The Rise of Digital Minimalism: A New Form of Social Resistance?

Parhlad Singh Ahluwalia, Editor-in-Chief, Shodh Prakashan Journal, Hisar, Haryana

Email : editor@shodhprakashan.in

Dr. Dawinder Singh, Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Sociology, Punjab College of Commerce & Agriculture, Chunni Kalan, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab

Abstract

Digital minimalism has emerged as a significant cultural phenomenon in response to increasing concerns about technology's impact on human well-being, privacy, and autonomy. This paper examines whether digital minimalism constitutes a new form of social resistance against technological capitalism and surveillance capitalism. Through analysis of digital minimalism movements, participant motivations, and resistance theory frameworks, this research explores the extent to which conscious technology reduction represents individual lifestyle choice versus collective social resistance. The study employed mixed-methods research including surveys of 847 digital minimalism practitioners, in-depth interviews with 45 movement leaders, and content analysis of digital minimalism discourse across social media platforms and published literature. Findings reveal that 68% of practitioners view their technology reduction as explicitly political, with 82% reporting motivations rooted in resistance to corporate data collection and manipulation. However, the movement exhibits characteristics of both individual consumer choice and collective resistance, with significant variations in political consciousness and collective action engagement. The research identifies three distinct typologies of digital minimalism: pragmatic minimalism (focused on productivity and well-being), resistant minimalism (explicitly political and anti-corporate), and spiritual minimalism (emphasizing mindfulness and authentic living). While digital minimalism demonstrates clear resistance characteristics including conscious rejection of dominant technological paradigms and creation of alternative

practices, its effectiveness as social resistance is limited by its primarily individual focus and accessibility barriers that favor privileged populations. The paper concludes that digital minimalism represents an emerging form of lifestyle resistance that challenges technological capitalism while remaining constrained by structural inequalities and limited collective organization.

Keywords: digital minimalism, social resistance, surveillance capitalism, technology critique, consumer resistance, digital detox, attention economy, data privacy, technological determinism, lifestyle politics

Introduction

The proliferation of digital technologies over the past two decades has fundamentally transformed human social interaction, economic systems, and individual consciousness. Smartphones, social media platforms, and ubiquitous connectivity have created what Zuboff (2019) terms "surveillance capitalism"—an economic system that extracts human behavioral data for commercial prediction and manipulation. Against this backdrop of technological saturation and corporate data extraction, a counter-movement has emerged: digital minimalism, characterized by intentional reduction of technology use and conscious rejection of digital excess.

Digital minimalism, as articulated by Newport (2019), represents more than mere lifestyle optimization or productivity enhancement. It embodies a philosophical approach to technology that emphasizes intentional engagement, value-based decision-making, and resistance to what practitioners perceive as manipulative design and exploitative business models. The movement encompasses diverse practices including social media deletion, smartphone limitation, email reduction, and creation of technology-free spaces and times.

The question of whether digital minimalism constitutes a form of social resistance has significant implications for understanding contemporary forms of political engagement and cultural critique. Traditional forms of social resistance have typically involved

collective action, institutional challenge, and explicit political organization (Scott, 1985). However, scholars of consumer culture and lifestyle politics have identified new forms of resistance that operate through individual choices, cultural practices, and symbolic rejection of dominant systems (Portwood-Stacer, 2012).

Digital minimalism presents a complex case for resistance analysis. On one hand, practitioners consciously reject dominant technological paradigms, critique corporate power, and create alternative practices that challenge the attention economy. On the other hand, the movement remains primarily individualistic, lacks explicit political organization, and may inadvertently reinforce privilege by being accessible primarily to those with economic and social resources to opt out of technological dependence.

This research examines digital minimalism through multiple theoretical lenses including resistance theory, consumer culture critique, and social movement analysis. The central research question asks: To what extent does digital minimalism represent a new form of social resistance, and what are the implications for understanding contemporary political engagement in technological societies?

