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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

We thank you and the reviewers for your comments which are very helpful. Please find our responses to the reviewer and editor comments below.

Sincerely

Kathryn von Treuer

1. Please remove the cover letter before resubmitting your manuscript.
Done

2. Please add the authors names and addresses to the title page, including indicating the corresponding author and giving their email address.
Done

3. Please ensure the Background has a title (Background).
Done

4. Please ensure that your manuscript contains a Declarations section, with all of the following subsections.

Done. This information has been placed at the end of the discussion.

Reviewer 1

5. I have no real change requirements but there are a few typos that require editing and one issue that you may want to explore further either in your research or in this manuscript.

Re-read the manuscript and removed typos.

6. I was surprised by the finding that the more work pressure in the workplace the more staff perceived a readiness for change. My sense would be that increased work pressure in the literature is generally associated with a higher degree of staff burnout and, therefore, less capacity / readiness for change. How do you account for your findings that the opposite is true?

This is the novel finding that was claimed. Some text was rewritten with one possible explanation. Readiness for change and capacity to undertake that change may be quite separate issues.

Reviewer 2

7. What is the definition of organisational climate? What are the factors to measure organisational climate?

Organisational Climate has been defined. The 8 factors that contribute to the OCQ scale, which was used to operationalise organisational climate are outlined. See page 4 of the manuscript.

8. Can you use a diagram to show the independent and dependent variables of the research model? Tell the reader what are your research hypotheses? What hypotheses were supported and what hypotheses were not supported by your empirical study.

Typically, the presentation of a hierarchical regression is not amenable to diagrammatic presentation, but rather, results are presented in a Table as reflected in Table 2. The presentation of the hierarchical regression is in line with widely used publishing formats such as APA and the Chicago style.

We had stated the hypotheses at the end of the introduction, however, we have re-worded hypothesis 2, to more clearly articulate that we expected leadership behaviors to contribute to organisational readiness to change above and beyond organisational climate. Hypothesis 2 now reads:
“Second, it was hypothesized that, transformational and transactional leadership behaviors would be positively associated with organizational readiness for change above and beyond the contribution made by organizational climate.”

In the first paragraph of the discussion, we addressed the hypotheses, however, we appreciate that this could be done in a more explicit manner. Therefore, we have revised paragraph one of the discussion for clarity. This now reads:

“The present study sought to explore the role of organizational climate variables and leadership style in organizational readiness for change in aged care facilities. It was hypothesized that organizational climate variables (hypothesis 1) and leadership behaviors (hypothesis 2) would predict organizational readiness for change. In relation to hypothesis 1, two of the eight organizational climate factors (i.e., work pressure and innovation) were found to be significantly related to organizational readiness for change. Thus, our first hypothesis was partially supported. In relation to hypothesis 2, only transformational leadership behavior (and not transactional leadership behavior) was found to predict organizational readiness for change. Thus, our second hypothesis was also partially supported.”

9. Method section: Please tell the reader explicitly the statistical analysis conducted on the data. Page 9 Line 10 to 42. This section describes the statistical methods used for data analysis, should be presented in the Methods section. The analysis results should be presented at the Results section.

We have moved the description of the statistical analysis used into a data analysis subsection of the end of the method. This section includes a description of the preliminary and primary data analysis.

10. Page 7. Line 22-23. It is written 'The subscale reliability has good internal consistency.' However, you have not yet told the reader how the reliability was measured.

Typically, the representation of internal consistency by way of the symbol alpha (α) indicates to the reader the statistical method by which reliability was assessed. However, we have made this more explicit by adding a line in the first paragraph of the method indicating the method of internal consistency applied to each scale. This reads:

“The study used several established instruments (described further below). For each of the established measures, the internal consistency (i.e., reliability) is reported through the calculation of Cronbach’s alpha (α).”

11. The introduction section that introduces the leadership style is not presented clearly. Please re-organise the sections. Need to provide the definition about transformational leadership and transactional leadership and the difference between the two concepts.

A brief section on the leadership model was added, which described/defined transformational and transactional leadership.
12. Page 8 Line 54 - 56. It is recommended to present a table to show the comparative results between two groups, management and non-management staff; the same for the comparison between the senior and junior staff.

We have added in further information into Table 1 which shows the comparative results between two groups, management and non-management staff.

13. Page 8 Line 56. A typo "for changed"

This typo rectified. Proof read entire document.

14. Page10. Line 22-24 "The findings of this study in relation to work pressure are novel". Explain further why.

This query seems to align with point 6 from Reviewer One. We have added & rewritten a small part of the text so as to explain this point.

15. The causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not clear without a diagrammatic presentation that are often used to illustrate such relationships in this type of research.

We are somewhat unclear on this request by the reviewer. The analysis conducted was a hierarchical regression. We did not conduct any causal variable modelling analysis such as a path model, nor did we assume some kind of causal relationship between the variables as is the case with mediation.

As noted in point 9 (which we re-iterate here) “Typically, the presentation of a hierarchical regression is not amenable to diagrammatic presentation, but rather, results are presented in a Table as reflected in Table 2. The presentation of the hierarchical regression is in line with widely used publishing formats such as APA and the Chicago style.”