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Abstract: The research focuses on digital nomadic work and the emergence of new cultures of labor control, exploring how professionals in cyberspace react to these changes. The theme is developed through a dialogic methodology, investigating the reality of the modern work ecosystem and distinguishing concepts linked to the subject. Nomadic work, while attractive to workers, increases the possibility of risks to fundamental guarantees, distancing the achievement of decent work. This is due to uncontrolled working hours and mechanisms of digital dependence promoted through a false sense of belonging. On the other hand, the economic and purely capitalist culture does not prevent the realization of nomadic work. The principled basis motivating decent work is applicable to workers through social valuation and the reinforcement of mechanisms that promote social identity.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the years, a new ideal of work has become the subject of fervent promotion, enabling its execution anywhere and at any time, provided there are technological mechanisms facilitating access to the virtualized environment. This emerging paradigm in the labor scenario signifies a realm yet to be fully explored, with its trailblazers identified as digital nomads.

Digital nomads actively engage in a professional ecosystem where their efforts are directed towards utilizing electronic devices that facilitate extensive communication and task performance. According to Mannrich¹, this novel professional archetype is intricately linked to the use of smartphones and computing applications, enabling them to contribute to work and income production from any location connected to the World Wide Web.

The expansive and liberating nature of this evolving work perspective heralds the advent of new cultures in the realm of employment. Notably, a
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key element in the digital nomad's work context is the culture of maximum
effort and overwork. The culture of maximum effort, or "hustle culture,"
revolves around the notion of worker commitment, emphasizing the swift
execution of activities, often referred to as scrums. This culture not only
promotes a continuous work ethic but also underscores the escalating volume
of tasks aimed at heightened profitability.

Conversely, overwork manifests as a reactive measure among workers
who, in pursuit of the maximum effort concept, utilize technology to engage
in multiple employment contracts simultaneously.

The elucidation of these concepts preceding the development of this
research sets the stage for the central issue under examination. This entails an
exploration of the mechanisms employed by the digital nomadic work
culture, with a specific focus on the interplay between worker freedom and
control mechanisms, particularly through the lens of the hustle culture
imposed by contractors.

I. DIGITAL NOMADISM AND TELEWORK

Digital nomadism has its roots in a movement focused on virtual
individualism. It bears resemblance to the movement articulated by Timothy
Ferris, who advocated for the preservation of the ability to work from any
location. Technological constraints, as highlighted by Ferris, do not pose an
impediment to the execution of work, particularly concerning the financial
accomplishments of the worker. The digital nomadism movement aligns
itself with the concept of the "anywhere office." This term is defined as
follows:

This is a direct result of what is called work from anywhere, the concept
of “work from anywhere” whose characteristics include flexibility and
freedom to change the workplace at your discretion, usually freelancers;
Quickly accessible professionals who are almost always motivated and
self-managed. The work is also almost always result-oriented, that is,
paid at the end of the task when the results are delivered. Nomadic work, particularly in the context of digital nomadism,
underscores the aspiration and promotion of synchrony devoid of
geographical constraints, characterized as cross-border immediacy. This
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immediacy seeks diverse forms of realization, benefiting both contractors and individuals engaged in nomadic work in general.

While the discourse often emphasizes the absence of geographic limitations in conducting work, another touted advantage of digital nomadism is the relativization of working time. This factor aligns with the nature of work and the nomadic worker operating under a Brazilian contract, where there is no strict control over the working day. Consequently, this relativization opens avenues for exploring different territories through the manipulation of varied working hours, as long as the stipulated obligations are met.

This organizational approach, characterized by flexible criteria regarding working hours based on the execution of tasks outlined in the employment contract, is conceptualized as a phenomenon known as smart working. Smart working explicitly seeks harmony between time, personal life, and production growth. It redefines the concept of work allegiance, emphasizing the completion of agile tasks and departing from the conventional model centered on single, prolonged tasks.

Another advantageous aspect of smart working lies in its detachment from the physical premises of the employer. This departure from the "standard" work model allows the worker the freedom to perform tasks anywhere.

