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Introduction
This Resource Bank was developed with the support of an SMC Fellowship to address the issue of workplace civility and mistreatment. As part of the Fellowship, I received intensive training at the Workplace Bullying Institute in Bellingham, Washington. This Resource Bank reflects that training as well as many months of exploring the work of scholars and educators in this field. The Bank contains links to videos and websites, along with periodical and scholarly articles on the topic of workplace civility and mistreatment.

The issue of workplace health is receiving greater attention by business and nursing professionals, scholars, and within academe, as the enormous costs of toxic work environments become clear. Costs include lost work hours, disengaged employees, greater health care costs, and expensive employee turnover.

Popular media tend to focus on the dynamic between Perpetrators and Targets, but workplace mistreatment is truly a group phenomenon. It is not a “personality conflict.” It tends to flourish within specific types of environments and, unfortunately, colleagues may unintentionally reward destructive behavior or may respond to Targets in unhelpful ways that add to their distress. Once a pattern of mistreatment begins, it is difficult to stop. Ultimately, the damage affects everyone in an unhealthy workplace.

But there is good news. Just as honor codes help to diminish academic dishonesty, civility codes (i.e., mutually agreed upon standards for acceptable conduct) can improve interactions and the work environment. For example, UC, Davis has developed clear civility standards and UMass, Amherst and Rutgers University have developed comprehensive workplace civility initiatives involving the entire campus community.
The phenomenon of workplace mistreatment is much discussed these days, and there are countless self-styled experts who recycle information that is “common sense” yet inaccurate. This Bank includes contributions from some of the most respected sources, scholars and educators in this field. Although there are still some controversial issues, the surveys and studies of mistreatment have yielded some highly convergent findings and a great deal is known.

Many of the resources included here address mistreatment generally and a number of them (especially the brief videos) are quite suitable for use in a classroom; I have also included several items that specifically address mistreatment and civility in higher education. This Resource Bank concludes with information on how two universities are addressing the problem.

Finally, I have developed a powerpoint presentation that specifically addresses civility and mistreatment in higher education that is suitable for faculty groups (about 45 minutes) and also a 20-30 minute general workplace presentation for classrooms. I am happy to give a presentation to your group on request.

If you have any questions about the materials, would like to discuss this issue with me personally, or would like me to give a presentation to your Department or to one of your classes, please contact me and I will be happy to do so.

Best Regards,
Lisa Farwell
Psychology
Students may have many misconceptions about the importance of civility for success in the workplace, for successful leadership and for the business “bottom line”. For example, many people do not know that the most competent workers are at risk for mistreatment in the workplace and about the role that inadequate training of management plays. The videos below go a very long way toward dispelling “bullying myths” and clarifying the importance of civility for long-term student success.

1. Incivility in the workplace and “the cost of bad behavior”. Search for *Christine Pearson Thunderbird* at Youtube or go to:
   Forms of incivility:
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c5UscVB4eCo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c5UscVB4eCo)
   Women vs. Men?
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RWmjP0pVQUU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RWmjP0pVQUU)
   Coping with Incivility:
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1GrGg8MU0yE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1GrGg8MU0yE)

2. An excellent, 12 ½ minute overview of workplace bullying by Qualia Soup. Search for: *Qualia Soup Bullying* at Youtube or go to:
   [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wAgg32weT80](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wAgg32weT80)

3. A short audio on the Typical Bullying Scenario from the Workplace Bullying Institute. Search for *Workplace Bullying Institute typical workplace bullying scenario* at Youtube or go to:
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQjUp_nDEsA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQjUp_nDEsA)

4. A short video on the four workplace bully types from the Workplace Bullying Institute. Search for *Workplace Bullying Institute bully types* at Youtube or go to:
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvPqSn-W7QY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvPqSn-W7QY)
5. A short video on what bullying is versus what it is not from the Workplace Bullying Institute. Search for *Workplace Bullying Institute what bullying is* at Youtube or go to:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q5IvyopCAr4

6. A short video on “Freedom From Workplace Bullies Week”. Search for *Workplace Bullying Institute freedom from bullies* at Youtube or go to:  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H4PvEZPXnrM

7. A brief review of research on the overrepresentation of psychopaths among bullies and why they tend to succeed in corporations. Search for: *Clive Boddy Corporate Psychopaths* at Youtube or go to:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tlB1pFwGhA4

8. A brief review of the positive impact of a leader’s “character” on corporate profits (good news: “character” can be taught!). Search for: *Fred Kiel Psychopaths* at Youtube or go to:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vqBPZR63vfA

9. A 45 minute highly informative and thought-provoking talk (followed by a 10 minute Q and A) by Johns Hopkins Civility Project Director P.M. Forni on “Choosing Civility”. An excellent resource for all.
http://www.iptv.org/video/detail.cfm/14297/ccd_20110205_conversations_civility_dr_forni
Online Resources:
(There are others, of course, but these are from leading experts in the field)

1. The Workplace Bullying Institute: 
http://www.workplacebullying.org/

2. Law Professor David Yamada’s Blog “Minding the Workplace”: 
https://newworkplace.wordpress.com/author/dcy1959/

3. University of Manitoba Organizational Researcher Sandy Hershcovis: 
http://sandyhershcovis.com/

4. The American Psychological Association (APA) Center for Organizational Excellence has an excellent resource bank: 
http://www.apaexcellence.org/resources/special-topics/workplace-bullying

5. Sociologist Kenneth Westhues’ website on “mobbing” (i.e., bullying by a group) in higher education. This site contains many excellent resources by a leading researcher on this topic: 
http://www.mobbingportal.com/index.html

6. *Myths and Misperceptions of Workplace Bullying* from Bullyonline.org, a well-known organization in the U.K. 
http://www.bullyonline.org/workbully/myths.htm
Books
Available at Amazon, etc; titles are abbreviated.

*Workplace Bullying in Higher Education.* (2013). Edited by Jaime Lester (George Mason University). **** Note: this is a brief and very informative collection of chapters authored by a diverse group of professionals.


*The Cost of Bad Behavior.* (2009). By Christine Pearson (Thunderbird School of Management) and Christine Porath (USC).


March 8, 2008

**Bullying more Harmful than Sexual Harassment on the Job, Say Researchers**

WASHINGTON—Workplace bullying, such as belittling comments, persistent criticism of work and withholding resources, appears to inflict more harm on employees than sexual harassment, say researchers who presented their findings at a conference today.

“As sexual harassment becomes less acceptable in society, organizations may be more attuned to helping victims, who may therefore find it easier to cope,” said lead author M. Sandy Hershcovis, PhD, of the University of Manitoba. “In contrast, non-violent forms of workplace aggression such as incivility and bullying are not illegal, leaving victims to fend for themselves.”

This finding was presented at the Seventh International Conference on Work, Stress and Health, co-sponsored by the American Psychological Association, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health and the Society for Occupational Health Psychology.

Hershcovis and co-author Julian Barling, PhD, of Queen’s University in Ontario, Canada, reviewed 110 studies conducted over 21 years that compared the consequences of employees’ experience of sexual harassment and workplace aggression. Specifically, the authors looked at the effect on job, co-worker and supervisor satisfaction, workers’ stress, anger and anxiety levels as well as workers’ mental and physical health. Job turnover and emotional ties to the job were also compared.

