From nomadic work to nomadic leisure practice: A study of long-term bike touring

PEDRO FERREIRA, IT-University of Copenhagen, Denmark
KAREY HELMS, Department of Media Technology & Interaction Design, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
BARRY BROWN, Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, Sweden
AIRI LAMPINEN, Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, Sweden

Mobility has long been a central concern in research within the Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) community, particularly when it comes to work and how being on the move calls for reorganizing work practices. We expand this line of work with a focus on *nomadic leisure practices*. Based on interviews with eleven participants, we present a study that illuminates how digital technologies are used to shape and structure long-distance cycling. Our main analysis centers on bike touring as a nomadic leisure practice and on how it offers a radical departure from traditional modes of structuring work and life, and thus, complicates the relationship between work and leisure. We complement this with an account of managing the uncertainties of nomadicity by focusing on participants' experiences with arranging overnighting and network hospitality. We offer this study, firstly, as one response to the call for more diversity in the empirical cases drawn upon in theorizing nomadic work and leisure practices, but more productively, as an opportunity to reflect upon the temporal and spatial logics of digital technologies and platforms and how they frame our attitudes towards the interplay between work and leisure.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing → Empirical studies in collaborative and social computing**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Bike touring; nomadicity; tourism; network hospitality; work-life balance

ACM Reference Format:
Pedro Ferreira, Karey Helms, Barry Brown, and Airi Lampinen. 2019. From nomadic work to nomadic leisure practice: A study of long-term bike touring. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 111 (November 2019), 20 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359213

1 INTRODUCTION

Mobility has long been a central concern in research within the Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) community, particularly when it comes to work and how being on the move calls for reorganizing work practices [6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 28]. Previous work has mainly considered mobility as discrete — albeit at times very frequent — events, such as having to travel regularly for work [14]. The moment of mobility itself has also been studied, for instance in the work of Perry et.

Authors' addresses: Pedro Ferreira, pedf@itu.dk, IT-University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark; Karey Helms, karey@kth.se, Department of Media Technology & Interaction Design, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden; Barry Brown, barry@dsv.su.se, Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden; Airi Lampinen, airi@dsv.su.se, Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

2573-0142/2019/11-ART111 $15.00
https://doi.org/10.1145/3359213

al. on travel down-time, such as waiting in airports [39]. While early writings presented a vision of a nomadic knowledge worker who can work 'anytime, anywhere', propelled by the promise of ubiquitous connectivity and the development of mobile devices and services [28, 29], recent empirical accounts paint richer pictures of mobility and nomadicity, illustrating that the boundaries between different spheres of life, including work, require complex and careful negotiation (e.g. [11, 48]). Within CSCW, accounts of nomadicity have largely focused on nomadic work practices (e.g. [15, 41, 43, 48]). Mobility in the context of leisure has received less attention, with some notable exceptions, namely in relation to tourism [4, 46].

We expand this line of work with a focus in this paper on *nomadic leisure practices*. Based on 16 in-depth, semi-structured, individual interviews with 11 participants with experience of long-term bike touring, we present a qualitative study that illuminates the relationship between leisure, work, and nomadicity, analyzing the role technology plays in how we orient to where and when work and leisure take place. We discuss how temporalities and spatialities of leisure, such as holiday making, are increasingly organized via different app logics, for instance with the rise of network hospitality services such as Airbnb and CouchSurfing [31, 35]. From Sharma's work on 'chronographies of power' [45], to Gregg's critique of 'the productivity imperative' [23] and the research of Mazmanian and colleagues [34] on 'temporal logics', prior literature examines the impacts of time on our experiencing of work as well as the role of technology design in shaping those impacts [50]. We further draw on tourism and leisure studies to illuminate how contemporary spaces of leisure, and specifically tourism, are increasingly collaboratively constructed [38, 51, 54], and how platforms play a crucial role in constructing those spaces [38, 54].

After situating our work in relation to prior literature, we set up our analysis with a description of bike touring as a nomadic leisure practice, focusing on its effortful, enjoyable, and collaborative facets. Our main analysis centers on how it offers a radical departure from traditional modes of structuring work and leisure, further complicating this relationship. It is worth noting that while the concept of work has multiple meanings within CSCW, in this paper, we use the term 'work' to refer to formalized, paid work and in some cases the pursuit of studies central to the participants' professional identity. We complement this with an account of overnighting as a core tenet of nomadic leisure practices, its social dimensions, risks, and uncertainties. This study is intended as an empirical contribution in response to calls for more diverse case studies of nomadic cultures beyond work practices [43], while also adding to discussions on how platforms and technologies produce new spatialities and temporalities of nomadic work and leisure.

2 BACKGROUND

We contextualize our study by reviewing research from two lines of work within and beyond CSCW. First, mobility and nomadic work practices have been a key aspect of inquiry into the changing workplace and the temporal organization of everyday lives. Second, we draw on tourism, hospitality, and mobility studies as the practices studied in these fields are central to bike touring. Here, we connect in particular to recent work on network hospitality — a key example of how digital technologies can enable nomadic tourism.

2.1 Nomadic work and its temporalities

Within CSCW, the persistent vision of a nomadic knowledge worker who can work 'anytime, anywhere', was propelled by the promise of ubiquitous connectivity and the development of mobile devices and services [28, 29]. This vision has long been critiqued as a naïve, technology-centered understanding of mobile work, starting with early investigations of nomadic work practices, including but not limited to micro-mobility and the mobility of artefacts [33], place-making [6, 39, 41], planful opportunism [39], and the infrastructure of nomadic work [47], that is, the range

of situated practices to recreate the mobile office. More broadly, glamorous narratives of being able to work anywhere [13], commonly associated with promises of individual empowerment and flexibility, are now increasingly questioned [19]. Workers may be offered the possibility to work full-time from home [21], but this flexibility is not equally desirable for all, and may be an unwanted burden for some. Prior work has illustrated how current politics around flexible work arrangements (e.g. freelance work, independent contracting, and working from home policies) may nurture a tendency to put work at the center, sometimes at the expense of important forms of personal fulfillment [2, 21].

Over the years, the variety of mobile apps and devices, along with the pervasiveness of cloud services has turned the nomadic practices encompassed in moving resources across locations into an everyday occurrence for many workers [42]. However, the fact that mobility is now technologically easier to accomplish does not mean it is always easy. Digital nomadicity borrows from a time management culture designed with certain assumptions regarding temporal logics. Here, we draw upon Mazmanian and colleagues' notion of temporal logics as *"the socially legitimated, shared assumptions about time that are embedded in institutional and societal norms, discourses, material and technological processes, and shared ideologies."* [34]. A temporal logic defines *"what is rational, normal and expected, and imbues a society with a definition of what time is that directs individuals in how they should operate in and through time"* [34], as illustrated for instance in Wajcman's study of calendar designers in Silicon Valley [50]. Partly these assumptions concern notions of time as 'circumscribed', that is, time as *"chunkable, single-purpose, linear, and ownable"* [34] as opposed to 'porous time' that emphasizes how people adapt to the fluidities of time even when the structures around them do not. This borrows from Zerubavel's foundational examination on a Western domination of quantitative philosophical perspectives of time [52]. This has implications for how we design time management and productivity and how our individual and collective self-appreciation becomes permeated by a sense of productive virtuosity, as Gregg discusses in her historical analysis of productivity, its technologies, and logics [23]. The ways in which these logics order and define our lived experiences of time have obvious, and not so obvious, political implications that require untangling. These form and produce what Sharma calls 'chronographies of power' where *"individuals' and social groups' senses of time and possibility are shaped by a differential economy, limited or expanded by the ways and means that they find themselves in and out of time."* [45]

The implications of mobility and nomadicity on social relationships are key to our case. A workshop at ECSCW 2007 investigated the rapid emergence of nomadic work practices and argued for an understanding of the *"dynamic practical achievement involved in making, making the most of, and working in different places"* [41]. Ten years later, at ECSCW 2017, a follow-up workshop revisited the theme, this time with an emphasis on the notion of nomadic culture as the entanglement of economic, social, cultural, and technological practices that enable and constitute nomadicity [43]. The workshop organizers' summary from this latter event emphasizes a need for more systematic investigations of different cases of nomadic culture, calling for a move beyond entrepreneurship and knowledge worker narratives. Investigations in more varied settings, ranging from blue collar work to grassroots movements and beyond, are relevant as they provide opportunities to raise analytic issues that a more narrow scoping risks overlooking. Secondly, the organizers call for practice-centered research on the negotiation and reconfiguration of work-life boundaries. One important aspect here are the interpersonal efforts to manage and coordinate boundaries between different activities and roles. These issues of how technology-mediated nomadicity [15] and always-on connectivity may shape the desired boundaries between work and personal life have so far been left with lesser attention within CSCW. As one notable exception, Ciolfi and Lockley [12] explored technologically-mediated practices of work/life balancing, blurring, and boundary-setting of a cohort of professionals in knowledge-intensive roles in a regional city in Northern England.

