PUBLIC SERVICES
LABOR PROTECTIONS

LABOR
INSECURITY

SHIFTS
IN LABOR

FLEXICURITY
COMMONFARE

CARE
CRISIS

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT
CITIZENSHIP OTHERWISE

CARE-TIZENSHIP
REORGANIZATION OF CARE

BORDERS
& MOBILITY

FREEDOM OF KNOWLEDGE
COPYLEFT

PRECARITY ACTIVISM

Youth and Social Change in Southern Europe

Maribel Casas-Cortés

Precarity Activism

Youth and Social Change in
Southern Europe

Maribel Casas-Cortés

6 Platform precarities[1]

Organizing efforts at the intersection of Prec-Mig-Gig

My current research project focuses on the platform-based food delivery sector in Spain, where all the traits signaled by different waves of precarity struggles strikingly come together: labor, care and mobility. First, the loss of previous labor rights won by historical workers' movements is obvious in the platform delivery sector, with non-standard work schedules, no sick or holiday pay and no wage-based contracts but instead a piece-rate payment system. In turn, platform delivery labor is based on so-called "flexible" labor arrangements such as total availability, an *intermittent* relation between the company and the figure of the independent contractor as well as many components of immaterial labor. The immaterial labor in platform delivery combines artificial intelligence-based algorithmic management, with a high level of human-to-human interaction requiring affective communication with consumers, and effective negotiation with restaurants providers. Second, platform-based delivery entails an intense process of blurring the spaces and times of production and reproduction signaled by feminist precarity struggles. While algorithmic management leads to automated forms of labor control, somehow the rhythms and itineraries of platform delivery allow for interstices where couriers are indeed able to juggle the application-assigned deliveries with domestic and family tasks. Indeed, several female couriers assert that precisely this possibility to engage in care practices toward family members is the reason why they initially choose to be a part of the platform delivery sector. Also, from a feminist economic perspective, carrying food to homes is an act of care in its own right, although being monetarized and outsourced to minimum-wage laborers through the platform economy (Cid 2022). Finally, platform delivery is a trademark of highly mobile labor due to both its very highly itinerant character of carrying food from point A to point B several times during the journeys and the very constitution of the labor force. Delivery platforms, concretely in countries where national labor legislation has not been applied to AI-based sectors yet, are strongholds for persons under unstable migratory status, that is, for those with unresolved asylum and refugee applications, pending visa renewals, temporary residency permits as well as visa overstayers and those who crossed the borderline without passing through official border

control. Platform studies have pointed out to the constituent role of migration in platform labor, especially in the delivery sector. Still, "The neglect of [migration] questions in the literature on platform labour is a serious omission, given that migrants constitute a large and growing section of the urban gig economy workforce" (van Doorn, Ferrari, and Graham 2022, 2). Researchers are indeed alerting on how "the intersection of citizenship, language, visa, work permit, and the gig economy has been under-researched" (Lata, Burdon, and Reddel 2023, 9). Despite the evidence of high numbers of migrants with precarious administrative statuses in key platforms such as *Uber*, *Deliveroo*, *Glovo* or *Delivery Hero*, national and EU-level negotiations for regulating platform labor disregard this structural migrant component in the current unfolding of the gig economy, especially in the delivery sector. Despite celebratory discourses, current platform developments have become a site of precarity, interlinking the spheres of production, reproduction and migration, precisely those three realms previously identified and intertwined by precarity activists. In this chapter, reflecting my current research, I focus on the intermingling of platform precarity and migration.

I start with a succinct state-of-the-art platform research, emphasizing two sides in the debate, although precarity stands out as one of the main disadvantages of this *digital revolution*. The chapter then centers on the food delivery sector, signaling how precarity is being recomposed under digital technologies and how different forms of resistance are developing therein. I highlight an empirical finding, which is emerging timidly in the academic literature and not yet in the political and legislative debates about platform delivery: the presence and practices of couriers with precarious migrant statuses. This final chapter concludes with the realization that precarity in the platform economy reflect the prophetic critiques and insights raised by previous precarity networks.

The platform economy: Precarity strikes back!

The term platform economy refers to the latest transformations in production, distribution, labor and consumption, mainly due to technological developments in internet reach and the increase in cloud storage. These changes have been analyzed in openly celebratory terms, such as "digital revolution" popularized by the book *Race against the Machine* (Brynjolfsson and McAfee 2011). With their futuristic accounts, these two authors from the MIT Business School not only captured the imagination of many business student cohorts but also influenced emerging digital companies by serving as their expert consultants. Their appraisal portrayed an overly utopian landscape where machines, platforms and people interact happily ever after (Brynjolfsson and McAfee 2016; McAfee and Brynjolfsson 2017). The overoptimism engendered by the San Francisco start-ups was captured in terms of the *digital*, *creative*, *gig* or *sharing* economy, for instance. Although used

interchangeably, these depictions are neither sufficient nor completely syn-onymous, and indeed, some are overly idealistic or misleading.

According to critical economists, current empirical evidence indicates a move not toward a more democratic and inclusive economy, but rather to-ward growing centralization of power, as in previous capitalist cycles, includ-ing monopoly creation and the appropriation of infrastructures (Langley and Leyshon 2016; Plantin et al. 2018; Srnicek 2016). The Canadian economist Nick Srnicek detects solid continuities, and also identifies significant changes, renaming the new economy as "platform capitalism" (2016). For instance, although platforms constitute business models that differ from traditional corporations, their propensities toward monopoly are amplified due to the digital nature of economic transactions, turning them into powerful actors in the digital economy, as indeed Srnicek shows in his case studies. Google is one of the main examples he uses to explain how the search engine platform sector has entered a vicious cycle of depending upon a single, ever more pow-erful company. Furthermore, every time information is digitally exchanged, these companies are set up to extract and control immense quantities of data, which they later use for further profit-making. According to this author, "twenty-first-century capitalism has found a massive new raw material to appropriate: data" (Srnicek 2016, 48).

For both critical and pro platform scholars, the defining feature of the platform-based economy is the intermediary role it plays in economic and social interactions. It is a business model based on expectations of high economic participation, where individuals are viewed as both potential consumers and potential providers. As such, this economic model is able to interconnect multiple interested parties in agile economic transactions, mainly through the mobilization of data analytics. Some authors argue that this intermediation has capillary properties, since it is able to penetrate old markets and generate new ones. This rhizomatic effect goes beyond the economic sphere, having a variety of effects on many everyday activities, certain industrial operations and even international relations (Cusumano, Gawer, and Yoffie 2019; Dijck, Poell, and Waal 2018). As such, platforms have been hailed as a new model of business governance, legally speak-ing, different from the vertically integrated corporation (Davis 2016). The emergence of this model has generated two main sets of academic nar-ratives (Pasquale 2016). On the one hand, platforms are celebrated to the point of being proclaimed as the basis of a "peer-to-peer capitalism" (Sundararajan 2016). According to this pro-platform narrative, democracy will be enhanced thanks to the platform economy. This view envisions the participation of many individuals, including those who are commonly mar-ginalized, who can now act as micro-entrepreneurs in a dynamic economy thanks to intermediary platforms (Gillespie 2010). On the other hand, platforms are posited as furthering previous controversial tendencies of depredatory capitalism in search of accumulation, not only furthering mo-nopolistic tendencies but also deepening precarious working conditions. In

this view, precarity strikes back, under updated forms of digital labor based on uses of artificial intelligence in management.

