Making Sense of Digital Nomadism, Workplace Surveillance and Resistance

Nathan Bishop

Abstract

Workplace surveillance is a common occurrence in many traditional workplaces and excessive forms can lead to resistance efforts from employees. However, most of the literature on this topic has been focused on the traditional office worker. There is now a new evolutionary worker that goes against social norms by travelling around the world while working remotely, the Digital Nomad. Therefore, this article aims to incorporate Digital Nomads into workplace surveillance research. This resulted in the research question "How does the Digital Nomad lifestyle interact with workplace surveillance and resistance acts". To answer this, 5 semi-structured interviews were conducted on Digital Nomads recruited from social media platforms. Interview transcripts were analysed using thematic data analysis where 3 main themes were identified: Shift from Traditional Restraints, Perks of Elite Workers, Panopticon's Future. Overall, Digital Nomads did not experience intensive surveillance and findings supported the idea that they are productive, elite workers, opting to work for employers that do not monitor their employees. It was also found that Digital Nomads take part in minor acts of resistance, but they were not actively resisting their employers. These results suggest the need for future researchers to further expand upon the status of the Digital Nomad worker and explore their experiences of workplace surveillance and resistance.

1 Introduction

The definition for workplace surveillance in this paper is an employer's enactment "to monitor, record and track employee performance, behaviours and personal characteristics in real time" (Ball 2010: 87). Sewell and Barker (2006) denoted surveillance as either coercive or caring with coercive surveillance referring to negative, intrusive efforts while caring surveillance aims to protect employees and help them grow within an organisation. Therefore, workplace surveillance is a necessity for the success of a capitalist society and has intensified greatly since the pandemic (Manokha 2020; Vitak & Zimmer 2023). Foucault (1977) attempted to explain how workplace surveillance functions, with his metaphoric panopticon, where the supervisor could be watching, ensuring that employees are working. Accordingly, it is not surprising that a wide majority of employees reported negative attitudes towards being surveilled intensively, and some even took part in resistance acts (Clawson & Clawson 2017). While it is not the only cause for deviant behaviours in the workplace, it is no doubt one of the contributors that negatively impacts organisations financially (Baharom et al. 2017). The problem is most of the literature around this topic has only focused on traditional and remote workers. There is a new type of worker that scholars are gradually becoming interested in, the Digital Nomad (Hannonen 2020). Unlike traditional workers, these workers can travel globally while doing their work remotely (Herman & Paris 2020). This article will therefore fill in this gap of surveillance literature to see how Digital Nomads interact with workplace surveillance and resistance.

Research question: How does the Digital Nomad lifestyle interact with workplace surveillance and resistance acts?

2.1 Workplace Surveillance and Capitalism

Workplace surveillance has always been a pressing issue for society with the first notable examples originating in the 20th century. Ford introduced their "5 Dollar Day scheme" in the 1900s, promoting a healthy lifestyle for factory workers" (Loizides & Sonnad 2004). Their sociology department would make surprise visits on these workers, collecting "information on every one of the employees on living conditions and lifestyles" (Ford Motor Company, as cited in Manokha 2020a: 548). This scheme was shut down shortly after, due to opposition from workers who found it too intrusive (Manokha 2020). This idea that intensive and intrusive surveillance has negative impacts upon employees remains prevalent in the 21st century.

