

Gligorić Sladjana*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4535-8041>

Zlatanović Sanja**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7753-0876>

UDC: 364.63-057.16:004.738.5

Review article

DOI: 10.5937/ptp2504187G

Received on: September 23, 2025

Approved for publication on:

November 25, 2025

Pages: 187–201

ADDRESSING WORKPLACE CYBERBULLYING – KEY CHALLENGES AND THE EVOLVING ROLE OF LABOUR LAW

ABSTRACT: The Fourth Industrial Revolution has made the use of internet technologies and digital tools standard components of modern workplaces, particularly among white-collar employees. Alongside these advancements, new forms of workplace misconduct have emerged, including cyberbullying. This phenomenon may be understood as inappropriate behavior – whether repeated or as a single act with enduring consequences – conducted through emails, messaging applications, social media, or other digital platforms, with the intent to harass, intimidate, or demean colleagues, subordinates, or workers in general. Unlike traditional „face-to-face” bullying, which requires direct interaction, cyberbullying transcends physical boundaries, taking place in digital environments both during and outside working hours. Its persistence makes it difficult to escape, often following victims through their devices and networks, thereby posing serious risks to health and overall well-being. The paper employs normative and comparative legal methods to examine existing legal provisions on workplace cyberbullying within selected jurisdictions, with the aim of identifying models of good legislative practice for improving Serbian

*LLD, Assistant Professor, University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Law for Commerce and Judiciary in Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia, e-mail: sladjana.gligoric@pravni-fakultet.info

**Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia,
e-mail: sanjazlatanovic1@gmail.com



© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

labour law. Current Serbian legislation on the prevention of workplace harassment does not explicitly define or address cyberbullying, creating regulatory gaps that leave workers insufficiently protected. As the world of work increasingly shifts toward virtual and digital spaces, a holistic legal approach to the prevention of cyberbullying and the protection of affected workers becomes essential. Strengthening the normative framework is critical not only for safeguarding workers' rights, but also for fostering a healthy and more sustainable working environment.

Keywords: *digital workplaces, cyberbullying, bullying, labour law aspects.*

1. Introduction

Work, labour relations, and work environment are rapidly changing nowadays. Changes are becoming faster due to the development of artificial intelligence and the use of various digital tools. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, work has become increasingly organized in a hybrid manner, combining office and remote work. However, many employees are working only from home, using information and communication technologies to carry out work outside the employer's premises. In home-based working environments, employees often experience a sense of constant surveillance, particularly due to the use of digitally enabled performance monitoring tools such as keystroke logging and screen-monitoring software (Tomczak, Lanzo & Auginis, 2018, p. 252). This raises a significant concern regarding the protection of employees' right to privacy, particularly in situations where employer control may become excessive or disproportionate. Employees working from home could feel disintegrated from the work collective (Kociatkiewicz, Kostera & Parker, 2021, p. 936) and in a position where the employer withholds important business-related information from them. Communications in workplace is performed via emails and phones or on a social media, like LinkedIn, or by using social platforms.¹ Recent studies shown that employees working from home are at higher risk to be a victim of bullying or cyber bullying, that remote work may open up new avenues for abusive behaviors and can be a risk factor

¹ According to 2022 European Union Labour Force Survey data, almost 30% of employed people (aged 15–74) in the EU use digital devices for all or most of their working time. Also, data from Eurostat's ICT usage in enterprises survey point to a significant increase in the share of enterprises in the EU using social media (59% in 2021 compared with 37% in 2015) (Eurofound, 2024, p. 1).

for cyber bullying at work (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), 2024, p. 35).

Cyberbullying, as a relatively new phenomenon, has not been explored enough yet. In the rapidly changing world of work, where working performance includes digitalization and automation, cyberbullying is becoming very widespread, and it can be seen as a phenomenon that represents the continuation of traditional direct, face-to-face bullying. In 2018, a foresight study conducted by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA) recognized cyberbullying as an emerging psychosocial risk in the workplace (Eurofound, 2024, p. 1).

2. Labour law challenges in protecting against cyberbullying

There is no unique definition of cyberbullying, both in theory, among scholars, and in practice. According to the International Labour Organization, the term ‘cyberbullying’ has been used to describe aggressive conduct carried out through information and communication technologies (ICT), and can involve picture/video clips, emails, or social network sites, among others (De Stefano, Durri, Stylogiannis & Wouters, 2020, p. 1). It is aggressive, unacceptable conduct happening at work and in the work environment to a person or a group. The perpetrator could be an individual or a group, operating at any level of supervision, whether higher or lower.

