Digital-free Tourism: the state-of-art and future research directions

Wenjie Cai, University of Greenwich, UK w.cai@greenwich.ac.uk

Brad McKenna, University of East Anglia, UK b.mckenna@uea.ac.uk

Abstract

Technology is used for a wide variety of activities in tourism. However, the overwhelming use of technology in our everyday lives has resulted in a growing disconnection movement for people who desire to resist digital technology. Digital-free tourism (DFT) has become an increasingly popular phenomenon. The focus of DFT studies thus far is on the consumer side. For example, millennials and digital wellbeing, escape, personal growth, mindfulness, technostress, relaxation, and emotions. This chapter suggests a future research agenda, for example, linking DFT with nature-based tourism, quality of life, digital wellbeing, and sustainability. Some practical applications of DFT are suggested such as helping with Zoom fatigue, adopting DFT in tourism operations, or rebranding opportunities for destinations. The chapter closes with future trends of DFT such as new business opportunities, growing adoption across tourism and hospitality services, or combined with other forms of tourism such as slow, rural, spa, or adventure tourism.

Keywords: digital-free tourism, digital detox, digital wellbeing, unplugged, disconnect

Introduction

Digital technologies have transformed tourism in various aspects and have become increasingly adopted by providers (Cai et al., 2019) and integrated into tourist experiences (Neuhofer et al., 2014). Tourists use technology for a wide variety of activities such as trip planning (Ferrer-Rosell et al., 2017), live streaming (Deng et al., 2021), self-service (Liu & Hung, 2020), sharing experiences on social media (Munar & Jacobsen, 2014), making bookings (Murphy et al., 2016), voice assistants (Buhalis & Moldavska, 2021), smart tourism (Buhalis, 2020), real-time co-creation (Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019), or robotics (Pizam et al., 2022). Smartphones have long been an essential tool for travel (Lamsfus et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016) and have impacted human interactions (Dickinson et al., 2014). However, the overwhelming use of technology has resulted in a growing disconnect movement (Syvertsen, 2020) for people who desire to resist the omnipresent power of digital technology (Cai & McKenna, 2021).

Ubiquitous connectivity in society has blurred the boundaries between work and life, causing negative impacts on travel experiences (Kirillova & Wang, 2016). Responding to the increasing well-being issues caused by the dark side of technology (Gao et al., 2018), digital-free tourism (DFT) has become an increasingly popular phenomenon both in consumer demands and academic research in recent years. Many tourists voluntarily disconnect from their smartphones to set a clear boundary between home and away to reclaim their well-being on holiday. Although DFT is still a niche concept in the digitalised society, we can see its growth potential with the increasing emphasis on digital wellbeing (Vanden Abeele, 2021). In the tourism and hospitality sectors, several organisations and DMOs have incorporated the digital detox concept either through developing an unplugged experience or marketing a remote destination. Current studies on digital detoxing in the tourism context are largely exploratory, focusing on media representation, motivation, perception, emotion, and character strength. Most studies to date focus on the consumer perspective.

The future of technology use in tourism includes smart tourism and the metaverse, and we acknowledge the potential for technology for various stakeholders such as managers, operations, staff, and tourists. However, the perceived overuse of technology within society has led to increasing demand for DFT. From DFT, new tourism providers such as digital detox retreats have emerged, or tourists are partaking in their own digital-free trips. Therefore, this

chapter aims to bring together the key discussions related to the issues of DFT by firstly introducing a working definition of digital-free tourism by building on existing academic work; secondly, providing a comprehensive and critical review of the state-of-art of digital detox research in tourism; thirdly, situating digital-free tourism research within the umbrella term of digital wellbeing, and link it to the larger agenda of sustainability; and finally, the chapter will outline future research directions and practical implications.

