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Abstract
This study explores the relationship between leadership style and employee motivation in the public and private sectors in Oman. The public sector is represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, whilst the private sectors are represented by Oman Cable and Bahwan Automotive Group. The questioners are distributed to public and private sector. There are 661 employees from these organisations who act as the respondents for the survey. Primary data collected was subject to both descriptive as well as inferential statistics. The results reveal a statistically significant relationship between motivation and classical, transactional, and organic leadership styles, and lack of significant relationship between visionary leadership style and employee motivation. The results also found a statistical relationship between leadership style and employee motivation in the private sector; between leadership and age; between motivation and age; between leadership and number of years of experience; between motivation and number years of experience in the organisations; between motivation and number years of experience; between leadership and motivation in both public and private sectors; between Classical, visionary and organic leadership styles and employee
motivation in both sectors; and between the organic leadership style and employee motivation in the public sector.
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INTRODUCTION
In the present business environment, leadership styles have emerged as key to achieving greater organisational success because of their direct effect on employee motivation (Gopal and Chowdhury, 2014). Gouraki (2013) mention that human resources are one of the key components of organisational management, implying that human resource motivation is crucial to achieving set organisational goals and objectives.

According to Gopal and Chowdhury (2014), leadership styles are key factors that create and support high motivation levels among employees. Buble et al. (2014) showed a direct correlation between leadership style and employee motivation by demonstrating that an appropriate leadership style results in the most motivated workforce. Therefore, understanding the most appropriate and ideal leadership style is key to directing, influencing, changing, and controlling the behaviours of employees in the positive direction, a factor that results in a more motivated workforce. In the same vein, Rumasukun et al. (2015) explain that leadership style is directly correlated with employee motivation. According to the authors, leadership style has a direct impact on employees’ confidence, trust, sense of belonging and involvement levels, factors that are essential in determining the extent to which employees are motivated. However, Rashid and Rashid (2012) note that there exist a significant different in the extent to which employee motivation is achieved in the public and private sectors. In a similar vein, the study by Irum et al. (2012) revealed that motivation levels among public sector employees significantly vary from that of employees in the private sector. Arguably, it can be reasoned that the approach to and leadership style embraced among organisational leaders in the private sector is different from that of organisational leaders in the public sector.

Lăzăroiu (2015) suggests that the study of employee motivation is central to the growth and success of an organisation. Porter & Riesenmy (2016) adds that when staff members are motivated, are likely to be dedicated, innovative and their performance will improve. Chaudhary & Sharma (2012) supports this view, stating that high levels of motivation in staff members correlates to increased levels of contentment, dedication and enthusiasm for work. This results in the achievement of the maximum level of staff retention. As such, maintaining a high level of
staff motivation can contribute to the success and development of a company (Kumar et al., 2015). Alternatively, de-motivated staff are more likely to produce low quality work (Manzoor, 2012). Further studies by Basford & Offermann (2012) found a positive correlation amongst effective leadership and employee motivation. However, while extensive research has been given towards the subject of how leaders can affect staff member’s motivation, Chaudhary & Sharma (2012) argues that the subject of motivation is still not clearly understood and poorly implemented by many organisations. For example, in 2012 a YouGov study found that only 32% of employees in Oman were ‘highly motivated’. This indicates that there is a large room for improvement in employee motivation which can be achieved through a more developed understanding of the influencing factors over employee motivation, such as leadership. Yet, even with these clear evidences of the importance of motivation, there is a lack of research on leadership of motivation of employees in Oman. Despite the growth in research literature in motivation of employees, there is a considerable uncertainty as to the relevance of these researches to specific culture contexts. Moreover, motivation of employees in Oman remains largely unexplored. In this comparative study, the motivation of employees was used as the dependent variable. In an endeavour to understand the correlation between perceived leadership style and employees’ motivation as well as the variation between the motivational levels among employees in the private and public sector, this research primarily focuses on the private and public sectors in Oman. Oman is one of the global markets that has been experiencing the problem of employee motivation in both the private and public sectors of the economy with industries such as the education (Al-Aufi and Al-Kalbani, 2014), oil and gas and automotive industries (Al-Harthy, 2008), and the banking sector (Al Araimi, 2013) recording low levels of employee motivation. This research study attempts to understand the motivation level and influencing factors in the private and public sectors of Oman. Specifically, the public sectors used in the research are the education and energy sectors, represented Ministry of Agriculture and Fishers resources. On the other hand, Oman Cable and Bahwan Automotive Group are used as specific case organisations to represent the private sector.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 1:</strong> How do leadership relate with motivation in the case organisations?</td>
<td>H1.1 Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1.2 Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1.3: Leadership is statistically related to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an endeavour to understand the correlation between perceived leadership style and employees’ motivation as well as the variation between the motivational levels among employees in the private and public sector, this research primarily focuses on the private and public sectors in Oman. Oman is one of the global markets that has been experiencing the problem of employee motivation in both the private and public sectors of the economy with industries such as the education (Al-Aufi and Al-Kalbani, 2014), oil and gas and automotive industries (Al-Harthy, 2008), and the banking sector (Al Araimi, 2013) recording low levels of employee motivation. This research study attempts to understand the motivation level and influencing factors in the private and public sectors of Oman. Specifically, the public sectors used in the research are the education and energy sectors, represented Ministry of Agriculture and Fishers resources. On the other hand, Oman Cable and Bahwan Automotive Group are used as specific case organisations to represent the private sector.
employee motivation by gender.

| Research Question 2: How does leadership style affect motivation in the private and public sectors in Oman? | H2.1: Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani public sector. |
| Research Question 3: How do leadership styles relate with motivation vis-à-vis age and years of experience in the organisations? | H2.2: Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani private sector. |
| Research question 4: How can Omani private and public sectors enhance employee motivation? | H3.1: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation's items with regard to age. |
| | H3.2: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation's items with regard to number of years of experience on the job. |

**Research Aim and Objectives**

The primary aim of the present study is to explore the impact of leadership style on employee motivation in the public and private sectors of Oman. In this regard, the specific research objectives that it intends to fulfil are as follows:

1. To review the extant literature about leadership styles and employee motivation;
2. To identify the leadership style(s) commonly adopted in Omani public and private sectors;
3. To provide an understanding of the association between leadership and employee motivation in these sectors; and
4. To determine the roles of age and number of years of experience in relation to the link between leadership style and employee motivation in the public and private sectors in Oman.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Leadership styles**

Jiang (2014) says that leadership style refers to the way a leader manages a specific project or organisation. Organisational success can be achieved through a leader who is characterised with critical leadership qualities, along with the positive impacts of their leadership to their subordinates and the organisation as a whole. Team building, clear communication links,
clear roles are aspects of leadership styles. Researchers agree that the concept of leadership is universal; however, some note that its adoption is usually driven by culture (Roebuck, 2014; Rowley and Ulrich, 2014). Moore (2007) has the same views as he maintains that transformational and transactional leadership theories, which are based on the interaction of the leader and the subordinate, transcend organisational and cultural boundaries. With regard to this, Avolio and Bass (2004) note the importance of location as a conditional factor with regard to the relationship between leadership and organisational culture.