Nowadays, in labour relations, the usual way to communicate with colleagues, partners, and customers is by using digital devices, such as emails, telephone, and digital platforms. Such business communication blurred boundaries between employees’ private and professional lives, as often employees use their private social platforms to finish work tasks or to communicate with the public, potential clients, or partners (Schongen, 2023, p. 226). Through such communication tools, individuals can often become victims of insults, psychosocial harassment, or violence (Pothuganti, 2025, p. 81). When defining what constitutes cyberbullying at work, we first need to consider where and when the behavior occurs. It is important to determine whether the harassment is related to the victim’s work tasks or not. In this context, the boundaries are defined as ‘occurring at work, in connection with work, or arising out of work’. Therefore, regular working hours are less relevant, as employees frequently work overtime or participate in work-related seminars and events outside of standard working hours. The concept „of being at work” includes performance at work (at any time and anywhere) even if employees are engaged in other activities allowed by the

employer or during a daily break or accessing social media while performing the work (De Stefano et al., 2020). It is worth mentioning that the spread of ICT arguably warrants an understanding of violence and harassment in the world of work that is not bound by specific physical or temporal limits and extends to conduct that originates – anytime and anywhere – in relation to work (De Stefano et al., 2020). This certainly complicates the situation of defining whether inappropriate behaviour is electronic/cyber harassment, whether it results from employment and labour relationship, and whether it requires labour-law protection.²

Legal protection against bullying and cyberbullying varies across different national legal systems. In some countries, large groups of workers – such as temporary, casual, platform, or self-employed workers – fall outside the scope of labour law protections and are therefore at a higher risk of becoming victims of bullying and cyberbullying. In this regard, it is essential that measures against violence and harassment in the world of work – including cyberbullying – provide universal coverage and apply to all workers, regardless of their contractual status, to ensure that the most vulnerable are not excluded from protection, as stipulated by the ILO Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) (De Stefano et al., 2020, p. 20).

On the other side, cyberbullying can be understood as merely an extension of face-to-face bullying (Forssell, 2016), but it can happen separately. However, when it happens after work time and outside the workplace, it could be seen as a “safe zone” for the perpetrator in terms of labour law liability and initiating disciplinary proceedings by the employer. Since work-related cyberbullying can take place outside traditional work-related environments, the negative acts can become visible to a large audience, which further aggravates the victim’s position. Thus, cyberbullying becomes a public form of bullying (Forssell, 2016, p. 456). In such a digital environment, perpetrators could make fake profiles, made-up names, which creates anonymity of the perpetrator and worsens the position of the victim. Also, a lack of supervision makes the situation for the victim even more difficult.

² In Australia *Bowker case* represents an example of how existing anti-bullying instruments can be interpreted to include instances of cyberbullying. The Australian Fair Work Act prohibits bullying „at work”. In this judicial case, the aggressive behaviour was carried out through a series of Facebook posts. The Fair Work Commission adopted a notion of being bullied „at work” that was not confined to the „physical workplace”, and held that there was no requirement for the worker to be at the workplace at the time when the contents were posted online. It sufficed for her to access those comments while „at work” (De Stefano et al., 2020, p. 31). In this case, legal protection of cyberbullying comes above the physical place of work, and it is in line with “in relation to work”, therefore; legal protection is needed.

