

Peer Review

Review of: "The Moderating Effect of Leadership Style on the Relationship between Employee Monitoring and Employee Outcomes"

Rudolf Siegel¹

1. Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

I would like to thank the authors for exploring such an interesting and important topic. The relationship between electronic surveillance, the organisational context, and how it shapes employees' behaviour and perceptions is still not well understood.

However, I see multiple severe issues in the current version of the article:

- The authors invite human resource managers to propose ideas on the motivations behind employees' behaviours and perceptions regarding electronic monitoring. While this is not an issue on its own, the authors should explicitly state this in the abstract and the introduction. It should be clear that employees were not directly surveyed on their perceptions of electronic monitoring; their views were gathered through other people.
- Additionally, the authors try to identify relationships between electronic monitoring, employee outcomes, and leadership styles by asking their participants for these relationships. I think the authors should discuss the limitation that participants' beliefs about these relationships might not be equivalent to the actual relationships. The relationships might look different if they were examined quantitatively in a moderation analysis.

The following articles might be a good starting point for more insights into this differentiation:

- Petter Johansson, Lars Hall, Sverker Sikström, Betty Tärning, and Andreas Lind. How something can be said about telling more than we can know: On choice blindness and introspection. *Consciousness and cognition*, 15(4):673–692, 2006.

- Norbert Schwarz. Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American psychologist*, 54(2):93, 1999.
- In the article, the differences between qualitative and quantitative aspects of the work are confusing. In the introduction and theory sections of the article, I get the impression that the authors want to examine the relationship of electronic monitoring and employee outcomes. In addition, how this relationship is moderated by different leadership styles. Thus, I expect a quantitative moderation analysis of these variables.

However, in the results section, the authors provide mostly a qualitative analysis supported by some distributions to a few rating scales. However, this qualitative approach does not fit the explanatory approach as indicated by the hypotheses. In addition, a qualitative analysis is not adequate to examine moderations.

Thus, I would like to suggest to the authors to be clearer in their description and analysis of whether they want to conduct a qualitative or quantitative study. It should also make clearer what type of data fits the respective approach.

The following articles might help in making this distinction:

- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford publications.
- Ahmad, S., Wasim, S., Irfan, S., Gogoi, S., Srivastava, A., & Farheen, Z. (2019). Qualitative v/s. quantitative research-a summarized review. *Population*, 1(2), 2828-2832.

Structure of the Article

I think it is a bit unconventional to present the hypotheses and then present the framework on which the hypotheses are based. I think it's easier to follow the argumentation if the framework is presented first and then the hypotheses.

Detailed Notes

Abstract

- Please make clear whether this is a quantitative or qualitative study.

Introduction

- “This then may imply that the leadership of an organisation influences its overall performance; its character reflects the expectations it has for its employees.” → I don't see how this implication follows from the previous paragraph. I would suggest to the authors to make the relationship clearer.
- “If specific qualities are desired from employees, the leadership should exemplify those same qualities.” → I'm not sure how this sentence relates to the rest of the paragraph.

Conceptual Framework

- Figure 1: The authors posit leadership style as a moderator. Thus, I think it would be better to present the leadership style in the figure between “employee monitoring” and “employee outcomes” instead of being a result of “employee outcomes”.

Research Method

- I think the authors should provide more details on how the sample was gathered and provide key characteristics of the sample (country, gender, age, years of experience, etc.).
- “The researcher explained that data would be saved on the cloud to minimise unauthorised access.” → I do not understand how the usage of cloud storage minimizes unauthorised access. The authors should provide more details on how this relates to each other.
- “To guarantee that responses remained anonymous and confidential, the researcher employed codes (P1-P20) instead of names. It was ensured that the participants consented to these terms before being involved in the study.” → The authors stated above that data from 203 participants were collected. Why do the codes reach only from 1 to 20?
- I think the authors should make it clearer which people participated in the quantitative part (online survey) and the qualitative part (interview + open-ended question on an online survey).

Results

- “The responses indicated that most organisations (75%) had some form of EMTs, suggesting a global trend.” → How did the authors come to the conclusion that EMTs are a global trend? Was

their sample from all over the world? I think it's a bold statement to generalize from 203 participants to a global phenomenon.

- Table 1: Where does the purpose of the surveillance method come from? Is this an interpretation from the authors, or have participants stated these purposes? Have all participants agreed on these purposes?

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.