Strategies for a Nonviolent Response to Perpetrator Actions: What Can Christianity Offer to Targets of Workplace Mobbing?
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Abstract. This study sought to identify what strategies Christianity can offer for a morally justifiable, nonviolent response to mobbing actions. A qualitative content analysis of the Gospel of Luke was performed, and Heinz Leymann’s action groups of workplace mobbing were used to create categories. Three strategies of nonviolent response to attacks on communication, personal and professional reputation as well as social exclusion and physical attacks were identified. Their set consists of active efforts to maintain the observers’ support, refusal to engage in a stubborn and destructive struggle, and cognitive reappraisal and making sense of negative experiences. The possibilities for using these strategies in different situations are discussed, and directions for further research are outlined, enabling us to evaluate the effectiveness of millennia-old religious coping practices in cases of workplace mobbing.
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Introduction

“His followers, seeing what was about to happen, said, ‘Lord, shall we use our swords?’” (Luke 22, 49). The question of how to act in the face of violence is not just a question for Jesus’ disciples. It is a question that is always relevant when confronted with a violent person at home or in the workplace. However, isn’t a prayer and a Christian response to workplace mobbing a passive, losing strategy?

Indeed, nonviolent resistance is not a new topic, but according to Ryan Essex et al. (2023), such a response remains a disputed concept in regard to the forms and consequences of such resistance. Although nonviolent individual responses to violence are most often examined in the context of collective resistance (Dahlum et al. 2022; Essex et al. 2023; Vollhardt et al. 2020), it is important to understand the motives that drive people to adopt these strategies. For example, a study conducted by Ryan Essex et al. (2023) demonstrated that 12.9% of physicians surveyed mentioned conscience, ethical, moral beliefs or principles. In another study, Sirianne Dahlum et al. (2022) explained response to violence according to two logics: instrumental, which is based on cost–benefit considerations, and internal, when nonviolent response is motivated by perceived intrinsic moral values. In this context, an important role is played by religious beliefs influencing moral decision-making and moral behaviour, which are common across the whole spectrum of religiosity (Shariff 2015).

However, in the case of collective resistance, individuals have the support of the group, unlike in the process of workplace mobbing. The latter is described in the scientific literature as long-lasting and distinguishing itself by the systematic unethical, intimidating behaviour of co-workers towards any one person (Bokek-Cohen et al. 2022; Leymann 1996; Pheko 2018). It includes verbal and non-verbal violence used by a group of individuals to cause physical or psychological harm to the victim, to damage the reputation and to drive out the victim from the unit or organization.

---

Mobbing stands out from other conflicts occurring in the work environment by its multidimensionality (Stergiannis 2019; Yamada et al. 2018) and by its particularly tragic consequences for both the victim him- or herself and the social environment (e.g., Mulder et al. 2014; Pheko 2018). The study conducted by Simona D. Cakirpaloglu et al. (2021) showed that the prevalence of mobbing in European countries varied between 1 and 24.8%. These are huge numbers when you consider that they represent specific personal tragedies.

Although the importance of support provided by the social environment is described quite extensively in the scientific literature (e.g., Yurcu and Akinci 2019; Molero et al. 2021; Rossiter and Sochos 2018), less is known about individual strategies for nonviolent resistance. Such knowledge is important in helping the targets of mobbing develop a response to specific hostile acts so that resistance is not only moral from the religious standpoint but also effective. For example, it has been observed that a retaliatory response by the target of mobbing may cause an even more violent attack, whereas withdrawal does not violate any clear moral norms and is unlikely to cause any negative reactions (Houshmand et al. 2012).