The authors distinguished among different forms of workplace aggression. Incivility included rudeness and discourteous verbal and non-verbal behaviors. Bullying included persistently criticizing employees’ work; yelling; repeatedly reminding employees of mistakes; spreading gossip or lies; ignoring or excluding workers; and insulting employees’ habits, attitudes or private life. Interpersonal conflict included behaviors that involved hostility, verbal aggression and angry exchanges.
Both bullying and sexual harassment can create negative work environments and unhealthy consequences for employees, but the researchers found that workplace aggression has more severe consequences. Employees who experienced bullying, incivility or interpersonal conflict were more likely to quit their jobs, have lower well-being, be less satisfied with their jobs and have less satisfying relations with their bosses than employees who were sexually harassed, the researchers found.

Furthermore, bullied employees reported more job stress, less job commitment and higher levels of anger and anxiety. No differences were found between employees experiencing either type of mistreatment on how satisfied they were with their co-workers or with their work.

“Bullying is often more subtle, and may include behaviors that do not appear obvious to others,” said Hershcovis. “For instance, how does an employee report to their boss that they have been excluded from lunch? Or that they are being ignored by a coworker? The insidious nature of these behaviors makes them difficult to deal with and sanction.”

From a total of 128 samples that were used, 46 included subjects who experienced sexual harassment, 86 experienced workplace aggression and six experienced both. Sample sizes ranged from 1,491 to 53,470 people. Participants ranged from 18 to 65 years old. The work aggression samples included both men and women. The sexual harassment samples examined primarily women because, Hershcovis said, past research has shown that men interpret and respond differently to the behaviors that women perceive as sexual harassment.

**Presentation:** Comparing the Outcomes of Sexual Harassment and Workplace Aggression: A Meta-Analysis, M. Sandy Hershcovis, PhD, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba and Julian Barling, Queen's University, Ontario, Canada; Saturday, March 8, 8:00 - 9:30 AM, Regency Ballroom - B6

M. Sandy Hershcovis, PhD can be reached by e-mail or by phone at (204) 474-9951

The American Psychological Association (APA), in Washington, DC, is the largest scientific and professional organization representing psychology in the United States and is the world's largest association of psychologists. APA's membership includes more than 148,000 researchers, educators, clinicians, consultants and students. Through its divisions in 54 subfields of psychology and affiliations with 60 state, territorial and Canadian provincial associations, APA works to advance psychology as a science, as a profession and as a means of promoting health, education and human welfare.
Ken Westhues describes how academics can gang up on unpopular colleagues — and alerts readers to the signs that an academic “mobbing” is in the works.

Twenty years ago, Swedish psychologist Heinz Leymann gave the name mobbing to this terror, taking the word from Konrad Lorenz’s research on aggression in nonhuman species. Mobbing of alien predators and sometimes of conspecifics occurs among many birds and primates. Something about the target arouses a fierce, contagious impulse to attack and destroy. Mobbers take turns vocalizing hostility and inflicting wounds. The target usually flees. Sometimes it is killed and eaten.

Violent mobbing is endemic to our species. Harvard sociologist Orlando Patterson has analyzed lynching as a cannibalistic “ritual of blood.” Teenage swarming is similar, as in the murder of Reena Virk in Victoria, BC, in 1997. Her friends set upon her in a frenzy of bloodlust, reviled and tortured her, eventually held her head under water until she was dead.

Leymann studied the nonviolent, polite, sophisticated kind of mobbing that happens in ostensibly rational workplaces. Universities are an archetype. If professors despise a colleague to the point of feeling desperate need to put the colleague down, pummeling the target is a foolish move. The mobbers lose and the target gains credibility.

The more clever and effective strategy is to wear the target down emotionally by shunning, gossip, ridicule, bureaucratic hassles, and withholding of deserved rewards. The German word Todschweigen, death by silence, describes this initial, informal stage of workplace mobbing.

This is often enough to achieve the goal. Many targets crumble, flee to a job elsewhere, or take early retirement. Others surrender to the collective will, behaving thereafter like a dog that has been bested by another dog in a fight for dominance.

If the target refuses to leave or acquiesce, the mobbing may escalate to a formal outburst of aggression. Mobbers seize upon a critical incident, some real or imagined
misbehavior that they claim is proof of the target’s unworthiness to continue in the normal give and take of academic life. A degradation ritual is arranged, often in a dean’s office, sometimes in a campus tribunal. The object is to destroy the good name that is any professor’s main resource, to expose the target as not worth listening to. Public censure by the university administration leaves the target stigmatized for life. Formal dismissal with attendant publicity is social elimination in its most conclusive form.

In its more advanced stages, mobbing is rare. Leymann estimated that fewer than five percent of ordinary workers are mobbed during their careers. The percentage among professors may be a little higher.

In his comprehensive book on academic freedom, York historian Michiel Horn recounts some famous cases from Canada’s past of what would today be called mobbing. Biochemist George Hunter’s firing from the University of Alberta in 1949 is one example. Historian Harry Crowe’s ouster from United College in Winnipeg in 1958 is another.

My own research has been on recent mobbings in academe. About two dozen of the hundred or so cases I have analyzed are from Canadian universities.

Because McGill University closed down its inquiry into her death, the 1994 case of Justine Sergent is especially noteworthy. She was a successful neuropsychologist there whose adversaries positioned her on the wrong side of the local research ethics board. Sergent received a formal reprimand and grieved it. The Montreal Gazette learned of the dispute from an anonymous letter and ran with the story. “McGill researcher disciplined for breaking rules,” the headline read. The humiliation was more than Sergent could bear. She and her husband, Yves, wrote poignant letters the next day and then committed suicide.

My most detailed study has been of the seven-year mobbing of theologian Herbert Richardson at St. Michael’s College, University of Toronto. His formal dismissal in 1994 was the most publicized in Canadian history. The case is unparalleled in its complexity and documentation, and in the insight it offers into current cultural trends.

Other recent Canadian mobbing targets include theologian Hugo Meynell at Calgary, linguist Hector Hammerly at Simon Fraser, social work professor Kathleen Kufeldt at Memorial, and mathematician Jack Edmonds at Waterloo.
All these cases are contentious. Stigma, once officially imposed, is generally thought to be deserved. Like everybody else, professors want to believe the world is just. Academic mobbings are as hard to correct as wrongful convictions in courts of law.

At a practical level, every professor should be aware of conditions that increase vulnerability to mobbing in academe. Here are five:

- Foreign birth and upbringing, especially as signaled by a foreign accent;
- Being different from most colleagues in an elemental way (by sex, for instance, sexual orientation, skin color, ethnicity, class origin, or credentials);
- Belonging to a discipline with ambiguous standards and objectives, especially those (like music or literature) most affected by postmodern scholarship;
- Working under a dean or other administrator in whom, as Nietzsche put it, “the impulse to punish is powerful”;
- An actual or contrived financial crunch in one’s academic unit (according to an African proverb, when the watering hole gets smaller, the animals get meaner).

Other conditions that heighten the risk of being mobbed are more directly under a prospective target’s control. Five major ones are:

- Having opposed the candidate who ends up winning appointment as one’s dean or chair (thereby looking stupid, wicked, or crazy in the latter’s eyes);
- Being a ratebuster, achieving so much success in teaching or research that colleagues’ envy is aroused;
- Publicly dissenting from politically correct ideas (meaning those held sacred by campus elites);
- Defending a pariah in campus politics or the larger cultural arena;
- Blowing the whistle on or even having knowledge of serious wrongdoing by locally powerful workmates.