Digital precarious gigs? The case of food delivery platform labor

A delivery courier does not commute to an office or factory to be supervised by in-person managers during the delivery journey. Urban public spaces constitute the main sites for the business of platform delivery. According to companies such as UberEats or Stuart, riders are supposed to be "his/her own boss", choosing their schedules and providing their own mode of transport, to deliver prepared food across the city by receiving orders via a company application. Automatic calculations indicate where and how long it will take to conduct the delivery. This satellite-based matching of the courier's changing locations to restaurants and homes will then award or punish their performance with more or fewer orders. Despite platform couriers' apparent autonomy, several studies have analyzed the role of "algorithmic management" in furthering control over the labor process in the platform economy (Griesbach et al. 2019; Huws 2020; Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin 2020; Shapiro 2018; Wood et al. 2019). In addition to these automated forms of labor control, platform labor has been described as deeply precarious for other reasons also. For instance, the generalization of the *gig*-like contractual arrangement has given rise to several labor insecurities, including pay rates that are dependent on consumer satisfaction, unpredictable protocols for hiring and laying off, patchy and intensive labor schedules and low professional promotion (Woodcock and Graham 2020). This modality of short-term, task-oriented hiring, with no social provisions or other related benefits associated with stable jobs, predates the rise of platforms. Nonetheless, although the gig contractual relationship has been historically present in sectors without platforms or digital technology (e.g. spectacle sector, see Kalleberg 2018; Kalleberg and Vallas 2018). The platform economy has instaurated the modality of gigs based on the use of digital applications, furthering the proliferation of a "just-in-time workforce" (De Stefano 2016; Drahokoupil and Vandaele 2021; Neufeind, O'Reilly, and Ranft 2018). Platform labor has thus been explicitly criticized by many for fostering "precarious" conditions (Schor et al. 2020; Vallas and Schor 2020). Despite new analytical terms such as the "uberization of labor" (Rosenblat 2018), "ghost-work" (Gray and Suri 2019) and "hustling work" (Ravenelle 2019), current forms of platform precarity (less security, lower salaries and poorer working conditions) are in continuation with previous recent trends in labor relations. As such, they are the result of decades of institutional re-structuring of labor laws (Arnold and Bongiovi 2013; Foti 2017; Friedman 2014; Kalleberg and Vallas 2018; Scholz 2017; Vallas 2019). Long-term discontents with precarity are facing yet again one more expression of imposed uncertainty: platform precarities. In terms of resistance to the hegemonic development of platforms, it is possible to identify a series of emerging initiatives.

Platform resistances: Organizing among food delivery couriers

These multiple faces of precarity transversally frame different forms of resistance within platforms. Controversies and organized responses have emerged against platform companies focused on different kinds of service provision. In the case of lodging, critical arguments against the sharing economy such as *What's Yours is Mine* (Slee 2015) have led to local neighbors in Barcelona to organize campaigns against Airbnb and criticize its model for promoting a brutal and unsustainable kind of tourism (Romero-Lecrivain and Micaletto-Bleda 2020; Sequera 2022). In the case of ride-sharing services, animosity of taxi drivers toward Uber's aggressive entrance into local markets, disrespecting rules and lowering standards, had led to violent protests in Buenos Aires and other cities (Del Nido 2022). In this case, my national research project focuses on organizing by couriers within the app-based food delivery sector. Precisely because of the precarity of their journeys, many riders are testing out forms of improving their conditions, trying to make a living in the platform of food delivery sector. Some of these initiatives include forms of union-like organizing, platform-based cooperatives, and methods of "algorithmic resistance" within corporate platforms.[2]

In terms of union-like organizing structures, these initial forms of self-organization are rather informal and with a rank-and-file grassroots base, often without the support of traditional trade unions. Explicit forms of mobilization in the food delivery sector increased from 2016 onward, when protests against companies such as Deliveroo and Foodora emerged in cities in the UK and Italy. Delivery couriers' complaints included: opaque management and the asymmetry of information; low payment for single yet long orders and their non-consideration by the company as workers, which denies them access to representation mechanisms and conventional labor rights (i.e. a monthly wage, unemployment benefits and medical insurance). Their status as self-employed who perform micro-tasks in their spare time leads to insecurity in the workspace, and the financial uncertainty associated with the informal economy. The low-activity level of traditional unions in these sectors has prompted workers to self-organize. The absence of a labor rights framework that guarantees workers' the right to strike and take collective action has encouraged the renewal of classical repertoires, such as calling for actions without previous warning. Digital strikes have been enacted, "whereby workers *log out* en masse from the firm's app that allocates work shifts and deliveries to boycott and block the delivery service" (Cini and Tassinari 2018). Social media has also been used, with online "brand shaming" and "shitstorming" of the company's websites to mobilize public opinion. Other workers have supported mobilizations through less risky actions, such as placing protest flyers inside bags of food delivered to customers (Tassinari and Maccarrone 2020). *Riders Union Bologna* is an example of an "informal union" of food delivery workers, a grouping of riders and activists contesting the precarity born out of the impossibility of accessing representational rights as workers

([Marrone and Finotto 2019](#)). Active since 2017, it has made mutualism its banner, providing what the platforms denied: bike repair shops; stands where cyclists could recharge their smartphones; shelters for waiting times and opportunities for socializing outside of work. Entangled with local activist movements, this informal union made up of platform couriers joined forces with the Bologna cycling movement in the Critical Mass, and participated with other precarious workers in the Rider's Pride Parade on May 1, 2017. It also pushed for the "Bill of Rights of Digital Workers in Urban Contexts", an agreement between platforms and riders that stimulated the first nationwide collective bargaining process in Europe.

Subsequently, in 2021, the Spanish Congress passed the so-called "*Ley Rider*" (Delivery Labor Act), a national attempt to regulate the app-based delivery sector demanding algorithmic transparency from companies and granting all couriers the status of wage-earner instead of self-employed. However, this law was preceded by heated negotiations with unresolved social unrest. On the one hand, the law was supported by *Riders x Derechos* (Riders for Rights), an alliance among rank-and-file small trade unions arguing for couriers to be turned into wage-earners; and on the other, the *Sí soy autónomo* (*Yes, I am self-employed*) campaign emerged in opposition to the government's intention to force platforms to hire couriers as employees. Food-delivery couriers were divided among those who were for, and those who were against, the self-employment narrative advocated by platforms. The controversy exemplifies the current tension which exists between different notions of work and employees' identities and statuses, reflecting the contrast with previous workers' rights logics of the XIX and XX centuries. New logics have developed under the spread of unregulated labor markets, exacerbated by the outsourcing processes taking place in the transtion from supply chain capitalism to platform capitalism. This gives rise to "nonwork" kinds of identities among laborers, who self-describe as either "entrepreneur or consumer, but not as worker" ([Tsing 2009](#)). In her ethnography of Uber, [Rosenblat (2018)](#) explains how the company has performed the notion of work, using technology and language, to transform the rhetoric of work into a rhetoric of both consumption, turning drivers and passengers into "users", and entrepreneurship, talking about "entrepreneurs" instead of workers and flattering the "neutrality" of algorithms ([Rosenblat 2018](#)).