The advancement of technology has resulted in the increasing amounts of interest in workplace surveillance (Ball 2022). It has intensified greatly as employers are now able to carry out: "personal data gathering, Internet and email monitoring, location tracking, biometrics and covert surveillance" (Ball 2010: 87). Empirical studies on employee attitudes suggest mixed responses to whether this is a positive or negative practice. Allen et al. (2007) carried out 154 interviews on employees from different organisations and the majority felt positive towards surveillance, arguing it as a necessity to ensure workers are being productive. Similarly, Kizilglu (2018) surveyed 218 employees in Turkey and found that there was no relationship between workplace surveillance and employee stress. On the other hand, there are studies that highlight negative attitudes, such as Lockwood (2018) finding that Employees were concerned about being watched in their workplace, feeling issues of trust, creativity and demotivation. Similarly, Siegel et al. (2022) carried out a meta-analysis finding that electronic monitoring decreases job satisfaction while increasing stress. They also did not find a relationship between increased productivity and monitoring thus contrasting Allen et al. (2007) findings. One issue with studies on workplace surveillance is that it is experienced on such a subjective, individual level in different forms, so it is hard to conclude outright that it causes positive or negative effects in workplaces. However, it can be argued that workplace surveillance can cause negative effects, especially with the more intensive forms.

Being that there is a relationship between productivity and workplace surveillance, a discussion of capitalism and its role in workplace surveillance is important. In a capitalist society, employees are exploited for their labour to produce commodities that owners sell to gain a profit (Marx et al. 2008). What maintains this continuous production of commodities by employees is the constant threat of unemployment (Patnaik 2019). Surveillance allows employers to ensure that employees are doing their job under the threat of unemployment, thus making it a necessity for the success of a capitalist society (Manokha 2020a). This gives reason for why some individuals, such as the participants in Allen et al. (2007) believe that monitoring in the workplace will maintain productivity. Employers need to ensure that their workers are being productive, which workplace surveillance can help achieve.

2.2 Resistance in the Workplace

There are two types of resistance behaviours that can stem from intensive workplace surveillance: production deviance and resistance to surveillance. Lawrence and Robinson (2007) said that resistance is the act of going against power structures in their workplaces. Production deviance can include "working slow intentionally, avails excessive breaks [8], gossiping on non-work topics with coworkers during official working hours, late arrival at workplace and leave office early, day dreaming while on job [8], and involved in cyber loafing" (Baharom et al. 2017: 3). These behaviours that resist power structures are a massive problem for companies and can cost them millions in lost revenue (Baharom et al. 2017). Employees carry out deviant behaviours when they feel dissatisfied in their workplace and start to develop negative attitudes (Kalemci et al. 2019). One of the factors that develops employee negative attitudes is the experience of intensive and invasive surveillance in workplaces. This can result in resistance to surveillance actions with employees turning off devices on purpose or covering their cameras on laptops (Clawson & Clawson 2017). A case study illustrates this where

employees resisted the installation of new CCTV cameras in a power station because they felt their managers did not trust them. (Mason et al. 2002). There was also another case study where employees refused to use the new management system, "Casemix" in a hospital because the information it collected was deemed too invasive (Johnson et al. 2014). Overall, it appears there is a relationship between intensive surveillance and resistance acts in traditional workplaces. However, there is no research on Digital Nomads and resistance acts in their virtual workplaces, so it is necessary to research this and compare it with traditional workers.

2.3 Foucault's Hegemony and other Theoretical Assumptions

The most popular and hegemonic surveillance theory that addresses workplace surveillance is Foucault's panopticon theory (Haggerty 2006). Despite the various critiques and extensions of this theory, it still manages to remain relevant in surveillance studies (Manokha 2020a). Foucault, who based his theory from Jeremy Bentham's prison design, aimed to explain how surveillance is a disciplinary tool that functions in enclosed environments such as the prison (Foucault 1977). The work setting is one of the "enclosure" examples that Foucault discussed when addressing the factory as a panoptic tool (Foucault 1977). For a panopticon to achieve its goal of conformity and docility, the surveillance must be visible yet unverifiable (Foucault 1977). This makes the bodies of the surveilled subjects 'docile' because there is now the possibility that they are being watched (Foucault 1977). Hence this explains how and why individuals self-regulate their behaviour, which in a workplace enclosure environment would be attributes of productivity. Despite the panopticon's hegemony in surveillance studies, it has been critiqued for not considering the technological advancements in society (Haggerty 2006). This has resulted in other scholars Lyon and Manokha extending or interpreting his unfinished work.