The upshot of available research is that no professor needs to worry much about being mobbed, even in a generally vulnerable condition, so long as he or she does not rock the local academic boat. The secret is to show deference to colleagues and administrators, to be the kind of scholar they want to keep around as a way of making themselves look good. Jung said that “a man’s hatred is always concentrated on that which makes him conscious of his bad qualities.”
Most of the mobbing targets I have studied were dumbstruck that such impassioned collective opprobrium could be heaped on them. They thought they were doing good work – as indeed they were, by standards broader than those locally in force. They trusted overmuch in reason, truth, goodness, and written guarantees of academic freedom and tenure. They missed the cue for when to shut up.

Mobbing is by now well researched and widely recognized as a workplace pathology. It is formally illegal in most European countries. Quebec enacted North America’s first anti-mobbing law in 2004. Such laws force mobbers to use subtler techniques.

Professors and other workers will continue to be mobbed from time to time. Most will be idealistic high achievers with loyalties higher than the local powers that be. Targets will be humiliated and punished – though less harshly than Socrates was. The academy has in some ways progressed.

*Kenneth Westhues is Professor of Sociology at the University of Waterloo. His books on mobbing include* Eliminating Professors (1998), The Envy of Excellence (2005), *and* The Remedy and Prevention of Mobbing in Higher Education (2006). *For web resources on academic mobbing, google* his name *or go to* mobbing.ca
Consider this scenario: You are now the head of a large unit in which you have been a faculty member for many years. Until you became head, you were not fully aware of the problems with one of your colleagues, Professor Choler. Now you feel besieged by complaints from staff members about his treatment of them.

You remember, over the years, having received Choler's periodic e-mail messages -- sent to the whole department -- complaining about one matter or another, but since most of them didn't affect you directly, you paid little attention. You also knew that Choler could be unpleasant at faculty meetings, but he didn't attend very often, and most of his complaints were ruled out of order.

Now both the messages and the conduct have become your business. In his typical e-mail message, Choler describes a problem, personalizes the fault to a single individual, and recommends a solution that usually involves humiliation, if not discipline, for that person. The people he targets (or, in some cases, their union representatives) are the ones complaining to you and demanding that you take action. In addition, a few faculty members have asked you to "get this e-mail thing under control". At meetings Choler uses the same general tactic, usually going after a particular person with strong language and in a loud voice. This makes some people so uncomfortable that they will not attend a meeting if they see him in the room.

There is no evidence in the files that anyone has ever spoken to Professor Choler about his e-mail tirades or his conduct in meetings.

What do you do?

Some difficult people are merely minor irritants: Others learn to avoid them as much as possible, and the overall working environment is not badly compromised. But a person who targets others, makes threats (direct or indirect), insists on his or her own way all the time, or has such a hair-trigger temper that colleagues walk on eggshells to avoid setting it off, can paralyze a department. In the worst cases, this conduct can create massive dysfunction as the department finds itself unable to hold meetings, make hiring decisions, recruit new members, or retain valued ones. When I first got involved in helping department heads cope with such people, my colleagues and I used concepts and approaches we gleaned from studies of bullies.

The bullies I have encountered in the academic environment come in many forms, from those who present themselves as victims, all the way to classic aggressors who rely on physical intimidation. In academe and other settings populated by "knowledge workers," one often encounters other kinds of bullies as well, including "memo bullies" (who send regular missives to a long mailing list) and "insult bullies" (destructive verbal aggressors).
Whatever their approaches, bullies are people who are willing to cross the boundaries of civilized behavior that inhibit others. They value the rewards brought by aggression and generally lack guilt, believing their victims provoked the attacks and deserve the consequences. Their behavior prompts others to avoid them, which means that, in the workplace, bullies are likely to become effectively unsupervised. I've seen secretaries, faculty members, and businesspeople who were so unpleasant to deal with that they were neither given the same duties as others in their environment nor held accountable for the duties they did hold.

Aggressor bullies fit the usual idea of a bully: They threaten to beat you up if you don't give them your lunch money. Victim bullies, in contrast, demand your lunch money because of some harm they claim you've done to them.

While many workplaces have bullies, institutions of higher education may be especially vulnerable to them because of some of the distinctive characteristics of academe. First, bullies flourish in the decentralized structure of universities: the isolation of so many microclimates, from laboratories to small departments, creates many opportunities for a bully to run roughshod over colleagues. Then too, the bullies of academe typically manipulate the concepts of academic freedom and collegiality with flair. The propensity of bullies to misuse these central academic concepts only adds to the importance of being well grounded in those concepts yourself. If you have a firm understanding of what academic freedom is and what it is not, you’ll be better prepared to cope with those who try to distort the concept for their own ends.

Another reason people in academe are generally unprepared to deal with bullies is that bullies are relatively rare. They are what is known as "low-incidence, high-severity" problems: one in which the problems don't arise very often, but when they do they are so serious that they can threaten the integrity of the environment.

For prevention of bullying, creating and maintaining an environment in which respectful professional interactions are expected and reinforced is the most powerful approach.

When unprofessional or uncivil conduct occurs in the workplace, it's important to nip it in the bud. The tone of your response should be nonconfrontational: "Oh, I'm sorry, maybe we forgot to tell you that we don't act that way here." Dealing with the problem head-on and promptly is critical. If someone is verbally abusive to staff or threatens physical violence, the appropriate penalty must be imposed. Any other response only erodes the trust of those who work hard to do the right thing. Similarly, ignoring or tolerating inappropriate conduct in the workplace sends the message that the way to prosper is to misbehave.

**How to Handle a Bully**

I once got a request from a department administrator (let's call him Holmes) for advice about how to deal with a visiting faculty member (and let's call him Cooper) whose contract was to expire in just a few weeks. Cooper had been verbally explosive all year, so people had learned to tread gently around him. But recently his volatility had increased, and a colleague who collaborated with him on research had begun to feel unsafe around him.

I asked Holmes whether Cooper had been informed that his outbursts were causing concern. Well, Holmes responded, "everybody knows" that that kind of behavior is unprofessional. I advised calling Cooper in, nonetheless, and telling him that his conduct was unsettling to his
colleagues and students. He'd be doing both Cooper and the intimidated collaborator a favor by letting Cooper know -- unequivocally -- that he was expected to control his behavior and to conduct himself professionally in all interactions with colleagues, students, and staff. People who are acting out need to be told clearly that there will be consequences for uncivil behavior.

Holmes acknowledged that this made sense. But what could he say, and how should he say it?

I've learned to recommend a three-step process: First, try to identify and describe a pattern in what you're observing. In this case, the escalating explosive verbal conduct is the pattern, and it intimidates others. It sounds like a bullying situation. Second, sketch out a general strategy. In this case, the strategy is to send the message to the offender that this sort of behavior is not welcome in this department or this university. Finally, it is tremendously helpful to outline the points you wish to communicate and practice how you'll say them.

Be sure your words convey the message that you expect him to change his behavior -- a warning that he is approaching, and has crossed at times, a boundary that must not be crossed.

After the conversation, you should send a cordial and factual confirming letter restating the gist of what was said. Some people's eyes work better than their ears, and you want to be sure the bully gets your message.