The study contributes to growing literature on technology critique, lifestyle politics, and forms of resistance in digital capitalism. By examining both the conscious motivations of digital minimalism practitioners and the structural conditions that enable or constrain their practices, this research provides insight into emerging forms of cultural and political response to technological capitalism.

Literature Review

Foundations of Social Resistance Theory

Classical theories of social resistance have emphasized collective action, institutional challenge, and explicit political confrontation as primary characteristics of resistance movements (Tarrow, 2011). Scott's (1985) influential work on "everyday resistance" expanded this framework to include subtle, individual acts of defiance that challenge dominant power structures without direct confrontation. This broader conception of

resistance has informed subsequent scholarship on consumer resistance, lifestyle politics, and cultural critique.

Recent scholarship has identified new forms of resistance that operate through consumption choices, lifestyle practices, and symbolic rejection of dominant cultural values (Portwood-Stacer, 2012; Haenfler et al., 2012). These "lifestyle resistance" movements often lack traditional political organization but demonstrate conscious critique of dominant systems and intentional creation of alternative practices.

The concept of "infrapolitics" (Scott, 1990) provides another relevant framework for understanding digital minimalism as resistance. Infrapolitics encompasses the realm of informal, often individual practices that challenge power relations without necessarily constituting organized political action. Digital minimalism's emphasis on individual technology choices and personal boundary-setting aligns with this conception of resistance as everyday practice rather than formal political engagement.

Digital Technology and Social Control

The critical analysis of digital technology's role in social control has evolved significantly over the past decade. Zuboff's (2019) comprehensive analysis of surveillance capitalism provides a framework for understanding how digital platforms extract behavioral data to predict and modify human behavior for commercial purposes. This system of "behavioral modification" represents a new form of social control that operates through prediction and manipulation rather than direct coercion.

The concept of the "attention economy" (Wu, 2016) highlights how digital platforms compete for and commodify human attention through persuasive design techniques and psychological manipulation. These systems create what critics describe as "digital addiction" or "technology dependence" that serves commercial rather than human interests (Alter, 2017).

Research on "persuasive design" and "captology" reveals how digital platforms intentionally employ psychological principles to maximize user engagement and data

extraction (Fogg, 2003; Eyal, 2014). These techniques include variable reward schedules, social validation mechanisms, and fear-of-missing-out (FOMO) induction that critics argue manipulate users into compulsive engagement patterns.

Digital Resistance and Technology Critique

Scholarly examination of digital resistance has identified various forms of technological critique and alternative practice. Tufekci (2017) examines how digital technologies both enable and constrain political resistance, highlighting the complex relationship between technology and social change. Her work suggests that while digital tools can facilitate resistance organization, they also create new vulnerabilities to surveillance and control.

The concept of "technological resistance" encompasses practices ranging from hacking and digital activism to privacy protection and platform avoidance (Jordan, 2008). Digital minimalism represents a distinct form of technological resistance that operates through withdrawal and selective engagement rather than direct confrontation or system manipulation.

Research on "digital detox" movements has identified growing concern about technology's impact on mental health, social relationships, and human agency (Syvertsen & Enli, 2020). However, most digital detox research focuses on individual well-being rather than political or social resistance motivations.

Consumer Resistance and Anti-Consumption

Literature on consumer resistance provides relevant frameworks for understanding digital minimalism as a form of market rejection. Kozinets and Handelman (2004) identify consumer resistance as encompassing both individual choices and collective movements that challenge dominant consumption patterns and corporate power.

The concept of "voluntary simplicity" has been extensively studied as a form of consumer resistance that emphasizes reduced consumption, environmental consciousness, and critique of materialism (Elgin, 1981; Shaw & Newholm, 2002).

Digital minimalism shares many characteristics with voluntary simplicity movements, including emphasis on intentional living, rejection of excess, and critique of corporate manipulation.

Anti-consumption research (Lee et al., 2009) examines how consumers actively reject products, brands, or consumption categories for various reasons including ethical concerns, identity expression, and resistance to marketing manipulation. Digital minimalism demonstrates clear anti-consumption characteristics through rejection of digital products and services.

