CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: BULLYING
Not Just Politics as Usual

Cristyn L. Elder and Bethany Davila

Right out of graduate school, we, Cris and Beth, the editors of this collection, individually and collectively found ourselves faced with unexpected difficult situations.[1] At the time, we called it departmental "politics," but, in actuality, it was a pattern of incivility. It was bullying. We found many ways to explain to ourselves what we witnessed and experienced. For example, during a department meeting, when a senior faculty member called our research "suspect" and "a subject of concern" (research, by the way, that has been well received in our field, resulting in multiple publications and a national award), we tried to explain it away as professional insecurity. When we saw a full professor yell at a lecturer in the hallway, chastising him and calling him insubordinate, we recoiled at the lack of professionalism. When a pre-tenured[2] colleague repeatedly snapped at us, telling us we shouldn't be at an R1 if we were so committed to teaching, we reasoned that a combination of ego and insecurity might be manifesting as aggression.

While these examples (from multiple institutions) detail specific occurrences we have experienced, they also represent patterns of behavior tied to individuals as well as patterns of bullying documented in this collection. In our own case, our interpretations of the situation were (somewhat) helpful frames that cast our colleagues' behavior as not personal; however, our explanations did not help us formulate agentive responses that would improve our workplaces. In fact, as we now realize, we were falling into the practice of using coded language to conceive of workplace bullying as simply *politics*. Although some may consider it impolite or bad form to talk about departmental politics outside of one's institutional home, when we do so with close friends and mentors we are struck by how accepted—and expected—certain behaviors are, especially in regard to writing program administration (WPA) workplaces. Institutional politics are presented as regrettable but assumed *working conditions*—a term we take up in greater detail below. As *Defining, Locating, and Addressing Bullying in the WPA Workplace* demonstrates, a culture of silence—including the use of coded

language—discourages our talking about bullying and making it more visible rather than discouraging the behaviors or the bullies.

In fact, the culture of silence is part of what inspired this collection, as it made it difficult for us to respond productively to the bullying we were experiencing. In response to the silencing and in an effort to try to understand the motivations of her bully, Cris began reading Robert I. Sutton's (2007) *The No Asshole Rule: Building a Civilized Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't.* At the same time, Cris and Beth attended the 2015 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Tampa, Florida—the theme of which was "Risk and Reward." There we listened to a discussion on the "role of racialized and gendered bodies as WPA practitioners" and the accompanying risks. As each speaker (including one of the contributors to this collection) described the patterned abuse they[3] had faced, we began to think of bullying as a social justice issue, with already-marginalized groups facing the highest risk. Therefore, it was this confluence of events—Cris's and Beth's own experiences with bullying, Cris's reading of *The No Asshole Rule* (Sutton 2007), the serendipitous theme chosen for CCCC 2015, and the presentations in response to that theme—that collectively gave birth to the idea for this collection.

When we issued the CFP for this collection, we were struck by how many people contacted us directly to thank us for taking on this work and often to express regret at not being able to contribute, given the possibility for retribution on their campuses. Faculty from all sorts of institutions, with varying levels of field-wide recognition, with and without tenure, worried about what it would mean to publish their experiences with bullying. We quickly learned that while this collection is an important project, it is also difficult to break the culture of silence and fear that surrounds workplace bullying. As a particularly poignant example, one of our contributors who had decided to publish under a pseudonym later withdrew from the project based on the advice of a mentor at her institution.

In acknowledgment of the risks associated with this topic, we designed a research project using surveys and interviews to capture as many experiences as possible and to give a collective voice to those who find it too risky in their current situations to speak out individually. We present the results of the survey in chapter 1. Because of limitations of space, we leave the interview data for a separate, forthcoming article in the journal *WPA: Writing Program Administration.*

We are continually inspired by and grateful to everyone who has contributed to this collection or who has encouraged us as we ventured forth in this project. In particular, we are thankful to the chapter

authors; in addition to the risks of exposing oneself as having been bullied, these authors have also been forced to revisit feelings of angst, frustration, fear, anger, and sadness as they've shared their stories. We hope that by sharing these experiences, theirs and ours, we can help others name the bullying they may be experiencing for what it is. Only then can it be addressed.

