

*Helga ŠPADINA**
Faculty of Law, “Josip Juraj Strossmayer” University of Osijek, Croatia
*Marijana LJUBIĆ***
Faculty of Law, University of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

CYBERBULLYING AND DIGITAL EXCLUSION AS NEW FORMS OF WORKPLACE MOBBING

Technological innovations in labour law are allowing us to accelerate the pace of labour and to achieve more in a shorter time. Innovations led to the digitalization of all spheres of life, including our work, which then significantly increased the possibility of virtual and digital violence. Virtual violence has several well-known forms, such as digital abuse, cyberbullying, cyberstalking, online sexual harassment, cross-platform harassment, non-consensual intimate image sharing (or revenge porn), sextortion, unsolicited pornography, unwanted sexualization, impersonation, hate online speech, hacking, doxing, trolling, digital voyeurism, Zoom bombing and other forms of digital abuses. Among those, cyberbullying is moving from online social networks to the world of labour relations. There, it takes several forms from the apparent one to the almost invisible form which is the digital exclusion of access to work-related information in digitalized work environments.

Cyberbullying through digital exclusion is very peculiar because it is difficult to establish facts and prove that a worker was intentionally digitally excluded from important work information. Secondly, it is difficult to prove the intention of the abuser. Thirdly, it is difficult to establish a link that would amount to cyberbullying.

Digital exclusion as one of the forms of harassment at work, can be used to isolate and ignore workers and deliberately exclude them from other employees and superiors. Victims of digital exclusion at work can also be managerial employees of individual organizational units within the institution, whose supervisor prevents them from implementing digitalization and business improvement through computerization and connecting common services within a single organizational unit.

The paper has two research questions: the first question is whether we can qualify digital exclusion as a form of cyberbullying in labour relations. The second research question is

* PhD, Associate Professor, ORCID: 0000-0002-5826-176X, e-mail: hspadina@pravos.hr

** M.sc. iur, Doctoral Candidate, ORCID: 0009-0005-7609-1193, e-mail: marijana.ljubic@gmail.com

how labour law could regulate the prevention of cyberbullying and digital exclusion. The aim of the paper is to contribute to academic discussions on the timely regulation of novel issues in labour law.

Keywords: digital violence, digital exclusion, cyberbullying.

1. VIOLENCE AND HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE

„Recognizing the right of everyone to a world of work free from violence and harassment...
...violence and harassment in the world of work can constitute a human rights violation or abuse...
...a threat to equal opportunities... and unacceptable and incompatible with decent work“

ILO, C190, 2019

Digital transformation of a workplace is a key step in modernizing work and maintaining competitiveness. Digitalization is a prerequisite for modern, efficient, competitive, secure business, and more efficient use of human resources leads to better work results, and easier and faster communication and cooperation. However, despite today's digital age, digitality offers ample space for abuse in the workplace. Digital violence or cyber violence including cyberbullying and all other sub-forms like digital exclusion is becoming one of the prevailing forms of harassment at work, which can be used to isolate and ignore workers and deliberately exclude them from active participation in work processes and decision-making.

Violence and harassment at work jeopardize the health of a victim, dignity, right to livelihood and decent work. It breaks the emotional and psychological well-being of a worker, reduces productivity and it turns a workplace into a place of anxiety and fear for a worker who is a harassment victim. Harassment has huge financial costs for employers who instead of investing in research and development, have to cover the high costs of litigation, investigation and sick leaves, all with huge loss in productivity and turnover of workers. ILO pointed out that harassment impacts negatively on the organization of work, workplace relations, worker engagement, enterprise reputation, and productivity.¹

Prior to the digitalization of work, workplace violence was broadly identified as physical and psychological, with numerous sub-categories dependent on the severity of the offence. Violence at work in person was slightly different than today, sometimes more visible because in many cases incidents would have witnesses. In recent years, with the rapid development of digitalization, violence has digitalized with some remarkable features because of very sophisticated methods, extremely fast sharing time or on the opposite side, very easy cover (it takes few seconds to delete online abuse) and its availability to basically unlimited or insufficiently limited online audience. All of these can cause devastating health consequences and can be even fatal (as we witnessed in recent

¹ ILO C190, 2019.

suicides of youth who were cyberbullied) if a victim does not develop an appropriate coping mechanism or reach out for professional help.