As an alternative to the monopoly of large companies, platform-based cooperatives update the P2P culture and articulate a two-fold resistance: first, by re-appropriating technology; and second, by deconstructing the ideological discourse of platforms, advocating for a truly "collaborative" economy. This is the case of "platform cooperativism" ([Scholz and Schneider 2017](#)), which is conceived as an ethical and self-managed endeavor to provide a model for businesses not rooted in the exploitation of their workers (Fernández and Soliña 2020). It is a model that emphasizes new property regimes, democratic governance and mutual aid. According to Scholz, platform cooperativism is about cloning the technology of companies like Airbnb and UpWork, but with opposite goals, seeking to benefit the many rather than the

few. In fact, platforms can be owned and operated by national governments, regional authorities, city halls, universities and school systems (Scholz 2016). The organizational principles of these cooperatives are inspired in the debates on the commons and the practice of *commoning* (e.g. Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Stephen Healy 2016). Nonetheless, this kind of cooperativism faces other challenges, such as scale of impact and economic sustainability (Moral-Martín et al. 2023), as well as gender and ethnic inclusion (Fuster Morell, Espelt, and Renau Cano 2021). This last issue is especially pressing in the conventional platform economy, whose algorithms have been denounced for reproducing gender and racial hierarchies (Benjamin 2019; Noble 2018).

Fairbnb is an example of a platform cooperative. Since 2019, it has been connecting supply and demand for holiday or occasional rentals. Whereas Airbnb prioritizes economic profit, Fairbnb promotes social ties and has generated communities of users in Europe. Similarly, *Equal Care Co-Op, Cotabo* and *CoopCycle* offer a fairer alternative to the extractivist and outsourcing practices of Helpling, Uber and Deliveroo, respectively, in the domestic work, mobility and food delivery sectors. For instance, those delivery workers from Barcelona who first self-organized as an informal union called *Riders x Derechos*, later become a platform-based cooperative known as *Mensakas* (Soto Aliaga 2023). As such, instead of demanding labor improvements from a capitalist-driven platform, they engage in making their own platform, designing its own application and algorithmic calculations, which include variables other than lowering labor costs. The rise of platform cooperatives is evolving at the local level in several cities in Spain (Madrid, Vitoria, Valencia and Zaragoza) as well as in other places, such as London and Berlin (see Figure 6.1).

Those located in Europe are organized along European networks, the most active one being *CoopCycle*, a federation of bike delivery coops. While small in scale and without a significant customer base as of yet, these coops are definitely reclaiming platform infrastructures in order to put their intermediary capacities to the service not only of companies but also of couriers and consumers. These experiments reveal how technology, from design to implementation, is rather political. That is, the digital revolution holds the capacity to serve different uses and ends, and in turn, benefiting more or less people. As such, it is not the technology itself that produces precarity, but a certain ideologically driven technology development.

Last but not least are forms of *algorithmic resistance*, articulated individually and collectively during delivery times (Velkova and Kaun 2019; Woodcock 2021). These practices include interacting with delivery platform applications in ways that can benefit the riders' own timing and itineraries of delivery, rankings and compensations. They are often led by stakeholders who are not members of either unions nor cooperatives, but who weave together forms of "invisible organizing" through which they try to take care of improving delivery conditions and addressing survival concerns (Cant 2020). Everyday life has been one of the most explored areas in recent works on platform resistance

Figure 6.1 Logo of Wings, a delivery platform cooperative in London. Creative Commons CC BY-NC. Reprinted with author permission.

(Duus, Hojer Bruun, and Anne Line Dalsgård2023; Frey 2020). In the food delivery sector, this is articulated in streets, squares, social media, WhatsApp groups as well as during waiting times, where the digitalization of managerial functions via the app enables spaces mostly free from direct managerial gazes. Faced with geo-localized control and the opaque management of the platforms, couriers develop practical tactics to make the application work better for them. According to my research team's ethnographic work, in the absence of protection provisions by the companies, couriers team up to digitally solve many issues on their own. In contrast with the discourse of total algorithmic control vs. autonomy (Shapiro 2018), we have observed different forms of algorithmic mediation, which in turn, entail certain "participatory subjectivity" in the part of the couriers (Allen-Perkins and Cañedo-Rodríguez 2023). Platform riders develop and share tactics to improve their position vis-a-vis

the algorithmic-based calculations in the labor process. For instance, by deploying strategies of visibility/invisibility, such as switching the app on and of and disconnecting to avoid unsafe places (Bergua, Montañés and Báez 2023). Also, by inventing ways to circumvent the facial recognition control of delivery platforms such as *UberEats* and *Glovo* (Casas-Cortés, Moya Santander, and Piñeiro 2023). While constantly checking their phone for possible incoming orders, delivery couriers organize via digital communication to repair their vehicles, to warn about police checks or alert about crime events providing locations and times (Diz, González, and Prieto 2023).

Despite fears of being punished or "deactivated", isolated or left unpaid, day by day, in the shadow of public demonstrations, yet unfolding in relation to them, riders put their stratagems into action through the cracks of the platform economy (Cant 2020). Platform couriers demonstrate that platform resistances are sometimes able to open the algorithmic black box (Ferrari and Graham 2021) and go beyond the "drama of the algorithm" (Seaver 2017). Everyday algorithmic resistance generates fissures in the platforms' socio-technical regime in search of improving living and laboring conditions (Velkova and Kaun 2019). In the case of delivery, the city itself is the platform workspace where dispersed couriers wait for their orders and zig zag through the streets on their multiple itineraries for on-time deliveries. In fact, delivery platforms make use of public spaces and items, from bike-lanes to plazas' benches, without having tax responsibilities nor contributing to any maintenance costs. This drastic absence of formal and protected workspaces led couriers to rely on basic forms of mutual support to respond to basic needs, such as finding secure areas during nighttime shifts, as well as strategizing together against crime, traffic injuries and inclement weather conditions. Despite this high level of unprotection in terms of labor rights in platform delivery, somehow couriers swear by it as a real source of possibilities unthinkable in other sectors.

This deeply ambivalent character of precarity, as both deteriorating basic conditions and opening certain opportunities, was prophetically advanced by the initial precarity debates of the 2000s. This tension became sharply evident upon analyzing platforms from the point of view of migration. The rise of migrant couriers in the delivery sector assumes them to be in a victimized position within a blackhole for exploitation and fatal injuries. However, besides this undeniable reality, there is more to the picture. Practices of survival and resistance are emerging at the intersection of platform labor and the migration statuses of couriers in food delivery apps.

Migration and food delivery platforms: App-account sharing among deportable couriers

Quantitative data on the *migrant* presence in platform labor is not easily achievable, as platform businesses are not required to disclose numbers (Huws, Spencer, and Coates 2019). Still, a recent survey conducted by the International Labor Organization shows how large percentages of workers

relying on the digital gig economy have an international migrant background, reaching 70% of the platform workforce in Argentina and Chile (ILO 2021). Furthermore, qualitative studies are revealing the geographical scope of this interrelation between migration and platform-based delivery. According to incipient ethnographic research in urban centers, migrant labor is becoming an intercontinental phenomenon across cities not only in North America, Africa and Europe (Altenried 2021; Anwar and Graham 2021; Metawala, Golda-Pongratz, and Irazábal 2021; Schaupp 2022; van Doorn and Vijay 2021; Vieira 2020), but also in South America (Jirón et al. 2021; Tironi and Albornoz 2022), Asia (Chen and Qiu 2019; Zhang 2020; 2021; Zhang and Chen 2022) and Australia (Barratt, Goods, and Veen 2020). Many of these scholarly works insightfully point out how the migratory statuses in the platform sector have evolved. While starting with mostly young national citizens to make an extra money, the current generation is mainly composed of an international labor force engaging app-based gigs for a living. One of the material reasons to explain why migrants, especially those without all the required documents to work, constitute a remarkable portion of platform labor is the unbureaucratic application process with very few formal requirements concerning qualifications or documents in contrast with standard labor markets. Some authors describe the fast online "onboarding" processes within the food delivery industry as conducting a kind of "selective formalization" where they "dissolve the formal employment relation into a nexus of non-negotiable commercial contracts and user agreements [...and] are often quite lax with their enforcement of formal requirements such as background checks" (van Doorn et al. 2022, 4).