However, this book is not a collection of "victim narratives." Rather, this book itself has become a form of agentive response to the bullying the chapter authors, the survey/interview participants, and we ourselves have faced. This book draws on the experiences of individuals of varying status, in different types of WPA programs, across many kinds of institutions, in order to define and locate bullying in the WPA workplace. The authors use these locations as points of departure to further theorize bullying and to provide clear advice about agentive responses. We expect this book to be useful to WPAs and other actors within the WPA workplace, including instructors, faculty who mentor graduate students, and faculty who might move into other kinds of administrative positions (e.g., department chair or dean). Graduate students will also benefit from this collection, as it works to disrupt normalized, systemic bullying often introduced in graduate school and to offer models for creating and participating in workplace civility.

As we worked on this collection, our definition of bullying evolved. We began to see as a form of bullying the common, particularly nasty reviews that are sometimes part of the peer review process. We now read the genre of Facebook posts that belittle students or disparage certain kinds of scholarship as bullying. Moreover, we discovered that it no longer feels acceptable—or ethical—to leave bullying unchecked when we witness it, even when addressing the behavior puts us at professional risk. Indeed, since beginning this project, we have worked to protect graduate students from bullying by a tenured faculty member, and one of us—despite her pre-tenure status—has taken considerable professional risk to do so. Ultimately, we hope this book will encourage and empower all of our readers to take an active role in defining, locating, and addressing bullying in their own workplace.

BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE

According to Gina Vega and Debra R. Comer (2005, 104), "Various studies report between 38% and a terrifying 90% of the [US] workforce has experienced bullying at some point in their work lives." The large span between these figures illustrates the difficulty many scholars have faced

when attempting to identify the prevalence of workplace bullying—in part because of the different terms used to describe this phenomenon, including mobbing, emotional abuse, incivility, and microaggressions, to name a few. Although the bullying described in this collection takes multiple forms—incivility, mobbing, systemic bullying—we use the overarching term *bullying* to include all of these actions and behaviors because it is the term most commonly used in reference to the academic context and because formal definitions of bullying often include the different terms listed above. In addition, US K–12 schools have begun implementing zero-tolerance bullying policies, and the media has condemned what was once normalized as a part of childhood. Our hope is that this collection will elicit similar ethical responses when it comes to bullying in the WPA workplace.

While many different behaviors can constitute bullying, they must meet the criteria that the behaviors persist over a period of time and negatively impact the target to be considered bullying. For example, one list of bullying behaviors includes harassment, social exclusion or isolation, rumors, criticism, and verbal abuse (Keashly and Neuman 2010, 49; Salin 2003, 1215). To be considered bullying, these behaviors must represent a pattern of behavior that spans a period of time, with most scholars using six months as the example time frame (Fox and Cowan 2015, 124; Keashly and Neuman 2010, 49).

Some definitions of bullying include a statement about an imbalance of power where the bully holds some sort of power over the target. However, many scholars recognize the shifting and varied nature of power, noting that bullying involves "*a perceived power imbalance*" (Salin 2003, 1214–15; original emphasis) or that regardless of power relations prior to bullying, targets lose power through the bullying interaction (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, and Cooper quoted in Keashly and Neuman 2010, 49). Finally, multiple scholars point out the connection between power in the workplace and power dynamics in our society writ large. In other words, people who have a minority status (for whatever reason) in our larger culture are likely to have a minority status in academia. Denise Salin (2003, 1219) notes that regardless of workplace positions and titles, "organizational power differences are . . . often connected with societal power differences and bullying often overlaps with related phenomena such as sexism or racism in the workplace."

All scholars who study bullying agree that workplace bullying has myriad negative consequences for the targets, spanning economics and mental and physical health. Vega and Comer (2005, 106) list among the consequences "depression, anxiety, aggression, insomnia, psychosomatic

effects, stress, and general physical and mental ill health." Suzy Fox and Renee L. Cowan (2015, 116) list a similar set of adverse effects but also note that targets can suffer post-traumatic stress disorder and "emotional damage such as humiliation, doubt and stress; and vicious cycles of counterproductive work behavior." Bullying affects more than just the target, though, as institutions suffer costs associated with "people leaving . . . reduced productivity, and a loss of creativity and innovation" (Fox and Cowan 2015, 106). In addition, there is consensus that witnessing unchecked bullying leads to more bullying (McDaniel, Ngala, and Leonard 2015, 599; Salin 2003, 1217).