Let's hope no further action will be necessary. But if the bully’s behavior does not revert to the upsetting-but-tolerable category, your next response will be to call the campus police, who will supply a bit of what my colleagues and I have come to call "blue therapy": a talk with a uniformed (and trained) peace officer. I predict that, should the need arise, the interaction with the police will be both educational and therapeutic for a tantrum habit.

But many situations involving academic bullies date back years, if not decades. Problems with long histories are not quickly resolved. In fact, it generally takes more than a year to bring about significant change in a pattern of conduct that stretches back over years. But significant, positive change can be achieved, given the right mindset, some patience, and persistence.

The key to changing a bully's behavior is to change the environment. Most bullies have never been confronted with the consequences of their actions, or even been told that their conduct is not well regarded in their environment. Thus your task is to change the environment to begin attaching natural consequences to unpleasant behavior, and most of all, to remove any rewards it has yielded. This is the essence of the hard work to come.

It's not hopeless -- you can make a difference. True, taking action will not be without cost. But what will be the costs of inaction? Read more:

http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2006/11/30/gunsalus#ixzz2zOq8pkbV
Inside Higher Ed
My experience as a faculty member at two-year colleges, while generally quite positive, has not been all sweetness and light. One negative is what I’ve come to think of as “Claggart Syndrome.”

In Herman Melville’s novella, *Billy Budd*, the master-at-arms aboard the HMS Bellipotent — on which seaman Billy Budd has been impressed — is named John Claggart. Although Billy is beloved by the captain and crew for his good looks, his physical prowess, and his naturally sunny disposition, for some reason he arouses Claggart’s fierce hatred. Most readers quickly deduce that Claggart, himself a mean and miserable little man, is simply jealous of Billy’s appearance and abilities, not to mention the esteem in which the other crew members hold him (and in which they fail to hold Claggart).

“Claggart Syndrome,” then, is characterized by petty jealousy and irrational hatred. If you’ve taught at a community college for more than a few years, you’ve probably encountered that sort of thing — especially if you’ve accomplished anything of note beyond the narrow confines of your campus.

The core job responsibilities of a community-college faculty member are to teach your classes, advise your students, and serve on committees, and those are all worthwhile activities. Doing them conscientiously, over time, can bring well-deserved recognition, perhaps in the form of campus-based awards that will be perfectly acceptable to your peers.

But for faculty members who want to accomplish more than that in their professional lives, who want (and have the ability) to write highly regarded books or conduct meaningful research — well, quite frankly, a community college might not be the best place. And that’s a shame, not only because community colleges are otherwise great places to work, but also because we need people who achieve beyond what’s merely expected. They enrich the lives of our campuses and add great credibility to the work we all do.

At this point I should probably note that, for the purposes of this analogy, I am not casting myself in the role of Billy Budd. Instead, I’m thinking of a couple of people in particular — fellow faculty members at different institutions — who accomplished far more professionally...
than the typical community-college professor. And for that, it seems that some of their colleagues, who had not accomplished as much, could not forgive them. For daring to stand out, they were viewed with suspicion, shunned by former friends, and even verbally attacked.

The roots of Claggart Syndrome lie in the fact that community-college faculty members, almost by definition, are generally not great scholars, writers, or scientists, even though they might have dreamed at some point of making such noteworthy contributions.

And that’s fine, because you don’t have to be a great scholar, writer, or scientist to be successful at a community college. You just have to be a great teacher. The vast majority of my colleagues are completely at peace with the direction their lives have taken, happy and fulfilled in their teaching, their service, and their interactions with students.

Sadly, though, most community-college campuses harbor at least a few Claggarts — people filled with self-loathing because of their own perceived failures. And if you accomplish anything that makes the Claggarts appear unaccomplished by comparison, or that reminds them of those failures, they will do everything in their power to bring you down.
Faculty incivility can rear its ugly head at various levels within higher education institutions. It can surface at any one of the many administrative levels with administrators being the bullies, or it can be found within the faculty ranks with faculty members bullying each other. Interestingly, students can also be victims of uncivil behavior. Administrators, faculty, and students can play different roles in the bully culture: perpetrator, victim, or mediator. This article focuses on faculty incivility with the department chair as mediator, as well as faculty incivility to students, particularly graduate students.

The Chair as Mediator

Although chairs can be involved in bullying as the bully, as the one bullied, or as the mediator in a departmental bullying situation, this section will focus on the chair as a mediator between faculty members. This job responsibility often creates consternation in department chairs. At the same time they are trying to build camaraderie among faculty, they are also facilitators who are responsible for carrying out the institution's mission, liaising between the department faculty and higher administration, and making merit and promotion and tenure recommendations. These tasks can often be in conflict with one another.

Because chairs have a major impact on the future of individual faculty members, they must be able to recognize when a faculty member is being bullied and intervene to stop the bully while simultaneously respecting the privacy, professionalism, and integrity of the faculty member involved. Recognizing a bullying situation means chairs must be aware of the indications of a bullied faculty member as well as the traits of a bully.

Indicators of a bully include showing disrespect toward a faculty member and continually promoting him or herself. Chairs should also be aware of a faculty member who makes a habit of "secretly" informing them of departmental matters, be they manufactured or bona fide. That is, the bully will repeatedly initiate and/or perpetuate rumors. He or she may continually break the confidences of other faculty members and reveal highly classified committee proceedings. The chair must recognize this for what it often is: the bully's attempt to ingratiate him or herself to the chair in order to continue bullying without reprimands from the chair. It's an I'll-take-care-of-you-but-I-expect-you-to-take-care-of-me-in-return situation. A bully is also difficult to recognize because his or her behavior is frequently disguised as concern for the department in some way while it is actually promoting the bully's own personal agenda. Aside from ignoring the rumors and confidences shared by the bully, the chair must avoid contributing to the sharing of confidences. This will essentially "grant permission" to the bully to continue his or her inappropriate behavior. The chair must learn to recognize such behavior and not succumb to it. Not supporting the bully ultimately renders him or her ineffective.

The chair must learn not only to recognize bullying behavior but to discern the indications of a bullied faculty member as well. If a faculty member approaches the chair with assertions of being bullied, the chair must not ignore the individual. Bullying is frequently very subtle, and bullies are good at disguising their behavior in public settings. Often, the chair believes that the bullied faculty member is being paranoid, when, in fact, there is a genuine problem. If the chair is uncertain, he or she should avoid immediately dismissing the claim, but rather carefully watch for other indications that the faculty member is being bullied. The chair must recognize behavioral changes in the faculty member. Bullied faculty members frequently isolate themselves. They remain in their offices and talk with no one during the day. Because they often feel marginalized (and, in fact, may actually be marginalized) they rarely volunteer for service opportunities, be they departmental committees or other activities, and seldom engage in departmental discussions. They rarely participate in social activities with colleagues, even when sponsored by the department or institution. The work effort of previously productive faculty who are bullied may suffer. Research productivity may noticeably decrease, and
Once above-average student evaluations of teaching may suddenly drop. The constant pressure of being bullied might manifest itself as aggression by the bullied. The aggressive behavior will be misdirected, and this will be the clue for the chair that something is amiss. Bullied faculty members are likely to avoid the office and work at home more than usual. Any one or all of these changes should be an indication to the chair that something is wrong.