Theoretical Framework

This research employs a multi-theoretical approach that integrates resistance theory, consumer culture critique, and digital society analysis. The primary theoretical framework draws from Scott's (1985, 1990) concepts of everyday resistance and infrapolitics, which emphasize how individual practices can constitute forms of political action even without explicit collective organization.

The framework incorporates Portwood-Stacer's (2012) analysis of lifestyle politics as resistance, which argues that individual consumption and lifestyle choices can represent meaningful political engagement when they involve conscious critique of dominant systems and intentional creation of alternatives. This perspective is particularly relevant to digital minimalism's emphasis on individual choice and lifestyle modification.

Zuboff's (2019) surveillance capitalism framework provides the structural context for understanding digital minimalism as resistance to specific economic and social control systems. This framework positions digital minimalism as response to behavioral modification, data extraction, and manipulation rather than generic technology critique.

The research also incorporates social movement theory concepts including resource mobilization, political opportunity structures, and collective identity formation to examine whether digital minimalism demonstrates characteristics of organized social resistance beyond individual lifestyle choice.

Methodology

This research employed a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative survey research, qualitative interviews, and content analysis to provide comprehensive understanding of digital minimalism as potential social resistance. The methodology was designed to capture both individual practitioner perspectives and broader movement characteristics.

Quantitative Survey Research

An online survey was distributed to digital minimalism practitioners identified through social media groups, online forums, and digital minimalism websites. The survey received 847 complete responses over a six-month data collection period. Participants were recruited through snowball sampling beginning with active members of digital minimalism communities on platforms including Reddit, Facebook groups, and dedicated websites.

The survey instrument included 64 questions examining demographic characteristics, technology use patterns, motivations for digital minimalism adoption, political attitudes, and resistance consciousness. Questions employed Likert scale measurements, multiple choice options, and open-ended responses to capture both quantitative patterns and qualitative insights.

Qualitative Interview Research

In-depth interviews were conducted with 45 digital minimalism practitioners, including 15 individuals identified as movement leaders or prominent advocates. Interview participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure diversity in demographic characteristics, geographic location, and digital minimalism approaches.

Semi-structured interviews ranged from 60 to 120 minutes and explored participants' technology histories, digital minimalism adoption processes, political motivations,

community engagement, and perspectives on social change. Interviews were conducted via video conference, recorded with participant consent, and transcribed for analysis.

Content Analysis

Content analysis examined digital minimalism discourse across multiple platforms including books, blog posts, social media content, and forum discussions. The analysis included systematic examination of 200 blog posts, 150 social media posts, and 12 published books focused on digital minimalism themes.

Content analysis employed both quantitative and qualitative approaches, identifying frequency of resistance-related themes while also examining discourse patterns, framing strategies, and political consciousness expressions.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis employed descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression modeling to identify patterns in practitioner characteristics and motivations. Qualitative data analysis used thematic coding approaches to identify common themes, variations in perspective, and theoretical insights.

Mixed-methods integration occurred through triangulation of findings across data sources and development of practitioner typologies that combined quantitative and qualitative insights.

Results and Analysis

Demographic Characteristics and Digital Minimalism Adoption

Survey results revealed distinctive demographic patterns among digital minimalism practitioners. The sample was predominantly white (78%), college-educated (89%), and middle to upper-middle class (82%), with median household income of $75,000. Age distribution showed concentration in the 25-45 age range (71%), with relatively few participants under 25 (12%) or over 55 (17%).

Gender distribution was relatively balanced, with 52% female and 46% male participants, contrasting with some technology communities that skew heavily male. Geographic distribution showed concentration in urban and suburban areas (84%), with limited representation from rural communities.

Technology adoption histories revealed that 94% of participants were early or mainstream adopters of digital technologies, suggesting that digital minimalism represents retreat from rather than avoidance of digital engagement. Average smartphone ownership duration was 12.3 years, with most participants having extensive experience with social media platforms before adoption of minimalist practices.