There is some contention regarding whether and how bullying is measured or assessed. Many scholars are careful to point out that it is the target who decides when bullying has occurred (Hoel, Einarsen, and Cooper 2003; Twale and DeLuca 2008). Others suggest that bullying should pass a reasonable person test, in that behaviors count as bullying when "a reasonable person would find [them] abusive" (Fox and Cowan 2015, 124). Likewise, scholars in the field of human resources are working to create objective measurements for identifying bullying to rule out the possibility that targets could be misreading a situation (e.g., Fox and Cowan 2015). The field-specific discrepancies surrounding identifying and naming bullying are likely related to the stakes associated with these acts. For human resources, jobs are on the line, so they need objective measures for bullying. In contrast, researchers who study the consequences of bullying understandably focus on the target(s) and their experiences.

Indeed, the issue of who decides what counts as bullying shows up in many of the chapters in this collection, and we can attest to at least two instances we know of personally where both the bully and the target claim to have been bullied, putting institutions in the difficult position of having to determine whose claims hold more truth—or, more commonly, whether to get involved at all. This points to the importance of documenting bullying as it occurs, particularly to establish a pattern of behavior by the bully. In this collection, our goal is not to argue the validity of the narratives included in each chapter. Instead, the narratives offer an opportunity to locate bullying, allowing the authors to further theorize their experiences and, importantly, to offer suggestions for how others can respond when facing similar situations.

BULLYING IN ACADEMIA

A growing body of research suggests that bullying is especially prevalent in higher education institutions. Leah Hollis (2012, 36) estimates the

incidence of workplace bullying in higher education to be approximately 62 percent. Jamie Lester (2013, viii), in the introduction to *Workplace Bullying in Higher Education*, cites studies (Keashly and Neuman 2008; Goodyear, Reynolds, and Both Gragg 2010) that put incidence rates anywhere from 32 percent to over 80 percent. As with the research on the prevalence of workplace bullying more generally, research on workplace bullying in higher education often relies on small population sizes and a mix of terms—factors that leave us with little ability to accurately estimate the size of this problem.

Although we may not know how many people directly experience workplace bullying in academia, Loraleigh Keashly and Joel H. Neuman (2010) identify features of the academic work environment that could make bullying more likely in this context. Perhaps the most expected factor is tenure. The tenure structure ensures that it can be hard to fire someone who has tenure and creates a possibility that people will work together for long periods of time, which increases the likelihood for conflict and interpersonal aggression (Keashly and Neuman 2010, 53). In addition, because it is hard to fire someone with tenure, colleagues might turn to bullying as a way to get an unwanted colleague to leave on his or her own (Taylor 2013, 27). The tenure structure is also a competitive one that can make space for bullying. According to Salin (2003, 1223), faculty may bully other faculty members whom they perceive to be more competent so as to gain limited merit-based rewards for themselves. Finally, bullying seems to thrive in hierarchical environments, "characterized by rank structure" (Salin 2003, 1220), which the tenure structure ensures. These highly structured environments enable bullying in part by creating strict reporting lines that simultaneously make it difficult for a target of bullying to report the behavior to anyone outside their own department and allow upper administration to assume that someone else—a department chair, for example—should handle the situation. However, as authors in this collection and those we have surveyed can attest, having tenure or a higher status in the hierarchy does not necessarily protect one from being bullied.

Additional risk factors for bullying are perceptions of unfairness and frustration within one's institution more broadly. For example, faculty may find student evaluations and merit and promotion processes to be unfair, which can lead to anger, aggression, and bullying (Salin 2003, 1222; Keashly and Neuman 2010, 55–56). There might also be growing frustration related to budget cuts, which affect both class sizes and salary increases (Keashly and Neuman 2010, 58). In fact, the restructuring that accompanies budget cuts and changes in administration can be a

trigger for bullying (Salin 2003, 1224–25). According to Lester (2013, xi), "Bullying is known to be highly correlated with leadership changes and resource shortages."

