**The rise of gig economies: How freelancing is reshaping labor markets**

Abstract

The gig economy, characterized by short-term, flexible jobs facilitated by digital platforms, has rapidly transformed labor markets worldwide. While this shift offers workers greater autonomy and access to diverse income opportunities, it also raises concerns about job security, benefits, and labor rights. Despite growing attention, significant research gaps remain regarding the long-term socioeconomic impacts of gig work, particularly in differentiating between skilled freelancing and low-wage platform labor.

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative analysis of labor market data from OECD countries (2015–2023) with qualitative interviews of 50 gig workers across sectors (ride-hailing, freelance programming, and microtask platforms) (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).Key findings reveal a dualistic impact: high-skilled freelancers report increased earnings and career flexibility, whereas low-skilled platform workers face wage stagnation and algorithmic precarity. Notably, 68% of respondents lacked access to employer-sponsored benefits, exacerbating financial instability.

Policy implications highlight the need for adaptive regulatory frameworks. Recommendations include portable benefits systems, minimum wage guarantees for platform work, and algorithmic transparency mandates to rebalance power between platforms and workers. The study underscores the gig economy’s role in reshaping labor norms, urging policymakers to address inequalities while preserving innovation in non-traditional employment.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The New World of Work

The labor market is undergoing a seismic shift, with the gig economy emerging as a dominant force in the 21st-century workforce. In 2023 alone, 56 million Americans engaged in freelance work, contributing approximately $1.27 trillion to the U.S. economy (Upwork, 2024). This signals a paradigm shift in employment structures, wherein traditional full-time jobs are increasingly replaced by short-term, task-based contracts. These transformations have reverberated across global economies, fundamentally altering how people work, earn, and interact with labor markets.

Globally, digital labor platforms like Uber, Fiverr, TaskRabbit, and Upwork have redefined employment, enabling on-demand, flexible work arrangements. Workers can now connect with clients or consumers through apps and websites that facilitate immediate hiring, bypassing conventional recruitment processes. The gig economy, often defined as "platform-mediated, on-demand labor markets" (Sundararajan, 2016), encapsulates a broad spectrum of occupations—ranging from high-skilled freelancing (e.g., graphic design, consulting, software development) to low-skilled, location-based platform labor (e.g., ride-hailing, delivery services, cleaning tasks).

This transformation is primarily fueled by several key forces. Technological advancements have lowered the barriers to entry, allowing individuals to monetize their skills and time more efficiently. The proliferation of smartphones, broadband internet, and cloud-based tools has made remote collaboration and service delivery easier than ever before. In parallel, changing worker preferences—particularly among millennials and Gen Z—reflect a growing appetite for autonomy, flexibility, and non-linear career paths (Kuhn & Maleki, 2017). Meanwhile, corporations have increasingly embraced gig labor as a means of reducing operational costs, enhancing workforce scalability, and minimizing liability (De Stefano, 2016).

However, this evolution is not without controversy. While proponents tout the benefits of flexibility, entrepreneurial freedom, and income diversification, critics have raised serious concerns about precariousness, income instability, and the erosion of worker protections (Woodcock & Graham, 2020). Gig workers are typically classified as independent contractors, meaning they are often excluded from social protections such as minimum wage guarantees, paid leave, health insurance, and collective bargaining rights.

The rise of algorithmic management further complicates labor relations in the gig economy. These platforms use sophisticated algorithms to allocate tasks, monitor performance, and even deactivate workers, effectively replicating managerial oversight without assuming traditional employer responsibilities (Rosenblat, 2018). This opaque form of digital supervision raises questions about fairness, accountability, and power asymmetries in modern labor systems.

Moreover, datafication and surveillance capitalism are increasingly shaping the gig work environment. Workers' behaviors, ratings, and productivity metrics are continuously tracked, quantified, and used to make automated decisions that significantly impact livelihoods (Zuboff, 2019). This shift raises ethical concerns about privacy, autonomy, and the commodification of human labor.

From a macroeconomic perspective, the gig economy presents both opportunities and risks. On the one hand, it offers a mechanism for absorbing labor market slack, particularly during economic downturns or in regions with high unemployment. It also encourages entrepreneurship and the development of new service markets. On the other hand, the expansion of non-standard employment forms threatens to weaken the foundational pillars of the social contract, including job security, stable incomes, and equitable access to benefits.

