Workplace Bullying, Mobbing and Harassment in Academe: Faculty Experience

Loraleigh Keashly

Contents

1 Why Academe? The Culture and the Environment 3
1.1 The Culture 3
1.2 The Environment: Internal and External 6
2 Defining the Literature Domain 7
3 Prevalence of Academic Bullying and Mobbing 9
3.1 Samples: Who Is Asking and Who Is Asked? 9
3.2 Measurement: How the Question Is Asked 33
3.3 Determining Prevalence 35
3.4 Duration of Exposure 38
3.5 In Sum 38
4 Academe vs Other Sectors 39
5 Impact of Academic Bullying 40
5.1 In Sum 42
6 Responding to Academic Bullying 42
6.1 Target Responding 42
6.2 Witness Responding 43
6.3 Institutional Responding 44
6.4 In Sum 44
7 Relational Nature of Academic Bullying 45
7.1 Relative Power 45
7.2 The Actors 47
7.3 In Sum 51
8 Cultural Nature of Academic Bullying 51
8.1 National Culture 51
8.2 Disciplinary Culture 52
8.3 Institutional Culture 53
8.4 In Sum 53
9 Behaviour Does Not Speak for Itself: Contextualizing Study and Practice 54

L. Keashly (✉)
Department of Communication, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA
e-mail: l.keashly@wayne.edu

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019

P. D'Cruz et al. (eds.), *Special topics and particular occupations, professions and sectors*, Handbooks of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment 4,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5154-8_13-1

9.1 Research Implications 54
9.2 Measurement: What Is Asked Matters 58
9.3 Practice Implications 59
10 Conclusion 62
10.1 One Last Comment: Faculty as Participant-Observers 63
11 Cross-References 63
12 Cross-References to Other Volumes 64
References 64

Abstract

The culture of academe and academics has been characterized as hostile and cruel with campuses described as "rife" with bullying. In this chapter, extant global research on bullying in academe is reviewed to assess the validity of these characterizations. Given the central role of faculty in shaping the nature of higher education, the experiences of faculty as targets, actors and witnesses of workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment are the focus. The unique features of academe and the nature of the university as a "workplace" and faculty as "workers" as well as the broader social, political and economic context are considered for (1) how they shape the prevalence, nature, dynamics and impact of bullying, mobbing and harassment and (2) resultant insights that have value for the broader workplace bullying literature. Key insights include the status-based nature of bullying, the public and the state as powerful yet understudied actors and the critical influence of culturally shaped behavioural norms in defining what is and is not bullying, who should be involved in assessing and addressing bullying and the limitations of the policy solution. The chapter concludes with a discussion of future research directions as well as current and future practical actions for addressing and ameliorating these destructive and disruptive interactions.

"Bullying rife across campus"
—*Times Higher Education Supplement* headline, September 16, 2005
https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/bullying-rife...campus/198392.article

There is a pervasive belief that academe in general and universities in particular are hotbeds of conflict and, by extension, bullying (Barsky, 2002; Berryman-Fink, 1998; Twale, 2017). Academe has been characterized as a "culture of cruelty" (Farley & Sprigg, 2014), and academics, in particular, have been labelled as "mean and nasty" (Hiatt, 2008). The implication is that bullying is inevitable (and by implication unmanageable) given the nature (structure, processes, values, norms) of academe, its occupants and the (neo-liberal) university administration and (corporate) management (e.g. Canaan & Shumar, 2008; Chandler, Barry, & Clark, 2002; Twale & DeLuca, 2008; Young, 2017; Zábrodská, Linnell, Laws, & Davies, 2011).

To assess the basis and, hence, the validity of this belief, I will consider scholarly and relevant institutional and organizational literature from around the globe that focus on examining bullying and hostility in the academy. The experiences of faculty

will be the focus of this review because of their central role in the manifestation of the research and education missions of institutions, their partnership with administration (management) through shared governance and, more broadly, their positioning as public intellectuals commenting on the state of the world and specifically the dynamics of power and inequity (Keashly & Wajngurt, 2016). How faculty are doing and how they are feeling both reflects and has profound implications for the well-being and success of the institution and its members (including students), the state of higher education more broadly and society writ large (Scholars at Risk [SAR], 2018). A central influence on faculty experience is their relationships with administration (management), students, staff, their faculty colleagues and increasingly the public (e.g. Ferber, 2018; Shin & Jung, 2014; Trower, 2012). To this end, faculty experiences as targets, actors and witnesses of workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment will be discussed. The features of the university and academe as a "workplace" and faculty as "workers" will be considered for how they shape the nature, dynamics and impact of bullying, mobbing and harassment. This discussion will focus particularly on what is distinctive about academe and academics vis-à-vis other sectors and other workers and what this distinctiveness offers our examination of workplace bullying more broadly. The broader social, political and economic context within which academe exists will also be considered. While there is variability across countries, there is also a surprising degree of consistency in terms of the impact of these forces on the societal and institutional enablers of bullying behaviour (Eastman, 2018; Salin, 2003). I will conclude with a discussion of future research directions as well as current and future practical actions for addressing and ameliorating these destructive and disruptive interactions.

1 Why Academe? The Culture and the Environment

Discussion of faculty is a discussion of power and its roots in the culture of academe, the structure of institutions and the role of scholars and scholarship in the broader society.

1.1 The Culture

Academe as a workplace and academics as "workers" are unique among other sectors, and these unique features have implications for what is expected (normative) conduct for academics and, by extension, what is inappropriate conduct. These features also shape how and by whom inappropriate conduct is addressed.

Academe broadly and universities specifically are framed as *the* places for free and unfettered thought, which is viewed as critical for the development and refinement of knowledge and the vitality of a democratic society, that is, universities as a public good (Gabbert, 2014). The principle of academic freedom supports such inquiry by allowing faculty to pursue ideas and thoughts even if they may be controversial, unpopular and contrary to current thinking or narratives and to do so

without fear of capricious retaliation or sanction, particularly from institutional and state authorities. Academic freedom positions faculty as leaders in, and arbiters of, knowledge production, which is a very powerful position in crafting the narrative of education, research and higher education more broadly. Academic freedom is bolstered by the norm of autonomous functioning and the status protection of tenure or permanent, indefinite contract (job and economic security, albeit only for some faculty), features which are rare in other sectors. Thus, faculty as workers can be viewed as independent contractors with job security with all the freedom that entails to craft their experience and their environment (O'Meara, 2004; Twale, & DeLuca, 2008).

The communicative environment conducive to free and unfettered inquiry needs to be vibrant and free-flowing, with ideas promoted and challenged, enhanced or dismissed. Debate, argumentation, critique, disagreement and dissent are the discursive practices critical to this knowledge process resulting in the "cut and thrust" of academe discourse (Armstrong, 2012; Nelson & Lambert, 2001; Tepper & White, 2012; Tracy, 2011). To contribute to and operate in this communicative space, faculty are trained to be analytical, critical, challenging, argumentative and persistent. Tannen (2002) has referred to this environment as supporting agonistic aggression, with scholars competing to gain status by pointing out the flaws and holes in another's argument and work, that is, "rough-and-tumble" rules of engagement (Sternberg, 2015). These rules are quite different from the rules by which other workers both within the university and outside are expected to abide (Christy, 2010; Fratzl & McKay, 2013). Indeed, the conduct and speech that these rules permit/promote may be perceived as bullying, mobbing and harassment in other work environments and with other workers.

These "rules of engagement" and what is permissible are further shaped by faculty's distinctive position as leaders in the institution (Keashly & Neuman, 2013). The principle of shared governance uniquely positions faculty among other university workers as leaders alongside administration/management in the development and manifestation of the university and its mission. Such governance involvement and the associated power it entails are not typical for workers in other industries or, indeed, other workers within the institution. In this role, faculty skills in debate, argumentation and critique are extended to (and expected for) the realm of decision-making, challenging administrative decisions and administrators, frequently characterized as "speaking truth to power". Such conduct in other work contexts and within the university by non-academic staff would likely be construed as problematic and disruptive, framed as "insubordinate", even bullying and, thus, sanctionable. In academe and for academics, then, similar conduct can be framed as normal and indeed necessary (Bloch, 2012; Friedenberg, 2008; Nelson & Lambert, 2001; Simpson & Cohen, 2004).

"Power of the peer" is another unique element of faculty as workers. Academics are framed as a self-regulating profession managed through the process of peer review and collegial decision-making (Scott, 2014; Twale, 2017). Thus, faculty are empowered to craft their own work environment both individually but also as academic departments or disciplinary units. This framework positions faculty

colleagues as particularly influential in assessment of, and response to, faculty conduct and experiences. Indeed, peers are to be the arbiters of what is (in)appropriate, in the realm of ideas and knowledge and also in the realm of professional conduct (Braxton & Bray, 2012). This is not the case in other workplaces where co-workers are not vested with legitimate authority to manage each other's behaviour. Unfortunately, the ideal "power of the peer" as a cooperative and constructive enterprise among scholars often manifests differently in practice (Armstrong, 2012; Tannen, 2002). It cuts in at least two ways. First, "power of the peer" can be embraced as a way of asserting authority vis-à-vis colleagues in order to force conformity or silencing of these other faculty and their ideas. The ones who are often silenced in these ways are those that challenge by their mere presence (e.g. women, racial/ethnic minorities, LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning), disabled) or by their actions that contradict current ways of operating within the department, for example (Jones, Hwang, & Bustamante, 2015; Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piker-King, 2015; Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010; Saloojee, 2014; Twale, 2017). The faculty's positioning as evaluators in subjective processes such as mentoring, promotion and tenure, review of scholarly and creative work and selection of colleagues to join and continue in the department provides opportunities for exclusionary and derogatory activities to occur outside of others' eyes, allowing undue influence (Armstrong, 2012). This manifestation of "power of the peer" looks a lot like bullying in terms of misuse/abuse of power.

The second twist on "power of the peer" is when it comes to assessing and addressing a colleague's conduct (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). As Crouch (2016) notes in her analysis of the issues of sexual harassment and racial discrimination in the US academe:

> . . .there is very little in academe or the discipline that curbs this (abusive) behavior. We tend to leave our colleagues alone, not to criticize their behavior when it is abusive to students or to junior colleagues. . .the reaction of many colleagues, or bystanders, to the knowledge of such conduct is to do nothing. (p. 8)

The norms of autonomy and collegiality create a dilemma for faculty colleagues (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). In her study of beliefs regarding post-tenure faculty review, O'Meara (2004) found that faculty peers believed that giving feedback on a tenured colleague's behaviour undermines the other's right to choose their actions and direct their own work, including *how* they work. This feedback was viewed as not "collegial" because it violated norms of professional respect. The result is colleagues do not engage with others around their conduct, which can facilitate its continuance (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Thus, what appears as unique power and attendant social control faculty colleagues have with one another is undercut by their interpretation of the very norms that give them that power. This discussion of the "power of the peer" raises the question about who has the legitimacy to define and regulate faculty behaviour generally and specifically to address bullying, mobbing and harassment by faculty. To the extent peer "control" is not embraced, then faculty

as workers are operating in an environment that has little to no organizational constraints on the behaviours (Roscigno, Lopez, & Hodson, 2009).

In essence, the story of academe and academics vis-à-vis faculty conduct is about the sources of power and control that faculty have and the norms and values in which those sources are grounded (Lester, 2009; Simpson & Cohen, 2004). The faculty's unique organizational citizen status as free-thinking, autonomous actors with leadership of knowledge production as well as the research and education mission of the university, their power as evaluators, and their positioning and training as critics shapes faculty expression, what is considered *by faculty* (but not perhaps others!) as appropriate (normative or "reasonable") conduct (and thus, what is not) and also the management of faculty conduct (Tracy, 2011). This assessment of appropriateness of conduct is further influenced by the social context, particularly who says/does what to whom and what the issues are under discussion. For example, contentious engagement between faculty and administration around governance issues such as budgeting and restructuring or among faculty regarding ideological and theoretical perspectives may be contexts that call for "reasonable hostility" by faculty (strong criticism of ideas infused with powerful negative sentiments) but in other contexts such as with students and staff may be considered "unreasonable" (Petrina, 2012; Tracy, 2011). This narrative and the associated norms provide justification for framing of one's behaviour and actions as other than problematic and often as normal and necessary (Friedenberg, 2008; Hutchinson, Vickers, Jackson, & Wilkes, 2010; Nelson & Lambert, 2001; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Tannen, 2002). This narrative can also be used by faculty actors and by faculty witnesses to resist attempts to challenge or manage problematic conduct. This creates a very interesting context in which to examine the manifestation, experience and management of workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment (Lester, 2009).

1.2 The Environment: Internal and External

The academy and universities exist within an economic, political and social environment that influences their challenges, experiences and their responses. The academy like other organizations and industries are at greater risk of bullying when under pressure (Salin, 2003). Academe generally and universities specifically are under tremendous scrutiny and pressure globally. The very qualities that make the academy and faculty unique are being challenged from a number of different directions. Globalization, co-modification of knowledge, massification of education, reduction in state or government funding, disruptive technologies and the rise of neoliberalism, managerialism and marketization create competitive pressures directed at institutional survival and fundamental challenges to the role of faculty scholars in institutional leadership and as public intellectuals (Jackson, 2018; Pelletier, Kottke, & Sirotnik, 2018; Petrina, Mathison, & Ross, 2014; Tucker, 2012; Tytherleigh, Webb, Cooper, & Ricketts, 2005). Specific threats to academic freedom occur in the form of politicization of the funding agenda (e.g. decreased state funding, targeted research funding), increasing involvement of the state in setting the content

and structure of the institution (e.g. Eastman, 2018; Tucker, 2012), increase in contingent and temporary faculty vis-à-vis permanent faculty (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 1993), silencing of scholars asking "dangerous questions" (SAR, 2018) and the rise of anti-intellectualism (Jaschik, 2018; Stanley, 2018). Public responses to controversial social media posts of faculty thought and also websites such as Professor Watchlist https://www.professorwatchlist.org, Campus Reform https://www.campusreform.org and Campus Fix https://www.thecollegefix.com that profile and target faculty as problems are also framed as bellwethers for free-thought (Ferber, 2018). These external and internal pressures, which could be characterized as bullying in and of themselves (D'Cruz, 2015; Tucker, 2012), place tremendous pressure on universities and their own climates as they manage academic freedom and ability to survive in a turbulent and resource-restrictive environment. In essence, the higher education environment is rich with "motivating" (threat to survival) and "precipitating" factors associated with bullying (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, & De Cuyper, 2009; Salin, 2003; Twale & DeLuca, 2008), making faculty particularly vulnerable for bullying as targets, actors and witnesses (SAR, 2018; Shin & Jung, 2014).

Together, the structure and values of academe and faculty roles and the political, social and economic environment in which universities and higher education exist create a rich context for examining the manifestation, experience, effects and management of workplace bullying.

2 Defining the Literature Domain

The life and experiences of academics have been a long-standing area of research interest particularly regarding job/career satisfaction (Bentley, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2013; Lacy & Sheehan, 1997), job stress (e.g. Catano et al., 2007; Shin & Jung, 2014; Winefield et al., 2003; Zábrodská et al., 2018), work engagement (Mudrak et al., 2018), departure (e.g. Gardner, 2012), conflict (e.g. Barsky, 2002; Berryman-Fink, 1998; Volpe & Chandler, 2001), the changing landscape of higher education (e.g. Burnes, Wend, & By, 2014; Fielden, 2007) and (d) evolution of academic freedom (e.g. Karran & Mallinson, 2017; Turk, 2014). While problematic and abusive interactions have been identified in these literatures, they are not systematically explored and examined as phenomena in their own right. Fortunately, more recently, academics have turned attention to their own experiences of bullying, focusing primarily on documenting and exploring interpersonal bullying (e.g. Henning et al., 2017; Hollis, 2012; Keashly & Neuman, 2013) and, increasingly, depersonalized, organizational or socio-structural bullying (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2009; Keashly & Harvey, 2006; Liefooghe & Mackenzie Davey, 2001) and bullying and harassment from the public and the state (Ferber, 2018; SAR, 2018; Scott, 2018).

Thus, there are rich, diverse and continually evolving interrelated literatures that could be drawn upon for this review. However, the domain needs to be delimited for manageability. To define the pool of relevant studies and writings, the following

search terms were used: *bullying*, *mobbing*, *(personal) harassment*, *emotional abuse*, *workplace mistreatment*, *psychological aggression* and *incivility* in connection with the terms of *academe*, *university*, *college*, *higher (and further) education*, *professors*, *faculty* and *academic staff*.

Incivility is worth noting for its inclusion particularly since several authors (e.g. Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Hershcovis, 2011) distinguish it from the other terms noted above. There are several reasons for its inclusion in this review. Frequency and persistence of "uncivil" behaviours are key in influencing the degree of impact (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Magley, & Nelson, 2017), and these are also central features of bullying, mobbing and harassment (Leymann, 1996). Further, "uncivil" environments have been argued to create opportunity for bullying through the normalization of aggression and hostility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; King & Piotrowski, 2015; Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998), highlighting the connection between incivility and bullying. More pragmatically, measures of incivility encompass behavioural items that are also included in measures of bullying and mobbing suggesting that these constructs, at least in their measurement, are more similar than different (Cortina & Marchiondo, 2012; Hershcovis, 2011). Thus, studies that encompass incivility alongside bullying and mobbing are included in this review.

Harassment and discrimination on the basis of identity group membership were not explicitly utilized as a search term. However, given that various forms of mistreatment tend to "travel together" (Raver & Nishii, 2010) and there is evidence that bullying and mobbing can be selective in terms of targeting "others" (Cortina, 2008; Keashly & Neuman, 2018; Sallee & Diaz, 2013), studies that encompass these constructs alongside bullying and mobbing were included. This pool of studies was further affected by the requirement that they be available in English due to the author's own language limitations.

Google and Google Scholar were the primary search engines utilized. While Google Scholar captures the academic literature (published articles, books, conference presentations, dissertations and theses), Google searches capture publicly available reports of surveys and studies by universities, unions and government bodies. Even though these reports may not appear in the scholarly literature, they are often empirically rigorous and perhaps more importantly drive institutional and public policy responses (Keashly, 2018a).

There have been a number of articles focused on specific audiences to introduce them to what is known about bullying and academe and whose focus is informational rather than empirical, critical and analytical. This includes pieces in professional or trade publications such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed* (USA (United States)), *Times Higher Education Supplement* (UK (United Kingdom)), *The Guardian* (Higher Education section) and *University World News* as well as popular websites such as http://www.kwesthues.com/mobbing.htm and http://bulliedacademics.blogspot.com and Facebook groups such as Workplace Bullying in Higher Education. These articles and sites are important as informational and discussion forums. However, they do not typically provide unique findings and data beyond the studies reviewed here. These writings will be cited as appropriate to

make the case for increasing interest and the range of academic contexts and roles for which bullying, mobbing and harassment are relevant.

3 Prevalence of Academic Bullying and Mobbing

For the purposes of assessing prevalence, this section will focus on studies that utilized surveys. Table 1 has been organized by country and provides information on the time period of data collection; sample; measurement; timeframe; reported rates of experience as a target, witness or actor; sources of the bullying; and the effects studied.

The empirical research on bullying in academe is similar to what is seen in bullying research in other work contexts. Specifically, these studies vary in terms of nature of sample (representative, convenience; population targeted), measurement utilized (self-labelling and behavioural checklist), timeframe (anywhere from currently to "in your career") and source (none, rank, social identity group). These features influence the numbers that are reported and their meaning (Keashly, 2018a; Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010). In essence, there is little standardization, which makes addressing the question of whether bullying is "rife on campus" difficult and cross-study and cross-country comparisons challenging. However, this variety could be a benefit for other purposes as there are studies that can support a variety of claims or goals from "rifeness" to "no big deal" (Keashly, 2018a). With these caveats in mind, here are some observations that are useful in the consideration and discussion of workplace bullying in academe and more broadly.

3.1 Samples: Who Is Asking and Who Is Asked?

As can be seen from Table 1, research is predominantly from Western, particularly Anglo-Saxon countries, such as the UK, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the USA. This may well be a reflection of increasing and intense managerial reforms in these countries and the implications for high job stress among academics (Shin & Jung, 2014; Williams, 2008). It is exciting to see the increasing presence of research from Eastern Europe (e.g. Albania, Czech Republic, Estonia, Turkey), the Middle East (e.g. Egypt), Africa (e.g. Ethiopia, Nigeria, Uganda) and South Asia (e.g. India, Pakistan). This presence enriches the discussion of bullying in academe as countries will vary in terms of the nature and structure of higher education; the social, political and economic context; as well as the social value and status attributed to academe and academics, all of which can be expected to shape the existence, expression and management of faculty experiences (Shin & Jung, 2014; Teichler, Arimoto, & Cummings, 2013). National culture and the presence of legislative or regulatory responses to bullying also can be expected to influence the meaning and (un)acceptability of conduct as bullying (Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2011; Hershcovis, Reich, & Niven, 2015; Jacobson, Hood, & Van Buren, 2014; Power et al., 2013; Severance et al., 2013).