Finally, Salin (2003, 1220) notes that large institutions seem to provide safety for bullies because of their size and the lack of willingness by upper management to respond to bullying. This last point cannot be overstated, as it shows up in many of the chapters in this collection and was a constant thread in our interviews. In our own personal experiences, it is not just upper management that chooses not to respond to bullies; other colleagues in positions to support us have responded with empathy, not action. For example, we have been advised "to choose your battles," which really means the person who could be an ally is not choosing *this* battle; "to keep our heads down," which suggests that we should not defend ourselves; or "to put on our big-girl pants," advising us to develop thicker skin so we can endure the bullying these colleagues choose not to address. Our point in offering these examples is to highlight the endemic problem and the likely familiar language that allows bullying to continue on our campuses, in our departments.

BULLYING IN THE WPA WORKPLACE

While the research on bullying in academia does not focus on administrative positions specifically, some scholarship suggests that administrators—such as WPAs—may be at a higher risk for being targets of bullying (Fratzl and McKay 2013, 61). Furthermore, according to Karen Rogers McDaniel, Florence Ngala, and Karen Moustafa Leonard (2015, 600), administrators who see their work as filling a social need or contributing to a social good are especially vulnerable, as being bullied while doing this kind of work "adds to the emotional strain already inherent in the work." (Of course, as some of our survey participants and contributors to this collection acknowledge, WPAs themselves are sometimes the bullies.)

The concept of bullying is not new to the field of WPA, although we may not have identified it previously as such. Much of WPA literature has addressed issues of power associated with WPA work (e.g., Bailiff, Davis, and Mountford 2008; Dew and Horning 2007; Edgington and Gallaher 2009; Enos and Borrowman 2008; George 1999). However, workplace bullying has not yet received focused attention in WPA scholarship. Despite acknowledgment of the challenges WPAs face, there has yet to be a collection that focuses on defining, locating, and addressing bullying in the WPA workplace—including perspectives from non- or pre-tenured WPAs,

WPAs from underrepresented social groups, and WPAs responding to the bullying of others (e.g., students, staff, faculty). This, we believe, leaves workplace bullying largely unnamed and under-theorized, forcing WPAs into the vulnerable position of having to seek out resources and advice on their own or to read between the lines of what has been published.

One location where this reading between the lines seems to be necessary is in Debra Frank Dew and Alice Horning's *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics* (2007). For example, in the preface to the collection, Edward M. White (2007, vii) describes the only recent valuing of WPA work among "traditional English departments" and how, still, "on a few campuses, writing programs have left indifferent or hostile English departments and established new homes in more friendly territory for teachers and administrators." While not explicitly framing it as bullying, White (2007) hints at the lack of respect generally shown to WPAs as individuals and to the field more broadly. This lack of respect and the hostility referenced can be forms of bullying and are not only risks for pre-tenured WPAs, as this current collection will show. As Horning (2007, 4) herself writes, "Even those with tenure do fall into political disfavor and are subsequently released from their WPA duties, despite the success of their programs."

Of course, this hostility or bullying does not take place only in traditional English departments where literature colleagues may have more power in numbers. As this collection reveals, our own rhetoric and composition colleagues can be among the worst perpetrators. Horning (2007, 7) argues that "senior faculty, department chairs, and other mentors need to help jWPAs negotiate the turbulent waters of running a program," but how does one respond when these are the same people, within our own programs, who stir up those waters?

However, the more senior colleagues that Horning (2007) suggests one turn to may themselves be among the bullied. Joseph Eng (2007), for example, offers an at-times-painful look at what WPA life can be like at two different institutions for a non-white, non-native English–speaking administrator when colleagues and graduate students make assumptions about his knowledge of grammar (good or bad), offer unsolicited opinions about which discipline he should be working in (e.g., ESL), and scrutinize his formal and informal written communication. Eng examines these inappropriate, unwanted acts in relation to his identity, but he does not at the time of writing in 2007 refer to these acts as microaggressions or patterns of bullying, as we might today.