Policymakers around the world are grappling with how to regulate and integrate gig work into existing labor frameworks. Some countries have introduced new laws to reclassify gig workers as employees, thereby extending legal protections. For example, Spain’s “Riders Law” and California’s controversial Proposition 22 highlight the ongoing tug-of-war between labor rights and corporate interests (Prassl, 2018). However, these legislative efforts often face legal, political, and economic challenges that make uniform enforcement difficult.

At the same time, gig workers themselves are mobilizing to demand better conditions. Online forums, digital communities, and platform cooperatives are emerging as new forms of labor solidarity, enabling workers to organize across geographic and linguistic boundaries. This points to the potential for digital labor activism, although it remains fragmented and under-resourced compared to traditional unions (Scholz, 2017).

In sum, the gig economy represents a profound restructuring of labor relations, with wide-ranging implications for workers, businesses, and society at large. Its rise poses critical questions: How can we ensure decent work in platform-mediated environments? What role should governments, corporations, and civil society play in safeguarding worker rights? And, perhaps most importantly, how can we balance innovation and flexibility with fairness and equity in the future of work?

As we delve deeper into this evolving world, this paper aims to explore the structural, social, and ethical dimensions of the gig economy. Through a multidisciplinary lens, we examine its emergence, key characteristics, and the regulatory dilemmas it presents. Ultimately, understanding the gig economy is essential not only for crafting responsive labor policies but also for reimagining the values and norms that underpin the modern workplace.

1.2 Research Problem: The Paradox of the Gig Economy

The rise of the gig economy—enabled by digital platforms and shifts in labor market dynamics—has introduced both opportunities and challenges. At its core lies a paradox: while gig work offers unprecedented autonomy and flexibility, it also undermines economic security, long-term planning, and equitable labor standards. This contradiction is central to ongoing academic and policy debates concerning the nature of work in the 21st century. Workers enjoy the freedom to choose assignments and set their schedules, yet many live with persistent financial instability, lack access to social protections, and are subject to opaque algorithmic management systems (Kalleberg, 2018).

Gig work, defined by short-term, task-based engagements, has become a prominent form of employment in both developed and developing economies. As platforms like Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, Upwork, and Fiverr proliferate, the labor market has seen a marked shift away from traditional full-time employment. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2023), more than 147 million workers worldwide are engaged in platform-mediated labor, and the number is rapidly growing. However, unlike traditional employment models, gig work typically excludes benefits such as health insurance, paid leave, unemployment protection, and retirement savings. This lack of social security is especially concerning in times of economic uncertainty or health crises, as demonstrated during the COVID-19 pandemic, when gig workers were disproportionately affected (Smith et al., 2022).

The Flexibility-Precarity Trade-off

One of the main attractions of gig work is flexibility. Workers can choose when, where, and how much they want to work, allowing them to balance other responsibilities such as education, caregiving, or creative pursuits. For some high-skilled professionals—such as freelance designers, consultants, and programmers—this model enables entrepreneurial freedom and higher earnings than traditional employment (Sundararajan, 2016). However, for the majority of gig workers engaged in low-skilled, location-based tasks such as ride-hailing or food delivery, the flexibility is often illusory. Workers must remain on-call for long hours to earn a living wage, and algorithmic scheduling often penalizes inactivity (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

The gig economy’s promise of freedom is thus tempered by the reality of precarity. Gig workers typically face irregular incomes, lack of job continuity, and volatile demand patterns. Many are classified as independent contractors, exempting companies from providing legal protections, contributing to social insurance, or adhering to minimum wage standards (De Stefano, 2016). This misclassification has sparked legal challenges and calls for labor law reform in numerous countries.t for emergencies (Pew Research Center, 2021).

These vulnerabilities are even more pronounced in developing economies, where public welfare systems are often underdeveloped. In countries like India, Nigeria, and the Philippines, a significant portion of gig work occurs in the informal sector, where regulatory oversight is weak, and labor standards are unenforced (Berg et al., 2023). For example, many delivery workers in Southeast Asia operate without written contracts, are paid below minimum wage, and must bear the costs of equipment, fuel, and injuries out-of-pocket (Asia Foundation, 2022).

Regulatory Challenges and Jurisdictional Disparities

One of the most significant challenges posed by the gig economy is the inadequacy of current legal and regulatory frameworks. Existing labor laws were designed for an industrial economy based on long-term employer-employee relationships. In contrast, the gig economy operates through decentralized platforms that mediate labor transactions but disclaim employer responsibilities (Prassl, 2018). As a result, platform companies often occupy a “gray zone” in which they extract value from labor without being held accountable for workers’ rights.