Their research illustrates that boundary sculpting pertains not only to work pervading personal spheres of life, but also the opposite, and that people resort to establishing, softening, and dissolving boundaries to handle situations when the personal seeps into professional life. We build on this troubling of the relationship between work and life in our study of nomadic leisure practices.

2.2 Tourism spaces and network hospitality

While CSCW has had a sporadic interest in tourism [4, 46], our main resource has been the field of tourism studies, in particular discussions of how 'the tourism space' is constructed [51]. As Edensor puts it, tourist spaces are places transformed by the routine regular actions of tourists [16]. Tourism transforms places through economic pressures - making places easy to understand, easy to travel through, and increasingly anonymous. Recently, various reviewing apps have exacerbated these processes. Zukin [54] discusses how the crowd-sourced review service Yelp shapes tourism space, emphasizing an amplification effect where reviews posted on the system end up having a cumulative effect that either intensifies or contradicts pre-existing understandings of different neighborhoods [3]. These intensifying platform effects are often at odds with the spatial and temporal rhythms of local communities, where a diversity of grassroots movements have emerged in parallel, manifesting discontent and resisting the ways in which platform economies commodify urban spaces [38]. Zuev [53], in his analysis of Couchsurfing as a spatial practice, writes about rhythm and the relational dynamics of host and guest interactions, including their co-present experience of space, time, and life rhythms. His analysis highlights how guests are often in a holiday rhythm that is more free and open to variation while hosts are more confined by everyday routine and work obligations. This may become grounds for conflict and it calls for constant negotiation of access and alignment of the rhythms of host, guest, and place.

Social scientists in hospitality and mobility studies have examined the emergence and increasing popularity of online hospitality exchange systems, such as Airbnb and Couchsurfing. Germann Molz [35, p. 216] uses the term network hospitality to discuss the way users of hospitality exchange services *"connect to one another using online social networking systems, as well as to the kinds of relationships they perform when they meet each other offline and face to face"*. While network hospitality itself is still a relatively recent phenomenon, practices of hosting, guesting, and extending hospitality to strangers more generally has, of course, a much longer history. Molz [35] illustrates this point with the example of pre-Internet efforts to arrange homestays around the world with the help of telephone calls, letters, and postcards. Online hospitality exchange services, such as Couchsurfing, have joined these types of peer-to-peer efforts in striving to replace (or complement) traditional commercial intermediaries, such as hotels [30]. In CSCW, Stors and Baltes have documented how user-generated content on platforms like Airbnb has become a dominant force in the construction of tourism spaces, challenging or even replacing traditional forms of tourism promotion [46]. This observation is corroborated in tourism studies (e.g. [54]).

The two most common examples of network hospitality within CSCW and HCI literature have been Couchsurfing and Airbnb. As summarized by Klein and colleagues [27], Couchsurfing and Airbnb both help users host strangers in their homes, but they differ in the important sense that Couchsurfing prohibits monetary payment while Airbnb is built around it. Previous work on Couchsurfing (e.g., [1, 31, 37]) has emphasized the value of intense, sociable encounters for both hosts and guests. In contrast, more recent studies on Airbnb [26, 30] indicate that an initial financial exchange between hosts and guests may, perhaps surprisingly, support sociable interaction by alleviating perceived social obligations and facilitate social exchange and interpersonal interaction. Finally, host-guest relationships have been central to the study of network hospitality (e.g [1, 7, 37], with calls to conceptualize network hospitality as a collaborative activity where everyone makes hospitable gestures and to better account for the broader network of actors who are impacted,

Table 1. Overview of participants and their activities

Pseudonym	Demographics	Length of Tour	Where	Company
Matt	49, male, British	< 1-month	Europe	1-3 friends/family
Yann	29, male, Polish	4-month + 1-month	Africa/Europe	Solo
Gary	60+, male, American	1-month	Balkans	Solo
Adrian	30, male, Dutch	1-month	Europe	Girlfriend
Paul	25, male, Brazilian	3-month	USA	Friend
Jeff	27, male, American	2-month	USA	Solo
Hannah	20+, female, Hungarian	> 1 year bike	Europe	Boyfriend
Renee	22, female, American	1 month	USA	Group: Cycling for MS
Sophia	30+, female, American	3-month	South America	Husband
Elina	34, female, Finnish	3x1 month	Europe	Husband
Olivia	25, female, American	1 month	Europe	Solo

ranging from family members and housemates to travel partners, neighbors, and beyond. This is further complicated by Klein and colleagues' analysis of the diverging expectations of Couchsurfing and Airbnb "dual-users"[27] where, compared to Couchsurfing, Airbnb (1) appears to require higher quality services, (2) places more emphasis on places over people, and (3) shifts social power from hosts to guests.

3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Our qualitative study includes altogether 16 in-depth, semi-structured, individual interviews with 11 participants. It is part of a broader research project on long-term outdoors activities [25], and research agenda on the relationship between enjoyment and technology [5, 17]. Here, we explore empirically experiences of long-term cycling, or bike touring, with a focus on the relationship of this nomadic leisure practice to participants' everyday life and work.

3.1 Participants

We recruited our participants through two distinct calls on a popular internet forum, a subreddit, dedicated to bike touring, with one exception recruited over personal networks. On the first one we called for participants who would like to share their experiences of bike touring, asking specifically for participants who were about to go on a tour, so as to be able to interview them before and after their experience, but leaving it broad enough for others to express interest in participating. Our framing of the call as looking for participants engaged in "long distance, long term, cycling", was broad enough to attract a diverse set of views on what exactly long term cycling entails. In the end, the length of our participants' tours ranged from a little under a month to over a year. Our first call attracted exclusively male respondents, leading us to issue a second call, on the same forum, framed in the same terms but explicitly looking to recruit recruit female participants. With the help of this second call, we were able to arrive at a more diverse representation of experiences across genders. Table 1 provides an overview of participants' demographics and activities. We use pseudonyms when referring to participants unless they explicitly permitted using their first name.

3.2 Interview Procedure

The aim of the interviews was to elicit detailed accounts of cycling trips, their experiences throughout the trips with particular focus on aspects of everyday planning and struggles, preparation for the trip, including the gear relevant to them, as well as broader reflections on technology use and social interactions in the course of these activities. Five participants were interviewed both before

and after their activity, one participant only before, and three only afterwards. We interviewed two of our participants, Hanna and Sophia, during their trips, although while Sophia was still traveling, she and her husband had for now concluded the bike touring part of their trip, including selling their bikes.

Pre-interviews started with questions about the upcoming activity, prior experiences, as well as motivations and aspirations for the activity. We went on to discuss specific gear and equipment, digital or not. Further, we probed into expectations of available resources or infrastructures, the role of digital technologies, as well as thoughts about social interactions with both possible travel companions and strangers encountered in the course of the activity. Post-interviews started with reflections on the experience, supported by questions on expectations, achievements, and disappointments. We then revisited questions about gear, packing, and unpacking. Further, we asked about experiences with connectivity and digital technologies specifically, along with thoughts about the social aspects of the activity. The two participants who were still traveling were interviewed both with an eye towards past experiences as well as their plans going forward. All interviews concluded with an opportunity for participants to share additional thoughts, stories, or future plans.