Lyon discussed the idea of an "electronic panopticon" where the conditions of the panopticon are applied to modern surveillance methods (Lyon 1993). Despite this, Lyon never explains in his literature how the conditions are applied to contemporary society and instead argues that an electronic panopticon is only partially applicable to workplace surveillance (Lyon 1994). Yet, 26 years later, Manokha (2020a) believed that the panopticon theory is even more useful in the modern age when addressing workplace surveillance due to technological advancements. He claimed that new surveillance technology fully meets the requirements of the panopticon: "(1) the omnipresence of the inspector, ensured by his total invisibility; (2) the universal visibility of objects of surveillance; and (3) the assumption of constant observation by the watched" (ibid: 547). This idea is based on new surveillance technologies being able to run in the background, so it is unknown if the employee is being watched, making them docile to the supervisor.

A second theory, aiming to explain the motivations for workplace surveillance is Sewell and Barker (2006) and their theory on coercive and caring surveillance. Coercive surveillance aims to monitor workers, observing productivity whereas caring surveillance aims to monitor workers for beneficial reasons (Allen et al 2007). Panopticon surveillance could be grouped together with coercive surveillance since they are both concerned with employee productivity and regulating behaviour. Caring surveillance would receive positive responses from employees since it is done to benefit instead of discipline them (Allen et al 2007). In Allen et al. (2007), 58% of research participants saw surveillance as coercive, being a necessity for tracking productivity. Coercive surveillance efforts are more intensive and invasive and there is evidence that this type of surveillance can increase actions of resistance (Anteby & Chan 2018). Hence, this theory is useful for categorising whether surveillance efforts are done for positive or negative purposes.

When addressing empirical research, references to the panopticon are more common than other surveillance theories. Firstly, Johnson et al. (2014) found that the panoptic "CaseMix" software resulted in resistance measures from employees because they found it too invasive (Johnson et al. 2014). Additionally, Ramasundaram et al. (2022) found that employees in an office were uncomfortable that they were being surveilled constantly

and felt a lack of trust. Furthermore, there was a decrease in productivity from employees due to being constantly watched (Ramasundaram et al. 2022). Perhaps panoptic surveillance is partially flawed since employees have resisted it, which goes against the objective of achieving docility. Nevertheless, regardless of its effects, panoptic surveillance does achieve its goal partially since employees are aware that they could be getting watched.

But evidence has shown that it does not achieve self-regulation and is instead met with resistance. It would be interesting to see if it is possible to apply these surveillance theories to the Digital Nomad workplace.

2.4 Technological Advancements, the Pandemic and Digital Nomads

Many scholars have argued that workplace surveillance has intensified greatly since the start of the pandemic due to employees working from home (Kalischko & Riedl, 2021; Masoodi et al. 2021; Ball 2021). The closest literature that can be applied to Digital Nomads and workplace surveillance would be the emerging research on remote employees and their surveillance experiences. This gives reason for why it is important to research Digital Nomads, they are remote workers but travel around instead of staying in one place (Hannonen 2020). During the Covid-19 pandemic, there was an increased demand for monitoring software from companies and this software had a panoptic nature, running in the background (Ball 2021; Kalischko & Riedl 2021). Surveillance during the pandemic became more intrusive as it extended into the privacy of an employee's own home (Manokha 2020b). Vitak and Zimmer (2023) carried out a survey on 645 traditional US workers during the pandemic and found increased usage of surveillance tools, increased job stress and decreased satisfaction from employees. Therefore, this extends the narrative that surveillance in the workplace on traditional workers has become more intensive, especially since the pandemic. Capitalism plays a role here with employers having to ensure employee productivity.