In response, some jurisdictions have attempted to redefine gig work through legislative means. California’s Assembly Bill 5 (AB5), passed in 2019, sought to classify gig workers as employees rather than independent contractors, based on the “ABC Test”. While the law aimed to extend benefits and protections, it faced intense opposition from platform companies, culminating in Proposition 22, which exempted certain gig firms from the law. This back-and-forth reflects the broader tensions between innovation and regulation, and the political influence of tech giants in shaping labor policy.

Elsewhere, countries like the United Kingdom and Spain have enacted laws to reclassify gig workers. In 2021, the UK Supreme Court ruled that Uber drivers should be treated as “workers” with access to minimum wage and holiday pay (UK Supreme Court, 2021). Similarly, Spain’s “Riders Law” mandates that food delivery couriers must be considered employees rather than self-employed. However, such reforms are rare in the Global South, where gig work often operates beyond the reach of formal institutions.

Inequality in Gig Work

Gig economy outcomes are unevenly distributed across skill levels, gender, and geography. High-skilled gig workers often experience greater autonomy and better pay, while low-skilled workers face greater vulnerability and algorithmic control (Woodcock & Graham, 2020). Women are underrepresented in many gig sectors, and when they do participate, they often earn less than their male counterparts due to occupational segregation and caregiving responsibilities (ILO, 2023).

Moreover, platform algorithms can reinforce bias and discrimination. For instance, research has shown that racial profiling and customer ratings can disproportionately affect minority workers, leading to deactivation or loss of income opportunities (Rosenblat, 2018). These technological biases compound existing structural inequalities, particularly in countries with weak anti-discrimination laws.

Policy Solutions and Social Innovation

To address these challenges, scholars and policymakers have proposed various solutions. One approach is to create a new legal category of “dependent contractors” who fall between employees and freelancers and are entitled to basic protections such as minimum wage, social insurance contributions, and collective bargaining rights (Kalleberg & Vallas, 2017). This model has been adopted in Canada and parts of the European Union and aims to reconcile flexibility with security.

Another solution is the establishment of portable benefits systems, where social protections are tied to the individual rather than the employer. Workers could accumulate benefits like health coverage, retirement savings, and paid leave regardless of where or how they work. Pilot programs in the U.S. and Europe have demonstrated the feasibility of such models, although scaling them remains a challenge (Harris & Krueger, 2015).

Digital cooperatives and platform unions also offer alternative models. By collectively owning the platform infrastructure, workers can democratically govern their work environments and retain a greater share of profits. Examples include the Drivers Cooperative in New York City and CoopCycle in France. These initiatives challenge the extractive practices of traditional gig platforms and point toward a more equitable digital economy (Scholz, 2017).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Evolution of the Gig Economy

The gig economy, while often portrayed as a novel phenomenon, is rooted in longstanding forms of casual and contingent labor. Historical records show that forms of nonstandard work—such as day labor, freelance work, and seasonal employment—have existed for centuries. What distinguishes the current era is the scale and digital mediation of such labor arrangements. Digital platforms like Uber, TaskRabbit, and Airbnb have formalized and globalized contingent work through algorithmic coordination and on-demand access (De Stefano, 2016).

The 2008 global financial crisis and the concurrent rise of mobile technologies catalyzed the platform economy. As traditional employment contracted, digital platforms promoted gig work as entrepreneurial, empowering, and flexible (Sundararajan, 2016). They marketed themselves not as employers but as intermediaries connecting independent contractors with consumers, thereby evading many labor law obligations. Sundararajan (2016) famously described this transformation as a shift toward “crowd-based capitalism,” wherein technology replaces traditional hierarchies with peer-to-peer exchange.

However, subsequent scholarship has challenged this utopian narrative, highlighting the asymmetrical power dynamics embedded within platform labor. Although platforms claim to offer autonomy and choice, they often retain significant control over pricing, visibility, and access to work opportunities (Rosenblat, 2018). These dynamics resemble classical employer-employee relationships, albeit without the accompanying responsibilities on the part of the platform. Research has documented how platforms unilaterally alter algorithms, impose non-negotiable terms of service, and surveil workers’ behavior, creating what some have termed “algorithmic management” (Woodcock & Graham, 2020).

The gig economy's evolution thus represents a dual movement: the technological innovation of work coordination on one hand, and the legal and ideological reframing of employment relations on the other. This framing allows platforms to scale rapidly while externalizing the risks and costs traditionally borne by employers (Prassl, 2018).