Leaders play a significant role in ensuring that teams are embodied with a high degree of organisational commitment and job performance (Gautam & Malla, 2013). It is even more challenging for a leader to motivate employees as businesses continue to prosper. A number of studies confirm the contributions of effective leadership in attaining competitive advantage for any kind of organisation (e.g. Petrick et al., 1999). The leader is duty-bound to lead and direct the employees towards achieving the objectives of the organisation. Gautam and Malla (2013) are focused on investigating the leadership traits of managers in both the private and public sectors. A significant positive relationship is found between leader effectiveness and organisational performance in both sectors. A positive relationship also exists between organisational performance and job satisfaction for organisations belonging to these sectors. These findings denote the importance of ensuring leadership effectiveness and good organisational performance in ensuring organisational performance, so that employees may perceive that they are satisfied with their jobs.

Aishat et al. (2015) point out that top management employs a specific leadership style to enable them to achieve corporate goals. Top management carries out decisions that ascertain the levels of accomplishing appropriate leadership styles. Towards this end, Aishat et al. investigate the link between the leadership styles of managers and the job performance of employees. Just like the findings of other studies such as that of Ojokuku et al. (2012), the authors find that it is the transformational leadership style which is practiced the most by most managers. A significant positive relationship is also indicated between leadership styles and job performance. This leads the study to infer that since job performance is positively impacted by an effective leadership style, a well-performed job therefore embodies a motivated employee, thereby giving light to the essential association between leadership style and employee motivation.

Tsai et al. (2011) takes on a dissimilar emphasis regarding how leadership styles are applied. The effects of employees’ leadership styles, efficacy, organisational commitment, and emotional intelligence are investigated in their research with the use of SEM, which Bahmanabadi (2015) also used in his own study. The results of Tsai and colleagues’ (2011)
Study denote that the supervisor’s leadership style is positively impacted by his/her emotional intelligence, indicating that with high emotional intelligence, the leader can embody exceptional leadership skills to help motivate employees for the development of their self-efficacy. The study also indicates a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and organisational performance. The results suggest that the leader’s emotional intelligence is vital to the other outcomes of the organisation, including employees’ self-efficacy, organisational performance, and organisational commitment. This denotes that a mediating role is played by the leader’s emotional intelligence vis-à-vis the link between leadership style and the self-efficacy of employees.

Iqbal et al. (2014) takes a similar research direction as that of Shafie et al. (2013), as the former deals with the impact of leadership styles on an organisation and employee performance. The aim of the study is to offer a broad understanding of the influence of various leadership styles on employee performance. In particular, the leadership styles tackled in Shafie and colleagues’ study are autocratic, democratic, and participative. In order to properly address the research problem, the authors use a qualitative approach and conclude that the usefulness of an autocratic leadership style is only short-term, whilst that of the democratic leadership style is of all-time horizon. On the other hand, the participative leadership style is the most useful with regard to long-term horizon, having a positive impact on employees. The results of Iqbal and colleagues’ study provide a valuable idea about the link that governs leadership style and employee performance. This is in consideration of the fact that effective employee performance necessitates the essence of employee motivation. This is why Iqbal and colleague’s article is useful in this study.

Similarly, Jung et al. (2003) state that the leadership style of top management serves as a factor that abates organisational innovation. Yet, only limited empirical research has established the link between leadership style and innovation at the organisational level. Further, their study reveals that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and organisational innovation, as well as between transformational leadership and organisational climate with innovative orientation. Their findings suggest a useful direction for the study, as it intends to establish a link between leadership style and employee motivation. Jung and colleagues’ article may be indirectly related to the topic of investigation because of its focus on innovation; however, the essence of leadership style might indicate the placement of employee motivation within this innovation framework, which could be dealt with by future research.

The impact of leadership on organisational commitment is the focus of the study of Oztekin et al. (2015) as they look into the association between the organisation and its employees, with reference to organisational commitment and job performance. It is posited that
organisational commitment involves leadership, which is an important factor of job performance. Additionally, recent studies have investigated the link between organisational commitment and leadership styles, revealing the positive relationship between paternalistic leadership and organisational commitment (e.g.). Oztekin and colleagues’ findings reveal a note-worthy insight about the association between organisational commitment and job performance, taking into account the concept of employee motivation.

**Avery’s Leadership Model**

Offering an alternative typology, Avery (2004) sought to account for both the modern and the traditional leadership styles. In her 2004 model, Avery offered a proposal that overcomes the ambiguity seen in the transactional and transformational leadership styles by incorporating points of views of many models, and offering a wide range of leadership styles. The typology proposes four leadership styles, which are organic, classical, visionary, and transactional leadership styles. This study utilises Avery (2004) leadership styles because they not only effectively overcome the challenges faced by previous styles, but they also give room for scholars in different disciplines to classify observed leadership styles within a border range than that offered by Bass and Burns. The use of Avery styles necessitates the definition of the four leadership styles.

Classical leadership refers to the ancient leadership styles rarely used in the 21st century in which an elite group or a pre-eminent individual commands other people into following a given objective with little questions or objections to the commanding authority (Avery, 2004). According to Avery (2004), this leadership style may be coercive as in dictatorships, or benevolent as in monarchical settings, and it is limited when a leader is incapable of commanding every action or is in need of support during change of leadership. In contrast, transactional leadership is the style in which a leader interacts with followers to broker a deal in which either party completes one part of a transaction (Bass and Avolio, 1994). This means that followers complete a given objective, and in return, leaders promise a given reward or punishment for the successful or unsuccessful completion of the set objective respectively, with the promise for reward/ punishment acting as a motivating factor for the followers. However, this arrangement is often cited as short-term, and can be hampered when punitive measures are exerted to followers who are not interested in long-term organisational goals (Avery, 2004; Drath, 2001). It is therefore best for short-term goal as leaders rarely empower their followers, and since they are not often consulted, the only powers followers have is to give or withdraw their labour into the organisation, and only very few of the followers are often skilled.
Unlike classical and transactional leadership, visionary leadership refers to the style in which leaders provide a clear map for the future of the organisation and the long-term objectives (Avery, 2004; Bass, 1978; Burns, 1985). The term is coined from the need for the leader to be a vision-bearer, and is also referred to as transformational or charismatic leadership. In addition to shaping the organisation’s vision, this leader is challenged with the task of motivating followers not only to accomplish given tasks, but to do go beyond their individual expectations (Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Keller, 2006; Langford and Rawlings, 2006). The nature of this leadership is that followers are empowered, and given a significant level of autonomy to accomplish their tasks, and in most cases, the leaders work with skilled taskforces unlike the case of classical and transactional leaderships. Comparatively, organic leadership is a style in which the role of leadership is distributed among many individuals, rather than focused on a single leader (Avery, 2004; Avolio et al, 2009). Because of its lateral nature, organic style of leadership blurs the line that separates a “leader” from a “follower” and leaders can generally by swapped based on circumstances, and in most cases, organic organisations have multiple leaders, rather than one leader. Whilst it is not a universal panacea, it has evolved as an elaborate solution to the evolving question of leadership in highly knowledge-based environments as it leads to positive peer pressure, autonomy, self-organisation, mutual decision-making, and equitable treatment.

