



The coming of the post-digital workplace? A survey of how white-collar workers experience and cope with digital media reliance

André Jansson^{a,*}, Karin Fast^a, Paul C. Adams^b

^a Department of Geography, Media and Communication, Karlstad University, SE 651 88 Karlstad, Sweden

^b Department of Geography and the Environment, University of Texas at Austin, 305 E. 23rd Street, RLP 3.306, Austin, TX 78712, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Digitalization
Office work
Territoriality
Communicative agency
Mediatization
Digital work
Technological dependency

ABSTRACT

The coming of the post-digital workplace? A survey of how white-collar workers experience and cope with digital media reliance.

New media technology can both hamper and amplify workers' agency. Much research shows that the ambiguities of digital reliance are accentuated among office workers, especially knowledge workers, who spend most of their working time handling different types of information and data. Thus, in times of constant connectivity, people might feel compelled to create time-spaces for disconnection, or find spatial and temporal routines for restricting their use of digital tools. This article provides a quantitative analysis, based on a survey, of how private and public officials ("white-collar workers") in Sweden experience and handle digital media reliance at work, with a special focus on whether they think communicative and territorial agency are enhanced or constrained under digitalized working conditions. Based on a principal component analysis (PCA), five dispositions toward (the handling of) digital media reliance are identified: the skeptical, the embracing, the captivated, the reluctant and the disciplined. These dispositions are further analyzed in relation to demographic and contextual variables, pointing especially to the significance of employment sector. While digital media reliance is appreciated and associated with extended agency by many informants, the study also reveals different facets of post-digital sentiments and tactics. These are particularly constitutive of the skeptical disposition, reflecting inclinations to avoid certain media and find alternatives to digital tools, but also in the disciplined disposition which encompasses internalized routines for media use. The study also shows that the normalization of digitalized work processes is entwined with, and necessitates, different forms of territorial micro-politics extending beyond the workplace per se.

1. Introduction

People's growing reliance on media technology across different realms of their lives implies extended capacities for expressivity, connectivity and coordination, while at the same time causing negative experiences like stress, distraction and feelings of intrusion. This makes mediatization an inherently dialectical process, and the dialectics of mediatization are more accentuated than ever, due to the implementation of digital platforms in every corner of our existence. This is particularly obvious in working life, where the individual's chances to negotiate media reliance are most often limited due to organizational policies, technological standards and professional demands. Whereas many workers embrace the growing flexibility that digitalization enables, for example, working remotely or managing world-wide business

relations, they may also feel that the boundaries between professional and private life are collapsing and that their work is surveilled. Even the very request to adopt new platforms may cause a sense of lost agency – despite being legitimized organizationally as the means by which workers will gain *more* agency. This calls for research that looks at how people experience, and eventually develop routines that may counter, or limit, the side-effects of digitalized working conditions.

Much research shows that the ambiguities of digital reliance are accentuated among office workers, especially knowledge workers, who spend most of their working time handling different types of information and data and pursuing other basically communicative tasks (e.g., Wajcman & Rose, 2011; Schaefer, Andersson, Bjarnason, & Hansson, 2018; Fast & Jansson, 2019; Bossio & Holton, 2021; Karlsen & Ytre-Arne, 2022). These job categories are at the forefront of digitalization,

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: andre.jansson@kau.se (A. Jansson), karin.fast@kau.se (K. Fast), paul.adams@austin.utexas.edu (P.C. Adams).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diggeo.2025.100121>

Received 8 November 2024; Received in revised form 7 April 2025; Accepted 14 April 2025

Available online 17 April 2025

2666-3783/© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

and therefore also the ones most likely to carry the burdens of digital (over-)reliance (e.g., Bagger, 2021a, 2021b; Gregg, 2013; Mullan & Wajcman, 2019). Yet, there are few studies that directly chart the problematic relations between digitalization and individual agency in such environments. The aim of this paper is to provide a differentiated view of how private and public officials, whom we broadly refer to as “white-collar workers” (see below), experience and handle *digital media reliance* at work, with a special focus on whether they think *communicative and territorial agency* are enhanced or constrained under digitalized working conditions.

We fulfil this aim by means of a nationwide online survey conducted in Sweden in 2023. Based on a principal component analysis (PCA), we identify different dispositions toward (the handling of) digital media reliance at work, and relate these dispositions to background variables. Through this empirical contribution, we open up a theoretical discussion around *post-digital territoriality* in the workplace, where “post-digital” does not denote the end of digitalization but a condition, or a stage, of mediatization, where digital norms are problematized and non-digital alternatives are increasingly valued (Adams & Jansson, 2023; Fast & Jansson, 2024). Territoriality, in turn, involves boundary-creation across multiple scales, from the bodies to buildings, and out to the cities, even to the multi-state region (such as the European union) and issues of data sovereignty (Glasze et al., 2023). Post-digital territoriality thus arises as an increasingly critical research topic with far-ranging societal implications – including power relations in the workplace – when it comes to who are able to stay in control of digital reliance and under what premises.

We pose the following research questions:

- To what extent do white-collar workers think that digital tools enhance or restrain their communicative and territorial agency?
- Is it possible to crystallize different dispositions when it comes to how white-collar workers experience and handle media reliance at work?
- How can such dispositions toward media reliance be explained in relation to demographic factors and overarching working conditions?
- How can different dispositions be understood and contextualized through self-reported levels and forms of work-related media practices?

Conceptually, our study revolves around the triangular relationship between media reliance, communicative agency and territorial agency. Our point of departure is that the implementation of new media technology under some conditions hampers rather than supports communicative agency, meaning that people at work feel that their ability to communicate efficiently and according to their own judgement is disturbed. Likewise, media reliance may have both positive and negative consequences for territorial agency, by which we mean people’s ability to claim and master certain time-spaces, in this case related to work and non-work. This is just as much about opening-up and negotiating territorial boundaries and markers, as it is about enclosure and compartmentalization.

Our terms communicative agency and territorial agency may suggest more familiar concepts such as engagements and boundaries. The latter terms imply an opposition between engagement and boundaries, with boundaries suggesting disengagement, or limits to engagement, and therefore a sort of curtailment of agency. But boundaries are created and preserved as part of agency. By framing our project around communicative agency and territorial agency we are hoping to present the two concepts as complementary manifestations of agency. Communicative agency works by connecting and disconnecting, initiating and breaking off communications directly. Territorial agency works through bounding and unbounding, and thereby including and excluding others in material contexts that render communication possible or probable. Contemporary digital platforms, especially in combination with mobile

devices, attain unprecedented affordances to dissolve spatial and temporal demarcations, for good and for bad. As a consequence, territorial agency emerges as an important means of coping with digital reliance and its slide toward dependency, inescapability, and entanglement. Territoriality therefore remains as a very old set of practices, but at the same time it takes new roles bounding, framing, and containing the impulses toward digital mediatization.

Our study is an attempt to study these conditions from within, while at the same time presenting generalizable data based on viable operationalizations of key concepts (Ekström, Fornäs, Jansson, & Jerslev, 2016). The questions we ask in the survey – a battery of 20 statements – get at the “intimate politics of everyday digital practices” (Adams, 2024), pointing to how petty acts of territorial agency may function as “coping” or “making-do” mechanisms that most of the time do not fundamentally challenge mediatization processes but rather secure the stability of day-to-day life. As such, our findings contribute not just to a refined picture of digitalized office work and post-digital territoriality, but also to a more fundamental theorization of how the dialectics of mediatization are experienced and handled on a micro level – processes that play an increasingly important part in the formation of work-related power differentials.

