Precarious Migrants in a Sharing Economy: Collective Action, Organizational Communication, and Digital Technologies

Introduction

AMANDA ALENCAR
YIJING WANG
Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

An instantiation of the sharing economy marked the emergence of an ad hoc governance structure, including joint efforts from the public sector, NGOs, private firms, civil society, and migrant organizations. On one hand, such an ad hoc governance structure built on challenging organizational legitimacy and inventing new co-creation tools may contribute to reducing the disconnections between interventions by governance actors and migrants' experiences, situations, and actual needs. On the other hand, the complexity of multilevel governance systems and collaborations can also generate greater uncertainty about migrant integration processes. This special issue involves articles that contribute knowledge to how collective action is enabled in a sharing economy in support of precarious migrants in a diversity of contexts and situations. This collection includes articles examining voluntary contribution to migration management and care at all different levels, from the public sector organizations to private firms, to civil society and migrant-led initiatives and networks.

Keywords: migration, refugees, governance, integration, care

The complex and rapidly changing circumstances of migration as a global and regional phenomenon, coupled with an overall deterioration of state support and services, gave rise to hybrid governance infrastructures shaping the migratory experience (e.g., displacement and settlement). The "reform and re-treat of the welfare system" (Lindbeck, 1994, p. 4) has led to decentralization of migration governance and the growing importance of a multistakeholder approach, with public–private partnerships being formed to tackle the challenge of migration and integration in various societies (Skran & Easton-Calabria, 2020; Wang & Chaudhri, 2019). In addition, technological innovations and the so-called digital economy have played a great role in this decentralization (Easton-Calabria, 2019; Udwan, Leurs, & Alencar, 2020). Examples include the proliferation of hackathons, coding schools, and crowdsourcing initiatives (migrant entrepreneurship), as well as the large numbers of apps developed by activists, aid organizations, and private actors to assist migrants at different levels of their experiences (Marino, 2020).

Amanda Alencar: pazalencar@eshcc.eur.nl
Yijing Wang: y.wang@eshcc.eur.nl

This global phenomenon is argued as an instantiation of the sharing economy—an economic system built on autonomy that shares concern, help, and hope (Kornberger, Leixnering, Meyer, & Höllerer, 2018). Some scholars argue that this phenomenon marked the emergence of an ad hoc governance structure, including joint efforts from the public sector, NGOs, private firms, civil society, and migrant organizations (Börzel & Risse, 2016). Along with this idea, organizations and private firms voluntarily contribute to migration management and care (e.g., integrating refugees at the workplace or providing medical support), taking over what are traditionally tasks of the state. Such an ad hoc governance structure built on challenging organizational legitimacy and inventing new co-creation tools may contribute to reducing the disconnections between interventions by governance actors and migrants' experiences, situations, and actual needs. On the other hand, the complexity of multilevel governance systems and collaborations can also generate greater uncertainty about migrant integration processes (Scholten & Penninx, 2016).

Further, it is important to emphasize that digital media technologies, data systems, and networks are increasingly being employed by these multiple stakeholders (private and public) to help maintain the delivery of inclusive services and promote migrants' economic participation and well-being in many cities within Europe and elsewhere. However, very little is currently known about the efficacy of these digitally mediated practices for addressing migrants' integration challenges in their new society. At the same time, there is a lack of work that surveys a diversity of governance actors regarding the development and application of digital technologies, and how this affects migrants' social participation. A recent study by Georgiou (2019) with refugees in London, Berlin, and Athens found that innovative collaborative/co-creative projects within the digital economy framework have brought both challenges and opportunities for refugees and receiving societies. As Georgiou (2019) notes, while technology use for migration governance can enhance economic and sociocultural participation prospects for newcomers, it may also contribute to creating new forms of divide and segmentation among refugees, as well as digital monitoring of their performance in various aspects of integration in the new place. Against this backdrop is a pressing need to shed light on the potentialities and vulnerabilities of digital responses and communication initiatives put in place by local organizations, migrants, and volunteers to fill the gaps in states' asylum and integration systems.

