
- Taşkın, A. (2023). *Otantik liderliğin yöneticiye güven ve iş performansına etkisi: Sivil toplum kuruluşları üzerine alan araştırması*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Uçar., Z. & Gündoğdu, B. (2023). İşgörenler tarafından algılanan açık liderliğin yenilikçi iş davranışına etkisinde yönetici destek algısının aracılık rolü. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 25(2), 740-765.
- Volckmann, R. (2012). Integral leadership and diversity—definitions, distinctions and implications. *Integral Leadership Review*, 12(3), 1-21
- Yedigöz, A., & Doğrul, B. Ş. (2023). Lider-üye etkileşiminin iş performansına etkisinde yenilikçi iş davranışının aracılık rolü: bir liman işletmesinde saha araştırması. *Dicle Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(25), 170-195.
- Yıldız, D. (2023). Örgütlerde işgören ve işverenlerin güncel sorunu sessiz istifa. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi*, 12(6), 795-802.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81.
- Yuldashev, S. (2023). Liderlik sıfatlarını şekillendirishda sınıf rahbarınının O ‘Rni. *Журнал Педагогики и психологии в современном образовании*, 3(1).