The paper begins with a literature review, where we position our study in relation to previous research on digitalized work. After that, we provide a more detailed account of our theoretical framework. The methods section presents the survey and how we have operationalized key concepts, as well as the main statistical techniques deployed in the analysis. The analytical part of the paper is organized according to the research questions, where the identification (via PCA) of different dispositions to media reliance among white-collar workers constitutes the central component. We use the term white-collar worker as the most appropriate translation of the Swedish term *tjänsteman*, which refers to employees who perform professional, managerial, or administrative work on different levels in both the public and private sectors. In the concluding discussion, we advance our theoretical argument regarding communicative and territorial agency in the post-digital workplace.

2. Previous research on digital reliance in office work

It is tempting to think of digital media as something that intervenes with “proper” office work. However, as Wajcman and Rose (2011) argued already over a decade ago, such an outlook fails to acknowledge that contemporary office work *is reliant on* digital technology. Their ethnographic measurement of workday episodes in an international company showed that technologically-mediated interactions dominated over face-to-face interactions during the workday and, moreover, that the knowledge workers who were studied considered mediated communication an essential feature of their jobs (Wajcman & Rose, 2011).

Yet, the fact that digital technology is inseparable from present-day office work should not obscure the truly transformative powers of digitalization. While recognizing that knowledge work has *always* relied on mediated communication, Wajcman and Rose (2011) point out that “the office worker of today inhabits a work environment that is very different to that of his or her predecessor” (p. 941). Since their study, the mediatization of work has indubitably deepened. In post-digital societies, techno-economic changes such as the platformization of work (Bagger, 2021a, 2021b; Richardson, 2021), the “smartphoneification” of work (Cavazotte, Heloisa Lemos, & Villadsen, 2014; van Zoonen, Sivunen, & Rice, 2020; Ytre-Arne, Syvertsen, Moe, & Karlsen, 2020), and technology-enabled “flexible” work arrangements have accentuated existing trends, as have new norms about how we ought to work with digital media.

The literature on digital reliance in office work and adjacent contexts is largely concerned with the causes, manifestations and effects of two key processes: the *extensification* and *intensification* of work. Both processes are regularly linked to technological transformation – notably the

normalization of digital, connective, and mobile media in working life – yet critical scholars also connect them to wider structural and cultural changes, such as the mounting *pressure* on workers to be attentive to, available on, and responsive via digital media (Gregg, 2013; Gregg, 2018; Mazmanian, Orlikowski, & Yates, 2013; Fast & Jansson, 2019). In the literature, extensification and intensification appear as distinct yet intertwined developments (e.g., Chesley, 2014; Hassard & Morris, 2022; Jarvis & Pratt, 2006; Richardson, 2018). To some extent, the concepts overlap.

Extensification refers to processes that frees work from spatial and temporal constraints. While the home-office and atypical job schedules existed long before digitalization, connectivity and digital mobile technology have normalized remote, flexibilized work. In commercial tech discourse, the standard message is that digital media now allow us to work “anytime, anywhere” (Fast, 2018). In response to such promises, critical researchers have pointed out that, for aspiring workers in competitive work cultures especially, “anytime, anywhere” tends to mean “all the time, everywhere” (Cousins & Robey, 2015: 35). In research drawing on boundary theory (e.g., Clark, 2000; Cowan & Hoffman, 2007; Seeber & Erhardt, 2023; Storch & Juarez-Paz, 2022), extensification processes are typically related to increased levels of boundary *flexibility* and *permeability*. Flexibility renders spatial and temporal borders elastic, whereas permeability can cause work to “leak” into private domains, and vice versa

Intensification is typically associated with the acceleration of work processes due to technology, and resulting feelings of time pressure, “technostress”, or work overload (e.g., Marsh, Vallejos, & Spence, 2022). Sometimes, the concept also takes into account new or semi-new work tasks triggered by, or directly emerging from, digital technology. “Digital housekeeping” (see e.g., Horst & Sinanan, 2021; Whiting & Symon, 2020) constitutes an increasingly indispensable yet mostly unrecognized type of work. It includes the never-ending work tasks that make digitalized work possible in the first place, such as the upgrading of computer software, the decluttering of digital screens, the sorting or removal of data files or apps, and the classification of emails and messages. Another category of new work tasks that, according to Richardson (2018), contributes to an intensified working life (and life more generally) is the endless “management of spatio-temporal arrangements” (p. 247) that flexible work arrangements necessitate (see also, e.g., Adkins & Premeux, 2014; Thulin & Vilhelmson, 2022; Rosengren, Bergman, & Palm, 2021). “Without static location”, writes Richardson (2018), “a greater number of tasks are required so that space can be ‘fixed’ for work” (p. 247). To fix space in this way involves designating an area of space and an interval of time in which a task will take place, as well as (increasingly) the associated means of digital access to the carved-out territory in space-time.

While the scholarly literature reproduces the narrative that both extensification and intensification processes escalate with deepened mediatization, research results are somewhat ambiguous regarding the actual correlation between these trends and increases in digital media use for work. For instance, a study by Mullan and Wajcman (2019) on the links between work extension, total work hours and subjective time pressure partly contests the direct linkage between time pressure and the use of digital devices for work.

Overall, existing research provides contradictory results regarding the perceived effects of digital media use on office workers' wellbeing and performance. For example, an interview study by Seedoyal Doarga Judhur and Hosanoo (2023) on the effects of “Bring Your Own Device” (BOYD) policies in knowledge work contexts provides multilayered insights. The authors found that the use of private mobile devices at work contributed to work-life conflict, stress, exhaustion and burnout, but also to feelings of autonomy, satisfaction, and motivation. These results are in line with findings from other studies indicating the Janus-faced character of mediatized work. Mazmanian et al. (2013) discuss these ambiguities as “the autonomy paradox”, suggesting that professionals in digitalized work contexts are constantly forced to navigate “between

their interests in personal autonomy on the one hand and their professional commitment to colleagues and clients on the other” (p. 1337). More recently, Kokshagina and Schneider (2023) framed the autonomy paradox as one out of five interrelated paradoxes that signify the digital white-collar workplace (the other four being the “information”, “interaction”, “engagement” and “opportunity” paradoxes), thereby providing even more fine-grained insights into the multi-layered tensions that exist in such work contexts.

To deal with issues like information overload and stress, the managers in Kokshagina and Schneider's (2023) study developed a number of coping mechanisms, including tactics such as switching off one's phone or prioritizing face-to-face interactions over technologically-mediated interactions. Similar forms of boundary management – through what may be called *disconnective work* (Fast, 2021) – have been identified in a number of other recent studies, further testifying to the new demands that office or knowledge workers face in the wake of digitalization (Fast & Jansson, 2019; Bossio & Holton, 2021; Šimunjak, 2022) but also raising questions about the shifting meanings of “boundaries” and “disconnection.” In the subsequent section, we theoretically extend our inquiry into the ambiguities of digital pervasiveness in the post-digital workplace.

3. Conceptualizing the post-digital workplace

As stated above, we understand the white-collar workplace as a digitally reliant space, crisscrossed by data and information, where digital housekeeping (Horst & Sinanan, 2021) and routines for regulating media (non-)use become mandatory. In the following subsections, we develop this understanding further by means of three key notions: the *post-digital*, *communicative agency* and *territorial agency*.

3.1. The post-digital

We think of the post-digital as a *social condition* emerging in response to digitalization. It is a condition (defined by space and time) in which digital communication is (a) inevitable and expected, and (b) inherently problematic, because of the ways (c) it links empowerment and appropriation to being surveilled, controlled, and subject to the planting of internalized compulsions. As such, the post-digital evolves as a dialectical counterforce *within* digitalization, rather than as a rupture with or replacement of the digital.