The State-of-Art of Digital-free Tourism

Early studies on digital disconnection in the tourism context mainly focus on forced disconnection (e.g., technology dead zone) (Pearce & Gretzel, 2012) due to the constraints of Internet connection facilities. While some benefits were discussed, these studies mainly focus on the negative aspects of digital disconnections on holidays, such as anxiety and social tensions (Paris et al., 2015). Other earlier studies placed disconnection as just a part of their studies on connectivity. For example, Dickinson et al. (2016) explored campsite connectivity, and the concept of disconnection arose through their data analysis. Their findings revealed that being completely disconnected was not universal among all tourists. Other studies of partial disconnection include Rosenberg (2019), who studied backpacker behaviour; Tribe and Mkono (2017), who conceptualised "e-lienation" and the negative consequences of technology; and Tanti and Buhalis (2016) presented five consequences of being disconnected.

Some earlier work began to partially discuss issues such as well-being and work-life balance (Dickinson et al., 2016). More recently, DFT research has begun to reflect on positive outcomes of disconnection, for example, increasing well-being issues due to technostress (Y. Liu & Hu, 2021) and blurred boundaries between work and life (White & White, 2007). The term DFT is coined by Li et al. (2018) as "tourism spaces where internet and mobile signals are absent, or digital technology usage is controlled" (p.317). Differing from travel experience in the technology dead zone, DFT emphasises the voluntary aspect; in other words, tourists voluntarily engage in the digital detox experience.

DFT research has become more popular in recent years and has begun to explore various aspects of DFT. Despite a growing number of digital detox providers, for example, Unplugged (in the UK), studies focusing on the DFT provider side are scarce. Digital detox providers offer facilities to enable their guests to lock away their phones for several days and enjoy remote rural destinations free from the distractions of technology. As far as we are aware, Pawłowska-

Legwand & Matoga (2020)'s study is the only one investigating the diverse offering of DFT experiences in Poland, such as farm stays, spa hotels, monasteries and contents, tour operators, and an addiction treatment centre.

The focus of DFT studies thus far is on the consumer side, ranging from perception and motivation to experiences and outcomes. Floros *et al.* (2021) found that millennials tend to have positive perceptions towards DFT and believe the experience can help them improve their wellbeing; however, they also perceive constraints from social expectations, digitalised tourism infrastructure, and their high dependence on technology. Egger *et al.* (2020) identified escape, personal growth, health and well-being, and relationship are four key motivations for participating in DFT. Using a mixed-method approach, Jiang & Balaji (2021) found that mindfulness, technostress, relaxation, or self-expression motivate tourists to partake in digital-free holidays. In the same vein, Liu & Hu (2021) argued that both techno-exhaustion and social-network-services-exhaustion positively affect the intention of participating in DFT.

In terms of the DFT experience, Cai *et al.* (2020) investigated the emotional journey of DFT. The study revealed that DFT participants suffered from withdrawal symptoms at the beginning of the experience but later enjoyed and appreciated the experience. The study highlighted that DFT leads to increased social interactions and more engagement with the surroundings. From a positive psychology aspect, Li *et al.* (2020) revealed that DFT builds nine character strengths, including self-regulation, appreciation of beauty and excellence, spirituality, social intelligence, love, open-mindedness, creativity, perspective, and vitality. From a critical perspective, Cai & McKenna (2021) explored how individuals negotiated and resisted the omnipresence of digital technology. They found that leveraging strategies such as going for complete disconnections, negotiating punishments and rewards, recalling nostalgic memories, engage in self-reflections help digital detox participants to maximise the positive experience of DFT.

Different studies discussed above have various interpretations of DFT, with some other similar terms, such as unplugged tourism (Pawłowska-Legwand & Matoga, 2020) and digital detox holiday (Jiang & Balaji, 2021). Fan *et al.* (2019) provide a tourist typology for technology use at destinations. Among six tourist types, they suggest two which are relevant for DFT, a "disconnected immersive traveller" and a "digital detox traveller". Although Li *et al.* (2018) did not explicitly define DFT as voluntarily disconnecting, most DFT studies using this definition consider it as a voluntary disconnection. For example, Zhang & Zhang (2022)

discussed voluntary disconnection with selective unplugging, where tourists decide to partially disconnect or connect to rethink their relationship with everyday life and travel. However, Jiang & Balaji (2021) differentiate the digital detox holiday from DFT and emphasise tourists' conscious, voluntary, and goal-directed behaviour. For the future theoretical development of the field, it is essential to have a universal understanding of the term. In this case, we suggest understanding DFT the same as Jiang & Balaji (2021) 's definition of a digital detox holiday has an emphasis on voluntary disconnection. In this case, unplugged tourism and digital detox holiday should be considered as DFT, which is positioned within the umbrella term of disconnected tourism (both forced disconnection and voluntary disconnection).