2.2 Worker Experiences: Flexibility vs. Precarity

A central theme in gig economy scholarship is the tension between worker flexibility and precarity. This dichotomy often depends on the type of work, the worker’s skill level, and the platform’s operational model. Research has identified a bifurcation in gig worker experiences.

High-skilled freelancers—such as IT consultants, designers, and digital marketers—often report greater autonomy, job satisfaction, and income potential. Kässi and Lehdonvirta (2018), analyzing data from the Online Labour Index, found that these workers enjoy the benefits of global labor markets, setting their rates, choosing projects, and working remotely. For such workers, platforms like Upwork and Freelancer.com can serve as gateways to professional growth and economic mobility.

In contrast, low-skilled gig workers—such as ride-hail drivers, food delivery personnel, and home service providers—face significantly more instability. These workers are often at the mercy of algorithmic management systems that dictate work availability, route optimization, and customer matching (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). They face suppressed wages, unpredictable schedules, and constant performance monitoring. A 2023 ILO report found that 72% of ride-hail drivers earned below their country’s minimum wage after accounting for expenses such as fuel, maintenance, and platform commissions (ILO, 2023).

These disparities underscore that the gig economy is not a monolith. While some workers may experience gig work as a form of empowered freelancing, others encounter it as a continuation of precarious, low-paid labor. Moreover, the promises of flexibility often ring hollow for workers who must stay logged in for hours without guaranteed work, thus effectively reintroducing the rigidity of traditional employment under the guise of freedom (Vallas & Schor, 2020).

Another dimension of precarity is the exclusion from traditional employment protections. Gig workers generally lack health insurance, retirement plans, paid leave, and access to grievance mechanisms. This exclusion has been widely criticized as a form of labor arbitrage, where platforms gain a competitive advantage by circumventing labor laws (De Stefano, 2016). Workers must shoulder the risks of injury, illness, and economic downturns with minimal institutional support.

2.3 Regulatory and Ethical Challenges

The legal classification of gig workers remains one of the most contentious issues in the platform economy. In many jurisdictions, gig workers are designated as independent contractors, which absolves platforms from providing minimum wage, overtime pay, and social security contributions. This classification has been the focus of numerous legal and policy debates across the globe.

In the United States, California has been at the forefront of these debates. The state passed Assembly Bill 5 (AB5) in 2019, which aimed to reclassify gig workers as employees using the “ABC Test”—a three-part standard that shifts the burden of proof to employers. However, in 2020, gig economy companies mounted a successful campaign to pass Proposition 22, which exempted app-based transportation and delivery companies from AB5, thereby maintaining workers’ contractor status. This legal tug-of-war illustrates the complexity and political stakes involved in regulating gig work.

In contrast, the European Union has taken steps toward greater protection for platform workers. The 2024 draft Platform Work Directive presumes employment status for gig workers unless platforms can prove otherwise. This reversal of the burden of proof marks a significant departure from existing norms and seeks to address the systemic misclassification of workers. Member states such as Spain and the Netherlands have also passed national legislation to reclassify platform workers as employees, demonstrating a growing policy consensus around the need for reform.

Beyond classification, ethical concerns abound regarding algorithmic control and surveillance. Scholars have warned of “algorithmic discrimination,” where opaque algorithms may systematically disadvantage certain groups based on race, gender, or geography. For instance, rating systems can be biased against minority workers, leading to fewer job opportunities or even deactivation (Rosenblat, 2018). Moreover, platforms collect extensive data on workers’ locations, behaviors, and interactions, often without clear consent or transparency. These practices raise significant questions about digital rights, autonomy, and labor dignity (Moore, 2019).

Privacy concerns are compounded by the lack of regulatory oversight over platform algorithms. Unlike traditional human managers, algorithmic systems are difficult to contest or appeal, leaving workers vulnerable to arbitrary penalties or exclusion. Calls for algorithmic transparency and ethical AI governance are gaining traction, but implementation remains limited (Binns et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the transnational nature of platform work complicates regulatory efforts. Platforms often operate across multiple jurisdictions, exploiting legal loopholes and jurisdictional ambiguities. National labor laws struggle to keep pace with the borderless character of digital labor, necessitating international cooperation and standardized frameworks (ILO, 2021). Efforts such as the European Commission’s Gig Economy Guidelines and the OECD’s labor standards initiative reflect attempts to address this regulatory fragmentation.

Finally, the literature highlights emerging forms of worker resistance and organization. Despite legal and structural barriers, gig workers have mobilized through digital forums, grassroots unions, and platform cooperatives. Movements such as Gig Workers Rising and the App Drivers & Couriers Union (UK) exemplify new forms of labor activism adapted to the platform economy (Scholz, 2017). These efforts reflect a growing recognition among gig workers of their collective interests and the need for solidarity in confronting algorithmic exploitation.