The technological ease of having a single account used by several couriers has given rise to practices of subletting and lending of platform accounts. International media initially reported this phenomenon in the United Kingdom (Bryan 2019), France (Alderman 2019), Italy (Allaby 2021) and more recently in Spain (Palacios and Martínez 2023). Some studies briefly mention the practice of informal subletting of accounts, specifically among those without work or residency permits, tracing how current migratory regimes led many couriers to rent accounts from others who do have the documents to register officially with the platforms (Altenried 2021; Casas-Cortés, Moya Santander, and Piñeiro 2023; Sanz et al. 2023; van Doorn, Ferrari, and Graham 2022). Some studies also briefly acknowledge the practice of borrowing accounts when couriers let others use their own accounts without charging money for it, mostly as a "practice of solidarity" (Altenried 2021). While these works are among the few which acknowledge the informal uses of individual accounts, they present them as rather incidental, and as internally resolved with measures taken by labor inspections, police raids or companies' surveillance methods.

My research though shows how these apparently unimportant practices of subleasing and lending delivery accounts among couriers under precarious migratory statuses are re-shaping the platform delivery sector. Further

analyzed in my article *More than a Glitch*, I point to the structural role of migration in platform capitalism (Casas-Cortés forthcoming). Practices of sharing delivery accounts have become key drivers of change within the sector of platform delivery as we know it, even contributing to certain companies' success. This is the case of Glovo, founded in 2015 as a start-up with three employees in Barcelona, Spain. In 2023, this delivery tech platform was operating in 25 countries across Europe as well as in several national markets in the African continent and the Middle East. According to *Business Insider* magazine, *Glovo*'s CEO, Oscar Pierre co-founded this home-delivery company with a clear image of the courier prototype: the standard "collaborator" will be a young person, in search of spare cash or to complement a main source of income, someone excited to travel and have "fun". Discursively, the case of *Glovo* has become a hallmark of the so-called "platform revolution", where anyone is a potential business actor and in which free time becomes an asset to make money. Still, there are certain keys to *Glovo*'s success that, while absent from public debate, scholarly attention and media coverage, are traceable by following the opening and actual functioning of a single, yet multi-user, delivery account.

Acquiring a *Glovo* account is as "fast and easy" as the step-by-step process of getting a Google account, affirms a courier from Venezuela under international protection living in Spain. According to *Glovo*'s online registration website, "you just need to introduce basic ID information and you will be delivering in less than 24h". Once the delivery account is open, it is even easier that the same account is passed around to other users. A *user name + a password* is all you need to connect to the application and start receiving orders, regardless of the person introducing those codes. Given this high level of exchangeability, the same account might be in use by several couriers. It is common that one or more third users access a single account making deliveries simultaneously. Multiple users access other couriers' profiles by subleasing or borrowing them directly from the individual owner of the account. There is no quantitative data to measure the scope of this practice. Still, posts selling and searching for delivery accounts are common in social media such as *Facebook*, *Instagram* and *WhatsApp*. When several couriers are making deliveries non-stop and simultaneously under the same account, that account makes more money, awarded by getting more orders. As such, this use of delivery accounts becomes more profitable for everyone: for the account holder, for the account users, and for the delivery company. Nonetheless, the main reason behind the shared and subleased accounts is that most of the couriers are missing residency status or valid work permits, which are required by national labor legislation. Without those two pieces of paperwork, these couriers are not allowed to work either as self-employees or wage-earners. Still, this practice facilitated earning an income outside of those two labor categories within the worker/citizen framework. The incipient literature on migration and platforms speaks in terms of undocumented migrants. Still, there is a large spectrum of administrative statuses between citizen and non-citizen, including those with permission to reside but

not to labor (Anderson 2013; Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas 2012). This is precisely Glovo´s constituency. According to a national union report (Diez et al. 2020), which concurs with our qualitative data, many *Glovo* couriers fall into this grey zone of having some, but not all, of the required administrative papers to legally labor in Spain: those in the midst of asylum-process resolutions; those under temporary international protection and those over-staying their initial visa periods. Regardless of differential stages in migratory status, these couriers may sooner or later be regularized or become deportable. For these couriers, delivery becomes a feasible option to enter the labor market and obtain the main source of income. By engaging technological possibilities offered by the very same platforms – e.g. having multiple users delivering under a single account – migrant couriers unfold their "precarious instinct" to face high levels of insecurity. In this case, insecurity was produced by the intersection between the deregulation of platform delivery on the one hand, and a rigid regulation of migration management on the other hand.

The market of delivery accounts remained under the radar until May 27 2019, when a 22-year-old bike-courier in the midst of a delivery with a *Glovo* backpack was mortally wounded in a collision with a garbage truck late at night in one of the central avenues of Barcelona. A debate followed, in terms of an unfortunate "traffic accident" according to the company vs. "injury on the job" as denounced by pro-labor rights organizations.[3] Only a few newspapers focused on how the courier was originally from Nepal, arriving in Spain six months before his death and was residing under a precarious migratory status: "The deceased had been distributing for Glovo for just over a week and it was the only job he could access without a work permit", said a fellow courier from Pakistan.[4] This attention to the administrative migration status of the dead courier, while *Glovo* was claiming how he was not officially registered as a collaborator, went beyond the usual debate about self-employed vs wage-earner models of work. Instead, the strictly labor-centered debate on reclassification of couriers was placed temporarily on pause. A thus far ignored reality came to light: many deliveries under *Glovo* accounts were made by couriers without work and/or residency permits. Still, while *Glovo* claimed subcontracting was illegal, this use of *Glovo* accounts kept growing exponentially from 2017 onward (Diez et al. 2020). Given the circumstances of the courier's death, the apparent rarity of subleased accounts within the delivery sector was suddenly under public scrutiny. *Glovo* responded via national media announcing blunt measures: offering to pay funeral costs; calling all couriers to register to access the security safety manual and finally threatening to close all accounts in use by unregistered riders via the installation of verification devices in the applications for customers and restaurants. Despite the seemingly vehement response, *Glovo* deactivated a total of 17 accounts as a response to the courier's death. *Glovo*, together with other key delivery companies such as *Deliveroo* and *UberEats*, was accused of relying massively on clandestine employment of irregular migrants. According to the interviews and the sole union report on this, registered couriers subleased their own delivery accounts to people in

precarious administrative status for a percentage, usually 30%, of the profits from their deliveries. While the national press reported how home delivery platforms were aware and allowed "a dark business of delivery account scams", a similar lethal accident of a motorcycle courier took place in downtown Madrid the night of February 8, 2021.[5] This time it was an asylum-seeker, a lawyer from Venezuela in the midst of a delivery with a *Glovo* backpack, yet without a *Glovo* account under his name.

Back in 2019, around the time of the first mortal accident of an unregistered courier, *Glovo* vehemently prohibited any attempt at subcontracting *Glovo* accounts. In contrast, on November 2, 2022, *Glovo* announced new terms and conditions, where it included the possibility of subcontracting by downloading the same account on several cellphones. This measure makes it even easier for third-party users to deliver under the same account. As such, user verification via technologies, such as facial recognition software, were easily overcome, and only comprise a minor inconvenience. According to the riders interviewed, this recent *Glovo* policy accepts and encourages the informal subcontracting of delivery accounts.