The discussions of DFT have been embedded in digital well-being and sustainability. Floros *et al.* (2021) suggested that DFT can potentially contribute to psychological sustainability by aligning 'mental' away with 'physical' away. In Stankov & Gretzel (2021)'s conceptualisation of digital wellbeing, they positioned DFT in the tech-scarce tourism category and avoidance of tech-savvy living. By placing DFT in the broad scope of digital well-being and psychological sustainability & IT, it brought in a bigger picture of how the balanced use of digital technology can contribute to the quality of life.

Future Research Agenda

Firstly, future research can discuss how DFT can be connected with other forms of tourism with a similar wellness-centred focus. Further developing from Pawłowska-Legwand & Matoga (2021), we suggest future research can explore various nature-based tourism with DFT potentials such as forest tourism, coastal tourism, rural tourism, and adventure tourism. As these tourism forms strongly emphasise well-being and embodying experiences, it is worth exploring how the removal of disruptive digital technology contributes to the overall experience. Future DFT studies can develop a framework that includes various forms of tourism that can adopt DFT experiences with a focus on improving well-being and self-developments. These discussions and conceptualisation of DFT should be connected to the quality of life, digital wellbeing, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG), in particular, UNSDG 3 (good health and wellbeing); UNSDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities). In addition, although several studies so far suggest the well-being benefit of DFT, there are no studies dedicated to investigating the long-term well-being benefits of digital detox. Therefore, we encourage more studies investigating the short-term and long-term well-being benefits of DFT.

Secondly, we call for more studies focusing on the provider side of DFT. Many tourism and hospitality providers are offering digital-free experiences. It is worth exploring how they design the product, in particular, how they help participants deal with the withdrawal symptoms (Cai et al., 2020), private and professional commitments (McKenna et al., 2020) and maximise the benefits such as developing character strengths (Li et al., 2020). It is also worth exploring the servicescape design in these digital detox holiday spaces and how they afford DFT consumers' experiences. In addition, future research can also explore how the providers co-create a digital-free experience with the consumers. We also suggest future research in hospitality and events can investigate the potential of using digital-free experiences in the experience design.

Thirdly, we call for more studies on the dark side of DFT. The rationale of DFT is based on the awareness of the dark side of technology. Although DFT helps to address these issues, such as unbalanced technology use, technostress, and the lack of immersive engagements with social and environmental surroundings, the potential issues of DFT should not be neglected. So far, most DFT studies are still in the advocate stage. However, the nature of DFT, asking for a certain period of disconnecting from digital technology, might lead to some levels of adverse effects. By conceptualising digital technology of disciplinary power, Cai & McKenna (2021) argued that being constantly connected has become a norm. Partaking in DFT experiences might improve the well-being during the trip and the number of emails to respond to, but issues to resolve after the disconnection might lead to more stress. As discussed in Cai *et al.* (2020), participants felt rather stressed and anxious when the DFT experience approached the end before the re-connection. In addition, without the disruptions of smartphones, DFT tourists have more time to engage with reflective thoughts, which might trigger some traumatised memories and experiences. Particularly, the setting of many digital-free providers is in isolated locations, which also raise potential concerns for participants wellbeing and safety.