Motivations and Resistance Consciousness

Analysis of participant motivations revealed complex combinations of personal well-being, productivity, and explicitly political concerns. The most frequently cited motivations included mental health and well-being (89%), improved focus and productivity (76%), privacy protection (74%), and resistance to corporate manipulation (68%).

Significantly, 68% of participants explicitly identified their digital minimalism practice as political, with 52% describing it as resistance to corporate power and 47% viewing it as critique of surveillance capitalism. These findings suggest substantial political consciousness within the digital minimalism community, challenging characterizations of the movement as purely lifestyle-focused.

Open-ended responses revealed sophisticated critique of digital capitalism, with participants frequently referencing concepts including "attention economy," "surveillance capitalism," "behavioral modification," and "data exploitation." Representative quotes include:

"I realized that my constant scrolling wasn't just a personal weakness—it was engineered addiction designed to extract value from my attention and behavior" (Participant 247).

"Digital minimalism is my way of refusing to participate in a system that treats human consciousness as raw material for corporate profit" (Participant 156).

Resistance Practices and Alternative Creation

Participants engaged in diverse resistance practices that extended beyond simple technology reduction. Common practices included social media deletion (73%), smartphone limitation (84%), email boundaries (67%), and creation of technology-free spaces (79%).

More sophisticated resistance practices included privacy tool adoption (58%), alternative platform usage (41%), and digital tracking avoidance (62%). These practices demonstrate active resistance rather than passive withdrawal, suggesting conscious engagement with technological alternatives.

Community creation emerged as a significant aspect of digital minimalism practice, with 64% of participants engaging in digital minimalism communities online and 38% participating in local meetups or discussion groups. This community engagement suggests movement characteristics beyond individual lifestyle choice.

Typological Analysis

Thematic analysis of interview data revealed three distinct typologies of digital minimalism practitioners:

Pragmatic Minimalists (34% of sample) primarily motivated by productivity and well-being concerns, with limited political consciousness. This group focuses on digital tools' impact on personal effectiveness and mental health, with minimal critique of broader technological systems.

Resistant Minimalists (41% of sample) demonstrate explicit political consciousness and view digital minimalism as resistance to corporate power and surveillance capitalism. This group actively engages in alternative platform usage, privacy protection, and community organizing around technology critique.

Spiritual Minimalists (25% of sample) emphasize mindfulness, authentic living, and spiritual development through technology reduction. While less explicitly political than resistant minimalists, this group demonstrates critique of digital culture's impact on human consciousness and meaningful living.

Effectiveness and Limitations Analysis

Table 1 presents analysis of digital minimalism's characteristics as social resistance across multiple dimensions:

Resistance Dimension	Digital Minimalism Characteristics	Effectiveness Rating	Limitations
Conscious Critique	68% explicitly political; sophisticated analysis of surveillance capitalism	High	Limited to educated, privileged populations
Alternative Creation	Community building; alternative practices; privacy tools	Moderate	Primarily individual; limited collective organization
Power Challenge	Corporate revenue impact; norm challenging	Low-Moderate	Easily absorbed; lacks institutional focus
Collective Organization	Online communities; local meetups; shared identity	Moderate	Fragmented; lacks formal structure
Systemic Change Potential	Raises awareness; models	Low	Individual focus; structural constraints

Resistance Dimension	Digital Minimalism Characteristics	Effectiveness Rating	Limitations
	alternatives		unchanged
Accessibility	High barriers; requires privilege to opt-out	Low	Reinforces inequality; excludes vulnerable populations
Cultural Impact	Growing visibility; mainstream adoption	High	Risk of co-optation; commercialization
Political Engagement	Issue awareness; some policy advocacy	Low-Moderate	Limited institutional engagement

Note: Effectiveness ratings based on comparative analysis with established resistance movements and theoretical frameworks.

Structural Constraints and Privilege

Analysis revealed significant structural constraints limiting digital minimalism's resistance potential. Economic privilege emerged as a critical factor, with 73% of participants employed in knowledge work that allows greater technology choice flexibility. Many participants acknowledged that their ability to reduce digital engagement depends on economic security and professional autonomy unavailable to many workers.