This special issue involves articles that contribute knowledge to how collective action is enabled in a sharing economy in support of precarious migrants in a diversity of contexts and situations. The term *precarious migrants* can be defined as "population groups with low economic and cultural capital and with irregular or vulnerable migration status" (Nedelcu & Soysüren, 2020, p. 2); these groups include refugees, asylum migrants, low-skilled migrant workers, and undocumented migrants. The latter terms will be used interchangeably in this editorial introduction to highlight the specific context and situations of the studied migrant populations across the different articles composing this special issue. This collection includes articles examining voluntary contribution to migration management and care at all different levels, from the public sector organizations to private firms, to civil society and migrant-led initiatives and networks. A few interdisciplinary themes are addressed through these studies, which can be summarized into three aspects: (1) responsibility sharing in refugee integration: the role of public and private sectors; (2) digital governance of migration in the sharing economy; and (3) the sharing economy in social media: migrant belonging, politics, and mobilization. In the rest of the article, we will first discuss how the sharing economy is conceptualized in the experiences of precarious migrants, and then introduce each of the

articles included in this special issue. Afterward, suggestions for future research will be proposed, followed by the conclusion.

Conceptualizing the Sharing Economy in the Experiences of Precarious Migrants

The sharing economy as an alternative economic system refers to the value in redistributing excess to a community through the sharing of human and physical assets (Parsons, 2014). Its emergence can be understood through a neoliberal framework that defends deregulation and free trade. In a broad sense, the term entails exchanges of unused goods and services, either in-person or through digital transactions (Sutherland & Jarrahi, 2018). Different from individual ownership, it emphasizes the caring and moral value of engaging in economic activities to foster the sharing of access, collective consumption, and the creation of a new market space, often enabled and mediated by new technology (Schor & Attwood-Charles, 2017). In light of the need for sustainable development, the sharing economy as a new economic model has evolved at a global level involving various participants, including business and society in general (Berkowitz & Souchaud, 2019). However, critics argue that much discussion around sharing practices derives from a class-based premise of excess capacity that favors the depiction of tech-savvy, socially-driven youth generation leading the development of sharing economic activities, including the sharing of cars, bicycles, workspaces, food, and knowledge (Waite & Lewis, 2017). In this regard, scholars have already shed light on the different forms of inequalities that emerge from tech-enabled sharing practices, challenging optimistic and utopian accounts of the socioeconomic and environmental benefits generated by the "sharing" platforms (e.g., Uber and Airbnb) and their impact on labor practices and community exchange (Codagnone & Martens, 2016). While it is often claimed that societies are increasingly being affected by the sharing economy in terms of innovation, security risks, or the alleged deterioration of labor rights and state support, solid evidence is lacking regarding the effects of the sharing economy on populations experiencing certain conditions of precarity and vulnerability in today's configuration of neoliberal policies and practices (Waite & Lewis, 2017). In this section, we focus on discussing how the notion of the sharing economy is defined in this study and in relation to mobility and integration trajectories of precarious migrants.

Considering the importance of analyzing both positive (optimistic) and critical (pessimistic) perspectives on the types of sharing and their dynamics within migratory processes, this thematic issue adopts Belk's (2014) four key principles of the sharing economy: (1) the creation of reciprocal economic value, (2) making use of underutilized assets, (3) exchanges within a community, and (4) facilitating transactions through increased accessibility. Adherence to these principles would support social participation and well-being of precarious migrants in their host countries and cities (Belk, 2014). However, it is necessary to critically engage with the socioeconomic relations that are created and shaped through processes of exchange to better understand how the sharing economy develops within contexts of asymmetrically power dynamics (Waite & Lewis, 2017).

First, the reciprocal economic value can be realized when both parties of an exchange (e.g., producer and consumer) gain an economic benefit (Belk, 2014). Being a fundamental element of the sharing economy, this principle explains one of the main reasons that precarious migrants' integration could be facilitated through the framework of the sharing economy: When engaging in the literature on

refugee integration, for instance, there is a consensus that both the refugees and the local community should experience a mutually beneficial exchange. Migration scholars have increasingly emphasized the importance of mutual adaptation (Ager & Stranger, 2008), arguing that we need to think about integration beyond a focus on refugee individuals and communities only. Consequently, it is important to highlight the role that host societies play in supporting and providing context for integration while creating opportunity structures that benefit both the newly arrived migrants and the local community (Phillimore, 2021). A shift from the perspective on individual migrants to context enables responsibility sharing of different actors in the process of local integration (Scholten & Penninx, 2016), reflecting the so-called local turn in integration studies. Here the argument lies in the idea that "integration occurs at the level of communities and in the context of austerity measures" (Phillimore, 2021, p. 1950). This is exemplified in the recent study of Karakaya Polat and Lowndes (2021), which focused on the different spheres of governance and responsibility-sharing agreements shaping local responses to refugee integration in Turkey. In this special collection, we adopt an approach to responsibility sharing in precarious migrants' integration that accounts for the mobilization of resources in relation to education, politics, employment, and sociocultural participation.