The preference for smart working and its integration with nomadic work stems from the propagation of its perceived advantages and a "freestyle" approach compared to the traditional work model, garnering numerous proponents. This trend has even given rise to communities known as villages of digital nomads, serving as a communal hub for those engaged in mobile work.

In this paradigm, work transcends its traditional association with a specific location, transforming into an activity conducted in any virtual environment.

In this context, the report by Irish entrepreneur Marina Fuentes Corridan to the "Irish Examiner" played a pivotal role in establishing a hub for digital
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nomads in the Canary Islands. The region witnessed a tenfold increase in the number of nomads during the pandemic.8

This trend prompted the Portuguese government to pivot towards the digital economy. The Ministry of Economy and Digital Transition prepared an "Action Plan for the Digital Transition," approved through the Resolution of the Council of Ministers No. 30/2020, published on April 21, 20209. As part of the Portuguese incentive program, hotels and establishments were mobilized to accommodate digital nomads, with the inauguration of a digital nomad community on Madeira Island10.

In Brazil, efforts are underway to encourage digital nomadism through regulatory measures, such as the regulation for granting temporary visas and residence permits by the National Immigration Council (CNIg). This regulation, outlined in Resolution 45/202011, allows immigrants without employment relationships in Brazilian territory to provide services for foreign employers in Brazil.

The initiative aims to welcome nomads, stimulate fundraising, and boost the local economy by leveraging the motivations that brought them to Brazilian territory while maintaining profitability through remote work. The "migrantweb system" platform facilitates the registration of immigrants for the issuance of a 12-month temporary visa, renewable for the same period12.

Government incentives in various territories, aimed at facilitating digital nomadism, represent an economic response to the imperative of connecting to capital production, even on a global scale13. This need for economic connectivity across different territories underscores the consistent demand
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driven by the widespread technological advancements, fostering the development of nomadic work. This flow reflects the transformative impact of Industry 4.0, encompassing changes related to labor displacement, flexibility in working hours and location, training in the utilization of new technologies, and the proliferation of platforms, including crowd working\(^\text{14}\).

**II. CHALLENGES: THE HUSTLE CULTURE**

Propaganda extolling the advantages of nomadic work, such as organizational autonomy, flexibility, improved time management, increased productivity, and enhanced quality of life, has led many individuals to embrace the concept of labor nomadism.

However, notwithstanding the positive aspects associated with this form of work, there are also negative considerations. In a study conducted by Diego Mendes, Horácio Hastenreiter Filho, and Justina Tellechea, analyzing various authors discussing the pros and cons of telematic work\(^\text{15}\), a review of fourteen authors revealed that approximately 85.71% (twelve authors) identified social isolation as a significant drawback.

Furthermore, an interview conducted by Bryan Lufkin with Olga Hannoen, a researcher on nomadic work and a professor at the University of Finland, highlighted the growing inequality within the digital nomadism movement. This phenomenon, perceived as a Western-centric trend, is propelled by individuals with the means to travel globally\(^\text{16}\). The movement, in this context, is portrayed as a form of selective freedom perpetuated by a capitalist ideal, often diverging from the realities of nomadic labor.

Lufkin’s interview with Beverly Yuen Thompson, a sociology professor at the University of Siena in New York, emphasizes that, due to inherent inequalities, the nomadic workforce may inadvertently reinforce such disparities. Limited access to decent work, education, and fundamental rights is a challenge for those with fewer resources, hindering their initial engagement in comprehensive remote work. The scarcity of opportunities in the nomadic workforce tends to favor individuals with greater economic


Concerning economic disparities in the realm of digital nomadism, the portrayal of it as a worker's choice for freedom is nuanced. The nomadic worker may not necessarily have the option to work anywhere, as their choices are often constrained by the accumulation of tasks that impose temporal and geographic limitations.

In terms of work dynamics, the study conducted by PNAD supports activities aligned with Industry 4.0, wherein the workplace is defined by the tasks performed in cyberspace, utilizing technological equipment. This trend distances workers from territorial constraints and diminishes the necessity for physical presence at the contracted location to carry out work activities.

