Review of: "Protection against a Toxic Environment: Strategies for Planning the Radical Development of Engineering Faculty Members"

Natanael Karjanto[1]

1 Sungkyunkwan University

The paper presents a series of arguments related to the protection and fostering of engineering faculty members in India. It shows strength in its clear problem identification and calls for leadership with integrity. In particular, the research investigates the relationship between ethical climate, collective moral efficacy, team cohesion, and ethical leadership in higher education organizations. Surveying 364 university employees, the study finds that ethical climate influences ethical leadership both directly and indirectly, with collective moral efficacy mediating this relationship. Team cohesion also moderates the association between collective moral efficacy and ethical climate. The research contributes to social cognitive theory by illustrating how collective moral efficacy mediates the link between ethical climate and ethical leadership. It highlights the importance of fostering an ethical climate in higher education, which indirectly promotes ethical leadership, with team cohesion playing a critical role as a moderator. These findings offer practical insights for cultivating ethical leadership in educational settings. The following provides some remarks:

1. Problem Identification: The effective identification of issues in toxic academic environments is a strong starting point. The argument is valid, as it acknowledges real challenges faculty members face, such as bullying and innovation suppression.

2. Specific Examples and Solutions: The paper's provision of strategies is valuable. However, the lack of detailed analysis or empirical evidence weakens this argument. Without supporting data, it is unclear if the solutions are theoretical or have been tested with positive outcomes.

3. Emphasis on Stakeholder Support: Acknowledging the role of stakeholders shows a comprehensive understanding of

the ecosystem. It is a solid argument since institutional change often requires broad support. Yet, it may not penetrate deeper into the underlying systemic problems within the academic institution.

4. Strategies for Faculty Development: The argument for the necessity of faculty development through various initiatives holds merit and is backed by data. However, the argument lacks compelling strength due to the absence of direct examples from implemented programs and their impacts.

5. Quantitative Analysis: The use of survey data lends credibility to the argument about gender differences in development areas. The argument is weakened, however, by a limited sample size and a narrow geographical focus, which limits the generalizability of the findings.

To reinforce the argument and address critiques, the paper could benefit from several enhancements:

a) Include diverse and larger sample sizes that span various states or even compare international contexts.
b) Provide in-depth case studies or longitudinal data to show the efficacy of the proposed strategies over time.
c) Consider the influence of potential bias due to the author's background and ensure a balanced perspective by incorporating views from different levels of faculty and management.
d) Address systemic issues directly by exploring institutional policies, cultural norms, and leadership practices that contribute to the challenges faced by engineering faculty.
e) Strengthen the recommendations by citing specific instances where suggested strategies have led to measurable improvements in faculty well-being and career development.

In conclusion, while the paper sets out a valid and needed discussion on protecting and fostering engineering faculty growth, its argumentation could be significantly enhanced with a more robust methodology, greater sample diversity, and the inclusion of case studies that provide concrete evidence of strategy outcomes.