Table 1 Empirical studies of workplace bullying in academe

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
ALBANIA						
Buka and Karaj 2012 Collected 2012	Faculty at four universities $N = 105$ (response rate 70%)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist—NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 91% $\geq$ 1 behaviour 7% at least weekly	Not asked	Anxiety, depression, motivation, sleepless, fatigue headache
Buka 2013 Collected 2012–2013	Faculty at 22 universities $N = 460$ (response rate 77%)	Paper and online questionnaire—definition of mobbing + NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 12.3% self-label 5.8% frequent **Perpetrated** 11.5% self-label 4% frequent Targeted Superior 13.2% Colleague 68.4% Subordinate 18.4%	Superior 39.1% Colleague 56.5% Subordinate 4.3%	Anxiety, depression, motivation, sleepless, fatigue headache
AUSTRALIA						
Cox and Goodman 2005 Collected 2000	All staff at one university; $N = 191$ (**65 acad staff**) (9.5% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—single-item on bullying + behavioural checklist	No timeframe provided	Experienced 52.4% self-label Women = men	Superv/mgmt—30% Colleagues—15%	Ill health, emotional stress, time off work, intent to leave, changing job
NTEU 2012 Collected 2011	Prof and academic staff at one university $N = 552$ (**270 acad staff**) (9.1% response rate)	Online questionnaire—single-item on bullying + behavioural checklist	No timeframe provided	Experienced 68.6% self-label Witnessed/known about 83.2%	Co-workers most frequent	Stress, health, work absence, disengagement, job performance, transfer, resign

Strachan et al. 2012 Collected 2011–2012	**Academic staff**, 19 universities $N = 8391$ (35% response rate)	Paper or online questionnaire—one item on experience of harassment or bullying	Prior 5 years	Experienced 29% self-label Women > Men Was severe? 44% (12% of sample) Women < men	Not asked	Adverse career impact
CANADA						
Catano et al. 2007 Collected 2005	Faculty from 56 universities; random sample; $N = 1470$ (27% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 48.5% ≥1 behaviour Women > men	Co-workers > admin = students	Stress, health, job satisf, org commitment, medication use
McKay, Arnold, Fratzl and Thomas 2008 Collected 2005	Teaching staff and librarians at one university; $N = 100$ (12% response rate); **71% faculty;** 23% instructors; 6% librarians	Online questionnaire—one item on bullying + behavioural checklist	Prior 5 years	Experienced 52% self-label 32% "seriously" 10% unsure Women > men	[a]Superior 45% Peers 64% Students 27%	Stress, frustration, anger, anxiety demoralize, powerlessness
Cassidy, Faucher and Jackson 2014 Collected 2012–2013	Faculty at one institution; $N = 121$	Online questionnaire—definition of **cyberbullying**	Prior 12 months	Experienced 17% self-label Women > men Tenured > untenured People of colour > Whites English not first language > English speakers	Students 12% (no diff in tenure) Colleague 9% Women 13% Tenured target 19%	Physical and mental health, confidence, concentration, safety, intent to quit, productivity

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Cassidy, Jackson and Faucher 2016 Collected 2012–2014	Faculty at four institutions; $N = 331$	Online questionnaire—definition of **cyberbullying**	Prior 12 months	Experienced 25% self-label Women > men Professor > sessional instructor > teaching assistants Tenured > untenured People of colour > Whites English not first language > English speakers	Students 15% Women 16% Men 13% Colleague 12% Women 14% Men 8%	Physical and mental health, confidence, concentration, safety, intent to quit, productivity
CZECH REPUBLIC						
Zábrodská and Kveton 2013 Collected 2010–2011	Employees and Ph. D. candidates at three universities; $N = 1533$ (no response rate provided); **faculty** (51.9%), Ph.D. candidates (30.1%)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 12 months	Experienced: self-label 7.9% at least occasionally 0.7% weekly Experienced 13.6% ≥ 1 behav weekly 6.8% ≥ 2 behav weekly Witnessed—28.8%	Superior—73.3% Colleague—23.3% 1 actor—62.2% 2–4 actors—36.3% Men > women	Not studied
EGYPT						
Yousef, El-Houfey and El-Serogy 2013 Collected 2012–2013	Assist profs and demonstrators—six disciplines, one university $N = 535$ (no response rate given)	In-person questionnaire—behavioural checklist based on LIPT	Prior 6 months	Experienced ≥1 behav: 53.7% demonstrators Assist profs 44.1%	Superiors > co-workers > staff > students	Sadness, fear, rumination, concentration, distrust, sleeplessness, headache, job performance, conflict with others

ESTONIA						
Meriläinen et al. 2017 Collected 2014	Staff at nine universities; $N = 864$ (23% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition of bullying, inappropriate behaviour + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced: 42% self-label 27% bullied 15% inapprop	Not reported	Not studied
ETHIOPIA						
Marsh et al. 2009	**Female** faculty and staff at eight colleges and universities $N = 387$ (99.9% response rate) 59 faculty 328 admin staff	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist based on GWHQ	Prior 12 months	Experienced ≥1 behav 82.2% 79.7% faculty 82.6% admin staff	Boss 24.5% Co-worker 23.5% Student 14%	Depressive symptoms
FINLAND						
Bjorkqvist, Osterman and Hielt-Black 1994	Employees at one university; $N = 338$ (47% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 6 months	Experienced 20.5% ≥ .75 mean 24.4% women 16.9% men Admin > teaching or research Witnessed—32%	Not asked Superior 55.5% Peer 32.1% Subordinate 12.4%	Depression, anxiety, aggression

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Meriläinen, Sinkkonen, Puhakka and Kayhko 2016 Collected 2014	Social studies faculty at one university $N = 114$ (38% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition of bullying, inappropriate behaviour + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced: 60% self-label 15% bullied 45% inapprop	Teaching personnel > admin > student > research personnel	Anxiety, helplessness, self-confidence, work performance, exclusion, quality of work env't
INDIA						
Navayan and Chitale 2016	Teaching faculty in the Pune region; $N = 50$ (response rate 10%)	Online questionnaire—single-item on repeated mistreatment	Not provided	Experienced—44.7% Witnessed—53.9%	1 actor—50% >1 actor—40.6%	Anger, rumination, self-confidence, work interest, desire to quit
Singh 2017	Teaching faculty at one university; $N = 280$ (response rate 56%)	Mail questionnaire—single-item on bullying + behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 12.9% self-label	[a]Senior rank 77.7% Boss 44.4% Colleague 33.3% Staff 11.1% Students 11.1%	Irritability, depression, fear, headache, sleeplessness, loss of confidence and self-esteem
ITALY						
Giorgi 2012 Collected 2008–2009	Administrative staff at one university (**faculty excluded**)—$N = 371$ (32.1% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 19% ≥ 2 behav weekly 7+ years on job more likely	Not asked	Psychological and physical health

Fadda et al. 2015	Staff at one university $N = 221$ (teaching staff = 57) (16.2% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 10.1% ≥ 2 behav weekly Admin staff > teaching staff	Not asked	Psychological health
JAPAN						
Takeuchi et al. 2018 Collected 2014	Faculty at one university: $N = 330$ (27.9% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist	In career at university	Experienced 26% 34% women 23.4% men Witnessed 52.7% 63% women 50% men	Not asked	Burnout
NEW ZEALAND						
Raskauskas 2006 Collected in 2005	Employees; six universities; $N = 1117$ (617 acad, 500 admin staff) (~17% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist	Previous year	Experienced 67.7% self-label 65.3% acad 70.6% admin Of those who self-labelled: 27.4% 1–2 incidents 37.8% ≥ 10 incidents	Superior—60.7% Co-worker higher rank—18.1% 1 actor—38.4% 2 actors—29.9% ≥5 actors—9.4%	Depression, stress, emotional exhaustion, self-esteem, sleeplessness
NORWAY						
Einarsen and Skogstad 1996	Multi-industry samples; employees at one university; $N = 1470$ (59% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 6 months	Experienced 6.2% self-label 2.7% once/twice 2.8% monthly 0.7% weekly Women = men ≥50 years of age least likely	Not available for this sample	Not studied

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Koval 2014	Employees at one university; $N = 211$ (response rate 12.7%)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced ≥1 behaviour 84.8% now and then 16.1% ≥ weekly 5.2% daily Full prof > admin > asst prof > assoc prof > researcher	Not asked	Psych distress, intent to leave
NIGERIA						
Nkporbu and Douglas 2016	Employees at one university; $N = 600$; $\boldsymbol{N = 481}$ **academic staff** (no response rate reported)	Administrative method unclear—behavioural checklist	Not stated	Experienced ≥1 behaviour 58.5% acad staff 70.1% nonacad Women > men	Boss "most likely"	Not studied
Ojedokun, Oteri and Ogungbamila 2014	Faculty at seven Southwestern Nigerian universities; $N = 475$ (67.9% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R as **perpetrator**	Prior 6 months	**Perpetrated** 20.4% self-label	Position of actor not reported	Not studied
PAKISTAN						
Ahmad, Kalim and Kaleem 2017 Collected 2009–2010	Academics; 43 universities, Punjab $N = 214$ (49.7% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist	Prior 6–12 months	Experienced ≥3 behav/weekly 47.9% Women = men Witnessed—68.2% 41.1% rarely 20.6% monthly 4.2% weekly	Sr rank—28.4% Same rank—22.6% Jr rank—21.4% Student—14% Admin—13.6%	Not studied

				2.3% daily 40s > other age grps. **Perpetrated:** 30.8% self-label 20.6% rarely 3.7% monthly 4.7% weekly 1.9% daily		
SPAIN						
López-Cabarcos and Vázquez-Rodríguez 2006 Collected 2003	Teachers and researchers at a three-university system; *N*~1500 (~20% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—single-item on psych harassment	Not reported	Experienced—self-label 11.6%, 17.7%, 23% (vary by university) Women > men Teaching > research Witness—46%	Higher rank—58% Equal rank—15% Lower rank—2%	Anxiety, irritability, concentration, unfairness, powerlessness, trapped
TURKEY						
Ozturk, Yilmaz and Hindistan 2007 Collected 2006	Nursing faculty, nine state universities $N = 162$ (66% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist	In career	Experienced 20.4% ≥ 180/300 total score	[a]Manager—70% Colleague—46%	Fear, anxiety, job performance
Yildirim and Yildirim 2007 Collected 2006	Nursing faculty, 11 university nursing schools; $N = 210$ (69% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 91% ≥ 1 behaviour 17% multiple behaviours ("direct mobbing")	Supervisors > co-workers	Fatigue, stress, rumination, headaches, spillover to family, trust, detachment, conflict at work, displaced aggression

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Tigrel and Kokalan 2009	Faculty at five universities; $N = 103$ (85.5% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Not reported	Experienced 11.7% $\geq$ 1 behaviour	Not reported	Psych distress, depression, intent to leave
Gül, İnce and Özcan 2011	Faculty at one university; $N = 97$ (80.8% response rate)	Admin method not stated—behavioural checklist—LIPT	Prior 6 months	Experienced 70% $\geq$ 1 behaviour frequently	Not asked	Burnout
Taspinar et al. 2013	Faculty at one university $N = 100$ (40% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist—LIPT	Prior 6 months	Experienced 13.6% mean score	Not asked	Musculoskeletal discomfort
Korukcu, Bulut, Tuzcu, Bayram and Öztürk Türkmen 2014	Health sciences academic staff at one university; $N = 270$ (no response rate provided)	Admin method not stated—behavioural checklist—LIPT	Varying timeframes	Experienced 53% across timeframes 16.3% often/very often Specific timeframes: 12.2% (current) 4.1% (6 months) 6.3% (3 years) Women > men	Not asked	Not studied
Senol, Avsar, Peksen Akca, Argun and Avsarogullari 2015 Collected 2010	Faculty at one university; $N = 450$ (53% response rate)	Paper questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 58.2% $\geq$ 1 behaviour 5.4% frequently 16.6% daily Women = men	Superior > colleague > subordinate	Not studied

Minibas-Poussard, Seckin-Celik and Bingol 2018	Research assistants and assistant prof at 51 universities in 3 cities; $N = 605$; 141 assist profs (6.1% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist NAQ-R and WAR-Q	Prior 6 months	Experienced 26% ≥ 1 behav/wk Women = men Public Uni > private	Superior >80% Men > women	Not studied
UGANDA						
Kakumba, Wamala and Wanyama 2014	Faculty at one university; $N = 102$ (not report response rate)	Admin method not reported—behavioural checklist	Not reported	Experienced 53.3% ≥ 1 behaviour at least once	Sr rank—60.8% Same rank—24.6% Other of lower rank or staff—15%	Not studied
UNITED KINGDOM						
Lewis 1999 Wales	Further/higher education union members; 32 institutions; $N = 415$ (50.3% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—single-item on bullying	Not reported	Experienced—18% Witnessed—22%	Not asked	Shame
Hoel and Cooper 2000	Multi-industry sample; employees at one university; $N = 487$ (45.4% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 6 months Past 5 years	Experienced 7.2% self-label 6% at least occasionally 1.2% ≥ weekly Experienced—21.3% Witnessed—42.8% Women > men	[a]Supervisor 62.9% Colleague 51.4% Subord 11.4% Client/student 2.9%	Motivation, satisfaction, efficiency, work pressure

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Kinman and Jones 2004 Collected in 2004	Members, Association of University Teachers; 99 institutions; $N = 1100$ (22% response rate) **840 acad staff**	Mail questionnaire—single-item on bullying	Prior 5 years	Experienced 18% self-label Women > men	Not reported	Stress
Simpson and Cohen 2004	Members, Association of University Teachers; one university; $N = 378$ (19.8% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist	Not reported	Experienced 25% self-label 28.5% women 19.8% men Witnessed—33% 67.5% women 29.4% men	Superior—80% Colleague—20%	Anxiety, self-confidence, self-esteem
Boynton—*Times Higher Education Supplement* Bullying Survey 2005	Self-selected sample of higher education employees; $N = 843$	Online questionnaire—self-definition of bullying + behavioural checklist	"Currently"	Experienced 42% self-label Witnessed—72%	49% Manager 26% Senior rank (not manager) 1 actor—61% Group—39% Men > women	Psychological impact
Court 2008 Stress survey Collected 2008	Members, Union of Colleges and Universities; $N = 14,270$ (9740 higher education; 3190 further education)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition of bullying personal harassment	Not reported	Experienced **Bullied**: Further education 27.3% 7.2% often/always Higher education 23.4% 6.7% often/always	Not asked	Relationship well-being Stress

				Personal harassed: Further education 31% 8.8% often/always Higher education 25.8% 7% often/always		
Court 2008 Negative behaviours survey Collected 2008	Members, Union of Colleges and Universities; $N = 679$; (response rate 17%) 48% in higher education; 44% in further education	Online questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 25.9% self-label 15.6% now and then 10.3% $\geq$ several times/ month	[a]Superior—75.4% Colleague—38.7% Subordinate—9.7% Clients—1.6% Students—6.0%	Relationship well-being
Kinman and Wray 2013a Collected 2012	Members, University and College Union (UCU)—**higher education** $N = 14, 667$ (no response rate reported)	Online questionnaire on stress—respond to definition of bullying personal harassment	Not reported	Experienced **Bullied:** 24% 15.6% sometimes 8.4% often/always (range 2.2–19%) **Personal harassed**: 25.5% 17.3% sometimes 8.2% often/always	Not asked	Stress, well-being

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Kinman and Wray 2013b Collected 2012	Members, University and College Union (UCU)—**further education** $N = 7110$ (no response rate reported)	Online questionnaire on stress—respond to definition of bullying personal harassment	Not reported	Experienced **Bullied:** 26.3% 17.5% sometimes 8.8% often/always (range 0–31.8%) **Personal harassed:** 30.5% 21.4% sometimes 9.1% often/always	Not asked	Stress, well-being
Kinman and Wray 2014 Collected 2014	Members, University and College Union (UCU)—**further education** $N = 2251$ (no response rate reported)	Online questionnaire on stress—respond to definition of bullying personal harassment	Not reported	Experienced **Bullied**: 27.3% 17.4% sometimes 9.9% often/always **Personal harassed**: 29.3% 19.7% sometimes 9.6% often/always	Not asked	Stress, well-being
Guardian Higher Education Network 2014 Collected in 2014	Faculty readership in UK and outside $N = 1366$ (685 in UK; 681 outside UK)	Online questionnaire on bullying—item on being bullied	In career	Respondents are those who self-identify as bullied	**UK** Manager > other **Outside UK** Colleagues > other	Stress, irritability, sleeplessness, headaches, self-confidence, spillover to outside, work absence, intent to leave
Karran and Mallinson 2017	Faculty at UK and EU universities on academic freedom	Online questionnaire item on being	Not provided	Experienced: **Bullied:** 23.1% UK	Colleagues No specific actors	Self-censorship

UK and EU Ongoing collection	*N*(UK) ~500: *N* (EU) ~5000	bullied for acad views by colleagues item on psych pressure from others for views		14.1% EU **Psych pressure:** 26.6% UK 15.7% EU		
UNITED STATES						
Price Spratlen 1995 Collected 1990	Employees at one university; random sample; $N = 805$; **208 faculty**; 92 prof staff; 506 classified staff (51% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—item on mistreatment	Prior 18 months	Experienced self-label 23% overall **11% faculty** 38% prof staff 25% classif. staff Women = men Witnessed 27% overall **19% faculty** 27% prof staff 31% classif. staff	**Overall**: Superior 48% Co-worker 31% Subordinate 9% Other 12% **Faculty:** Superior 52% Co-worker 36% Subordinate 4% Other 8% incl students	Self-esteem, self-confidence, job satisfaction, communication, productivity
Richman et al. 1999 Data collected in 1996	Employees at one university; $N = 2492$; **765 faculty**; 295 service; 557 clerical; 875 student workers (51.6% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—behavioural checklist GWHQ	Prior 12 months	Experienced 55% $\geq$ 1 behaviour $\geq$2 times; **50% faculty** 57% service 63% clerical 53% student workers Overall: 56% women 54% men **Faculty:** **68% women** **52% men**	Not asked	Depressive symptoms, anxiety, hostility, alcohol use
Keashly and Neuman 2008	Employees at one university;	Online questionnaire—	Prior 12 months	Experienced 32% self-label	1 actor 43% 2 actors 30%	Emotional and physical health,

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Collected 2008	$N = 1185$; (34.3% response rate)	respond to definition + behavioural checklist WAR-Q		**39% faculty**; 43% staff; 53% directors and dept. chairs; 9% student workers Bothered by bullying? 62% great deal 27% moderately Women > men Experienced: 23% ≥1 behaviour week 12% 1–2 behavs/week 11% ≥ 3 behavs/week Women > men Witnessed 41% **32% faculty** Bothered by what witnessed 64% great deal 23% moderately	≥3 actors 27% Superior 43% (**25% faculty**) Co-worker/colleague 42.4% (**63% faculty**) Subordinate 4% (**10% faculty**) Customer/student 2% Superior 44% Peer 40% Subordinate 6% Customer/student 2%	fear, stress, job satisfaction, org commitment, intent to leave
Lampman, Phelps, Bancroft and Beneke 2009	Faculty at one institution—$N = 399$ (61% response rate)	Mail questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 98% ≥ 1 behaviour Degree of upset— Women > men	Students as actors	Anxiety, stress, fear, sleeplessness, productivity
Neuman 2009 Collected 2009	Faculty at one university; $N = 241$ (55% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition +	Prior 12 months	Experienced 26% self-label 19% ≥ 1 behaviour weekly Witnessed—46%	Superior 24% Colleague 66% Sr colleague 37% Equal status 21%	Emotional and physical health, fear, stress, job satisfaction, org

		behavioural checklist WAR-Q			Jr colleague 8% 1 actor 43% 2 actors 21% ≥3 actors 36% Superior 28% Colleague 71% Sr colleague 49% Equal status 15% Jr colleague 7%	commitment, intent to leave
Fox 2010	Faculty; convenience sample $N = 228$	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 5 years	Experienced 36.6% pervasive/freq bullying Women > men	Superior 22.1% Colleague 23.9%	Negative emotions, physical symptoms, burnout, job satisfaction, commitment, intent to leave
Raineri, Frear and Edmonds 2011	Business and economics **faculty**, multiple institutions—$N = 60$ (2.7% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 6 months	**Witnessed** ≥ 1 behaviour occurring at least monthly: 55.3% faculty victim 10.9% Sr faculty 44.5% Jr faculty 36.4% admin victim 16.4% staff victim Women > men	Senior faculty 52% Junior faculty 7.6% Admin 36.4% Staff 4.2% Men > women	Not studied
Hollis 2012	175 colleges and universities—all employee groups—$N = 401$ (15.5% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 18 months	Experienced 31% Women > men African Am > White LGBTQ > straight Witness 32%	Admin > faculty > staff **Faculty**—tenure > untenured	Not studied