3. The concept of bullying and cyberbullying – key legal elements

As emphasized earlier, there is no single, internationally accepted labour-law definition of bullying or cyberbullying. “Cyberbullying”, instead, continues to be used as an umbrella term for a range of aggressive behaviors that are perpetrated through Information Technology usage (De Stefano et al., 2020). A group of authors defines cyberbullying as “an aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly, and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend himself or herself” (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376). On the other side, others place cyberbullying within the broader framework of digital violence, emphasizing its connection to digital exclusion (Špadina & Ljubić, 2024, p. 241). In this context, digital exclusion has been defined as “an act of aggression that undermines equal opportunities, discriminates against employees subjected to unfair treatment, and threatens the right to work” (Špadina & Ljubić, 2024, p. 244). Nevertheless, cyberbullying in the workplace cannot be confined solely to the dimension of digital exclusion. It encompasses a wider range of behaviors and manifestations shaped by the dynamics of the digitalized work environment, including algorithmic management, remote supervision, and the blurring of professional and private communication channels. Therefore, understanding workplace cyberbullying requires a multidimensional approach that integrates labour law, occupational safety, and digital governance perspectives. Overall, in theory, some scholars view cyberbullying as a distinct phenomenon, while others argue that it is merely an extension of traditional face-to-face bullying (Eurofound, 2024, p. 2). Recently adopted ILO Violence and Harassment Convention outlines in Article 3 cyberbullying in the world of work as a situation of violence and harassment occurring “in the course of, linked with or arising out of work through work-related communications, including those enabled by information and communication technologies” (Violence and Harassment Convention, 190/2019). Therefore, this provision applies regardless of physical or temporal boundaries and covers all forms of communication that are work-related or arise from work.

According to the prevailing view, the defining characteristics of bullying relate to the hostility or underlying negativity of the behavior, the repetition of the negative acts over time, and the imbalance of power, which makes it difficult for the victims to defend themselves (Eurofound, 2024, p. 2). This definition highlights three core points: (1) inappropriate behavior that is aggressive and negative, (2) behavior that is intentional, and (3) behavior

that persist over time. Hence, we need repetition of inappropriate behavior to define it.³ Thus, in academic literature, workplace bullying is typically defined by three elements: (1) the frequency of the behavior, (2) its impact on the worker's health and well-being – which is rightly highlighted as a key component, and (3) treating others in ways that fall below accepted standards of respectful workplace conduct (Martin & LaVan, 2010, p. 177).

On the other side, what happens if someone intentionally behaves aggressively toward someone, and such behavior happens once? While the definition excludes this behavior from the scope of cyberbullying, we maintain that such a conclusion is debatable. Some authors, thus, suggest that a singular event can in some cases be deemed bullying, having regard to its impact, where the consequences of the one-off event would have to be repeated regularly for a prolonged period (Einarsen, Hoel, Zaph & Cooper, 2011). That said, while traditional definitions of bullying emphasize the subjective nature of bullying experience (Healy-Cullen, 2017, p. 564) as repeated behavior, a single, severe incident can have a lasting impact and may be argued to constitute bullying, particularly if it involves significant harm or a power imbalance (Pothuganti, 2024). Therefore, it is essential to consider the context and consequences of an incident when determining whether it qualifies as bullying or cyberbullying.

Repetition, as a critical element in the legal definitions of bullying and cyberbullying, raises an important question: what constitutes repetition of acts? For instance, if someone shares a video or clip that is viewed by a large audience online, is this considered a single act, or does one email sent to multiple recipients qualify as repeated behavior? Here, the impact and consequences of a single act can be extensive and amplified. One act may repeatedly affect the victim, even if the perpetrator did not necessarily intend such an outcome. The internet and platforms are available for millions of users, where one click and sharing could cause huge damage to the victim. This may render 'repetition' a less reliable criterion for defining cyberbullying (De Stefano et al., 2020). One post, or picture shared on the internet, is more

³ Some jurisdictions have used a different concept to define bullying. Harassment is the broadest term that includes bullying, sexual harassment, and discrimination harassment. Harassment is also synonymous with bullying, mobbing, moral harassment, victimization at work, and violation at work. The New Zealand Harassment Act (2017) defines bullying as any specified act done to the other person on at least 2 separate occasions within a period of 12 months, so the repetition is needed to define harassment. Similar in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, and Serbia, repetitive action, behaviour, or act, active or passive, is needed to define harassment or bullying (De Stefano et al., 2020). Different terms are used as similar.

difficult to cancel and to prevent damages to victims, if we do not include the owners of digital platforms in deleting offensive content. It is also worth mentioning that, sometimes, victims of bullying can retaliate by using cybermeans (De Stefano et.al., 2020) to hurt the perpetrator, in despair and a feeling of revenge. Therefore, at the level of an employer, it is very important to work on the management and development of prevention measures of bullying and cyberbullying at work to maintain a healthy and safe work environment.⁴