When considering the elements of the definition of digital violence in the workplace, the starting point should be a standard definition of violence transformed into the digital space. International Labor Organization in the C190 - Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) defined “violence and harassment in the world of work as to refer to a range of unacceptable behaviours and practices, or threats thereof, whether a single occurrence or repeated, that aim at, result in, or are likely to result in physical, psychological, sexual or economic harm, and includes gender-based violence and harassment.”² Awareness of the digital vulnerability of workers to online abuse was reflected in the 2019 ILO Violence and Harassment Convention as the first international legal instrument which regulated cyberbullying through inclusion of the ICT communication in the scope of the Convention in the art. 3 (“This Convention applies to violence and harassment in the world of work occurring in the course of, linked with or arising out of work: (d) through work-related communications, including those enabled by information and communication technologies...”).³

Considering possible forms of digital violence, it can take the form of digital abuse, sending inappropriate (usually offensive or sexualized) text messages, chats or comments, cyberbullying, cyberstalking, online sexual harassment, cross-platform harassment, nonconsensual intimate image sharing (or revenge porn), sextortion, unsolicited pornography, unwanted sexualization, impersonation, hate online speech, hacking, doxing, trolling, digital voyeurism, Zoom bombing and other forms of digital abuses. In this paper, we will focus on digital exclusion as one form of cyberbullying which is moving from online social networks to the world of labour relations and can lead to negative work status outcomes, usually demotion or termination of employment.

2. DEFINING DIGITAL EXCLUSION

Exclusion at work refers to the situation in which individuals or groups of employees are intentionally or unintentionally left out, marginalized, or treated unfairly within the workplace environment. Exclusion can manifest in both overt and subtle ways, creating a hostile or unwelcoming atmosphere that can have negative consequences for individuals and the organization as a whole.⁴

Formerly obvious exclusion from work and withholding of important documents and/or information became more blurred and hidden behind the vast size of electronic correspondence.

Victims of electronic violence through digital exclusion at work can be all categories of workers within the employer's organizational structure, including employees who perform managerial tasks within the institution, i.e. heads of individual organizational units.

² ILO, C190, 2019.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Fermin, J. 2023. How to identify exclusion in the workplace. Available at: <https://www.allvoices.com/blog/how-to-identify-exclusion-in-the-workplace> (1. 7. 2024).

The basic form of digital exclusion as a form of harassment at work is complete disconnection from digital communication by intentionally disabling access to communication technologies and tools, i.e. refusing digital communication with the employee. In this way, the employee is excluded from teamwork, intentionally not invited to work meetings, social events and activities related to the employer. This exclusion, lack of support in work and ignoring the employee's contribution to work results in a lack of information due to intentional withholding of data or insufficient information of the employee about the data necessary to perform the tasks of his workplace, as well as the social exclusion of the employee from the rest of the business team in the performance of his work tasks, which leads to a decline in motivation for work and efficiency in performing tasks.⁵ Furthermore, a form of digital exclusion is the intentional denial, restriction or difficulty of access to information that is essential for the performance of the employer and the duties of the employee's workplace. This restriction can intentionally hinder the use of communication channels and make it difficult to access information through the use of digital documents, thus depriving the employee of important information and instructions for performing the work tasks of his workplace (for example, obstructing or disabling the receipt of e-mails, restricting access to certain content on the employer's website or content located in the so-called shared folders used by more than one person, intentionally excluding an employee from webinars and online meetings, and many other forms), disabling access to information occurs by restricting access to the employer's official documentation and certain documents stored in digital form, as well as access and use of IT programs necessary for the performance of the duties and tasks of the employee's workplace.⁶

All of the above forms of digital exclusion can result in harassment of employees at work and have serious negative consequences on productivity, efficiency, professional development and health of the worker who is a victim of cyberbullying.⁷

3. IN-PERSON BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE V. CYBERBULLYING

Workplace bullying is usually repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or a group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety. Examples of behaviour, intentional or unintentional, that may be workplace bullying if they are repeated, unreasonable and create a risk to health and safety include, but are not limited to abusive, insulting or offensive language or comments, aggressive and intimidating conduct, belittling or humiliating comments and victimization.⁸

For the International Labor Organization (ILO), workplace bullying is “offensive behaviour through vindictive, cruel, malicious or humiliating attempts to undermine an individual or groups of employees. It involves ganging up on or “mobbing” a targeted employee and subjecting that person to psychological harassment. Mobbing includes

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Safe Work Australia, Guide for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying, 2016.

constant negative remarks or criticisms, isolating a person from social contacts, and gossiping or spreading false information.”⁹

This definition is applicable to cyberbullying which includes the same elements as the ILO outlined, with some distinctive elements such as lack of isolation of a victim from social contacts.