More specifically, the post-digital constitutes a multifaceted set of critical reactions to the *technological pervasiveness* and *social normalization* of digital media. Much critique against digital technologies targets precisely the fact that they gradually evolve into digital enclosures (Andrejevic, 2007) that make users reliant on certain infrastructures and software, which in turn foster a culture of automated surveillance (on behalf of industries) and continuous upgrading (on behalf of users). Many mobile applications have become functionally indispensable to conduct ordinary activities such as banking, parking, or making appointments. Other platforms hold the propensity to drag, or lure, people into endless streams of information whose captivating power is strengthened by means of algorithmic programming (e.g., Gerlitz & Helmond, 2013; Weltevrede et al., 2014). In particular, social media platforms are blamed for being distractive and addictive, disrupting the agency of (sometimes involuntary) users (e.g., Lupinacci, 2021). Throughout, we can see how technological pervasiveness or “enclosure” (Andrejevic, 2007), interweaves with normative structures, turning digital ways of connecting, sharing, and exchanging information into the normal ways of doing things (Gregg, 2013; Van Dijck, 2013). At workplaces, such transitions can be particularly powerful, as digital imperatives are enforced through various innovation programs and policies for maximizing efficiency and measurability in organizations. As shown in our research review, it is not uncommon that employees feel that digitalization goes too far and also replaces, or alters, work-procedures that are well-functioning, adds unwanted tasks, or limits the individual's

space for making decisions.

Technological pervasiveness and social normalization have in common that they constitute a threat to individual (and sometimes also collective) agency. Phenomena like digital unease (Fast, Jansson, & Lindell, 2021), digital irritation (Ytre-Arne & Moe, 2021), and digital resignation (Draper & Turow, 2019) – to name just a few notions that have been advanced recently – all point to everyday experiences of a shrinking, even colonized, space of self (see also Couldry & Mejias, 2019). However, while the societal responses to such social maladies of digitalization are easy to identify – ranging from political initiatives to regulate screentime for children to technological solutions intended to defy problematic media use, and corporate discourses and programs to promote “digital wellbeing” (e.g., Jorge, Amaral, & de Matos Alves, 2022; Vanden Abeele & Mohr, 2021) and voluntary forms of “digital detox” (e.g., Syvertsen & Enli, 2020) – it is a more complex matter to unpack how post-digital tendencies unfold at the micro level, in specific social settings. What should be seen as resistance to digital pervasiveness, or as a questioning of the digital norm? As Koskenniemi (2021) argues in relation to consumer culture, the question of what counts as “alternative”, “oppositional”, or “deviant”, in relation to dominant trends in society, is notoriously difficult to answer, and as a researcher one must be aware of the authority one has to influence discourses relating to what is normal and not.

In our case, pertaining to working life, we approach the post-digital as a continuum, ranging from (a) experiences of digital threats to individual agency, to (b) more or less routinized forms of coping with, or compensating for, such threats, to (c) deliberate resistance to digital pervasiveness and social norms. We argue that post-digital conditions evolve through these stages (which of course cannot be uncoupled from overarching social discourses and collective efforts to modulate digitalization) and that empirical research must therefore account *both* for the feelings signifying that agency is under pressure, *and* the forms of agency that emerge (more or less intentionally), or are called for, as solutions. Here, the rich body of disconnection scholarship, which has developed during the last decade, is particularly important to consider (e.g., Ross et al., 2024; Fast, 2021). In addition, an adequate understanding of the post-digital must account for the inevitable gains associated with digitalization. As shown in previous research (see above), digital reliance is a double-edged sword, which is experienced quite differently among different groups of workers, where most people are willing to pay a certain price in exchange for gaining extended agency in important realms of their lives. The question of agency is a complex one that requires some unpacking.

3.2. Communicative and territorial agency

The growing social prominence of digital disconnection and other forms of media withdrawal and non-use, has led to a renewed interest in agentic perspectives among media researchers (Karsay & Vandenbosch, 2021). In comparison to classical uses and gratifications approaches, as well as more hermeneutic approaches, the focus has shifted toward ways of coping with, or creating distance from, digital platforms. As given by our notion of the post-digital, questions of agency figure on two principal levels in our study. First, we are concerned with how digital reliance both *enhances* and *restrains* the (felt) agency of white-collar workers. Schematically, we may think about this as “power through” media versus the “power of” media (Adams, 2024). Second, we focus on the forms of agency that evolve in response to problematic experiences of media reliance, that is, people’s attempts at (re)gaining “power over” media (*ibid.*). On both levels, we make a theoretical distinction between communicative agency and territorial agency. Whereas communicative agency is the fundamental variable to consider in any account of mediatization processes – due to the very nature of media as means of communication – territorial agency appears as an increasingly important outcome of advanced logistical media affordances *and* as a resource for people in handling their connected lives (Adams & Jansson, 2023).

This is because of the fact that digital media have become so pervasive that efforts to adapt to social, professional, economic, political and bureaucratic demands, or to negotiate or contest those demands, almost always entail some territorial component. Stated more simply, the seemingly placeless or “virtual” quality of digital media has been thoroughly overturned and now they are everywhere, inspiring responses (again ranging from coping and compensating to deliberate resistance) that have a spatial component. One sequesters one’s devices, structures one’s space-time, or secludes oneself as a way to regain (a certain limited) control over communications.

In analyzing communicative agency among white-collar workers, we draw on Ytre-Arne and Das’s (2021) recent account of how datafication urges us to rethink the audience’s capacity to think and act independently. To do so, they elaborate an understanding of communicative agency as “interpretative, relational and increasingly prospective” (p. 781):

We thus propose that audiences’ communicative agency can be defined as capabilities to effect power potentials through interpretative engagements in everyday processes of communication, in relation to structures that take part in the same communicative processes. [...] Such capabilities are diverse, but often understood as socio-cultural, civic-political, creative or connective, or blending several of these categories, now potentially transformed by datafication. (pp. 785–86).

This is a valuable and relatively comprehensive definition. In our analysis, which is more concerned with professional media users than with “audiences”, however, we put the emphasis primarily on its relational dimension. Our focus is not on the hermeneutic practices through which people make sense of and negotiate the meanings of media texts (even though digitalization and datafication indeed change the preconditions for such practices also in the realm of work). Rather, we analyze the subsequent step: whether the appropriation of digital media enhances or restrains people’s (here, white-collar workers’) capabilities to act in relation to certain communicative goals. In the context of white-collar and knowledge work, one might specify these goals, following Ytre-Arne and Das, as the meaningful engagement in work cultures and communities (*socio-cultural*); the potential to understand and affect the governing (infra)structures of work (*civic-political*); the expression of ideas and the creation of various end products (*creative*), and the opportunities for maintaining extensive connections that can benefit personal and organizational development (*connective*).

While these are all important components of an overall understanding of how digitalization affects work, and life in general, they do not acknowledge the growing complexity of time-space relations, and the significance of territoriality in coping with these new conditions. Hanging a “TEST IN PROGRESS – DO NOT DISTURB” sign on a classroom door, or installing a digital entry system (RFID keycard reader) on the door to an office suite, are two familiar examples of territorial acts. Territoriality is, in fact, one of the most basic ways in which a person can exercise agency, whether acting as an individual, a member of a family or household, or a representative of an organization or institution. Territoriality is used to control objects, people, and relationships within an area, obviating the need to specify everything that is meant to be controlled (Sack, 1983, 56). Whatever lies within a given area is presumed to be under the control of whoever (or whatever) controls that territory. Although territory functions in much the same way whether it is exerted on behalf of an individual or a collective (such as a family, university, business, government body, and so on), most scholarship focuses on the ways in which territoriality controls people or is imposed from above, rather than how people control territories or enact territoriality from below. Indeed, it is the case that government bodies, agencies, and businesses employ territorial strategies to naturalize top-down control over people, by imposing rules, surveilling people, and undermining resistance (Sack, 1983, 60–62; Painter, 2010). However,

territoriality is simultaneously used by individuals as a means of carving out spaces for (relative) autonomy vis-à-vis other individuals and all manner of collectives, organizations, institutions, and companies. Personal agency is also legally linked to territoriality, for instance, through the legal recognition of private property (e.g., Delaney, 2005; Blomley, 2015).