Among many other responsibilities, the chair must address bullying issues in the department. All faculty must be able to trust the chair, believe that their work will speak for them, and that rewards will be allocated based solely on productive work, evaluated both for quality and quantity. To prevent or minimize bullying, chairs must be focused on their department, not on themselves or on matters outside the department or institution. Chairs must be very careful not to inadvertently reward bullying behavior. At the beginning of each academic year the chair should establish a code of behavior encouraging courtesy and respect and discouraging yelling and arguing and promulgating rumors. If rumors do circulate, the chair is responsible for seeking the truth and thwarting the gossip. The bully must be confronted and reprimanded.

The chair must be knowledgeable about internal grievance procedures and share workplace harassment policy with new faculty. The chair's job is to ensure that faculty work together to understand the institution's policies and procedures and to develop departmental policies and procedures. This cannot be done without establishing common ground within the department. If bullies in the department are only concerned with their own welfare, the goal of common ground or community will be impossible. The chair must protect the tenured as well as nontenured faculty. It is a mistake to believe that bullies go after only nontenured faculty. Faculty members who have only their self-interests in mind and are not concerned with the successes or accomplishments of other faculty will bully anyone they feel is in their way, be the person tenured or not. Above all, the chair must be cognizant of the signs of bullying and be willing to address the behavior as a problem.

Conclusion

Although we have discussed two different levels of incivility in this article, the indicators of victimization and the solutions for the prevention of bullying are the same regardless of who is being bullied and who is doing the bullying. Victims of bullying, be they faculty members or graduate students, generally retreat into their own world. They become silent, fearful of repercussions or being seen as a whiner or troublemaker. Providing an environment in which the victim feels comfortable to share what is happening is the first step toward minimizing bullying behavior. Another major step is to establish formal policies against bullying, including the actions to be taken to eliminate the behavior. The policy must also include a process by which the bullied can seek help without fear of retribution by the bully. Finally, the policies and processes contained therein must be made available to everyone, even discussed with new faculty and graduate students, so they feel comfortable in the environment and confident that someone will intervene if incivility occurs. The department chair plays a pivotal role in facilitating this process.
The Following pertains to Sexual Harassment, but the phenomenon of Double-Victimization affects Targets of other types of workplace mistreatment.

Study Shows Sexual Harassment Leads to Double-Victimization in the Workplace
(Press Release from David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah).

Approximately 50 percent of women experience some form of sexual harassment in the workplace at some point during their career.

As shocking as that number is, perhaps more so is the fact that many of those women find themselves doubly victimized through the reactions of judgmental coworkers who might think the victims didn’t do enough to stop the harassment, or that they somehow “asked for it,” depending on how the victim responded to the situation.

A new study co-authored by the University of Utah’s Kristina A. Diekmann, a professor in the David Eccles School of Business, illustrates how “passive” victims of sexual harassment in the workplace—women who don’t aggressively and directly respond to a harassment situation, or even report it afterward—are often unfairly condemned by coworkers, to the point where their peers wouldn’t recommend them for a job or want to collaborate with them on projects in the workplace.

More importantly, the research paper—“Double-victimization in the Workplace: Why Observers Condemn Passive Victims of Sexual Harassment,” scheduled for publication in an upcoming issue of Organization Science—shows how this condemnation by coworkers can be attenuated.

The Anita Hill case offers a classic example of a passive victim. Hill’s claims of repeated sexual harassment by Clarence Thomas during his U.S. Supreme Court confirmation hearings in 1991, and her own perpetual inaction at the time of the alleged events, led to public suspicion and condemnation of Hill among many observers.

A similar thing happens on a micro scale in the everyday work environment of businesses across the country. Diekmann and her co-authors Sheli Sillito-Walker of BYU, Adam Galinsky of Columbia, and Ann Tenbrunsel of Notre Dame found that people harshly judge passive victims based on how they believe they themselves would react if put in a similar situation.

“The problem with this is that people’s predictions and forecasts of what they would do are often wrong,” Diekmann said. “While most people predict they would take immediate action against a harasser—report them, walk out, tell them to stop—most victims of sexual harassment don’t take any action and remain passive.

“As a consequence, because people mis-predict that they would take action against the harasser, they condemn the victim who remains passive and socially distance themselves from that victim. So, sexual harassment victims are double-victimized, once by their harasser, and twice by their colleagues who condemn them for remaining passive.”

Such double-victimization is clearly bad for the victim involved, as well as the work environment. Victims of sexual harassment often suffer from reductions in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance and productivity, as well as increased depression and anxiety. Moreover, the condemnation from coworkers adds to social undermining in the workplace.

Diekmann and her co-authors show that condemnation by colleagues of a passive sexual harassment victim can be attenuated through better understanding of the situation the victim is experiencing. Helping co-workers consider the motivations of the victim who remains passive, such as how much they might need the job, or their desire to get along with others in the workplace, creates a more supportive environment for victims.

Businesses can help reduce such condemnation via improved training, according to Diekmann and her co-authors.

“We recommend that organizations not just focus on ways to reduce sexual harassment, but to also address the psychological processes affecting the organizational response to the victim by coworkers, HR administrators and managers,” Diekmann added.

In particular, the authors recommend that training programs include awareness of people’s tendency to mis-predict what they would do in the same situation experienced by sexual harassment victims, as well as how those erroneous predictions affect coworkers’ judgment of and behavior toward the victims. Organizations also need to train employees how to reduce their biased perceptions and behavior.
Links to Scholarly Articles:
(These are available either online or through the SMC Library)

**Overview Of Workplace Mistreatment Generally and in Higher Education:**

[http://www.ccas.net/files/ADVANCE/Keashly_Bullying.pdf](http://www.ccas.net/files/ADVANCE/Keashly_Bullying.pdf)

**The Impact of Mistreatment on Targets:**

**How Bystander Colleagues Can Unintentionally (and Intentionally) Add To The Problem:**

**Motives and “Payoffs” for Mistreatment of Colleagues:**


**Females Derogating Females:**

**Legal Issues in Workplace Bullying:**
D. Yamada, The Phenomenon of “Workplace Bullying” and the Need for Status-Blind Hostile Work Environment Protection. Download from Social Science Research Network:
Strategies for Promoting Workplace Civility

A number of Colleges/Universities have developed and implemented strategies to promote civility, productivity, and well-being in the workplace. Here is information on three.

First, faculty/staff at UC Davis developed a “communication protocol” for faculty and staff after mediation efforts unraveled once faculty/staff returned to toxic environments. The entire protocol is reprinted on the pages to follow and may be found also at: http://www.campus-adr.org/CMHER/print/hooover4_1.pdf

Second, UMass, Amherst has recently initiated a comprehensive, university-wide program of fact-finding, planning, and intervention toward building a healthier workplace. An article on their work is the second document in the following pages.

Finally, Rutgers University is in its third year of a campus-wide civility initiative emphasizing respect, diversity, and compassion. They have a comprehensive website with multiple resources. It may be found at: http://projectcivility.rutgers.edu/about-project-civility
A “Communication Protocol” is a set of guidelines for day-to-day communication and informal problem solving developed in a mediation context involving a group of co-workers. These “Protocols” are most effective when developed with the full participation of both staff and management. Although difficult to achieve, in academic units the chair needs to participate. The more inclusive the group, the more the “Protocol” will reflect the culture and norms of the organization. Developing a “Communication Protocol” is typically done in a two to three hour session. The session is divided into three discrete subsections. The first consists of a 30 to 45 minute discussion led by the mediator describing various definitions of conflict, as well as, one description of the “stages of conflict”. * The emphasis is on helping individuals begin to focus on how they contribute to “conflict” in their respective organizational relationships. The second and most critical subsection is a group discussion of three questions posed by the mediator. This section takes from one to one and one half hours. The discussion eventually becomes the “Protocol”. The final subsection discusses the implementation process, which generally takes thirty to 45 minutes.