Whilst organisations have as many styles to choose its leadership from, it is noteworthy that only one style can be used at a time, as organisations structure their operations and remunerations along the chosen style. This effectively makes it an uphill task to alternate between leadership styles as an organisation. Additionally, whilst no typology is perfect, the need for an organisation to choose wisely among the portions cannot be overemphasised. Also worth noting is the point that leaders might sometime, albeit occasionally, use alternative styles, since it is not unheard of for a visionary leader to coerce followers into action. Having so eloquently presented the leadership styles and pointed out those used in this study, the next section discusses another prerequisite of organisational operations, namely, management competencies.

**Avery’s Leadership Model: Why Adopt Avery’s Typology of Leadership**

It has been the practice of the leadership literature to conceptualise leadership typologies. A typical typology would involve leader behaviours being theoretically classified into major leadership styles (Zhang, 2011). Hence, there is a range of ways in which leadership style is described, and an important current notion of this is to treat it as a rather consistent pattern of behaviour characterising a leader (Eagly et al., 2003; Lee & Chang, 2006). There are nevertheless some limitations to this notion and an example of this is the fact that leadership
does not involve only the leader but the subordinates as well; hence, leadership style should be described as a rather coherent pattern of behaviour applied to the interaction between the leader and the subordinate. The literature bears various authors’ propositions about a number of categories governing leadership styles. For example, Bass (1985) claimed that transformational leadership has four aspects whilst transactional leadership has three. Still other authors identified their own typologies of leadership, such as Drath (2001), who identified three: personal, interpersonal, and relational; Goleman et al. (2002) who identified six, and Avery (2004) who identified four.

Goleman and colleagues’ (2001) typology of leadership bears certain features: They felt that it is necessary for a leader to vacillate amongst the six leadership approaches in their typology based on the situation in which the leader is operating. However, this pronouncement is assumed to be embodied by an idea that flexibility is easily ascertained and that leaders are able to change the followers’ behaviours despite their lack of ability to precisely detect a range of situations. Considerable scepticisms also prevail in relation to an idea that people can excellently analyse situations and determine what is necessary with regard to leadership style. From the follower’s perspective, the perception that a leader is inconsistent and unpredictable can be potentially problematic (Yunker & Yunker, 2002). These problems pave the way for hesitation on the usability of Goleman and colleagues’ (2002) typology of leadership. On the contrary, leadership styles have been regarded by Avery (2004) as having consistent relationships between leaders and subordinates, thereby overcoming Goleman and colleagues’ (2002) shortcomings in their own typology. This is one reason why Avery’s (2004) leadership styles is worthy of adoption.

Moreover, it must be noted that Bass’ (1985) typology bears the basis of most leadership studies. However, despite the recognition placed on this typology, various criticisms have been posed on it. One is its alleged over-emphasis on the value of one or two leadership styles, such as visionary and transactional, whilst not giving much importance to the rest (Jing & Avery, 2008; Trottier et al., 2008). A recommendation from a number of researchers is to cover other leadership styles as well in future studies. This is exemplified by Liu et al. (2003) who expanded Bass and colleagues’ typology to include directive leadership and empowering leadership. Further, an identification of Bass’ conceptual problems was made, thereby removing doubt on its theoretical validity (Zhang, 2011). By concurrently considering conventional and modern leadership styles and disposing of unclear sub-dimensions of Bass’ model, Avery’s (2004) typology is able to overcome some of the shortcomings in said model. He does this through an integration of many more approaches and theories into four leadership styles: Classical, visionary, transactional, and organic. In this way, Avery demonstrates that there are only certain
styles to which some theories fit; hence, indicating the broad utility of the typology in the leadership field.

Therefore, an integration of the foregoing approaches of leadership is covered in Avery’s styles in order to offer a basis that allows for various forms of leadership that have developed over time. The usefulness of Avery’s leadership styles is seen in the notion that no single best way of leading prevails, but that various types of leadership represent social origins. By taking in a full variety of leadership styles, Avery’s typology enables leadership to be situated within a particular context and respond to organisational needs and challenges (Jing & Avery, 2008). This is why Avery’s leadership typology is adopted in the present study.

**Employee Motivation**

Employee motivation according to Lin (2001) refers to the psychological factors which determine the behaviour of the employee in a given organisation. Agreeing with this definition, Hafiza et al. (2001) add that employee motivation involves certain process, which, taken together, has a significant impact on the behaviours of the employees. Adding a third rejoinder, Egan and Kim (2013) note that employee motivation refers to anything that elicits voluntary positive action or mind-sets from employees. Thus, this discussion considers employee motivation to involve three major parameters, which are any psychological factors that influence the attitudes and behaviour of employees to think and act positively in a voluntary manner. Employee motivation can have been studied from the perspective of some theories, which include equity theory and discrepancy theory, among others as discussed in the following section.

Clear evidence about organisations’ focus on the retention of motivated employees has been demonstrated in a number of studies (e.g. Araimi, 2013; Lowe et al., 2008). Although the academic literature cites motivation as a broadly discussed topic, this is not the case with employee motivation in the Omani private sector, specifically in the banking sector. Thus, the aim of Araimi’s (2013) study is to identify some insights about the determinants of employee motivations in this sector in Oman. Using a cross-sectional method, a survey is conducted on 105 employees, which is analysed through correlational methods. The study evidently sheds some light on the value of relationship between employees and their co-workers with regard to motivation. It is useful to the topic of investigation as it discusses the concept of employee motivation and likewise explains how employee motivation is well-cited in the literature, validating its relevance to a well-managed organisation.

According to Tella et al. (2007), managing people at work is an essential part of the management process. Understanding the vital importance of people in the organisation requires recognising the synonymous state of human element and the organisation itself. Usually, an
effectively managed organisation views an average worker as the main source of quality and productivity and does not likewise place greater importance to capital investment than to people resource as the basis of improvement. Tella et al. (2007) further that a well-managed organisation will ensure that the spirit of cooperation is fostered in the organisation as a way to achieve its objectives. In order to ensure employees’ satisfaction and commitment to their jobs, a strong motivation at various levels is necessary. The authors reveal an association between perceived motivation and job satisfaction. However, their study also demonstrates a negative correlation between motivation and commitment, which may be an outcome of the fact that the employees in the study are not highly motivated by the development of a shared vision. This study is useful to the present research investigation as it delineates how employee motivation functions with regard to commitment to one’s job.

In Rajasekar and Khan’s (2013) study, which focuses on Omani public sector organisations, it is revealed that employees’ participation in the determination of their training needs has certain advantages and disadvantages. One advantage is the development of employee motivation, as they tend to have shared learning and knowledge transference in the workplace. However, it is suggested that certain problems are found in such participation, specifically when an employee is willing to adhere to an extensive training programme which the department or the organisation does not consider a priority. Thus, it is necessary for the organisation to carefully analyse the identified needs so that priorities may be determined. This inference is connected to Al-Harthy’s (2008) conclusion about the importance of motivating the workforce in order to retain them in the organisation and compete effectively in the present competitive environment. Rajasekar and Khan’s (2013) study is relevant to the topic of investigation because of its focus on the importance of enabling individual and organisational goals link so that both would operate in synergy. It likewise provides a notion of the kind of leadership that managers have with regard to not prioritising employees’ goal to receive training and thus enhance their skills and capabilities.