While there appears to be no literature on “territorial agency” per se, a helpful approach can be found in feminist geography, which links agency to notions of care, embodiment, and ethics and calls for attention to “the multiplicity of actors, practices, and knowledges that may inform the formation, performance, and maintenance of territorial orders” (Jackman, Squire, Bruun, & Thornton, 2020, 2). This feminist intervention points us back to a foundational description of the territorial aspects of everyday life by Robert Sack: “The parent could hope to control the actions of the children regarding books, manuscripts, and note cards without telling them not to touch just these kinds of things. This could be done by telling the children that they may not go into the study without permission, that the study is off limits” (1983, 56).

The example offered by Sack is dated by the reference to note cards (rectangles of thick paper with handwritten notes, physically stacked in useful ways), but this anachronism is instructive; it points to the potential for large and small spaces of various sorts (like a home office or a box of sorted cards) to be imbricated in structures of meaning. Instead of protecting information with such a box, within the larger box of a room, the perimeter of exclusion may be collapsed to the virtual boundary of a digital platform or application reinforced by user ID codes and passwords. Again, personal agency is indicated, as shared access to information, data, and records can be controlled by an agent using code to impose a territorial effect. The gap between a parent imposing discipline on a child, a homeowner standing his (or her) ground, and a password-protected computer is striking, but the principle is the same: an agent excludes other agents, and the power to do so exerts a certain form of territoriality.

This is also to say that there is a continuous interplay between territorial and communicative agency. While we recognize that there is a theoretical distinction between these forms, in everyday practice they are often intertwined. For example, office workers may individually or jointly define specific areas of the workplace as “digitally free”, in order to establish time-spaces for, say, contemplation or concentrated conversation. Digital devices can be placed in a designated, and recognizable, “mobile phone box”, a form of micro-territorialization (Fast & Syvertsen, 2024), and meetings can be transformed into “walk-and-talk” sessions where the boundaries of office-space are loosened up and communication is freed from digital reliance. Interestingly, little has been written about such manifestations of territoriality, although in his summary Delaney mentions that territoriality has a “performative or semiotic aspect” (2005, 47) and notes a relational sense where territory appears less as “an inert ‘thing’ and more as an aspect of various dimensions of social life” (2005, 15). Our study will shed further light on these matters.

4. Methods

This study is part of the ongoing research project, *Measuring Mediatization, Stage 2*, in which survey research is deployed to chart the mediatization of everyday life in Sweden. To grasp post-digital developments, Sweden is allegedly a relevant country to study due to its high level of digital uptake in businesses and organizations as well as in private life. According to Eurostat (2024), Sweden is among the very top countries when it comes to digitalization of businesses, including buying cloud computing services. The data underpinning the current analyses were gathered in February 2023 via Kantar Sifo's online panel, including Swedish citizens aged 18 years and older. The total sample contains 13,243 persons, out of which 2403 persons responded to the web-based questionnaire (18 % answering rate). In our data file, the material has been weighted to provide a representative sample of the Swedish adult

population. In a subsequent step, we filtered the sample to include only *white-collar workers* who are *currently employed*, which provided us with a sample of 927 respondents. This was based on self-reported occupation, where the Swedish word *tjänsteman* is translated as white-collar worker. Within this category, 7 % stated that they are white-collar workers with a senior managerial function (leader of company or organization); 16 % that they have some other managerial function, and 77 % that they are white-collar workers without any managerial function.

The survey question analyzed for this study includes 20 statements which the respondents were asked to rate. The statements were formulated to capture aspects of post-digital territoriality in working life. As discussed above, this means that we wanted to capture elements of fractured communicative and territorial agency due to digital reliance, as well as potential measures to counter such experiences. In order to assess the social impetus of such critical attitudes, we also included statements that indicate positive experiences of digital media reliance. Each statement was assessed on a four-graded scale from “do not agree at all” to “fully agree”. Table 1 presents a list of all statements, including mean values and standard deviation for each item. Here, we have marked all statements representing digitally enabled agency (“positive media reliance”) in green; statements representing digitally disrupted agency (“negative media reliance”) in red; and statements representing digital counter-agency (“negotiated media reliance”) in yellow.

Table 1 shows that the introduction of digital technology at work is, by and large, understood as a good thing among white-collar workers; something that sustains more flexible working conditions and thus improved communicative and territorial agency. If we look at the mean values (translated from an ordinal scale), it is much less common to have negative experiences of digital reliance. This may seem to speak against much of the research undertaken on digital work, especially with qualitative approaches, which rather emphasizes how flexibility fosters “technostress” and over-extension (e.g., Cousins & Robey, 2015; Kokshagina & Schneider, 2023; Marsh et al., 2022). While it is important to keep the “positive balance” in mind and not exaggerate the prevalence of post-digital counterforces, however, our data *also* show significant levels of frustration, tension and negotiation. As told by the red areas in Table 1, it is relatively common to feel distracted by email and tempted to look at things online. Likewise, turning to the yellow areas, it is common to have routines for managing email at work and to monitor, or delimit, the inclusion of digital media into one's work space in order to avoid disturbances.

In the following steps, we use SPSS to analyze the material by means of principal component analysis (PCA) in order to make the data more manageable. This means that we extract underlying patterns within the responses, leading to factor scores, or dimensions, that are independent from one another. In this way, we can unveil how different attitudes to digital reliance come together as more or less distinct *dispositions*. First, we conducted a PCA pertaining to all white-collar workers in our sample ($N = 927$). The factor scores were then saved as new variables according to the regression score model (DiStefano, Zu, & Mindrila, 2009). This enabled us to study if and how different background variables play into the formation of dispositions toward digital reliance. The overall mean for each new variable is 0 and the standard deviation is 1. A score of 1 or -1 would thus imply a very strong positive or negative effect of a certain independent variable on a certain disposition. Finally, we conducted correlation analyses including the factor variables and a selection of work-related territorial and communicative practices.

5. Findings

Based on a PCA including all 20 statements, we could identify five dispositions toward digital reliance at work. Since the underlying statements include experiences, attitudes and practices, we use the term “disposition” to capture what the factors are about. For communicative purposes, we label the dispositions here according to their key traits.

Table 1

Statements capturing experiences of digital reliance among white-collar workers in Sweden (mean and std. deviation; $N = 927$).

<i>Experiences of digital reliance at work</i>	Mean	Std dev
Online meeting spaces are important to me in my work	3.04	1.00
I like to use digital media when I want to take a break from work	2.63	0.90
I enjoy testing new digital tools	2.54	0.89
Digital media makes it possible for me to plan work in a good way	2.49	1.01
I have routines for when I manage my email	2.48	1.03
Thanks to digital media I am free to work where I want	2.36	1.11
Thanks to digital media I am free to work when I want	2.09	1.04
I'm often tempted to check things online during worktime even though I shouldn't	1.99	0.87
I avoid certain digital media to gain peace at work	1.96	0.95
I regularly put away, turn off or put my mobile on flight mode when I don't want to be disturbed at work	1.94	1.05
I'm distracted by email in my work	1.93	0.88
I experience that it has become more and more important to find alternatives to digital media and tools in my job	1.86	0.91
I feel that it takes too much time to learn how new digital media and tools work	1.83	0.85
In my job, I usually prefer analog media (e.g., paper) over digital media	1.79	0.83
Digital media makes it difficult for me to delimit my working time	1.73	0.84
Due to digital media and tools, I have got new working tasks that I don't like	1.69	0.83
Due to digital media, I have too little contact with people in my work	1.65	0.81
I'm distracted by social media in my work	1.64	0.78
Due to digital media, I sometimes feel a need to go away to work in peace	1.55	0.80
Digital media make me feel surveilled at work	1.54	0.75

The mean values are translations from an ordinal scale where 1 means “do not agree at all”; 2 means “agree to a low degree; 3 means “agree to a high degree”, and 4 means “fully agree”.