Second, making use of underutilized assets—both tangible and intangible—provides a neoliberal alternative to find value in assets that has not yet been fulfilled (Belk, 2014). This principle also implies the creation of reciprocal economic value, given that the two are highly interconnected. The crucial role of migrants within host countries' national and local integration policies has often been neglected within public and scholarly narratives (Glick Schiller & Çağlar, 2011). Critical migration scholars have increasingly emphasized the importance of approaching migrants as key social actors to urban development processes by engaging in the daily lives of cities in various ways. The inability to recognize migrants' agency, according to de Haas (2021), reinforces essentialist conceptions of migrants as "passive victims of global capitalist forces" who lack human capital to "establish communities and their own economic structures in destination societies" (p. 8).

Next, the principle—exchanging within a community—refers to businesses' role beyond earning economic gains in the sharing economy (Belk, 2014). In other words, the traditional economic model of supply and demand should be refined to take human needs into account. This principle emphasizes social activity as a fundamental aspect of economic systems (Pouri & Hilty, 2021). Accordingly, social interaction within a community is crucial for driving economic exchange. Particularly in the case of precarious migrants, sharing activities may be used as a coping mechanism in response to constraints and incremental changes in social welfare systems and the lack of support from official institutions. Previous research has showed the role of networks formed by family, friends, and community organizations in providing informal support to migrants in precarious situations when formal support or resources from public funds cannot be achieved (Sigona, 2012). Turcatti (2021) uses the term *care communities* to refer to NGOs that are run by migrants to assist members of the migrant community in various aspects of their life in the host country, such as with access to "entitlements, information and welfare support, while fostering spaces where reciprocal caring relationships emerge" (p. 2). As noted by Gupta (2017), these kinds of support are primarily based on ethno-cultural and faith relations, in which a sense of responsibility is often shared among migrants who identify with the needs and struggles of others, generating solidarity and care.

Further, the fourth principle of the sharing economy draws on enhancing accessibility (Belk, 2014). While the connectivity between individuals has been lifted through the evolution of the Internet and social media in the past 20 years, it explains why the sharing economy has grown to the magnitude that it has now. Regardless of social or geographic differences, individuals now can interact with each other in the digital world. An important aspect of mediated family relations among refugees constitutes the practice of sharing visual contents online (e.g., photos and videos) as a way to sustain multiple levels of digital intimacy (Twigt, 2018; Witteborn, 2015). Similarly, several scholars have emphasized that migrants engage with social media platforms and digital devices for circulating information, resources, and experiences that can enhance resilience and community building during integration processes (Udwan et al., 2020). The different kinds of media content produced and shared in social networking sites have the potential to mobilize for migrants' rights and political agency in shaping their own forms of belonging and participation (Georgiou, 2018; Witteborn, 2015). Nevertheless, the different types of online sharing among precarious migrants (e.g., information, resources, crowdsourcing, care, support networks) do not always result in benefits and accessibility. Recent studies highlight barriers related to (a lack of) digital accessibility and literacy among precarious migrants (Alencar, 2020), as well as associated dangers of technology use (mis/disinformation, privacy issues, surveillance, and algorithmic bias) that might exacerbate their vulnerabilities and existing conditions and render them invisible as a community (Wall, Campbell, & Janbek, 2017).

This Special Section contributes a critical perspective to the analysis of the "sharing economy" in the experiences of precarious migrants in various contexts and in relation to emerging technology and communication processes. The next sections present the three main themes that make up our understanding of the sharing economy in the articles contributing to this Special Section.