This striking move by the main delivery company in Spain points to the influence of the large presence of deportable couriers, and their uses of delivery accounts, on the readjustment of platform business strategies. Somehow, by offering the option of subcontracting accounts, *Glovo* re-appropriates what once was an illicit practice and frames it as a permissible, even legal, possibility held by any self-employee to contract their own labor force. As such, this reconfiguration enables *Glovo* to keep counting with that readily available labor force at its disposal, while outsourcing all the responsibilities, including the breaking of migratory laws, to those registered self-employees holding *Glovo* accounts.

With this move, the platform responds and adapts its infrastructure to an apparent simultaneous interest between platforms and couriers, at least temporarily, in the practice of subleased and shared accounts. My argument points to how platform companies and migrant couriers, at different points in their journeys, somehow overlap in sharing interests, in this case, maintaining a highly unregulated labor market in delivery. Many food couriers are asylum seekers under international protection. Following current EU and national migratory legislation, they need to wait for a series of periods to sequentially regularize their right to stay, and eventually, their right to labor in Spain or the EU. This waiting time gets delayed and stretched in the absence of concrete deadlines due to heavy backlogs in bureaucratic procedures. During this imposed "border time" – entailing long waiting for their migratory status to get regularized-, one of the only sectors where they can make a living is the platform-based food delivery sector (Diz and Casas-Cortés forthcoming).[6] Therefore, on the one hand, companies exponentially multiply their labor force ensuring 24/7 availability to respond to delivery orders across urban landscapes, and thus, increasing their profit-making margins. On the other hand, those with uncertain administrative migratory status are able to enter rigid and exclusive national labor markets, usually entitled to

those with citizenship or long-term residence permits, allowing a sector of the population with few labor options to make a living while avoiding controls by migratory enforcement agencies. Somehow, the uses of delivery accounts in the hands of deportable couriers interact with the interests of platform companies. This strange synergy is reminiscent of the ambivalence of precarity pointed out by precarity movements. It seems clear by most accounts that laboring conditions in platform delivery feature many of the diminishing conditions of labor highlighted for more than 30 years in flexibilizing labor markets. Yet the very informality within recruitment and supervision of these companies facilitates the incorporation of migrants with unstable administrative statues. These same people would otherwise be unable to enter the labor market in their country of current residence, or would be forced into sectors such as farm-work and care-work where conditions may be far worse.

While migration has remained an afterthought in political as well as scholarly debates on platforms until recently, migrant platform couriers as well as the measures taken around their presence kept popping up as recursive anomalies reconfiguring the very inner workings of platforms. The interplay between Glovo's sidestepping of labor and migratory legislations, and the sharing practices displayed by its "riders sans papiers", is a paradigmatic case. The apparent yet structural "glitch" of migration within platform-based delivery initially emerged with the spread of un/expected uses of individual accounts. It became visible when reported by the mainstream media after several couriers suffered mortal accidents while delivering as unregistered riders. Companies responded installing biometric surveillance technology to catch illicit users of accounts, implicitly focusing precisely on those without the necessary documents to work or reside. This is the very same surveillance technology also used for border control purposes, although not so thoroughly implemented in the case of riders. The latest move from *Glovo* has been to grant formal permission and necessary app infrastructure to subcontract multiple riders under the same account, breaking their own stipulation initially forbidding multiple users under the same account. This empirical work points to the structural role of newly arrived persons under current migration regulations in reshaping the very developments of a particular delivery company. Therefore, it speaks of the centrality of migration in understanding current configurations of precarity in the delivery sector.

Couriers' practices of sharing and subleasing accounts have been analyzed in terms of double exploitation by the media and traditional unions. It is also possible to interpret them in terms of acts of resistance, as instances of individual agency. Adding to that, and based on the tradition of Autonomy of Migration, I pose them as co-constitutive forces shaping the delivery sector in the current interplay among the platform economy, migration regimes and national labor legislations. Therefore, the platform-based delivery sector becomes a realistic route for labor market integration of otherwise deportable migrants. Somehow, this is possible due to the rather unintentional yet factual entanglements between companies' drive to lower labor costs on the one hand,

and the practices of sharing and subleasing delivery accounts rendered possible by the very platforms on the other hand. In this way, many recently arrived persons, who otherwise would have limited or negative access to national labor markets under current restrictive migration laws, are able to make a living by delivering food. This has the added bonus of not being stopped by security forces for ID checks, since delivering food with the cube-shaped isothermal backpack stamped with a platform company logo usually acts as a buffer. As such, precarious migration within delivery platforms is subtly contributing to challenging the contours of closed national labor markets. By logging into and working a shared delivery account, these migrant couriers are contributing to internationalize a particular labor market. In the process, they are further un-bounding the notion of precarity beyond a strictly labor issue.

Platform precarity: Going beyond labor-centrism, reloaded

Besides comprehensive research backing up well-argued accusations against platform capitalism for over monopolistic tendencies and hyper-surveillance power, most critical platform studies are predominantly labor-centered (Casas-Cortés, Cañedo-Rodríguez, and Diz 2023). Extensive research thus far has focused on contractual arrangements starting out from debates on the labor status of workers (wage earner vs. self-contractor) and engaging dilemmas of algorithmic management vs. algorithmic workers/users autonomy. While informative in their empirical engagement, and insightful in their conceptual reading of platform capitalism, these analyses remain too narrow in their understanding of precarity when merely focusing on strict labor issues. These can be enriched by the broader existential and intersectional understandings of precarity coming out of precarity activism. In turn, these activist readings have been influenced and remained in conversation with alternative approaches to precarity beyond labor, mainly feminist theory (e.g. Butler 2006; Butler, Gambetti, and Sabsay 2016; Lorey 2015; Puar et al. 2012) and feminist economic thinking (e.g. Gibson-Graham 2006; Cavallero, Gago, and Mason-Deese 2024; Orozco and Mason-Deese 2022); as well as anthropologies of precarity (Allison 2013; Tsing 2015), critical migration studies (De Genova 2013; De Genova 2017; Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Tazzioli 2020) and critical management studies (Graham and Papadopoulos 2021; Shukaitis and Figiel 2020). All of those readings have called for an understanding of precarity as an induced, ambivalent and multi-layered condition of uncertainty where different axes of power are at stake, in defining limits and possibilities of the human condition within situated conjunctures. Therefore, for these approaches, non-labor factors are also key to defining current reconfigurations of precarity.

For instance, taking migration as the point of departure of the analysis, my research identifies the unexpected ways in which platforms currently unfold, adapting themselves to evolving entanglements with migration regimes, labor markets and institutional attempts at legally regulating the platform sector.

While usually neglected in public policy and scholarly discussion thus far, this intricate relation between capital and human mobility requires deeper and broader research attention. Based on the multi-layered notion of precarity advanced initially by social movements, wherein mobility and migration are considered central to the condition of precarity, I argue for an urgent need within gig economy scholarship for reckoning with critical migration studies and alternative approaches to precarity beyond labor. This requires adopting migration as an analytical gaze to shed further light onto broader tendencies, beyond investigating the characteristics and demographics of migrants in the platform economy. For instance, this gaze identifies how current delivery platform arrangements deliver a distinct configuration of labor and life conditions, which are dictated by a constant demand for availability entangled with required mobility. These two traits – availability and mobility – are precisely those which mark uncertain migrant lives. Therefore, precarity under delivery platform capitalism is reworked as deeply migrantized. Interestingly, and to end with a necessary recognition of intellectual ancestors, this tendency deeply resonates with what precarity activists from Spain, Italy, France etc. back in the 2000s identified as "the becoming migrant of labor". The prophetic power of their writings and actions advancing the "prec-mig hypothesis" might be fulfilled in the current conjuncture as "the becoming migrant of platform precarity". An ambivalent and multi-layered uncertainty keeps growing among those relying on digital gigs, who are often those who remain actively, or potentially on the move. As such, this characterization of platform precarity as availability and mobility *on-demand*, goes beyond the distinction between those labeled as "migrants" and "natives" (Anderson, Sharma, and Wright 2012; Sharma 2020). This leads to alliances and strategies á la "prec-mig-gig".