It is important to suggest that the group take some additional time subsequent to the session for reflection on the material developed. This additional time will insure the proposed implementation process does not in anyway disturb existing policy or union agreements. It will also allow those in the group, who need reflection time to compose and articulate their views, to do so.

**Historical Development**

The formal mediation program at UC Davis began in 1994. Although the Mediation program achieved a high percentage of agreement (90%), there were two problems that quickly emerged. The first was that many agreements fell apart rather quickly, when participants in the mediation returned to their workplace. The problems they had addressed in the mediation were typically generalized in their department, and the environment into which they returned was often very toxic. Immediately upon reentry various hostile “camps” would begin working to undermine the mediation agreement, very often successfully. The second issue was the reluctance of many individuals, or their departments to use mediation. They often wanted a more general problem solving approach that initially avoided any direct confrontation between individuals, or groups.

**Rules of the Game**

Have you ever gone to someone’s house to play cards or some game? As the game progresses, based on your understanding of the rules you announce “you win”. Suddenly the home owner announces with some annoyed astonishment, “oh no, you don’t win, that’s not how we play it here!” Nearly everyone’s reaction to the imposition of new unknown rules after the start of the game is typically somewhere between frustration and anger. The same situation arises in a work location when
individuals with widely diverging backgrounds come together to work. Typically, basic assumption about “how to communicate respectfully”, as well as, “how to respectfully address problems”, is seldom if ever discussed. The result is not unlike the situation described above. If individuals interact, they are surprised, if not annoyed that their coworkers behave so badly. The assumption is of course, that there is some a priori understanding and agreement on “the rules of the game” for communication and problem solving. The manner in which people interact is so unacceptable that those involved become stuck on how they are communicating, rather than being able to focus on what the issues are about which they are concerned.

* For information see: Human Resource Management in the Hospitality Industry, Frank M. Go, Mary L. Monachello, Tom Baum; John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1996

The development of these “Protocols” has been effective in addressing both the reluctance of departments who are more comfortable with an initial indirect approach to problem solving, as well as, insuring that individuals returning to a department have a greater chance of making the implementation of their agreement successful.

Process for Development of a Communication Protocol
The manager of a department notifies those who will be attending of the time, date and location of the two to three hour session. The purpose of the session typically is described as follows:

The purpose of this session is for the group to develop a “Communication Protocol” for all employees in the department to use, when appropriate, for respectful communication and effective conflict management. Using material provided the group will develop a set of guidelines (Protocol) that reflects the culture and needs of each of us as individuals or those of our group. Once the session is completed, a draft will be circulated to the group for additional comment. Once this comment period has ended, the remarks will be incorporated, and the new “Protocol” will be distributed, posted on the department’s bulletin boards, and provided to all employees as part of their orientation. It should be seen as an evolving document that will be periodically revised on an annual basis to reflect the evolving needs of our staff.”

Normally, the session is mandatory, since it is during normal work hours, and does not take on involuntary discussion of any specific individual’s problems, complaints or grievances. The session is usually away from the regular work location. Casual coming and going during the session is not permitted. This is particularly important regarding the participation by the organization’s management. Such behavior is typically seen as an indication that the session is not important.

The two or three hours session for developing a “Protocol” is divided into three subsections.

Protocol Process: Subsection One
The first subsection begins by asking attendees to “think of the name of an individual in your organization who causes problems.” After a brief period for reflection, the participants are asked “who has thought of their own name?” Typically no one has.
This initial question begins a process for self-examination of how each person may contribute to problems in the organization. This is followed by a discussion of various definitions of conflict, ending with a customer service definition, suggesting that complaints are important “gifts of information”, necessary to allow for change. The soon to be developed “protocol” is described at this point as a mechanism or set of ground rules for “giving (or receiving) the gift of information”. The section then turns to a discussion of the “stages of conflict”. This discussion allows participants to see how conflict becomes individually and/or institutionally dysfunctional, including the development of “camps”. This latter point allows for a discussion of how mediation agreements are sometimes undermined by an individual’s friends within their camp, who may resist the reduction of conflict, if it is seen as devaluing the friendship, demonstrated by new behavior which is friendlier with the “enemy”.

Protocol Process: Subsection Two
Once the discussion of the didactic material is complete the second subsection begins. As a group, attendees are asked to respond to a series of three questions. Each question is followed by a discussion of the attendee’s thoughts and perceptions. The remarks are written of a flip chart for all to see and reference as the discussion unfolds.

The questions are as follows:
1. If someone is having a problem with you, how would you like them to handle it?

2. If a coworker comes to you to complain about someone else in the department, what should you do?

3. If you have made a “good faith” effort to follow what was developed in #1 above, but you can’t successfully address the issue, what is your next step?

The group’s answer to the first question is always “come talk to me”. The dialogue that follows allows each individual in attendance to discuss what must be included in the “Protocol” to insure a safe and respectful discussion process. Typically, the items listed identify a comprehensive set of “rules of the game”, or ground rules, that allow individuals to get past process issues and on to substance. Sample agreements are provided in attachments #1 and # 2.

The answer to the second questions allows the group to develop alternatives to “camps”. It also identifies an alternative role to that of “gossiper”. Individuals can remain good friends with their old “campmates”, and evolve into coaches for developing their friend’s communication and conflict management skills.

The outcome of the discussion of the third question leads to a change in management’s role in the department’s informal problem solving process. Often the supervisor self identifies as the point for initiating complaints. This often creates an atmosphere where individuals give up personal responsibility for problem solving, instead “tattling” to the supervisor, who becomes a sort of ultimate parent. This tattling approach often evolves to the point where the “tattler” insists that the supervisor resolve the problem in such a way that the person “tattled” about will be unable to identify the “tattler”. This frequently evolves into a no win situation with the supervisor being unable to be sufficiently clear about the problem to insure the problem individual understands either the problem, or the expected outcome. Often the result is that the problem behavior continues, and the “tattler” now is able to
further complain “management never does anything!”.  

Typically, the outcome of this discussion leads to a change in role of management from “parents” to quasi mediators, who bring the parties together and helping them manage their conflicts directly.

Not surprisingly, the “protocols” developed by various groups are very similar. Attachment #1 and #2 are good examples.

**Protocol Process: Subsection Three**

The third section of the session focuses on the implementation of the protocol. In this section attendees are divided into small groups and asked to discuss assigned questions. As the small groups report back, their reports are written on a flip chart. The whole group then determines an implementation process that meets individual, organizational and institutional needs. Questions that need to be discussed are as follows:

1. Should the Protocol developed in the session be kept in draft form for additional review and comment by the group, if yes, how long?

2. When implemented should the “Protocol” be seen as a regular part of the departments operational expectations, or should it be a “pilot program”?

3. When and how should the “Protocol” be evaluated as to its usefulness, need for revision, etc.?

4. When implemented are there any organizational changes that need to be made or overcome?

5. How does the “Protocol” link to either the mediation or formal grievance processes?

6. (Optional for groups with union contracts) Are there any formal notice requirements for any of the unions.