Other publications also hint at or describe experiences within WPA work that may be recognized as bullying but weren't identified as such

in the context in which they were written. In *Kitchen Cooks, Plate Twirlers, and Troubadours: Writing Program Administrators Tell Their Stories,* editor Diana George (1999, 64) refers to the challenges of "sexual politics and disciplinary lines drawn in the sand." In the same collection, Nancy Barbara Conroy Maloney Grimm (1999, 14) likens her status to that of an Irish maid relegated to the downstairs quarters, as she is "marginalized and excluded from decisions that have a direct impact on [her] work." Mara Holt (1999, 27) writes of her own questioning "about the validity of my 'oppression'" in the face of "gender politics." As stated above, "politics" can simply be a euphemism for bullying, which is often accompanied by the doubt Holt expresses about her own experiences and how to characterize them.

Another seemingly common euphemism for bullying in WPA scholarship is *working conditions.* Or, perhaps better said, clear patterns of bullying are often inappropriately conflated with the material circumstances of WPA work when narrating our working conditions. In his foreword to *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration,* John Trimbur (2008, ix), in reference to George (1999), lists "meetings, e-mail, mentoring, phone calls, public relations, networking, annual reports, and daily multitasking" as examples of WPA material circumstances at the same time he refers to WPAs as "mid-level managers" who perform these tasks while caught "between the staff they manage and the supervisors they report to." It's this casual reference to being "caught in the middle" (Trimbur 2008, ix) or being part of "a beleaguered group" (Bruffee quoted in Rose 2008, 28) that we take issue with, as it is this aspect of our "working conditions" that is largely assumed and unaddressed, as the following narrative from Randall McClure (2008, 104; original emphasis) illustrates: "For example, a senior faculty member once took offense in a department meeting to my use of the term *composition program* to describe our developmental and FYC [first-year composition] courses. She quipped, 'We do not have a composition program, just some courses.' The idea, I think, was to make it clear that I, as a junior faculty member, was not in charge of any program, and if I were in charge of anything, it was *just* a course or two in *comp* [as opposed to *real* writing]."

The material circumstances of McClure's situation are the actions he took to improve the TA program at his institution and his consequential strengthening of the composition program. His colleague's derisive attitude in response to this work, in contrast, is not a material circumstance. It is not something to be expected. Or accepted. It is just plain incivility—and if part of a larger pattern, it is workplace bullying. It is

this aspect of a WPA's working conditions that is rarely addressed and that gets hidden—and protected—by our coded language.

Other material circumstances that WPAs might unfortunately expect include budgetary constraints, a lack of transparency in the tenure and promotion process, and what is often perceived as the paternalistic hierarchy maintained in academia. WPA scholarship has collected a number of narratives about the special challenges these circumstances bring to our work lives (see Dew and Horning 2007; Enos and Borrowman 2008; George 1999). However, rarely do these narratives separate out from one's material circumstances the aggressive attitudes of others that can accompany this work. Elizabeth Hodges's narrative is a rare exception. In her chapter "At the Pleasure of the Chair: A Cautionary Tale from the Private Side of the Public Story," Hodges (2008, 232) recounts the patterns of abuse she experienced over a period of years in a new faculty/WPA position, ranging from colleagues' attacks on her character to their open disregard for her work and her discipline to the anonymous grievance(s) made against her, "thus denying the alleged guilty [party the opportunity] to face [her] accuser." Hodges (2008, 232) identifies her patterns of experiences within the department as "workplace mobbing," a form of bullying.

It is a grave mistake not to separate out from one's material circumstances within WPA work the deliberate actions performed by others that aim to impede or disparage that work. By not identifying patterns of bullying for what they are, we not only make it all the more difficult to address bullying, but we also end up normalizing these patterns as something that comes with the job, as something to be expected as a part of "working conditions."

Perhaps even worse is when we problematize not the working conditions but the WPAs themselves. For example, Shirley K Rose (2008, 21) admits that her initial response to jWPA (junior WPA) narratives about the promises and perils of doing WPA work pre-tenure was to characterize the jWPAs as "naive and uninformed" rather than "powerless or overworked" and perhaps deaf to the "well-meaning and sound advice of would-be mentors," only then to acknowledge that these initial responses were not merited. As Rose might, we ask our readers to reconsider the ways we have unjustly characterized individuals, particularly jWPAs and gWPAs (graduate student WPAs), in the literature and through the "common sense" advice we have offered WPAs in response to what could be identified as bullying.