The nonviolent response to experienced violence and forgiveness are deeply rooted in the Christian tradition (Dreyer 2018; Tönsing 2019), but research shows that it matters how a disaster is interpreted in the religious context, and inappropriate strategies (e.g., perception of the disaster as a punishment) can only worsen the situation (DeRossett et al. 2019; O’Brien et al. 2019). On the other hand, although forgiveness is considered an effective measure for coping with various traumatic situations (Cerci and Colucci 2018; Jang et al. 2022; Song et al. 2021), it has been observed that forgiving people find it more difficult to accept that the other person could treat him cruelly (Escartín 2016). Thus, this paper seeks to answer the question of how, using the Christian sacred text, to help the targets of workplace mobbing develop a religiously moral and adequate response to the assaults they experience. The article will show how collaboration between religion and social sciences can improve the situation of employees experiencing physical and psychological violence in the contemporary workplace and help make sense of their suffering.
This article consists of three parts. To answer the question posed, the paper first discusses the methodological issues that arise in the search for links between Luke’s Gospel narrative and the experiences of victims of workplace mobbing are discussed, and the research methodology is presented. In the second part, the experiences of victims of workplace mobbing, described in the scientific literature, are examined in the evangelical context, distinguishing response methods offered by the religious text. Finally, the paper discusses how the identified ways of responding can be interpreted in the contemporary context for conflict resolution in mobbing cases. This study demonstrates how the example of religious text can be used to motivate a person experiencing workplace violence to remain active and choose a nonviolent response, which would not worsen his or her situation.

1. Methodological issues of the research

Before examining the Christian response to violence on the basis of the New Testament, specifically the Gospel of Luke, several methodological issues need to be discussed. First, the story of the persecution of Jesus and his disciples is not a precisely timed record of events. However, Luke differs from other evangelists in that already in his prologue, he notes the fact that he referred to written material, which he investigated, organized and presented as a single coherent narrative (Lk 1:1–3). For example, after evaluating the word καθεξῆς used in the Gospel prologue in the Bible and its etymology, Benjamin W. Fung et al. (2017) believe that this indicates Luke’s intention to present his narrative in a chronological order.

Following Luke’s narrative, a certain chronology of conflict escalation can be observed, where confrontations with individual opponents (cf. Lk 5:27–39; 5,30; 6:1–11; 11:53; 13:14) develop into the engagement of the community’s spiritual leaders (cf. Lk 4:28–29; 8:37; 9:51–52; 22:47–67) and end in physical crackdown (Lk 23:33–46). This circumstance is notable in that workplace mobbing is described as conflict escalation evolving from one stage to another (Rosander and Blomberg 2019).
Another important aspect of this study is the psychologism of the Gospel of Luke. For example, Eben Scheffler (2014) notes that the author of the Gospel paid particular attention to the alleviation of human psychological experiences, for example, suffering such as illness, hostility, and social rejection. All this may also be relevant for victims of mobbing, who experience social rejection, hostility and psychosomatic health problems (for more, see Nielsen et al. 2017; Pheko 2018).

The present research employed a qualitative content analysis approach, creating categories based on a theoretical framework (Graneheim et al. 2017; Mayring 2002). The basis of the research is five groups of offensive actions distinguished by Heinz Leymann (see Leymann 1996), whose equivalents and responses are sought in the Gospel of Luke. According to Heinz Leymann, although mobbing is a very old phenomenon, it was not systematically studied until the 1980s. The model he has created includes 5 victim attack strategies (Table 1), duration of the attack (at least 6 months) and frequency of attacks (at least once a week). The model is based on research conducted in Sweden in the 1980s, during which persons who experienced various psychological traumas at work and attempted suicide were interviewed.

Publications corresponding to the research topic were searched in research databases using different combinations of keywords “workplace mobbing”, “victim”, “nonviolent response”, “Christianity”, “Luke”, “Gospel”.

This study also has several limitations. Of course, such correspondence of experiences is conditional, and the modern work organization cannot be equated to the society described in the Gospel, but this problem can be solved by applying the hermeneutic approach to the interpretation of the text. According to Camilla A-L. Koskinen and Unni A. Lindström (2012), classical texts enable one to rediscover essential dimensions and to understand human reality at a deeper level, providing knowledge about people’s lives and suffering.

Another limitation is related to the lack of research. Although no research that directly examines religious coping in cases of workplace mobbing could be found, there are indirect indications in the literature that encourage further investigation of this approach. For example, it has been
found that in the case of mobbing, reappraisal coping together with “confrontive coping, practical coping, direct coping, active coping, social support (problem-focused coping) and self-care (emotion-focused coping) decrease the association between work stressors and bullying (i.e., buffer-effect)” (Van den Brande et al. 2016). That is, the coping mechanism itself is important in this case, as is the principle of non-violent response. Answers as to how these are affected by the strength of an individual’s faith, the processes of secularization in societies and other circumstances require separate studies.