Heinz Leymann who is considered a creator of the term “mobbing” defined key elements of mobbing at the workplace as: "psychological terror or mobbing in working life involves hostile and unethical communication which is directed systematically by one or more individuals, mainly toward one individual who, due to mobbing, is pushed into a helpless and defenceless position and held there by means of continuing mobbing activities. These actions occur on a very frequent basis (at least once a week) and over a long period of time (at least six months' duration). Because of the high frequency and long duration of hostile behaviour, this maltreatment results in considerable mental, psychosomatic and social misery."¹⁰

OECD pointed out key differences between in-person bullying and cyberbullying¹¹

Table 1.1. Core features of traditional bullying and cyberbullying

Features	Traditional bullying	Cyberbullying
Aggressive acts	Verbal, physical, relational	Verbal, relational
Repetition	The actions occur repeatedly	Easy sharing and forwarding, and permanence of the digital environment mean that one act of cyberbullying can be viewed and experienced many times without repetition of the act or bullying behaviours by the perpetrator
Power imbalance	Key factors could be physical strength, age, social status, intelligence	More difficult to define in the digital environment; key factors could be popularity, social status, digital skills, anonymity
Intentionality	Present	Present
Space	Relegated to school or other in-person environments	Omnipresence of digital environment means cyberbullying has no fixed boundaries
Bystanders	Physically present; tends to be a small group	Bystanders could simply be witnesses to the acts in real time or at a later time; they could be physically present with the bully or the victim when the act occurs; the audience can be large or small

(Source: OECD, 2022)

4. IS DIGITAL EXCLUSION A SUBFORM OF CYBERBULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE?

In testing whether digital exclusion can be considered a form of cyberbullying in the workplace, we need to look into the crucial elements of (cyberbullying and analyse whether these elements are applicable to digital exclusion. In doing so, we will take elements of workplace mobbing or bullying as defined by Leymann¹² and key elements of cyberbullying as defined by the OECD.

⁹ ILO, 1998, p. 2.

¹⁰ Leymann, 1996.

¹¹ Gottschalk, 2022.

¹² Leymann, 1996.

4.1. Comparison Between Crucial Elements of Bullying Definition (Leymann) and Digital Exclusion

4.1.1. Psychological Terror

Omission to do something in the workplace which jeopardizes job security – like exclusion from work communication and information sharing – can be considered a form of psychological terror because the victim is constantly under stress and is unable to perform the job due to exclusion. Psychological terror in the workplace is difficult to establish post-festum and it is subject to individual perception. One person can consider digital exclusion a terror and harassment because of his/her work ethic and interest in the job, while the other person can be satisfied that the workload decreased, while the salary is still being paid. Therefore, in order to establish properly whether digital exclusion led to psychological terror, we need to employ the usual and widely accepted standard of a reasonable person that is used to establish harassment in the workplace.¹³

4.1.2. Hostile and Unethical Communication

Lack of necessary work-related communication in the workplace signals a high likelihood of visible or invisible harassment. If an employer or peers exclude someone from usual communication, although there is no direct hostile or unethical communication, silence in communication creates hostility because the victim of such communication is unaware of the reasons, next steps (if the perpetrator is a supervisor), possibility to get promoted and participate in the professional development and overall future prospects of that job. A subtle message linked to digital excommunication is always that the victim is not needed anymore, so his involvement in work-related communication is unnecessary, leading to the possibility of demotion or termination of an employment contract. Hostility in this case is performed by the omission of including workers. The unethical component is the manner in which this is done. Instead of clearly and transparently communicating to the worker that his performance is lower than expected, that his position will be laid off in the near future or that there are issues in his/her performance, by digitally excluding a worker, the employer is choosing the most unethical venue because it creates hostile work environment.