Fourthly, we invite more theoretical and epistemological discussions on DFT. One of the future research areas could discuss how DFT is positioned in today's postmodern world. One of the key characteristics of today's postmodern society results from disruptive technology, which compresses and detaches time and space (Harvey, 1999). This has shown in today's network sociality, which replaces the community-oriented sociality (Wittel, 2001). In the postmodern society, boundaries between work and life are blurred. In the tourism context, the emergence of a digital nomad (Olga, 2020) and bleisure (Chung et al., 2020) reflect travel in the

postmodern era. The DFT, however, criticises and challenges this fluidity and aims to re-establish the boundary between work and leisure, everyday life, and holiday experience. To reflect this trend, we can argue a new theoretical tendency of post-postmodernity, which also reflects other aspects of consumer behaviour and today's society. We encourage future research to reflect and discuss DFT within the wider context of the cultural and societal state.

Fifthly, we suggest that future DFT research reflect the development of new technologies and new consumers. The 'digital' element in DFT today mainly focuses on smartphones. In the next few decades, we will witness the increasing adoption of new technologies and mobile devices such as augmented reality, service robots, virtual reality, mixed reality, or the metaverse. There might be new portable devices designed to facilitate these new features. With the adoption of these new technologies in everyday lives, the withdrawal symptoms and challenges to disconnect could be somewhat different, which requires new studies to investigate. Future research should also acknowledge new consumers in a different demographic cohort. So far, most DFT studies have focused on millennials (e.g., Cai et al., 2020; Floros et al., 2021). It is worth noting that Millennials grew up in a period without disruptive technology, in which they can recall their memories (Cai & McKenna, 2021). However, Generation Z, also known as digital natives (Vodanovich et al., 2010), has a very different relationship with technology which requires new evidence-based understandings of their perceptions and experiences of DFT.

Sixth, we call for future research to investigate the influential factors of DFT experiences. In Cai *et al.* (2020) 's study, they briefly discussed the type of destination, travel companions, commitments, reliance on technology, and motivation that affect the DFT experience. However, these factors should be further tested and validated in various contexts. Other factors such as nationality and length of the trips should also be considered. We encourage more studies investigating DFT in various contexts to bring more contextual and theoretical insights.

Seventh, we encourage future research to take on a more critical lens on investigating DFT. Cai & McKenna (2021) discussed Foucault's power and resistance in DFT. Future research can also embed DFT within today's geopolitical climate. For instance, the relationship between digital detox travel and the political view (Sutton, 2020), the re-conceptualisation and rejuvenation of the concept of 'escape'. As DFT is considered a 'new trend' and 'resistance', we

encourage future research to use DFT as a vehicle to push new theoretical development and paradigmatic boundaries.

Eighth, we call for more creative and advanced research methods to contribute to DFT studies. For instance, using physiological measurements will help to measure participants' objective responses during the digital detox experience. Methods such as interventions and focus groups are also encouraged to bring more empirical insights. So far, most studies in DFT are still qualitative by nature, and we thus encourage more quantitative contributions to deliver generalisable findings.

Future Trends for Digital-Free Tourism

With the increasing awareness of digital well-being and embedded experiences of the dark side of technology in everyday life, we expect substantial growth of the digital-free experience in tourism, hospitality, and leisure. There are already several successful businesses building on the concept of digital-free tourism, such as Unplugged in the UK, Getaway in USA, and Buzzoffski in Serbia. These businesses share similar ideas of having digital detox cabins in the rural and natural environment (Figure 1). The target customers for these hospitality products are knowledge workers from the urban area. These customers struggle with overwhelming screentime and blurred boundaries between work and life. By observing the successful expansions of these businesses, we can expect the hospitality sector will develop more similar products by combining nature, idleness, and digital-free experiences with a focus on improving the digital well-being of their guests. There is also great potential for destinations to develop digital-free experiences. This is more suitable for destinations that are in rural areas. The design of such digital-free products should not detach from the unique offering of the destination and must engage in user-centric experience design to maximise the visitor's experience.