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Lampman 2012	Faculty at 100 institutions—$N = 524$ (66% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist	Prior 12 months	Experienced 91% ≥ 1 behaviour; 10–15%—several behaviours Women > men People of colour > White Degree of upset— Women > men	Students as actors	Not studied
Taylor 2013	Faculty at one institution—$N = 1060$ (43% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced self-label 12% overall 13% tenured 9% tenure track 10% non-tenure track Women > men LGBTQ > straight Arts and humanities > other disciplines Witness 22%	Not asked	Job satisfaction, cynicism, exit, neglect duties
Williams and Ruiz 2012	Employees at one institution—$N = 2254$ (**374 faculty**) (28% response rate overall**; 26% faculty**)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 2 years	Experienced 39% overall 11% once 36% 2–3 times 18% 4–5 times 36% ≥ 5 times **36% faculty** **41–43% staff** Women > men Witness	Overall: [a]Supervisor 38% Higher rank not superv 25% Co-worker 32% Faculty 23% **Faculty:** 74% other faculty 31% admin 7% lower rank 3% student **Other staff**	Physical and emotional health, stress, job satisfaction, work absence, performance, intent to leave

				48% overall **43% faculty**	Supervisor and co-worker primary actors Overall: [a]Supervisor 34% Higher rank not supervisor 27% Co-worker 35% Faculty 25% **Faculty:** 76% other faculty 27% admin 10% lower rank 2–3% student	
Beckmann, Cannella and Wantland 2013	Nursing faculty in three NE states—$N = 473$ (28% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 36% $\geq$ 1 behaviour Women > men Jr faculty > Sr faculty	Admin 28% Senior faculty 60% Junior faculty 9%	Not studied
Landes 2013	Employees at one university; $N = 304$ (8.2% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 2 years	Experienced 38% >50% $\geq$ 4 times 36% > 5 times Women > men Witness 50%	[a]Supervisor 37% Someone of higher rank 31% Co-worker 33% Faculty 30% Admin 24% Staff member 20% Lower rank 9% [a]Faculty 37% Someone of higher rank 32% Co-worker 32% Admin 29% Supervisor 27% Another staff 31% Lower rank 9%	Emotional health, self-confidence, job satisfaction, intent to leave

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
Onorato 2013	Multi-industry sample; business and social science faculty in state university system; $N = 83$ (4.15% response rate)	Online questionnaire—behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced Behavioural—total score (specific cut-off unclear) Tenured—16.2% Untenured—10.9%	Not asked	Not studied
Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin and Wang 2014	National sample of health administration faculty; $N = 134$ (53% response rate)	Online questionnaire—one item on bullying + behavioural checklist (McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008)	Prior 5 years In career	Experienced 64% self-label 55% "seriously" Full > Associate > Asst prof Witness 78% Assoc > full > assist Perceived as bully? 5% Men > women	Dean 17.7% Full prof 43% Assoc prof 24.9% Assist prof 12% 1 actor 66% 2 actors 20% ≥3 actors 14% Men > women	Anger, irritability, stress, anxiety, demoralize, self-confidence, sleeplessness, concentration, powerlessness, performance, spillover to life, desire to retaliate
Mourssi-Alfash 2014	Employees at state university system; $N = 786$; **163 faculty** (16% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced 37.7% self-label 15.1% now and then 8.4% several times/week 82.4% ≥1 behaviour Women > men	Not asked	Organizational citizenship behaviours.
Rankin and Associates 2014 Collected 2012–2013	Employees and students of state university system; institution—12 campuses;	Online questionnaire or hard copy—one item personal experience of	Prior 12 months	Experienced: **Overall**—24% 9% affected work/ learning **Faculty**—23%	**Overall**: Students—30% Faculty—19% Co-workers—25% Staff—16%	Not studied

	$N = 104, 208$; **8010 faculty** (27% response rate)	exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile behaviour		Students—21% Postdoc—17% Staff—30% Women > men Transgender and Genderqueer > other gender identity grps. Underrepresented minority and multi-minority > White or other people of colour Witnessed Overall—23% **Faculty**—25%	Admin—16% Supervisors—16% **Faculty:** Faculty—19% Admin—10% Students—4% Staff—4% Supervisors—3% **Staff:** Supervisors—57% Staff—48% Admin—41% Faculty—21% Students—6% Students—31% Faculty—17% Co-workers—14% Admin—14% Supervisors—13% Staff members—12%	
Hollis 2016a	142 community colleges—all employee groups—$N = 201$ (14% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition	Prior 18 months	Experienced and witnessed (combined)—64% Women > men Af. American > White LGBTQ > Straight	Admin > faculty > staff **Faculty—**tenure > untenured	Not studied
WISELI 2016 Collected 2016	Tenure/tenure-track faculty + clinical faculty at one university; $N = 2001$ (58% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition of hostile and	Prior 3 years	Experienced 36.4% overall 24.2% 1–2 times 5.1% 3–5 times 6.1% >5 times Women > men	Not asked	Job satisfaction, intent to leave

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Method	Timeframe	Rates	Actors	Effects
		intimidating behaviour		Tenured > untenured Faculty with disabilities > no disability Soc studies > Science Witnessed 44.2% overall 28.1% 1–2 times 8.4% 3–5 times 5.9% > 5 times Women > men Tenure > not tenure Faculty with disabilities > no disability Soc studies > Science		
Zemanek 2016 Collected 2014	Agricultural and life sciences faculty; 20 universities; $N = 38$ (11% response rate)	Online questionnaire—respond to definition (compare Williams & Ruiz, 2012)	Prior year	Experienced 52.6% overall 14.3% once 38.1% 2–3 times 9.5% 4–5 times 38.1% > 5 times Witnessed 81.6% in university 63.1% in own dept 38.5% currently 23.1% year ago	Admin > tenured > nontenured > staff > higher rank **For tenured faculty** Admin > tenured **For untenured faculty** Tenured > admin Tenured—52.6% Admin—44.7%	Physical and emotional health, stress, job satisfaction, work absence, performance, intent to leave

Aranda 2018	University employees; Western and Midwest universities; $N = 259$; **81 faculty** (no response rate provided)	Online questionnaire respond to definition + behavioural checklist NAQ-R	Prior 6 months	Experienced (rarely to daily) Overall—21% **Faculty** 22% Admin 19% Support staff 18% Prof staff 26% Women > men Tenured < not tenured	Colleagues > superiors > subordinates	Not studied
Lee 2018 UNF Collected 2017–2018	Full-time faculty at one university; $N = 145$ (24% response rate)—focus on faculty-to-faculty bullying	Online questionnaire—respond to definition	Multiple timeframes—6 months, 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, >5 years	Experienced[a] 32.6% 6 mo 31.5% 1 year Women > men Witnessed[a] 44.4% 6 mo 41.5% 1 year Women > men	Not asked	Personal life impact, career impact

LIPT, Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (Leymann, 1996); NAQ-R, Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (Einarsen et al., 2009); GWHQ, Generalized Workplace Harassment Questionnaire (Rospenda & Richman, 2004); WAR-Q, Workplace Aggression Research Questionnaire (Neuman & Keashly, 2004)

[a]Multiple responses permitted

Notable in their absence are prevalence studies of academe from other Asian countries such as China and Russia as well as Latin and South American countries. This is not to suggest that these are not issues in these countries. Research on bullying in other workplaces as well as evidence that workplace bullying tracks broader societal trends on violence suggests that workplace bullying in academe in these countries is quite likely (e.g. Kawabata, 2014; Schafferer & Szanajda, 2013; Van de Vliert, Einarsen, & Nielsen, 2013; Zhang, 2017). In Japan, for example, "power harassment" (power hara) is considered a serious problem affecting approximately 25% of the working population (Roberts, 2014). A very specific form of power harassment in universities is "akahara" (academic harassment), which refers to abuses of power by senior faculty directed at junior faculty and particularly discrimination that keeps women from rising in the ranks (Craft, 2006; Normile, 2001). Recent research by Takeuchi et al. (2018) indicates that both female and male faculty are victims of bullying at rates higher than the general working population.

While interest in empirically examining bullying and mobbing in academe has increased compared to earlier reviews (e.g. Keashly & Neuman, 2013), some of these studies are not "published" in traditional scholarly venues such as journals and books. Several are dissertations and theses as well as reports from a variety of public and private entities. Thus, interest is widespread, but it appears that academic empirical research in this area while increasing particularly among newer scholars is still lagging behind other interested parties such as unions, professional associations, governmental bodies and institutional systems. Who is asking has implications for the purpose of the study and resultant influence on who is asked and how they are asked, that is, sample and measurement (Keashly, 2018a). The uniqueness that academics bring to the study of bullying, mobbing and harassment in academe is a broad and deep understanding of macro-, meso- and micro-influences and theorizing around the dynamics and outcomes of these experiences (e.g. Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012; Samnani, 2013a). For example, Giorgi (2012) and Qureshi, Rasli and Zaman (2014) articulate the relationship of institutional climate to workplace bullying and its impact. Effective action needs to be grounded in this deeper understanding of the dynamics and mechanisms that academic research and theorizing have to offer.

The specific nature and development of the samples have implications for the generalizability of the findings to faculty experience writ large. Study samples are varied ranging from the broad focus of "academic as an occupation" (across institutions) to more specific focus on particular disciplines or sets of disciplines to institutionally based samples. Of note are the nationwide samples, which tend to be associated with or supported by unions, professional associations, higher education systems and government. These organizations have the mechanisms and resources to permit large-scale samples. For example, the University of California system sample (USA) reported by Rankin and Associates (2014) had over 100,000 respondents! Further, these surveys tend to have greater response rates enhancing the representative nature of the samples and, thus, the generalizability of their findings to the larger population. The samples accessed through unions (e.g. Australia, Cox & Goodman, 2005; National Tertiary Education Union [NTEU], 2012; Canada, Catano

et al., 2007; UK, Kinman & Wray, 2013a, b, 2014) encompass a variety of institutions within a specific country, thus permitting a snapshot of national higher education system/approach. The disciplinary samples can provide a glimpse into the influence of disciplinary culture, while the individual university samples highlight institutional influences on the prevalence of bullying (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008).

Another important consideration is the context within which the measures of bullying were embedded, that is, whether they are part of a workplace climate (e.g. Rankin & Associates, 2014; Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute [WISELI], 2016), occupational stress or quality of academic life survey (e.g. Catano et al., 2007) vs those surveys specifically focused on bullying and mistreatment. Surveys that focus explicitly on workplace bullying and mobbing may face self-selection by the respondents. A vivid example is the recent 2014 survey by the Guardian Higher Education Network (Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014), which focused exclusively on those who self-identified as bullied. With surveys focused on bullying, some may choose not to respond for a variety of reasons (e.g. not a victim, afraid to share this information), while those who have had experiences may be more inclined to participate. Thus, prevalence rates from these studies are affected by respondent connection to the topic and affect the accuracy of the resultant rates. Confidence that the reported rates are representative is further affected by the response rate. Thus, samples vary in terms of their representativeness to the population of academics, and this has implications for their contribution to the profile of the extent of the problem of bullying, mobbing and harassment in academe and with faculty.

While this review is focused on faculty experiences, several institutional studies included other employee groups in the sample with faculty. When data are broken out by employee group so that faculty are discernible, those data are provided in Table 1. These studies provide the opportunity to examine the relative risk of bullying for faculty vis-à-vis other worker groups within the same institution (Henning et al., 2017).

3.2 Measurement: How the Question Is Asked

There are a variety of measurements used to determine rates of experienced bullying. The two broad approaches of self-labelling by single items (with or without a specific definition) and researcher identification (operational) based on multi-item behavioural checklists are represented in the studies reviewed here. These two measurements reflect different aspects of bullying, that is, experience of victimization and exposure to hostile behaviours, respectively (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010). While these measures are related, their correlation is not perfect. Thus, rates based on these two types of measures will differ.

An examination of the self-labelling measures reveals how meaning and interpretation influence self-identification as a victim of bullying, mobbing and harassment. Thus, how victimization is described influences the self-identification rates. In the case of the single item where the definition of bullying is left up to the respondent

(have you been bullied?), several studies of academics utilized items with different terms and the rates were different. Court (2008; UK) had respondents indicate whether they had been bullied and whether they had been personally harassed resulting in somewhat different rates. In their study of academic freedom challenges for UK and EU academics, Karran and Mallinson (2017) asked about being bullied for their views on academic freedom and experiencing psychological pressure for those views. The rates for these two experiences were different with psychological pressure higher than being bullied. In their industry study, Hubert and Van Veldhoven (2001) found that the education industry (higher education included in the category) reported rates of aggression from co-workers and from superiors lower than the average of all industries while reporting rates of "unpleasant interactions" with co-workers and superiors above average and higher than many other industries. In their study of social studies faculty at one Finnish university, Meriläinen, Sinkkonen, Puhakka and Kayhko (2016) found the 15% of respondents self-identified as experiencing "bullying", while another 45% identified as experiencing "inappropriate behaviour", distinct from bullying. These studies beautifully illustrate the influence of *what* we include in our questions shapes the rates reported.

Severity or degree of impact (a proxy for "meaning of the behaviour") as an element of scholarly definitions of bullying is relevant in this discussion of prevalence. As an illustration, among those who identified as bullied, a proportion of them **did not** view being bullied as "serious" (Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Strachan et al., 2012) and disruptive to their work (Rankin & Associates, 2014) nor were "bothered" by it (Keashly & Neuman, 2008). These indicators of severity reflect the importance of meaning/interpretation of behaviour, which is influenced by the normative and discursive context of academe, for example, the cut and thrust of academic life (Nelson & Lambert, 2001).

The meaning of behaviour is relevant for the operational method as well. This method, which determines bullying exposure based on a minimum number of behaviours, presumes that behaviours are equal in impact (Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004). However, behaviours included are unlikely to be perceived and experienced similarly, particularly when we factor in conduct expectations for a specific workplace and specific workers along with the source of the behaviour, its persistence and the presence of other behaviours (Meriläinen & Kõiv, 2017, 2018; Meriläinen, Sinkkonen, Puhakka, & Kayhko, 2016). This is vivid in the academic workplace where, for example, criticizing someone's ideas will likely be evaluated and experienced differently by faculty vs staff (different conduct expectations) and depending on who delivers it (dean/supervisor vs colleague/co-worker). Given evidence that what is considered problematic behaviour is dependent on who is evaluating it and that scholarly conceptualizations of bullying are distinguished from forms of hostility by severity, pervasiveness or impact, indicators of severity/upset are important in determining and interpreting resultant prevalence rates of bullying (Escartín, Rodríguez-Carballeira, Zapf, Porrúa, & Martín-Peña, 2009; Price Spratlen, 1995).

Holding the behaviours included to the side for the moment, several studies that used the operational method in Table 1 defined being bullied as one or more behaviours, often not specifying the more restrictive criterion of weekly or often/very often. Are such indicators of exposure to one behaviour indicative of bullying or of more occasional aggression or the typical friction of interacting with others? For example, Gül, İnce and Özcan (2011) reported that 70% of Turkish faculty indicated they had been the subject of gossip. Is being the subject of gossip sufficient for a definition of bullying? It may reflect an environment that is problematic, but is it bullying? In other studies, the most frequent behaviours fell under the category of work-related where single behaviours may reflect the nature of doing more with less, rather than part of the persistent targeted form of hostility that we typically focus on in workplace bullying research (e.g. Minibas-Poussard, Seckin-Celik, & Bingol, 2018; Zábrodská & Kveton, 2013). In order to distinguish these behaviours from the "day to day" of institutional and social life, persistence and patterning need to be assessed.

Persistence is a key distinguishing feature of bullying from other forms of hostility. Persistence is captured in self-labelling measures when the specific definition used includes reference to frequent occurrence. Behavioural checklists such as the NAQ-R and the WAR-Q utilize frequency responses of not at all, occasionally, monthly, daily and weekly. These measures allow the discernment of the degree of exposure, which is related to the nature and degree of impact (Keashly & Jagatic, 2003). What is clear from Table 1 is that the more frequent the exposure, the lower the rate of prevalence (e.g. Court, 2008; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Mourssi-Alfash, 2014; Singh, 2017; Zemanek, 2016). Across the studies in Table 1, then, we may be looking at varying degrees of exposure or experience with bullying.

Patterning is another element of the definition of bullying and can be assessed by the variety of behaviours involved. For example, Raskauskas (2006; New Zealand) examined the number of incidents people reported once they self-identified as being bullied and found variability in patterning of exposure ranging from one to two incidents to a sizable group reporting ten or more incidents within the timeframe. This argues for the importance of examining both the number and frequency of behaviours in identifying people as being bullied.

The time referent also varies notably in these studies ranging from 6 months to 5 years to "in your career or experience as an academic". What is true for both the operational and self-labelling measures and clear in Table 1 is that the longer the timeframe, the higher the reported rates of exposure and experience of bullying.

3.3 Determining Prevalence

Comparing the two main measurement methods, the rates of self-labelling tend to be lower and hence more conservative than those of the behavioural checklist (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010). Ideally, to examine this pattern in academe requires that both measures be utilized and compared. While a number of studies report using

both measures, prevalence was typically based on self-identification with the behavioural checklist used to describe the experience of those who self-identify as being bullied. Only four studies reported prevalence rates for each type of measure (USA, Keashly & Neuman, 2008; Mourssi-Alfash, 2014; Neuman, 2009; Czech Republic, Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). While Mourssi-Alfash's (2014) study of a US state university system and Zabrodska and Kveton's (2013) study in the Czech Republic were consistent with the pattern found in other work contexts of higher rates based on operational vs self-identification, Keashly and Neuman's (2008) and Neuman's (2009) US studies of individual institutions found that self-labelling rates were higher than operational rates. This may reflect recognition of bullying as an institutional issue. Both institutions specifically requested a study of workplace bullying because other data sources had told them it was a problem. Mourssi-Alfash (2014) and Zabrodska and Kveton (2013) do not appear to have been motivated by an institutional willingness to discuss the issues. Thus, familiarity with, and sensitivity to, workplace bullying and the resultant perceived legitimacy of bullying as a real, genuine and unacceptable experience accorded by the institution gave a name to people's experience that they may not have had before (Furedi, 2001; Lewis, 2003). In such environments, there may be less stigma associated with perceiving oneself as a victim. These studies illustrate the impact of institutional context and legitimacy particularly on self-labelling and the resultant prevalence.

With all these contextual influences in mind, what is the prevalence of faculty bullying? The prevalence of self-labelling with specific definition (perceived victimization) for 6 months varies from 6.2% (Norway, Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996) to 37.7% (USA, Mourssi-Alfash, 2014). With the addition of frequency of this experience, rates are much lower, for example, 0.7% weekly for Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) and 8.4% for Mourssi-Alfash (2014). In the 12-month framework with a specific definition, rates range from 26% (Neuman, 2009) to 52.6% (Zemanek, 2016). Adding the element of frequency of experience reduces this 12-month prevalence rate. For example, Zemanek's (2016) exposure rate of four or more times in the 12-month period drops the rate to approximately 25%.

Prevalence rates based on behavioural checklists, operationalizing persistence as overall frequency (at least one behaviour per week) within a 6-month period, range from 5.8% (Buka, 2013) to 13.6% (Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). Looking at the mean frequency over 6 months, the range is 13.5% (Taspinar et al., 2013) to 20.5% (Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Hielt-Black, 1994). Extending the timeframe to 12 months of at least one behaviour weekly, the rates are higher ranging from 19.1% (Neuman, 2009) to 47.9% (Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017). Looking at the stricter requirement of at least two or more behaviours (a pattern) weekly, the rates are lower ranging from 6.8% (Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013) to 12% (Keashly & Neuman, 2008). The rate of 47.9% in Pakistan universities is of particular interest as it is based on a startling three or more behaviours per week! For comparison, Keashly and Neuman's (2008) study of a US university reported a much lower rate of 11% for three or more behaviours per week. The differences in these rates may illustrate how the meaning and interpretation of behaviours vary culturally. Cultural influences regarding bullying and nature of academia will be explored in a later section.

Within countries, rates differ even when measure and timeframe are the same. The Union of College and Universities 2012 surveys (Kinman & Wray, 2013a, b) report institutional rates of bullying in higher education (2.2–19%) and further education (0–31.8%) showing notable variability across universities in the UK. López-Cabarcos and Vázquez-Rodríguez (2006) found wide variability in a three-university system in Spain. In the USA, separate studies of individual institutions also show variability, even when the measurement is held constant (e.g. Keashly & Neuman, 2008; Neuman, 2009; Rankin & Associates, 2014 (12 campuses)). Such variability highlights the significance of institutional influences such as reward structure, resources, participation in governance, expectations for continued appointment and institutional leadership, beyond the broader cultural influences of academe or country, in shaping people's exposure and experiences (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006).

Cross-national research is important for discerning how national culture shapes the meaning and experience of bullying beyond what is accounted for by academic culture (e.g. Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017). In order to make cross-national comparisons, the measures and timeframe need to be the same with similar sample composition (e.g. nationwide or multiple institutions; Van de Vliert, Einarsen, & Nielsen, 2013). Comparing studies of countrywide samples that used the bullying definition from the NAQ-R with a 6-month timeframe, national differences are visible, for example, the UK (25.9%; Court, 2008) and Albania (12.3% Buka, 2013). Two studies explicitly focused on cross-national comparisons and found differences. Meriläinen, Käyhkö, Kõiv and Sinkkonen (2019), using the same measures for bullying and for inappropriate behaviour, documented different rates for Estonian and Finnish academic samples. Estonian university staff reported greater exposure to bullying and lower exposure to inappropriate behaviour than the Finnish academics. Interestingly, Finnish academics reported higher rates of inappropriate behaviour relative to bullying rates, while in the Estonian sample, the rates of bullying were higher than the rates of inappropriate behaviour. Karran and Mallinson's (2017) study of bullying of academics for their views on academic freedom found that UK academics experienced bullying at a higher rate than academics from the European Union (23.1% vs 14.1%). These differences have implications for the types of actions that may be more or less effective in addressing academic bullying in different countries (Van de Vliert, Einarsen, & Nielsen, 2013).