Responsibility Sharing in Migrant Integration: The Role of Public and Private Sectors

Viewing migration as a global and regional phenomenon, different actors—from both public and private sectors—have played an important role in addressing the challenge of refugee integration at various levels. While it is argued that the development of the sharing economy offers great opportunities for refugees to better integrate into their host countries and become self-sufficient financially, this cannot be realized without taking a critical view of the ways in which multiple actors can enhance and hinder this process. Three articles included in the Special Section addressed this aspect through investigating the responsibilities shared in the integration of refugees and migrants with low economic status. Essentially, they all argued the important role of nongovernment actors in providing services and facilitating refugee integration and regarded this as a new development to establish sound governance structures in the sharing economy.

More specifically, Yijing Wang (2022) focused on refugee integration into the labor market and argued for business support of refugee (economic) integration as a manifestation of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Her study distinguished four types of corporate refugee support—corporate advocacy, sponsorship, partnership, and hiring refugees—to assess how they are perceived differently by employees. In addition, a comparative analysis was conducted to examine the perceptions of employees based in the United States and the United Kingdom (UK). Through an experiment design, Wang (2022) found that, in

terms of refugee integration, corporate partnership and sponsorship are perceived more positively by employees compared with corporate advocacy and hiring employees, and these effects are mediated by perceived organizational morality. In addition, the value of corporate advocacy turns out to be better recognized by the employees based in the United States than those in the UK. Overall, Wang (2022) underlined the importance of genuine engagement of businesses in fostering economic participation of refugees because these processes and practices can affect not only various aspects of refugee lives (Craig, 2015; Esses, Hamilton, & Gaucher, 2017), but also the perception and identification of employees.

Also drawing on the private sector, Ping Sun (2022), in this Section, examined how platforms could serve as a key site for the recognition and performance of precarious migrant workers' social economic integration in China through combining ethnographic fieldwork, in-depth interviews, and secondary materials. A socioeconomic approach was taken to understand to what extent platforms support precarious migrant workers in integrating into urban life. Emphasizing their social integration as a crucial issue, Sun (2022) demonstrated that food delivery platforms in China have employed both offline intermediaries and online management to expand, legitimize, and consolidate their governance structures for precarious migrant workers. For example, the platforms launch massive business expansion in lower tier cities in the name of poverty alleviation and community service. This can be viewed as an effort paid by the food delivery platforms to construct a governing model that enhances precarious migrant workers' economic integration into China. In particular, Sun (2022) focused on the institutional and structural factors that promote or hinder precarious migrant workers' embeddedness into urban life and proposed the concept of "platformed integration" to argue for the rise of a platformed governance model in China.

Sofia Zanforlin and Rafael Grohmann (2022), in this Section, studied how the platformization of labor and the entrepreneurial discourse in Brazil shape the relationship of precarious migrants and refugees with NGOs. Through interviewing the migrants and refugees working in São Paulo, their research revealed that the entrepreneurial rhetoric pressured the migrants and refugees to hind their concern of job insecurity and lack of transparency in the hiring system. In turn, they had to fully depend on the NGOs to enter the job market and take several jobs at the same time to earn sufficient income to survive. In addition, the authors found that the communication about the NGOs as "migrant saviors" in public arena further forced the migrants and refugees to become on-demand migrants who carry all the insecurities and responsibilities in the scope of their work. It is worth mentioning that while Sun (2022) argued that platforms complemented the existing governance structure to support precarious migrants' social integration into urban life, Zanforlin and Ghromann (2022) called for a more critical view of the role of platformization and the communication in relation to it in the sharing economy.

While social integration of precarious migrants can be regarded as a relational and contextual process in which various spheres (e.g., cultural, structural) differ in terms of scope and extent, the three studies addressing the theme all stated the value of practicing alternative governance models involving the contribution of nongovernment actors in supporting refugees in manifold ways. They also shed light on the cultural-specific solutions, which implies that there is no "one size fits all" formula with respect to facilitating refugee integration (Scholten & Penninx, 2016). Government and nongovernment actors need to tailor their strategies toward crucial local issues to better fulfill their responsibilities in the humanitarian and logistical challenge.