When we simply advise junior faculty and graduate students not to take WPA positions because they are unprepared for the "working

conditions" and "politics" they are likely to face, we participate in a type of victim blaming that is already so prevalent in rape culture, discourses of whiteness, and other forms of systemic oppression and violence. We blame the bullied for their lack of preparation (or experience/status/ tenure) in attending to the "politics" of the situation rather than blaming the perpetrator for inappropriate, unprofessional, and unethical behavior. And, as within rape culture, we rarely see the perpetrators of bullying in academia held accountable.

With this collection, by identifying bullying for what it is, we hope to stop the recursive cycle that in the past has been perpetuated even by our own scholarship when we don't recognize bullying for what it is.

BULLYING IN THIS COLLECTION

The following chapters provide a comprehensive description of bullying in the WPA workplace: they define bullying within specific institutional contexts, showing how many actions can become bullying when they represent a pattern of behavior that creates professional and personal harm; they describe various forms of bullying, including microaggressions, incivility, mobbing, and emotional abuse; they define bullying as institutional racism, "academic systemic incivility," a crisis of insularity, and faculty fundamentalism; they locate bullying in research institutions, small liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and in writing programs and writing centers. Of course, not all contexts and circumstances of bullying may be covered in this collection, and we do not address matters of sexual harassment, which is distinct from, though often accompanied by, bullying behaviors. However, we hope readers will find the defining, locating, and addressing of bullying discussed within to be useful and applicable to other instances of bullying in the WPA workplace.

The narratives in each of the chapters outlined below represent the authors' memories and interpretations of their experiences. While it is possible, even likely, that other people involved in these situations would characterize them differently, that is not of utmost importance to the aims of this collection. The primary contributions of this collection are not necessarily the narratives themselves—as engaging as they are; the major contributions are the theoretical grounding of the experiences, the naming of patterns of behaviors as bullying, the resistance against ideologies of normalcy, and, most of all, the agentive responses to bullying that readers can apply to their own contexts.

In the opening chapter, Bethany Davila and Cristyn L. Elder report on survey data collected from stakeholders in WPA workplaces across

the United States on their experiences with bullying. The authors use these data to establish the scope and patterns of bullying in the WPA workplace, to define various behaviors linked to bullying, and to contextualize the scholarship on bullying in our field.

Chapter 2 is a reprinted manuscript by Harry Denny with a new coda. The chapter argues that while we are able to recognize very public and tragic instances of bullying, most of the time workplace bullying has become so normalized that we fail to recognize it. Denny, who situates his experiences of bullying within the writing center and in response to his sexual identity, calls for us to learn to identify this form of everyday oppression so we can be allies for those in need. He leaves us with a perhaps now familiar refrain but important reminder: we cannot wait until "it gets better."

In chapter 3, Aurora Matzke, Sherry Rankins-Robertson, and Bre Garrett suggest that the everyday nature of bullying is attributed to a culture of bullying embedded in academia that begins in graduate school and extends across institutions and designations of tenure. They locate bullying in their experiences as three female WPAs at different institutions and at various stages of tenure, complicating traditional notions of power that center on top-down bullying between tenured faculty or administrators and pre-tenure WPAs. Finally, they provide specific strategies for counteracting and surviving bullying in the WPA workplace.

Sarah Allen, in chapter 4, offers an explanation for one way bullying becomes part of the culture of a department. She draws on Sharon Crowley's (2006) *Toward a Civil Discourse: Rhetoric and Fundamentalism* to define academic fundamentalism as a precursor to bullying. Allen draws parallels to the political context of the Trump presidency, in which citizens are polarized, dissenting voices cannot be heard, we are haunted by threats of violence, and individuals no longer choose to participate in democratic practices. In addition, Allen shows how complicated bullying can become when sometimes the bullied bully back. She then offers recommendations on how to work toward civility under such circumstances in the WPA workplace.

In chapter 5, Dawn Fels demonstrates that in addition to being part of the academic culture, risk factors for being bullied are often related to other systems of oppression—in this case, contingent labor. Fels examines the experiences of contingent writing center directors, which she has collected over a three-year period through interviews. She uses these data to highlight the particular difficulty this group faces in finding "justice" when bullied, the effects this bullying has, and what can be done about it.