The process of deterritorialization and the increasing prevalence of nomadic work, both nationally and internationally, are intrinsic to propelling global virtualization, reflecting the profound effects induced by contemporary society.

Initially, it should be noted that the place where services are provided at work is routinely cyberspace (ie, a non-physical location). When observing the classic sense of place as an element linked to geographical limits, it can be said that the work is an example of deterritorialized work.

(…)

This new format of contemporary society brought about by new technologies, therefore, shifted the carrying out of work activities from the employer's establishment to any place in the world (including to a “non-place”), making the location of service delivery extremely flexible.

It should be noted that, contrary to the interviews conducted by Lufkin, digital nomadism is not inherently an elitist process solely designed for overtly capitalist propaganda. While it is marketed as an ideal of freedom, given the contemporary advancements in new technologies, particularly within the framework of Industry 4.0, the potential for change is evident, and the reality for workers across various job sectors increasingly distances itself from a predetermined or fixed physical space.

An exemplification of this virtualization process in the work environment can be observed in Mark Zuckerberg's latest creation: the metaverse. The
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metaverse represents virtual reality, allowing users to transcend the physical concept of space and engage in activities within cyberspace.

In the realm of work, the metaverse materializes through "workrooms," virtual spaces where users, equipped with virtual reality glasses, can access conference rooms, conduct meetings, and engage in various interactions, employing either anonymous or identifiable avatars.

Nevertheless, this does not imply a lack of challenges for the nomadic worker; on the contrary, there is a reinforced need to consider the conditions under which work is performed, underscoring the importance of the axis of decent work.

Even though the nomadic worker experiences freedom in moving unrestrictedly while fulfilling contracted activities, regardless of location, it is crucial to emphasize the necessity for dignified conditions, healthy environments, and ensuring security and equity.

The protection of nomadic workers is intricately linked to preserving their dignity as individuals. It involves safeguarding the person rather than treating them as a mere mechanism fulfilling a specific task. Failure to observe this principle would amount to a violation of work without distinction, reminiscent of the commodification promoted by the economic system, as analagized to Karl Polanyi's definition:

"Allowing the market mechanism to be the sole director of the fate of human beings and their natural environment, and even arbitration of the amount and use of purchasing power, would result in the breakdown of society. This supposed 'commodity,' labor power, cannot be pushed around, used indiscriminately, or even left unused, without also affecting the human individual who happens to be the bearer of this peculiar commodity."  

However, certain aspects surrounding digital nomadic work remain somewhat obscure, particularly when discussing work within the framework of decency and the worker's perspective on new psychosocial risks that arise outside the physical premises of the employer.

These challenges correspond to the development and implementation of diverse mechanisms that uphold the rights of decent work, affirming the hypothesis of current regulations adapting to constant technological changes in the modern environment that introduce new labor paradigms.

In the context of digital nomadic work, with emerging work
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methodologies and directive forms such as the hustle culture, presented under the discourse of implementing decent work, there may be an actual effect acting as a subterfuge to reinforce worker dependence on technology.

The subterfuge lies precisely in the utilization of smart working, promising the absence of time and space restrictions, devoid of fixed shifts, and enabling task execution from any location\(^\text{22}\). In reality, there is an intention to utilize scrums and foster a hustle culture in the work environment, grounded in the prospect of working without spatial restrictions. The constancy of work through the fulfillment and belonging concept becomes tangible as a result of telematic means.

The notion of worker productivity and profit, propagated through this discourse, introduces a new challenge termed "technofeudalism." Technofeudalism serves as the dark side to the narrative of massive digitalization and virtualization as a progressive idea. It posits that the continuous implementation of technological devices is, in fact, a matter of capitalist control, entailing the maintenance and restoration of mechanisms of dependence, monopoly, and manipulation across various axes\(^\text{23}\).