While this literature review has discussed traditional worker's experiences of surveillance and resistance, Digital Nomads live a different lifestyle from these workers. They are defined as a "mobile knowledge worker equipped with digital technologies to work anytime, anywhere" (Müller as cited in Hannonen 2020: 4). In broad terms, a Digital Nomad is a worker who is on the move while doing their work remotely. There is a steady growing amount of sociological interest with examples of Goffman's dramaturgy theory and Bauman's liquid society idea being applied to Digital Nomads (Nina 2020; Herman & Paris 2020). Yet, due to the lack of literature, it is unknown if Digital Nomads experience the same levels of surveillance as remote and traditional workers. It is also unknown if they take part in resistance acts in their workplaces. They live a very different lifestyle to the traditional employee and many chose to become a Digital Nomad because they felt unsatisfied with their traditional lifestyle (Reichenberger 2018). They opted to escape a lifestyle with less balance so they could have a more balanced lifestyle between work and leisure (Fabiola 2020). Unlike traditional tourists, Digital Nomads believe their experiences with culture are more authentic because they spend a longer time residing in foreign countries (Thompson 2019). Research from Fabiola (2020) has shown that they tend to have a better balance between work and leisure and live a more fulfilling life. After conducting 50 semi-structured interviews, Fabiola reported that Digital Nomads wanted to escape their traditional lifestyle to seek happiness and freedom (Fabiola 2020). Similarly, participants from the 22 interviews from Reichenberger (2018) reported feelings of freedom and location independence. This new type of worker is fascinating because their lifestyle is different from traditional workers where they are less constrained to traditional structures. Therefore, it is necessary to include them within the research of workplace surveillance and resistance to introduce new findings in surveillance and resistance studies.

3 Methodology

The research consisted of 5 semi-structured interviews, 4 on Zoom and 1 by email. Semi-structured interviews were identified as the most suitable method for this research. Qualitative methods allow the researcher to get closer with the participants and gain a deeper understanding of how social phenomenon is constructed (Aspers & Corte 2019; Cleland 2017). It is important to seek out Digital Nomads and learn about their experiences and attitudes towards workplace surveillance and resistance acts in the workplace.

Digital Nomads were recruited using the online snowball sampling method on social media platforms: Facebook, Reddit, LinkedIn and Discord. Posts were made reaching out to Digital Nomads that were interested in partaking in a study on workplace surveillance and resistance. It was hard to obtain participants especially when there was no financial incentive for them.

Nevertheless, interviews were arranged, corresponding with the timezones of the 5 Participants. An information sheet and consent form was given to them to uphold ethical practice. A topic guide was used, containing around 14 questions and ideas to be used as a prompt. Question topics ranged from asking about their backstory, motivations to become a Digital Nomad to experiences and opinions of workplace surveillance and resistance acts. For example: "How would you say that your lifestyle is different to the lifestyle of the traditional worker?", "Do you feel like you are being surveyed in your workplace?" and "Could you tell me a memorable time that you felt surveyed?".

The interviews lasted from 20 to 35 minutes and were recorded on Zoom then transcribed manually. Thematic analysis was carried out to analyse the transcripts where 101 coded statements were identified between 10 codes. Then 3 themes emerged from finding patterns between the transcripts and codes. Step-by-step guidance from Braun and Clark (2006) ensured that thematic analysis was carried out rigorously.

The 5 participants' nationalities were Brazilian, American, Italian and Colombian. Job sectors ranged from the travel industry, tutoring, local government and technology. The countries they explored between themselves were on a global scale: europe, central america, north america, southeast asia and western asia. While not working remotely they enjoyed leisure activities such as hiking, sunbathing, food tours, embracing new culture, snorkelling, scuba diving.

4 Results & Discussion

Three themes emerged from the empirical data: shift from traditional restraints, perks of elite workers and panopticon's future. These themes were constructed with the purpose to further explain the relationship between the Digital Nomad lifestyle, surveillance and resistance.