Figure 1: Digital Detox Cabin
Photo Credit: Unsplash; Photographer: Nachelle Nocom

In addition to the dedicated digital-free experience, we are expected to see lots of hospitality and tourism services incorporate the idea of a digital detox as part of their experience. For

instance, restaurants can provide a phone lockbox on the dining tables to enhance social interactions without distraction from social media or work emails. Hotels and leisure centres can also create a phone-free zone that facilitates genuine interpersonal interactions or mindful reflections. Further development of technology could also facilitate tourists to be more mindful and present in their leisure experiences. For example, artificial intelligence could predict the activity types based on the location and the time and suggest the users turn the phone into 'do not disturb' mode.

We predict DFT will be further woven into specific tourism experiences such as slow tourism, rural tourism, spa tourism, and adventure tourism, as they share a similar focus on existential authenticity and tourists' well-being. These tourism operators and providers could introduce the awareness of digital wellbeing in their experience design to maximise tourists' overall experience of self-reflection, learning, and relaxation. In addition, the DFT, together with other sustainable tourism initiatives, will become an essential part of tourism and travel in the decades to come. The development and popularity of DFT is a counterculture with excessive technology use and its negative consequences. Therefore, we expect DFT and digital tourism to improve tourists' well-being in the decades to come.

We also expect an increasing number of tourists will participate in various forms of DFT, including selective unplugged periods or a full digital detox. Currently, participants of DFT are mostly millennials who started to experience the dark side of technology. With Gen Z joining the workforce in the next decade, their relationship with digital technology will shift from the advocate stage to a more critical and reflective one. In other words, we will witness more Gen Z consumers take action to look after their digital well-being and partake in leisure activities that separate them from the ubiquitous digital world. Differing from Millennials that grew up at a time without digital technology, Gen Z are digital natives who require a different experience design of DFT to maximise their well-being benefits.

Practical Implications

The COVID-19 pandemic and working from home has resulted in several issues such as Zoom fatigue and increased technostress (Waizenegger et al., 2020). Many people have started to pay more attention to their digital well-being in the post-COVID world (Blake et al., 2021). This creates many business opportunities for DFT. For DFT businesses, it is essential to understand the perceptions, motivations, concerns, experiences, and expected outcomes of DFT travellers.

The understanding should be implemented into marketing communications, product and experience design, and additional supports. We encourage DFT start-ups engage in professional training in digital wellbeing and mental health look after their guests. We also suggest DFT operators to avoid urban destinations, and work closely with the nature-related tourism activities.

There are also many opportunities for existing tourism and hospitality organisation to adopt the digital detox concept in part of their operations. For instance, some restaurants are already adopting this concept by offering a box to lock away guests' mobile phones. Museums, resorts and hotels can create some digital-free zones; whilst tour operators can design some trips with mindful reductions of technology use.

DFT is potentially an excellent marketing strategy or re-branding opportunity for destinations in remote areas. Examples already can be found on the Isle of Man and Scotland's marketing campaign with an emphasis on a digital detox. We encourage destination management organisations (DMOs) to recognise this potential, not only using 'unplug' or 'digital detox' as a buzzword in the marketing messages and actively engage with stakeholders to develop DFT destinations that are dedicated to improving people's wellbeing. For some destinations suffering from overtourism or being overwhelmed by one type of tourism, DFT could be a solution to diversify tourism offerings and encourage tourists to visit beyond "Instagramable" attractions and explore the hidden gems in the cities.

We encourage DMOs and DFT providers to recognise the alignment of DFT within the scope of sustainability. This requires DMOs and DFT providers to engage in various forms of socially sustainable tourism (e.g., community-based tourism, pro-poor tourism, voluntourism), seek green solutions in the operation details, or empower women in employment and career development. We urge DFT providers to work closely with stakeholders to deliver a cohesive and consistent DFT experience. By aligning DFT with the sustainability agenda, a sustainable DFT experience should not only provide long-lasting well-being impacts to tourists but should also benefit local communities.