Each of them represents an inclination among respondents to relate and act in a certain way toward digital media in the context of work. The five factors together explain 53 % of the variance, which is most often described as low explanatory power in the statistical literature, but is in fact an acceptable level in the humanities and behavioral sciences (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). As given by Table 2, while the explained variance of Factor 1 is 16 %, Factor 5 only explains 6 % of the variance. The former disposition is thus more distinct and has a stronger effect on how respondents assess the statements.

Factor 1 denotes a sense of fractured communicative and territorial agency and a *skeptical disposition* toward digital media in the workplace. It captures experiences of being surveilled and distracted (by email), as well as an inclination to avoid certain media to gain peace at work. By and large, while keeping in mind that most people agree to a rather low degree with the statements making up this disposition (see Table 1), Factor 1 corresponds in interesting ways with post-digital tendencies in society.

Factor 2, by contrast, represents an *embracing disposition*, where digitalization is taken as a trajectory toward improved communicative and territorial agency. Here, digital media reliance is associated with opportunities for flexible work conditions and positive experiences of interacting with people online.

Factor 3 seems to describe a disposition revolving around digital *captivation*. It captures experiences of lost agency, for example when it comes to delimiting one's working time, and a sense of compulsion related to social media platforms and other online temptations that may distract the office worker. Compared to Factor 1, which is mainly about external pressures and demands, Factor 3 gets at the internal(ized) dimensions of digital compulsion. In other words, these factors represent different experiences of what it means to lose communicative and/or territorial agency.

Factor 4 denotes a generally negative, or *reluctant*, disposition

toward digital tools and an inclination to reject – or, feel constrained by – this type of technology. Whereas this factor shares some traits with Factor 1, especially the experience that it takes too much time to learn about new digital technology (relatively high correlation with both factors), it does not articulate any form of counter-measure in relation to digital reliance.

Factor 5, finally, represents a disposition among white-collar workers to take control over their digital media through *discipline* and routines.

Saving the five factor solutions as new variables (see Methods section) makes it possible to analyze the underlying impact of background variables. The most important finding here is that the work context plays a key role in forming these dispositions. Table 3 shows, among other things, the role of occupational sector and the existence of organizational policies for digital media use at work. One can see that whereas the skeptical and embracing dispositions (Factors 1 and 2) are *not common* in the healthcare/medicine and pedagogical sectors, the opposite holds for the reluctant and disciplined dispositions (Factors 4 and 5). These are sectors where much work is oriented toward clients (e.g., pupils and patients) and where the use of digital platforms, especially on privately owned devices, is regulated by the organization. Accordingly, as Table 3 shows, workers who state that they have routines for their media use (Factor 5) are probably referring not just to their own judgements but also to the fact that their jobs are shaped by rules and guidelines. At the other end of the spectrum, respondents who experience that digital media give them temporal and spatial flexibility, and opportunities to coordinate their work efficiently (Factor 2), can be found especially in media, journalism and marketing, and in organizations where there are no regulations as to how private mobile devices should be used in relation to work and where users craft their own media use routines.

When it comes to demographic factors, an important finding is that

Table 2
Five dispositions toward digital reliance at work (PCA).

Felt consequences of digital reliance:	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
Feel a need to escape	0.737	0.022	0.094	-0.131	0.020
Get new and unwanted working tasks	0.643	-0.119	0.130	0.312	-0.008
Feel surveilled at work	0.641	0.002	-0.008	0.171	0.038
Lose contact with people	0.640	0.197	0.013	0.086	-0.078
Avoid certain digital media to gain peace	0.603	-0.003	0.080	0.050	0.255
Distracted by email	0.477	0.030	0.358	-0.065	-0.180
Important to find alternatives to digital tools	0.458	0.133	0.131	0.108	0.269
Feel free to work where I want	0.092	0.865	0.110	-0.120	-0.031
Feel free to work when I want	0.053	0.855	0.109	-0.024	0.040
Easier to plan work	-0.028	0.747	0.071	-0.141	0.108
Online meeting spaces are important	0.187	0.490	0.022	-0.400	-0.192
Distracted by social media	0.265	-0.041	0.737	0.006	-0.007
Take a break with digital media	-0.190	0.257	0.632	0.017	0.092
Tempted to check things online	0.119	0.029	0.805	0.034	-0.060
Difficult to delimit working time	0.380	0.247	0.482	-0.027	0.017
Enjoy testing new digital tools	0.070	0.213	0.080	-0.708	0.161
Too much time to learn new digital tools	0.391	-0.056	0.050	0.635	-0.075
Prefer analog over digital	0.208	-0.069	0.060	0.663	0.180
Regularly putting away mobile during work	0.119	-0.158	0.066	0.113	0.711
Email routines	0.005	0.201	-0.115	-0.147	0.674
<i>Explained variance (Total 53 %):</i>	<i>16 %</i>	<i>13 %</i>	<i>10 %</i>	<i>9 %</i>	<i>6 %</i>

Rotation method; Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

gender does *not* have any significant effect on any of the dispositions (and is thus not shown in the table). One can only speculate about the reasons to this; one factor might be that gender equality is high in Sweden, also when it comes to economic opportunities, (World Economic Forum, 2023). Age has a positive effect on the reluctant disposition (Factor 4), while a negative effect on the captivated disposition (Factor 3). That means it is particularly common among young white-collar workers to experience internal compulsion to seek entertainment by digital media, whereas older respondents are more inclined to reject digital technologies in favor of analog alternatives. In socioeconomic terms, education has a significant effect only on Factor 3, indicating foremost that people with lower education, who are generally older, are less inclined to feel captivated, or trapped, by social media and other online content than other people. White-collar workers with lower incomes are less likely to experience a sense of digital agency (Factor 2), while more likely to dislike the implementation of digital tools at work (Factor 4).

An important finding in Table 3, is that the skeptical and embracing dispositions (Factor 1 and Factor 2) expose somewhat similar patterns. Both dispositions tend to include people in finance, retail, administration, technology, construction, and manufacturing, suggesting that people in these occupational sectors are more likely to feel *both ways*, or perhaps that these environments tend to produce polarized feelings, depending on the individual. This suggests, in turn, that people depend intensely on digital technologies in these sectors, which prompts workers to feel both empowered and enabled by digital technologies and burdened and obligated by digital technologies. We return to the theoretical implications of this in the Discussion section.

In order to get a richer understanding of what the different dispositions stand for, that is, how they are socially intertwined with other

work-related practices, we have analyzed the *correlations* between the five factor variables and how respondents rate a number of other statements that were included in our survey (Table 4). None of these statements are thus to be seen as explanatory factors. The first battery of statements concerns *where* people have worked during the last six months, and thus gives us more detailed information about territorial agency. The list of workplaces in Table 4 was exploratory composed in order to capture a variety of non-office-based work, where for example working from home is likely to denote a different disposition and/or a different set of resources than working in a vacation house or on a bus. It should be noted that employees in Sweden were no longer affected by Covid restrictions at the time of the survey (February 2023), meaning that the results largely reflect elective forms of mobile or remote work. The second battery concerns to what extent people use different digital media during worktime, for either professional or private purposes, and thus illuminates how different media may crisscross the boundaries of work and non-work. Finally, we have looked at two items indicating whether people are inclined to disconnect from digital media when they are at home, or rather see their devices as a source of joy and diversion. While in the former case, the home place is constructed as a territorial shelter from digital flows, the latter disposition denotes a sense of everyday comfort based on positive communicative agency.