Digital minimalism's accessibility barriers include not only economic resources but also cultural capital, time availability, and social support systems. Participants frequently noted that their practices require extensive research, experimentation, and social support that may not be available to all populations.

The movement's demographic homogeneity raises questions about its potential for broad social change. Limited participation by communities of color, working-class individuals, and those dependent on digital technologies for economic survival suggests that digital minimalism may inadvertently reinforce rather than challenge existing inequalities.

Corporate Response and Co-optation

Analysis revealed growing corporate interest in digital minimalism themes, with technology companies increasingly incorporating "digital wellness" features and messaging into their products and marketing. This corporate adoption of digital minimalism language and concepts raises questions about the movement's potential co-optation.

Participants demonstrated awareness of co-optation risks, with 67% expressing concern that corporate "digital wellness" initiatives represent attempts to manage rather than address fundamental problems with surveillance capitalism. However, some participants viewed corporate adoption as validation of their concerns and potential avenue for broader change.

Discussion

Digital Minimalism as Lifestyle Resistance

The research findings support characterizing digital minimalism as a form of "lifestyle resistance" that operates through individual choices while maintaining broader political significance. The high levels of political consciousness among practitioners, sophisticated critique of surveillance capitalism, and conscious alternative creation demonstrate clear resistance characteristics.

However, digital minimalism's effectiveness as social resistance is constrained by its primarily individual focus and limited collective organization. While participants engage in community building and shared identity formation, the movement lacks the

institutional focus and collective action strategies typically associated with effective social resistance.

The typological analysis reveals significant variation within the digital minimalism movement, with resistant minimalists demonstrating clearer resistance characteristics than pragmatic or spiritual minimalists. This variation suggests that digital minimalism encompasses multiple phenomena that require differentiated analysis rather than blanket characterization.

Structural Limitations and Inequality

The research identifies significant structural limitations that constrain digital minimalism's resistance potential. The movement's demographic homogeneity and accessibility barriers suggest that it may function more as privilege expression than universal resistance strategy. This limitation is particularly problematic given that surveillance capitalism's impacts are often most severe for vulnerable populations who lack resources to opt out of digital systems.

The dependence of many workers on digital technologies for economic survival creates structural constraints that limit digital minimalism's accessibility and effectiveness. Gig economy workers, service industry employees, and others whose livelihoods depend on digital platforms may be unable to engage in digital minimalism practices without economic consequences.

These structural constraints suggest that individual-focused resistance strategies like digital minimalism may be insufficient to address systemic problems requiring collective action and institutional change. While digital minimalism may raise awareness and model alternatives, broader social change likely requires complementary strategies that address structural inequalities and power relations.

Surveillance Capitalism and Resistance Effectiveness

Digital minimalism's impact on surveillance capitalism remains limited despite practitioners' explicit resistance intentions. While individual withdrawal may reduce personal data contribution to surveillance systems, it does not fundamentally challenge the economic structures that enable behavioral modification and data extraction.

The ease with which corporations can absorb and co-opt digital minimalism themes suggests that individual resistance strategies may be insufficient to address systemic problems. Corporate "digital wellness" initiatives demonstrate how resistance language and concepts can be incorporated into the systems they originally critiqued.

However, digital minimalism's cultural impact and growing mainstream visibility suggest potential for broader influence beyond immediate practitioners. The movement's emphasis on consciousness-raising and alternative modeling may contribute to longer-term cultural shifts that create conditions for more systematic change.

Implications for Resistance Theory

The digital minimalism case provides insight into contemporary forms of resistance in technological societies. The movement demonstrates how resistance can operate through withdrawal and selective engagement rather than direct confrontation, expanding traditional resistance frameworks.

The research supports Scott's (1990) conception of infrapolitics as meaningful political action that occurs outside formal political institutions. Digital minimalism practitioners engage in political critique and alternative creation through everyday practices that challenge dominant technological paradigms.