In theory, the intention to harm is generally not regarded as a central element of bullying, and, by extension, of cyberbullying (De Stefano et al., 2020, p. 8). Consequently, the legislation follows this view: under Serbian law, when bullying is proven in court as a violation of professional integrity, reputation, or health, the perpetrator's intention is not relevant. On the other hand, when the case is aimed at establishing that bullying is specifically intended to harm professional integrity, reputation, or health, the perpetrator's intention becomes important. Also, in Serbian law, there is no definition of cyberbullying in the Law on the prevention of harassment at work (The Law on prevention of harassment at work, 2010). On the other side, the Law on the Basics of the Education and Training System stipulates that physical, psychological, social, sexual, and digital, and any other violence, abuse and neglect of an employee, child, student, adult, parent, or other legal representative or third person in the institution is prohibited. Violence and abuse are considered any form of verbal or non-verbal behavior committed once or repeated that has the effect of actually or potentially endangering the health, development, and dignity of the personality of a child, student, or adult (The Law on the Basics of the Education and Training System, 2017). Hence, a single act could be regarded as cyberbullying under Serbian education legislation.

One of the first pieces of legislation to provide a clear and precise definition of 'cyberbullying' is found in the legal framework of Nova Scotia, Canada. The "cyberbullying" has been defined as an electronic communication, direct or indirect, that causes or is likely to cause harm to another individual's health or well-being where the person responsible for the communication maliciously intended to cause harm to another individual's health or well-being or was reckless with regard to the risk of harm to another individual's health or well-being. It may include 1. creating a web page, blog, or profile

⁴ In only seven EU Member States – Belgium, Greece, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, and Spain – employers are mandated by statutory law to adopt an anti-harassment and bullying policy (Eurofound, 2024).

in which the creator assumes the identity of another person, 2. impersonating another person as the author of content or a message, 3. disclosure of sensitive personal facts or breach of confidence, 4. threats, intimidation, or menacing conduct, 5. communications that are grossly offensive, indecent, or obscene, 6. communications that are harassment, 7. making a false allegation, 8. communications that incite or encourage another person to commit suicide, 9. communications that denigrate another person because of any prohibited ground of discrimination listed in Section 5 of the Human Rights Act, or 10. communications that incite or encourage another person to do any of the foregoing (Intimate Images and Cyber-protection Act (Intimate Images and Cyber-protection Act, 2017)). The purpose of this Act was (a) to create civil remedies to deter, prevent and respond to the harms of non-consensual sharing of intimate images and cyber-bullying; (b) uphold and protect the fundamental freedoms of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication; and (c) provide assistance to Nova Scotians in responding to nonconsensual sharing of intimate images and cyber-bullying (Intimate Images and Cyber-protection Act, 2017).

In general, legal provisions worldwide that prohibit cyberbullying primarily protect relationships established in educational settings, such as schools and universities, but may also extend to professional relationships in the workplace. Legal provisions on cyberbullying in workplaces in general are rare. New Zealand represents the country where the Harmful Digital Communications Act was adopted in 2015. New Zealand law outlines the proper conduct for digital communication, establishes its main principles, defines what constitutes digital communication, and specifies its scope.⁵ Digital communication has been defined as any form of electronic communication and includes any text message, writing, photograph, picture, recording, or other matter that is communicated electronically (Harmful Digital Communications

⁵ The communication principles are: 1) A digital communication should not disclose sensitive personal facts about an individual; 2) A digital communication should not be threatening, intimidating, or menacing; 3) A digital communication should not be grossly offensive to a reasonable person in the position of the affected individual; 4) A digital communication should not be indecent or obscene; 5) A digital communication should not be used to harass an individual; 6) A digital communication should not make a false allegation; 7) A digital communication should not contain a matter that is published in breach of confidence; 8) A digital communication should not incite or encourage anyone to send a message to an individual for the purpose of causing harm to the individual; 9) A digital communication should not incite or encourage an individual to commit suicide; 10) A digital communication should not denigrate an individual by reason of his or her colour, race, ethnic or national origins, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability (Harmful Digital Communications Act, 2015, Art. 6, Par 1).

Act, 2015). In Europe, Denmark is the only country to explicitly mention ‘digital harassment’ in relevant regulatory frameworks (Eurofound, 2024). In Denmark, digital harassment is explicitly recognized in the legal framework, encompassing both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. The Danish Working Environment Act prohibits workplace bullying when it is perceived as degrading and harmful to the victim’s health, including through digital means, while the Danish Act on Occupational Accident Insurance recognizes the consequences of online harassment as a workplace accident (Németh, 2025, p. 350). Additionally, Denmark is pioneering legislation that grants individuals copyright over their own image and voice, enabling them to demand the removal of non-consensual deepfake content and seek compensation, with exceptions for parody and satire (Németh, 2025, p. 349).