We conducted the interviews between April 2018 and March 2019 with video calls whenever possible, using voice calls as a backup option. Interviews ranged from just over 30 minutes to over three hours, with most in the range of 50-80 minutes. To ensure informed consent, participants were provided information on the study and their rights, as well as given the opportunity to ask any questions they might have. Participants were offered a rechargeable battery pack as a gesture of appreciation. All interviews were conducted in English, audio-recorded, and transcribed verbatim.

3.3 Analysis

Our analysis resulted in multiple iterations of coding and interpreting the research materials. Firstly, researchers familiarized themselves with the interviews conducted by others, namely by listening to them while walking or cycling, during commutes or recreationally, engaging with the outdoor materials partly in outdoor settings. Our first layer of analysis was geared to understanding the diversity of experiences and practices depicted from a broader outdoor perspective, drawing on coding both as an interpretative act [9, 44], and a communication tool for team analysis [44, p. 34]. This meant that each researcher created a personal, initial coding schema [9], what Layder refers to as pre-coding [32]. This allowed for some initial interpretative flexibility and passages could be coded with overlapping initial codes, such as: e.g. "Social Interaction", "Alone" or "Eating", mainly trying to capture a rich set of experiences for later analysis, but without a definite view on their analytic worth. Moreover, by drawing on analytic memos [44] at this stage, we were able to communicate more complex points within the team. Following this initial coding structure, through a series of meetings focused on creating higher level codes, the initial codes were aggregated, or at times separated into 17 higher level codes, such as: e.g. "Routines", "Challenges and Solutions" or "Skills and experience". These were used for the second-cycle coding [44]. We generated the analytic themes presented here through axial level coding, in conjunction with decisions made in aggregating the initial codes. For the coding process we used Nvivo 11, and the first author served as a central 'codebook editor' [24, p. 23]. This last decision was done mainly given Nvivo's limitations for collaboration.

We now present three themes we generated from our analysis. The first paints a general picture of bike touring as a nomadic leisure practice. This is a descriptive account that ties together participants' diverse views of what constitutes bike touring. Secondly, we look at the relationships between nomadic leisure and work and how bike touring both disrupts and reframes these. Finally, we focus on overnighting and network hospitality, as a central and repeated endeavour that both

structures bike touring and highlights its role as a social and community-oriented nomadic leisure practice.

4 BIKE TOURING: A NOMADIC LEISURE PRACTICE

Bike touring takes on a multitude of forms and participants differ in their routines and ambitions. Part of the identity of the touring community is built around a tolerance to different ways of doing bike touring. This would make it challenging to provide a singular *a priori* description that does justice to the wealth of our participants' (and the wider community's) experiences. Here, instead, we describe bike touring from participants' accounts in order to provide a richer picture of this nomadic leisure practice. We focus on three unifying aspects: the enjoyment of effortful mobility, planning as a community, and collaborative navigation.

4.1 Effortful, enjoyable mobility

Most bike tours are structured around the interleaving of cycling and breaks, some of which span whole days (known as 'rest days'). These breaks vary in purpose from eating, resting, socializing or just enjoying a view. This loose structuring of bike touring affords the necessary flexibility for participants to enjoy these experiences on their own terms:

> "I mean, the routine is pretty simple. You just wake up, camp, and ride all day. Eat food when you need it. Set up camp and just enjoy each other's company." (Jeff)

While each day on a bike tour tends to be rather unique, there is a repetitiveness in, not only pedaling, but also attending to basic needs and seizing opportunities for enjoyment. These repetitive requirements of touring on a bike — pedaling several hours daily, finding a place to stay or camp every night — provided clear constraints that structured days on tour. The way pedaling in particular dominated large segments of the day, did not allow for meaningful multitasking, meaning that engagement with digital technologies, rather than ever present and ever tempting, got confined to particular uses and particular times of the day. As for flexibility, moving on the bike allowed participants to go to places that would have been hard to reach otherwise. More importantly, it invited a different focus on the surroundings and encouraged exploring places away from the most popular tourist destinations. Participants also talked about the freedom that stemmed from being able to update plans along the way, change the route, or opt for detours, stop to rest or to explore, as well as to combine cycling with other modes of transportation to cover some distance. While some trips were more structured than others, the idea that bike touring is a moment of freedom where goals are less important than the journeying itself was common across participants:

> "There are no goals in terms of cycling so many miles or so many kilometers. If we're behind, we will happily jump the train or whatever. It's not a challenge. It's just a month of freedom." (Matt)

The readjusting of expectations and figuring out what kind of bike touring one wants to do was common especially among those participants who were interviewed about their first longer bike tour. Letting go of strict goals laid out before the trip, coming to terms with the flexibility these experiences require, and learning to make touring enjoyable required some adaptation. Bike touring, as Matt explained, can be relatively easily combined with other modes of transportation whenever needed. With the focus placed on the journey itself, this ability to change plans is fundamental to sustaining an enjoyable experience. However, most of the enjoyment still comes from the simple, inescapable pace of cycling, which rather than being a limiting factor, provides a welcome rhythm around which participants planned their days.

Finally, in participants' accounts, events like a rainy day, while likely bothersome in the moment, quickly became just another part of the day that was nothing to fuss about. Sometimes challenging

weather conditions made for memorable moments, such as Hanna describing a hale storm in the Alps as one of the "coolest" moments of the trip. The experience of bike touring is highly adaptable, given the general lack of strict goals, but also the sense that dealing with contrariety is part of the experience. Despite momentary upsets, problems and challenges are accepted as part of the experience. This sets bike touring in contrast with other types of holiday making where the fluidity and comfort of the experience, for instance good weather or timely transportation, are more central to expectations of what a good day is like.

4.2 Planning for mobility as a community

Bike touring involves different levels of planning, ranging from broader considerations for when a long-term trip might be taken to daily preparations for being on the road. Knowing how to prepare is not obvious for first-timers. As such, engaging with the bike touring community online can serve both as a source of inspiration and encouragement to get on the road, and more practically, as a means of gathering relevant information. Carving out time for bike touring is not always easy given how lives are structured around commitments to work and/or study. The time usually available for holiday making is not necessarily sufficient to engage in meaningful long-term cycling. Our participant group was rather diverse in this regard. For example, while Olivia and Renee found time to cycle in between changes in their studies, Matt and Adrian go out bike touring while on holiday from their jobs. Elina similarly arranges her trips to take place during holiday time from work, yet the trips have a continuity as the next one begins where the last one ended. Gary is retired with the time and financial resources to plan for variable time away, and Hanna, Jeff, Sophia and Yann are on trips with no planned ending date. Such variations impacted the constraints participants needed to deal with and the room for flexibility and improvisation they had — a key part of what made bike touring a compelling activity.

Planning often involved looking up information online, for instance reading blogs, checking maps both online and on paper, or planning for where to overnight. Bike touring, mainly in the leading up to a particular experience, involves substantial online engagement. Participants discussed reading blogs, engaging on Reddit, or following social media accounts around bike touring. They (especially the first timers) were curious as to what gear they needed to purchase, the safety of wild camping in certain countries — or, more generally, the types of challenges and rewards they should expect to face on the road, and how to prepare accordingly. In turn, it was not uncommon for participants to contribute, or 'give back', to online communities by sharing documentation of their own trip. For Jeff, bike touring was in part about building community and he was excited to promote the activity by showing people how to do it without lots of money. Similarly, Gary, discussed how he believed that documenting his practices will be valuable and meaningful to others, too:

> "I've got programming experience, so I created a website specifically tailored to what I thought a website about bike touring should be and slowly I added some things. [...] I do a very detailed journal. I mean, you go to my website, it's a public website, a free public website, and you can sort of see any of these things that I've done; bikes I ride, all kinds of stuff."