2. Nonviolent and active ways of responding to persecution

According to Heinz Leymann’s (1996) typology of offensive actions, the methods of responses to violence, identified in Luke’s Gospel, are divided into five areas. In each of these areas, the reaction to the experienced attack has a certain goal, which can be interpreted as an active solution that stops the escalation of local conflicts, preventing a power advantage from being gained and securing the support of observers (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of impact (Leymann 1996)</th>
<th>Impact (Lk)</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Reaction (Lk)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Effects on the victim’s opportunities to communicate adequately (management limits the opportunities to communicate, the victim is silenced, screaming, criticism, verbal threats, etc.)</td>
<td>13:14; 15:2;</td>
<td>Verbal aggression: (a) public criticism of actions;</td>
<td>13:15–17; 14:3–5; 15:3–7;</td>
<td>Maintaining beliefs, to thwart the aggressor’s efforts to gain the power advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:24; 23:10;</td>
<td>(b) highlighting incongruity with the group</td>
<td>17:25–27</td>
<td>Confirmation of group membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of impact (Leymann 1996)</th>
<th>Impact (Lk)</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Reaction (Lk)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Effects on the victims’ opportunities to maintain social contacts (colleagues do not communicate, or this is forbidden by the management, the victim is moved farther away from others, etc.)</td>
<td>4:28–29; 22:47; 54</td>
<td>Social exclusion: (a) group rejection; (b) physical isolation</td>
<td>4:30 (context 4:23–24) 22:51 (context 22:35–46)</td>
<td>To demonstrate personal strength of spirit without deepening the conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Effects on the victims’ ability to maintain their personal reputation (gossip, mockery, making fun of one’s physical condition, ethnic origin, beliefs, etc.)</td>
<td>5:30; 5:33; 16:14;</td>
<td>Compromising the target’s personality: (a) by stigmatizing (b) by mockingly referring to the target</td>
<td>5:31–32; 5:34–39; 16:9–13, 15</td>
<td>Acceptance of unavoidable circumstances Changing the meaning imposed Demonstration of moral ambivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Effects on the victims’ occupational situation (work tasks are not assigned, they are meaningless, exceed the victim’s capabilities or are intended to compromise, etc.)</td>
<td>20:2; 20:20–22; 20:27–33; 6:7; 11:53–54; 14:1;</td>
<td>Compromising the target’s actions: (a) by causing group dissatisfaction with the target’s performance; (b) compromising by provoking errors</td>
<td>20:3–7; 20:9–18; 20:23–26; 20:34–38;</td>
<td>Neutralizing accusations, meaning-making, securing group support Seeking a compromise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways of impact (Leymann 1996) | Impact (Lk) | Area | Reaction (Lk) | Meaning |
---|---|---|---|---|
E Effects on the victims’ physical health (dangerous jobs are assigned, threats of physical crackdowns or physical attacks, etc.) | 4:29; 9:53; | Causing fear for physical safety: (a) potential threat | 4:30; 9:54–55 (context 9:3–5) | Withdrawal from a dangerous situation |

A. *Response to verbal violence.* On the one hand, criticism emphasizes the noncompliance of the victim’s behaviour with the established requirements, making him or her feel guilty and insignificant. In other words, it is sought to change the target’s opinion about himself and his actions, to convince him that he is wrong and for this reason he should experience the feelings of guilt and shame. Jesus’ reactions show that the “image” of guilt, simulated by accusers, has no power over a person if the person measures himself and his actions according to the way they are judged by the Heavenly Father (e.g., 15:3–7). That is, Jesus proposes a model for the person’s evaluation, which does not depend on the people’s will and does not change. On the other hand, verbal violence causes fear through which the victim’s status quo is maintained. One such episode in Luke’s Gospel is public criticism of the synagogue elder for controversial behaviour, which is treated as a serious violation of the norms of Judaism (13:14). This is a serious pretext for driving out the “offender” from the community (more in Bridget 2010).