As with the question of migration, the same detailed intersectional analysis needs to be done with questions of gender and care-work within platform precarity, which unfortunately are beyond the scope of this writing project at this time, but are in process.[7] Ultimately, building upon the activist notion of precarity, my research project on food delivery platforms is designed to conduct intersectional analysis of the effects brought on by platform capitalism. Therefore, following the legacy of precarity activism, it is imperative to bring border and migration studies, feminist economics, dis/ability studies and critical race studies to platform research agendas. This embracing will enrich our understanding of platform precarities and enhance our possible interventions within the socio-cultural and economic transformations at hand.

Notes

1 This chapter is based on the *Riders R&D* national project I have been directing as principal investigator since 2021: *Emerging cultures of mobile precarity in the digital gig economy: A case-study on the food delivery sector in Spain* (PID2020-115170RB-100) is funded by Spain´s National Research Agency and its Ministry of Science. Based the *University of Zaragoza*, researchers from other universities and research centers in Spain, Argentina and the United States, have been

interdisciplinary working at different urban centers. For ongoing results under Open Access, see: http://riders.unizar.es/

2 I am thankful to anthropologist Carlos Diz, research member of the Riders research project, for his grounded work and key insights into platform resistances informing part of this chapter.

3 Álvaro Monge "Quema de mochilas de Glovo por la muerte de uno de sus repartidores" *El periódico* (May 26, 2019). https://www.elperiodico.com/es/barcelona/20190526/muerto-atropello-glovo-barcelona-7473779

4 Albert Vargas "Glovo: Rider sin papeles, morir trabajando sin ser trabajador" *Público* (May 30, 2019). https://www.publico.es/sociedad/glovo-rider-papeles-doble-precariedad-mato-pujan-koirala.html#analytics-noticia:contenido-enlace

5 Alejandra de la Fuente "Así funciona el oscuro negocio de las licencias de los riders: cesiones, alquileres y estafas" *Público* (February 11, 2021). https://www.publico.es/economia/funciona-oscuro-negocio-licencias-riders-cesiones-alquileres-estafas.html

6 The time dimension of precarity became apparent during one of the early initiatives of precarity activism: *Les Intermittents* de Paris pointed to the intermittent character of many emerging forms of labor, occasional yet somehow recurrent, and without a clear medium/long-term perspective. Rescuing the key role of time in understanding precarity at the intersection of migration, I am co-developing a longer engagement with the entanglement between waiting under the border regime ("bordering time") and the waiting of those deportable riders during food delivery journeys' "delivery time" (see Diz and Casas-Cortés forthcoming).

7 See upcoming publications by the Riders research project at: https://riders.unizar.es/resultados/

References

Alderman, Liz. 2019. "Food-Delivery Couriers Exploit Desperate Migrants in France." *The New York Times*, 16 de junio de 2019, sec. Business. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/16/business/uber-eats-deliveroo-glovo-migrants.html

Allaby, Elaine. 2021. "The Rise of Uber Eats Gang Masters Is Tearing the Gig Economy Apart." *Wired UK*, February 15, 2021. https://www.wired.co.uk/article/uber-eats-italy

Allen-Perkins, Diego and Montserrat Cañedo-Rodríguez. 2023. "Weaving the Algorithm: Participatory Subjectivities amongst Food Delivery Riders." *Subjectivity* 30, 435–454. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41286-023-00167-6

Allison, Anne. 2013. *Precarious Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Altenried, Moritz. 2021. "Mobile Workers, Contingent Labour: Migration, the Gig Economy and the Multiplication of Labour." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 17 (3). https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X211054846

Anderson, Bridget. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. 1st ed. Oxford; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Bridget, Nandita Sharma, and Cynthia Wright. 2012. "'We Are All Foreigners' No Borders as a Practical Political Project." In *Citizenship, Migrant Activism, and the Politics of Movement*, edited by Peter Nyers and Kim Rigiel, 73–91. London: Routledge Press.

Anwar, Mohammad Amir, and Mark Graham. 2021. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Freedom, Flexibility, Precarity and Vulnerability in the Gig Economy in Africa." *Competition & Change* 25 (2): 237–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529420914473

Arnold, Dennis, and Joseph Bongiovi. 2013. "Precarious, Informalizing, and Flexible Work: Transforming Concepts and Understandings." *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (3): 289–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764212466239

Barratt, Tom, Caleb Goods, and Alex Veen. 2020. "'I'm My Own Boss…': Active Intermediation and 'Entrepreneurial' Worker Agency in the Australian Gig-Economy." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 52 (8): 1643–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X20914346

Benjamin, Ruha. 2019. *Race after Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Medford, MA: Polity.

Bergua, Jose Ángel, Montañés, Miguel, and Juan Miguel Báez. 2023. "Riders, algoritmos y negociación de la realidad." *Empiria: Revista De metodología De Ciencias Sociales* 59: 81–102. https://doi.org/10.5944/empiria.59.2023.37939

Bryan, Kenza. 2019. "Police Swoop on Uber Eats and Deliveroo Delivery Riders." *The Sunday Times*, 2019, sec. news. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/police-swoop-on-uber-eats-and-deliveroo-delivery-riders-xvljrt8r9

Brynjolfsson, Erik, and Andrew McAfee. 2011. *Race against the Machine: How the Digital Revolution Is Accelerating Innovation, Driving Productivity, and Irreversibly Transforming Employment and the Economy*. Lexington, MA: Digital Frontier Press.

Brynjolfsson, Erik, and Andrew McAfee.. 2016. *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. First published as a Norton paperback. New York, NY; London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Butler, Judith. 2006. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.

Butler, Judith, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, eds. 2016. *Vulnerability in Resistance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Cant, Callum. 2020. *Riding for Deliveroo: Resistance in the New Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Casas-Cortés, Maribel, Montserrat Cañedo-Rodríguez, and Carlos Diz. 2023. "Platform Capitalism." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, edited by Mark Aldenderfer, 1-26. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190854584.013.597

Casas-Cortés, Maribel (forthcoming) "More Than a Glitch on the Platforms: Multiple Migratory Statuses and Other Structural Anomalies in App-based Food-delivery." *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*.

Casas-Cortés, Maribel, Laura Moya Santander, and Eleder Piñeiro Aguiar. 2023. "Algoritmos de reconocimiento facial entre repartidores en España: vigilancia y complicidad con las prácticas de subarriendo y uso compartido de cuentas personales." *Disparidades. Revista De Antropología*, 78 (1): e001c. https://doi.org/10.3989/dra.2023.001c

Cavallero, Luci, Verónica Gago, and Liz Mason-Deese. 2024. *Home as Laboratory: Finance, Housing, and Feminist Struggle*. Brooklyn, NY: Common Notions Press.

Chauvin, Sébastien, and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas. 2012. "Beyond Informal Citizenship: The New Moral Economy of Migrant Illegality." *International Political Sociology* 6 (3): 241–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-5687.2012.00162.x

Chen, Julie Yujie, and Jack Linchuan Qiu. 2019. "Digital Utility: Datafication, Regulation, Labor, and DiDi's Platformization of Urban Transport in China." *Chinese Journal of Communication* 12 (3): 274–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2019.1614964

Cid, Xabier. 2022. *10000 Millas de andar na bici*. Vigo: Xerais Ediciones.