Considering the foregoing, bullying and cyberbullying constitute distinct phenomena, albeit with significant similarities, with cyberbullying frequently conceptualized as a specific subtype of bullying. Cyberbullying occurs in digital environments, in contrast to traditional bullying, and can have broader consequences even when it involves a single act of inappropriate behavior, due to the capacity of information and communication technologies (ICT) to amplify and widely disseminate its effects. For it to be of relevance under labour law, the behavior must be work-related, specifically occurring at the workplace, in connection with work, or arising from work activities. Thus, cyberbullying refers to inappropriate behaviors that occur within digital environments, whereas traditional bullying typically involves direct, face-to-face interactions, occasionally encompassing physical contact. Both constructs are encompassed within the broader framework of workplace harassment, reflecting the spectrum of behaviors that may adversely affect employees’ health and well-being as well as the workplace environment.

4. Workplace cyberbullying, imbalance of power and legal subordination

In the context of workplace cyberbullying, a central consideration is the asymmetry of power, particularly legal subordination, whereby employers or executive managers exercise economic, disciplinary, and normative authority. As a result, they occupy a position of power that is inherently unequal relative to other employees. This framework primarily pertains to vertical cyberbullying, whereas horizontal cyberbullying, which occurs among peers, is not characterized by such an imbalance of power. These powers, in cases of

vertical cyberbullying, position employers or managers closer to the role of perpetrators, should they choose to abuse their authority.⁶

The study performed in Sweden used a sample of 3371 correspondents, trying to explore the prevalence of cyberbullying in working environments. According to the results, email was among the most commonly employed tools for cyberbullying. An interesting finding of this study is that the vulnerability of men and supervisors was evident only in instances of online bullying. This heightened vulnerability was not observed among those subjected to face-to-face bullying. This discrepancy between organizational position among victims of face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying suggests that electronic devices in cyberbullying challenge traditional power relations. In this context, earlier studies highlight the significance of power distribution and subordination in the workplace regarding cyberbullying, revealing notable findings and suggesting that online anonymity may allow formally weaker individuals to retaliate against more powerful aggressors (Forssell, 2016). Cyberbullying in the workplace is a multifaceted phenomenon that extends beyond traditional employee-targeted harassment. It can also be directed at employers, managers, and even top-level executives, reflecting a broader scope of interpersonal conflicts facilitated by digital platforms. Unlike conventional bullying, which often involves a clear power imbalance with the 'weaker' party being the primary victim, cyberbullying can occur across various hierarchical levels, with power dynamics being more fluid and context-dependent. This shift is particularly evident in environments characterized by *laissez-faire* leadership styles, where passive management approaches may inadvertently foster conditions conducive to cyberbullying. In such settings, the lack of clear boundaries and oversight can lead to increased interpersonal conflicts, which may escalate into cyberbullying behaviors. Therefore, understanding the dynamics of cyberbullying requires a comprehensive examination of organizational structures, leadership styles, and the pervasive influence of digital connectivity, all of which contribute to the complex landscape of workplace harassment. Furthermore, cyberbullying occurs outside of physical contact, where nonverbal communication can not be seen,

⁶ Hence, bullying is most often a process that happens at the vertical level. Those in low-power positions, such as subordinates, entry-level employees, and women, are more likely to become victims of bullying. Scandinavian countries and Finland are exceptions to this rule. Studies from these countries show that colleagues are reported as often as supervisors being perpetrators (Forssell, 2016, p. 456). It is worth mentioning that bullying also occurs in the horizontal level, between colleagues with the same power relations, or can be seen as reverse mobbing, where employees harass their supervisors, for different reasons.

leading to perpetrators' lack of awareness of the victim's emotional reaction. That makes cyberbullying more difficult for the victim. On the other hand, the absence of physical contact can influence the victim to be braver and confront the perpetrator. Consequently, labour law must be integrated with insights from organizational sciences, organizational psychology, and corporate ethics to develop a comprehensive and holistic framework for addressing cyberbullying in the workplace.