¹³ First explicitly espoused and adopted by the Ninth Circuit court of Appeals in *Ellison v Brady*, 924 F2d 872 (9th Cir 1991). The reasonable woman standard was first espoused in the *Rabidue* dissent by Judge Keith. *Rabidue v Osceola Refining Co.*, 805 F2d 611, 623-28(6th Cir 1986). In his dissent, Judge Keith criticized the majority's finding that the lewd comments and posters of nude and semi-clad women did not create a hostile working environment since "the overall circumstances of the plaintiff's workplace evince[d] an anti-female environment". *Rabidue*, 805 F2d at 623. In criticizing the majority's conclusion, he disagreed with the court's holding that, in considering hostile environment claims, the courts should adopt the perspective of the reasonable person's reaction to a similar environment. The judge opined, "the reasonable person perspective fails to account for the wide divergence between most women's views of appropriate sexual conduct and those of men." *Id* at 626. The judge concluded, unless a reasonable woman standard is adopted, "the defendants as well as the courts [will be] permitted to sustain ingrained notions of reasonable behavior fashioned by the offenders, in this case, men," in *Gettle*, 1983. Available at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/dlr/vol31/iss4/9> (5. 7. 2024). Cf. *Winterbauer*, 1991, pp. 811-821.

4.1.3. Systematic Manner

Digital exclusion is mostly systematic in its course. In order to establish a harassment pattern of digital exclusion, there must be systematic behaviour, meaning that one incident of digital exclusion would not suffice to be considered cyberbullying through digital exclusion. The systematic manner of digital exclusion could be established only through a detailed electronic analysis of the digital correspondence of the perpetrator and the applicability of the relevance test of correspondence to the victim of digital exclusion. If the systematic manner of digital exclusion is firmly established, then digital exclusion evidently forms one sub-group of mobbing or bullying in the workplace.

4.1.4. Conducted by One or More Individuals

Digital exclusion can be conducted by anyone in the workplace. Most frequently, it will be conducted by the supervisor for the mere fact that such exclusion would be reported and acted upon due to its labour status implications for the victim. Digital exclusion can be conducted by several individuals and this situation is frequent when the management of an employer company systematically harasses one worker through work-related isolation and exclusion from work-related correspondence. Also, we can have digital exclusion by individual peers (colleague) or a group of colleagues who intentionally excluded their colleague.

4.1.5. Directed Toward One Individual

Digital exclusion can be directed either toward one worker or a group of workers. If one worker is excluded from work-related communication, it is more difficult to prove exclusion, while group exclusion might be rare, but definitely easier to establish in possible informal and formal proceedings to demonstrate digital exclusion.

4.1.6. Helpless and Defenseless Position

A worker who has been digitally excluded is in a helpless and defenceless position because he/she might not be aware that important work decisions have been made without him/her. Victims of such abuse might not be aware he/she is left out of training opportunities, promotions, webinars and other professional development opportunities. The position of digitally excluded worker is defenceless because the person is unaware of ongoing cyber mobbing and cannot properly prepare his/her defence. Due to the ease of deleting digital trail of work correspondence, a worker might not be able to prove that he/she was indeed a victim of digital exclusion unless his/her peers were copied to the correspondence.

4.1.7. High Frequency (At Least Once a Week)

Due to the high rate of digital exchange in today's workplaces, it would not be an issue to have a high frequency of digital exclusion. In addition to the exclusion from email correspondence, worker can be excluded from social networks which are being used to communicate such as Telegram, Microsoft Teams, Viber, Instagram and other platforms for communication.

4.1.8. Long Duration of Hostile Behaviour (At Least Six Months)

This element of in-person mobbing¹⁴ is not applicable to the digital exclusion because of the speed of digital communication and the amount of electronic messages exchanged during working hours and after working hours, all related to work. In such a speed of digital communication, one can easily receive hundreds of electronic messages per day, so this element of having hostile behaviour lasting at least six months is more applicable to real life, rather than in cyber work where throughout just one week, a worker can be excluded from several hundreds or even thousands relevant messages.