Witnessing. Another important indicator of the extent of bullying and mobbing is the witnessing rate. Using a 12-month timeframe with a specific definition of bullying, the rates ranged from 27.1% (Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017) to 46% (Neuman, 2009). Extending the timeframe to experience in one's career reveal rates of over 50% (e.g. Navayan & Chitale, 2016; Takeuchi et al., 2018) to as high as 83.2% (NTEU, 2012). Clearly, bullying and mobbing occur in the presence, and with the knowledge, of other faculty.

Beyond being an indicator of bullying presence, witnessing is important for other reasons (Keashly & Neuman, 2018). First, it is an indicator of the overall climate of the department or university (Hollis, 2012). Second, witnesses may show similar negative effects as targets, spreading the impact net more broadly (Nielsen

& Einarsen, 2013; Salin & Notelaers, 2018; Sprigg, Niven, Dawson, Farley, & Armitage, 2018; Vartia, 2001). Third, witnesses are rarely uninvolved (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2011; Keashly & Neuman, 2013; Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). Witness involvement can be destructive by, for example, remaining silent, joining in (mobbing) or instigating others (vicarious bullying; Hollis, 2017). However, this involvement can also be constructive as colleagues work to defuse, intervene or call for aid. Given the centrality of colleagues in faculty life, harnessing other faculty's presence and developing their ability to constructively engage early on would be a powerful approach for managing bullying and mobbing in universities. Building bystander efficacy will be discussed in the section on strategies for addressing bullying.

3.4 Duration of Exposure

The duration of bullying and mobbing is notable ranging from 17.4% (Korukcu, Bulut, Tuzcu, Bayram, & Öztürk Türkmen, 2014) to approximately one third of the targets (Hollis, 2012; Keashly & Neuman, 2008; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008), indicating the bullying lasted more than 3 years! Studies that focused exclusively on faculty report rates as high as half of faculty targets indicate the mistreatment has lasted 3 or more years, with rates of 5 or more years in 10–20% of cases (e.g. Keashly & Neuman, 2008; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). This long-term exposure may be due to some of the unique features of academe. First, the role of tenure or permanent contract has faculty in long-term relationships with each other and other institutional members. Second, this long-term exposure may also reflect the reduced mobility of faculty within academe. Unless one is a star faculty member, it is hard to move to another institution, particularly once tenure is granted. Third, faculty are tied to departments unlike other workplaces where lateral transfers as a way to cope in other workplaces are available. Thus, environmental escape is limited unless the faculty member were to move to administration or to leave the specific institution. Finally, given the nature of academic culture as one of disagreement, dissent and critique, it is hard to get away from it without leaving academe itself. The data on withdrawal in response to bullying, where faculty remove themselves from department life, may be a more likely form of coping for faculty given their freedom to choose the timing of their presence in the work location (Huston, Norman, & Ambrose, 2007; Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Cyberbullying, however, can tend to undercut this coping response as these types of behaviours have no respect for boundaries or time (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2014).

3.5 In Sum

It is clear that faculty are exposed to hostile behaviour in their workplaces and that some exposure is persistent and patterned, meeting scholarly definitions of bullying.

Using the 12-month framework, approximately 25% of faculty will identify as being bullied. Adding in the witnessing data, the research suggests that 50–75% of faculty will have had some exposure to bullying in the prior 12 months. Extending the timeframe to career, it appears that faculty who have no exposure are in the minority! Further, bullying of faculty is notable for its duration. There is also evidence that rates of bullying differ cross-nationally and institutionally, suggestive of sociocultural influences.

4 Academe vs Other Sectors

As noted earlier, bullying is perceived to be "rife" in academe with suggestions that the university as a workplace is worse than other industries (Hollis, 2012; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). The veracity of this claim depends upon the comparator. If the standard of comparison is the general working population, rates in academia are notably higher (e.g. Italy, Giorgi, 2012; Norway, Koval, 2014; Pakistan, Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017). The UCU surveys in the UK (Kinman & Wray, 2013a, 2013b, 2014) directly compared results regarding the quality of working relationship indicator (included bullying and personal harassment and anger between colleagues) to the overall industry rating of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) from 2008. They found that further and higher education respondents showed less well-being than the mean of the average working population, suggesting academe was indeed worse off.

However, when specific industries or other employee groups within academic workplaces are the comparator, a different picture is revealed. Using multi-industry samples, Hoel and Cooper (2000; UK), Einarsen and Skogstad (1996; Norway) and Onorato (2013; USA) report that rates in academe were among the lowest of any industry in their respective samples. Comparing employee groups within individual institutions (Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Hielt-Black, 1994; Fadda, Giorgi, & Salinas, 2015; Keashly & Neuman, 2008; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; Nkporbu & Douglas, 2016; Price Spratlen, 1995; Rankin & Associates, 2014; Raskauskas, 2006; Richman et al., 1999; Williams & Ruiz, 2012), faculty rates are lower than staff rates. Intra-institutional differences may reflect the different normative and discursive contexts within which faculty, administration and staff exist and which influence how bullying is defined and experienced (Christy, 2010; Fratzl & McKay, 2013). It may also reflect the power structure of institutions, in which faculty and administration are leaders and students are the clients. Staff provide support and service to all groups, that is, they are more vulnerable to a greater range of actors. A comparative examination of the type and perceived severity of behaviours as well as who are the actors for each of these employee groups would be important to explore this argument.

5 Impact of Academic Bullying

The consequences of bullying and mobbing in academe are remarkably consistent across national and institutional contexts and with bullying and mobbing in other sectors. The consequences mirror the effects of other chronic workplace stressors (see Volume 2 Section A; Keashly & Harvey, 2006). The effects manifest at the individual (target, witness), departmental/group and institutional levels.

The impact at the individual level (as a target and less frequently as a witness) is the focus of survey research in Table 1. Qualitative research focused on targets' lived experiences (e.g. Agarwala, 2018; Dentith, Wright, & Coryell, 2015; Johnson-Bailey, 2015, Misawa, 2015; Reed, 2016; Sedivy-Benton, Strohschen, Cavazos, & Boden-McGill, 2015; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Wilkin, 2010) provides rich detail and nuance to the statistics. Being bullied has strong negative implications for psychological and physical health (Giorgi, 2012). As with any workplace stressor, the immediate impact is felt psychologically and emotionally (Barling, 1996). Specific effects include negative mood (e.g. anger, irritability; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Richman et al., 1999; Singh, 2017), anxiety and depressive symptoms (Buka, 2013; Gül, İnce, & Özcan, 2011; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; Marsh et al., 2009; Raskauskas, 2006; Reed, 2016; Richman et al., 1999; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Singh, 2017; Yousef, El-Houfey, & El-Serogy, 2013) and feeling stressed (Catano et al., 2007; Gül, İnce, & Özcan, 2011; Takeuchi et al., 2018). Cognitive distraction and disruption are also documented noting problems with attention, concentration, intrusive imagery and rumination (Navayan & Chitale, 2016; Yousef, El-Houfey, & El-Serogy, 2013). With prolonged exposure, individuals may develop lowered self-esteem and self-confidence (Navayan & Chitale, 2016; Price Spratlen, 1995; Raskauskas, 2006; Reed, 2016; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Singh, 2017; Zemanek, 2016), a sense of powerlessness to fundamentally change the situation (López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008), cynicism (Taylor, 2013) and burnout (Gül, İnce, & Özcan, 2011; Takeuchi et al., 2018). Bullying impact is also manifested physically (Catano et al., 2007; Giorgi, 2012; Qureshi, Rasli, & Zaman, 2014). Specifically, targeted faculty report physical illness (Cox & Goodman, 2005), musculoskeletal pain (Simpson & Cohen, 2003; Taspinar et al., 2013), neurological symptomatology such as headaches (Buka, 2013; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Singh, 2017), sleeplessness and fatigue (Buka, 2013; Raskauskas, 2006; Singh, 2017) and increased alcohol use (Richman et al., 1999). More long-term and extensive effects can lead to psychological, emotional and physical disability (e.g. Buka, 2013; Cox & Goodman, 2005; Gül, İnce, & Özcan, 2011; Simpson & Cohen, 2004). Prolonged exposure is also associated with increasingly negative job attitudes such as job satisfaction, work engagement and organizational commitment (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Catano et al., 2007; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Price Spratlen, 1995; Zemanek, 2016), declining job performance (Celep & Konakli, 2013; Navayan & Chitale, 2016) and exit through psychological or physical withdrawal (time off work, sick leave, transfer, turnover; Cox & Goodman, 2005; Goldberg, Beitz, Wieland, & Levine, 2013; Hollis, 2017; Navayan & Chitale, 2016; Price Spratlen, 1995; Taylor,

2013; Wilkin, 2010). Becoming aggressive or engaging in more conflict was also identified as an effect of exposure (Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Hielt-Black, 1994; Yousef et al., 2013), which would likely contribute to tension and hostility in the department.

The multidimensional nature of faculty work (research, teaching and service) and the intimate connection of faculty identity with their work require that job performance, productivity and withdrawal metrics need to be more nuanced. As noted earlier, it is difficult for faculty to leave a bullying situation through internal transfer or a move to another institution. Thus, faculty may withdraw in ways that are not visible in typical productivity or withdrawal metrics. For example, Huston, Norman and Ambrose (2007) argue that the traditional notion of productivity as scholarship and teaching fails to pick up on faculty who continue to write and teach but who disengage from other aspects of university life such as mentoring, advising and service. In their study, they found that in the face of unsatisfying or non-collegial relationships in the institution, some senior faculty continued "producing" but directed their energies outside their department and institution. Future research on the effects of academic bullying needs to assess the unique and complex ways that faculty can withdraw while still "producing".

As targeted individuals struggle and decline, the effects likely extend out and can reduce department and institutional functioning (Faria, Mixon, & Salter, 2012; Giorgi, 2012; Hollis, 2015; Jackson, 2018). Although there is little empirical research on unit and institutional impact currently, consideration of the implications of faculty withdrawal on group functioning reveals what the possible damage could be. Discussion of faculty withdrawal needs to consider *all* the spheres in which faculty are core to institutional success, that is, research, teaching and service. Faculty reducing or withdrawing from their efforts in scholarship or creative activity not only has huge personal costs for them in terms of their careers (Agarwala, 2018) but also impacts their ability to mentor and advise graduate students and other faculty, increasing the load on their colleagues and putting graduate programmes at risk. Withdrawal also impacts the faculty's ability to shoulder professional responsibilities such as being reviewers for journals and granting agencies, which has implications for the discipline itself. If faculty reduce their investment in teaching, the students and the quality of their learning experience will be negatively impacted. This has direct implications for the department as well as the institution as they face dissatisfaction from students, their families and other supporters including donors, potentially impacting institutional reputation and accreditation. While service is often seen as less important, withdrawal from service within the institution places a heavier burden on other faculty and staff, increasing their stress and dissatisfaction and decreasing their institutional commitment as well as reducing the amount and quality of work necessary to keep the institution moving forward (Keashly & Neuman, 2013).

5.1 In Sum

The impact of bullying in academe is one of loss at a number of levels:

- Loss for the individual who has been victimized in terms of their health and well-being, productivity and potentially their career
- Loss for the students in terms of quality of teaching and faculty advising and mentoring
- Loss for the department and colleagues as they have to shoulder the load of a "missing" colleague and deal with an upset colleague and also their own negative effects from witnessing the mistreatment, including a worry about whether they will be next
- Loss for the institution in terms of time and money to replace faculty, to address complaints that are raised, risk of hostile climate, reputation among academic and professional communities, potential students, government attention and funding, donor support, accreditation and the broader community as information about the experiences spread

Given the faculty role as innovators, knowledge producers, educators, public intellectuals and social critics, the bullying and silencing of academics can have profound implications beyond the individual and the institution to society more broadly.

6 Responding to Academic Bullying

Given that bullying in academe is frequent and harmful, the next section explores what research reveals about how individuals and institutions have responded.

6.1 Target Responding

Talking to friends and family is the most frequently reported response to the experience (Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Keashly & Neuman, 2008; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; Senol, Avsar, Peksen Akca, Argun, & Avsarogullari, 2015; Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014; Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). While this is critical emotional support, because these supporters are not within the university, these friends and family are not in a position to directly impact the situation (Richman et al., 1999). Seeking support from colleagues was also a frequent choice, bringing with it the possibility of direct action in the work environment (Cox & Goodman, 2005; Lewis, 2003; Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014).

Informing influential people within the university has the greatest opportunity for substantive change. Official channels include management/administration

(Cox & Goodman, 2005; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014), union (Cox and Goodman, 2005; Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014) and human resources (HR; Cox & Goodman, 2005; Shaw and Ratcliffe, 2014). However, formal reporting was a less frequently chosen response (Cox & Goodman, 2005; Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; López-Cabarcos & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2006; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Minibas-Poussard, Seckin-Celik, & Bingol, 2018; Senol, Avsar, Peksen Akca, Argun, & Avsarogullari, 2015; Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014; Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). For example, Zabrodska and Kveton (2013) found that less than 2% of targets filed formal grievances. Reasons for not reporting include concern that nothing would be done, no difference would be made, and the fear of consequences such as retaliation (Shaw & Ratcliffe, 2014). Kakumba, Wamala and Wanyama (2014; Uganda) and Boynton (2005; UK) found that response and complaint handling systems were viewed as ineffective in addressing bullying. Cox and Goodman (2005; Australia) found reporting was variably effective with 18% finding resolution, 16% receiving no response to complaint and 4% feeling victimized in response to raising it. Dzurec's (2013) study of nursing faculty who self-identified as bullied found that over half reported it to their supervisors. Of those who reported, approximately half indicated that no action was taken. In a third of the cases, administrators took action, the majority of which was clear and early. However, regardless of the action taken, respondents indicated that they were uncertain of the outcome resulting in "status limbo" (Dzurec, 2013). Similarly, Keashly and Neuman's (2008) and Shaw and Ratcliffe's (2014) studies found that when people report, most efforts did little to change the situation or made it worse. Indeed, McCarthy, Mayhew, Barker and Sheehan's (2003) study of bullying in tertiary education in Australia found that the majority of actors suffered no consequences. Such experiences solidify the belief that nothing will be done or what is done makes no difference. Finally, studies that considered HR found it was least accessed, which is important given that many policies identify HR as the unit for reporting.

6.2 Witness Responding

While it is clear that faculty acknowledge seeing others bullied and that targets frequently tell their colleagues about their experiences, the research on precisely what these witnesses do in response is sparse. What is available does suggest that witnesses are active though. In a study of student affairs professionals, Gerstenfield (2016) found that approximately half of the witnesses sought assistance to address the situation. Keashly and Neuman (2008) had witnesses identify what they did and the perceived effectiveness of the action. Despite many witnesses reported being uncertain about what to do, they still engaged in a variety of actions. The most frequent response involved talking to co-workers, family and friends, likely in an effort to understand what they had seen. Of particular importance, 75% let the target

know what they saw, validating the target's experience. Many actions were focused on buffering the target from the actor. Less than half reported what they had seen to higher-ups. Similar to targets, formal reporting was perceived as worsening the situation.

6.3 Institutional Responding

Target experiences of little to no action and ineffectiveness of the action taken may be a result of the administrators' own uncertainty with how to respond. Research from the perspective of administrators suggests that they struggle with how to respond, trying a number of different strategies. Administrators may feel particularly hamstrung by the lack of clear work rules and policies regarding conduct making it challenging for them to determine if there has been contravention of appropriate behaviour (Dzurec, 2013; Hegranes, 2012; Theiss, Webb, & Amason, 2012). A solution to this would be the development and implementation of policies, which will be explored in a later section.

The explanation above presumes that the university and by extension administrators view bullying as a problem because it runs counter to institutional values, hurts their members and facilitates a hostile climate. The lack of or lukewarm responding by the institution, however, may reflect something more sinister, specifically the privileging of the institution's needs over the needs of its members. The arguments proposed earlier regarding the nature of academic culture generally and academic freedom specifically can be utilized to reframe bullying from a systemic issue requiring institutional response to a personal or interpersonal issue, which leaves individuals to work it out. This framing permits the institution to ignore or minimize the target's concern (Keashly, 2001) or to problematize the target as a troublemaker or difficult person (Friedenberg, 2008; Lester, 2009; Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piper-King, 2015).

6.4 In Sum

Responding to bullying involves a number of players including the target, witnesses and the institution. Targets and witnesses engage in a variety of strategies, many of which fail to ameliorate the situation. Of particular note is the lack of or limited success in effective aid from institutional offices, particularly HR offices. Faculty appear to have little confidence that they will receive institutional support and may well put themselves at risk of being problematized themselves.

7 Relational Nature of Academic Bullying

Bullying specifically and workplace aggression generally are inherently relational (Hershcovis & Reich, 2013; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003). Thus, who is doing what to whom is important in understanding the manifestation, experience and impact of workplace bullying. Similar behaviours coming from relatively powerful actors (senior faculty to junior faculty, tenured to non-tenured, dean to faculty) vs equal rank (peers) may be experienced and, thus, labelled differently, for example, annoying from the peers or abusive from one with the power to harm. Also, without knowing the source, it is hard to distinguish between single acts by various actors and multiple actions by the same actor, which may reflect hostile work environment vs a bullying relationship, respectively. Finally, evidence suggests that different actors do engage in different behaviours (Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Minibas-Poussard, Seckin-Celik, & Bingol, 2018; Senol, Avsar, Peksen Akca, Argun, & Avsarogullari, 2015), the patterning of which may be assumed to have different impacts. Given the importance of source of aggression in the experience and impact of bullying, it is surprising that much of the survey research cited here did not gather nor report this information.

7.1 Relative Power

As Table 1 reveals, bullying and aggression come from a variety of actors of different organizational levels or relative social power. Of particular note for faculty is that colleagues are frequently identified as the actors (peer-to-peer bullying). Even faculty bullies identify other colleagues as their most likely targets (Buka, 2013). This primacy of colleagues as actors is different than other industries and also within the university context itself, where bosses/superiors are more frequently identified by staff as the bullies (Keashly & Neuman, 2013; Rankin & Associates, 2014; Williams & Ruiz, 2012).

In the academic context, the term "peer" obscures the fact that faculty vary in their access to sources of influence or power to manifest their desires. Faculty experiences of bullying may be more accurately described as "positional" bullying (Misawa, 2015). Positional power in academe has several faces. First, the relative institutional position of various groups, specifically faculty, staff, students and administration, influences who bullies and how they do so (Rankin & Associates, 2014; Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2015). For example, in the study of a US state university system, Rankin and Associates (2014) reported that organizational position/role was the most frequently identified basis for respondents' reported mistreatment. With respect to faculty, academic management such as chairs and deans, who control access to key resources and desired positions, are relatively more powerful (e.g. Dentith, Wright, & Coryell, 2015; Wilkin, 2010). Students as consumers or clients within a neo-liberal model of higher education may wield considerable power and be permitted greater behavioural latitude as a result, that is, contrapower (academic) harassment (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2014; Cassidy, Jackson, & Faucher, 2016;

DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman, Phelps, Bancroft, & Beneke, 2009; May & Tenzek, 2018; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008).

Second, within the faculty category, professorial rank matters because of the associated influence in processes and practices key to career development of other faculty, such as merit review, promotion and tenure/permanent contract as well as the peer review process itself. Studies that examined professorial rank within the category of "colleague" found that actors are more likely to be senior in rank relative to the faculty target (Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017; Beckmann, Cannella, & Wantland, 2013; Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; Neuman, 2009; Singh, 2017). Even within rank, faculty power disparity can come from temporary administrative appointments or involvement as institutional governance representatives such as the academic/faculty senate (Lester, 2009).

As noted in the discussion of academic culture, the holding of tenure (permanent employment) is a source of power in the university as it provides protection from retaliation and has been argued as reducing the perceived cost of behaving inappropriately (Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Only a few studies (Canada and the USA) explicitly gathered data on tenure status of targets and actors. Aranda (2018), Hollis (2012) and Zemanek (2016) find evidence that untenured faculty were more at risk. However, other studies report that tenured faculty were more at risk of being bullied (e.g. Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2014; Cassidy, Jackson, & Faucher, 2016; Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; Onorato, 2013; Taylor, 2013; Westhues, 2006; WISELI, 2016). Westhues (2006) suggests that the reason for this is that bullying and mobbing may be framed as the only way to get rid of a tenured faculty member who is perceived as oppositional or "troublesome" by colleagues and administration.