Digital Governance of Migration in the Sharing Economy

The second theme draws on the digital governance of migration in the sharing economy. It involves the role of data practices and management of migration from a perspective of technological developments. In the last decade, different fringes of society—humanitarian organizations, private entrepreneurs, tech corporations, volunteers, and grassroots organizations—have increasingly relied on digital solutions with the purpose of circulating solidarity. While technological developments serve manifold purposes (e.g., communication, transition, resource allocation) in the context of forced migration and refugee integration, they also create issues connected to data privacy and ownership, as well as vulnerabilities, exclusions, and discrimination deriving from data management practices (Madianou, 2019; Molnar, 2020). Two studies included in the Special Section tackled this perspective and called for more ethical uses of data and technology that center on care as a guiding sharing principle and value.

Sara Marino (2022) in this Section, stated that technologies are used in both a preemptive and performative manner during the refugee crisis. This refers to the transformation of migrant bodies into data that can be collected for identification, verification, and surveillance purposes on one hand and for state authorities' power to perform selective acts of exclusion at every border inspection on the other. Through interviewing the "tech for social good" community, including UK and Silicon Valley entrepreneurs, start-uppers, volunteers, and digital humanitarians, the author examined how the deterioration of governmental and humanitarian support for refugees contributed to the proliferation of initiatives and networks using technology as a driving force and as an opportunity for growth in the areas of refugee integration and participation. Such opportunities include the proliferation of hackathons and tech hubs, coding schools and resources, digital initiatives, and mobile applications. The findings suggest that reconciling the politics of solidarity with the ethics of data collection is incredibly complex and open to constant negotiations. Marino (2022) hence argued that for technologies to be used ethically and caringly, collaboration must happen horizontally and vertically, in a spirit of mutual sharing of political, economic, cultural, and affective resources across all sectors of society, and not as independent initiatives.

Dennis Nguyen and Sergül Nguyen (2022), in this Section, focused on the role of digital media in the refugee context. Similar to Marino (2022), the authors recognized the value of digital services and apps in providing refugees with useful tools that help with practical challenges of transition and integration on one hand and questioned the clarity and transparency of data practices in organizations on the other. Based on exploring 10 digital services (apps and Web based) and using the walkthrough method in combination with a content analysis of data policies, Nguyen and Nguyen (2022) concluded that organizations do not contribute to users' data literacy, but rather make it a requirement for comprehension of their data practices. The authors emphasized that, given the vulnerabilities of forced migrants, organizations should explore opportunities to inform users in more proactive, accessible, and educative ways. Such opportunities include implementing principles of privacy by design, revising formats, and identifying moments for communicating about data practices throughout the user experience.

Reflecting on the key principles of the sharing economy aforementioned, both Marino (2022) and Nguyen and Nguyen (2022) concluded with the value of making use of underutilized assets (e.g., technologies, digital media) for creating alternative governance structures in support of refugee

integration. Not surprisingly, the authors agreed on the social activity of various organizations as a fundamental aspect of driving societal change, and they identified enhancing individual refugees' accessibility to technologies and digital media as a crucial step toward such a change. But their concerns on the issues developed in the sharing economy—including data literacy, privacy, and ownership, as well as vulnerabilities, exclusions, and discrimination deriving from data management practices—point to the urgency and necessity of developing new guiding principles and innovative solutions for more ethical and transparent uses of data and technology to help the refugees.

The Sharing Economy in Social Media: Migrant Belonging, Politics, and Mobilization

The third theme reflects on social media as key spaces enabling sharing practices and different types of interactions and connections among migration actors. It is widely acknowledged that social media platforms are shaping the formation of diaspora communities (Diminescu, Matthieu, Mehdi, & Jacomy, 2011; Kumar, 2018) as well as their engagements and mobilization around particular issues online (Alinejad, 2019). Migrant networks in the digital space have been engaging in parallel acts of place-making and integration through the (algorithmic) affordances of digital platforms that use differential technological systems, data practices, and designs to intervene in the social contexts and structure the everyday lives of precarious migrants (Masso & Kasapoglu, 2020). This theme highlights the issues and interests that connect migrants online and that also gain visibility within digital networks and how these sociotechnical configurations affect different migrant communities in diverse settings. The two articles featured inthis Special Section introduce new discussions of the role of migrants' individual and collective organizing strategies in social media platforms to negotiate belonging and rights.

