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

Edina Molnár[1]

1 University of Debrecen

Abstract Section Feedback:

The abstract appropriately addresses the objective of the study and the methodology. Consider briefly introducing the findings and implications/significance of the crimes/causes in the abstract.

Introduction Section Feedback:

The introduction has an appropriate flow. To improve the introduction, address the following:

- Don't paste the opening statement of the abstract into the introduction; consider substituting one for the other, or get a narrative hook to replace either.
- Consider defining the concept of non-violent crime offenses.
- "White-collar crimes in higher education, often characterized as non-violent criminal offenses, are typically committed by heads of institutions in educational institutions." Add citation.
- The introduction is too brief and does not fully address the background required for the variables.
- What is the geographical scope of the study?
- The problem statement lacks sufficient literature basis, citations, and a funnel approach dissection of the key issues.

Literature Review

The theoretical framework is lacking.

- The objectives and gaps are not clearly addressed and are not premised on scientific literature.
- The literature only has 7 recent sources (2018 to date).

Methodology Feedback:

- This paper considers 30 case studies collected from five autonomous institutions and the white-collar crimes committed by 15 toxic leaders. What was the distribution of these 15 cases? Did any one of the five institutions demonstrate a higher frequency? What was the criteria?
- "A SWOT analysis has to be undertaken to suggest strategies to resolve white-collar crimes in engineering institutions." The rationale and weighting criteria are unclear.
- I recommend that you consider the IFE & EFE matrices.

Results and Discussion:

The study findings are clearly presented and discussed. The paper needs additional recent literature to support the discussed results, especially because the discussions were not founded on any specific literature, including the literature cited under the literature review section. At the end of the paper, the discussion circles back to the introduced issues and the problem statement.

Overall Feedback:

Thank you for your paper; the topic is appropriate and relevant. The key arguments under discussion of findings should be anchored more in current research.

Overall, the article is simply written; the case studies are well done and easy to understand.

Citation and References:

The references are relevant. More literature (2018-date) should be added.