Bike touring revolves around a community sharing experiences on blogs, YouTube, reddit, and elsewhere. This moment of planning, anticipating and sharing back your experiences are crucial to understand the mindset of bike touring. Before a trip begins, key decisions entail the kinds of gear to bring along, which depend on a variety of factors such as planning for overnighting. This takes careful consideration as space in panniers (bags attached to the sides of a bike or on racks attached to the bike) is limited and extra gear makes the bike heavier to move. All decisions about what to pack and what to leave home involve compromises and trade-offs. For instance,

carrying camping gear comes with the increased flexibility of being able to camp spontaneously but at the cost of extra weight. Furthermore the way these plans are readjusted throughout the trip is crucial to the feelings of freedom and flexibility that participants seek in bike touring. These constant readjustments are done in a highly contingent and collaborative manner, both among travel partners and through engagement in topical online fora.

4.3 Navigation and collaborative rhythms

Another apparent paradox of bike touring is between the seemingly lonely and introspective endeavour of pedaling for several hours a day, as a means of transport, and participants' desires for social interaction. Even when participants travel in pairs, or as Renee in a larger group, socializing while riding can be impractical. More often than not participants rode single-file (as opposed to side-by-side, or in a 'lump' as Renee termed it) for safety reasons. On top of that, participants often discussed breaking up the group in different ways. The diversity in Renee's group led members to adopt different paces, gathering together to pre-set camping locations at the end of the day. We saw similar arrangements also in how couples, such as Elina and her husband, biked together:

> "[I]t happens quite often that my husband is... Well, he is often faster than me, and he goes somewhere, so then I still have my paper maps, and I can follow the route then"

Elina and her husband's dual use of paper and digital maps allowed them to not only have a back-up for moments when the smartphone ran out of battery, but also enabled flexibility and moments apart. Co-riding requires balancing between the syncing of pace, plans as well as desires for social interaction and serendipity. Hanna discussed wanting to ride along other cyclists met along the way. She came to the conclusion, though, that their different plans and paces made for unfeasible alliances. Olivia, too, pointed out how joining forces with other cyclists can present challenges:

> "Well, there was this one guy who was pulling a dog. It was a big dog, and he's pulling it in the trailer meant for children. And we had a discussion about where the trail was going, and then we started biking together. Eventually, I had to leave him, because he was going so slow and I had to get [to] the next place. But that was really fun. It was nice to have some company." (Olivia)

Syncing between riders is a real challenge exposing the limits of the flexibility in the riding experience and the balancing between keeping to one's rhythms with desired interactions. Talking about roads and paths, as in Olivia's description above, was an often used cue for social interaction, particularly as people tend to meet cyclists riding in the opposite direction and who thus have useful information of the respective roads each were facing, such as possibilities for eating or shops available along the way:

> "Quite often, we talk with other cyclists [...] It depends on the place a lot. Like some places, there are lots of cyclists. In some places, even too many I mean, if there are lots of the cyclists in Southern France for example, then it starts to be so many, [...] otherwise, in Bosnia for example, last summer, we met only a few cyclists, and we were also always really happy when we met them, and I guess they were happy to meet us too, because it's in a way like a shared feeling to be on the road with a bicycle when you are in the place where it's not so common" (Elina)

Meeting with other cyclists typically occurred by the roadside, but also in cafes or restaurants in smaller localities. Given the lower prevalence of commercial establishments, these places ended up attracting passing bike tourists. While in other aspects of their lives participants reported commonly making choices based on online reviews or crowd-sourced recommendations, what was notable

in bike touring was how decisions such as where to eat, or even where to sleep, were more often (although not solely) driven by serendipitous engagements with the surrounding environment and emerging opportunities — rather than a focus on finding the right, or best, place.

5 RECONCILING NOMADIC LEISURE AND WORK PRACTICES

The relationship between leisure and work can be uneasy. In CSCW, where work is a (and traditionally *the*) central element of the study in relation to social uses of digital technologies, leisure is often treated as a lesser complement to work. CSCW has been particularly interested in the spatialities that work produces in opposition to something else: e.g. work-life, work-home, work-leisure. Our findings regarding bike touring add to this discussion by complicating notions of 'home', 'leisure' and 'life', since these spatialities are themselves disturbed and reconfigured. Rather than seeing bike touring as merely an escape from the everyday, a space apart, we are inspired by how it intersects with other aspects of life, including work. That is, how time is structured differently during long term cycling, but also how the ways in which places feature comes to create quite different sorts of tourist spaces. To illuminate these connections and disruptions, we now depict how participants negotiated work boundaries in relation to bike touring — a leisurely activity that was both construed in opposition to work and, still at times, co-constitutive and inseparable from it.

5.1 Leisure as an escape from work

Like other forms of leisure such as holiday making, bike touring is commonly framed as an escape from work and other requirements of everyday life. When discussing his break from work and its demands, Matt lumped this together with carving time away from worrying about mortgage payments, attending to the endless news cycle, or showing up for family obligations. While these are all responsibilities that he shouldered in his day-to-day life, the bike tour became an opportunity to let go for a moment and enjoy *"a month of freedom"*:

> "I run my own business. I work hard. I've got two kids. I've got a mortgage. [...] And it's really cool to just be able to go, right, a month, I'm not checking my emails. I'm not going on social media. I don't care about what Donald Trump's doing. I'm not going to let the news upset me about Brexit. I'm just going to switch off, drop off the grid."

Similarly, Adrian and Elina engaged in bike touring in ways that fitted with their regular holidays. For others, escaping the requirements of work and/or study involved a longer-term effort. Sophia and her husband saved up over many years to finance a longer trip. Paul waited until an opportune time window finally presented itself:

> "For three and a half years I've been planning this trip. [...] the planning itself didn't take much of my time. It was making sure that I had the three month window in my career and in my work life, to pursue this opportunity. So, I had to time the precise moment that I would have three months available to go and do this trip. [...] I was a consultant until last year, and then I transitioned into a tech start up, and I'm going into an MBA degree in the fall."

Preparing to be away from work, particularly knowledge work, also required participants to adjust their expectations and their socio-technical configurations so as to sustain the desired separation from the everyday while on the road. For instance, Adrian benefited from the flexibility of being able to do some work at a distance but it also required him to set up appropriate expectations in work networks, particularly when these intersected with personal life:

> "Being a freelancer, I can just ... I say to people I'm going to be away for four weeks, so that's how long it takes and that's fine. [...] some of the people I work with did contact

> me just casually through WhatsApp. But they respected the fact that I wasn't there. [...] I think I do tell people that I don't read email on my phone, so the people know that we can chat but we can't really do anything right now."

Just as our participants had their idiosyncratic ways of engaging with bike touring, they also had different career paths, jobs, and family situations. These influenced heavily their opportunities to hit the road and the amount of planning that was required. However, there are several common themes with regarding setting up to 'escape' work: preparing one's social networks, preparing one's physical infrastructure for the trip, and arranging a time frame for the tour that fits reasonably with other life goals and commitments. Finally, it is worth noting that not all participants wished to demarcate bike touring from everyday life in the same way. Those, however, who were more constrained in their daily life by time restrictions, commitments to care for family, or professional responsibilities, were more prone to strive to use their leisure time "efficiently", for instance to recover from work and everyday life. Approaching leisure as a recovery function from work however risks underappreciating its central role and importance in life [40].

5.2 Leisure as inseparable from work

While participants often separated bike touring as a space away from the demands of work, a first aspect in which work is constitutive to bike touring has to do with the financial enabling of the leisure experience. Our participants financed their trips through work, savings, or retirement as well as sometimes help from their parents and their work.