Third, a faculty member's academic capital is defined by their relevance to the university's agenda, for example, STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) focus, major grant getters and high productivity. Such capital permits more influence and these faculty are often given broader behavioural latitude, that is, idiosyncrasy credits (Hollander, 1958; Twale, 2017). "High-performing instigators" (Williams, Campbell, & Denton, 2013, p. 35) who engage in unprofessional behaviour can mobilize their academic capital and associated status to frame their behaviour in ways to resist attempts by colleagues and administrators to manage their behaviours. Being a high performer can also be a risk factor for being targeted (Keashly & Neuman, 2018). Specifically, being a high performer in terms of academic achievements when perceived as a threat to colleagues' statuses, particularly in a competitive academic environment, may make some faculty "noticeable" and, hence, vulnerable (Friedenberg, 2008; Jackson, 2018; Kim & Glomb, 2014; Kotleras, 2007; Twale, 2017; Westhues, 2006). Junior faculty and faculty-in-training (graduate students and postdocs; Martin, Goodboy, & Johnson, 2015; Morris, 2011; Yamada, Cappadocia, & Pepler, 2014) may be particularly vulnerable. Selected for, and supported in, their scholarly and creative productivity, new tenure-track faculty will be among the high performers. They are at particular risk, due to lack of job security and the reliance on tenured senior faculty in their performance appraisal and promotion. Thus, they are less likely to be able to defend themselves against actors

who are senior in rank (Burk & Eby, 2010). Even senior faculty who are high performers have been found to be at risk, particularly for academic mobbing (Friedenberg, 2008; Westhues, 2006).

Finally, and most importantly, social power and rank in terms of race and ethnicity, caste, class, gender, LGBTQ and (dis)ability shape bullying expression and experience (Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piper-King, 2015; Misawa, 2015; Pathania & Tierney, 2018; Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2015). Gender was the most frequently studied across countries. However, race, ethnicity, LGBTQ and disability status were reported only in the North American research. As can be seen from Table 1, women, racial and ethnic minorities, LGBTQ and disabled faculty are more likely to report being victimized. Similar patterns of biased treatment show up in research on student incivility, with women and minority faculty more at risk of disrespectful treatment and negative teaching evaluations (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016; Lampman, 2012; Reid, 2010). These data support the argument that bullying in the academy is a gendered (Dentith, Wright, & Coryell, 2015; Lester, 2009; Salin & Hoel, 2013; Sedivy-Benton et al., 2015; Simpson & Cohen, 2004), racialized (Frazier, 2011; Johnson-Bailey, 2015) and heteronormative (Misawa, 2015; Sallee & Diaz, 2013) phenomenon. It may also be a "classed" phenomenon. In many countries, universities have been characterized as reflecting middle- to upper-class values and norms with faculty coming from these backgrounds. The literature on working class academics reveals faculty who feel like fish out of water, struggling to fit in, often meeting with resistance (e.g. Nelson, Englar-Carlson, Tierney, & Hau, 2006). Thus, faculty bullying and mobbing may reflect identity-related bias.

The various sources of positional power noted above often co-occur and demonstrate unequal influence. Research on intersectionality reveals that the power (and protection) of faculty rank, tenure/permanent status or institutional position can be overridden by social identity status creating counter-positional bullying (Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Misawa, 2015). Faculty with marginalized group identities and particularly those with multiple marginalized identities are more likely to be bullied regardless of being "up in the hierarchy" (e.g. senior rank, tenured, administrative appointment), and faculty of privileged group identities are more likely to be the actors (Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piper-King, 2015; Misawa, 2015; Phipps, 2017; Rankin & Associates, 2014; Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2015). Thus, in order to fully reveal the dynamics and nuances of power and vulnerability, research on bullying in academe and other work contexts must focus on organizational and social group identities and their intersectionality (Hodgins, 2014).

7.2 The Actors

Faculty as actors. Typically, in workplace bullying research in academe and other work contexts, data are gathered from the perspective of targets and, less frequently, witnesses. Rarely is information provided from the perpetrator's perspective (Bloch, 2012; Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009). Intriguingly, Ahmad, Kalim and Kaleem

(2017; Pakistan), Buka (2013; Albania) and Ojedokun, Oteri and Ogungbamila (2014; Nigeria) did ask faculty whether they had engaged in bullying and mobbing, and the reported rates (30.8%, 11.5% and 20.4%, respectively) are remarkable in terms of size. For comparison, rates of 0.3% have been reported in samples of the US working population (WBTI, 2017). Identifying oneself as bullying/mobbing others would seem to be a socially undesirable label. Indeed, there is evidence that faculty actively resist this characterization of their behaviours (e.g. Friedenberg, 2008; Nelson & Lambert, 2001; Westhues, 2004). These rates may reflect cultural differences in terms of the "acceptability" of bullying-type behaviours (Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2011; Power et al., 2013) or that these labels are highly regarded in these cultural contexts, that is, being tough and smart. Ahmad, Kalim and Kaleem (2017) suggest that the honour culture of Pakistan is reflected in its academic culture. In this cultural context, "being bullied disgraces the honour of an academic" (p. 208), and bullying thus becomes a means to "safeguard their honour" (p. 214). Ahmad et al.'s interpretation highlights the contextual nature of social behaviour in this case, bullying, that requires a multilevel cultural contextual lens.

Student as actor: Contrapower harassment. As evidenced by the robust literature on student incivility in the classroom (e.g. Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Clark, 2009; DeSouza, 2011; Goodyear, Reynolds, & Gragg, 2010; Lampman, 2012; Reid, 2010), and as seen in Table 1, students are frequent actors. McKay, Arnold, Fratzl and Thomas (2008) described behaviours of purposeful interruption, challenging authority, excessive/aggressive questioning of decisions, unwarranted professional remarks, yelled at and threatening with law suits directed at faculty. The case of student as actor is interesting because their activities may be considered counter-positional (Misawa, 2015), contrapower harassment (Lampman, Phelps, Bancroft, & Beneke, 2009) or "bottom-up" bullying (McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008). This challenges the notion of power and what contributes to the power differential. While faculty have significant impact on student experience and fate, students do wield power in the current higher education context. With the shift to neo-liberal and managerial culture that emphasizes enrolment-driven funding and prioritizing of career-focused training, the student has become a customer and is empowered in that capacity (Cassidy, Jackson, & Faucher, 2016; Lewis, 2003; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Thus, student evaluations and satisfaction are important metrics in the evaluation of the faculty member and their career progress. Also, the competitive nature of some programmes for entry and the drive to succeed (e.g. pre-med and pre-law) create an environment where students want to ensure top grades and, thus, may pressure faculty. The increased sensitivity regarding dealing with controversial topics and resultant student (dis)comfort have faculty positioned in the role of classroom manager and arbiter. Thus, the environment is ripe with features that would be conducive to bullying and incivility on the part of students. As is clear from Table 1, students are more likely to be uncivil to or bully women, racial and ethnic minorities and

LGBTQ faculty (Cassidy, Jackson, & Faucher, 2016; Goodyear, Reynolds, & Gragg, 2010; Lampman, 2012; Sallee & Diaz, 2013).

University as actor: Depersonalized bullying. Institutions may be viewed as "bullying" through the nature of institutional structure and focus, which influences the nature of faculty work and in the process has implication for academic freedom and faculty autonomy. An increasingly academic managerial focus privileges effectiveness and efficiency as key criteria for achieving university goals (Chandler, Barry, & Clark, 2002). Certain activities and, thus, the faculty associated with them are viewed as more supportive of these goals. Some examples are the emphasis on engaging in research that brings in grant money, privileging of "scientific" disciplines over the humanities and the arts, teaching that brings in students (often with a career focus) and conducting teaching in less expensive ways. Not surprisingly then, faculty whose work is not viewed as core to the university agenda receive less support and resources and may even be ignored. Further, faculty who critique the university' s goals and privileged activities may be perceived as threats to the institutional agenda (Ilongo, 2016; Zabrodska, Linnell, Laws, & Davies, 2011). Intimidation and hostility conveyed by administrative representatives such as chairs, deans and other senior administrators, often through selective application of policies (Lester, 2009; Simpson & Cohen, 2004), are utilized to ensure university members' compliance with the university agenda (i.e. "get with the programme"; D'Cruz, 2015; Ilongo, 2016; Vanhoutte, 2010; Wilkin, 2010). The vulnerability of faculty as critic described earlier, particularly when administrators are involved, captures this dynamic (Dentith, Wright, & Coryell, 2015; Friedenberg, 2008; Oleksiyenko, 2018; Westhues, 2006).

Beyond the university: Public and state as actors. Most research on faculty bullying focuses on experiences with actors within the institutional community. Yet there are actors outside the university worthy of note, specifically the broader public and the state. These two sets of actors are particularly influential as they (a) reflect broad societal discourses and narratives regarding what and who are considered as valuable and important and (b) drive public and social policy.

The public. While the work of academics has always been subject to public scrutiny, the advent of the Internet and social media has made faculty and their scholarly and pedagogical activities even more visible. In their roles as public intellectuals utilizing social media for knowledge mobilization and dissemination, the availability of recordings of presentations or class lectures on YouTube or simply information about faculty on university websites, faculty perspectives and work are exposed to a broader public, some of whom have different ideological perspectives and values. Further, those outside of academe may not understand nor appreciate the meaning and implications of academic freedom for legitimizing faculty behaviour, particularly speech. As a result, some faculty have been on the receiving end of public targeted online harassment, directed at their scholarship and perspectives (e.g. Ferber, 2018; Flaherty, 2017; Veletsianos, Houlden, Hodson, & Gosse, 2018). These attacks are perceived as attempts to silence and intimidate faculty and the sharing of controversial ideas and challenges, that is, to challenge the role of public intellectual

and critic (Ferber, 2018). The harassment is often delivered anonymously through a variety of media including comments posted to websites and blog posts, emails and phone calls, making it difficult to isolate and address the source. The content is often hypercritical and hostile involving name-calling, slurs and threats of job loss and physical harm to the faculty and their family. A powerful feature of information communication technology is the ability to reach a wide and varied audience quickly. That audience can also respond as quickly and has, at times, resulted in online mobbing that fuels more hostile rhetoric and potential for actual harm in terms of faculty and institutional health and well-being (Ronson, 2016). Such media are also boundaryless in terms of time and geography (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2013) making it difficult for faculty to get away from the bullying and harassment. The permanence of electronic content also means that the content can be revived, reframed and re-circulated, beginning the harassment anew (Dooley, Pyżalski, & Cross, 2009). Thus, even if a faculty member withdraws from electronic engagement, they cannot hide (Veletsianos, Houlden, Hodson, & Gosse, 2018).

In terms of institutional responding, universities have struggled to address such situations, as they navigate the importance of defending free speech and academic freedom of their faculty and the potential threat to their reputation and economic survival as an institution. Indeed, university responding to these public critiques may result in faculty feeling attacked and then abandoned and betrayed by their own institutions (Smith & Freyd, 2014). The pervasive and virulent nature and wide-ranging impact of targeting and bullying of faculty by the public warrant more focused attention both for our understanding of faculty experiences and also for the workplace bullying literature more broadly.

The state. The literature on academic freedom and threats to academic freedom illustrates how state actors can silence academics in violent, coercive and seemingly peaceful ways. Silencing can be covert through state influence on structures, policies and practices of institutions, what is considered legitimate research and "appropriate" academic curricula. For example, the government of Hungary recently proposed the banning of gender studies programmes citing them as not "economically rational" (Redden, 2018). Postiglione and Jung (2017) in their report on the changing academic profession in Hong Kong note how some academics are subjected to "political bullying" for their scholarship through pro-establishment newspapers.

This silencing can be overt through violent and coercive attacks on faculty, students and universities (Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA], 2018; SAR, 2018). The most recent report from Scholars at Risk (SAR, 2018), an organization that monitors threats to academic freedom worldwide, highlights a range of violent and repressive incidents and efforts directed at universities, academics and students. SAR (2018) frames these as attempts to undermine the freedom to think and to question, and undercut universities, which have been spaces that allow and support this. Turkey's current situation is particularly dire, with over 5000 academic staff having lost their jobs and faculty brought up on charges of conspiring to overthrow the country's leader. These activities are quintessentially bullying and have profound implications for the freedom to think and question, a defining quality of academe and academics. While institutional (depersonalized)

bullying has been an increasing focus of workplace bullying research (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2009; Liefooghe & Mackenzie Davey, 2001), the state as bully is rarely considered in the broader workplace bullying literature (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012).

7.3 In Sum

Being different and being "noticeable" in this difference (Dentith, Wright, & Coryell, 2015) are connected to bullying in academe. Faculty who are "different" from some presumed standard or comparator and thus perceived to be counter-normative and a threat to the status quo are more likely to report being bullied or treated uncivilly (Cortina, 2008; Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piper-King, 2015; Simpson & Cohen, 2004). The presumed standard is deeply grounded in broader socio-structural inequities, in which those with social status privilege victimize those without. Thus, studying and addressing bullying in academe means studying and addressing social inequity. Finally, compared to other workers, faculty "get it from all sides", and each set of actors brings their own unique expression and challenges. This variety of actors both within and outside the institution (public and state) and their power to inflict harm is relevant for the workplace bullying literature more broadly.

8 Cultural Nature of Academic Bullying

The examination of the prevalence of bullying based on studies in Table 1 highlights that faculty experiences are influenced by other cultural factors, including national (e.g. Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017; Meriläinen et al., 2017), disciplinary and institutional as evidenced by studies of state or national systems of universities (e.g. Rankin & Associates, 2014; UCU surveys, Kinman & Wray, 2013a, 2013b, 2014).

8.1 National Culture

The question of national culture influence on academe raises interesting questions. First, what are the relative contributions of national culture and academic culture to the manifestation, experience and management of bullying? Cross-country comparisons of academics' experiences would provide some insight. Meriläinen, Käyhkö, Kõiv and Sinkkonen's (2018) comparative study of Finnish and Estonian academics is an exemplar of the type of research. Utilizing the same measure of bullying and collecting data within the same timeframe, the authors reported differences in the rates and forms of academic bullying and suggested these reflected cultural differences between the countries. Comparing academe to other industries within a country (Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017) as well as across countries would be important in sorting out the relative contributions of national and academic culture. Second, what does bullying look like and how is it experienced within an institution,

when faculty are from a number of different countries? Research on the relationship of cultural diversity to employee (mis)treatment in multinational organizations (Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2006; Leng & Yazdanifard, 2014) suggests this is an important issue.

Another interesting question is whether the culture of academe could be considered an honour culture (Leung & Cohen, 2011). For faculty, their identity and their reputation are their currency, grounded in the value of their scholarship and creative activity. To have their reputation attacked or undermined would be deeply threatening. Earlier, the culture of academe was described as one where critique and debate are expected and indeed embraced. The presumption is that critique is to be targeted at ideas and not at people, that is, "not personal". The challenge for faculty is that their identity and reputation are closely intertwined with their work, so these critiques, depending upon how they are handled or delivered or indeed whether the faculty shares the same normative expectations for critique, may be experienced as personal attacks and deliberate attempts to undermine, that is, a threat to honour (Infante & Gorden, 1989; Tannen, 2002; Tracy, 2011). Examining the culture of academe through the lens of culture type (e.g. honour, dignity and face; Leung & Cohen, 2011) or via cultural dimensions such as GLOBE (Jacobson, Hood, & Van Buren, 2014) may provide additional insight into the dynamics, impact and management of bullying in the academic workplace, particularly with faculty (Samnani, 2013b).

8.2 Disciplinary Culture

Disciplinary culture and practices can also shape bullying. Regarding this influence, some study samples were composed of faculty from specific disciplines (agricultural and life sciences, Zemanek, 2016; business and economics, Raineri, Frear, & Edmonds, 2011; health administration, Dellifraine, McClelland, Erwin, & Wang, 2014; health sciences, Korukcu, Bulut, Tuzcu, Bayram, & Öztürk Türkmen, 2014; nursing, Beckmann, Cannella, & Wantland, 2013; Ozturk, Yilmaz, & Hindistan, 2007; Yildirim & Yildirim, 2007; social studies, Meriläinen, Sinkkonen, Puhakka, & Kayhko, 2016; social work, Horton, 2016; Johnson, 2014) with authors often making the case that the particular discipline(s) would be ripe for bullying. Without providing data from other disciplines for comparators, it is difficult to discern unique disciplinary influence in bullying exposure. Interestingly, most of the studies noted here included faculty of a variety of disciplines, yet disciplinary influences were often not explored. For studies that did explore, it is clear that rates were different. Yousef, El-Houfey and El-Serogy (2013) in their study of Egyptian academics found that the actors from the practical/professional disciplines in contrast to the theoretical disciplines utilized more direct negative behaviours. Taylor (2013; USA) reported higher rates in colleges of arts and humanities. WISELI (2016; USA) noted faculty in social studies, arts and humanities rated overall climate less positively than other disciplines. These latter two studies were single-institution studies, and thus, the influence of institutional culture may also be relevant here as well. Given the

significance of discipline to faculty identity and work (Clark, 1987), it would be informative to explore the ways disciplinary norms, structure and the focus and production of work connect to bullying exposure and experience and by extension the implications for addressing bullying (Metzger, Petit, & Sieber, 2015).

8.3 Institutional Culture

Universities are not the same, even within a country or higher education system (Rankin & Associates, 2014; UCU surveys). Institutional differences such as type (e.g. research, comprehensive, liberal arts, community colleges), mission (teaching vs research focused), financial and administrative structure, nature of the student body and funding sources (public or private institutions) have implications for the nature of faculty work and overall culture and climate (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Clark, 1987). In the USA, fuelled by the espoused values of diversity and inclusion, many institutions undertake climate surveys, which focus on articulating the experiences of faculty, staff and students and identifying the institutional and environmental features that influence those experiences. Several studies in Table 1 are based on institutional climate surveys. The most notable in terms of its extensiveness is the climate assessment of the University of California system, which includes 12 campuses, with varying missions and mandates. A comparative examination of the individual institutional reports reveals the variety in the rates of harassing, discriminatory and bullying experiences. The connection between bullying and climate is recursive; bullying influences and is influenced by work environment. For example, Giorgi's (2012) study of an Italian university demonstrated how workplace bullying negatively affected institutional climate. On the other side, Qureshi, Rasli and Zaman's (2014) study of faculty from 144 universities in Pakistan demonstrated how constructive organizational climate as reflected in management support, work–life balance and team orientation reduced workplace bullying and its negative effects on health. An aspect of institutional culture that is particularly relevant to bullying is the culture for conflict management (Einarsen, Skogstad, Rørvik, Lande, & Nielsen, 2018). Desrayaud, Dickson and Webb (2019) demonstrated that academic departments characterized by avoidant or dominating conflict cultures were more likely to experience bullying. These findings underline the need to explicitly identify the aspects of institutional culture central in the support and mitigation of workplace bullying.

8.4 In Sum

The research reviewed here has been suggestive of a nested set of cultural influences on academic bullying. Beyond the influence of academic culture, bullying in academe is grounded in and is hypothesized to be shaped by national, disciplinary and institutional culture. The precise nature and intersectionality of these influences and their impact remain to be investigated.

9 Behaviour Does Not Speak for Itself: Contextualizing Study and Practice

The available research on the acceptability of bullying behaviours based on national culture (e.g. Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2011; Power et al., 2013) and research documenting the relationship of identity group membership (Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Piper-King, 2015) and source with the enactment and experience of bullying (e.g. Hershcovis & Reich, 2013) illustrate that behaviour never speaks for itself; rather, behaviour is interpreted within a context. This context is often not clearly articulated nor, as evidenced in the situation of dominant identity group structures (e.g. critique of academe as male and heteronormative), even considered. A consideration of the aspects of academic culture (academic freedom, shared governance, autonomy, tenure) and the role of faculty as scholars/artists, as leaders within the institution and as public intellectuals vividly reveals that "rules of engagement" for faculty are different in content and perhaps degree than those of other employee groups in the institution and indeed of other sectors (Klein & Lester, 2013; Fratzl & McKay, 2013). These "rules" for academics are further influenced by disciplinary culture (Clark, 1987). Similar contextual logics could be applied in other industries. That is, the nature of the work, values of the organization, organizational culture, role in the work and the organization as well as national culture will influence what the rules of engagement are and that those rules likely vary within the organization across employee groups. The fact that the rules of engagement or relational conduct norms may differ across employee groups or positions and that such differences may not be recognized has implications for the interpretation of, and responses to, conduct generally and to workplace bullying specifically (Klein & Lester, 2013). We can debate (respectfully) whether there should be, or whether it is even possible to have, a single set of rules of engagement or room for multiple sets that interconnect around core conduct rules or more broadly core values. While we theorize the nature and impact of contextual features, we do not often capture the contextual nature of workplace bullying in our measurement and methodology (Hershcovis, 2011; Meriläinen & Kõiv, 2017).

9.1 Research Implications

Fully embracing the contextual nature of behaviour has several implications for workplace bullying research in general and academic bullying research in particular.

Samples: Partnering with other efforts. As argued earlier, the samples used influence what is found and to whom the findings can be generalized (see also Fahie & McGillicuddy, Volume 1 Section B). The survey studies in this review included samples focused on the academic profession broadly, disciplines, or specific institutions or institutional systems. Each type of sample permits the investigation of different aspects or elements of workplace bullying involving faculty. To address questions about the prevalence, nature and effects of bullying among academics, large-scale representative samples are important. Australia, Canada and the UK

through their nationwide academic unions have access to such samples. For other countries such as the USA, where unionization of academics is not widespread, the challenge is how to develop such large representative samples.