However, we should also acknowledge the challenge of operating and marketing digital-free experiences. Today's marketing is predominated by user-generated content through social media platforms such as Instagram and Snapchat. Using digital forms of marketing

communications tools might be considered controversial to the idea of a digital-free experience. Therefore, an alternative, innovative marketing communication approach is required to promote such forms of tourism experiences and engage with customers.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we discussed the theoretical and contextual development of the DFT phenomenon. We have suggested a definition for DFT and suggest that it should be situated within the larger context of digital wellbeing and sustainability. We suggested eight future research directions, predicted future trends, and offered some practical implications for stakeholders. Looking forward, there will be an increasing demand for DFT due to the increasing awareness of digital wellbeing. However, researching and implementing DFT requires alternative theoretical lenses and operational/marketing strategies as outlined in this chapter.

References

Blake, H., Mahmood, I., Dushi, G., Yildirim, M., & Gay, E. (2021). Psychological Impacts of COVID–19 on Healthcare Trainees and Perceptions towards a Digital Wellbeing Support Package. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(20), 10647.

Buhalis, D. (2020). Technology in tourism-from information communication technologies to eTourism and smart tourism towards ambient intelligence tourism: A perspective article. *Tourism Review*, *75*(1), 267–272.

Buhalis, D., & Moldavska, I. (2021). Voice assistants in hospitality: Using artificial intelligence for customer service. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*.

Buhalis, D., & Sinarta, Y. (2019). Real-time co-creation and nowness service: Lessons from tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *36*(5), 563–582.

Cai, W., & McKenna, B. (2021). Power and resistance: Digital-free tourism in a connected world. *Journal of Travel Research*.

Cai, W., McKenna, B., & Waizenegger, L. (2020). Turning it off: Emotions in digital-free travel. *Journal of Travel Research*, *59*(5), 909–927.

Cai, W., Richter, S., & McKenna, B. (2019). Progress on technology use in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, *10*(4), 651–672. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTT-07-2018-0068

Chung, J. Y., Choi, Y.-K., Yoo, B.-K., & Kim, S.-H. (2020). Bleisure tourism experience chain: Implications for destination marketing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *25*(3), 300–310.

Deng, Z., Benckendorff, P., & Wang, J. (2021). Travel live streaming: An affordance perspective. *Information Technology & Tourism*, *23*(2), 189–207.

Dickinson, J. E., Ghali, K., Cherrett, T., Speed, C., Davies, N., & Norgate, S. (2014). Tourism and the smartphone app: Capabilities, emerging practice and scope in the travel domain. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *17*(1), 84–101.

Dickinson, J. E., Hibbert, J. F., & Filimonau, V. (2016). Mobile technology and the tourist experience:(Dis) connection at the campsite. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 193–201.

Egger, I., Lei, S. I., & Wassler, P. (2020). Digital free tourism–An exploratory study of tourist motivations. *Tourism Management*, *79*, 104098.

Fan, D. X., Buhalis, D., & Lin, B. (2019). A tourist typology of online and face-to-face social contact: Destination immersion and tourism encapsulation/decapsulation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *78*, 102757.

Ferrer-Rosell, B., Coenders, G., & Marine-Roig, E. (2017). Is planning through the Internet (un) related to trip satisfaction? *Information Technology & Tourism*, *17*(2), 229–244.

Floros, C., Cai, W., McKenna, B., & Ajeeb, D. (2021). Imagine being off-the-grid: Millennials' perceptions of digital-free travel. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(5), 751–766. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1675676

Gao, W., Liu, Z., Guo, Q., & Li, X. (2018). The dark side of ubiquitous connectivity in smartphone-based SNS: An integrated model from information perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *84*, 185–193.

Harvey, D. (1999). Time-space compression and the postmodern condition. *Modernity: Critical Concepts*, *4*, 98–118.

Jiang, Y., & Balaji, M. (2021). Getting unwired: What drives travellers to take a digital detox holiday? *Tourism Recreation Research*, 1–17.

Kirillova, K., & Wang, D. (2016). Smartphone (dis) connectedness and vacation recovery. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *61*, 157–169.

Lamsfus, C., Wang, D., Alzua-Sorzabal, A., & Xiang, Z. (2015). Going mobile: Defining context for on-the-go travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, *54*(6), 691–701.