More relevant to our analysis were accounts of when integrating work into the bike touring experience was desirable. In some cases, being able to follow up on work remotely made the leisure experience possible in the first place. For instance, Elina, a knowledge worker, was able to manage some of her online teaching duties remotely, which allowed her to head out for a bike tour with her husband. While she needed to bring her laptop along, the hours spent pedaling meant that there was still a fair amount of moments when she felt that she was truly on holiday:

> "I work a lot with a laptop and writing and stuff, so it's a good way to have in a way a complete break from that. Because otherwise, I usually when I have laptop with me, I'm working at least a bit in a bus or in a train, and if I'm traveling like that. [...] But with cycling, it's not possible. That's a good thing, so it's a good way to have a holiday, like a real holiday in a way. [...] I wish it would be possible to leave it [the laptop] away, but I think all of the times have been so because I'm teaching also, [...] so most of the times I have had an online course going on when I have been on those cycling trips"

The physically demanding nature of daily cycling creates a space apart from apparent working. However, not all work requires a particular bodily orientation. One way in which work permeated participants' bike tour experiences were thoughts and concerns that bubbled up in their minds while pedaling. For instance Adrian, a freelancer, contemplated on work while pedaling:

> "Some things will flash through my head. I don't know, I think I'll definitely be contemplating some stuff, because as a freelancer you just have to figure out 'What am I going to do like the next six months, next year. What's that going to take me?' So, that kind of thing is sort of always present."

For other participants, work during the trips manifested itself quite differently. Some, notably Hanna and Jeff, worked during their trips partly to make them financially possible. Jeff also wanted to get involved in communities that seemed interesting and relevant for him, with an eye out for future opportunities. Having quit his previous job, he was exploring specific options, but also in a more holistic sense, the kinds of projects and communities he might want to contribute to:

> "But also on my trip I'd like to visit intentional communities and communes. I try to find where they are in the country and then find them along my route and meet them. I've lived in communal housing since I was about 21, and so meeting groups that are living in groups and farming together or having regular meals together or working on projects together. I'd like to just see what people are doing. Ultimately trying to keep a little register of where I might want to move in the future."

Similarly, Hanna and her boyfriend's goal of starting a permaculture farm lead them to structure their work along the way so as to learn about this. At the time of the interview, they had worked in a variety of places along the way, such as hostels, offering their labor in exchange for accommodation. Their main goal going forward was to learn from existing farms, found through HelpX:

> "[W]e research on the Internet, what looks nice and [...] also we use a website [...] I don't if you know it, HelpX, which is similar to WorkAway, so volunteering work. And we register on HelpX and we find places on there. For example, we worked in a permaculture farm in Turkey already for a week, East of Istanbul and we wanted to discover what a farm looks like, but then after a week we realized it's like winter and there's nothing really happening where we can learn stuff."

At times, these experiences had lacked in the kinds of learning they were hoping to experience. At other times, they had experienced positive surprises, as Hanna was having at the time of the interview working at a horse farm, hoping to extend their stay as she was enjoying both the work and the break from cycling.

Our analysis echoes discussions around boundary formation between work and life, and how there are often advantages in keeping boundaries porous, in ways that are a little distinct from the analysis around knowledge workers. The long term nature of bike touring points to radical shifts in how participants may see their relationship to work and everyday life, namely disturbing the way work is often taken as the foundation around which everything else gets structured. The long-term sustainability of these types of experiences remains understudied, and it is not our intention to romanticize our participants' efforts to break away from more typical life arrangements. Work plays a fundamental role in many people's lives, as a means of everyday subsistence, a source of meaning and belonging, or looking from another point of view, as a painful absence in some cases of unemployment. Amid increased discussion of automating or task-ifying work [20], long-term bike touring presents an interesting point of contrast, highlighting distinct ways in which technological temporalities and spatialities can structure the relationship between work and everyday life.

6 MANAGING THE UNCERTAINTIES OF NOMADICITY: OVERNIGHTING AND NETWORK HOSPITALITY

As in other forms of tourism, our participants resorted to network hospitality platforms to organize some of their overnighting while on bike tours. The flexibility of bike touring carries the physical uncertainties of having to physically pedal to the next destination. Bike touring was also unpredictably determined by the serendipity of emerging opportunities, such as a particularly beautiful location or enjoyable social encounters. This was balanced around other concerns such as managing risk and finances, but also infrastructural needs such as electricity. All of our participants, with the exception of Gary, carried camping gear with them, a common feature in bike touring. Broadly speaking participants generally set out with an idea of how they intended to overnight with common options being camping (at designated camping grounds or "wild camping"), network hospitality services, hostels or, at times, by asking locals. We now turn to an analysis of how participants managed risks and uncertainty while on the road, by relying on strangers and reciprocal social encounters.

6.1 Risks, uncertainties, and the kindness of strangers

Bike touring comes with much desired flexibility, and as a consequence, uncertainty. Smartphones were a fundamental resource in managing those uncertainties through the more obvious uses of maps to identify camping locations but also to connect with others, namely via network hospitality platforms. The self-reliance of camping and hotels were balanced with opportunities for social encounters and hosting via platforms such as CouchSurfing and WarmShowers, a network that Hanna described as "Couchsurfing for bike tourism"[1]. Yann and Jeff also relied extensively on hospitality arranged in-person, sometimes simply by riding to someone's house and asking to pitch up the tent on their property for the night. Both CouchSurfing and WarmShowers rely on informal peer-to-peer hospitality and do not give any guarantees of accommodation, one of the defininings attributes of these platforms [27]. Hosts have no obligation to accept visitors or even to reply to requests. Starting to arrange stays early was one way to deal with uncertainty, but even then, it was necessary to be prepared to improvise. Yann described being always ready to camp:

> "For Warmshowers or Couchsurfing, I would try to text people earlier if possible, but also there have been times ... late, like this, like at 6:00 or 7:00 I was writing people because I hadn't found a camping spot and I was hoping for a warm shower. I know I cannot rely on that, because just some people they may not be home, they may not be available right now. So I will try to find places to stay, but I'm prepared to wild camp."

In addition to camping and network hospitality, Jeff and Hanna made use of platforms which exchange voluntary work, usually for accommodation and food, such as HelpX. As we saw previously, this was partly due to financial considerations but also motivated by the desire to accumulate different work and personal experiences. Centrally, the uncertainty of bike touring was not an undesirable fact to deal with as much as the catalyst for the kinds of experiences that participants sought to derive from it, for instance by relying on the kindness of strangers. Hanna, for instance, described how relatively small acts of hospitality, such as being allowed to pitch one's tent in someone's garden, could then evolve so as to include also the sharing of food and stories. In a similar vein, Yann discussed how he routinely approached locals to ask for recommendations of where to stay or whether camping at a particular location was appropriate, and getting invited for a homestay:

> "I've had a lot of success with that in Africa. [...] the thing that's common in Africa but not so common in Europe, which is just getting invited to someone's place, getting well fed and entertained for the whole evening."

Of course, safety was also a consideration in relation to overnighting, present especially in the accounts of the female cyclists in our study. Olivia described how she had opted for designated camping sites because she felt safer at them with plenty of people around and also because she was not certain about the legal status of wild camping in various places. Renee, who had chosen to go on an organized tour to have an easier first experience of touring, was now considering a solo tour and turning to WarmShowers for accommodation:

> "There's the app called WarmShowers and so I know that that's a good way to meet people who are willing to house you or at least lend you their backyard to camp in. So I think that will be interesting. I guess as a girl and I'm a pretty small girl, it's just a little bit scarier to be out on my own in a very unfamiliar place, but I don't know, I'm just willing to take the risk a little bit more now than I was when I was a little younger."

[1]Warm Showers has the "goal [...] to bring together cyclists who offer their hospitality towards touring cyclists", the name derives from the base expectation of being able to take a warm shower at the host's place. https://www.warmshowers.org/

This account lines up with prior research on network hospitality [37] that has documented how people build up confidence for participation over time. Finally, while participants reported sporadic negative encounters with strangers, these left their reliance on platforms and their desires for social encounters with strangers largely unaffected. The excitement and serendipity of stranger encounters seems to be at the core of the experiential quality that bike touring offers. The balancing with other modes of hospitality, however, helped minimize risk and alleviate some of the exhaustion resulting from repeated coordination with strangers. Jeff reflects on this last point via his choice of a more established cycling route for his second longer trip to spare himself of some of the asking:

> "And this route's good too because the last time I ... A lot of my energy just went into getting off the highway and knocking on somebody's door and like, 'Hi, I'm Jeff. I'm on my bike. Can I camp here?' I'm a social guy, but that takes a lot of mental energy to try to convince a stranger that you're safe every night. [...] But this time around, like I say, because the trail is so established, a lot of city parks, they'll let you camp there. [...] I'm hoping to just free up a lot of mental energy to do things other than just figuring out where I'm going to sleep and figuring out my route and everything."