4.1.9. Maltreatment Results in Considerable Mental, Psychosomatic and Social Misery

Digital exclusion does lead to the misery of a victim the same way as in-person forms of harassment lead to negative health outcomes and can cause mental, psychosomatic and social misery. The direct link between digital exclusion as any other form of workplace mobbing and the health of a victim has been well established and documented in comprehensive research on the topic of health consequences of workplace abuse.¹⁵

4.2. Comparison Between Cyberbullying (OECD) and Digital Exclusion

4.2.1. Aggressive Acts

Digital exclusion at work is an act of aggression because it jeopardizes equal opportunities, discriminates against an employee who becomes a victim of unfair treatment and it jeopardizes the right to work. It is not relevant whether the aggression is done at the micro or macro level, as long as it creates information isolation and a work environment in which an employee cannot perform his/her work due to a lack of relevant digital correspondence and work-related information. Aggressive acts can also take the form of exclusion from online meetings and webinars. All of these lead to a situation in which an employee cannot participate in the work-related discussion and will bear labour status-related consequences of such abuse.

4.2.2. Repetition

Digital exclusion can easily be frequently repeated in digital space. A worker who is a victim of digital exclusion can notice it if he/she maintains contact with colleagues. If a victim works remotely, there is a limited possibility of noticing digital exclusion and digital isolation. In assessing the relevance of repetition, we would need to apply the same reasoning as courts when assessing whether harassment was persistent.¹⁶

¹⁴ Cf. Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018. pp. 71-83.

¹⁵ Study links workplace harassment to serious health issues. Atamba *et al.*, 2023; Abdulla, Lin & Rospenda, 2023, pp. 899-904; Rospenda *et al.*, 2005 pp. 95-110; Rospenda, Richman & McGinley, 2023.

¹⁶ Cf. High Court in DPP (O' Dowd) v Lynch, 2008, IEHC 183.

4.2.3. Power Imbalance

Digital exclusion in the workplace has more serious consequences if it is done by superiors and targets subordinate employees. In this case, the employee can easily lose a job because he/she is unable to perform well without access to all important information. If peers digitally exclude a colleague from work-related correspondence, consequences can also be detrimental, but they might not result in job loss. If a subordinate employee intentionally digitally excludes his/her supervisor(s), consequences would likely be rather detrimental for a perpetrator.

4.2.4. Intentionality

In today's digitalized work, it will be challenging, but not impossible, to establish intentional digital exclusion of an employee because usually emails address large groups of employees and it is very easy to blame the speed of communication and unintentional omission. Therefore, it is crucial to include a factor of repetition of such behaviour over the course of a certain time to establish properly that a specific employee was intentionally excluded from work-related correspondence. Another issue is the necessity to examine professional email accounts to establish which correspondence was withheld from certain employees, as emails can easily be deleted and supervisors can easily say that simply forgot to share certain information with an employee.

4.2.5. Space

Digital exclusion happens in digital space which is a very vast term to encompass not only email correspondence, but also work-related information exchanged through various social networks such as WhatsApp, Viber, Instagram, Facebook, Telegram, SMS messages, internal work platforms, clouds, shared maps, and many other forms of digital communication. In such a diversity of communication channels, and with unlimited options to delete sensitive communication for criminal or labour dispute litigation purposes, a victim of digital exclusion should not be in a position to prove the discriminatory behaviour of the perpetrator and the burden of proof should shift to the respondent to prove that he/she did not commit the unlawful act.

4.2.6. Creation of a Hostile Work Environment

Digital exclusion at the workplace creates a hostile work environment in both situations – if the employee is aware of it and if an employee is unaware of it and assumes he/she might be a victim of digital exclusion. An employee who has been excluded from important information and discussions with the purpose of sending a subtle message that the employer does not need him/her anymore and his/her contract will soon be terminated, experiences a hostile work environment in which employee feels insecure, stressed and under pressure. If exclusion goes unnoticed and unaddressed by the supervisor for a certain period of time, the level of stress for an employee is even higher due to a lack of information about why exclusion happened and a lack of feedback on performance, so in this case, the hostile

work environment can yield more serious health wellbeing consequences for a worker. US Supreme Court even further extended the scope of hostile work environment in *DPP v Doherty* to include communications which are not directly addressed or sent to the subject of those communications but to persons close to the victim.¹⁷ Along the same line of thought, there is a theoretical distinction between direct and indirect cyberbullying.¹⁸

In conclusion of this chapter and taking into consideration of above-mentioned test for all key elements of cyberbullying and workplace mobbing, digital exclusion fulfils all main criteria of both definitions and therefore, it can be considered as a sub-form of cyberbullying at work.