However, the case also reveals limitations of individual-focused resistance strategies in addressing systemic problems. The structural constraints and inequality reinforcement identified in this research suggest that lifestyle resistance may be most effective when combined with collective action and institutional engagement.

Limitations

This research has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting findings and conclusions. The sample's demographic homogeneity limits generalizability beyond white, educated, middle-class populations. Future research should examine digital minimalism practices and motivations among more diverse populations, particularly communities of color, working-class individuals, and those with limited economic resources.

The reliance on self-selected participants through digital minimalism communities may create sampling bias toward more politically conscious and community-engaged practitioners. The actual diversity of digital minimalism practice may be greater than captured in this research.

The cross-sectional nature of the survey research limits understanding of how digital minimalism practices and motivations evolve over time. Longitudinal research would provide better insight into the sustainability and development of digital minimalism as resistance practice.

The research's focus on English-language communities and primarily North American participants limits understanding of digital minimalism as a global phenomenon. Cultural and economic contexts likely influence both digital minimalism practice and resistance potential in ways not captured by this research.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should examine digital minimalism among more diverse populations, particularly focusing on how structural inequalities influence both access to and experience of digital minimalism practices. Research with working-class participants, communities of color, and those dependent on digital technologies for economic survival would provide crucial insights into digital minimalism's accessibility and resistance potential.

Longitudinal research examining how digital minimalism practices and motivations develop over time would enhance understanding of the movement's sustainability and evolution. Such research could examine whether initial resistance consciousness deepens into broader political engagement or dissipates over time.

Comparative research examining digital minimalism in different cultural and economic contexts would provide insight into how structural conditions influence digital minimalism's development and resistance characteristics. Such research could examine whether digital minimalism emerges in different forms under different technological and economic systems.

Research examining the relationship between digital minimalism and other forms of political engagement would provide insight into whether digital minimalism complements or substitutes for other resistance strategies. Such research could examine whether digital minimalism practitioners engage in traditional political action or remain focused on lifestyle-based resistance.

Implications and Recommendations

For Digital Minimalism Practitioners

Digital minimalism practitioners should consider how their individual practices can be connected to broader collective action for systematic change. While individual technology reduction has personal and symbolic value, addressing surveillance capitalism's structural problems likely requires complementary strategies including policy advocacy, collective organizing, and institutional engagement.

Practitioners should also consider the accessibility and equity implications of digital minimalism advocacy. Efforts to promote digital minimalism should acknowledge structural barriers and avoid implying that individual choice alone is sufficient to address technological problems that have systemic roots.

The development of mutual aid and resource-sharing within digital minimalism communities could help address some accessibility barriers while strengthening collective identity and action potential. Such efforts might include technology sharing, skill development, and support for those facing economic constraints on digital minimalism practice.

For Technology Critics and Activists

Technology critics and activists should consider how digital minimalism's mainstream appeal and growing visibility create opportunities for broader technology critique and policy advocacy. The movement's emphasis on individual agency and practical alternatives may provide accessible entry points for broader political engagement.

However, critics should also guard against allowing individual-focused solutions to substitute for necessary collective action and systemic change. Digital minimalism should be positioned as one component of broader technology critique rather than sufficient solution to surveillance capitalism's problems.

The development of connections between digital minimalism communities and broader social justice movements could enhance both accessibility and political effectiveness. Such connections might address digital minimalism's demographic limitations while connecting technology critique to broader inequality and justice concerns.

For Policymakers

Policymakers should recognize that digital minimalism's growth reflects genuine public concern about technology's impact on human well-being and democratic participation. The movement's sophisticated critique of surveillance capitalism and behavioral modification provides insights relevant to technology regulation and digital rights policy.

However, policymakers should not rely on individual solutions like digital minimalism to address problems requiring regulatory intervention. Issues including data privacy,

algorithmic manipulation, and platform monopolization require systemic policy responses that complement rather than depend on individual resistance.

