

# The Relationship Between Leadership Style and Managers' Communication Patterns on Employee Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment


Elahe. Marhouni<sup>1</sup>, Samira. Pali<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MSc Student of Industrial Organizational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor of Educational Management, Department of Educational Sciences, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: samirapali624@gmail.com

## Editor

Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti<sup>1</sup>  
Educational Administration,  
Faculty of Psychology and  
Educational Sciences, Semnan  
University, Semnan, Iran  
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Ali Sargolzaie<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Zahedan, Iran.

Email: a.sargolzaie@iauzah.ac.ir

**Reviewer 2:** Alireza Rajabipoor Meybodi<sup>1</sup>

Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Yazd University,  
Yazd, Iran

Email: Rajabipoor@yazd.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The first paragraph mentions "individual characteristics" and "workplace conditions" as factors influencing job performance. Adding recent references to support these factors would strengthen this statement and align it with contemporary research.

The exclusion criteria mention "non-cooperation with the researcher." Specifying how "non-cooperation" was defined and identified would improve transparency.

Including a description of how the study addressed potential biases in data collection or analysis, as part of ethical considerations, would improve the rigor of the methodology.

The Communication Skills Questionnaire is described but lacks justification for its selection. Including a rationale for choosing this specific instrument over others would be beneficial.

The description of scoring ranges (e.g., 42-84 for poor performance) is clear. However, adding a citation or theoretical basis for these scoring cutoffs would help validate them.

The conclusion could be strengthened by providing specific recommendations for managers on how to implement effective leadership styles and communication patterns based on the findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

"The use of modern technologies and digital tools in the workplace can contribute to improved productivity and performance." This claim could be expanded by mentioning specific types of digital tools (e.g., collaborative software) relevant to the study's context (Pardis Petrochemical Company).

The paper states that 280 individuals were sampled. Please clarify whether any efforts were made to ensure diversity in terms of demographics, as this would affect the generalizability of the findings.

The results of skewness and kurtosis tests for normality are briefly mentioned. Providing visual representations, such as histograms, would enhance understanding of the data distribution.

The  $R^2$  values are presented in Table 2. Interpreting these values directly within the text would improve clarity and help readers understand the predictive power of each variable.

"Managers who regularly provide constructive feedback and promote empathetic communication can enhance employee job satisfaction." Expanding on how "empathetic communication" was measured or observed would make this point more concrete.

The discussion references prior studies that align with the current findings. Including counterexamples or studies with differing results would provide a more balanced discussion.

The paper acknowledges the use of a questionnaire but does not discuss potential self-report biases. Addressing how self-report bias was mitigated or controlled would improve methodological rigor.

Since the study focuses solely on Pardis Petrochemical Company, discussing potential limitations in generalizing findings to other industries would be valuable.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.