4.1 Shift from Traditional Restraints

The Digital Nomad lifestyle differs from the traditional worker lifestyle but they first started out as a traditional worker, feeling a desire to escape from traditional structures:

> [P1] ''*...and had to start dealing with being alone in the living room, just doing my work by myself the entire day and it was so boring and like no, I hate this!*''

This feeling is similar to findings from Reichenberger (2018) where Digital Nomads were unsatisfied with their lifestyle. Whether it was commuting to work or working remotely from their homes, they realised that it was time for a drastic lifestyle change:

> [P5] ''*I'm one of those who are not comfortable staying in one place; I crave changes of scenery and location*''

Therefore, the nature of remote work allows for Digital Nomads to fulfil this craving of escapism, granting them the freedom they desire. Taking on the role as a Digital Nomad, has allowed them to have the agency to travel, free from restraints that traditional workers are tied to:

[P2] ''*Part of the reason Digital Nomad is so attractive to me is because of the freedom it provides me*''

This idea of freedom and agency has already been established by some scholars, arguing that Digital Nomads experience "freedom from an office to travel the world" (Thompson 2019: 27). Alongside freedom is this heightened sense of exploration when exploring new areas and culture. Digital Nomads have the ability to do leisure activities that traditional workers are restricted:

[P5] ''*I go trekking, snorkeling and scuba diving, walking around historical sites, taking pictures, eating exotic foods, hanging out in karaoke bars and trying local beers*''

One of the benefits of this lifestyle appears to be the limitless leisure activities that Digital Nomads can partake in. While their lifestyle is different from the traditional worker, participants also stressed how they do share a normal work-life with the traditional worker:

[P3] ''*There's a lot of preparation to be put into travel, but then it's exciting and adventurous although we are technically working the same as if we were at home but then when we stopped working at the end of the work day, we are just exploring a different place instead of a walk in the hometown*''

This participant suggested that their identity as a Digital Nomad does not make a difference to their working lifestyle; they are working as if they were working remotely from home but then acting out the role of Digital Nomad outside of work hours. Therefore, there is a feeling of normality in their lifestyle as they are no different from remote workers when discussing work life:

[P1] ''*The more you try to organise your schedule the better, so I try to have the same as I used to have when I used to work in an office. I have a job that is 9-5 full time... so monday to friday I need to work...*''

However, they still need to be flexible in their time management skills where they may be working hours that are unsociable or against social norms:

[P1] ''*So if I'm in Europe it happens like late in the afternoon, 2 or 3pm depending where I am*''

Participant responses demonstrated how their lifestyle has changed and what made it more exciting. They experienced a shift from their previous lifestyle where they were constrained by the traditional worker structure. They are able to partake in exciting activities in their leisure time which traditional workers do not experience.

4.2 Perks of Elite Workers

Engaging in these leisure activities is only one part of this lifestyle; they still have to work. Digital Nomads are professional, elite workers as shown from their work experience, high education and lucrative professions. While one of the benefits is the possibilities of the wide range of leisures activities, there is another benefit of this elite worker, they do not experience high levels of surveillance in their workplaces.

[P4] ''*I don't think so... I'm so lucky that I don't have that sort of thing, control in my work*''

The only notable example of surveillance was from one participant who had to track their hours for their employer:

> [P1] ''*We have a tracking platform for hours but it is not because they are actually tracking everything that I am doing... they wanna measure how many hours I'm spending in each project so they can budget better*''

This type of surveillance relates to the theory of caring surveillance, where surveillance is done for the purpose of helping employees (Allen et al. 2007). This example here had the purpose of helping the company improve, instead of disciplining the worker. But when asked about sentiments of intrusive surveillance, participants showed signs of resistance and were slightly insulted by the idea of intensive surveillance in their workplace.