5. LEGAL REGULATION OF DIGITAL EXCLUSION IN THE WORKPLACE

Legal regulation of prohibition of all forms of cyberbullying, including, but not limited to digital exclusion, is crucial in the prevention of such abuse of labour relations. International and national labour law – through primary and secondary legislation - laws, regulations, collective agreements and internal employment policies - could minimize the risk of all forms of cyberbullying, including digital exclusion. In that sense, ILO has stipulated obligations of Member States in art. 42. of C 190 Violence and Harassment Convention from 2019.¹⁹ Therefore, when regulating the prohibition of digital exclusion, we need to be aware that the starting point should be a clear legal commitment grounded on a strict and explicit prohibition of all forms of digital violence, including digital exclusion or intentional omission to facilitate digital work tools as a method of mobbing of workers. Further, policy needs to provide a definition of a problem, establish confidential reporting procedures, disciplinary procedures and investigation and regulate proper informal and formal settlement procedures, prior to court litigation and post-festum counselling services for victims.

¹⁷ *DPP v Doherty*, 2019, IECA 350.

¹⁸ Langos, 2012, pp. 285-289; De Stefano *et al.*, 2020.

¹⁹ ILO C190, 2019 “Each Member shall adopt, in accordance with national law and circumstances and in consultation with representative employers’ and workers’ organizations, an inclusive, integrated and gender-responsive approach for the prevention and elimination of violence and harassment in the world of work. Such an approach should take into account violence and harassment involving third parties, where applicable, and includes:

- (a) prohibiting in law violence and harassment;
- (b) ensuring that relevant policies address violence and harassment;
- (c) adopting a comprehensive strategy in order to implement measures to prevent and combat violence and harassment;
- (d) establishing or strengthening enforcement and monitoring mechanisms;
- (e) ensuring access to remedies and support for victims;
- (f) providing for sanctions;
- (g) developing tools, guidance, education and training, and raising awareness, in accessible formats as appropriate; and
- (h) ensuring effective means of inspection and investigation of cases of violence and harassment, including through labor inspectorates or other competent bodies.”

The next step is to regulate properly the rights and obligations of all workers regarding cyber communication, including basic rules on decent digital communication, prohibition of online harassment and digital exclusion. All of these need to be sanctioned adequately through disciplinary sanctions. Each employee and all managers should get familiar with all the rules, organize induction and refresher training and sign a form outlining that the employee has understood the main features of the policy.

Victims of digital exclusion should not be in a position to prove digital exclusion and discriminatory behaviour of the perpetrator and the burden of proof should shift to the respondent to prove that he/she did not intentionally digitally exclude the worker and that exclusion was reasonable and justified for the benefit of work.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Due to the rapid pace of digitalization of work, cyberbullying at work replaces in-person workplace bullying and mobbing. As such, it required immediate attention of legal practitioners and academics because if it is ignored, the basic labour rights of workers will be jeopardized while employers will have to bear the loss in other, previously mentioned workplace harassment-related costs - primarily, the cost of productivity.

Subsequently, within cyberbullying at work, we can distinguish several sub-categories of abusive behaviour, among which is digital exclusion leading to negative work status outcomes, usually demotion or termination of employment.

Digital exclusion at work is a serious breach of labour law and this paper tested the main elements of cyberbullying and workplace mobbing against their applicability to digital exclusion. The result of such a test is that digital exclusion fulfils all the crucial criteria of bullying definition (psychological terror, hostile and unethical communication, systematic manner, conducted by one or more individuals, directed toward one individual, helpless and defenceless position, high frequency, and maltreatment results in considerable mental, psychosomatic and social misery) while it partially meets criteria of long duration (of at least six month) due to high frequency of such abuse linked to the amount of electronic correspondence. In the second test, we compared the OECD definition of cyberbullying to digital exclusion and established that all elements exist in digital exclusion (aggressive acts, repetition, power imbalance, intentionality, space and creation of a hostile work environment). Therefore, the conclusion is that digital exclusion can be qualified as a sub-form of both - cyberbullying and workplace mobbing.