This criticism highlights the efforts of the synagogue elder as a person with institutional power to provoke indignation among community members, further reinforcing the asymmetry of power, which would ensure greater control for the “whippersnapper”. There are two notable
aspects in Jesus’ response to criticism, which can be called a two-step neutralization of criticism. First, the accusation is “weakened” by showing that the rule has exceptions that are illustrated by a practical example (13:15). In other words, personal experiences and emotions are addressed; humanity is appealed to, casting doubt on the indisputability of the rule. Second is the neutralization of criticism, grounding on community values and turning the negative aspect of behaviour into a positive one. That is, Jesus explains his actions as charity that is appropriate for the Sabbath, God’s day (13:16).

Obedience to the established rules does not indicate the renunciation of one’s attitude or beliefs. In contrast, it emphasizes the connection with the group and efforts to belong to it. In addition, rational explanation of actions to supporters (17:27) protects from their negative reactions and turning away. Of course, these actions do not turn the opponents into friends, but they are forced to retreat and are deprived of appreciable leverage – the group’s support that would free their hands to deal with the victim (13:17). Furthermore, this shows how a wise evaluation of the situation allows one to avoid a potential attack and to creatively turn the situation around while remaining true to one’s beliefs.

B. Response to social exclusion. If we look at the context of 4:29 (4:14–27), the community’s outrage is caused by Jesus’ “act of misdemeanour”, which results in his physical removal from that community’s space. In this case, there is a clear asymmetry of power (group vs. one person), and the reaction of the potential victim (4:30) seems inadequate to the situation and paralyzing – no one dares to hold back.

The group demonstrating aggression may expect aggressive resistance, fear, or pleas for mercy, but when it does not receive any of these, it becomes confused. Jesus does not fight for the opportunity to stay in the city but shows surprising strength of spirit and quietly walks away. Verses 4:23–24 are important for understanding such reactions. This is the realization of the potential target of violence that certain actions, or rather the idea they carry, surpass the group’s capacity to adequately accept them. In other words, a broader understanding of human nature leads to
the fact that aggressive reactions do not become unexpected, which is why they do not confuse as much as they could. This positioning protects the potential victim from spontaneous actions that could provoke even greater aggression. This context highlights empathy and the ability to accept certain situations as inevitable and as having a deeper meaning.

C. **Response to compromising the target’s personality.** By stigmatizing the target, persecutors seek to influence their own self-esteem and the opinion of observers, encouraging them to distance themselves from the target. Expressing criticism (5:30), emphasis is placed on treating Jesus and his disciples as despised social groups (publicans and sinners), since sitting at a communal table is like being infected by their “uncleanliness”. The answer (5:31–32) shows how creatively meaning can be given. That is, there is no attempt to make excuses or contest the words that are aimed at undermining the reputation, but instead, being with “the unclean” is metaphorically elevated to the level of a healing mission.

Meanwhile, the response to the mockery (16:14) is based on the revelation of the moral controversy of the perpetrators (16:15). This case illustrates how the attempt of the Pharisees, who are morally controversial with regard to wealth, to undermine Jesus’ attitude towards money by mockery (value approaches) is turning against them, simultaneously making their efforts useless in the eyes of the observers.

D. **Response to compromising the target’s actions.** Unlike the encroachment on personal reputation, the aim is to undermine trust in the person as an expert in a particular field. In the Gospel of Luke, such efforts come to light in two ways: seeking to cast doubt on the goodness of the work done, on the legitimacy of the means used, and by provoking the target to make a mistake. Jesus’ mission is to teach, and he actively does this in the temple. The question expressed in verse 20:2 means that he does so, in modern parlance, without a licence.

Meanwhile, the response consists of two parts. *First,* Jesus deprives the persecutors of the basis to question “authorizations” by skilfully using another undisputed authority known to the group as an example
Second, since the aim of the efforts is to cast doubt among the members of the religious group gathered in the temple, the answer is not so much directed to the persons who asked the question but to the whole group. Therefore, the group’s knowledge and emotions are appealed to (20:9–18) while simultaneously also demonstrating personal competence – knowledge of the Scriptures (20:17).