In their framework of effective leadership, Avery (2004, 2008) proposes four paradigms of leadership: “classical leadership”, “transactional leadership”, “visionary leadership”, and “organic leadership”. These different paradigm characteristics are thought to be helpful to inform an understanding of the way in which different styles of leadership can be used by a leader within an organisation (Avery, 2008). Avery’s (2004) paradigms are considered to offer value to in the way in which they present a different view of leadership style, depending on where the leadership is located: in the individual, the role, or the process. When leadership is situated at the individual level, Avery (2004) explains that the leadership competencies and leader/follower relationship is the key. When leadership is situated in the role or position, Avery (2004) cites the
authority and hierarchy of the organisation as the key leadership focus within the organisation. When leadership is considered to be a process then it is the actions of the organisation that is given as the main focus (Avery, 2004). As such, whilst classic, transactional and visionary leadership place the leadership focus at different levels, they possess a shared view that leaders must exorcise leadership via power systems and the strength of their leader’s competencies and traits (Avery, 2004). Both classical and visionary ideologies focus on the individual as a leader, placing significance on progressing from inherent traits to behavioural qualities expressed through the ways of working and influence over the staff member’s level of motivation in their roles. Transactional leaders also focus on the designated position in a structure within organisational hierarchies and the superiority of the leader over other staff members (Avery, 2004). The primary focus is on overall efficiency and measuring success against outputs and key targets.

The Link between Perceived Leadership Style and Employee Motivation

As noted by Jing and Avery (2008) the purpose of leaders is to create impact an influence on an organisation’s dimension, and relationship with other stakeholders. Mahmood and Basharat (2012) state that, communication of a leader is important and has an effect of causing charisma to instil confidence and trust in the followers. Leadership style as defined by McCleskey (2014) involves the various modes that the leader uses to influence people to get the job done by use of inspiration rather than the use of coercive powers and authority. Leadership is all about influencing the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviours of other people that leads to increased motivation (Mahmood and Basharat, 2012).

A study done by Somech (2006) shows leaders give direction to the organisation and make strategic plans for the organisation. As such, Memon (2014) states that numerous leadership styles are applied all over the world today in many organisation with an ultimate goal of achieving the best from the employees. Their reasons for this variation include changes in social values, technology and political system (Nemaei, 2012). Such a change, as noted by McCleskey (2014) may make a leadership style that was previously effective and efficient to be ineffective, organisations need to adopt leadership styles that matches with their objectives and one that will have a great impact on their employees. In their study about leadership style and motivation, Khuong and Hoang (2015) denote that leadership styles strongly influence employee retention and the development of employee motivation. Additionally, a positive association is found between employee motivation and charismatic leadership, relation-oriented leadership, and ethic-based leadership.
According to Zhang (2011), employee motivation has long been viewed as a necessary element in business performance. In line with this, a strong link has been made by a number of consultants and academic researchers regarding employee motivation and organisational performance, whilst other studies indicate that around 80 percent of the workforce do not experience motivation in the workplace. This then leads to low productivity, as a disengaged workforce has a corresponding cost to the business; thereby allowing the topic of employee motivation an important attention for managers and human resource practitioners alike. However, even though a practical importance has been demonstrated for employee motivation, relatively little research about the leadership field has been carried out. Thus, in order to obtain valuable insights into employee motivation levels, Zhang’s (2011) study examines the relationship between employee motivation and four leadership styles, namely: classical, visionary, transactional, and organic leadership styles. The extant literature recognises the influence of follower characteristics in the leadership equation. Using a sample of 439 respondents, the study reveals that employee motivation is negatively related to employees’ perception of the leader’s classical and transactional leadership styles, and is positively related to visionary and organic leadership styles. These findings provide a useful insight regarding which leadership style/s should be adopted by leaders and organisations in promoting employee motivation.

Similarly, Almansour (2012) suggests that when broadening and heightening the interests of their subordinates, leaders adopt transformational leadership, which likewise functions as a way to draw awareness and acceptance of organisational tasks. This leadership style is characterised by leader-follower interactions which are required in accomplishing routine performance that the leader and the followers have agreed on. The author also mentions situational leadership, which involves the need for leaders to become flexible and socially perceptive to have their behaviour harmonise with the situational demands. This suggests that a flexible leader is able to demonstrate appropriate behavioural responses to a broad range of situations. The authors furthers that transactional, transformational, and situational leadership styles positively influence the direction of the organisation; which is contrary to Zhang’s (2011) findings mentioned earlier. Specifically, Zhang said that transactional leadership is negatively perceived by employees. These findings are worthy of note in examining the extent of influence posed by leadership styles on employee motivation.

Similar to Zhang (2011) and Almansour (2012) who both cited the importance of effective leadership, Teshome (2011) also points out that effective leaders serve as ‘enablers’, who are committed and competent employees themselves. Research in organisational behaviour demonstrates that the success or failure of an organisation is characterised by the
link between leadership styles and employee motivation, which determines such success or failure. Teshome’s (2011) study examines the link between leadership styles and employee motivation, with the participation of 115 participants. Leadership is measured using two kinds of questionnaire, such as multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) and organisational commitment questionnaire (OCQ). The study reveals that the transformational leadership style is significantly and positively correlated with affective employee commitment, whilst the transactional leadership style is significantly and positively correlated with normative commitment. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership has significant and negative relationship with employees’ affective commitment. These findings denote the importance of employing transformational leadership if an organisation needs its employees to develop affective commitment; and transactional leadership if it needs them to develop normative commitment, such as job values; or perhaps both types of leadership, if it wants them to develop both affective and normative commitments. The findings also connote the non-necessity and ineffectiveness of adopting a laissez faire leadership style in relation to developing employee commitment. These therefore aid the present study with regard to how employee motivation and leadership style are carried out in Omani private and public sectors.

Perceived leadership style and employee participation are likewise examined in the article of Mitonga-Monga et al. (2012). The authors look into how individuals differ in relation to leadership style and employee participation with respect to demographic factors, such as gender, age, and education. The results reveal a significant relationship between how the participants perceive leaders’ behaviour and how they perceive employee participation. It is found out male participants have a more significantly positive perception of their leader’s approach compared to female participants. Moreover, participants with graduate and postgraduate degrees have more significantly positive perception of employee participation compared to those with undergraduate degrees. Mitonga-Monga and colleagues’ (2012) study is useful to the present research as it adds new knowledge about leadership style and employee participation, which may be utilised in addressing the research problem.

Gopal and Chowhudry’s (2014) study explores how leadership styles influence employee motivation by using a questionnaire method involving 50 respondents. The results reveal a moderately motivated direction between employees and transformational and transactional leadership styles, which are the dominant leadership styles cited in the article. This denotes that various factors of leadership style have different effects on employee motivation. Gopal and Chowhudry’s (2014) study is useful to the current research endeavour as it offers an insight into the impact of leadership style factors on employee motivation, which can help in tackling the research problem.
METHODOLOGY

Unit of Analysis
The present study involves the employees employed in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Oman Cable, and Bhawna Automotive Group as the specific units of analysis.

Sampling Design
The study obtained 823 employees (354 from the public sector and 469 from the private sector) as the specific sample from the given population. Convenience sampling is chosen as the specific sampling technique since it enables identifying the research respondents who are readily available and easily accessible to participate in the study (Saunders et al. 2009).