Generally, the correlations are on a low level (below 0.3), but we can still provide significant and interesting characteristics of each disposition. The skeptical disposition (Factor 1) is characterized by an inclination to disconnect from digital media in the home, and *not* using devices for relaxation. In Factor 1 we also find the strongest correlation with having worked in a vacation house. This underscores the ambition to cope with felt digital pressures at work, presumably reacting defensively against intensification. Going to a vacation home is a relatively privileged form of territorial agency—demonstrating that one can physically remove oneself from the spaces where one feels an obligation to deal with work tasks.

The embracing disposition (Factor 2) is marked by engaging extensively with a variety of digital tools during worktime, for private and professional purposes. It also correlates strongly with working in a home office, and correlates positively to all workplaces mentioned in the survey. This confirms the picture of a deeply digitalized workstyle where flexibility and extensification are embraced. It also demonstrates a territorial agency opposite to that in the skeptical disposition. The worker actively creates a work environment overlapping or closely adjacent to his/her living environment.

The captivated disposition (Factor 3) is characterized by using digital media – especially social media, chat search engine and email – for *private purposes* during worktime. This adds to the above-described picture of internal compulsion to blur the lines between work and leisure, and the challenges that white-collar workers face to re-establish beneficial territorial boundaries.

The reluctant disposition (Factor 4) is characterized by being less digitalized than the other dispositions. Especially, it correlates negatively with using video-calls, chat and digital calendar as part of work.

The disciplined disposition (Factor 5), finally, hardly exposes any significant correlations, adding to its relatively diffuse character, but is positively correlated to turning off or putting away digital devices when at home. This also demonstrates territorial agency, but through exclusion of work from home rather than inclusion of work in home. This aligns with the inclination to handle digital media through routines, and, as shown in Table 3, internalized rules and regulations. It does this in a way that contrasts with the reluctant disposition in Factor 3.

6. Discussion

This article, and the empirical study informing it, emerged from a desire of ours to better grasp the post-digital workplace and its paradoxical nature. Our point of departure was the assumption that new media technology can both hamper and amplify workers' agency (e.g.,

Table 3
Influence of demographic factors and working conditions on the five dispositions (means).

	N	Dispositions				
		1. <i>Skeptical</i>	2. <i>Embracing</i>	3. <i>Captivated</i>	4. <i>Reluctant</i>	5. <i>Disciplined</i>
Age 18–29	70			0.32	–0.31	
Age 30–49	323			0.13	–0.05	
Age 50–64	183			–0.34	0.18	
Education low	77			–0.33		
Education medium	118			0.05		
Education high	388			0.05		
Income low	28		–0.40		0.41	
Income medium low	187		–0.22		–0.02	
Income medium high	265		0.15		0.02	
Income high	86		0.15		–0.28	
<i>Work sector (categories with < 10 respondents excluded):</i>						
Finance, retail, administration	117	0.15	0.17		–0.10	–0.05
Hotel, restaurant, service, beauty	11	0.28	–0.21		–0.13	0.29
Healthcare, medicine	43	–0.30	–0.69		0.33	0.20
Technology, construction, manufacturing, transportation	152	0.12	0.16		0.06	–0.08
Media, journalism, advertising	17	0.06	0.38		–0.15	–0.18
Natural sciences, computation	34	0.03	0.16		–0.37	–0.36
Pedagogics	58	–0.37	–0.34		0.45	0.35
Social sciences, law	31	0.17	–0.02		–0.13	0.16
Social work, psychology	42	–0.03	–0.28		0.25	–0.02
<i>Organizational media regulations (Yes)</i>						
Not allowed to use private phone at work	57		–0.31			
Rules for where private phones can be used	80	–0.10	–0.57			0.39
Rules for when private phones can be used	73	–0.27	–0.41	–0.29		
Rules for how to use social media at work	186			–0.15		
Rules for when to send email	47					0.29

The table displays only significant effects at the 0.05 level (ANOVA). The overall mean for each dependent variable = 0.

Kokshagina & Schneider, 2023; Mazmanian et al., 2013). We anticipated that in times of constant connectivity, people might feel compelled to actively create time-spaces for (temporary or partial) disconnection, or at least find spatial and temporal routines for restricting their use of digital tools to fight unwanted boundary leakages. We referred to this as post-digital territoriality (Adams & Jansson, 2023). Our aim was to provide a fine-grained understanding of how white-collar workers experience and handle digital media reliance at work, especially whether they think *communicative* and *territorial* agency are enhanced or constrained under digitalized working conditions. To do so, we completed a nationwide online survey in Sweden in 2023, addressing a wide spectrum of experiences, attitudes and practices pertaining to (the handling of) digital media reliance at work. A principal component analysis (PCA) revealed five distinct yet partly overlapping dispositions in this regard. The factors were subsequently related to background variables as well as work-related territorial and communicative practices.

Through these measures, we arrived at a complex understanding of digitalized white-collar work, one that effectively debunks any idea that such work represents *one* coherent category. Roughly, the five key dispositions reflect inclinations toward digital media that could be classified as *skeptical* (Factor 1), *embracing* (Factor 2), *captivated* (Factor 3), *reluctant* (Factor 4) and *disciplined* (Factor 5). Thus, while digital media reliance is appreciated by many informants, our data also reveals different facets of “digital unease”, similar to those reported in other mediatization studies (Fast, Jansson, & Lindell, 2021). Our contextualizing analysis suggests that work sector plays a key role in determining these dispositions.

What we acknowledge as post-digital sentiments and tactics are particularly constitutive of the skeptical disposition (Factor 1), reflecting inclinations to, for example, avoid certain digital media, find alternatives to digital tools and *not* use digital devices for relaxation, but

potentially also in the disciplined (Factor 5) which encompasses internalized (and possibly also externalized) routines for mobile phone use and email. Such routines could possibly be understood as a post-digital response to the side-effects of digital media reliance and an urge to carve out disconnected micro-spaces in a world of endless connectivity (Adams, 2024; Adams & Jansson, 2023). However, tackling the side-effects of digital media reliance seems difficult. Our data suggests that territorial agency is perceived more of a challenge than an achievement – for *most* white-collar workers, regardless of their fundamental attitudes toward technology. People indicating that it is “difficult to delimit working time” weigh positively on four out of five factors (the reluctant disposition being the only exception), suggesting that the task of creating self-supporting boundaries – and ultimately post-digital territories – remains a tough one.

In the end, our findings contribute not just to a refined picture of (post-)digitalized office work, but also to a more robust theorization of how the dialectics of mediatization are perceived and tackled on a micro level, or “from within” (Jansson, Bengtsson, Fast, & Lindell, 2021). Such knowledge, as we have argued, is particularly important to the extent that it can help us understand the role of media in work-related power dynamics. The relevance of a dialectical approach to mediatization is particularly evident in relation to certain findings. As shown, the skeptical and the embracing dispositions (Factors 1 and 2) share similar traits, especially in terms of working conditions. The respondents work in sectors that are deeply mediatized and where users have greater freedom to make up their own media routines (and are responsible for doing so, in absence of collective solutions). Still, they emphasize opposing inclinations toward digital media: negative versus positive. This suggests that the dialectical tension is particularly accentuated in work sectors where digital media reliance is strong and individualized. Individuals in these sectors – though equally reliant on digital media, as it seems – are inclined to emphasize different sides of this balance. In

Table 4
Correlations between factor variables and work-related territorial and communicative practices among white-collar workers (2-tailed significant correlations, Pearson's R).