Li, J., Pearce, P. L., & Low, D. (2018). Media representation of digital-free tourism: A critical discourse analysis. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 317–329.

Li, J., Pearce, P. L., & Oktadiana, H. (2020). Can digital-free tourism build character strengths? *Annals of Tourism Research*, *85*, 103037.

Liu, C., & Hung, K. (2020). A comparative study of self-service technology with service employees: A qualitative analysis of hotels in China. *Information Technology & Tourism*, *22*(1), 33–52.

Liu, Y., & Hu, H. (2021). Digital-free tourism intention: A technostress perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–4.

McKenna, B., Waizenegger, L., & Cai, W. (2020). The influence of personal and professional commitments on digitally disconnected experiences. In D. Kreps, T. Komukai, T. V. Gopal, & K. Ishii (Eds.), *Human-Centric Computing in a Data-Driven Society* (pp. 305–314). Springer.

Munar, A. M., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2014). Motivations for sharing tourism experiences through social media. *Tourism Management*, *43*, 46–54.

Murphy, H. C., Chen, M.-M., & Cossutta, M. (2016). An investigation of multiple devices and information sources used in the hotel booking process. *Tourism Management*, *52*, 44–51.

Neuhofer, B., Buhalis, D., & Ladkin, A. (2014). A typology of technology-enhanced tourism experiences. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *16*(4), 340–350.

Olga, H. (2020). In search of a digital nomad: Defining the phenomenon. *Information Technology & Tourism*, *22*(3), 335–353.

Paris, C. M., Berger, E. A., Rubin, S., & Casson, M. (2015). Disconnected and unplugged: Experiences of technology induced anxieties and tensions while traveling. In *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2015* (pp. 803–816). Springer.

Pawłowska-Legwand, A., & Matoga, Ł. (2020). Disconnect from the digital world to reconnect with the real life: An analysis of the potential for development of unplugged tourism on the example of Poland. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 1–24.

Pearce, P. L., & Gretzel, U. (2012). Tourism in technology dead zones: Documenting experiential dimensions. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, *12*(2), 1–20.

Pizam, A., Ozturk, A. B., Balderas-Cejudo, A., Buhalis, D., Fuchs, G., Hara, T., Meira, J., Revilla, R. G. M., Sethi, D., & Shen, Y. (2022). Factors affecting hotel managers' intentions to adopt robotic technologies: A global study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *102*, 103139.

Rosenberg, H. (2019). The "flashpacker" and the "unplugger": Cell phone (dis) connection and the backpacking experience. *Mobile Media & Communication*, *7*(1), 111–130.

Stankov, U., & Gretzel, U. (2021). Digital well-being in the tourism domain: Mapping new roles and responsibilities. *Information Technology & Tourism*, *23*(1), 5–17.

Sutton, T. (2020). *Digital re-enchantment: Tribal belonging, new age science and the search for happiness in a digital detoxing community*.

Syvertsen, T. (2020). *Digital Detox: The Politics of Disconnecting*.

Tanti, A., & Buhalis, D. (2016). Connectivity and the consequences of being (dis) connected. In *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2016* (pp. 31–44). Springer.

Tribe, J., & Mkono, M. (2017). Not such smart tourism? The concept of e-lienation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *66*, 105–115.

Vanden Abeele, M. M. (2021). Digital wellbeing as a dynamic construct. *Communication Theory*, *31*(4), 932–955.

Vodanovich, S., Sundaram, D., & Myers, M. (2010). Research commentary-Digital natives and ubiquitous information systems. *Information Systems Research*, *21*(4), 711–723.

Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *29*(4), 429–442.

Wang, D., Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2016). Smartphone use in everyday life and travel. *Journal of Travel Research*, *55*(1), 52–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514535847

White, N. R., & White, P. B. (2007). Home and away: Tourists in a connected world. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *34*(1), 88–104.

Wittel, A. (2001). Toward a network sociality. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *18*(6), 51–76.

Zhang, M., & Zhang, X. (2022). Between escape and return: Rethinking daily life and travel in selective unplugging. *Tourism Management*, *91*, 104521.