Cini, Lorenzo, and Arianna Tassinari. 2018. "On Struggles in Logistics: Notes for Militant Labor Activism from the Italian Experience." *Notes from Below*. December, 14. https://notesfrombelow.org/article/struggles-logistics-notes-militant-labor-activism

Cusumano, Michael A., Annabelle Gawer, and David B. Yoffie. 2019. *The Business of Platforms: Strategy in the Age of Digital Competition, Innovation, and Power*. 1st ed. New York, NY: Harper Business, An Imprint of HarperCollins Publishers.

Davis, Gerald F. 2016. *The Vanishing American Corporation: Navigating the Hazards of a New Economy*. 1st ed. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2013. "'We Are of the Connections': Migration, Methodological Nationalism, and 'Militant Research'." *Postcolonial Studies* 16 (3): 250–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2013.850043

De Genova, Nicholas, ed. 2017. *The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

De Stefano, Valerio. 2016. "The Rise of the "Just-in-Time Workforce": On-Demand Work, Crowd Work and Labour Protection in the "Gig-Economy"." 71. ILO Conditions of Work and Employment Series. Geneva: International Labour Office. http://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2682602.

Del Nido, Juan M. 2022. *Taxis vs. Uber: Courts, Markets, and Technology in Buenos Aires*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Diez, Felipe, Jose Domingo Roselló, Ana Maria Corral, and Ruben Ranz. 2020. "Con este modelo no habrá futuro: Informe sobre la explotación laboral de las plataformas digitales de reparto." Madrid: Unión General de Trabajadores-UGT Press.

Diz, Carlos and Maribel Casas-Cortés. Forthcoming. "On Delivery Waiting: The Entanglement of Gig and Border Temporalities in Platform Cities." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.

Diz, Carlos, Paula González Granados, and Amaia Prieto Arratibel. 2023. "Reaprendiendo a trabajar: saberes que cuidan en el manejo de algoritmos entre riders." *Disparidades. Revista De Antropología*, 78 (1): e001d. https://doi.org/10.3989/dra.2023.001d

Drahokoupil, Jan, and Kurt Vandaele, eds. 2021. *A Modern Guide to Labour and the Platform Economy*. Elgar modern guides. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Duus, Katrine, Maja Hojer Bruun, and Anne Line Dalsgård. 2023. "Riders in App Time: Exploring the Temporal Experiences of Food Delivery Platform Work." *Time & Society Online First*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X231161849

Fernández, Aina, and Maria Soliña Barreiro. 2020. "The Algorithm Is Not My Boss Anymore: Technological Appropriation and (New) Media Strategies in Riders x Derechos and Mensakas." *Contracampo, Brazilian Journal of Communication* 39 (1): 65–83. https://doi.org/10.22409/contracampo.v39i1.38404

Ferrari, Fabian, and Mark Graham. 2021. "Fissures in Algorithmic Power: Platforms, Code, and Contestation." *Cultural Studies* 35 (4–5): 814–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2021.1895250

Foti, Alex. 2017. *General Theory of the Precariat: Great Recession, Revolution, Reaction*. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.

Frey, Bronwyn. 2020. "Platform Labor and In/Formality: Organization among Motorcycle Taxi Drivers in Bandung, Indonesia." *Anthropology of Work Review* 41 (1): 36–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/awr.12187

Friedman, Gerald. 2014. "Workers without Employers: Shadow Corporations and the Rise of the Gig Economy." *Review of Keynesian Economics* 2 (2): 171–188. https://doi.org/10.4337/roke.2014.02.03

Fuster Morell, Mayo, Ricard Espelt, and Melissa Renau Cano. 2021. "Cooperativismo de plataforma: Análisis de las cualidades democráticas del cooperativismo como alternativa económica en entornos digitales." *CIRIEC-España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa* 102: 5–31. https://doi.org/10.7203/CIRIEC-E.102.18429

Gibson-Graham, Julie & Katherine. 2006. *A Post-Capitalist Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, Julie & Katherine, Jenny Cameron, and Stephen Healy. 2016. "Commoning as a Poscapitalist Politics." In *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking*

the futures of the commons, edited by Ash Amin and Philip Howel, 192–212. London: Routledge.

Gillespie, Tarleton. 2010. "The Politics of Platforms" *New Media & Society* 12 (3): 347–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809342738

Graham, Janna, and Dimitris Papadopoulos. 2021. "Organizing the Precarious: Autonomous Work, Real Democracy and Ecological Precarity." *Organization*, 30 (4): 649–667 https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211026874

Gray, Mary and Siddharth Suri. 2019. *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Griesbach, Kathleen, Adam Reich, Luke Elliott-Negri, and Ruth Milkman. 2019. "Algorithmic Control in Platform Food Delivery Work." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 5 (4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023119870041

Huws, Ursula. 2020. "The Algorithm and the City: Platform Labour and the Urban Environment." *Work Organisation, Labour & Globalisation* 14 (1): 7–14. https://doi.org/10.13169/workorgalaboglob.14.1.0007

Huws, Ursula, Neil H Spencer, and Matt Coates. 2019. *The Platformisation of Work in Europe: Highlights from Research in 13 European Countries*. Brussels, Belgium: Foundation for European Progressive Studies and University of Hertfordshire.

International Labour Organization (ILO). 2021. "The Role of Digital Labour Platforms in Transforming the World of Work." Report. http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/weso/2021/WCMS_771749/lang–en/index.htm

Jirón, Paola, Constanza Ulriksen, Daisy Margarit, and Walter Imilan. 2021. "Policy Brief - Trabajadores móviles digitales en Chile." 02. Santiago de Chile: Universidad de Chile. https://libros.uchile.cl/files/presses/1/monographs/1187/submission/proof/2/

Kalleberg, Arne L. 2018. *Precarious Lives: Job Insecurity and Well-Being in Rich Democracies*. Cambridge, UK; Medford, MA: Polity Press.

Kalleberg, Arne L., and Steven P. Vallas, eds. 2018. *Precarious Work*. 1st ed. Research in the sociology of work, Volume 31. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.

Kellogg, Katherine C., Melissa A. Valentine, and Angéle Christin. 2020. "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control." *Academy of Management Annals* 14 (1): 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Langley, Paul, and Andrew Leyshon. 2016. "Platform Capitalism: The Intermediation and Capitalisation of Digital Economic Circulation." *Finance and Society* 3 (1): 11–31. https://doi.org/10.2218/finsoc.v3i1.1936

Lata, Lutfun Nahar, Jasmine Burdon, and Tim Reddel. 2023. "New Tech, Old Exploitation: Gig Economy, Algorithmic Control and Migrant Labour." *Sociology Compass* 17 (1): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13028

Lorey, Isabell. 2015. *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious*. Translated by Aileen Derieg. Futures. London; New York, NY: Verso.

Marrone, Marco and Vladi Finotto. 2019. "Challenging Goliath. Informal Unionism and Digital Platforms in the Food Delivery Sector. The Case of Riders Union Bologna." *Partecipazione e conflitto* 12 (3): 691–716. https://doi.org/10.1285/i20356609v12i3p691

McAfee, Andrew, and Erik Brynjolfsson. 2017. *Machine, Platform, Crowd: Harnessing Our Digital Future*. 1st ed. New York, NY; London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Metawala, Prachi, Kathrin Golda-Pongratz, and Clara Irazábal. 2021. "Revisiting Engels' 'Housing Question': Work and Housing Conditions of Immigrant Platform Delivery Riders in Barcelona." *Human Geography* 14 (2): 243–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/19427786211010131

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method or the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Moral-Martín, David, David Pac, and Jaime Minguijón. 2023. "Resistencia versus destrucción creativa, ¿es posible una alternativa a la actual economía de plataformas?