Uncertainty and risk is carefully mitigated to the benefit of overall flexibility. Of course uncertainty means that negative experiences can also occur. These types of negative accounts were, however, secondary in our participants' accounts. This is not to say that they are not relevant, but rather that participants anticipated different degrees of disappointment and were prepared for an at times trying journey.

6.2 Sociable encounters and reciprocity

A key factor setting the network hospitality accounts in our study apart from prior literature, is their positioning in the niche community of bike touring. This is visible especially in the central role of WarmShowers. In line with what could be expected of generalized reciprocity in any community that is tied together by a special interest, those who had been bike touring themselves were responsive to hosting others in the same situation. Moreover, many people who are not tour cyclists have a curiosity for bike touring that can encourage and facilitate social interactions:

> "I think most people are a little curious to see what I'm riding on, how it works. What are you doing? 'Cause it's not something they've ever done." (Gary)

There can be a tension in network hospitality between just finding a place to stay for free and meeting expectations of a mutual exchange, often one involving intense social interaction. This has been documented in prior work on CouchSurfing where hosts were cautious about welcoming guests who were only interested in using them as a hotel [30]. In our case, hosts' eagerness for social interaction as a driver for welcoming strangers was enhanced by the fact that often times the places where participants were being hosted were outside of main urban centers, in places that do not attract much tourism, echoing Zuev's study of Couchsurfing in Krasnoyarsk [53]. Participants shared stories of locals who were eager to engage with people from other places, having scarce regular opportunities to do so. This, however, meant that participants needed to be prepared to interact with their hosts to co-create a mutually meaningful experience. Jeff's example illustrates how the daily schedule on a bike tour can get changed to accomplish this:

> "So we're at a host's house right now. If we're staying at something like that, we try to get there early enough that you can spend the evening. Chat and maybe eat dinner together. A lot more talking, then generally you get a later start the next day because you wake up and drink, talk. That's been really fun. Just getting to know hosts and stuff. That changes the schedule a little bit."

In addition to reciprocating hospitality by being an attentive and sociable guest, our materials include examples of exchanging volunteer labor for accommodation as in Hanna's use of the HelpX platform. Hanna described how these type of stay required longer breaks from cycling for the arrangement to make sense to the host:

> "[W]e just want to do some hikes and stuff and we want to stay longer, but we of course didn't want to pay for accommodation and [...] they don't like you if you just [...] stay like three, four days because then, it's obviously because you just want to save money. But two weeks is like the sweet spot."

These accounts position social encounters at the heart of bike touring. This is part of the desired flexibility and uncertainty that cannot be controlled to the same degree as many other forms of leisure and tourism. The distinctive nature of bike touring as a nomadic leisure practice is illustrated in the network hospitality platforms at play, which are both specific to bike touring, or used in specific ways to enable bike touring.

7 DISCUSSION

Bike touring gives us an opportunity to think through a quite contrasting case of mobility in CSCW and, in particular, we focus our discussion on three threads. First, we draw out the contrast between nomadic leisure and nomadic work. Second, we reflect upon the new 'temporal logics' of leisure for our participants - how long distance cyclists develop different relationships to time and their ongoing temporal rhythms. Third, we talk about the new 'spatial logics' of long distance cycling. Rather than structured around 'famous' well visited places, or highly reviewed commercial establishments, long distance cycle tourism depends upon a new type of spatiality, one that is based not on a ranking of desirable places, but rather on enjoyable experiences, nowhere in particular.

7.1 From nomadic work to nomadic leisure

While in CSCW, and the broader academic literature, discussions of nomadicity have nearly exclusively focused on its work aspects, in this paper we deal with *nomadic leisure*. This lets us reconsider the mobile roles of work *vis-à-vis* leisure. Indeed, while bike touring was often an escape from work it was also, at once, inseparable from it. The boundaries between work and not-work quickly become porous [11, 22], with nearly all our participants maintaining some sort of work connection on their travels. Nomadic leisure and nomadic work should therefore not be simply seen as opposing practices despite clearly notable differences. Bike touring involved a balancing of structure and plans with uncertainty and flexibility. In touring, our participants took pleasure in the act of mobility itself, the exertion of human powered movement, the experience of continually moving through different subtly different places. This is a 'pleasure in mobility', "One of the primordial human activities [...] our most cherished activities" [5, p115]. As with nomadic work [48], our participants were reliant on technology. Yet technology here was not primarily about achieving work and efficiency, but about supporting leisure, such as arranging overnight stays or brief moments of sociality with others on the road. This gives us a quite different view of nomadicity: rather than motivated by economics goals, our nomads were driven by enjoyment and personal and collective growth.

Indeed, for nomadicity more broadly leisure plays more than a mere supporting role. It is not only a refreshing function to keep docile workers properly motivated, ultimately in the service of work, as critiqued by Chris Rojek:

> "Building and developing satisfying emotional relationships remain one of the most enriching characteristics of leisure. However, they presuppose much greater spare-time engagement with media data streams and social networks organised around ethical,

> physical, political, corporeal and cultural desiderata. To develop qualities that convey competence, credibility and relevance, and to be seen by others as 'a good person', requires a good deal of non-paid work. The foundation of this labour occurs in leisure times and leisure settings. New technologies provided unanticipated ways of using leisure as a means of social control. The most notable means were informal life coaching, advertising and emotional regulation. This casts further doubt upon the validity of traditional associations of leisure with freedom and voluntarism." [40]

This viewpoint stands in contrast with many of the imbalances at the heart of nomadic work, criticized for its colonial undertones [49] and reliance on practices such as 'geoarbitrage'. The latter is a term popularized by lifestyle guru Tim Ferriss describing the asymmetry between the digital nomad and local communities, as something to be exploited, for instance by outsourcing part of their labor [18][2]. While nomadic leisure hardly avoids some of the same issues, it at least gives us a different framing. For nomadic leisure takes pleasure in the enjoyment of human powered movement and local interactions in their own right, rather than an arbitrage of different economies or cultures.

7.2 New temporal logics of leisure

Uncertainty is one of the central themes from our findings, particularly in how it is managed, negotiated, and most fundamentally, enjoyed. The flexible relationship to time is one of the ways in which bike touring is perhaps the most different from everyday life as well as many other leisure practices. This has important lessons for the ways we design and engage with time in our platforms. Drawing from her interviews with calendar designers in Silicon Valley, Judy Wajcman discusses how modern time management technologies, rather than working to *"deliver us more time"*, are instead designed towards particular temporal logics in which *"[t]he notion that time is a resource that is owned by an individual, that it is a territory that can be conquered, is an integral part of the injunction to manage one's own time efficiently"* [50]. This is not a mere reflection on details of implementation, but of the underlying implications of leaving the temporal logics of *"circumscribed time"* [34] unexamined. Zerubavel discusses how these understandings of time are not only reflective of particular temporal logics but implicitly promote them: *"The economic-utilitarian philosophy of time presupposes a particular way of viewing temporality, namely, from a quantitative perspective. It reflects, as well as promotes, a quantitative view of time, which involves a definition of time as an entity which is segmentable into various quantities of duration and, therefore, is countable and measurable"* [52]. As these are inscribed onto platforms and applications they lend themselves to particular logics of optimization or 'territorial conquering', to borrow Wajcman's metaphor. And while we can certainly appropriate platforms and applications for different purposes than the ones they were designed to support, these inbuilt temporal logics will privilege those kinds of experiences.

In Jeff's account of his own time and scheduling flexibility *vis-à-vis* the social interaction with hosts, we see how time, in bike touring, while not an easily commodifiable resource, is something to be 'offered' as well as 'received' with consideration. This preciousness of time has been documented by Zuev who describes how, in the context of Couchsurfing, hosts' and guests' rhythms are adjusted within the hospitality exchange, for mutual, non-financial[3] benefit [53]. This form of unpredictable, "spectral" time [34] stands at odds both with work time, but also, with forms of leisure time that are more contained and predictable (e.g. weekends or shorter holidays). Our account of bike touring

[2]To be fair, the discussion on digital nomads, as highlighted in [49] also discusses the vulnerability of digital nomads, given the often relatively precarious working conditions and economic security.