One possibility is to draw upon, or explicitly partner with, established large-scale surveys such as the General Social Survey (http://gss.norc.org) and the National Health Interview Survey (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/index.htm) in the USA, Health and Safety Executive (http://www.hse.gov.uk) in the UK and the European Working Conditions Surveys (EWCS; https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/european-working-conditions-surveys), which involves multiple countries. In addition, the World Health Organization (WHO; http://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/en/) sponsors cross-national surveys on various issues, including subjective well-being. These large-scale studies capture country experience and provide the opportunity to examine influence and impact of broader social, political and economic situations. As an example, Hodgins (2014) drawing on the 2010 EWCS demonstrated that workplace mistreatment (which included bullying) was associated with a number of work environment factors. Of note were findings that mistreatment was higher in countries with smaller gender gaps, better economic situations and anti-bullying legislations, findings that seem contrary to current theorizing and reflect the complexity of workplace mistreatment.

These particular large-scale surveys are also administered periodically allowing examination of changes over time. Further, through their demographic indicators of industry and occupation, these samples would permit comparisons of academe to other sectors. The addition of items on bullying or refinement of current items on bullying and personal harassment, the additional refinement of industry category to separate higher education from the broader education category typically used and the enhancement of the demographic categories to include discipline and faculty status would provide the detailed data to examine the profile of bullying among academics.

Beyond the general social or working population surveys, there are surveys focused specifically on the status of the academic profession. One example is the National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF; https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf; Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006), which gathered data from 1989 to 2004. This study was designed to provide data about faculty to postsecondary education researchers, planners and policymakers. Two current examples are the 20-nation study of the Changing Academic Profession (CAP; Teichler, Arimoto, & Cummings, 2013) and the "Academic Profession in Europe" (EUROAC). These studies examine academics' experiences and perceptions regarding numerous social challenges to higher education and the impact on identity, stress and job satisfaction (e.g. Shin & Jung, 2014). At present, none of the questions tap directly into the quality of working relationships or climate, where bullying would typically appear. It would be useful to explore whether it would be possible to incorporate relevant questions into any subsequent studies.

As noted earlier, institutional climate surveys are becoming part of the higher education environment in the USA. These are natural places to include items on bullying alongside items regarding discrimination and harassment. These surveys

are rich with demographic data including discipline/department, faculty status and other identity characteristics and would permit exploration of how working environments and climate in departments and units shape the existence, experience and impact of bullying.

Disciplines are powerful influences on faculty identity and behaviour. Disciplines differ to some degree regarding expected conduct, which suggests the nature and experience of bullying are shaped by this context (Clark, 1987; Metzger et al., 2015). Accessing discipline-specific samples could be facilitated through partnership with academic disciplinary associations. These associations are interested in understanding the state of the discipline and experience of their membership. An exemplar of such interest is the recently published report by the Royal Historical Society regarding the racial and ethnic profile and experience of students and staff in UK History Departments.

Enhancing the range and variety of study samples will enhance the quality of prevalence data and allow for comparative research. Two types of comparative research of particular importance are (1) cross-discipline, cross-institution and cross-national to examine the unique and shared manifestation of and influences on academic bullying and (2) cross-employee type within academe (staff, students, administration) and cross-industry, which would permit examination of the distinct influences of work type and work context. This comparative research highlights the importance of cross-national and cross-cultural collaborations (Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017; Ojedokun, Oteri, & Ogungbamila, 2014). The extensive collaborative work on cultural acceptability of bullying (Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2011; Power et al., 2013) is a fine exemplar of the richness of the data and interpretation that results.

Broadening perspectives examined. In addition to drawing on different cultural perspectives, research in academic bullying would benefit from expanding on whom we focus. Consistent with bullying research in other workplaces, the **target** perspective has been the focus of most research in bullying involving faculty. The experiences of full-time faculty, particularly those on the tenure track or permanent contract, have been the primary focus. Missing target voices are faculty who are in temporary or contingent status. A recent study in the USA (https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/10112018%20Data%20Snapshot%20Tenure.pdf) found that 73% of faculty were not on the tenure track and most of these were part-time (adjunct) faculty and graduate teaching assistants. These positions may be particularly vulnerable to bullying from other faculty, administrators and students. Because of their precarious connection to the university and lack of job protections, they may be less willing to speak out about their experiences. To get a fuller picture of bullying in academe, it is important that research expand to encompass contingent faculty experiences (see Djurkovic, chapter "Workplace Bullying in Precarious Employment", this volume).

With a few exceptions (e.g. Ahmad, Kalim, & Kaleem, 2017; Buka, 2013; Ojedokun, Oteri, & Ogungbamila, 2014; Zabrodska et al., 2016), research has not focused on the **actor's** perspective. Utilizing a collective biography method, Zábrodská , Ellwood, Zaeemdar and Mudrak (2016) conducted an analysis of target

and actor perspectives on initial hostile interactions. Six academics from a variety of countries shared a story where they were the target and a story where they were the actor. Through consideration of both target and actor perspectives, the relational and interactive nature of hostility was highlighted. From the actor perspective, the authors noted how actors justified their actions in terms of target behavioural inadequacies (norm violation) and also the actors' failure to recognize injury, thus enabling them to disregard the vulnerability of the target. Probing the actor perspective revealed how social norms and moral positioning can be used to support hostile action. Understanding what supports actor conduct highlights places where action can be taken to challenge this mistreatment.

Expanding the net of actor type beyond the immediate environment is important. The examination of academics' experiences of being bullied reveals the public and the state as powerful actors. Yet, the research on these actors, their behaviours and impact is very limited in the workplace bullying literature. A full exploration of the social architecture of bullying in academe and other work contexts requires that these actors become a focus of research attention (see Volume 2 Section B for chapters on actors in workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment).

Another perspective is the **witness** as third parties to the bullying relationship. As is clear from Table 1, faculty were aware of others being bullied. In addition to the harmful effects of bullying, witnesses can fundamentally influence the bullying interaction in both destructive and constructive ways (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2011; Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Paull et al., 2012; see also Pouwelse et al., Volume 2 Section B). Within the community of peers, colleagues as resources for sense-making (Lewis, 2003) and as potential interveners (Keashly & Neuman, 2018) can have profound influences. Thus, research on how witnesses in general and faculty in particular think about, experience and respond to bullying by their colleagues will be critical to understanding the social context and management of bullying in academe.

The witness is an exemplar of the much broader category of third party (Ury, 2000). This category also includes those who become informed about or are expected/assumed to have some involvement with addressing or managing the bullying situation. In academe this would include academic leaders such as academic department chairs, directors, deans as well as senior administrators. HR offices, equity offices, ombuds offices and unions would be units or groups that would likely have some contact with bullying situations. How these third parties think about bullying as well as their role vis-à-vis the university will affect how they respond to it. As noted earlier, several survey studies in Table 1 were sponsored by academic unions reflective of their interests in ensuring a healthy working environment for their membership and advocating for effective institutional responding. The perspective of HR professionals has been an increasing focus in the broader workplace bullying literature (e.g. Salin et al., 2018) and more recently in academic environments (e.g. Rockett, Fan, Dwyers, & Foy, 2017). Ombuds in academic institutions are often alerted to bullying situations before formally designated offices. In the USA, ombuds have been particularly influential in institutional change to address bullying (Hollis, 2016b; Keashly, 2018b). These third parties are important aspects of the social architecture of bullying and, thus, worthy of further research attention.

Identity, rank and intersectionality. The discussion of bullying in academe as cultural and relational draws attention to the fact that not all academics are equally vulnerable to being bullied or engaging in bullying (Jackson, 2018). Bullying is *not* status-blind, and to conduct research without questioning this assumption will at the very least create a superficial understanding and, at its worst, contribute to perpetuation of this experience for vulnerable others (see Volume 3 Section B for chapters on workplace bullying and various social identities). Thus, research on faculty experiences of bullying and workplace bullying more broadly needs to take this into account by consistently including social identity and organizational position of targets, actors and others and examining the nature and impact of intersectionality of these various identities on exposure, enactment, experience and management of bullying (e.g. Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Misawa, 2015).

9.2 Measurement: What Is Asked Matters

There is an extensive literature on the nature of measurement of workplace bullying and implications for rates and assessment of the nature and impact of the bullying experience (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010; see also Notelaers & van der Heijden, Volume 1 Section B). An important consideration from the contextual perspective is the extent to which we are capturing these influences in our measurement. Measurement of bullying has not typically taken into account the relational or conduct norms of the specific work context and how they affect perceptions as victims, as perpetrators, as witnesses and as other third parties. Faculty interpret their behaviour within a discursive and cultural context that creates a broader latitude for what is "appropriate" and, thus, inappropriate behaviour compared to other workers (Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2015). These contextual features need to be reflected in how we measure workplace bullying.

In terms of measurement by behavioural checklist, while many of those behaviours may be present and may be experienced as challenging, they may not be considered problematic or out of the norm for academics, where for other workplaces and for other employees within a university context, they are considered/experienced as bullying. Some researchers have attempted to capture the unique conduct norms indirectly by creating context-specific behavioural checklists developed through a focus on faculty or the academic environment (e.g. Meriläinen & Kõiv, 2017; Ozturk, Yilmaz, & Hindistan, 2007). One way of exploring normative influence is to assess the acceptability of different behaviours across employee groups within a university and across industries as has been done with national culture (e.g. Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2011; Power et al., 2013). Another approach would be to focus on the articulation of norms for different workers within higher education. Braxton and Bray's (1999) work on faculty articulation of inviolable and other norms regarding teaching demonstrates that such articulation by group members is possible and informative. Normative context is a feature of the work environment, and given the support for the work environment hypothesis and bullying (see Balducci et al., Volume 2 Section A), research focusing

on articulating these norms and then empirically examining the connection to bullying definitions, nature and meaning of behaviours and impact is important.

Another critical contextual element that influences the meaning and experience of the behaviours is relational, specifically the source/actor and who they are relative to the target. Despite evidence that different actors use different behaviours and that even holding the behaviours constant, who enacts the behaviour matters (Hershcovis & Reich, 2013; Lamertz & Aquino, 2004; Neuman & Keashly, 2010), much of the research in academe still does not assess bullying behaviour vis-à-vis the actor. As revealed in the discussion of the types of actors that faculty face, different actors have access to different resources that can be expected to influence the nature, variety and impact of behaviours they can utilize to persistently mistreat a faculty member. The failure to include the source of behaviour reflects a presumption that all behaviours are equal in their meaning and, thus, impact no matter from whom it comes (Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004).

Beyond surveys and checklists. In his critique of the broader workplace bullying literature, Samnani (2013b) argues for academics to draw on interpretivism, critical management theory and postmodernism perspectives to dig into and surface the structures, logics and discourses that position bullying as a strategy for gaining and maintaining power (see Cowan & Toth as well as Tye-Williams, Volume 1 Section B). While the findings from the studies in Table 1 help map the domain of the phenomenon of bullying in academe, it is qualitative research grounded in these other perspectives that fills in the rich details, making the experiences more vivid and real and revealing complex and nuanced dynamics and structures that survey findings hint at.

Through the rich and thick descriptions garnered through interviews (e.g. Lester, 2009; Misawa, 2015; Simpson & Cohen, 2004; Tigrel & Kokalan, 2009; Williams, Campbell, & Denton, 2013), personal narratives (e.g. Friedenberg, 2008; Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Kotleras, 2007), collective biography (e.g. Zábrodská, Linnell, Laws, & Davies, 2011; Zábrodská et al., 2016), case study (e.g. Frazier, 2011; Ilongo, 2016; Nelson & Lambert, 2001; Westhues, 2006; Wilkin, 2010) and policy analysis (e.g. Brisebois, 2010; Smith & Coel, 2018), the nature and structure of bullying of marginalized faculty, within specific disciplines and institutions, the (often covert) means by which legitimate institutional structures and policies are subverted and motives hidden and the dramatic impact of institutional restructuring on bullying of faculty are revealed. These studies draw our attention to broader narratives and discourses that support and normalize bullying in academe often by wrapping them in the sacred value of academic freedom (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012; Nelson & Lambert, 2001). Addressing bullying in academe will be hampered without such nuance, richness and depth.

9.3 Practice Implications

Systemic responding: To code or not to code. In terms of addressing academic bullying, the contextual perspective highlights the importance of articulating the

various rules of engagement, what they reflect and how that manifests in conduct and in evaluation of the acceptability of conduct (Klein & Lester, 2013). A standard recommendation in the academic bullying literature and bullying literatures in other work contexts is to develop anti-bullying policies (see Ferris et al., Volume 3 Section A). Lack of policy suggests that bullying is not considered an important issue in the community and may, in effect, enable these behaviours to continue (Lester, 2009; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, & Thomas, 2008; Salin, 2003; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Without policy, bullying incidents are examined in isolation increasing the chances they will be focused on as interpersonal issues, framed as subjective, thus not considering systemic or structural patterns (Lester, 2009). Policies grounded in shared values and ethical standards clarify the university community's expected standards for conduct and provide the framework by which university members can assess whether their own or another's conduct is (in)appropriate and constructive (Bray, Molina, & Swecker, 2012; Gallant, 2013; Smith & Coel, 2018). Useful policies articulate the specific steps to be taken to report and address conduct including sanctions for substantiated violation. Policies also provide a mechanism for tracking of complaints and investigations of incidents, which can facilitate the identification of patterning of problematic conduct, a key characteristic of bullying (Lester, 2009). Thus, policies are important in the "deterrence and detection of wrongdoing" (p. 1; Bray & Braxton, 2012).

While policies are recommended, their existence is variable across countries. For example, in Japan, Kawabata (2014) found that 40% of higher education institutions did not have policies and guidelines regarding academic harassment. An examination of faculty codes of conduct at 276 US institutions found that while harassment on the basis of protected class was noted and sanctioned, bullying was rarely mentioned (Smith & Coel, 2018). In her study of 15 medical-doctoral institutions in Canada, Brisebois (2010) found that all but one institution had policies on generalized harassment. Several countries have enacted legislation or are moving towards regulations regarding workplace bullying (Cobb, 2017), which will have implications for universities, particularly those that are publicly funded to implement anti-bullying policies (Rockett, Fan, Dwyer, & Foy, 2017).

A critique of anti-bullying policies in universities is that they pose a risk to academic freedom and freedom of expression because they fail to acknowledge the uniqueness of the academic and the academic workplace, that is, they do not incorporate context (Klein & Lester, 2013; Petrina, Mathison, & Ross, 2014; Smith & Coel, 2018). To the extent there are different rules of engagement in a university, the question is whether it is possible to formulate a single code of conduct or policy for an institution with diverse identities, work roles and functions (Bray & Braxton, 2012; Bray, Molina, & Swecker, 2012; Gallant, 2013). How can policy be developed that recognizes the importance of values and norms that create different behavioural spaces for different roles and people? The engagement of all university community members in the policy development process is critical (Keashly & Wajngurt, 2016). This increases the likelihood that policies will accurately capture the variety of perspectives and the shared values and goals, which, in turn, increases the likelihood that the policies will be viewed as valid and will be utilized. The involvement of

faculty, specifically, has implications for whether the policy will be grounded in a deep understanding of academic freedom and, thus, accepted and implemented appropriately and effectively (Keashly & Neuman, 2018; Westhues, 2007). Further, and perhaps more importantly, the process of policy development provides the opportunity for faculty and staff to explicitly identify, discuss and debate the varying conduct norms for each group, increasing the understanding of each other's work and goals (Klein & Lester, 2013).

An interesting example of policy development and outcome in the USA is the University of Wisconsin, Madison. The policy development process engaged faculty and staff as key partners and policy architects (Flaherty, 2014). The outcome was a set of policies with versions crafted for each core constituent group (https://hr.wisc.edu/hib/principles-and-policies/). The set of policies shares the connection to the vision and mission of the institution and constructive work environments. Consistent with a contextual perspective, the policies differ to some degree in what is considered problematic behaviour and processes for assessing and addressing conduct for each constituency.

In sum, policy is important for establishing the framework and the procedures for guiding the institution and its members regarding appropriate conduct. Involvement of all campus members in the policy development process enhances the possibility that the policy reflects and supports the unique context and norms of faculty and of staff work. While necessary, policy is not sufficient (Barratt-Pugh & Krestelica, 2019).

Beyond policies and codes. The nature of academe and the principles of academic freedom, freedom of expression, collegiality and shared governance create an environment for faculty, in particular, in which attempting to codify or legislate behaviour will be actively resisted. This environment facilitates (indeed requires) an openness to explore means other than restrictions on expression to address bullying (Berryman-Fink, 1998; Cameron, 2014). Thus, while policies and procedures are important, they are considered more limited than the power of the community to define and support constructive behaviour and challenge and address conduct that undermines the community (see also Volume 3 Section A for chapters on intervention in the context of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment).

Engaging peer influence. The nature of faculty as a self-regulating profession and community of scholars bolstered by peer review speaks to the importance of the academic community in formulating, enforcing and challenging its norms. Faculty peers communicate what is and is not appropriate from their colleagues through their responses to a situation. As evidenced in the earlier discussion of witness responding, when aware of a colleague being bullied, faculty tried multiple actions to change the problematic situation. Thus, faculty were willing to use their influence to help. The challenge for faculty was being uncertain about what to do. One strategy to leverage colleague influence to address extant bullying and mobbing situations would be developing faculty skills and confidence in intervention, that is, helping faculty become active and constructive bystanders (Keashly & Neuman, 2018; Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). Bystander training is grounded in the extensive research on bystander decision-making (e.g. Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Latané & Darley, 1970; Skarlicki & Kulik, 2004). Such training has been utilized on

university campuses in the USA and Canada, most often focused on students engaging their peers around high-risk behaviour such as drinking and sexual violence (e.g. Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004) and responding to prejudiced and discriminatory behaviour (e.g. Ashburn-Nardo, Morris, & Goodwin, 2008). These efforts focus on articulating and reinforcing desired community norms for conduct. Recent efforts in training faculty in active and constructive intervention in bullying situations with their colleagues are promising and require more systematic development and evaluation (e.g. Keashly & Neuman, 2018; Roderick, 2016).

Broadening the framework: Inclusive climate and culture. The extensive research on experiences of harassment and discrimination on the basis of gender, gender expression, race, ethnicity, class, caste and (dis)ability and the deep exploration within academic environments of these issues reveal the structural and societal nature of (in)justice and its manifestation in institutional inequities. Embracing the social-structural contextual influences means bullying needs to be considered as a reflection of and strategy for maintaining these social and institutional inequities (Samnani, 2013a). We can draw on and draw in the varied literatures on status-based harassment (e.g. sexual harassment, racial discrimination) to enrich and further reveal the dynamics of bullying interactions and how they are fuelled and maintained in service of maintaining the status quo. Within this critical cultural framework, being different is problematized, and harassment and by extension bullying can be framed as a response to that problematization (Berdahl, 2007). The studies reviewed here indicate that this dynamic is alive and well in academe. To address bullying then requires challenging the problematization, which means engaging and dismantling the systemic and social inequities within institutional walls. Klein and Lester (2013) and Barratt-Pugh and Krestelica (2019) argue for the value of developing inclusive and ethical institutional cultures as the means to directly engage these issues and, thus, ameliorate bullying (e.g. Gallant, 2013; Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010; Sallee & Diaz, 2013).

10 Conclusion

This chapter began with the intent to assess the validity of the claim that "bullying is rife on campus". In an attempt to address this question, the global literature on bullying in academe, particularly involving faculty, was reviewed. Research interest has increased substantially in the past decade, which on its own is a notable indicator of its importance. Despite the usual qualifications of sample and measure, it is clear that faculty are sadly familiar with bullying in their institutions. Approximately 25% of faculty will identify as having been bullied in a 12-month period with another 40–50% indicating they have witnessed others being bullied. An examination of who does what to whom reveals that academic bullying is inherently positional (Misawa, 2015) and solidly grounded in and reflective of socio-structural inequities, that is, bullying is not status-blind. Thus, faculty with marginalized social identities and lower organizational rank are the most vulnerable. Examination of the intersectionality of these identities reveals that not even tenure or high organizational

status can protect some faculty from being bullied. Bullying occurs most often at the hands of faculty colleagues, many of whom occupy senior ranks. These bullying relationships are very long-standing and hard to exit without leaving academe altogether. The examination of actors reveals that faculty "get it from all sides". They are bullied by internal actors such as colleagues, students and administrators but also by external actors such as the state and increasingly the public through online harassment. The identification of the state and the public as important actors suggests that bullying from these actors may be useful to consider in other work contexts.

The examination of bullying in academe reveals the inherently contextual nature of the behaviours. That is, behaviour does not speak for itself; rather, it is interpreted, enacted and experienced in a particular normative and discursive context. The unique nature of academic culture and the unique foundational features of academic freedom, professorial rank and tenure shape expectations for faculty conduct. These expectations and norms are different than norms for other employee groups in the institution as well as other work contexts and industry. These norms are critical in what gets identified and experienced as bullying as well as responses to and management of the bullying. These contextual logics are relevant to workplace bullying in other work contexts. Thus, research and practice *must* reflect this contextualization.

10.1 One Last Comment: Faculty as Participant-Observers

Academics as researchers are in a unique position to study workplace bullying in our own backyards (Keashly, 2015). We can apply our critical and discursive skills as well as our analytical perspectives to surfacing and discussing the "elephants in our own room" (Samnani, 2013b). We can embrace the "power of the peer" to engage our colleagues and beyond in analysis and responding to bullying among us. We can explicitly participate in sense-making for targets and third parties by sharing our research and understanding of the dynamics and systemic nature of bullying. We can help people tell their stories (Tracy, Alberts, & Rivera, 2007) as well as guide their attention to ways to address these situations. We may also need to prepare ourselves that we may be perceived as actors and be able to engage constructively and reflexively with that. As a community of scholars, we have a responsibility as members to lift up and address these issues.