In the market, capitalism historically monopolized the means of production, which were diverse. Workers sought employment and, to some extent, had the ability to choose their jobs. There was a circulation dynamic that fostered competition. However, in the current digital economy and techno-feudalism, individuals and companies increasingly align with digital platforms that centralize critical elements essential for economic existence in contemporary society. This entails a reliance on Big Data, databases, and algorithms facilitating various processes. It creates a self-reinforcing process where increased participation in these platforms leads to the provision of more essential services, fostering greater dependence. This scenario is significant as it undermines the concept of competition, locking individuals into this digital framework. The dominance exerted by these platforms follows a strategy of economic development through predation and conquest, aiming to acquire more data and digital spaces\(^\text{24}\).

Regarding technofeudalism, the challenge for nomadic work lies in


ensuring that the widespread use of technological mechanisms doesn't leave workers dependent on telematic means at the expense of their privacy. It's crucial to prevent control exercised through these means from infringing upon the dignity inherent to workers as human beings, rather than viewing them merely as digital tools for executing contracted activities.

It so happens that, unlike the feudalism of yesteryear, technofeudalism is situated in an era of connections. Even if there is control through technology, the same devices allow different contacts with different people, reinforcing and easing communication systems. Communication through digital spaces promotes connection and the possibility of exchanging information at levels not linked to geographic or temporal barriers.

As a result of the accumulation and easy access to digital connection spaces, some workers, especially in remote work, began to verify the existence of digital control exerted by economic forces, leading to a phenomenon known as "overwork." Overwork originated from job dissatisfaction, telematic work organization mechanisms, exacerbated control, and factors of the hustle culture, leading workers to exhaustion due to a manifestly disproportionate labor relationship.

The feeling of exhaustion, constant subordination, and supervision by employers led to the adoption of a second job without any communication to the employer about this additional work. While having two or more jobs is common in many scenarios due to *crowdworking* mechanisms through platforms like Uber, Cabify, Ifood, among others, overwork occurs when multiple jobs are performed simultaneously, facilitated by computerized systems.

In the context of nomadic work, overwork represents the hypothesis of simultaneously performing more than one activity for more than one employer. The media's response to this so-called corporate bigamy by workers is seen as a form of resistance to exacerbated control by employers through the widespread use of media. Simultaneously, it is also viewed as an immoral and unethical act by employees, with correct performance by colleagues being a potential complaint, verified by another employee, leading to the identification of the situation of overwork.

Faced with this, there is a clash between the exercise of technological
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In the absence of a fixed shift and with tasks as the primary focus, the worker would be free to carry out simultaneous activities. Lufkin suggests that another factor instigating the occurrence of overwork is as an alternative to the low probability of continuity in the employment relationship. Workers, especially in the case of nomadic work, when their contract is terminated, may remain vulnerable.

Some workers believe the secret second job helps them break free from employers who haven't provided the promotion or raise they've been seeking for years. "There's a sense that our bosses own us a little bit, and I see that as an interesting reaction against this normative sense of ownership," says Hatton. "We hope that we owe them everything. That we belong to them. But when the time comes, they can fire us tomorrow for no reason. This is to regain some of that feeling of power," he adds.\(^{28}\)

It does not mean to say that overwork is inherently a bad situation, but it reflects a context of freedom in the digital space. Its analysis, in the absence of prohibition, addresses new challenges within those already exposed, particularly in relation to decent work and the accountability of employers when work is carried out simultaneously for one or more contractors.

### III. Paradigms between Nomadic Telework and Decent Work

Decent work, as defined by the International Labor Organization (ILO) in 1999, aims to promote opportunities for individuals by ensuring "productive and quality work, in conditions of freedom, equity, security, and human dignity."\(^{29}\) The core objective of the ILO is to establish the concept of work within a healthy environment, where workers have access to rights encompassing four essential pillars.

The ILO's primary intention is to align the concept of decent work with four specific objectives outlined in its agenda. These objectives include upholding fundamental labor rights, such as the freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of discrimination, eradication of child labor, and the strengthening of dialogue and social protection. The overarching aim is to promote healthy and productive jobs.\(^{30}\)
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Recognizing the complexities arising from globalization, particularly the concentration of capital, the ILO emphasizes the importance of maintaining fundamental values. Social dialogue is seen as a crucial factor in fostering cohesion in international law concerning worker protection. Decent work is regarded as an evolutionary concept that not only contributes to economic progress but also social progress.