With a focus on Hispanic migrants in the United States and Spain, Daniela Jaramillo-Dent, Amanda Alencar, and Yan Asadchy (2022), in this Section, examined the ways in which these population groups appropriate and use the affordances and vernaculars of TikTok to engage in performative and creative practices through narratives of aspiration and belonging as well as deservingness and worthiness. The study built on content and critical discourse analysis of 198 TikTok videos produced by undocumented migrant workers deprived of their labor rights in the United States and Spain. The two countries have experienced the consequences of rising populism on migration policy, creating structural limitations that affect the rights of Latin American migrants who often migrate in search of better educational and work-related opportunities. In this study, the authors suggested that migrants are leveraging specific algorithmic affordances made possible by their platform literacy to deploy "belonging strategies" of self-representation. This perspective provides the groundwork for the conceptualization of *platformed belongings* proposed in the study, which includes an understanding of belonging as enacted through (self-)representation and shaped by the visibility and networked logic of digital platform models. Consequently, platform vernaculars and vernacular affordances provide the conditions in which belonging narratives are created and widely shared among migrant communities. Finally, it is argued that the aspirational nature of migrants' content creation strategies in TikTok responds to existing and new situations that directly challenge mainstream migratory narratives of exclusion and discrimination while fostering migrant networks of support.

Denise Cogo and Deborah Rodríguez Santos (2022), in this Section, set out to investigate the ways in which Cuban migrants create and share narratives to mobilize their rights in view of current migration policies in Cuba. As a case study, the collective "No Somos Desertores" [We Are Not Deserters] on Twitter was analyzed in relation to its focus on political activism of forced-exile Cuban professional migrants who abandoned international collaboration missions coordinated by the Cuban government, resulting in restrictions on the right to mobility and citizenship. The article drew on frameworks of migrant activism and communication agency and included Latin American academic perspectives to further expand the notion of migrants as "political subjects," as well as analyses of how social media mediate the production of transnational spaces for activism. In this study, the authors showed how Twitter was spontaneously adopted by Cuban migrant activists to construct and disseminate stories that mobilized support for their migratory rights, reported the consequences of family separation because of their banishment, and presented proposals to develop a policy agenda for Cuban migratory issues.

Acknowledging the growing relevance of social media technologies in the lives of precarious migrants provides an entry point to recognizing and meaningfully engaging with their agency to enact belonging and rights through informal citizenship tactics and membership online. Despite issues brought up by unstable information and communication environments that can limit the practice of online sharing, Cogo and Rodríguez Santos (2022), Jaramillo-Dent and colleagues (2022), and Wall and colleagues (2017) showed that precarious migrants' creative appropriations of digital platforms constitute acts of self-governance at both the individual and collective level, with the potential to shape the future of their own communities.

Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

While a number of collective actions have been enabled in the sharing economy in support of precarious migrants, the complexity of multilevel governance systems and collaborations in various forms can result in great uncertainty about migrant integration futures (Scholten & Penninx, 2016; Skran & Easton-Calabria, 2020). This Special Section aims to contribute to the ongoing dialogue concerning this issue and advancing knowledge on the mechanisms underlying and factors driving precarious migrants' social integration in a sharing economy. The studies in this issue examined various contextual and institutional components in relation to this topic; they involve responsibility sharing in migrant integration, digital governance of migration, and online connectivity and migrant belonging. One theoretical contribution of the Special Issue lies in its intention and effort to address the contemporary context and its implications for precarious migrants' social integration, in particular, with regard to the importance of possessing a critical view on how distinct actors can enhance and hinder this process and whether different spheres (e.g., cultural, structural, digital) can differ in terms of scope and extent. Additionally, the Special Section took a bottom-up approach to examine the ad hoc governance structure built on the efforts from the public sector, NGOs, private firms, civil society, and migrant organizations jointly (Börzel & Risse, 2016; Kornberger et al., 2018). This perspective is crucial for understanding new co-creation tools and context-specific cases, and in turn may motivate scholars to conduct interdisciplinary research examining migrant integration-related problems from different angles and through manifold ways.