Another system of oppression that can result in bullying is institutionalized racism. In the sixth chapter, Andrea Dardello combines the political genre of testimonial with academic research to illustrate the importance of resisting silence, which she argues has the power to erase bullying and "forfeit the change that can happen if I but dare to speak" (104). Dardello's experience—being publicly ridiculed and forced out of her administrative position at a community college because she resisted the department chair's characterization of her as hostile—in combination with scholarship, defines bullying as a manifestation of institutionalized racism used to disempower her, an African American female.

Staci Perryman-Clark, in chapter 7, continues to explore the relationship between bullying and race by locating bullying within racialized interactions and tactics steeped in white privilege. Specifically, she describes attempts by a graduate student teaching assistant, with the support of a tenured faculty member, to undermine her authority and their efforts to remove her from her administrative position. By locating and defining bullying in terms of tenure, race, and gender, Perryman-Clark identifies the possibilities of white ally-ship to address the bullying of WPAs of color—especially those who are pre-tenure.

In chapter 8, Erec Smith teaches us that the combination of bullying and racism can lead to academic insularity and mobbing against the "other." Smith describes the bullying he experienced as a form of insularity and racism while a writing center director, "diversity worker," and single academic in rhetoric and composition at a former institution. As Smith writes, "The insularity that creates a disdain for rhetoric and composition also creates a xenophobia that discourages cultural diversity within academia. As a black man—one carrying a torch for diversification to boot—I was a reminder of the outside world that was always threatening" (146). Smith argues that these forms of insularity, which in his case manifested as bullying, are a crisis that must be addressed.

Mobbing is again taken up in Amy Heckathorn's chapter. Heckathorn examines bullying as it relates to a familiar disciplinary divide that arises with the lack of acknowledgment of rhetoric and composition as a field and the expertise that academics in the field represent. However, she shows that, in her experience, the mobbing extended beyond the department and quickly cut the writing program off from all available resources to address the situation. As a solution, Heckathorn calls for independent writing programs, providing an overview of the benefits and challenges this response to bullying can bring.

While Heckathorn describes bullying that spans an institution, in chapter 10, W. Gary Griswold locates bullying at the level of a university

system. He defines the bullying he (and many other faculty members in the California State University [CSU] system) experienced as "Academic Systemic Incivility" (ASI), describing tactics used by administrators in the CSU system to enforce a mandated remediation program the faculty vehemently opposed. Ultimately, Griswold suggests that WPAs can counteract ASI by becoming—or recognizing their role as—servant leaders, thereby creating a model of civility.

NOTES

1. The authors contributed equally in the writing of this chapter.
2. In this collection we use *pre-tenure* to indicate those on the tenure track who have not yet gone through tenure, whereas *non-tenured* refers to those not on the tenure track.
3. This collection follows the NCTE (2012) recommended *Guidelines for Gender-Fair Use of Language* at http://www2.ncte.org/statements//genderfairuseoflang.

REFERENCES

Bailiff, Michelle, Diane Davis, and Roxanne Mountford. 2008. *Women's Ways of Making It in Rhetoric and Composition.* New York: Routledge.

Crowley, Sharon. 2006. *Toward a Civil Discourse: Rhetoric and Fundamentalism.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjng7.

Dew, Debra Frank, and Alice Horning, eds. 2007. *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Edgington, Anthony, and Robin Gallaher, eds. 2009. *Junior Faculty and Graduate Student Administration Issues (WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, no. 1.).* Council of Writing Program Administrators and CompPile. http://comppile.org/wpa/bibliographies/Bib1/Edgington_Gallaher.pdf.

Eng, Joseph. 2007. "Demystifying the Asian-American WPA: Location in Writing, Teaching, and Program Administration." In *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics,* ed. Debra Frank Dew and Alice Horning, 153–71. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Enos, Theresa, and Shane Borrowman, eds. 2008. *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Fox, Suzy, and Renee L. Cowan. 2015. "Revision of the Workplace Bullying Checklist: The Importance of Human Resource Management's Role in Defining and Addressing Workplace Bullying." *Human Resource Management Journal* 25 (1): 116–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12049.

Fratzl, Jae, and Ruth McKay. 2013. "Professional Staff in Academia: Academic Culture and the Role of Aggression." In *Workplace Bullying in Higher Education,* ed. Jaime Lester, 60–73. New York: Routledge.