[3]While we focus here on the non-financial value of the temporal logics of nomadic leisure, there are of course advantages to financial transactions with regards to hospitality, such as relieving the pressure of perceived needs to be social [30]

troubles the subordination to the temporal logics of productive life, by offering an account where the spectral temporal logics of nomadic leisure dominate. Our platforms and their designed temporal logics normalize and obscure what Sharma has termed 'power-chronographies' [45]. As Gregg discusses: *"Within a framework that stresses individual responsibility for self-improvement, calendars perpetuate a promise that an autonomous individual can control the unpredictability of real life that inevitably involves other people and plans"* [23]. This places additional stress on the individual and their perception of self in a time where managing time productively has become, in Gregg's historical analysis of productivity and time management, increasingly associated with virtuosity and a *"a framework for living ethically through work"*[23].

Nomadic forms of leisure, such as bike touring, and the specific uses of platforms and technologies that they involve, challenge dominant temporal logics in inspirational ways. They offer us a point of departure for rethinking the assumptions and ideals that are designed into our technologies and into our lives. This is not a simple appeal to more superficial qualities of slowness in the bike touring experience, for as Sharma reflects, slowness is *"not outside the normalizing temporal order. Slowness encompasses its own particular ideological time claims and beholds its own exclusive temporal practices. The promotion of slowness occurs for different ends — procapital, anticapital, and often in between."* [45]. This is instead an invitation to question the 'power-chronographies' [45] designed into our systems for more deliberate, and enjoyable, ways of designing time.

7.3 New spatial logics of tourism

Another, central theme in our findings is how nomadicity affects tourism space, and how participants, infrastructures, hosts and the cycling communities co-construct these spaces.

We borrow here from tourism studies who have long been interested in how the tourism space is constructed and the relationship between the perception and experiencing of tourism space [51]. In CSCW, Stors and Baltes have documented how the user generated content of platforms like Airbnb have become dominant in the construction of tourism spaces where traditional forms of tourism promotion used to dominate [46]. Platforms, and specifically reviews, have been part of intensified tourism — where places are increasingly ranked as peripheral/central, popular/unpopular, 'bucket list'/forgettable. Drawing on the crowd-sourced review service Yelp, Zukin explores this shift and its implications, emphasizing an amplification effect: *"[b]ecause reviews posted on Yelp.com are organized geographically, the cumulative effect of reading them either intensifies or contradicts preexisting perceptions of "good" and "bad" neighborhoods"* [54]. This happens through feedback loops reinforcing positive and negative perceptions of specific areas and establishments [54]. Zukin argues that amplified search for "authenticity", and "exclusivity", of places as well as experiences, carries costs with regards to the well-being of local populations and reconfigures the city, often reinforcing undesired aspects such as increased racial segregation [54]. This intensification increasingly comes at the cost of over-touristification. In response, a diversity of local movements have emerged, manifesting discontent and resisting the ways in which platform economies commodify and organize urban space [38].

Our study of bike touring, and in particular the focus on nomadicity, paints a potentially different picture of tourism space as constructed around the often unremarkable, mundane and opportunistic, as in Elina's meeting of other cyclists simply for being simultaneously in these unremarkable spaces. These experiences are centered around the appreciation of emerging opportunities rather than strict plan following. Places are made sense of, and valued, in the everyday context of touring, in a literal embodiment of the saying "getting there is half the fun". Nomadic leisure takes the focus of tourism space away from the specific geographic and urban locations and distributes them along unstable, contingent and collaboratively constructed spaces. Without romanticizing these accounts, bike touring offers us an opportunity to reflect on these new spatial logics of leisure. This is evident

for instance in Gary's recounting of the curiosity people feel when meeting someone touring on bike. To us there are exciting opportunities in how this reveals a different tourist spatiality — one that moves us away from popular/unpopular places, to leisure practice that encompasses the spaces of 'nowhere', creating a new spatial logic that came from the experience of travelling. This is not a simple anti platform/technological account, as our participants ostensibly made productive use of these, not just as practical tools for planning but much more fundamentally as the very *enablers* of these experiences (this was particularly obvious in how smartphones made participants feel connected and comfortable enough to engage in bike touring). We would rather highlight how platforms infrastructure tourism, both temporally and spatially in similar ways than physical infrastructures such as roads or airports do, amplifying and dominating particular flows, such as Airbnb or Yelp.

We can draw inspiration from our participants' use of technology, and in particular platforms like Warmshowers, to think *with* nomadic leisure and how it reconfigures tourism space, opening up for 'out of the way places', as described by Zuev in his study of Couchsurfers in Krasnoyarsk: *"CouchSurfing practice generates a particular type of spatiality, which opens up new 'out of the way' places and allows tourists (CouchSurfers) to grasp local rhythms and familiarize themselves with 'strangers' space'"* [53]. In addition, the spatial logics documented here are influenced not only by the constraints and possibilities of cycling through space but, as we saw from our participants, by broader and purposeful ethical commitments to building positive relationships with hosts and communities. This form of nomadic leisure echoes Germann Molz's analysis of Couchsuring as an act of resistance — a move that questions how acts of individual personal growth, such as traveling, can become collective [36], or as Zuev puts it: *"encountering a stranger through hosting or becoming the guest of a stranger is an act of resistance to commercialized mobility and a global sense of xenophobia"* [53].

8 CONCLUSION

By approaching nomadicity through the lens of leisure we are able to draw out both a richer picture of the relationship with work, as well as some of the aspects which make bike touring an enjoyable activity: exertion, unpredictability or reciprocity. We discuss how participants, through bike touring, resist dominant temporal and spatial logics of work and leisure (and tourism in particular) as constituted by contemporary apps and platforms. Instead, they thrive on temporal and spatial logics whose unpredictability and resistance to commodification and formalization is inexorably tied with what makes them enjoyable.

Nomadic leisure practice serves as a wider critique of a relentless focus on work itself. As we documented from our participants, their leisure trips were not just pleasurable interludes fitting neatly in the regular rhythms of life. Through the embracing of mobility and the management of different types of risk, nomadic leisure practices privilege flexibility and serendipity. We can see this through our analysis of how bike touring forces participants out of logics of circumscribed time, and the dominant geographies of tourism put in place and/or amplified by apps and platforms. This leads to a more considerate syncing of rhythms with communities and spaces encountered along the way. For our participants, bike tours were opportunities to prioritize leisure, enjoyment, and personal goals in combination with community building and positive local engagements through the creative use of digital applications and platforms. In turn this challenges the role work plays in our lives and its often unquestioned necessities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our interviewees for their time and perspectives. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and generous comments on the manuscript. This work has been supported by the

Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research project RIT15-0046 and by Swedish Research Council grant number 2017-05382_3.

REFERENCES

[1] Paula Bialski. 2012. *Becoming intimately mobile.* Peter Lang Frankfurt, Germany. http://www.peterlang.com/download/datasheet/62848/datasheet_263070.pdf

[2] Kristina A. Bourne and Pamela J. Forman. 2014. Living in a culture of overwork: An ethnographic study of flexibility. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 23, 1 (2014), 68–79.

[3] Barry Brown. 2012. Beyond recommendations: Local review web sites and their impact. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 19, 4 (2012), 27.

[4] Barry Brown and Matthew Chalmers. 2003. Tourism and mobile technology. In *ECSCW 2003*. Springer, 335–354. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-010-0068-0_18

[5] Barry Brown and Oskar Juhlin. 2015. *Enjoying machines.* MIT Press.

[6] Barry Brown and Kenton O'Hara. 2003. Place as a practical concern of mobile workers. *Environment and planning A* 35, 9 (2003), 1565–1587.

[7] Sonja Buchberger. 2012. Hospitality, secrecy and gossip in Morocco: Hosting CouchSurfers against great odds. *Hospitality & Society* 1, 3 (2012), 299–315.