	Dispositions				
	1. <i>Skeptical</i>	2. <i>Embracing</i>	3. <i>Captivated</i>	4. <i>Reluctant</i>	5. <i>Disciplined</i>
<i>Places of work (6-step scale; On a daily basis → Never)</i>					
Having worked in home office during last six months		.485		-.160	
Having worked in hotel /hotel apartment during last six months	.140	.118	.132		
Having worked in library during last six months		.124			
Having worked in café/restaurant during last six months		.167			
Having worked in vacation house during last six months	.189	.140			
Having worked in a coworking space during last six months		.154			
Having worked on bus/train/station during last six months		.114			
Having worked on airplane/airport during last six months	.135	.131			
<i>Digital practices at work (5-step scale; Several times a day → Less often than once a week)</i>					
Using email as a part of work		.165		-.180	
Using email for private purposes during worktime		.223	.244		
Using social media as a part of work		.178			
Using social media for private purposes during worktime			.385		
Using digital calendar as a part of work	.113	.276		-.275	
Using digital calendar for private purposes during worktime		.221	.161		
Using chat functions/SMS as a part of work		.238		-.258	
Using chat functions/SMS for private purposes during worktime		.180	.306	-.153	
Using voice call as a part of work	.117				
Using voice call for private purposes during worktime		.198	.118		
Using video calls as a part of work	.190	.390		-.316	
Using video calls for private purposes during worktime	.134	.141	.109		
Using search engine as a part of work		.226	.144	-.145	
Using search engine for private purposes during worktime		.199	.280		
Using cloud service as a part of work	.143	.273		-.183	
Using cloud service for private purposes during worktime	.129	.225	.128	-.136	.160
<i>Digital devices at home: (8-step scale; Several times a day → Never)</i>					
Turning off or putting away digital devices at home to get peace	.243				.217
Relaxing at home with digital device	-.209	.123	.159		

Correlations stronger than 0.2 are marked in grey.

other words: mediatization – under certain conditions – *polarizes*. One person's capacity to appropriate and utilize digital media extensively for work-related purposes can be experienced by another person as a pressure of digital media, acting on them and opposing or constraining their agency. Ultimately, findings like these verify what mediatization researchers have argued elsewhere: that every increase in capability of some kind (e.g., media-induced flexibility) comes with a cost in another field or dimension (e.g., work intensification or extensibility). This pertains to what has been conceptualized as the “transactional” form of media reliance or layer of mediatization (Jansson, 2018).

In relation to the polarizing element of mediatization, we should point out, however, that the digital media disposition in Factor 1 (the skeptical) is not simply telling about a disinclination toward digital media per se (since that shows up mainly in Factor 4, the reluctant) but instead has to do with how people experience the expectations and demands coming down on them *through* digital media. Simply put: digital

media might be more of a problem because it enables others (e.g., colleagues, supervisors, or higher-level administrators) to influence or make demands on you, rather than just being a new, “distracting”, technology.

We are content with the fact that our survey design allows us to provide these nuances regarding *why* digital media (reliance) might trigger skepticism, reluctance or other negative sentiments. Nonetheless, our research design has weaknesses that affect the study's validity negatively. Perhaps most importantly, we cannot be sure how people interpret the word “digital media” (as in our main survey question). From qualitative studies that we ourselves have conducted, we know that people tend to be rather traditional and narrow in their understanding of media (e.g., including newspapers or mobile phones in their media definition but excluding, for example, digital administrative systems or measurement tools). Another limitation is that our study does not reveal the impact of household or family conditions. We appreciate

that the domestic context, and how people cope with media reliance in relation to household- and family-related obligations (e.g., Ytre-Arne, 2023) may have a significant effect on how people experience digital reliance also at work, including their sense of (fractured) communicative agency and (in)ability to disconnect.

The latter point is particularly important if we want to deepen our understanding of post-digital territoriality. While our findings suggest that post-digital dispositions toward media reliance (in the white-collar workplace) are articulated through skepticism and discipline – meaning that concrete measures are taken to handle (ambiguous feelings of) digital pervasiveness – such measures are not bound to the workplace per se (at least not in the traditional sense). On the contrary, territorial measures to avoid or compensate for the digital extensification and intensification of work oftentimes involve spaces and places *beyond* the office. For example, as shown in Table 4, a sign of post-digital territoriality, associated with both the skeptical and the disciplined disposition, is to construct the home-place as a digitally “clean” territory where boundaries can be maintained. Similarly, it is a sign of post-digital territoriality to search for alternative spaces of work and leisure (such as, a vacation house or a coworking space), where normalized digital obligations can be managed more independently. This means that future research on post-digital territoriality must actively challenge compartmentalized thinking, and try to encompass how different social domains, as well as concrete places, are entangled, remediated and recoded not just *through* digitalization, but also *in response to* digitalization. The findings presented here can hence serve as a useful framework for analyzing the post-digital workplace as a multi-sited phenomenon.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

André Jansson: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Validation, Resources, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Karin Fast:** Writing – original draft, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Paul C. Adams:** Writing – original draft, Investigation, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interests pertaining to this submission.

Acknowledgement

This article was co-funded by grants from the *Swedish Research Council*, grant number 2020-01928, and the *Anne-Marie and Gustav Ander Foundation for Media Research*.