The second research question was related to possible legal regulation of the prevention of cyberbullying and digital exclusion in labour law. The paper sets out the key elements of such regulation, following the lines of ILO which guided the best avenue to take for regulation of prevention of workplace harassment in its Violence and Harassment Convention from 2019.

The way forward should be to take into consideration sometimes overly dynamic changes in labour relations, such as the digitalization of work communication, and predict and legally sanction possible abusive behaviours in digital space to prevent them from actually harming workers.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abdulla, A. M., Lin, T. W. & Rospenda, K. M. 2023. Workplace Harassment and Health: A Long Term Follow up. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 65(11), pp. 899-904. Available at: <https://acoem.org/Publications/Press-Releases/Workplace-Harassment-and-Health-%E2%80%93-A-Long-Term-Follow-Up> (17. 6. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002915>
- Atamba, C., Mosonik, J. K., Stuckler, D., Sungu, L. J., Santoso, C. M. A. & Mohamed, H. H. 2023. Impact of Workplace Mistreatment on Employees' Health and Well-Being in Chinese Firms: A Systematic Review. *Sage Open*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231211417>
- De Stefano, V., Stylogiannis C., Wouters, M. & Durri I. 2020. "System needs update": Upgrading protection against cyberbullying and ICT-enabled violence and harassment in the world of work. *ILO Working Papers*, 1. Available at: <https://webapps.ilo.org/static/english/intserv/working-papers/wp001/index.html> (20. 6. 2024).
- DPP v Doherty [2019] IECA 350. Available at: <https://ie.vlex.com/vid/dpp-v-doherty-840637726> (20. 6. 2024).
- Fermin, J. 2023. How to identify exclusion in the workplace. Available at: <https://www.allvoices.co/blog/how-to-identify-exclusion-in-the-workplace> (1. 7. 2024).
- Gettle, J. A. 1983. Sexual Harassment and the Reasonable Woman Standard: Is It a Viable Solution? *Duquesne Law Review*, 31(4), pp. 841-858.
- Gottschalk F. 2022. Cyberbullying: An overview of research and policy in OECD countries, *OECD Education Working Paper* No. 270. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/cyberbullying_f60b492b-en (20. 6. 2024).
- High Court in DPP (O' Dowd) v Lynch. 2008. IEHC 183.
- ILO, C190. 2019. Violence and Harassment Convention. Available at: https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C190 (20. 6. 2024).
- International Labor Organization (ILO). 1998. When working becomes hazardous, Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inf/magazine/26/violence.htm> (20. 6. 2024).
- Langos, C. 2012. Cyberbullying: The Challenge to Define. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(6), pp. 285-289. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2011.0588>
- Leymann, H. 1996. The Mobbing Encyclopaedia. Available at: <http://www.leymann.se/English/12100E.HTM> (20. 6. 2024).
- Long-Term Effects of Harassment on Mental Health. 2024. Available at: <https://workshield.com/long-term-effects-of-harassment-on-mental-health/> (20. 6. 2024).
- Nielsen, M. B. & Einarsen, S. 2018. What we know, what we do not know, and what we should and could have known about workplace bullying: An overview of the literature and agenda for future research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 42, pp. 71-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.06.007>
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., Ehmke, J. & Zlatoper, K. W. 2005. Is Workplace Harassment Hazardous to Your Health? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(1), pp. 95-110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-6992-y>

- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J.A., McGinley, M. 2023. Effects of chronic workplace harassment on mental health and alcohol misuse: a long-term follow-up. *BMC Public Health*, 23, pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16219-0>
- Safe Work Australia. 2016. Guide for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying. Available at: <https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/system/files/documents/1702/guide-preventing-responding-workplace-bullying.pdf> (25. 6. 2024).
- Study links workplace harassment to serious health issues. 2024. Available at: <https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/25192-study-links-workplace-harassment-to-serious-health-issues> (25. 6. 2024).
- Winterbauer, H. 1991. Sexual Harassment—The Reasonable Woman Standard. *The Labor Lawyer, American Bar Association*, 7(4), pp. 811-821.