In the context of protecting digital nomadic workers, the principles of decent work become relevant. According to the ILO and its Centenary Declaration, decent work serves as a means to maintain social peace through a network of social dialogue, seeking an existential minimum for workers 31.

The conditions of decent work, when associated with technology, aim to maintain human centrality in the productive sphere 32. This emphasizes that the core of work is the worker, and ensuring decent work imposes security conditions through network connections, applicable to any working environment. This rationale aligns the protection afforded by the ILO to nomadic work, considering the organization's objectives and dialogues with labor, particularly in anticipation of future job scenarios 33.

Decent work tailored for nomadic work encompasses the idea of productive and fairly remunerated labor, conducted in conditions of freedom, equality, and security. The characteristic of being both productive and justly remunerated in nomadic work implies that the nature of the work does not subject the nomadic worker to idleness or conditions of isolation as a punitive measure. The isolation inherent in this work is not exploited to the detriment of the employee.

Fair remuneration, intertwined with the equality aspect of decent work, ensures nondiscrimination in wages. In the context of nomadic work, fair remuneration also relates to cost reduction and sustainability. This is to prevent certain employer obligations from leading to manipulation of wages lower than the value of the work performed.

From an economic standpoint, the advantage of nomadic work must be proportionate and reasonable for both the employer and the worker. It should not be used as a mechanism to reduce or pay lower wages arbitrarily, which
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would contradict the principle of decent work being fairly remunerated.

Therefore, fairly remunerated work is that which considers the activities performed by the contracted party and adheres to equitable and congruent remuneration criteria.

Furthermore, discussions surrounding hustle culture and overwork revolve around the prism of the freedom and dignity of the digital nomadic worker. The implementation of hustle culture may correspond to controlling work by assigning a maximum effort workload to the worker. Overwork, on the other hand, acts as both a response and a mechanism linked to earning income through a greater number of job contracts.

Freedom, as the cornerstone of decent work, operates compatibly by constituting "the possibility of conscious coordination of the necessary means to achieve personal happiness"\(^{34}\). Thus, it cannot be dissociated from the pursuit of fulfillment by the free individual, understanding their potentiality and realization\(^{35}\). This removes any intention of progress or development that goes against the freedom of the individual.

**Final Considerations**

Adaptability proves to be necessary due to technology replacing human labor. This replacement, even though geared towards reducing the need for face-to-face presence, is a mechanism that also manifests externally. The existing flexibility, combined with the fulfillment of external tasks not tied to a predetermined workday, demands the unfolding of the worker in various situations involving technological dependency linked to labor dependency itself.

In this aspect, nomadic work, while resulting from the worker's ability to embrace freedom, poses dangers concerning the criteria of decent work and labor sociability. Virtual individualism, promoted as a new concept of freedom, is driven by marketing purposes, particularly in the context of digital nomadism. The work performed by individuals in this lifestyle does not always align with the conditions propagated by practitioners on social media.

The situation of the nomadic worker and the promotion of this lifestyle gains momentum in the entrepreneurial culture itself, embodied as hustle culture. The agile tasks and the sense of productivity inherent in nomadic work can lead to a dark side of hustle culture, demonstrating the potential for a technofeudal culture specifically aimed at the labor field. The nomadic
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worker remains tethered to digital mechanisms as a source of production, exposing characteristics that consolidate risks to the fundamental rights of workers.

In this environment, there are no fixed hours, but there are tasks, and these tasks can push the plausible limits of human work. In the modern context, this work should not be confused with tasks performed by artificially intelligent machines, as human limitations are a form of survival for the species itself.

Contrasting the damage caused to nomadic work by hustle culture and the potential for technofeudalism is the promotion of decent work, the social appreciation of work, and the social identity of the worker in cooperative and community environments. The broad characteristic of digital nomadic work should not be dissociated from the principles of community and social dialogue, where positive and negative assumptions of rights and duties respectively highlight ethical-fraternal behavior as a means of achieving decent nomadic work.
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