Research Instrument
The present study utilises the questionnaire as the primary data collection instrument. Specifically, it uses the structured questionnaire because it supports the collection of a broad range of responses from the target participants (Saunders et al. 2009). Utilising the questionnaire is therefore useful for the study because it enables the researcher to derive the needed information from the participants and permits the researcher to survey a relatively large number of people simultaneously (Pickard, 2007). Aside from this, the cost effectiveness of this sampling technique allows the study to achieve cost minimisation and saving time, which thereby helps the study to be completed on time.

The questions in the questionnaire are based on the research aim and objectives, as well as the theoretical propositions established in the literature review. This helps in ensuring that the research aim and objectives are being addressed by the information gathered from the research participants, thereby aiding the study to fulfil the purpose it sets out to achieve. In addition, the use of closed-ended questions ensures the collection of standardised data since the information being provided by the respondents is limited only to what the questionnaire contains; hence, further supporting easy analysis of the data gathered.

The questionnaire adopts Jing’s (2009) scale, which initially operationalised Avery’s (2004) four leadership styles. Jing’s study demonstrates satisfactory levels of reliability of data for classical, visionary, organic, and transactional leadership styles, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.7.

The questionnaire contains three parts. The first part comprises the respondents’ demographic information. It measures variables such as gender, age, the sector in which one belong (public or private), and position held in the organisation. The second part, on the other hand, contains questions about perceived leadership styles. The measurement variables
included in this section are organic leadership style, transactional leadership style, visionary leadership style, and classical leadership style. The third part constitutes measurement of motivational level, which includes personal satisfaction, social interaction or interpersonal relationships, sense of personal responsibility for work, individual performance, feelings of achievement, self-sufficiency (independence) at work, and the way decisions are made.

Data Presentation

Labelling the Variables
The survey used 34 questions without demographic variables to measure 4 latent variables, which are types of leadership styles (Jing, 2009). Table 1 below lists the labels of these variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLASSICAL</td>
<td>Classical leadership</td>
<td>Q1.1, Q1.8, Q1.9, Q1.14, Q1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>Q1.2, Q1.5, Q1.12, Q1.17, Q1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VISIONARY</td>
<td>Visionary leadership</td>
<td>Q1.3, Q1.6, Q1.7, Q1.13, Q1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ORGANIC</td>
<td>Organic leadership</td>
<td>Q1.4, Q1.10, Q1.11, Q1.15, Q1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, classical leadership is labeled as “CLASSICAL”; transactional leadership is labeled as “TRANSACTIONAL”; visionary leadership is labeled as “VISIONARY”, and organic leadership is labeled as “ORGANIC”. The sources of these latent variables and their corresponding labels are shown in their opposite space at the right side of the table, indicating the question items that represent them in the questionnaire.

Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive statistics are used to summarise any patterns in the responses. Descriptive statistics contains procedures that summarise and depict the important characteristics of a measurement set (Mendenhall et al., 2013). This section describes the response rate, characteristics of respondents, and means and standard deviations of the leadership styles.

Response Rate
A total of 661 responses were obtained from the case organisations (Table 2). The pilot study had a response rate of 100 per cent from 66 responses, and the main study had a response rate of 80 per cent from 661 responses.
As shown above, the reliability of the pilot study is 0.7; its validity by using correlation coefficient is: all value < than 0.05, which is valid. The population has a response rate of 80 percent.

**Characteristics of Respondents**

The sample data were analysed based on the organisation size and four respondent characteristics, namely: gender, age, experience, and number of the employees in the organisation as shown in Table 3. Of the 661 questionnaires kept for the analysis, the distribution of the organisation size represented was for public sector was 46 percent, whilst the organisation for the private sector represented by Oman Cable and Bahwan Automotive Group Company was 27 percent for each.

The male respondents consist of 79 percent whilst the female respondents consist of 21 percent. There were 7 percent respondents aged 25 years old or less; 58 percent respondents aged 26-34 years old; 27 percent aged 35-44 years old; 5 percent aged 45-54 years old; and 2 percent aged 55 years old and above.

In terms of number of years of experience on the job, five percent of the respondents had less than a year of experience; 11 percent had 1-2 years of experience; 28 percent had 3-5 years of experience; 21 percent had 6-10 years of experience; and 36 percent had 10 years and above experience. The three organisations employed 200 or more employees.

**Means and Standard Deviations of the Latent Variables**

Table 4 gives the means and standard deviations of the 4 leadership styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows that the classical leadership style has the highest mean value of 3.25 and a standard deviation of 0.47, whilst the organic leadership style has the lowest mean value of 2.80 and a standard deviation of 0.31.

**Reliability and Validity Analysis**

The characteristics of a sound quantitative research study, such as the present study, include: reliability, with consistency as the corresponding research standard; validity, with fidelity as the corresponding research standard; replicability, with verifiability as the corresponding research standard; and generalisability, with meaningfulness as the corresponding research standard (Brown, 2014).

In collecting the data which are the basis of the results, this study has been greatly concerned with the validity of the measurements that it is using. The researcher was able to obtain scores that produce a valid measure of strength to address the research questions. Validity of measurement denotes “the degree to which the scores from the test, or instrument, measures what it is supposed to measure” (Thomas et al., 2011, p. 193). Hence, it refers to how sound the interpretation of the scores from the questionnaire are, which is most importantly considered in measurement (Thomas et al., 2011), and which is likewise considered in this study’s measurement.

Therefore, the correct data are determined through the results of research quality. The use of reliability and validity are common in quantitative research and is reconsidered in the qualitative research paradigm. Creswell (2013) and Heppner and colleagues’ (2015) models provide a high degree of stability, which means that the results are repeatable. Also, reliability is a measure to indicate that an item is reliable by using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient, which normally ranges between zero and 1.0 (Malhotra et al., 2002). The closer Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is to 1.0, the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale, whilst increasing the value of alpha is partially dependent upon the number of items in the scale.

In the present study, testing the validity of the questionnaires was conducted through Pearson Correlations coefficients using SPSS software. The validity test of Pearson Correlations was done by correlating each item and questionnaire scores with the total scores.

**Reliability Analysis**

In this study, the total Cronbach’s alpha value for domains scale is 0.500, which is reasonable and satisfactory.
Validity Analysis
All items were validated using external validity, which is demonstrated by a statistical examination of probability. When all probability is less than the significance value (0.05), all items are considered valid.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY
Questionnaire Analysis
The demographic part of the questionnaire includes scales for gender, age, years of stay with the organisation, and an approximate number of employees in the organisation. These scales are necessary in tackling the study’s hypotheses, specifically the significant relationships between leadership and motivation by age, gender, and years of experience with the organisation.

The next part of the questionnaire, Leadership Styles, bears 20 statements which the respondents were made to answer by “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “unsure”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”. The statements were simple in order to be easily understood by the respondents. The third section is Employee Motivation, whose statements are spread out in 14 items, and which the respondents were also made to answer with “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “unsure”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”. The last question, which is an open-ended one, is: “How can your organisation enhance employee motivation?” Here, the respondents were made to offer insights and judgments about what they think could enhance their motivation in the workplace, thereby offering valuable information to the present study about enriching employee motivation in public and private sectors in Oman.