11 Cross-References

► Abuse from Organizational Outsiders: Customer Aggression and Incivility
► Physical Intimidation and Bullying in the Workplace
► Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment in Schools

12 Cross-References to Other Volumes

- ▶ Cyberbullying at Work: Understanding the Influence of Technology, Vol. 1
- ▶ Employee Silence and Workplace Bullying, Vol. 2
- ▶ Health Consequences of Workplace Bullying: Physiological Response and Sleep, Vol. 2
- ▶ Long-Term Consequences (Costs) of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment for the Workplace, Organization and Society, Vol. 2
- ▶ The Contested Terrain of Power in Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment, Vol. 2
- ▶ The Hallmarks of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment, Vol. 1
- ▶ The Presence of Workplace Bullying and Harassment Worldwide, Vol. 1
- ▶ The Relevance of Depersonalized and Institutional Bullying in the Contemporary Workplace, Vol. 1
- ▶ Upwards Bullying: What We Can Learn About Workplace Bullying, Vol. 2
- ▶ Workplace Bullying and Cyberbullying Scales: An Overview, Vol. 1
- ▶ Workplace Bullying and Mental Health, Vol. 2

References

AAUP. (1993). *The status of non-tenure-track faculty*. Washington, DC: Author.

Agarwala, T. (2018). Bullying and career consequences in the academy: Experiences of women faculty. In A.M. Broadridge and S.L. Fielden (Eds.) *Research handbook of diversity and careers* (pp. 241–255). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ahmad, S., Kalim, R., & Kaleem, A. (2017). Academics' perceptions of bullying at work: Insights from Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management, 31*(2), 204–220.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 803–830.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452–471.

Aranda, J. L. (2018). *Civility and bullying in higher education: Secrets in academia and the culture of incivility*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.

Armstrong, J. (2012). Faculty animosity: A contextual view. *Journal of Thought*, *47*(2), 85–103.

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 332–342.

Baillien, E., Neyens, I., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2009). A qualitative study on the development of workplace bullying: Towards a three way model. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*(1), 1–16.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*, 61–79.

Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 29–49). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Barratt-Pugh, L. G. B., & Krestelica, D. (2019). Bullying in higher education: Culture change requires more than policy. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 23*(2–3), 109–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2018.1502211.

Barsky, A. E. (2002). Structural sources of conflict in a university context. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 20*(2), 161–176.

Beckmann, C. A., Cannella, B. L., & Wantland, D. (2013). Faculty perception of bullying in schools of nursing. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 29*(5), 287–294.

Bentley, P. J., Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (2013). Academic job satisfaction from an international comparative perspective: Factors associated with satisfaction across 12 countries. In *Job satisfaction around the academic world* (pp. 239–262). Dordrecht: Springer.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 641–658.

Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy: Revised and expanded edition of The four cultures of the academy* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berryman-Fink, C. (1998). Can we agree to disagree? Faculty-faculty conflict. In S. Bolton (Ed.) *Mending the cracks in the ivory tower: Strategies for conflict management in higher education* (pp. 141–163). Bolton: Anker Publishing Company.

Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hielt-Black, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*(3), 173–184.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 89–123.

Bloch, C. (2012). How do perpetrators experience bullying at the workplace? *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion, 5*(2), 159–177.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*. https://www.scienceopen.com/document_file/25ff22be-8a1b-4c97-9d88-084c8d98187a/ScienceOpen/3507_XE6680747344554310733.pdf

Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(2), 288–306.

Boynton, P. (2005). *Higher education supplement bullying survey. Preliminary findings from the Boynton-THES bullying survey.* http://www.unitetheunion.org/pdf/Preliminary%20Findings%20from%20Bullying%20survey.pdf

Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 154–186.

Braxton, J. M., & Bray, N. J. (2012). Introduction: The importance of codes of conduct in academia. *New Directions for Higher Education, 122,* 1–4.

Bray, N. J., & Braxton, J. M. (2012). Reflections on codes of conduct: Asymmetries, vulnerabilities, and institutional controls. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2012*(160), 89–97.

Bray, N. J., Molina, D. K., & Swecker, B. A. (2012). Organizational constraints and possibilities regarding codes of conduct. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2012*(160), 73–87.

Brisebois, J. (2010). *Generalized harassment in Canadian universities: Policies and practices addressing bullying in the academic workplace*. Masters thesis, University of Manitoba.

Bronstein, P. & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 557–585.

Buka, M. S. M. (2013). *Mobbing in higher education in Albania: Its antecedents and consequences.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tirana.

Buka, M. S. M., & Karaj, T. (2012). Mobbing in the academe: The case of Albanian universities. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Human and Social Sciences, 8,* 26–29.

Burk, H. G., & Eby, L. T. (2010). What keeps people in mentoring relationships when bad things happen? A field study from the protégé's perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*(3), 437–446.

Burnes, B., Wend, P., & By, R. T. (2014). The changing face of English universities: Reinventing collegiality for the twenty-first century. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(6), 905–926.

Cameron, J. (2014). Giving and taking offense: Civility, respect and academic freedom. In J. L. Turk (Ed.), *Academic freedom in conflict: The struggle over free speech rights in the university*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Canaan, J. E., & Shumar, W. (Eds.). (2008). *Structure and agency in the neoliberal university*. New York: Routledge.

Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2014). The dark side of the ivory tower: Cyberbullying of university faculty and teaching personnel. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 60*(2), 279–299.

Cassidy, W., Jackson, M., & Faucher, C. (2016). Gender differences and cyberbullying towards faculty members in higher education. In *Cyberbullying across the globe* (pp. 79–98). Cham: Springer.

Catano, V., Francis, L., Haines, T., Kirpalani, H., Shannon, H., Stringer, B., & Lozanski, L. (2007). *Occupational stress among Canadian university academic staff*. Ottawa*:* Canadian Association of University Teachers. http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp

Celep, C., & Konakli, T. (2013). Mobbing experiences of instructors: Causes, results, and solution suggestions. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 13*(1), 193–199.

Chandler, J., Barry, J., & Clark, H. (2002). Stressing academe: The wear and tear of the new public management. *Human Relations, 55*(9), 1051–1069.

Christy, S. C. (2010). *Working effectively with faculty: Guidebook for higher education staff and managers*. Berkeley: University Resources Press.

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, C. M. (2009). Faculty field guide for promoting student civility. *Nurse Educator, 34*(5), 194–197.

Cobb, E. P. (2017). *Workplace bullying and harassment: New developments in international law*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, C. L., Hoel, H., & Faragher, B. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(3), 367–387.

Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(1), 55–75.

Cortina, L. M., & Marchiondo, L. (2012). Measurement of interpersonal mistreatment in organizations. In R. R. Sinclair, M. Wang, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Research methods in occupational health psychology*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V. J., & Nelson, K. (2017). Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 299.

Court, S. (2008). *The extent of bullying and harassment in post-16 education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Union of Colleges and Universities Tackling Bullying conference, London.

Cox, E., & Goodman, J. (2005). Belittled: The state of play on bullying. *Australian Universities Review, 48*, 28.

Craft, L. (2006). Unequal opportunity: Women engineers and scientists who want to pursue academic careers in Japan face almost insurmountable obstacles, but increasingly their fighting back. *ASEE Prism, 11*(7). http://www.prism-magazine.org/mar02/unequal.cfm

Crouch, M. (2016). Why can't we behave? Justice and ethical conduct in the academy. *Social Philosophy Today, 31*, 7–26.

D'Cruz, P. A. (2015). *Depersonalized bullying at work: From evidence to conceptualization*. Springer India.

D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2009). Experiencing depersonalised bullying: A study of Indian call-centre agents. *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation, 3*(1), 26–46.

D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2011). The limits to workplace friendship: Managerialist HRM and bystander behaviour in the context of workplace bullying. *Employee Relations, 33*(3), 269–288.

D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2013). Navigating the extended reach: Target experiences of cyberbullying at work. *Information and Organization, 23*(4), 324–343.

Dellifraine, J. L., McClelland, L. E., Erwin, C. O., & Wang, Z. (2014). Bullying in academia: Results of a survey of health administration faculty. *Journal of Health Administration Education, 31*(2), 147–163.

Dentith, A. M., Wright, R. R., & Coryell, J. (2015). Those mean girls and their friends: Bullying and mob rule in the academy. *Adult Learning, 26*(1), 28–34.

DeSouza, E. R. (2011). Frequency rates and correlates of contrapower harassment in higher education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(1), 158–188.

Desrayaud, N., Dickson, F. C., & Webb, L. M. (2019). The theory of bullying conflict cultures: Developing a new explanation for workplace bullying. In R. West & C. Beck (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of communication and bullying* (pp. 95–106). New York: Routledge.

Dooley, J. J., Pyżalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: A theoretical and conceptual review. *Journal of Psychology, 217*(4), 182–188.

Dzurec, L. C. (2013). Status limbo: Analysis of nurse faculty member reports of administrator response to workplace bullying complaints. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 29*(5), e1–e9.

Eastman, J. (2018, July 24). University autonomy in Canada: It's time for a check. *University Affairs.*

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress, 23*(1), 24–44.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 185–201.

Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., Rørvik, E., Lande, Å. B., & Nielsen, M. B. (2018). Climate for conflict management, exposure to workplace bullying and work engagement: a moderated mediation analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29*(3), 549–570.

Escartín, J., Rodríguez-Carballeira, A., Zapf, D., Porrúa, C., & Martín-Peña, J. (2009). Perceived severity of various bullying behaviours at work and the relevance of exposure to bullying. *Work & Stress, 23*(3), 191–205.

Escartín, J., Zapf, D., Arrieta, C., & Rodriguez-Carballeira, A. (2011). Workers' perception of workplace bullying: A cross-cultural study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(2), 178–205.

Fadda, S., Giorgi, G., Benitez Muñoz, J. L., Justicia Justicia, F., & Solinas, G. (2015). Do negative acts in Italian academia have a quadratic relationship with determinants of health? *International Journal of Educational Management, 29*(2), 158–166.

Faria, J. R., Mixon, F. G., & Salter, S. P. (2012). An economic model of workplace mobbing in academe. *Economics of Education Review, 31*(5), 720–726.

Farley, S., & Sprigg, C. (2014). Culture of cruelty: Why bullying thrives in higher education. https://www.theguardian.com/higher-educationnetwork/blog/2014/nov/03/why-bullying-thrives-higher-education

Ferber, A. L. (2018). "Are you willing to die for this work?" Public targeted online harassment in higher education: SWS Presidential Address. *Gender & Society, 32*(3), 301–320.

Fielden, J. (2007). *Global trends in university governance* (Education working paper series number 9). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Flaherty, C. (2014, December 2). Bully-free zone. U of Wisconsin Madison faculty approves an antibullying policy. *Inside Higher Education*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/12/02/u-wisconsin-madison-facultyapproves-anti-bullying-policy

Flaherty, C. (2017, June 26). Old criticisms, new threats. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/06/26/professors-are-often-political-lightning-rods-now-are-facing-new-threats-over-their

Fox, S. (2010, April). *Bullying in academia: Distinctive relations of power and control*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology conference, Atlanta.

Fratzl, J., & McKay, R. (2013). Professional staff in academia: Academic culture and the role of aggression. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp. 60–73). New York: Routledge.

Frazier, K. N. (2011). Academic bullying: A barrier to tenure and promotion for African-American faculty. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 5*(1), 1–13.

Friedenberg, J. (2008). *The anatomy of an academic mobbing*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Furedi, F. (2001). Bullying: The British contribution to the construction of a social problem. In J. Best (Ed.), *How claims spread: Cross-national diffusion of social problems* (pp. 89–106). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gabbert, M. A. (2014). The right to think otherwise. In J. L. Turk (Ed.), *Academic freedom in conflict: The struggle over free speech rights in the university* (pp. 89–109). Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Gallant, T. B. (2013). The ethical dimensions of bullying. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp. 118–134). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gardner, S. K. (2012). "I couldn't wait to leave the toxic environment": A mixed methods study of women faculty satisfaction and departure from one research institution. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5*(1), 71–95.

GCPEA. (2018). Education under attack 2018. http://eua2018.protectingeducation.org/#attacks-on-higher-education. Accessed 26 July 2018.

Gerstenfield, J. A. (2016). *Understanding workplace bullying among staff in higher education*. Doctoral dissertation, Texas Christian University.

Giorgi, G. (2012). Workplace bullying in academia creates a negative work environment. An Italian study. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 24*(4), 261–275.

Goldberg, E., Beitz, J., Wieland, D., & Levine, C. (2013). Social bullying in nursing academia. *Nurse Educator, 38*(5), 1–7.

Goodyear, R., Reynolds, P., & Gragg, J. B. (2010). *University faculty experiences of classroom incivilities: A critical incident study*. Paper presented as a roundtable discussion at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver.

Gül, H., İnce, M., & Özcan, N. (2011). The relationship between workplace mobbing and burnout among academics at a Turkish university. *Research Journal of International Studies, 18*(1), 118–134.

Harvey, M., Treadway, D., & Heames, J. T. (2006). Bullying in global organizations: A reference point perspective. *Journal of World Business, 41*(2), 190–202.

Hegranes, C. A. (2012). *Leadership response to workplace bullying in academe: A collective case study*. Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Thomas.

Henning, M. A., Zhou, C., Adams, P., Moir, F., Hobson, J., Hallett, C., & Webster, C. S. (2017). Workplace harassment among staff in higher education: A systematic review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *18*(4), 521–539.

Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying. . . oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(3), 499–519.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Reich, T. C. (2013). Integrating workplace aggression research: Relational, contextual, and method considerations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(S1), S26–S42.

Hershcovis, M. S., Reich, T. C., & Niven, K. (2015). *Workplace bullying: Causes, consequences and intervention strategies* [White paper]. Retrieved from Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology: http://www.siop.org/WhitePapers/WorkplaceBullyingFINAL.pdf

Hiatt, G. (2008, February 24). Mean and nasty academics: Bullying, hazing and mobbing. https://academicladder.com/mean-and-nasty-academics

Hodgins, M. (2014). Workplace mistreatment: Health, working environment and social and economic factors. *Health, 6*(05), 392.

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review, 65*(2), 117–127.

Hollis, L. P. (2012). *Bully in the ivory tower: How aggression & incivility erode American higher education*. Wilminton, DE: Patricia Berkly LLC.

Hollis, L. P. (2015). Bully university? The cost of workplace bullying and employee disengagement in American higher education. *SAGE Open, 5*(2), 1–11.

Hollis, L. P. (2016a). *The coercive community college: Bullying and its costly impact on the mission to serve underrepresented populations*. Bingley, West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group Publishing.

Hollis, L. P. (2016b). Canary in the mine: Ombuds as first alerts for workplace bullying on campus. *Journal of International Ombudsman Association, 9*(1), 23–31.

Hollis, L. P. (2017). Higher education henchman: Vicarious bullying and underrepresented populations. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 4*(12), 64–73.

Horton, K. B. (2016). Exploring workplace bullying through a social work ethics-informed lens. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 13*(1), 25–32.

Hubert, A. B., & Van Veldhoven, M. (2001). Risk sectors for undesirable behaviour and mobbing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 415–424.

Huston, T. A., Norman, M., & Ambrose, S. A. (2007). Expanding the discussion of faculty vitality to include productive but disengaged senior faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(5), 493–522.

Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M. H., Jackson, D., & Wilkes, L. (2010). Bullying as circuits of power: An Australian nursing perspective. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 32*(1), 25–47.

Ilongo, F. N. (2016). Forms of workplace bullying in institutions of higher learning in the light of the Integral Model of Workplace Bullying. *Journal of Organization and Human Behaviour, 5* (1), 17–28.

Infante, D. A., & Gorden, W. I. (1989). Argumentativeness and affirming communicator style as predictors of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with subordinates. *Communication Quarterly, 37*(2), 81–90.

Jackson, L. (2018). Reconsidering vulnerability in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *24*(3), 232–241.

Jacobson, K. J., Hood, J. N., & Van Buren, H. J., III. (2014). Workplace bullying across cultures: A research agenda. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 14*(1), 47–65.

Jaschik, S. (2018, August 15). Anti-intellectualism and "how fascism works". *Inside Higher Education*. http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/08/15/author-discusses-his-new-book-anti-intellectualism-and-fascism

Johnson, P. (2014). Bullying in academia up close and personal: My story. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor, 24*, 33–41.

Johnson-Bailey, J. (2015). Academic incivility and bullying as gendered and racialized phenomena. *Adult Learning, 26*(1), 42–47.

Jones, B., Hwang, E., & Bustamante, R. M. (2015). African American female professors' strategies for successful attainment of tenure and promotion at predominately White institutions: It can happen. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 10*(2), 133–151.

Kakumba, U., Wamala, R., & Wanyama, S. B. (2014). Employment relations and bullying in academia: A case of academic staff at Makerere University. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM), 9*(1), 63–74.

Karran, T., & Mallinson, L. (2017). *Academic freedom in the UK: Legal and normative protection in a comparative context*. Report for the University and College Union. https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/8614/Academic-Freedom-in-the-UK-Legal-and-Normative-Protection-in-a-Comparative-Context-Report-for-UCU-Terence-Karran-and-Lucy-Mallinson-May-17/pdf/ucu_academicfreedomstudy_report_may17.pdf

Kawabata, T. (2014). The prevention of the workplace harassment at Japanese universities: The perspective of the research and the findings from the complete count survey. In *Forum on public policy online* (Vol. 2014, No. 1). Urbana: Oxford Round Table.

Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: the target's perspective. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 233–268.

Keashly, L. (2015). When debate, discourse and exchange go bad: Bullying in the academic workplace. *SPECTRA, 51*(3), 23–28.

Keashly, L. (2018a). Nature and prevalence of workplace bullying and mobbing in the US: What do the numbers mean? In M. Duffy & D. Yamada (Eds.), *Workplace bullying and mobbing in the U.S.* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Keashly, L. (2018b). Ombuds and bystanding: Embracing influence. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 12*. https://www.ombudsassociation.org/assets/docs/JIOA-2018-5_Bystander_PDF.pdf

Keashly, L., & Harvey, S. (2006). Workplace emotional abuse. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. Furrell (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace violence*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Keashly, L. & Jagatic, K (2003). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf., & C. Cooper (eds). *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International research and practice perspectives* (pp. 49–79). London: Taylor Francis

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2008). *Final report: Workplace behaviour (bullying) project survey.* Mankato: Minnesota State University. Retrieved January 1, 2017, from https://www.mnsu.edu/csw/workplacebullying/workplace_bullying_final_report.pdf

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education: Causes, consequences and management. *Administrative Theory and Praxis, 32*(1), 48–70.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2013). Bullying in academia: What does current theorizing and research tell us? In J. Lester (Ed.), *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp. 1–22). New York, NY: Routledge.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2018). Workplace bullying and mobbing in U.S. higher education. In M. Duffy & D. Yamada (Eds.), *Workplace bullying and mobbing in the U.S.* (pp. 507–538). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Keashly, L., & Wajngurt, C. (2016). Faculty bullying in higher education. *Psychology and Education: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 53*(1/2), 79–90.

Kim, E., & Glomb, T. M. (2014). Victimization of high performers: The roles of envy and work group identification. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(4), 619.

King, C., & Piotrowski, C. (2015). Bullying of educators by educators: Incivility in higher education. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 8*(4), 1–6.

Kinman, G., & Jones, F. (2004). Working to the limit: Stress and work-life balance in academic and academic related employees. http://www.atn.edu.au/docs/workingtothelimit.pdf

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2013a). *Further stress: A survey of stress and well-being among staff in further education.* https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/5898/Further-stress-a-survey-of-stress-and-well-being-among-staff-in-further-education/pdf/FE_stress_report_July_2013.pdf

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2013b). *Higher stress: A survey of stress and well-being among staff in higher education*. https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/5911/Higher-stress-a-survey-of-stress-and-well-being-among-staff-in-higher-education-Jul-13/pdf/HE_stress_report_July_2013.pdf

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2014). *Taking its toll: Rising levels in further education, UCU Stress Survey, 2014*. https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7265/UCU-FE-stress-survey-2014%2D%2D-report/pdf/ucu_festressreport14.pdf

Klein, C., & Lester, J. (2013). Moving beyond awareness and tolerance. In J. Lester (Ed.) *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp.138–14). New York: Routledge.

Korukcu, Ö., Bulut, O., Tuzcu, A., Bayram, Z., & Öztürk Türkmen, H. (2014). An adaptation of Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror to health sciences programs in Turkey. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry/Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, 15*(4), 335–343.

Kotleras, R. (2007). The workplace mobbing of highly gifted adults: An unremarked barbarism. *Advanced Development, 11*, 130.

Koval, O. (2014). *Bullying among university employees: Prevalence, correlates, and consequences*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Stavanger.

Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 305–322.

Lamertz, K., & Aquino, K. (2004). Social power, social status and perceptual similarity of workplace victimization: A social network analysis of stratification. *Human Relations, 57*(7), 795–822.