The collection of articles in this section notes several possible directions for future research. First, thorough examinations of how nongovernment actors (e.g., humanitarian organizations, private

entrepreneurs, tech corporations, volunteers, and grassroots organizations) can practice alternative governance in supporting refugees in the sharing economy are greatly needed. In relation to this overarching theme, scholars can consider at least two potential research topics. One topic focuses on how nongovernment actors can develop affective citizenship in the social integration process of precarious migrants. It refers to a practice of social responsibility by these actors where all identities are seen as performative and innovative—not because of the role they play in our economy, but because of their intrinsic human value. Another topic draws on how to develop new principles and innovative solutions for more ethical and transparent uses of data and technology that center on care for precarious migrants as a guiding principle and value in supporting these population groups. Because reconciling the politics of solidarity with the ethics of data collection is very complex and open to constant negotiations (Marino, 2022), future research can pay special attention to advancing knowledge of the contexts and conditions that enable the development and enforcement of new principles and innovative solutions, as well as the generalizability of these factors. Finally, a greater focus on creative and effective forms of migrant activism online could produce interesting findings that account for more inclusive and sustainable digital practices by precarious migrants in the sharing economy.

References

Ager, A., & Stranger, A. (2008). Understanding integration. A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 21*(2), 166–191. doi:10.1093/jrs/fen016

Alencar, A. (2020). Digital place-making practices and daily struggles of Venezuelan forced migrants in Brazil. In K. Leurs, K. Smets, M. Georgiou, S. Witteborn, & R. Gajjala (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of migration and media* (pp. 503–514). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Alinejad, D. (2019). Careful co-presence: The transnational mediation of emotional intimacy. *Social Media + Society, 5*(2). doi:10.1177/2056305119854222

Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(8), 1595–1600. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001

Berkowitz, H., & Souchaud, A. (2019). (Self-) regulation of sharing economy platforms through partial meta-organizing. *Journal of Business Ethics, 159*(4), 961–976. doi:10.1007/s10551-019-04206-8

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (Eds.). (2016). *The Oxford handbook of comparative regionalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Codagnone, C., & Martens, B. (2016). *Scoping the sharing economy: Origins, definitions, impact and regulatory issues*. JRC Technical Reports. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/scoping-sharing-economy-origins-definitions-impact-and-regulatory-issues

Craig, G. (2015). *Migration and integration: A local and experiential perspective*. IRiS Working Paper Series, *7*(2015). Retrieved from https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/iris/2015/working-paper-series/iris-wp-7-2015.pdf

De Haas, H. (2021). A theory of migration: The aspirations-capability framework. *Comparative Migration Studies, 9*(8), 1–35. doi:10.1186/s40878-020-00210-4

Diminescu, D., Matthieu, R., Mehdi, B., & Jacomy, M. (2011). Digital diasporas atlas exploration and cartography of diasporas in digital networks. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, 5*(1), 657–658.

Easton-Calabria, E. (2019). *Digital livelihoods for people on the move*. Retrieved from https://www.undp.org/library/digital-livelihoods-people-move

Esses, V. M., Hamilton, L. K., & Gaucher, D. (2017). The global refugee crisis: Empirical evidence and policy implications for improving public attitudes and facilitating refugee resettlement. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 11*(1), 78–123. doi:10.1111/sipr.12028

Georgiou, M. (2018). Does the subaltern speak? Migrant voices in digital Europe. *Popular Communication, 16*(1), 45–57. doi:10.1080/15405702.2017.1412440

Georgiou, M. (2019). *City of refuge* or digital order? Refugee recognition and the digital governmentality of migration in the city. *Television & New Media, 20*(6), 600–616. doi:10.1177/1527476419857683

Glick Schiller, N., & Çağlar, A. (2011). Locality and globality: Building a comparative analytical framework in migration and urban studies. In N. Schiller & A. Çağlar (Eds.), *Locating migration: Rescaling cities and migrants* (pp. 60–81). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gupta, R. (2007). *Enslaved: The new British slavery*. London, UK: Portobello Books.