Leadership Style Scale
The leadership style scale in Figure 1 is represented by 10 statements in the second section of the questionnaire. These are: “My direct supervisor has all the say”; “I do not have much power here”; “My direct supervisor’s vision of the future governs what I do around here”; “The staff tends to have all the say in this group”; “Agreements between management and me govern what I do around here”; “I have a medium amount of power here”; “I am held accountable for achieving my direct supervisor’s vision”; “My direct supervisor controls everything I do in this group”; “My direct supervisor plans, organises and monitors everything in this group”; and “My direct supervisor is concerned about helping me to lead and organise myself”. Figure 1 shows the leadership domain that presents the leadership scale.
The figure above shows that the items 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 had the most “agree” responses, with mean values of 3.63, 3.78, 2.44, 2.74, 3.04 and corresponding standard deviations of 0.72, 0.69, 0.78, 0.99, and 0.94 respectively. On the other hand, items 4, 7 and 8 had the most “disagree” responses with mean values of 3.51, 3.57, 3.43 and SD of 0.55, 0.71, and 0.91 respectively.
Conversely, Figure 2 presents the leadership domain for items 11-20.

Figure 2: Leadership domain continued

From the figure above, the items 14 and 15 had the most “agree” responses with mean values of 3.72, 31.91 and SD scores of 0.83 and 0.88 respectively. Item no. 14 states: “My direct supervisor likes to keep some distance from staff in this group”, whilst item no. 15 says: “My direct supervisor does not display all the power he/she has.” The items 12,13,17,18,19 and 20 had the most “disagree” responses with mean values of 2.35, 3.79, 3.78, 2.06, 2.22, and 2.37, and SD scores of 0.68, 0.66,0.69, 0.70, 0.65, 0.81 respectively (See Appendix 2). It may be observed that the standard deviations of these items are not really separated by large scores. Items with lower SDs may indicate that the data points are close to the mean of the set, whilst higher SDs indicate the spreading out of the data points over a broader range of values; meaning, the data are more dispersed. This is also indicated in Babbie (2008).

Motivation scale
A motivation scale is shown in Figure 3. The “strongly agree” response had the highest scores for items 1 (mean value: 0.90), 3 (mean value: 1.12), 5 (mean value: 0.43), and 6 (mean value: 0.53). The “disagree” response was highest in items 2, 7, and 8. The “agree” response was highest in item 9. The items 2, 4 and 7 had mean values of 4.12, 3.64, 3.79, and SD scores of 0.84, 1.30, and 0.64 respectively.
Alternatively, the figure 4 shows the continuation of motivation domain presented in the earlier table. Items 9 and 13 generated “agree” responses as the most number of responses, with mean values of 4.35 and 1.91 and SD scores of 0.49 and 0.50 respectively. Item 11 generated a “strongly agree” response as the highest response, with a mean value of 4.77 and a SD score of 0.47. On the other hand, items 8, 12 and 14 had “disagree” responses as the highest responses, with mean values of 1.93, 3.78, and 2.22, and SD scores of 0.67, 0.81, and 0.93 respectively. For item 10, the most number of responses was “strongly disagree”, with a mean value of 1.53 and a SD score of 0.79.
Hypothesis Testing and Statistical Analyses

Table 6: Research questions and hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 1:</strong> How do leadership relate with motivation in the case organisations?</td>
<td><strong>H1.1</strong> Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H1.2</strong> Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H1.3:</strong> Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H1.4:</strong> Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H1.5:</strong> Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by number of years of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 2:</strong> How does leadership style affect motivation in the private and public sectors in Oman?</td>
<td><strong>H2.1:</strong> Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani public sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: How do leadership styles relate with motivation vis-à-vis age and years of experience in the organisations?

H3.1: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation's items with regard to age.

H3.2: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation's items with regard to number of years of experience on the job.

Research question 4: How can Omani private and public sectors enhance employee motivation?

Research Question 1: How do leadership relate with motivation in the case organisations?

Correlation is a technique used to investigate the relationship between two variables. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) is a technique that measures the strength of the association between two variables (e.g. Boslaugh, 2008).

Table 7 shows the relationship between leadership styles and employee motivation for the three organisations using Pearson Correlation Coefficient:

Table 7: Relationship between leadership styles and motivation for the three organisations using Pearson Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlations N=661</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.329**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table above shows the result of Pearson's Correlation Coefficient between leadership styles and motivation for both public and private sectors, represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries; Oman Cable; and Bhawna Automotive Group. It demonstrates a statistically significant relationship between motivation and classical, transactional, and organic leadership styles, with p-value<=0.05, except visionary leadership style. However, there is no significant relationship between visionary leadership style and employee motivation.
**H.1.1 Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the public sector**

Table 8 exhibits the relationship between leadership style and employee motivation in the public sector, represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries using Pearson correlation. The result directly answers the hypothesis (H.1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Correlations N=304-public</th>
<th>Classic</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8 reveals a statistically significant association between motivation and organic style of leadership, with p-value<=0.05, whilst no statistically significant association was found between motivation and other styles of leadership, such as classical, transactional, and visionary styles. The study therefore accepts the hypothesis: “Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the public sector” only for the three leadership styles mentioned.

**H.1.2: Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the private sector.**

Table 9 shows the relationship between leadership styles and employee motivation in the private sector, represented by Oman Cable and Bahwan Automotive Group, using Pearson Correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Correlations N=357</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.171**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
As shown in the above table, a statistically significant association exists between employee motivation and classical, transactional, visionary, and organic styles of leadership, with p-value<=0.05. The study therefore accepts the hypothesis: “Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the private sector.”

**H.1.3: Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by gender.**

Based on this hypothesis, independent T-test was conducted, which is considered appropriate for assessing the mean difference between two groups (e.g. Veal, 2005). Table 10 shows the mean difference in employee motivation by gender using T-test.

Table 10: T-test table for mean difference in employee motivation by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-2.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, there is no statistical significance between leadership and gender according to the mean value. However, there is a statistical significance between motivation and gender, which corresponds to the female gender, according to the mean value.

**H.1.4: Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by age.**

One-way ANOVA was used to address this hypothesis, which is appropriate in assessing mean differences amongst more than two groups (e.g. Veal, 2005). In this thesis, ANOVA functioned as a way to deal with the mean differences between leadership style and motivation using two categories: (1) age and (2) number of years of experience in the organisations. In order to know the statistical differences between age and each scale, LSD (post hoc) was used. Table 11 demonstrates the mean differences between leadership and motivation by age.
Table 11: ANOVA table for mean differences between leadership and motivation by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2698.535</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>674.634</td>
<td>35.371</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12511.852</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>19.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15210.387</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>193.235</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.309</td>
<td>6.347</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4992.735</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>7.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5185.970</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11, there is a statistical significance between leadership and age, with p-value < 0.05, as well as between motivation and age, with p-value < 0.05. However, there is no statistical significance between leadership and the age groups 25 or younger, 26-34 years; 45-54 years; and more than 55 years old.

**H.1.5: Leadership is statistically related to employee motivation by number of years of experience.**

This hypothesis is addressed by using ANOVA. Table 12 presents an ANOVA table for mean differences between leadership and motivation by number of years of experience. In order to know where the statistical differences between number of years of experience and each scale, the study used LSD (post hoc).