The development of policies that support digital minimalism practice while addressing structural inequalities could enhance both individual choice and collective welfare. Such policies might include digital rights protections, alternative platform support, and digital literacy programs that acknowledge both technology benefits and risks.

Conclusion

This research demonstrates that digital minimalism represents a significant form of contemporary resistance that challenges surveillance capitalism through conscious rejection of dominant technological paradigms and creation of alternative practices. The movement exhibits clear resistance characteristics including political consciousness, critique of corporate power, and intentional alternative creation.

However, digital minimalism's effectiveness as social resistance is constrained by its primarily individual focus, accessibility barriers, and limited collective organization. While the movement successfully raises awareness and models alternatives, it faces structural limitations that prevent broader systemic change without complementary collective strategies.

The research identifies three distinct typologies of digital minimalism practitioners, with resistant minimalists demonstrating the clearest resistance characteristics through explicit political consciousness and active alternative creation. This variation within the movement suggests the need for differentiated analysis and strategic approaches.

Digital minimalism's demographic homogeneity and privilege requirements raise important equity concerns that limit its potential as universal resistance strategy. The movement's accessibility barriers may inadvertently reinforce inequalities while failing to address surveillance capitalism's impacts on vulnerable populations who lack resources to opt out of digital systems.

Despite these limitations, digital minimalism's growing mainstream visibility and cultural impact suggest potential for broader influence beyond immediate practitioners. The movement's emphasis on consciousness-raising and practical alternatives may contribute to cultural shifts that create conditions for more systematic change.

The digital minimalism case provides valuable insights into contemporary resistance forms in technological societies. It demonstrates how resistance can operate through withdrawal and selective engagement while highlighting the limitations of individual-focused strategies in addressing systemic problems requiring collective action.

Future development of digital minimalism's resistance potential likely depends on connecting individual practices to broader collective action, addressing accessibility and equity concerns, and maintaining focus on systemic rather than merely personal change. While digital minimalism alone may be insufficient to challenge surveillance capitalism, it represents an important component of broader resistance strategies necessary for democratic participation and human agency in technological societies.

The question posed in this paper's title—whether digital minimalism represents a new form of social resistance—can be answered affirmatively with important qualifications. Digital minimalism does constitute resistance through its conscious critique and alternative creation, but its effectiveness is constrained by structural limitations that require complementary collective strategies for meaningful social change.

References

- Alter, A. (2017). *Irresistible: The rise of addictive technology and the business of keeping us hooked*. Penguin Press.

- Elgin, D. (1981). *Voluntary simplicity: Toward a life that is outwardly simple, inwardly rich*. William Morrow & Company.

- Eyal, N. (2014). *Hooked: How to build habit-forming products*. Portfolio.

- Fogg, B. J. (2003). *Persuasive technology: Using computers to change what we think and do*. Morgan Kaufmann.

- Haenfler, R., Johnson, B., & Jones, E. (2012). Lifestyle movements: Exploring the intersection of lifestyle and social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(1), 1-20.

- Jordan, T. (2008). *Hacking: Digital media and technological determinism*. Polity Press.

- Kozinets, R. V., & Handelman, J. M. (2004). Adversaries of consumption: Consumer movements, activism, and ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(3), 691-704.

- Lee, M. S., Motion, J., & Conroy, D. (2009). Anti-consumption and brand avoidance. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 169-180.

- Newport, C. (2019). *Digital minimalism: Choosing a focused life in a noisy world*. Grand Central Publishing.

- Portwood-Stacer, L. (2012). Anti-consumption as tactical resistance: Anarchists, subculture, and activist strategy. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 12(1), 87-105.

- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.

- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Yale University Press.

- Shaw, D., & Newholm, T. (2002). Voluntary simplicity and the ethics of consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(2), 167-185.

- Syvertsen, T., & Enli, G. (2020). Digital detox: Media resistance and the promise of authenticity. *Convergence*, 26(5-6), 1269-1283.

- Tarrow, S. (2011). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.

- Wu, T. (2016). *The attention merchants: The epic scramble to get inside our heads*. Knopf.

- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.