

Review of: "Toxic Leadership Leads to White-Collar Crimes in Autonomous Higher Education Institutions"

Marianne Jennings¹

¹ Arizona State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

REVIEW: Toxic Leadership Leads to White-Collar Crimes in Autonomous Higher Education Institutions

This sentence in the abstract should be reworded slightly: In this 21st century, most of the world-class universities have excellent educational leaders who have follow ethical standards, apply equity principles, possess equity, integrity, and create a culture to improve their institutions and expand their global outreach.

Likewise with the second sentence in the first paragraph.

~~develop~~ Those universities with outstanding leaders further their universities' reputation and standards through the practices of with-ethics and, integrity, principles of equity, and culture supportive of these characteristics. ~~excellent global universities~~

I am not sure that this sentence "Unfortunately, many other institutions are led by toxic leaders who believe in their discretion in making decisions and focus on self-growth."

reflects what is in the long string of citations. The issue I have is with the terminology. The research cited all has differing terms: "discretion" in decision-making and the focus on self-growth are not the key characteristics in these studies. For example, the first article cited deals with abusive behavior toward faculty and staff. And the citations deal with different terms such as "destructive leadership," – not toxic leadership, which is an evolved term. So, the paper needs to focus on the components of "bad" leadership it is addressing and limit citations to those articles with similar terms. For example, in an article from the same period (2007)

Researchers have proposed a number of concepts that arguably fall within the domain of destructive leadership that is aimed at subordinates. These include "abusive supervisors" (Hornstein, 1996; Tepper, 2000), "health endangering leaders" (Kile, 1990), "petty tyrants" (Ashforth, 1994), "bullies" (Namie & Namie, 2000), "derailed leaders" (Schackleton, 1995), "intolerable bosses" (Lombardo & McCall, 1984), "psychopaths" (Furnham & Taylor, 2004), and "harassing leaders" (Brodsky, 1976). Destructive actions directed against the organisation have also been identified (e.g., working towards goals other than those defined by the organisation), examples being Lipman-Blumen's (2005) concept of "toxic

leaders” and McCall & Lombardo's (1983) concept of leader derailment.

(17) (PDF) *Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model* Available

from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222819132_Destructive_leadership_behavior_A_definition_and_conceptual_model[accessed May 09, 2024].

I am just not sure the paper is clear on which type of leader can be connected with “white collar crime.” Then we move to the second problem, which is what definition of white-collar crime is being used.

However, the problems discussed above in the abstract and intro are overview issues because there are major problems with this research. The major problem with the piece – what is being labeled “white collar crime” – is not actually a crime. In the Norms, desired action, possible reasons for discretion chart, what is listed for “white collar crimes” are not crimes. Violating constitutional rights is a civil matter. There are civil and regulatory law violations such as not posting the positions as required – and there are situations in which the action taken was just unfair – these are ethical disputes and not white-collar crimes.

While there certainly is some correlation between leaders who are abusive, harassers, etc., and fraud in publicly traded companies, this piece tries to tie academic leaders to and their decisions to white collar crime. Their decisions may be bad, may countermand committees, and exhibit poor leadership, but they are not crimes.

If I were the author, I would write the paper as a discussion of leadership in engineering recruiting, advancement, fund allocation, etc. The fourth column in the chart would be the ethical issues. For example, if a leader rebukes an established process, the rules of the university are undermined and the stability of the faculty is threatened, but there are no crimes in the hypotheticals, and they certainly do not fit into the literature discussing the correlation between toxic leaders and white-collar crimes.

The other charts that reference prior research on white-collar crime are then not applicable because I believe there is an application of theory to 30 situations that did not involve crimes.