Table 12: ANOVA table for mean differences between leadership and motivation by number of years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3219.794</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>804.949</td>
<td>44.038</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>11990.593</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>18.278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15210.387</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>900.477</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225.119</td>
<td>34.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4285.492</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5185.970</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As demonstrated in table 12, there is a statistical significance between leadership and number of years of experience, with p-value < 0.05. Similarly, there is a statistical significance between motivation and number years of experience, with p-value < 0.05.

All the numbers of years of experience (less than 1 year, 1-2 years, 3-5 years, 6-10 years and 10 years and above) have a statistical difference in terms of leadership, except for experiences of less than one year, 3-5 years, 1-2 years, and 6-10 years.

**Research Question 2: How does leadership style affect motivation in the private and public sectors in Oman?**

In addressing this research question, the study used multiple regressions, which is a broadening of simple linear regression. It is utilise to explain the relationship between one continuous dependent variable and two or more independent variables. In this study, multiple regressions are undertaken to address the effect of leadership style on employee motivation. The prediction of Y (motivation) is accomplished through the equation:

\[ Y_i = b_0 + b_1X_{1i} + b_2X_{2i} + \ldots + b_kX_{ki} \]

Table 13 shows the multiple regression fit model by ANOVA for both the public and private sectors of Oman, represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Oman Cable, and Bahwa Automotive Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>27.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>22.689</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.459</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation (Y)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Classical, Transactional, Visionary, Organic

The full model has a statistical significance (F = 27.251, df = 4,656, sig.= .000), which is p<0.05; hence, the model is fit. Leadership significantly affects motivation in both public and private sectors in Oman.

Table 14, on the other hand, reveals a multiple regression coefficient for both public and private sectors. Unstandardized and standardized coefficients are shown for classical, transactional, visionary, and organic styles of leadership.
Table 14: Multiple regression Coefficient for both sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (N=661)</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.484</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>25.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-3.336</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>7.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

Y (Motivation)= 2.484 + (0.78)*classic +(0.12)*transactional +(-0.78)* visionary +(0.204)*organic

Classical, visionary, and organic leadership styles are positively significant to the level of employee motivation in both public and private sectors. An increase in these leadership styles indicates a corresponding increase in the level of employee motivation in the three organisations, whilst an increase in transactional leadership style negatively affects the level of motivation in these organisations.

**H.2.1 Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani public sector.**

This hypothesis is addressed through the use of multiple regression fit model by ANOVA. The analysis is specifically for the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, which represents the public sector. Table 15 shows the result of the model.

Table 15: Multiple regression fit model by ANOVA for public sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>9.855</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8.605</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.739</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Classical, Transaction, Visionary, Organic

A statistical significance is demonstrated by the full model (F = 9.855, df = 4,299 sig.= .000), which is p<0.05, indicating that the model is fit, when used for the public sector.
A multiple regression coefficient is generated for the public sector between the styles of leadership (independent variable) and motivation (dependent variable), as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Multiple regression coefficient for the public sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model (304)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable : Motivation

\[ Y \ (\text{Motivation}) = 2.537 + (-0.009)\times\text{classical} +(-0.023)\times\text{transactional} +(0.009)\times \text{visionary} +(0.238)\times\text{organic} \]

The table reveals a statistical significance between the organic leadership style and employee motivation in the public sector, with \( p<0.05 \); which means that organic leadership enhances employee motivation. However, no statistical significance was demonstrated between other leadership styles and employee motivation.

**H.2.2: Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani private sector.**

Table 17 presents the multiple regression fit model by ANOVA for the private sector.

Table 17: Multiple regression fit model by ANOVA for the private sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>23.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11.771</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.912</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Classical, Transactional, Visionary, Organic
The full model has a statistical significance with $F = 23.48$, $df = 3,352$, $sig. = .000$, which is $p < 0.05$, indicating that the model is fit when used for the private sector.

Alternatively, Table 18 illustrates the multiple regression coefficient for the private sector between the styles of leadership (independent variable) and motivation (dependent variable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (N=357)</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.372</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>21.284</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>7.748</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-2.081</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.298</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Multiple regression coefficient for the private sector

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

$Y$ (Motivation) = 2.372 + (0.185)*classical + (0.022)*transactional + (-0.68)*visionary + (0.082)*organic

The table above denotes that classical, visionary, and organic styles of leadership are statistically significant to employee motivation in the private sector, with $p < 0.05$. They increase the level of motivation in the private sector. This is not the same with transactional leadership style, which negatively affects the level of employee motivation in the two private organisations.

**Research Question 3: How do leadership styles relate with motivation vis-à-vis age and years of experience in the organisations?**

This research question is answered by using Pearson Chi-Square to identify the differences between leadership styles and motivation's items with the use of age group and number of years of experience within the organisations.

This part reflects the number of frequency by using cross tabulation 2*2 (contingency table) and tests the association between variables by using Pearson Chi-Square for the strength of association indicated by 0 to 1. Close to 0 means little association between variables. Close to 1 indicates a strong association between them.
H.3.1: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation’s items with regard to age.

- There is a statistical significance between leadership and number of years of experience in organisations, with p-value < 0.05; the highest being indicated between leadership and an experience of 26-34 years in the organisations.
- There is a statistical significance between motivation items and number of years of experience, with p-value < 0.05; the highest being indicated between motivation and an experience of 26-34 years in the organisations.

The study therefore accepts the hypothesis, “There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation's items with regard to age.”

H.3.2: There is a significant difference between leadership styles and motivation’s items with regard to number of years of experience on the job.

There is a statistical significance between leadership items and number of years of experience on the job, with p-value < 0.05. The highest is indicated for the job tenure of more than 10 years.

There is also a statistical significance between motivation items and number years of experience, with p-value < 0.05. The highest is indicated for the job tenure of more than 10 years.

Research Question 4: How can employee motivation in the private and public sectors of Oman be enhanced?

This question is directly asked in the questionnaire, allowing the research participants to provide their own assumptions and insights about how employee motivation in both Omani private and public sectors may be enhanced. Table 19 shows their responses. They were made to write as many as they want in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased pay and remuneration</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More paid vacations and leaves</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More days-off</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More effective managers</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family-friendly work setting</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most number of responses in terms of how motivation may be enhanced as viewed by the participants is 143 (increased pay and remuneration), followed by more effective managers (116) and then by more paid vacations and leaves (96). There were 51 who believed that employee motivation may be enhanced if their organisation would implement family-oriented work settings. Twenty-six respondents listed “more interesting training activities”, which was the least cited. Twenty-nine however left this section of the questionnaire blank.

DISCUSSIONS
This presents a discussion of the analysis of data discussed in the previous section. It allows for interpretation and description of the significance of the findings in light of what has been already found about the research problem.

How Leadership Relates with Motivation in Omani Public and Private Sectors
The demonstration of the relationship between leadership style and employee motivation for the public and private sectors, as represented by the three organisations, attests to the claims in the extant literature about the link between leadership and employee motivation (e.g. Almansour, 2012; Mahmood & Basharat, 2012; McCleskey, 2014; Shuck, 2011; Shuck & Herd, 2012; Soieb et al., 2013; Zhang, 2011). However, a lack of significant relationship exists between visionary leadership style and employee motivation using Pearson Correlation Coefficient was also noted (See Table 7). This is contrary to what has been found in the literature about visionary leadership (e.g. Avery, 2004; Kantabutra, 2003; Zhang, 2011). However, it matches Mahmood and Basharat’s (2012) claim that the visionary leadership style has a slow adaptability and is likely to create little or no motivation for employees.