> [P1] ''*I am not giving my time, I am giving my work, I'm delivering the projects with quality, that's what they are paying me for...In my principles I wouldn't work for a company that would make me stay on the computer that is paying me for my hours*''

They believe that intensive surveillance is coercive, done to ensure that employees are constantly working, because employers are fearful that they are not. The main reason that Digital Nomads in this study did not experience intensive surveillance is that they found jobs that reward capitalist attributes such as productivity and efficiency. They certainly know their worth in the job market:

> [P2] ''*This is something I've been building up skills for, for years and it's also stupid to not take advantage of it and enjoy life while you have it*''

Nevertheless, it cannot be claimed that all Digital Nomads do not experience workplace surveillance as this is something that differs in each individual organisation. There are still some Digital Nomads who could be prone to face more intensive surveillance:

> [P5] ''*They tend to be employees, and are looking for ways to conceal their location from an employer that doesn't permit international travel by their remote workers*''

Taking part in production deviance acts such as browsing on the internet is an activity that Digital Nomad workers also take part in. Despite the first part of this study suggesting that Digital Nomads do not carry out much resistance acts, one participant claimed that Digital Nomads are probably lying:

> [P2] ''*Oh I absolutely do... my phone's right here... I feel like a Digital Nomad who says they don't is probably lying*''

Another participant made a similar point, that they feel they need to prove themselves:

> [P5] ''*I suspect that part of this is that DNs feel the need to prove themselves more than those in traditional roles*''

This does highlight one of the limitations with asking participants directly if they take part in actions that they may not want to admit, particularly towards a researcher. Especially when considering the idea that Digital Nomads are skilled workers and take pride in their lifestyle; they do not want to have negative connotations attributed towards a community they are representing for research purposes. Nevertheless, resistance acts is something that is more common when the worker is being paid for their time, not their skills:

> [P3] ''*When you are forced to be at work 9-5 regardless of what's left to do its way more likely that you will found other distract yourself*''

Findings from this research illustrate the idea from Manokha (2020), that workplace surveillance is a necessity for the success of a capitalist society. Digital Nomads have

been established as elite workers who are productive and sought after, so companies that hire them do not need to monitor them intensively because of their worth in the job market. When surveilled, participants experienced what Sewell and Barker (2006) would call caring surveillance. This is also done for capitalist purposes but is more positive and less intensive. Other types of employees do not hold the same value as these elite Digital Nomads, so they are surveilled more intensively because their employers are fearful that they are not working, limiting profit for the company. Previous scholars such as Ball (2021) have illustrated many examples of intrusive surveillance on remote and traditional workers because employers are trying to check if they are working. This was shown to produce the opposite effects: negative sentiments, production deviance or resistance to surveillance. Overall, Digital Nomads in this study are elite workers, having a better workplace culture with surveillance only existing for caring purposes. Some may take part in resistance acts but they are not actively resisting their companies because they make up for lost time with efficiency and high productivity.

4.3 Theme 3: Panopticon's Future

As it has been established, Digital Nomads in this study did not experience extensive surveillance so it is difficult to discuss Foucault's panopticon. However, participants did recall more intensive examples of workplace surveillance from friends and employees that were both traditional workers and Digital Nomads. Participant 3 recollected an example from a student who was trying to pass an exam for a job during the pandemic.

> [P3] ''*The exam was 9 hours long and they couldn't leave the room where they were because of surveillance for the whole 9 hours, so they were recommended to wear an adult pad if they needed to go to the bathroom which to me is absolutely unacceptable*''

This student was watched through a webcam and was not allowed to leave their room in their own home. This example illustrates Foucault's panopticon perfectly where this individual has been made "docile" within the restraints of their own room. While the supervisor may not have been watching for the whole 9 hours, there is no guarantee of this, so the supervisor's gaze is visible but unverifiable (Foucault 1977). This does suggest that Foucault's panopticon theory can still be applied in the modern era, thus extending the thesis from Manokha (2020) that panoptic surveillance has intensified in the digital society.