[8] Monika Büscher. 2014. Nomadic work: Romance and reality. A response to Barbara Czarniawska's 'nomadic work as life-story plot'. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 23, 2 (2014), 223–238.

[9] Kathy Charmaz. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Sage.

[10] Luigina Ciolfi and Aparecido Fabiano Pinatti De Carvalho. 2014. Work practices, nomadicity and the mediational role of technology. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 23, 2 (2014), 119–136.

[11] Luigina Ciolfi and Eleanor Lockley. 2017. Work-Life Strategies on the Move: Reconfiguring Boundaries. *International Reports on Socio-Informatics (IRSI)* 14, 3 (2017), 35–40.

[12] Luigina Ciolfi and Eleanor Lockley. 2018. From Work to Life and back again: Examining the digitally-mediated work/life practices of a group of knowledge workers. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 27, 3-6 (2018), 803–839.

[13] Barbara Czarniawska. 2014. Nomadic work as life-story plot. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 23, 2 (2014), 205–221.

[14] Aparecido Fabiano Pinatti de Carvalho, Luigina Ciolfi, and Breda Gray. 2011. The making of nomadic work: Understanding the mediational role of ICTs. In *Handbook of research on mobility and computing: Evolving technologies and ubiquitous impacts*. IGI Global, 381–396.

[15] Aparecido Fabiano Pinatti De Carvalho, Luigina Ciolfi, and Breda Gray. 2017. Detailing a Spectrum of motivational forces shaping nomadic practices. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. ACM, 962–977.

[16] Tim Edensor. 2001. Performing tourism, staging tourism: (Re)producing tourist space and practice. *Tourist Studies* 1, 1 (June 2001), 59–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/146879760100100104

[17] Pedro Ferreira. 2015. Why Play? Examining the roles of play in ICTD. In *Proceedings of the 5th decennial conference on Critical computing: between sense and sensibility*. ACM.

[18] Timothy Ferris. 2007. The 4-Hour work Week: Escape 9-5, Live Anywhere, and Join the New Rich. (2007).

[19] Breda Gray, Luigina Ciolfi, Aparecido Fabiano Pinatti de Carvalho, Anthony D'Andrea, and Lisa Wixted. 2017. Post-Fordist reconfigurations of gender, work and life: theory and practice. *The British journal of sociology* 68, 4 (2017), 620–642.

[20] Mary L. Gray and Siddharth Suri. 2019. *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass.* Eamon Dolan Books.

[21] Melissa Gregg. 2013. *Work's intimacy.* John Wiley & Sons.

[22] Melissa Gregg. 2014. Presence bleed: Performing professionalism online. In *Theorizing Cultural Work*. Routledge, 136–148.

[23] Melissa Gregg. 2018. *Counterproductive: Time management in the knowledge economy.* Duke University Press.

[24] Greg Guest and Kathleen M. MacQueen. 2008. *Handbook for team-based qualitative research.* Rowman Altamira.

[25] Karey Helms, Pedro Ferreira, Barry Brown, and Airi Lampinen. 2020. Away and (Dis)connection: Reconsidering the use of digital technologies in light of long-term outdoor activities. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Supporting Group Work (GROUP '20)*, Vol. 1. ACM, 20.

[26] Tapio Ikkala and Airi Lampinen. 2015. Monetizing network hospitality: Hospitality and sociability in the context of Airbnb. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work & social computing*. ACM, 1033–1044.

[27] Maximilian Klein, Jinhao Zhao, Jiajun Ni, Isaac Johnson, Benjamin Mako Hill, and Haiyi Zhu. 2017. Quality Standards, Service Orientation, and Power in Airbnb and Couchsurfing. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 1, CSCW (2017), 58.
[28] Leonard Kleinrock. 1995. Nomadic computing - an opportunity. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 25, 1 (1995), 36–40.
[29] Leonard Kleinrock. 1996. Nomadicity: anytime, anywhere in a disconnected world. *Mobile networks and applications* 1, 4 (1996), 351–357.
[30] Airi Lampinen and Coye Cheshire. 2016. Hosting via Airbnb: Motivations and financial assurances in monetized network hospitality. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. ACM, 1669–1680.
[31] Airi MI Lampinen. 2014. Account sharing in the context of networked hospitality exchange. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing*. ACM, 499–504. http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2531665
[32] Derek Layder. 1998. *Sociological practice: Linking theory and social research*. Sage.
[33] Paul Luff and Christian Heath. 1998. Mobility in Collaboration.. In *CSCW*, Vol. 98. 305–314.
[34] Melissa Mazmanian, Ingrid Erickson, and Ellie Harmon. 2015. Circumscribed time and porous time: Logics as a way of studying temporality. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*. ACM, 1453–1464.
[35] Jennie Germann Molz. 2012. CouchSurfing and network hospitality:'It's not just about the furniture'. *Hospitality & Society* 1, 3 (2012), 215–225.
[36] Jennie Germann Molz. 2012. Solidarity on the move: Technology, mobility and activism in a hospitality exchange network. *Mobility and Communication Technologies in the Americas, edited by Vannini, Phillip, Lucy Budd, Christian Fisker, Paola Jirón, Ole B. Jensen. New York: Peter Lang* (2012).
[37] Jennie Germann Molz. 2014. Toward a network hospitality. *First Monday* 19, 3 (2014).
[38] Johannes Novy and Clair Colomb. 2016. Urban tourism and its discontents: an introduction.
[39] Mark Perry, Kenton O'hara, Abigail Sellen, Barry Brown, and Richard Harper. 2001. Dealing with mobility: understanding access anytime, anywhere. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 8, 4 (2001), 323–347.
[40] Chris Rojek. 2013. Is Marx still relevant to the study of leisure? *Leisure Studies* 32, 1 (2013), 19–33.
[41] Chiara Rossitto and Kerstin Severinson Eklundh. 2007. Managing work at several places: a case of project work in a nomadic group of students.. In *ECCE*. 45–51.
[42] Chiara Rossitto and Airi Lampinen. 2018. Co-creating the Workplace: Participatory efforts to enable individual work at the Hoffice. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 27, 3-6 (2018), 947–982.
[43] Chiara Rossitto, Aparecido Fabiano Pinatti de Carvalho, Luigina Ciolfi, Airi Lampinen, and Breda Gray. 2017. Nomadic cultures beyond work practices. (2017).
[44] Johnny Saldaña. 2015. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
[45] Sarah Sharma. 2014. *In the meantime: Temporality and cultural politics*. Duke University Press.
[46] Natalie Stors and Sebastian Baltes. 2018. Constructing Urban Tourism Space Digitally: A Study of Airbnb Listings in Two Berlin Neighborhoods. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 2, CSCW (2018), 166.
[47] Norman Makoto Su and Gloria Mark. 2008. Designing for nomadic work. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM conference on Designing interactive systems*. ACM, 305–314.
[48] Will Sutherland and Mohammad Hossein Jarrahi. 2017. The gig economy and information infrastructure: The case of the digital nomad community. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 1, CSCW (2017), 97.
[49] Beverly Yuen Thompson. 2018. The Digital Nomad Lifestyle:(Remote) Work/Leisure Balance, Privilege, and Constructed Community. *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure* (2018), 1–16.
[50] Judy Wajcman. 2018. How Silicon Valley sets time. *New Media & Society* (2018), 1461444818820073.
[51] Martin Young. 1999. The social construction of tourist places. *Australian Geographer* 30, 3 (1999), 373–389.
[52] Eviatar Zerubavel. 1985. *Hidden rhythms: Schedules and calendars in social life*. Univ of California Press.
[53] Dennis Zuev. 2012. CouchSurfing as a spatial practice: Accessing and producing xenotopos. *Hospitality & Society* 1, 3 (2012), 227–244.
[54] Sharon Zukin, Scarlett Lindeman, and Laurie Hurson. 2017. The omnivore's neighborhood? Online restaurant reviews, race, and gentrification. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 17, 3 (2017), 459–479.

Received April 2019; revised June 2019; accepted August 2019