George, Diana, ed. 1999. *Kitchen Cooks, Plate Twirlers, and Troubadours: Writing Program Administrators Tell Their Stories.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Goodyear, Rod K., Pauline Reynolds, and Janee Both Gragg. 2010. "University Faculty Experiences of Classroom Incivilities: A Critical-Incident Study." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual conference, April 30–May 3, 2010, Denver, CO.

Grimm, Nancy Barbara Conroy Maloney. 1999. "'The Way the Rich People Does It': Reflections on Writing Center Administration and the Search for Status." In *Kitchen Cooks, Plate Twirlers, and Troubadours: Writing Program Administrators Tell Their Stories,* ed. Diana George, 14–25. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Hodges, Elizabeth. 2008. "At the Pleasure of the Chair: A Cautionary Tale from the Private Side of the Public Story." In *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration*, ed. Theresa Enos and Shane Borrowman, 225–37. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Hoel, Helge, Ståle Einarsen, and Cary L. Cooper. 2003. "Organisational Effects of Bullying." In *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*, eds. Ståle Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf, and Cary Cooper, 2–30. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Hollis, Leah. 2012. *Bully in the Ivory Tower: How Aggression and Incivility Erode American Higher Education*. Wilmington, DE: Patricia Berkly LLC.

Holt, Mara. 1999. "On Coming to Voice." In *Kitchen Cooks, Plate Twirlers, and Troubadours: Writing Program Administrators Tell Their Stories*, ed. Diana George, 26–43. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Horning, Alice. 2007. "Introduction: What Is Wrong with THIS Picture?" In *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics*, ed. Debra Frank Dew and Alice Horning, 3–12. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor. https://doi.org/10.1053/sonc.2003.50036.

Keashly, Loraleigh, and Joel H. Neuman. 2008. *Final Report: Workplace Behavior (Bullying) Project Survey*. Mankato: Minnesota State University. https://www.mnsu.edu/csw/workplacebullying/workplace_bullying_final_report.pdf.

Keashly, Loraleigh, and Joel H. Neuman. 2010. "Faculty Experiences with Bullying in Higher Education: Causes, Consequences, and Management." *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 32 (1): 48–70. https://doi.org/10.2753/ATP1084-1806320103.

Lester, Jaime, ed. 2013. *Workplace Bullying in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.

McClure, Randall. 2008. "An Army of One: The Possibilities and Pitfalls of WPA Work for the Lone Compositionist." In *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration*, ed. Theresa Enos and Shane Borrowman, 102–9. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

McDaniel, Karen Rogers, Florence Ngala, and Karen Moustafa Leonard. 2015. "Does Competency Matter? Competency as a Factor in Workplace Bullying." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 30 (5): 597–609. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2013-0046.

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). 2002. *Guidelines for Gender-Fair Use of Language*. http://www2.ncte.org/statements/genderfairuseoflang.

Rose, Shirley K. 2008. "'Creating a Context': The Institutional Logic of the Council of Writing Program Administrators' Development of the Evaluator Service." In *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration*, ed. Theresa Enos and Shane Borrowman, 21–46. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Salin, Denise. 2003. "Ways of Explaining Workplace Bullying: A Review of Enabling, Motivating, and Precipitating Structures and Processes in the Work Environment." *Human Relations* 56 (10): 1213–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035610003.

Sutton, Robert I. 2007. *The No Asshole Rule: Building a Civilized Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't*. New York: Business Plus.

Taylor, Susan. 2013. "Workplace Bullying: Does Tenure Change Anything?" In *Workplace Bullying in Higher Education*, ed. Jaime Lester, 23–40. New York: Routledge.

Trimbur, John. 2008. "Foreword." In *The Promise and Perils of Writing Program Administration*, ed. Theresa Enos and Shane Borrowman, ix–xiv. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Twale, Darla J., and Barbara M. De Luca. 2008. *Faculty Incivility: The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to Do about It*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vega, Gina, and Debra R. Comer. 2005. "Sticks and Stones May Break Your Bones, but Words Can Break Your Spirit: Bullying in the Workplace." *Journal of Business Ethics* 58 (1–3): 101–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-1422-7.

White, Edward M. 2007. "Preface." In *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics*, ed. Debra Frank Dew and Alice Horning, vii–ix. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.