Similarly, Participant 1 spoke about a Digital Nomad peer who did experience intensive surveillance in their workplace:

> [P1] ''*But I've heard from another Digital Nomad friend who had a tracking system that was the same requiring to stay in front of the screen for a while and they found ways to trick the system*''

This also illustrates electronic panoptic surveillance where activity is being watched but it is unverifiable when they are being watched by a supervisor. Interestingly, participant 1 claimed that they "*found ways to trick the system*", thus highlighting that intrusive surveillance will be fought back with resistance measures. It is evident that Foucault's theory is still useful as a metaphor when discussing workplace surveillance, especially when it is intrusive and intensive. But in this example, the Digital Nomad was not "docile" and instead chose to resist the surveillance. This relates with research showing workers resisting panoptic surveillance such as the casemix case study from Johnson et al. (2014).

5 Implications for Future Research

One of the major limitations of this study was the small sample size. In an ideal situation, it would have been great to have received more responses and to have carried out more interviews. Therefore, is it difficult to conclude that the majority of Digital Nomads do not

experience surveillance from just 5 interview participants. This small sample provided an insight into how Digital Nomads interact with surveillance and resistance in workplaces but the research should not stop here. Other surveillance scholars need to start including Digital Nomads within their research. There is a vast amount of research on workplace surveillance on traditional and remote workers, but there is none on Digital Nomads except from this study. Scholars should not just repeat what has already been established, they need to branch out and research surveillance on Digital Nomads in their future research. There is already a small, yet insightful amount of literature on Digital Nomads and their lifestyle which surveillance scholars need to add towards. I urge future researchers to seek these Nomads that have experienced workplace surveillance and see how it interacts with this paper's idea of the elite worker status of the Digital Nomads.

6 Conclusion

This research has contributed to the ongoing work on workplace surveillance and resistance by incorporating the Digital Nomad lifestyle towards it. The interviews found that Digital Nomads experienced limited surveillance due to their status as an elite worker that produces results. This status allows them to take part in leisure activities that traditional workers are constrained from. It also allows them to seek employment in companies that do not carry out intensive, coercive surveillance. The only notable example of surveillance identified was caring surveillance, which was not even met with resistance since its purpose is to benefit the employee. This differs from literature demonstrating that surveillance has intensified since the Covid-19 pandemic for traditional workers. Therefore, the high status of the Digital Nomad is significant for understanding why participants in this study did not recall intensive surveillance. Secondly, resistance acts were carried out by Digital Nomads but they were not actively resisting their company. Instead, common resistance examples were acts of productivity deviance such as going on the internet, which was reported to not affect productivity. This has been shown to differ from current literature which showed resistance to be an issue in traditional workplaces resulting in less productivity and other negative effects for organisations. Thirdly, participants were not applicable under Foucault's panopticon theory being that they did not experience the same style of surveillance. However, evidence from this study adds to the belief that it is still a great theory for traditional workers that experience intensive surveillance. Further research should aim to increase the sample size to investigate how Digital Nomads have experienced intensive surveillance. A funded study could help achieve this, where participants are more likely to share their experiences if they receive a financial incentive.

References:

Allen MW, Myria W, et al (2007) Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. Management Communication Quarterly 21:172–200

Anteby M, Chan CK (2018) A self-fulfilling cycle of coercive surveillance: workers' invisibility practices and managerial justification. Organization Science 29:1–17

Aspers P, Corte U (2019) What is qualitative in qualitative research? Qualitative Sociology 42:139–160

Baharom MN, Sharfuddin MDK, Javed I (2017) A systematic review on the deviant workplace behavior. Review of Public Administration and Management 5:1–8

Ball K (2010) Workplace surveillance: an overview. Labor History 51:87–108

Ball K (2021) Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace. Literature Review and Policy Recommendations, pp 1–98

Ball K (2022) Surveillance in the workplace: past, present and future. Surveillance & Society 20:455–461

Bonneau C, Aroles J, Estagnasié C (2023) Romanticisation and monetisation of the Digital Nomad lifestyle: The role played by online narratives in shaping professional identity work. Organization 30:65–88

Braun V, Clarke V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology 3:77–101

Clawson D, Clawson MA (2017) IT is watching: workplace surveillance and worker resistance. New Labor Forum 26:62–69