References

- Adams, P. C. (2024). The intimate politics of everyday digital practices: Entangling and disentangling. *Political Geography*, 111, 103091.
- Adams, P. C., & Jansson, A. (2023). Post-digital territoriality: Disentangling from digital media as a return to place. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 113(3), 658–674.
- Adkins, C. L., & Premeux, S. A. (2014). The use of communication technology to manage work-home boundaries. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 15(2), 82–100.
- Andrejevic, M. (2007). *iSpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. University Press of Kansas.
- Bagger, C. (2021a). Social media and work: A framework of eight intersections. *International Journal of Communication*, 15, 20.
- Bagger, C. (2021b). An organisational cultivation of digital resignation? Enterprise social media, privacy, and autonomy. *Nordicom Review*, 42(S4), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nor-2021-0049>
- Blomley, N. (2015). The territory of property. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(5), 593–609.
- Bossio, D., & Holton, A. E. (2021). Burning out and turning off: Journalists' disconnection strategies on social media. *Journalism*, 22(10), 2475–2492.
- Cavazotte, F., Heloisa Lemos, A., & Villadsen, K. (2014). Corporate smart phones: Professionals' conscious engagement in escalating work connectivity. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 29(1), 72–87.
- Chesley, N. (2014). Information and communication technology use, work intensification and employee strain and distress. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(4), 589–610.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). Data colonialism: Rethinking big data's relation to the contemporary subject. *Television and New Media*, 20(4), 336–349.
- Cousins, K., & Robey, D. (2015). Managing work-life boundaries with mobile technologies: An interpretive study of mobile work practices. *Information Technology & People*, 28(1), 34–71.
- Cowan, R., & Hoffman, M. F. (2007). The flexible organization: How contemporary employees construct the work/life border. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 8(1), 37–44.
- Delaney, D. (2005). *Territory: A short introduction*. Blackwell.
- DiStefano, C., Zu, M., & Mindrila, D. (2009). Understanding and using factor scores: Considerations for the applied researcher. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 14(20).
- Draper, N. A., & Turow, J. (2019). The corporate cultivation of digital resignation. *New Media & Society*, 21(8), 1824–1839.
- Ekström, M., Fornäs, J., Jansson, A., & Jerslev, A. (2016). Three tasks for mediatization research: Contributions to an open agenda. *Media, Culture and Society*, 38(7), 1090–1108.
- Eurostat. (2024). Digitalization in Europe – 2024 edition. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/interactive-publications/digitalisation-2024#technology-uptake-in-bu-sinences>.
- Fast, K. (2018). A discursive approach to mediatization: Corporate technology discourse and the trope of medi indispensability. *Media and Communication*, 6(2), 15–28.
- Fast, K. (2021). The disconnection turn: Three facets of disconnection work in post-digital capitalism. *Convergence*, 27(6), 1615–1630.
- Fast, K., & Jansson, A. (2019). *Transmedia Work: Privilege and Precariousness in Digital Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Fast, K., & Jansson, A. (2024). Working in the comfort zone: Understanding coworking spaces as post-digital, post-work and post-tourist territories. *Digital Geography and Society*, 7, 100103.
- Fast, K., Jansson, A., & Lindell, J. (2021). Disconnection as distinction. A Bourdieusian study of where people withdraw from digital media. In A. Jansson, & P. C. Adams (Eds.), *Disentangling: The Geographies of Digital Disconnection*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fast, K., & Syvertsen, T. (2024). Post-digital consumption: The controversy surrounding the mobile phone box as a means of disconnection. In K. Albris, K. Fast, F. Karlsen, A. Kaun, S. Lomborg, & T. Syvertsen (Eds.), *The Digital Backlash and the Paradoxes of Disconnection*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Gerlitz, C., & Helmond, A. (2013). The like economy: Social buttons and the data-intensive web. *New Media & Society*, 15(8), 1348–1365.
- Glazze, G., Cattaruzza, A., Douzet, F., Dammann, F., Bertran, M. G., Bömönt, C., ... Grumbach, S. (2023). Contested spatialities of digital sovereignty. *Geopolitics*, 28(2), 919–958.
- Gregg, M. (2013). *Work's intimacy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gregg, M. (2018). *Counterproductive. time management in the knowledge economy*. Duke university press.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hassard, J., & Morris, J. (2022). The extensification of managerial work in the digital age: Middle managers, spatio-temporal boundaries and control. *Human Relations*, 75(9), 1647–1678.
- Horst, H., & Sinanan, J. (2021). Digital housekeeping: Living with data. *New Media & Society*, 23(4), 834–852.
- Jackman, A., Squire, R., Bruun, J., & Thornton, P. (2020). Unearthing feminist territories and terrains. *Political Geography*, 80, Article 102180.
- Jansson, A. (2018). *Mediatization and mobile lives: A critical approach*. London: Routledge.
- Jansson, A., Bengtsson, S., Fast, K., & Lindell, J. (2021). Mediatization from within: A plea for emic approaches to media-related social change. *Communication Theory*, 31(4), 956–977.
- Jarvis, H., & Pratt, A. C. (2006). Bringing it all back home: The extensification and ‘overflowing’ of work: The case of San Francisco’s new media households. *Geoforum*, 37(3), 331–339.
- Jorge, A., Amaral, I., & de Matos Alves, A. (2022). “Time well spent”: The ideology of temporal disconnection as a means for digital well-being. *International Journal of Communication*, 16, 1551–1572.
- Karlsen, F., & Ytre-Arne, B. (2022). Intrusive media and knowledge work: How knowledge workers negotiate digital media norms in the pursuit of focused work. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(15), 2174–2189.
- Karsay, K., & Vandenbosch, L. (2021). Endlessly connected: Moving forward with agentic perspectives of mobile media (non-) use. *Mass Communication and Society*, 24(6), 779–794.
- Kokshagina, O., & Schneider, S. (2023). The digital workplace: Navigating in a jungle of paradoxical tensions. *California Management Review*, 65(2), 129–155.
- Koskenniemi, A. (2021). Deviant consumption meets consumption-as-usual: The construction of deviance and normality within consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 21(4), 827–847.
- Lupinacci, L. (2021). ‘Absentmindedly scrolling through nothing’: Liveness and compulsory continuous connectedness in social media. *Media, Culture and Society*, 43(2), 273–290.

- Marsh, E., Vallejos, E. P., & Spence, A. (2022). The digital workplace and its dark side: An integrative review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 128, Article 107118.
- Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1337–1357.
- Mullan, K., & Wajcman, J. (2019). Have mobile devices changed working patterns in the 21st century? A time-diary analysis of work extension in the UK. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), 3–20.
- Painter, J. (2010). Rethinking territory. *Antipode*, 42(5), 1090–1118.
- Richardson, L. (2018). Feminist geographies of digital work. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(2), 244–263.
- Richardson, L. (2021). Coordinating office space: Digital technologies and the platformization of work. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 39(2), 347–365.
- Rosengren, C., Bergman, A., & Palm, K. (2021). ICT enforced boundary work: Availability as a Sociomaterial practice. In M. Will-Zocholl, & C. Roth-Ebner (Eds.), *Topologies of digital work. Dynamics of virtual work*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ross, M. Q., Gilbert, A., Klingelhofer, J., Matassi, M., Nassen, L. M., Van Bruyssel, S., ... Parry, D. A. (2024). Mapping a pluralistic continuum of approaches to digital disconnection. *Media, Culture and Society*, 46(4), 851–862.
- Sack, R. D. (1983). Human territoriality: A theory. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 73(1), 55–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1983.tb01396.x>
- Schaefer, S., Andersson, M., Bjarnason, E., & Hansson, K. (2018). *Working and organizing in the digital age. The Pufendorf Institute for Advanced Studies*. Lund University.
- Seeber, I., & Erhardt, J. (2023). Working from home with flexible and permeable boundaries: Exploring the role of digital workplace tools for job satisfaction. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 65(3), 277–292.
- Seedoyal Doarga judhur, M., & Hosanoo, Z. (2023). Te mobile technology era: Insights into the consequences of constant connectivity of personal devices by knowledge workers. *Information Technology and People*, 36(2), 701–733.
- Šimunjak, M. (2022). “You have to do that for your own sanity”: Digital disconnection as journalists’ coping and preventive strategy in managing work and well-being. *Digital Journalism*, 1–20.
- Storch, S. L., & Juarez-Paz, A. V. O. (2022). Influence of professional mobile device usage on work/family border theory. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 10(3), 510–530.
- Syvvertsen, T., & Enli, G. (2020). Digital detox: Media resistance and the promise of authenticity. *Convergence*, 26(5–6), 1269–1283.
- Thulin, E., & Vilhelmson, B. (2022). Pacesetters in contemporary telework: How smartphones and mediated presence reshape the time–space rhythms of daily work. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 37(2), 250–269.
- Van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.
- Vanden Abeele, M. M., & Mohr, V. (2021). Media addictions as Apparateist: What discourse on TV and smartphone addiction reveals about society. *Convergence*, 27(6), 1536–1557.
- Wajcman, J., & Rose, E. (2011). Constant connectivity: Rethinking interruptions at work. *Organization Studies*, 32(7), 941–961.
- Weltevrede, E., Helmond, A., & Gerlitz, C. (2014). The politics of real-time: A device perspective on social media platforms and search engines. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 31(6), 125–150.
- Whiting, R., & Symon, G. (2020). Digi-housekeeping: The invisible work of flexibility. *Work, Employment and Society*, 34(6), 1079–1096.
- World Economic Forum. (2023). *Global Gender Gap Report 2023*. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-gender-gap-report-2023/in-full/benchmarking-gender-gaps-2023/>.
- Ytre-Arne, B. (2023). *Media use in digital everyday life*. Emerald Publishing.
- Ytre-Arne, B., & Das, R. (2021). Audiences’ communicative agency in a datafied age: Interpretative, relational and increasingly prospective. *Communication Theory*, 31(4), 779–797.
- Ytre-Arne, B., & Moe, H. (2021). Folk theories of algorithms: Understanding digital irritation. *Media, Culture and Society*, 43(5), 807–824.
- Ytre-Arne, B., Syvvertsen, T., Moe, H., & Karlsen, F. (2020). Temporal ambivalences in smartphone use: Conflicting flows, conflicting responsibilities. *New Media & Society*, 22(9), 1715–1732.
- van Zoonen, W., Sivunen, A., & Rice, R. E. (2020). Boundary communication: How smartphone use after hours is associated with work-life conflict and organizational identification. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 48(3), 372–392.