7. Can or should the “Protocol” be a performance expectation for faculty, staff and graduate students of the department?

8. What do I, as an individual need to do differently if the “Protocol” is to be effective?

9. How are individuals new to the department to be oriented to the “Protocol”?

**Implementing Issues**

There are several issues to consider prior to the implementation of a new “Protocol”. They are as follows:

1. If you are in a unionized environment, the union may see the implementation of the “Protocol” as a change in working conditions requiring at a minimum official notice, if not bargaining. This would be particularly true if employees were to be evaluated on their adherence to the “Protocol”.
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2. The “Protocol’s” value is that it reflects communally developed “rules of the game”. Some managers see the end product as useful and simply impose it on other parts of their organization. This approach is inconsistent with the notion communal ownership and understanding, and typically leads to the imposed “protocol” being largely ignored.

3. The “Protocol’s” value is related to its being a document that reflect group norms and expectations. It must be periodically revisited and if necessary revised, or it will pass into oblivion as just another flavor of the month management project.

4. The “Protocol” is meant to address basic communication and conflict management issues. Participants should understand that certain issues such as allegations of sexual harassment, violence and “whistle blowing” are not covered by this process.

The First Protocol: A Case Study
The Davis Mediation Program came into official existence in 1994. The first actual “Communication Protocol” was developed in 1996 in the department of one UC Davis’ volunteer mediators. The mediator brought to the attention of her management group that she had observed some of the indirect communication and non-productive problem solving problems she had both learned about in her mediation training, and had observed as a mediator. She discussed the matter with the management team, who in turn advised staff of the process.

This department consisted of approximately 25 individuals including four management personnel. The entire group fully participated in the three hour session, and in a post session process of further editing and refining the material generated in the class. The “Protocol” was distributed to participants and posted on the department bulletin board. The “Protocol” is also used to orient new staff to the department’s behavioral expectations for effective communication and productive conflict management.

The “Protocol” has been in effect for seven years. Management of the unit describe the “Protocol” as “highly effective” and “has led to much more direct communication and depersonalized problem solving”.

Invitation
The Communication Protocol has been a useful tool at UC Davis. This year Mediation Services worked with nineteen departments to develop their unique “Protocol”. It is a tool that mediators are invited to use and give us any feedback which may help us with the evolution of this tool. Comments may be forwarded to ldoover@ucdavis.edu

Attachment 1
Communication Protocol
The following principles and ground rules have been agreed upon for communication and conflict management.

1. Deal directly with the person involved, unless it is a supervisory matter, in which case you should talk to the person’s supervisor. If, after dealing with
the person directly and you are unable to resolve the matter, then bring in the supervisor.

2. Appreciate that different communication styles exist.

3. Be civil – no yelling and no profanity.

4. Stick to the issue at hand – no “kitchen sinks” or irrelevant issues should be brought up.

5. Be aware of the work environment; use a private office when the situation calls for it.

6. Be honest and trustworthy.

7. Be consistent, especially when delivering your message to more than one party.

8. Don’t undermine by griping behind other’s backs. If you are brought into this type of situation as a third party, support our protocol by reminding the person to talk directly to the appropriate person.

9. Do your fact-finding, especially when representing the position of others in a critical manner.

10. Be willing to be identified if you have a concern or complaint; anonymous complaints will not be addressed.

11. During all aspects of communication, conflict management and decision making, separate the issue from the person. In other words, don’t personalize an issue when delivering or receiving.

12. When receiving a message, demonstrate verbal acknowledgment that you have received the message; avoid withdrawal, passivity or passive-aggressive behaviors.

The following protocol for decision-making was agreed to by staff.

1. Solicit input from the appropriate parties at the appropriate time. Different levels of involvement and responsibility will determine who is ultimately involved in the decision-making process. This step should be a proactive, information-gathering one without pre-judgment.

2. Acknowledge opinions/input and express appreciation for ideas. If information is known that has bearing on the decision, that information should be shared at this time, using language such as “Yes (acknowledging input), and (sharing information)....” A good faith effort will be made to address serious and legitimate disagreement.

3. When decisions are announced, provide information as to why the decision was made, including what the department/program/person’s needs are.
4. If an individual has questions, s/he is responsible for seeking answers from the supervisor or Program Coordinator.

Note: Factors that go into decision-making are often numerous and complex, and information will be shared to the appropriate extent. Recognize that there often exist constraints in decision-making including time, scheduling, budget, management prerogative, etc.

5. After seeking clarification, the individual staff member should express any remaining concerns or complaints in a timely (two-week period) way to the decision-maker(s). Anonymous complaints will not be considered.

6. Staff are expected to support the decision.

Note: It is important for everyone to trust that input was weighed in the final decision and for staff to be able to “get on with it” rather than always wait for consensus which may never be achieved. Consensus is not only not always possible, it is also not always desirable. It is also important to “let go”. If an individual finds him/herself in a pattern of disagreement with decisions and philosophies of the department, s/he can always pursue other available options.

Attachment 2
Communication Protocol

As a way of encouraging the management of the day to day conflict that is an inevitable part of life, this unit has developed a basic set of expectations regarding how individuals will go about handling workplace conflict. This alternative approach is a voluntary supplement to existing processes whose focus is problem solving.

1. If an individual has a problem with another person, all have agreed to go to that person first to discuss the matter. In order to insure the success of this direct approach, all agree to handle such discussions in the following manner.
   - Approach the person with whom you have the problem and ask to meet to discuss the matter; avoid approaching them in an “attach blame” mode.
   - Find a mutually agreeable time and place to meet. The location needs to allow the parties privacy.
   - Let the other party know what the general issue is you wish to discuss, when you set the meeting up.
   - Voice tone and body language must be civil and courteous.
   - Avoid personalizing the problem, focus on behavior. Attach the problem, not each other.
   - The conversation is to remain confidential until both agree it may be shared with others.
   - Ask open ended questions to promote discussion, rather than “interrogate by asking “yes-no” questions.
   - Listen, maintain appropriate eye contact, and keep an open mind.
   - Summarize the other parties concern to check for understanding before attempting to “solve it”.
Retaliation is not permitted.

2. If some approaches you to discuss a problem with a third party, remind them of #1.
   - If the person just needs to “vent”, listening with the intent of focusing the person with the concern on developing a #1 strategy is appropriate.
   - Pouring gas on the fire is not permitted.

3. If the parties have made a good faith effort to resolve the problem, and they are unable to find a solution, the matter may be referred to the next level in the chain of command.
   - Typically both parties will go together to discuss the issue with the supervisor/manager.
   - The same general conditions described in #1 are to be used to set up the conduct of this meeting.
   - The supervisor will listen with an open mind to both sides; acting as facilitator, rather than decision maker, when possible.
   - Decisions will be made on the basis of a principle that will be applied to all employees.
   - If the supervisor needs additional time to make a decision, all parties will come to a common understanding as to the specific time the response will be given before leaving the meeting. If the agreed to date cannot be met, all will be advised of the revised date.

Although this process is intended to promote direct one on one problem solving, if all involved agree, third parties may be present to provide support. If the third party is present to act as an advocate, traditional adversarial processes should be used in place of the above process.

Larry Hoover is the Director of Mediation Services at the University of California - Davis. He notes "I would like to thank Maureen Brodie for her earlier work and for continuing to collaborate with me on this process. I would also like to thank Sally Waters for her recent work with the "Protocol"."
The University of Massachusetts at Amherst has embarked on an ambitious campaign to fight workplace bullying, which a survey of its employees has found to be both widespread and a serious threat to morale, health, and productivity.