Lampman, C. (2012). Women faculty at risk: US professors report on their experiences with student incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5*(2), 184–208.

Lampman, C., Phelps, A., Bancroft, S., & Beneke, M. (2009). Contrapower harassment in academia: A survey of faculty experience with student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. *Sex Roles, 60*(5–6), 331–346.

Landes, C. L. (2013). *Familiarity and experience with workplace bullying: Workplace bullying at James Madison University*. Unpublished master's thesis, James Madison University.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York, NY: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Leng, C. Z., & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). The relationship between cultural diversity and workplace bullying in multinational enterprises. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 14*(6). https://journalofbusiness.org/index.php/GJMBR/article/view/1316

Lester, J. (2009). Not your child's playground: Workplace bullying among community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*, 444–462.

Leung, A. K. Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(3), 507–526.

Lewis, D. (1999). Workplace bullying: Interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 106–119.

Lewis, D. (2003). Voices in the social construction of bullying at work: Exploring multiple realities in further and higher education. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making, 4*(1), 65–81.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 165–184.

Liefooghe, A. P., & Mackenzie Davey, K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 375–392.

López-Cabarcos, M. Á., & Vázquez-Rodríguez, P. (2006). Psychological harassment in the Spanish public university system. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal, 2*, 21–39.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(1), 3–47.

Marsh, J., Patel, S., Gelaye, B., Goshu, M., Worku, A., Williams, M. A., & Berhane, Y. (2009). Prevalence of workplace abuse and sexual harassment among female faculty and staff. *Journal of Occupational Health, 51*(4), 314–322.

Martin, J. L., Sharp-Grier, M. L., & Piker-King, K. (2015). Prime targets: Identity markers as the secret rationale for the preponderance of bullying in academe. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Bullies in the workplace: Seeing and stopping adults who abuse their coworkers and employees*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Martin, M. M., Goodboy, A. K., & Johnson, Z. D. (2015). When professors bully graduate students: Effects on student interest, instructional dissent, and intentions to leave graduate education. *Communication Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1041995.

May, A., & Tenzek, K. E. (2018). Bullying in the academy: Understanding the student bully and the targeted 'stupid, fat, mother fucker' professor. *Teaching in Higher Education, 23*(3), 275–290.

McKay, R., Arnold, D. H., Fratzl, J., & Thomas, R. (2008). Workplace bullying in academia: A Canadian study. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal, 20*, 77–100.

McCarthy, P., Mayhew, C., Barker, M., & Sheehan, M. (2003). Bullying and occupational violence in tertiary education: risk factors, perpetrators and prevention. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety, Australia and New Zealand, 19*(4), 319–326.

Meriläinen, M., & Kõiv, K. (2017). Theoretical dimensions of bullying and inappropriate behaviour among faculty members. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(3), 378–392.

Meriläinen, M., & Kõiv, K. (2018). Bullying and an unfavourable working environment. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 11*, 159.

Meriläinen, M., Sinkkonen, H., Puhakka, H., & Kayhko, K. (2016). Bullying and inappropriate behaviour among faculty personnel. *Policy Futures in Education, 14*(6), 617–634.

Meriläinen, M., Käyhkö, K., Kõiv, K., & Sinkkonen, H. (2019). Academic bullying and inappropriate behaviour among faculty personnel in Estonia and Finland. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 41*(3), 241–261.

Minibas-Poussard, J., Seckin-Celik, T., & Bingol, H. B. (2018). Mobbing in higher education: Descriptive and inductive case narrative analyses of mobber behaviour, mobbee responses, and witness support. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 18*(2), 471–494.

Misawa, M. (2015). Cuts and bruises caused by arrows, sticks, and stones in academia: Theorizing three types of racist and homophobic bullying in adult and higher education. *Adult Learning, 26*(1), 6–13.

Metzger, A. M., Petit, A. & Sieber, S. (2015). Mentoring as a way to change a culture of academic bullying and mobbing in the humanities. *Higher Education for the Future, 2(*2), 139–150.

Morris, S. E. (2011). Doctoral students' experiences of supervisory bullying. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 19*(2), 547–555.

Mourssi-Alfash, M. F. (2014). *Workplace bullying and its influence on the perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour among faculty and staff in the public higher education in Minnesota system*. Doctoral dissertation, Capella University.

Mudrak, J., Zabrodska, K., Kveton, P., Jelinek, M., Blatny, M., Solcova, I., & Machovcova, K. (2018). Occupational well-being among university faculty: A job demands-resources model. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(3), 325–348.

Namie, G., & Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2010). Active and passive accomplices: The communal character of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Communication, 4*, 343–373.

Navayan, P. K., & Chitale, C. M. (2016). A study of nature and prevalence of mobbing amongst teachers in higher education in Pune. *KHOJ: Journal of Indian Management Research and Practices*, *National Research Conference Special Issue,* 297–312.

Nelson, E. D., & Lambert, R. D. (2001). Sticks, stones and semantics: The ivory tower bully's vocabulary of motives. *Qualitative Sociology, 24*(1), 83–106.

Nelson, M. L., Englar-Carlson, M., Tierney, S. C., & Hau, J. M. (2006). Class jumping into academia: Multiple identities for counselling academics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 1–14.

Neuman, J. H. (2009). *Workplace behavior project survey.* Unpublished raw data.

Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L. (2004, April). *Development of the workplace aggression research questionnaire (WAR-Q): Preliminary data from the workplace stress and aggression project.* In RJ Bennett & CD Crossley (Chairs), Theoretical advancements in the study of anti-social behavior at work. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L. (2010). Means, motive, opportunity, and aggressive workplace behaviour. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Insidious workplace behaviour* (pp. 31–76). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2013). Can observations of workplace bullying really make you depressed? A response to Emdad et al. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 86*(6), 717–721.

Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(4), 955–979.

Nkporbu, A. K., & Douglas, K. E. (2016). Prevalence and pattern of work place bullying as psychosocial hazards among workers in a tertiary Institution in Nigeria. *Open Access Library Journal, 3*(05), 1.

Normile, D. (2001). Women faculty battle Japan's Koza system. *Science, 291*(5505), 817–818.

NTEU. (2012). *A report into workplace bullying at the University of New South Wales*. http://www.nteu.org.au/unsw/campaigns/bullying

O'Meara, K. (2004). Beliefs about post-tenure review: The influence of autonomy, collegiality, career stage, and institutional context. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(2), 178.

Ojedokun, O., Oteri, I. O., & Ogungbamila, A. (2014). Which of the big-five traits is more predictive of workplace bullying among academics in Nigeria? *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, 184*, 184–203.

Oleksiyenko, A. (2018). Zones of alienation in global higher education: Corporate abuse and leadership failures. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *24*(3), 193–205.

Onorato, M. (2013). An empirical study of unethical leadership and workplace bullying in industry segments. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 78*(2), 4–16.

Ozturk, H., Yilmaz, F., & Hindistan, S. (2007). Mobbing scale for nurses and mobbing experienced by nurses. *Hospital Management, 11*(1–2), 63–69.

Pathania, G. J., & Tierney, W. G. (2018). An ethnography of caste and class at an Indian university: Creating capital. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *24*(3), 221–231.

Paull, M., Omari, M., & Standen, P. (2012). When is a bystander not a bystander? A typology of the roles of bystanders in workplace bullying. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 50*(3), 351–366.

Pelletier, K. L., Kottke, J. L., & Sirotnik, B. W. (2018). The toxic triangle in academia: A case analysis of the emergence and manifestation of toxicity in a public university. *Leadership*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715018773828.

Petrina, S. (2012). The new critiquette and old scholactivism: A petit critique of academic manners, managers, matters, and freedom. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, *20*, 17–63.

Petrina, S., Mathison, S., & Ross, E. W. (2014). Threat convergence: The new academic work, bullying, mobbing and freedom. *Workplace, 24*, 58–69.

Phipps, A. (2017, December 13). Tackling sexual harassment on campus is about more than naming and shaming. *The Guardian: Higher Education Network*.

Postiglione, G., & Jung, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The changing academic profession in Hong Kong*. Singapore: Springer.

Power, J. L., Brotheridge, C. M., Blenkinsopp, J., Bowes-Sperry, L., Bozionelos, N., Buzády, Z., . . . Madero, S. M. (2013). Acceptability of workplace bullying: A comparative study on six continents. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(3), 374–380.

Price Spratlen, L. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims, 10*(4), 285–297.

Qureshi, M. I., Rasli, A. M., & Zaman, K. (2014). A new trilogy to understand the relationship among organizational climate, workplace bullying and employee health. *Arab Economic and Business Journal, 9*(2), 133–146.

Raineri, E., Frear, D. F., & Edmonds, J. J. (2011). An examination of the academic reach of faculty and administrator bullying. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(12), 22–35.

Rankin, S., & Associates. (2014). *Campus climate project final report.* University of California System. http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/_common/files/pdf-climate/ucsystem-full-report.pdf

Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender people.* Campus Pride. https://www.campuspride.org/wp-content/uploads/campuspride2010lgbtreportssummary.pdf

Raskauskas, J. S. M. (2006, April). *Bullying in academia: An examination of workplace bullying in New Zealand universities*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association conference, San Francisco.

Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 236.

Redden, E. (2018, August 13). Proposal to ban gender studies in Hungary. *Inside Higher Education*. https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2018/08/13/proposal-ban-gender-studies-hungary

Reed, L. (2016). *The effects of bullying on emotional well-being as described by non-tenured university faculty: A qualitative inquiry.* Doctoral dissertation, Capella University.

Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(3), 137–152.

Richman, J. A., Rospenda, K. M., Nawyn, S. J., Flaherty, J. A., Fendrich, M., Drum, M. L., & Johnson, T. P. (1999). Sexual harassment and generalized workplace abuse among university employees: Prevalence and mental health correlates. *American Journal of Public Health, 89*, 358–363.

Roberts, G. (2014). 'Power harassment' and the workplace environment of Japan: The evolution of a concept amidst uncertain times. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies, 22*, 21–35.

Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behaviour of employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(6), 658–672.

Rockett, P., Fan, S. K., Dwyer, R. J., & Foy, T. (2017). A human resource management perspective of workplace bullying. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 9*(2), 116–127.

Roderick, E. (Ed.). (2016). *Toxic Friday: Resources for addressing faculty bullying in higher education*. Anchorage, AK: University of Alaska Anchorage.

Ronson, J. (2016). *So you've been publicly shamed*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Roscigno, V. J., Lopez, S. H., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and organizational context. *Social Forces, 87*(3), 1561–1589.

Rospenda, K. M., & Richman, J. A. (2004). The factor structure of generalized workplace harassment. *Violence and Victims, 19*(2), 221–238.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56*(10), 1213–1232.

Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2013). Workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28*(3), 235–251.

Salin, D., & Notelaers, G. (2018). The effects of workplace bullying on witnesses: Violation of the psychological contract as an explanatory mechanism. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1443964.

Salin, D., Cowan, R. L., Adewumi, O., Apospori, E., Bochantin, J., D'Cruz, P., . . . Işik, I. (2018). Prevention of and interventions in workplace bullying: A global study of human resource professionals' reflections on preferred action. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1460857.

Sallee, M. W., & Diaz, C. R. (2013). Sexual harassment, racist jokes, and homophobic slurs. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp. 41–59). New York, NY: Routledge.

Saloojee, A. (2014). Balancing academic freedom and freedom from discrimination in contested spaces, Chapter 10. In J. L. Turk (Ed.), *Academic freedom in conflict: The struggle over free speech rights in the university.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Samnani, A. K. (2013a). The early stages of workplace bullying and how it becomes prolonged: The role of culture in predicting target responses. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(1), 119–132.

Samnani, A. K. (2013b). Embracing new directions in workplace bullying research a paradigmatic approach. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 22*(1), 26–36.

SAR (2018). *Free to think: Report of the Scholars at Risk academic freedom monitoring project.* https://www.scholarsatrisk.org/resources/free-to-think-2018/

Schafferer, C., & Szanajda, A. (2013). Bullying in higher education in Taiwan: The Taiwan Higher Education Faculty Survey (THEFS). *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia, 12*(1), 81–93.

Scott, J. W. (2014). The limits of academic freedom. In J. L. Turk (Ed.), *Academic freedom in conflict: The struggle over free speech rights in the university.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Scott, J. W. (2018). Targeted harassment of faculty: What higher education administrators can do. *Liberal Education, 104*(2), n2.

Sedivy-Benton, A., Strohschen, G., Cavazos, N., & Boden-McGill, C. (2015). Good ol'boys, mean girls, and tyrants: A phenomenological study of the lived experiences and survival strategies of bullied women adult educators. *Adult Learning, 26*(1), 35–41.

Senol, V., Avsar, E., Peksen Akca, R., Argun, M., & Avsarogullari, L. (2015). Assessment of mobbing behaviours exposed by the academic personnel working in a university in Turkey. *Journal of Psychiatry, 18*(1), 1–10.

Severance, L., Bui-Wrzosinska, L., Gelfand, M. J., Lyons, S., Nowak, A., Borkowski, W., . . . Lin, C. C. (2013). The psychological structure of aggression across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(6), 835–865.

Shaw, C., & Ratcliffe, R. (2014, December 16). Struggle for top research grades fuel bullying among university staff. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2014/dec/16/research-excellence-framework-bullying-university-staff

Shin, J. C., & Jung, J. (2014). Academics job satisfaction and job stress across countries in the changing academic environments. *The Guardian Higher Education Network, 67*(5), 603–620.

Simpson, R., & Cohen, C. (2004). Dangerous work: The gendered nature of bullying in the context of higher education. *Gender, Work and Organisation, 11*(2), 163–186.

Singh, K. (2017). Measurement and assessment of bullying behaviours in departments and affiliated colleges of University of Delhi. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(2), 809–832.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Kulik, C. T. (2004). Third-party reactions to employee (mis) treatment: A justice perspective. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 26*, 183–229.

Smith, F. L. M., & Coel, C. R. (2018). Workplace bullying policies, higher education and the First Amendment: Building bridges not walls. *First Amendment Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/21689725.2018.1495094.

Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist, 69*(6), 575.

Sprigg, C. A., Niven, K., Dawson, J., Farley, S., & Armitage, C. (2018). Witnessing workplace bullying and employee well-being: A two-wave field study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(2), 286–296.

Stanley, J. (2018). *How fascism works: The politics of us and them*. New York, NY: Penguin Random House.

Sternberg, R. J. (2015, June 29). Coping with verbal abuse: Academic politics are vicious, but that doesn't me you have to be. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Strachan, G., Troup, C., Peetz, D., Whitehouse, G., Broadbent, K., & Bailey, J. (2012). *Work and careers in Australian universities: Report on employee survey.* Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing, Griffith University. https://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0024/88125/Work-and-Career-Report-on-Employee-Survey_Final-v2.pdf

Takeuchi, M., Nomura, K., Horie, S., Okinaga, H., Perumalswami, C. R., & Jagsi, R. (2018). Direct and indirect harassment experiences and burnout among academic faculty in Japan. *The Tohoku Journal of Experimental Medicine, 245*(1), 37–44.

Tannen, D. (2002). Agonism in academic discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(10–11), 1651–1669.

Taspinar, B., Taspinar, F., Guclu, S., Nalbant, A., Calik, B. B., Uslu, A., & Inal, S. (2013). Investigation of the association between mobbing and musculoskeletal discomfort in academicians. *Japanese Psychological Research, 55*(4), 400–408.

Taylor, S. (2013). Workplace bullying: Does tenure change anything? Chapter 2. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Workplace bullying in higher education* (pp. 23–40). New York, NY: Routledge.

Teichler, U., Arimoto, A., & Cummings, W. K. (2013). The design and methods of the comparative study. In *The changing academic profession* (pp. 25–35). Dordrecht: Springer.
Tepper, R. J., & White, C. G. (2012). Workplace harassment in the academic environment. *Saint Louis University Law Journal, 56*, 81–110.
Theiss, S. L., Webb, L. M., & Amason, P. (2012). *Workplace bullying: Academic administrators' intervention strategies*. Albuquerque: Western States Communication Association.
Tigrel, E. Y., & Kokalan, O. (2009). Academic mobbing in Turkey. *International Journal of Behavioural, Cognitive, Educational and Psychological Sciences, 1*(2), 91–99.
Tracy, K. (2011). "Reasonable hostility": Its usefulness and limitation as a norm for public hearings. *Informal Logic, 31*(3), 171–190.
Tracy, S. J., Alberts, J. K., & Rivera, K. D. (2007). *How to bust the office bully: Eight tactics for explaining workplace abuse to decision-makers* (Tech. Rep. No. 0701). Tempe: Arizona State University, The Project for Wellness and Work-Life.
Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure-track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Tucker, A. (2012). Bully U: Central planning and higher education. *The Independent Review, 17*(1), 99–119.
Turk, J. L. (2014). *Academic freedom in conflict: The struggle over free speech rights in the university*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.
Twale, D. J. (2017). *Understanding and preventing faculty-on-faculty bullying: A psycho-social-organizational approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Twale, D. J., & DeLuca, B. M. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
Tytherleigh, M. Y., Webb, C., Cooper, C. L., & Ricketts, C. (2005). Occupational stress in UK higher education institutions: A comparative study of all staff categories. *Higher Education Research & Development, 24*(1), 41–61.
Ury, W. (2000). *The third side: Why we fight and how we can stop* (pp. 4–17). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
Van de Vliert, E., Einarsen, S., & Nielsen, M. B. (2013). Are national levels of employee harassment cultural covariations of climato-economic conditions? *Work & Stress, 27*(1), 106–122.
Vanhoutte, K. K. P. (2010). The (bad) example of the university. In K. K. P. Vanhoutte & M. Lang (Eds.). *Bullying and the abuse of power* (pp. 41–48). Oxford, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 27*, 63–69.
Veletsianos, G., Houlden, S., Hodson, J., & Gosse, C. (2018). Women scholars' experiences with online harassment and abuse: Self-protection, resistance, acceptance, and self-blame. *New Media & Society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818781324.
Volpe, M. R., & Chandler, D. (2001). Resolving and managing conflicts in academic communities: The emerging role of the "pracademic". *Negotiation Journal, 17*(3), 245–255.
WBTI. (2017). *Workplace Bullying Institute US Workplace Bullying Survey*. https://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/2017/2017-WBI-US-Survey.pdf
Westhues, K. (Ed.). (2004). *Workplace mobbing in academe: Reports from twenty universities*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
Westhues, K. (2006). *The remedy and prevention of mobbing in higher education: Two case studies*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
Westhues, K. (2007). Before drafting your policy on workplace decency, compare these two alternatives. http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/~kwesthue/dignitypolicies01.htm
Wilkin, L. (2010). *Workplace bullying in academe: A grounded theory study exploring how faculty cope with the experience of being bullied*. Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.
Williams, K. (2008). Troubling the concept of the 'academic profession' in 21st century higher education. *Higher Education, 56,* 533–544.

Williams, E. A., & Ruiz, Y. (2012). *Workplace bullying survey: Final report.* University of Massachusetts Amherst. http://www.umass.edu/local1776/Flyers,%20Updates%20&%20Documents_files/WBS%20Final%20Report%202012%2010%2004.pdf

Williams, F. I., Campbell, C. R., & Denton, L. T. (2013). Incivility in academe: What if the instigator is a high performer? *Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 14*(1), 35.

Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management, 10*(1), 51.

WISELI. (2016). Results from the 2016 study of faculty worklife at UW-Madison: Tenured and tenure-track faculty. http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/Report_Wave5_2016TT.pdf

Yamada, S., Cappadocia, M. C., & Pepler, D. (2014). Workplace bullying in Canadian graduate psychology programs: Student perspectives of student–supervisor relationships. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 8*(1), 58–67.

Yildirim, A., & Yildirim, D. (2007). Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: Mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(8), 1444–1453.

Young, K. Z. (2017). Workplace bullying in higher education: The misunderstood academic. *Practicing Anthropology, 39*(2), 14–17.

Young, K., Anderson, M., & Stewart, S. (2015). Hierarchical microaggressions in higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 8*(1), 61–71.

Yousef, H., El-Houfey, A., & El-Serogy, Y. (2013). Mobbing behaviours against demonstrators and assistant lecturers working at Assiut University. *Life Sciences Journal, 10*(3), 901–912.

Zábrodská, K., Ellwood, C., Zaeemdar, S., & Mudrak, J. (2016). Workplace bullying as sensemaking: An analysis of target and actor perspectives on initial hostile interactions. *Culture and Organization, 22*(2), 136–157.

Zábrodská, K., & Kveton, P. (2013). Prevalence and forms of workplace bullying among university employees. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 25*(2), 89–108.

Zábrodská, K., Linnell, S., Laws, C., & Davies, B. (2011). Bullying as intra-active process in neoliberal universities. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(8), 709–719.

Zábrodská, K., Mudrák, J., Šolcová, I., Květon, P., Blatný, M., & Machovcová, K. (2018). Burnout among university faculty: The central role of work–family conflict. *Educational Psychology, 38*(6), 800–819.

Zemanek, K. A. (2016). *Identification of bullying among tenured and non-tenured faculty in Colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences at land-grant universities*. Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.

Zhang, H. (2017). Workplace victimization and discrimination in China: A nationwide survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.* https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517729403.