Un estudio de caso de dos cooperativas." *Revista Española De Sociología* 32(3): a176. https://doi.org/10.22325/fes/res.2023.176

Neufeind, Max, Jacqueline O'Reilly, and Florian Ranft, eds. 2018. *Work in the Digital Age: Challenges of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Orozco, Amaia Pérez, and Liz Mason-Deese. 2022. *The Feminist Subversion of the Economy: Contributions for Life Against Capital*. 1st ed. Brooklyn, NY: Common Notions.

Palacios, Lucía, and Martínez. 2023. "Home Food Delivery Company Glovo Hit with Another 38 Million Euros of Fines in Spain." Sur in English. 25 de enero de 2023. https://www.surinenglish.com/spain/home-food-delivery-glovo-fined-20230125161949-nt.html

Pasquale, Frank. 2016. "Two Narratives of Platform Capitalism." *Yale Law & Policy Review* 35 (1): 309–19.

Plantin, Jean-Christophe, Carl Lagoze, Paul N Edwards, and Christian Sandvig. 2018. "Infrastructure Studies Meet Platform Studies in the Age of Google and Facebook." *New Media & Society* 20 (1): 293–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816661553

Puar, Jasbir, Lauren Berlant, Judith Butler, Bojana Cvejic, Isabell Lorey, and Vujanovic Ana. 2012. "Precarity Talk: A Virtual Roundtable with Lauren Berlant, Judith Butler, Bojana Cvejić, Isabell Lorey, Jasbir Puar, and Ana Vujanović." *TDR: The Drama Review* 56 (4): 163–77.

Ravenelle, Alexandrea J. 2019. *Hustle and Gig: Struggling and Surviving in the Sharing Economy*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Romero-Lecrivain, Andrea, and Juan Pablo Micaletto-Bleda. 2020. "Overtourism." *Question/Cuestión* 2 (66): e456. https://doi.org/10.24215/16696581e456

Rosenblat, Alex. 2018. *Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Sanz de Miguel, Pablo, Maribel Casas-Cortés, Amaia Prieto Arratibel, and Juan Arasanz Díaz. 2023. "El empleo irregular tras la Ley Rider: ¿nueva regulación, idénticas estrategias empresariales?" *Revista Española de Sociología* 32 (3): a177. https://doi.org/10.22325/fes/res.2023.177

Schaupp, Simon. 2022. "Algorithmic Integration and Precarious (Dis)Obedience: On the Co-Constitution of Migration Regime and Workplace Regime in Digitalised Manufacturing and Logistics." *Work, Employment and Society* 36 (2): 310–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211031458

Scholz, Trebor. 2016. *Platform Cooperativism: Challenging the Corporate Sharing Economy*. New York, NY: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation.

Scholz, Trebor. 2017. *Uberworked and Underpaid: How Workers Are Disrupting the Digital Economy*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Schor, Juliet B., William Attwood-Charles, Mehmet Cansoy, Isak Ladegaard, and Robert Wengronowitz. 2020. "Dependence and Precarity in the Platform Economy." *Theory and Society* 49 (5): 833–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-020-09408-y

Scholz, Trebor, and Nathan Schneider, eds. 2017. *Ours to Hack and to Own: The Rise of Platform Cooperativism, A New Vision for the Future of Work and a Fairer Internet*. New York, NY: OR Books.

Seaver, Nick. 2017. "Algorithms as Culture: Some Tactics for the Ethnography of Algorithmic Systems." *Big Data & Society* 4 (2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717738104

Sequera, Jorge, ed. 2022. *Sé lo que hicisteis el último verano: la transformación del turismo urbano antes, en y después de la pandemia*. Biblioteca ciudadana. Barcelona: Bellaterra Ediciones.

Shapiro, Aaron. 2018. "Between Autonomy and Control: Strategies of Arbitrage in the "on-Demand" Economy." *New Media & Society* 20 (8): 2954–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817738236

Sharma, Nandita Rani. 2020. *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.

Shukaitis, Stevphen, and Joanna Figiel. 2020. "Knows No Weekend: The Psychological Contract of Cultural Work in Precarious Times." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 13 (3): 290–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2019.1574863

Slee, Tom. 2015. *What's Yours Is Mine: Against the Sharing Economy*. New York, NY; London: OR Books.

Soto Aliaga, Nuria.2023. *Riders on the storm: Trabajadores de plataformas de delivery en lucha*. Madrid: La Laboratoria y Traficantes de Sueños.

Srnicek, Nick. 2016. *Platform Capitalism (Theory redux)*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Sundararajan, Arun. 2016. *The Sharing Economy: The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-Based Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Tassinari, Arianna, and Vincenzo Maccarrone. 2020. "Riders on the Storm: Workplace Solidarity among Gig Economy Couriers in Italy and the UK." *Work, Employment and Society* 34 (1): 35–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019862954

Tazzioli, Martina. 2020. *The Making of Migration: The Biopolitics of Mobility at Europe's Borders*. London: SAGE Publications.

Tironi, Martin, and Camila Albornoz. 2022. "Surveillance and the Ecology of Frictions in Platform Urbanism: The Case of Delivery Workers in Santiago de Chile." *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society* 5 (1). https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2022.2123633

Tsing, Anna. 2009. "Supply Chains and the Human Condition." *Rethinking Marxism* 21 (2): 148–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/08935690902743088

Tsing, Anna. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: on the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vallas, Steven P. 2019. "Platform Capitalism: What's at Stake for Workers?" *New Labor Forum* 28 (1): 48–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796018817059

Vallas, Steven, and Juliet B. Schor. 2020. "What Do Platforms Do? Understanding the Gig Economy." *Annual Review of Sociology* 46 (1): 273–94. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857

van Dijck, José, Thomas Poell, and Martijn de Waal. 2018. *The Platform Society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

van Doorn, Niels, Fabian Ferrari, and Mark Graham. 2022. "Migration and Migrant Labour in the Gig Economy: An Intervention." *Work, Employment and Society* 37 (4): 1099–1111. https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170221096581

van Doorn, Niels, and Darsana Vijay. 2021. "Gig Work as Migrant Work: The Platformization of Migration Infrastructure." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 0 (0). https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X211065049

Velkova, Julia and Anne Kaun. 2019. "Algorithmic Resistance: Media Practices and the Politics of Repair." *Information, Communication & Society* 24 (4), 523–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1657162

Vieira, Tiago. 2020. "The Lose-Lose Dilemmas of Barcelona's Platform Delivery Workers in the Age of COVID-19." *Social Sciences & Humanities Open* 2 (1): 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100059

Wood, Alex J., Mark Graham, Vili Lehdonvirta, and Isis Hjorth. 2019. "Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy." *Work, Employment and Society* 33 (1): 56–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616

Woodcock, Jamie. 2021. *The Fight against Platform Capitalism*. London: University of Westminster Press.

Woodcock, Jamie, and Mark Graham. 2020. *The Gig Economy: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge, UK; Medford, MA: Polity.

Zhang, Lin. 2020. "When Platform Capitalism Meets Petty Capitalism in China: Alibaba and an Integrated Approach to Platformization." *International Journal of Communication* 14 (0): 114–34.

Zhang, Lin. 2021. "Platformizing Family Production: The Contradictions of Rural Digital Labor in China." *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* 32 (3): 341–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/10353046211037093

Zhang, Lin, and Julie Yujie Chen. 2022. "A Regional and Historical Approach to Platform Capitalism: The Cases of Alibaba and Tencent." *Media, Culture & Society* 44 (8): 1454–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221127796