

Results

Factor analysis-Analysis and model-Model improvementImprovement

Initial EFA extracted ~~7~~ **seven** factors for LB and 10 factors for QWL. While the factor structure was generally consistent with the designed questionnaires, there were **several many** items ~~not having been~~ clustered to the same factors as in the scales. We grouped the factors according to the questionnaires to examine ~~scales'~~ **factors'** internal consistency reliability.

Regarding LB, the Chronbach's alpha for all items was 0.861. The internal consistency was found adequate for **5** factors, ~~but except the~~ factors of 'Clarifying Vision and Expectations' and 'Motivating Sub-ordinates', **which** showed insufficient reliability ($\alpha < 0.7$). Regarding QWL, ~~the~~ Chronbach's alpha for all items was 0.78. The internal consistency was found adequate for **5** factors ~~except that~~, ~~but~~ factors 'Job Familiarity', 'Skill Development and Use', and ~~"Work Stress"~~ showed insufficient reliability ($\alpha < 0.7$).

To develop more reliable scales, **an** iterative cycle of model modification was run for each construct, and at each run, a single item ~~which that~~ had low factor loading and communality was dropped ~~from~~ the scale. The criteria for stopping the procedure were communalities and factor loadings ~~> of more than~~ **0.5** ~~for all items~~. The criteria were met for the constructs after removal of **8** items from LB, and **9** items from QWL. In the LB model, 'In-person P-person Recognition' and 'Motivating Employees' grouped into a single factor ~~resulting resulting~~ in a scale ~~with with~~ 29 items clustering into **6** ~~six~~ factors (see Table 2). In the QWL model, the model reduction led to merger of ~~"Job Familiarity"~~ with ~~"Feedback"~~ and merger of ~~"Skill Development and Use"~~ with ~~"Carrier Growth Opportunity"~~. **The Hence, the** final model ~~hence~~ consisted of 29 items clustered into **7** ~~seven~~ factors (see Table 2). Three items from the LB ~~scalescale~~ and two items from the QWL scale were not grouped with pre-allocated factors. To facilitate interpretation of data, **we grouped these items with the designated factors** during model validation and measurement ~~process we grouped these items with the designated factors~~. We assumed that this relocation would not have considerable effect on the results.

The resulting models were validated against the second half of data using CFA. Goodness-of-fit indices suggested adequate fitness of both models to data with GFI = 0.82, CFI = 0.93, TLI = 0.84 and RMSEA = 0.073 for LB model, and GFI = 0.78, CFI = 0.88, TLI = 0.91 and RMSEA = 0.057 **for the** QWL model. Reliability analysis of the improved model identified adequate levels of internal consistency for all factors ($\alpha > 0.7$) (see Table 2).

Survey resultsResults

The average score of LB was ~~obtained~~ **3.92** with the scores of dimensions varying **in** ~~between~~ **3.52** and **4.20**. The highest score was ~~received~~ **obtained** by 'Leader's Personal Characteristics and Management Style' (4.20), followed by 'Treating Subordinates with Trust

Comment [MP12D73]: کمی غیر معمول به نظر می رسد که در یک عبارت کوتاه بعضی اعداد با حرف و بعضی دیگر با عدد بیان شوند. قانون مربوط به اعداد کوچکتر از ۱۰ را اطلاع دارم ولی یکنواخت بودن عدد گذاری هم مهم است. نظر شما چیست؟

Comment [SMM63]: Check with your journal. To my knowledge the numbers law is superior.

Comment [MP2D64]: Not being or not having been? Or better to say: there were several factors that were not clustered to...

Comment [SMM65]: Same meaning

Comment [MP2D66]: In or within?

Comment [MP2D67]: It is a problematic structure.

Should we use 'all factors' then we could use 'except'. But we already specified a certain number (5), thus we cannot use 'except' here. Please re-consider the sentence structure. What was the problem with the original sentence?

Comment [SMM68]: I don't understand your intention here. I'll leave this to you to decide.

Comment [SMM69]: Check use of symbol α or spelled-out name

Comment [MP2D70]: Again above-mentioned problem. 'Except' can be imply the exception to all but not five factors.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [MP2D71]: I think resulting is correct. Please re-consider the structure. The gerund form conjuncts the phrases.

Comment [MP2D72]: What was the problem with 'with'? Scale with 29 items?

Comment [SMM73]: Some modifications are a matter of style of writing.

Comment [SMM74]: Both are acceptable.

Comment [MP2D75]: Between or in between?