5. Concluding remarks

From a theoretical standpoint, cyberbullying may be conceptualized as a behavioral construct that is not only aligned with but also transcends traditional forms of workplace bullying and harassment. It emerges as a distinct psychosocial phenomenon rooted in the digitalization of work processes and reinforced by the increasing dependence on digital platforms and tools that shape interactions within virtual working environments. Analogous to other labour-law institutions that have arisen in response to the digital transition, workplace cyberbullying calls for recognition as a distinct subject of legal regulation. Its specific features – most notably the capacity to be perpetrated *ubiquitously* ('anywhere and anytime') and without the physical presence of the victim – challenge the adequacy of existing frameworks on traditional workplace bullying and harassment, thereby necessitating a *lex specialis* approach within labour legislation.

Workplace cyberbullying can result in chronic stress, anxiety, and depression, reduced productivity, and, in extreme cases, employees leaving their jobs when the environment becomes so toxic that it must be abandoned. In such circumstances, mental health is severely affected not only for the direct victims but also for their colleagues, as the overall work climate becomes unhealthy. This underscores the need to address cyberbullying as an emerging psychosocial risk arising from digitalized workplaces.

In the context of cyberbullying, the traditional hierarchical power imbalance characteristic of face-to-face bullying is often absent. The perpetrator does not need to occupy a position of formal authority; rather, power may arise from anonymity and the affordances of digital technologies. From a legal-theoretical standpoint, this highlights the employer's duty, in coordination with social partners, to take proactive measures to prevent and address cyberbullying, thereby ensuring that all employees are guaranteed a safe, respectful, and legally compliant work environment.

Ratification of the International Labour Organization Convention on the elimination of violence and harassment at work, No. 190, outlines an obligation for states to adapt their current legislation to the Convention. The Republic of Serbia has not yet ratified this Convention. Under Serbian law, the level of legal protection is limited: if harassment is perpetrated by a third party – such as a patient, client, or consumer – legal remedies and employer obligations are not clearly established. Furthermore, cyberbullying is not addressed under this law. All of the above underscores the necessity of ratifying the Convention to ensure comprehensive protection against all forms of workplace harassment, including cyberbullying as an emerging legal category.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization, S.G., Writing – original draft, S.G.; Writing – review and editing, S.G. and S.Z., Resources, S.G. and S.Z. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Gligorić Slađana

Univerzitet Privredna akademija u Novom Sadu, Pravni fakultet za privredu i pravosuđe u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad, Srbija

Zlatanović Sanja

Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija

PRISTUP DIGITALNOM UZNEMIRAVANJU NA MESTIMA RADA – KLJUČNI IZAZOVI I EVOLUTIVNA ULOGA RADNOG PRAVA

APSTRAKT: Četvrta industrijska revolucija učinila je upotrebu internet tehnologija i digitalnih alata standardnim elementima savremenih radnih mesta, naročito među zaposlenima tzv. belih okovratnika. Tehnološki napredak uzrokovao je i pojavu novih oblika nedoličnog ponašanja na mestima rada, uključujući i elektronsko uznemiravanje. Ova pojava definiše

se kao neprimereno ponašanje na mestima rada i pravno je neprihvatljiva – bilo da je reč o ponavljanim radnjama ili o pojedinačnom aktu sa trajnim posledicama – a sprovodi se putem imejlova, aplikacija za razmenu poruka, društvenih mreža ili drugih digitalnih platformi, sa ciljem uznemiravanja, zastrašivanja ili omalovažavanja kolega, podređenih, odnosno radnika uopšte. Za razliku od tradicionalnog, „licem u lice“ uznemiravanja, koje podrazumeva direktnu interakciju, elektronsko uznemiravanje prevazilazi fizičke granice i odvija se u digitalnom okruženju, kako u toku, tako i van radnog vremena. Njegova upornost čini ga teškim za izbegavanje, jer često prati žrtvu preko digitalnih uređaja, pri čemu predstavlja ozbiljnu pretnju zdravlju i opštem blagostanju radnika.