Cleland JA (2017) The qualitative orientation in medical education research. Korean Journal of Medical Education 29:61–71

Fabiola M (2020) Digital Nomads: freedom, responsibility and the neoliberal order. Information Technology & Tourism 22:417–437

Foucault M (1977) Discipline and punish. Pantheon Books, New York

Haggerty KD (2006) Tear down the walls: on demolishing the panopticon. In: Lyon D (ed) Theorizing Surveillance, pp 23–45. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/suss/reader.action?docID=449679&ppg=38. Accessed 16 Jan 2023

Hannonen O (2020) In search of a Digital Nomad: defining the phenomenon. Information Technology & Tourism 22:335–353

Hermann I, Paris CM (2020) Digital Nomadism: The nexus of remote working and travel mobility. Information Technology & Tourism 22:329–334

Holleran M (2022) Pandemics and geoarbitrage: Digital Nomadism before and after COVID-19. City 26:831–847

Johnson N, Kilroy C, Turner M et al (2014) Are you watching me? A look at panoptic perceptions surrounding computer monitoring systems. Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research 16:9–26

Kalemci RA, Kalemci-Tuzun I, Ozkan-Canbolat E (2019) Employee deviant behavior: role of culture and organizational relevant support. European Journal of Management and Business Economics 28:126–141

Kalischko T, Riedl R (2021) Conceptualization, review of effects and moderators, and future research opportunities. Frontiers in Psychology 12:1–19

Kiziloglu M (2018) A research on the relationship between workplace monitoring and job stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior Research 3:1–12.

Lockwood G (2018) Workplace monitoring and surveillance: the British context. Athens Journal of Law 4:205–228

Loizides GP, Sonnad SR (2004) Fordist applied research in the era of the five-dollar day. Sociological Practice 6:1–25.

Lyon D (1993) An electronic panopticon? A sociological critique of surveillance theory. The Sociological Review 41:653–678

Lyon D (1994) In the electronic eye: the rise of surveillance society. Polity Press, Minneapolis.

Manokha I (2020a) The implications of digital employee monitoring and people analytics for power relations in the workplace. Surveillance & Society 18:540–554

Manokha I (2020b) Covid-19: teleworking, surveillance and 24/7 work. Some reflections on the expected growth of remote work after the pandemic. Political Anthropological Research on International Social Sciences 1:273–287

Marx K, Engels F, Harvey D (2008) The communist manifesto. Pluto Press, London

Masodi MJ et al (2021) Workplace surveillance and remote work: exploring the impacts and implications amidst Covid-19 in Canada.

Mason D et al (2002) On the poverty of apriorism: technology, surveillance in the workplace and employee responses. Information, Communication & Society 5:555–572

Nina W (2020) The travel blogger as Digital Nomad: (re-)imagining workplace performances of digital nomadism within travel blogging work. Information Technology & Tourism 22:391–416

Patnaik P (2019) Contemporary capitalism and the world of work. Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy 8:303–316

Ramasundaram A, Gurusamy R, George A (2022) Employees and workplace surveillance: tensions and ways forward. Journal of Information Technology Teaching Cases 0:1–5

Reichenberger I (2018) Digital Nomads – a quest for holistic freedom in work and leisure. Annals of Leisure Research 21:364–380

Sewell G, Barker JR (2006) Coercion versus care: using irony to make sense of organizational surveillance. The Academy of Management Review 31:934–961.

Siegel R et al (2022) The impact of electronic monitoring on employees' job satisfaction, stress, performance, and counterproductive work behavior: a meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior Reports 8:1–13

Thompson BY (2019) The Digital Nomad lifestyle: (remote) work/leisure balance, privilege, and constructed community. International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure 2:27–42

Vitak J, Zimmer M (2023) Power, stress, and uncertainty: Experiences with and attitudes toward workplace surveillance during a pandemic. Surveillance & Society 21:29–44