Similarly, as in modern organizations, the denial of professional reputation, supported by the observers, paves the way for the victim of mobbing to be removed from the organization even without legitimate grounds. Meanwhile, without group support, such intentions become complicated (cf. 20:19). Another method described in the Gospel is provoking an error that would cause the group’s indignation and become the basis for an official accusation. For example, when solving the issue of paying taxes, Jesus is provoked to recklessly support the emperor or the religious authorities (20:20–22), enraging either the community or the religious authority, while also trying to compromise his own teaching (20:27–33). The response can be explained as a refusal to act according to the imposed rules of the “game”, offering a compromise solution that satisfies the opposing parties (20:23–26 and 20:34–38) while not denouncing (renouncing) one’s ideas.

E. Response to situations threatening physical security. According to Heinz Leymann (1996), in cases of mobbing, unlike bullying, actions are more subtle. That is, direct violence is less common, but the target is still forced to worry about his or her physical security. Based on this approach, the situations in the Gospel can be divided into two groups: when the threat is potential and is eliminated by withdrawal and when the threat becomes inevitable. As already mentioned, the first situation emerges in 4:29, and Jesus simply withdraws from the city when threatened with a crackdown. The behaviour is similar to having approached an inhospitable village potentially at risk of conflict and expulsion (9:53).

In both cases, a nonconfrontational attitude is important, refusing to take personal revenge against the group behaving in a hostile manner (cf. 9:54–55). Such an approach is explained by the perception that there
are situations beyond the person’s control; therefore, the decision is left to higher justice (cf. 9:3–5). Such situations occur when hostility turns into direct physical violence and crackdown, which in the case of the victim of mobbing can be illustrated by the suffering of Jesus on the cross (e.g., 22:66–67; 23:26; 23:33). Therefore, maintaining the line of trust in the Father (22:42–43; 23:46) during Judas’ betrayal and Peter’s denial until the crucifixion and resurrection is an example of how to cope with the disaster that has occurred.

3. Discussion

This paper raises the question of what nonviolent responses Christian scriptures can offer to targets of workplace mobbing. As Stephen T. Carroll (2013) noted, the results of collaboration between religion and social sciences in contemporary organizations could help reduce stress experienced by employees and improve work performance. However, although workplace mobbing has been extensively investigated by social science disciplines, the theological aspect of this problem has so far been neglected. Therefore, our searches for the answer were based on an interdisciplinary approach, which not only provides valuable knowledge but also enriches the disciplines themselves (Snow 2022; Vanney and Sáenz 2021).

Of course, the question arises whether it is possible to compare situations in contemporary workplaces and the Jewish community 2000 years ago. According to Illian, Bridget (2010), in the early rabbinic community, individuals violating established rules were threatened with expulsion, which meant being considered as unclean as lepers. This meant the person’s physical separation from other members of the community, which resulted in difficulties in doing business, and all this must have been accompanied by severe psychological pain. Meanwhile, the contemporary workplace is based on employment contracts rather than on community ties and religion. This means that, depending on the situation in the labour market, the person may find it harder or easier to get a new job and that the social security system guarantees support in case of unemployment. However, studies show that in case of mobbing, individuals expe-
rience social isolation and the threat of job loss (Molero et al. 2021; Pheko 2018), while job loss is a highly stressful experience related to the loss of personal identity, social contacts, complicated grief, depression symptoms (Eersel et al. 2020). Although pain and fear cannot be measured retrospectively, the mechanism by which they are caused can be traced regardless of the historical period. Our study demonstrates that the text of Luke’s Gospel is abundant in examples of Jesus’ responses to hostile behaviour, according to which respective nonviolent responses can be modelled. These reactions represent several basic strategies.

The first strategy is active efforts to maintain the observers’ support. Research shows that as a result of being attacked, victims not only experience psychological and physical pain (Jacobsen et al. 2018; Pheko 2018) but also lose social support that protects them from the negative effects of mobbing (Rossiter and Sochos 2018). Verbal polemic with opponents is directed at several goals: a) to demonstrate the adequacy of one’s actions to the existing norms, b) to highlight the groundlessness of the accusations, c) to reveal hidden motives of opponents, and d) to demonstrate assertiveness and active efforts in response to attacks. All this is consistently supplemented by active nonverbal behaviour that confirms value identity and connection with the group.