Lindbeck, A. (1994). Overshooting, reform and retreat of the welfare state. *De Economist*, *142*(1), 1–19. doi:10.1007/bf01384998

Madianou, M. (2019). Technocolonialism: Digital innovation and data practices in the humanitarian response to refugee crises. *Social Media + Society, 5*(3), 1–13. doi:10.1177/2056305119863146

Kornberger, M., Leixnering, S., Meyer, R. E., & Höllerer, M. A. (2018). Rethinking the sharing economy: The nature and organization of sharing in the 2015 refugee crisis. *Academy of Management Discoveries, 4*(3), 314–335. doi:10.5465/amd.2016.0138

Kumar, P. (2018). Rerouting the narrative: Mapping the online identity politics of the Tamil and Palestinian diaspora. *Social Media + Society, 4*(1), 1–18. doi:10.1177/2056305118764429

Marino, S. (2020). *Mediating the refugee crisis: Digital solidarity, humanitarian technologies and border regimes.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Masso, A., & Kasapoglu, T. (2020). Understanding power positions in a new digital landscape: Perceptions of Syrian refugees and data experts on relocation algorithm. *Information, Communication & Society, 23*(8), 1203–1219. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2020.1739731

Molnar, P. (2020). *Technological testing grounds: Migration management experiments and reflections from the ground up*. EDRi and the Refugee Law Lab. Retrieved from https://edri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Technological-Testing-Grounds.pdf

Nedelcu, M., & Soysüren, I. (2020). Precarious migrants, migration regimes and digital technologies: The empowerment-control nexus. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *48*(8), 1–17. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2020.1796263

Parsons, A. (2014). The sharing economy: A short introduction to its political evolution. *openDemocracy*. Retrieved from https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/transformation/sharing-economy-short-introduction-to-its-political-evolution/

Phillimore, J. (2021). Refugee-integration-opportunity structures: Shifting the focus from refugees to context. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 34*(2), 1946–1966. doi:10.1093/jrs/feaa012

Polat, R. K., & Lowndes, V. (2022). How does multi-level governance create capacity to address refugee needs, and with what limitations? An analysis of municipal responses to Syrian refugees in Istanbul. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *35*(1), 51–73. doi:10.1080/03003930.2020.1825386

Pouri, M. J., & Hilty, L. M. (2021). The digital sharing economy: A confluence of technical and social sharing. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions, 38*(March), 127–139. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2020.12.003

Scholten, P., & Penninx, R. (2016). The multilevel governance of migration and integration. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe* (pp. 91–108). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Schor, J. B., & Attwood-Charles, W. (2017). The "sharing" economy: Labor, inequality, and social connection on for-profit platforms. *Sociology Compass, 11*(8), 1–16. doi:10.1111/soc4.12493

Skran, C., & Easton-Calabria, E. (2020). Old concepts making new history: Refugee self-reliance, livelihoods and the "refugee entrepreneur." *Journal of Refugee Studies, 33*(1), 1–21. doi:10.1093/jrs/fez061

Sigona, N. (2012). "I have too much baggage": The impacts of legal status on the social worlds of irregular migrants. *Social Anthropology, 20*(1), 50–65. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8676.2011.00191.x

Sutherland, W., & Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). The sharing economy and digital platforms: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management, 43*(December 2018), 328–341. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.07.004

Turcatti, D. (2021). Migrant-led organisations as caring communities: Towards a re-appreciation of the reciprocal dimension of care. *International Journal of Care and Caring*, *5*(4), 651–667. doi:10.1332/239788221X16226509568576

Twigt, M. A. (2018). The mediation of hope: Digital technologies and affective affordances within Iraqi refugee households in Jordan. *Social Media + Society, 4*(1), 1–14. doi:10.1177/2056305118764426

Udwan, G., Leurs, K., & Alencar, A. (2020). Digital resilience tactics of Syrian refugees in the Netherlands: Social media for social support, health, and identity. *Social Media + Society*, *6*(2), 1–11. doi:2056305120915587.

Waite, L., & Lewis, H. (2017). Precarious irregular migrants and their sharing economies: A spectrum of transactional laboring experiences. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers, 107*(4), 964–978. doi:10.1080/24694452.2016.1270188

Wall, M., Campbell, M. O., & Janbek, D. (2017). Syrian refugees and information precarity. *New Media & Society, 19*(2), 240–254. doi:10.1177/1461444815591967

Wang, Y., & Chaudhri, V. (2019). Business support for refugee integration in Europe: Conceptualizing the link with organizational identification. *Media and Communication, 7*(2), 289–299. doi:10.17645/mac.v7i2.1877

Witteborn, S. (2015). Becoming (im)perceptible: Forced migrants and virtual practice. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 28*(3), 350–367. doi:10.1093/jrs/feu036