In the public sector, only the organic leadership style was shown to be significantly related to employee motivation. This is similar to the assertion of Avery (2004), that organic leadership provides high levels of motivation to employees; as well as to that of Memon(2014), who claimed that employees have an opportunity to determine the direction of the organisation by being involved in the development of strategic objectives.
In the private sector, all styles of leadership (classical, visionary, transactional, and organic) proved to be significantly related to employee motivation (See Table 9); hence, accepting the hypothesis, “Leadership style is statistically related to employee motivation in the private sector.” Organic leadership has been proved to produce participative leaders (e.g., Nemaei, 2012), which is interestingly a good point for pondering how this kind of leader motivates employees on the job. Moreover,

Also presented a result of the T-test for mean difference in employee motivation by gender and found a statistical significance between motivation and gender but not between leadership and gender (See Table 10). This is worthy of note, considering that the present study aims to find out the relationship between leadership and employee motivation by gender, as identified in the research questions. A statistical significance was revealed between motivation and age, and between leadership and age; however, a statistical significance was not found between leadership and the age groups of 25 or younger, 26-34 years; 45-54 years; and more than 55 years, suggesting that there are only certain age groups to which leadership is related. The extant literature has provided evidence pertaining to the role of gender in motivation; that younger employees have different emotional needs and desires compared to older ones and are therefore motivated differently (e.g., Boumans, 2011; Navalkar, 2016; Ng et al., 2012). This finding only attests to the positive relationship between motivation and age.

Conversely, a statistical difference prevails between motivation and number of years of experience in the organisation, as well as between leadership and number of years of experience. However, there are some exceptions to the relationship between leadership and number of years of experience, as it was found that no statistical difference exists between leadership and experiences of less than one year, 3-5 years, and 6-10 years in the organisation (See Table 12). In the literature review, a positive relationship was found between transformational leadership and number of years on the job (Bartlomiejczuk, 2015; DeClerk, 2007), and that better educated employees with more years of experience in the organisation have less preference for task-oriented leadership behaviours (Vecchio and Boatwright, 2002).

**How Leadership Style Affects Employee Motivation in the Private and Public Sectors in Oman**

Analysing how leadership style affects employee motivation in both sectors in Oman is noteworthy, given that this is also the same research question identified in the first chapter. Through a regression analysis, the findings revealed that leadership significantly affects motivation in both public and private sectors in Oman. However, it was further found that only classical, visionary, and organic leadership styles were positively significant to the level of motivation in
these sectors, and that transactional leadership style was negatively related to such level of motivation. This is insightful, considering that transactional leadership was also earlier cited as one that enables achieving employee motivation by allowing employees to obtain their self-interests, encourage dialogue, and improve job satisfaction through achieved organisational objectives (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). However, there are also certain studies that found lack of positive relationship between transactional leadership style and employee motivation, supporting the findings of this study about this relationship. For example, Shuck and Herd (2012) found that employees are not motivated when the leader adopts a transactional leadership style. Zhang (2011) likewise found that employee motivation is negatively related to employees’ perception of the leader’s transactional leadership style. Generally speaking, transactional leadership places huge reliance on the leader’s skills and confidence in his/her ascertained direction and on seeking the followers’ cooperation. These leaders attend to influence the followers in achieving certain goals, with due consideration of the followers’ views as part of the negotiations. Moreover, they use their interpersonal skills to motivate and persuade their followers. Although the transactional leader may have a certain direction for the future, having this vision known is not imperative for effective transactional leadership. A short-term focus tends to ensue in this kind of leadership, alongside the maximisation of immediate results (Avery, 2004).

Using the multiple regression fit model, it was revealed that a statistical significance exists between the organic leadership style and employee motivation in the public sector, suggesting that this leadership style influences employee motivation positively. The hypothesis “Leadership styles influence the level of employee motivation in Omani public sector” was therefore partly accepted. The result for the private sector is different, where classical, visionary, and organic styles of leadership are said to be positively related to employee motivation, and only the transactional leadership style is negatively related to employee motivation (See Table 18). The literature abounds with the discussion of organic leadership, which provides high levels of motivation to employees. Avery (2004) explains that this is attributed by the fact that employee power is enhanced and very high. Thus, Memon (2014) finds out that employees have an opportunity to determine the direction of the organisation by being involved in the development of strategic objectives. The employees work in teams and groups and this help in creating increased levels of expertise. This makes the employees highly motivated and committed towards their work.

According to Shuck and Herd (2012), employees are not motivated when the leader adopts classical or transactional leadership styles, which draw negative outcomes; whereas when it is the visionary and organic leadership styles that the leader adopts, a positive
association between the motivation of employees and their perception of leadership tends to ensure. These different results about the classical and transactional leadership styles on one hand, and visionary and organic leadership styles, on the other hand, is in fact due to embedded assumption that the classical and transactional leadership styles are only appropriate for certain generations of people. Similarly, Keskes (2014) investigates the link between leadership styles and dimensions of organisational commitment, in which employee motivation may perceive to be embodied (e.g. Afshari & Gibson, Curtis et al., 2009). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership vary in the process of motivating employees by the leader.

**How Leadership Styles relate with Employee Motivation Vis-à-vis Age and Number of Years of Experience in Organisations**

The relationship between leadership style and employee motivation vis-à-vis age and number of years of experience in the organisations. The use of Pearson Chi-Square had been an appropriate one to enable establishing such relationship. A significant relationship exists between leadership and number of years of experience in organisations, and between motivation and number of years of experience. Some evidence to these findings is worthy of note; such as the study of Roos (2005) which posits that the number of years of experience in the organisation (job tenure) might be playing an important role in employee motivation. Findings also suggest that employees’ perceptions of work change as the they get older and the job tenure increases (e.g. Gkrezis and colleagues, 2011). Moreover, factors that motivate employees may likewise change as they gain more experience in the job. As many studies already demonstrated, employees’ work attitude tends to change in relation to demographic factors, including the number of years in their organisations. Research on career progression indicates that employees’ perception of work evolves in the passing of time. As people’s experience change, their job expectations also change. Job tenure has an influence on employees’ reward preferences and job security preferences. Similarly, increased job tenure denotes a corresponding need for employees to do something worthwhile in their jobs (e.g. Roos, 2005). Such interest to do something worthwhile is a good insight for citing a need for a specific leadership approach that the leader should employ. These studies support the findings in this present research investigation regarding the established relationship between leadership style and employee motivation vis-à-vis age and number of years of experience in the organisation.

Furthermore, the respondents identified various responses with regard to how employee motivation in both sectors may be further enhanced. The most number of these suggestions
was increased pay and remuneration, indicating that the respondents were more interested to have their salaries and benefits increased over other things, as a way to motivate them in their jobs. However, as the participants identified “more effective managers” as a way of further motivation in the workplace, the result suggests that they (participants) were aware of the need for an effective leadership style that harmonises with the employees’ motivation dimensions.

This is indicative of the fact that monetary factors are not the only important considerations for motivating employees (Al-Harthy, 2008). It also means that the public and private sectors of Oman should pay attention to the prevailing theories of motivation vis-à-vis various leadership styles when designing an appropriate HR strategy to motivate employees.
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