U radu se primenjuje normativni i uporedno-pravni metod prilikom analize pravnih pravila o elektronskom uznemiravanju na radu u odabranim državama, sa ciljem identifikovanja modela dobre zakonodavne prakse, a u kontekstu unapređenja domaćeg radnog zakonodavstva. Važeće srpsko zakonodavstvo o sprečavanju zlostavljanja na radu ne sadrži izričitu definiciju niti posebno uređuje elektronsko uznemiravanje, što stvara regulatorne praznine i ostavlja radnike nedovoljno zaštićenim. Kako se svet rada sve više premešta u virtuelne i digitalne prostore, postaje neophodan holistički pravni pristup prevenciji elektronskog uznemiravanja prilikom zaštite radnika. Jačanje normativnog okvira od ključnog je značaja ne samo za zaštitu prava radnika, već i za podsticanje zdrave i održive radne sredine.

Ključne reči: digitalna radna sredina, elektronsko (sajber) uznemiravanje, uznemiravanje na radu, radnopravni aspekti.

References

- 1 De Stefano, V., Durri, I., Stylogiannis, C., & Wouters, M. (2020). “System needs update” – *Upgrading protection against cyberbullying and ICT-enabled violence and harassment in the world of work – ILO Working Paper I*, Geneva: ILO
- 2 Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at Work – The European Tradition. In: Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (eds.), *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace – Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 3–39). New York: Taylor & Francis Group

- 3 Eurofound (2024). *Workplace bullying, harassment and cyberbullying: Are regulations and policies fit for purpose?*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg
- 4 Forssell, R. (2016). Exploring cyberbullying and face-to-face bullying in working life: Prevalence, targets and expressions. *Computer in human behavior*, 58, pp. 454–460, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.003>
- 5 Harmful Digital Communications Act, 2015, Downloaded 2025, May 07 from <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2015/0063/latest/whole.html>
- 6 Healy-Cullen, S. (2017). Is workplace bullying in the eye of the beholder? *Journal of Mediation & Applied Conflict Analysis*, 4(2), pp. 563–577. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33232/jmaca.4.2.9197>
- 7 Intimate Images and Cyber-protection Act. 2017. Downloaded 2025, May 07 from <https://nslegislature.ca/sites/default/files/legc/statutes/intimate%20images%20and%20cyber-protection.pdf>
- 8 Kociatkiewicz, J., Kostera, M., & Parker, M. (2021). The possibility of disalienated work – Being at home in alternative organizations. *Human Relations*, 74(7), pp. 933–957. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720916762>
- 9 Martin, W., & LaVan, H. (2010). Workplace bullying – A review of litigated cases. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights, Journal*, 22(3), pp. 175–194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-009-9140-4>
- 10 Németh, Z. (2025). Denmark – Future-proof provisions in the fight against cyberbullying In: Pázmándi K., & Hrecska-Kovács R. (eds.), *Cyberbullying, hatecrime and related issues: From a comparative perspective* (pp. 341–369). Budapest: Ferenc Mádl Institute of Comparative Law. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47079/2025.kprhk.cyberb.4_14
- 11 Pothuganti, S. K. (2024). Workplace cyberbullying – A systematic literature review on its definition, theories, and the role of HRD. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), p. 2408443. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2408443>
- 12 Pothuganti, S. K. (2025). Digital Harassment in the Workplace – The Impact of Cyberbullying on Employee Well-Being and Engagement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems*, 35(1), pp. 73–100. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14329/apjis.2025.35.1.73>
- 13 Schongen, S. (2023). Digitalisation as a prospect for work–life balance and inclusion – A natural experiment in German hospitals. *Social Inclusion*, 11(4), pp. 225–238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v11i4.7117>

- 14 Smith, P., K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying – Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), pp. 376–385. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x.
- 15 Špadina, H., & Ljubić, M. (2024). Cyberbullying and digital exclusion as new forms of workplace mobbing. *Regional Law Review*, pp. 237–249. DOI: https://doi.org/10.56461/iup_rlr.2024.5.ch19
- 16 Tomczak, D. L., Lanzo, L. A., & Aguinis, H. (2018). Evidence-based recommendations for employee performance monitoring. *Business Horizons*, 61(2), pp. 251–259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.11.006>
- 17 Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190), International Labour Organisation
- 18 Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja [The Law on the Basics of the Education and Training System]. *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 88/17, 27/18 – dr. zakon, 10/19, 27/18 – dr. zakon, 6/20, 129/21, 92/23 i 19/25
- 19 Zakon o sprečavanju zlostavljanja na radu [The Law on prevention of harassment at work]. *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 36/10