University leaders and experts on workplace bullying are hailing the effort, begun last year, as the most comprehensive ever mounted by one of the nation’s colleges. It involves both mandatory workplace training for all employees—including administrators, professors, and graduate assistants—and the establishment of a new adjudication body to handle bullying complaints.

"This is an area in which we hope to lead the way in attacking what we see as a very serious problem," says Randall W. Phillis, who has been involved as president of the campus’s faculty union and plans to speak about the effort on Monday at the annual conference, in New York, of the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

"The goal of this initiative," he says, "is genuine culture change on campus."

The campaign, involving the university’s administration and all five of its major employee unions, assumes that most workplace bullies can be taught not to behave
badly toward others—an idea that is debated by behavioral experts. It also, however, seeks to make clear that workplace bullying violates university policy, and is expected to provide for the disciplining of employees who have been found in grievance proceedings to have deliberately engaged in such behavior.

Other aspects of the campaign include mediation, training in bystander intervention, and the creation of support groups for victims of bullying. The 20-member committee overseeing it also plans to investigate whether there are any systemic causes of workplace bullying that need to be dealt with.

**Who’s Doing the Bullying?**

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst surveyed all of its employees in 2012 about workplace bullying. Those who said they had experienced it in the past two years were asked to indicate who had bullied them most recently.

- **My supervisor**: 38%
- **A co-worker**: 32%
- **Someone of a higher rank, but not my supervisor**: 25%
- **Faculty member**: 23%
- **Staff member**: 21%
- **Administrator**: 20%
- **Someone of a lower rank than me**: 8%
- **Undergraduate student**: 3%
- **Graduate student**: 3%

*Note: Respondents could mark more than one category of worker, so the percentages total more than 100 percent. The response rate among all 7,975 campus employees was 23.3 percent.*

*Source: U. of Massachusetts at Amherst*

"They are addressing workplace bullying in its totality," says David C. Yamada, who is assisting the effort as a professor of law and director of the New Workplace Institute at Suffolk University, in Boston. "It is much more," he says, "than simply asking, ‘What do we do when a bad situation arises?’"
Tough Problem

The question of how to deal with workplace bullying has long vexed colleges, which appear at least as likely as most other organizations to breed such bad behaviors.

Four years ago, two prominent organizations that provide alternative dispute resolution, the American Arbitration Association and the ADR Consortium, announced plans to urge the nation’s colleges to handle complaints of workplace bullying through the intervention of mediators or arbitrators. The idea ran into resistance, however, from experts on bullying who argued that third-party mediation is ineffective and may even result in greater harm for the victim, especially in cases involving a power imbalance.

Michael Clark, a spokesman for the American Arbitration Association, said last week that while his group never did establish a program to provide arbitration to colleges for workplace bullying, "we continue to do education events around this."

Joseph F. Connolly, who has been involved in the University of Massachusetts’ anti-bullying campaign as coordinator of the flagship campus’s workplace-education program, says arbitration is just "one of many aspects of what we are doing."

According to Fran A. Sepler, president of Sepler & Associates, a workplace-consulting firm, and an adviser to the Amherst effort, the appropriateness of third-party mediation in bullying cases "really depends on the nature of the bullying behavior" and whether substantial differences in power are involved.

Sorrow and Frustration

The Amherst effort arose in 2010, at a time of heightened public awareness of bullying at schools as a result of the suicide of Phoebe Prince, a 15-year-old girl who hanged herself after months of torment by other students at a high school in South Hadley, Mass.

Kathy A. Rhines, a former president of the Professional Staff Union at Amherst who also is scheduled to discuss the campaign there on Monday at the labor conference in
New York, says that, at about that time, she learned that workplace bullying was suspected to have played a role in the suicide of one of her union’s members. "We decided we needed to deal with this issue, that we were better than this," she says.

The UMass Amherst Campus Coalition Against Workplace Bullying was established by Ms. Rhines’s union, the campus’s chief administrative offices involved in handling workplace disputes, and the campus’s unions representing faculty members, classified staff members, trades and service workers, and graduate-student employees. The parties involved "came together out of frustration," Ms. Rhines says. "We all had our situations."

In a summary of events there written for this week’s conference, Mr. Phillis, the faculty-union president and an associate professor of biology, says the unions frequently received complaints of workplace bullying but "the resolutions we could provide were rarely satisfactory."

"If a resolution was reached at all," he writes, "the most common outcome was to move the target of bullying to another unit and away from the source of the problem," a solution that "was all but impossible" in dealing with faculty members and graduate students within an academic unit. "Rarely was any discipline given to the perpetrator of bullying," he says.

The coalition tapped a team of campus and outside experts to develop a survey on workplace bullying that was sent to all employees at Amherst in the spring of 2012. About 28 percent responded, with the sample being somewhat disproportionately female but fairly representative of the overall employee population.

The survey defined workplace bullying as "unreasonable behavior by a person (or group of people) that intimidates, degrades, offends, threatens, or humiliates a worker (or group of workers)." It said such bullying "negatively affects the physical or psychological health" of its targets.
Pleas for Help

According to a report on the survey, [4] 39 percent of respondents reported having experienced workplace bullying, and 48 percent reported having witnessed it, within the previous two years.

Nearly half of those who had experienced workplace bullying did not report it or otherwise seek help. Of those who reported seeking help, 17 percent said they had received none and 44 percent reported dissatisfaction with it. Many victims said their bullying had caused them emotional and physical distress and had reduced their productivity.

Kumble R. Subbaswamy, who became the campus’s chancellor as the survey numbers were being crunched, said in an email to campus employees last May that its findings were "consistent with those found at workplaces of all types" but that his campus "aspires to be something much better than average." His email said workplace bullying violates university policy requiring employees to treat one another fairly and with respect.

A campus symposium on bullying, held last December, was attended by more than 500 university employees—a number that Susan Pearson, an associate chancellor, calls "both gratifying and sobering." That event has been followed by mandatory workshops handled by Ms. Sepler, a workplace consultant whose interest in bullying grew out of handling discrimination complaints.

Ms. Pearson says the campus has devised a new grievance policy, now in its final draft, that offers employees who complain of bullying an option other than the current ones of going through administrative channels or a campus ombudsman. She says they can now turn to a "workplace-bullying board," with 30 members picked by the chancellor from union and student-government nominations, from which will be formed five-member hearing panels to determine if the university’s policy against bullying has been violated. The panels will make recommendations to a vice chancellor, whose decision as to a remedy can be appealed by either side of the dispute.
The committee overseeing the overall campaign plans to use an additional survey, as well as focus-group interviews, to see how well the campaign has worked.

Ms. Pearson says the campaign has focused mainly on educating people about bullying, its impact on victims, and the administration’s hard stand against it, out of a belief that most bullying is unintentional.

"Our objective here isn’t to punish the bullies," she says. "Our objective is to stop bullying."

Source URL:
http://umassmsp.org/u_massachusetts_mounts_assault_workplace_bullying
As part of the SMC Fellowship, I developed a powerpoint presentation (approximately 45 minutes) specifically addressing civility and mistreatment in Higher Education. I am happy to give this presentation at a Faculty meeting. I have a briefer, interactive presentation on the workplace in general that has worked well in SMC classrooms.