The effectiveness of such a composite strategy for the response to the attack is confirmed by research. Sibel A. Karakaş and Ayş E. Okanli (2015) found that the development of assertiveness (active communication, self-confidence) was an effective way to reduce mobbing, and victims who showed fewer signs of avoidance and were active were held less responsible for consequences and received less anger from observers (Mulder et al. 2017). Meanwhile, group identification reduces rejection and is associated with greater support from group members (Topa and Moriano 2013). This aspect is important in that the targets of workplace mobbing often do not help themselves by using destructive strategies, such as ignoring and not completing nonessential tasks and taking sick leave, that is, by reducing commitment to work and the organization (Karatuna 2015). All this damages the reputation of the target him– or herself in the eyes of coworkers and management; therefore, Jesus’ example motivates people
to remain patient and demonstrate organizational identity by one’s impeccable behaviour.

The second strategy is giving up the stubborn struggle over issues that are trivial, insurmountable, or causing the other person damage. Therefore, the retreat is understood not as a shameful escape but as a wise move. This is confirmed by previous studies showing that confrontation with the perpetrator may be useless in situations where there is a lack of power and situational control (Karatuna 2015; Reknes et al. 2016).

Thus, active resistance may not be useful in all cases, and the feeling of defeat only strengthens the feeling of helplessness (Nielsen et al. 2017; Reknes et al. 2016). From a religious coping perspective, the refusal to fight in an insurmountable situation can be treated as a passive coping strategy, where situational control is transferred to God without harming the person (Pargament et al. 2000). This perspective involves personal forgiveness of the perpetrator and removes the responsibility for situational control and further consequences from the person’s “shoulders”. Although no studies examining religious coping methods in cases of workplace violence could be found, some studies have shown that religion-related strategies facilitate psychological adjustment to stress in various situations (Carleton et al. 2008; Mahamid and Bdier 2021).

The third strategy is cognitive reappraisal and making sense of negative experiences. Its meaning emerges in the situations described in the Gospel, in which particularly strong and irreparable damage is experienced. Two elements making up this strategy can be distinguished: first, the foreknowledge that even a person doing the right thing can be treated wrongly (cf. Luke 4:24); second, application in a specific situation. According to Dean Mobbs et al. (2015), the cognitive reappraisal mechanism involving changing information about the threat is one of the means of active survival behaviour, especially when there is time to assess the situation. Research shows that cognitive reappraisal is frequently applied in different religions for coping in stressful situations (Krause and Pargament 2018; Vishkin et al. 2016). According to Neal Krause and Kenneth I. Pargament (2018), it is not attempted to deny the negative experience lived in religious coping, but the meaning of the stressful situation
is paraphrased, including it in a larger, more positive and more hopeful religious context. This response includes the belief that God has a plan, and although it is not perceptible to humans, it strengthens and helps to overcome the stressful situation more easily. This is considered an adaptive emotion regulation strategy because it maintains emotional stability in difficult or stressful life circumstances and protects against symptoms of distress (Dolcos et al. 2021).

**Conclusions**

This article aimed to show how Christian faith enriched the methods of responses to mobbing in the contemporary workplace, offered by social sciences. Anxiety about physical safety, fear of losing reputation, social contacts, of being expelled from the Jewish community in New Testament times or from the modern organization are the same human feelings, regardless of the historical period. In the workplace, perpetrators use the same methods of psychological influence that people have used for thousands of years to break their victims. Scientific research on coping with injuries caused by violence shows that religious traditions have effective methods enabling religiously motivated people to resist the devastating effect of violence. The strategies distinguished on the basis of the Gospel of Luke offer a nonviolent response to the actions used by perpetrators in the areas of communication, personal and professional reputation, social exclusion, and physical impact. Depending on the situation, an active response that allows the target’s reputation to be protected and helps the target maintain social support, avoidance of dangerous situations, cognitive reappraisal, and religious meaning-making of negative experiences can be combined.

The results of this study contribute to the literature on workplace mobbing and can serve as a basis for further research and discussion on how to integrate the millennial experience of the nonviolent response to personal injury in Christianity and other religions into contemporary models of helping victims of workplace mobbing. All of this is useful for
practitioners seeking to help religious targets of workplace mobbing discover moral strategies for nonviolent responses to attacks.
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