3. Methodology

To explore the socioeconomic impacts of gig work and assess potential policy responses, this study adopts a mixed-methods research design. The integration of both quantitative and qualitative approaches provides a comprehensive understanding of the gig economy’s diverse and complex nature. This triangulation enhances the validity of the findings, allowing for cross-validation and richer interpretation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

3.1 Quantitative Component: Secondary Data Analysis

The quantitative aspect of this study involves an analysis of secondary labor market data sourced from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), International Labour Organization (ILO), and World Bank. The dataset spans the period 2015–2023 and includes variables such as:

Growth of the gig workforce

Sectoral distribution (e.g., transport, digital freelancing, delivery services)

Median earnings by gig category

Social protection access and working hours

This longitudinal data was selected due to its reliability and international comparability (OECD, 2023). The statistical analysis employed descriptive methods (means, medians, percentages), along with regression modeling to examine relationships between gig participation and socioeconomic variables such as income levels, age, and educational attainment.

For instance, regression models were used to determine how earnings from gig work vary across skill levels and how these earnings correlate with access to traditional employment benefits. The goal was to establish general trends and identify disparities that exist within the gig economy. In line with best practices for secondary data research, the study ensured that all data sources complied with public licensing, ethical data governance, and documentation standards (Johnston, 2014).

The data revealed that while high-skilled gig workers (e.g., IT freelancers) report increasing earnings over time, low-skilled workers (e.g., ride-hailing and delivery) show stagnant or declining income trajectories. Moreover, less than 20% of platform workers reported access to any form of health insurance or retirement benefits (ILO, 2023), confirming significant gaps in social protection.

3.2 Qualitative Component: Semi-Structured Interviews

To complement and contextualize the quantitative findings, the study conducted 50 semi-structured interviews with gig workers from diverse platforms and regions. The participants were selected using purposive and snowball sampling techniques to ensure a broad representation across gig types (e.g., ride-hailing, online freelancing, domestic services, and microtasking) and regions (e.g., North America, Europe, Southeast Asia, and Africa).

Each interview lasted between 30 to 60 minutes and was conducted via Zoom or in person, depending on the respondent's preference and availability.

The interview protocol focused on the following themes:

Motivations for entering gig work

Experiences with platform algorithms and management

Access to social protections and benefits

Work-life balance and psychological well-being

Perceptions of policy and legal frameworks

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze the qualitative data, following Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-phase framework. This included familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. NVivo software was used to manage the data and support coding consistency.

Four dominant themes emerged:

1. Flexibility as a Double-Edged Sword: Many participants appreciated the flexibility but noted it often translated into unpaid waiting times and unpredictable income.

2. Algorithmic Control: Workers reported frustration over opaque rating systems and automatic deactivation without recourse, echoing concerns about algorithmic management (Rosenblat, 2018).

3. Lack of Social Protection: Over 80% of respondents lacked access to health insurance or paid leave, reinforcing findings from the quantitative data.

4. Worker Solidarity and Resistance: Some workers were organizing via online forums and new unions, highlighting emerging forms of labor activism (Scholz, 2017).

These qualitative insights enriched the quantitative findings by highlighting lived experiences and adding nuance to statistical trends. For instance, while data might show median earnings, interviews revealed hidden labor such as platform-imposed unpaid tasks (e.g., customer communication, profile updating) that distort net income assessments.

3.3 Policy Review

The final methodological component involves a comparative policy analysis of gig economy regulations in eight countries, representing diverse legal and economic systems: the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, India, China, Nigeria, Brazil, and Spain. These countries were selected to capture both developed and developing contexts and to explore variations in policy responses to gig work.

The study reviewed:

Legislative acts (e.g., California AB5, UK Employment Bill)

Government white papers and labor reports

Court rulings on employment status

Platform policy documents and press releases

Reports by international organizations (ILO, OECD, World Economic Forum)

Documents were sourced from official government portals, international institutions, and verified news databases. The analysis focused on three key policy domains:

1. Worker Classification: How legal systems define gig workers (employee vs. contractor)

2. Social Protections: Availability of health insurance, pensions, and paid leave

3. Platform Accountability: Regulations on algorithmic transparency and data governance

A coding framework was developed to assess each policy along a spectrum from protective to permissive. For instance, Spain’s “Riders Law” mandates employee status for delivery workers, placing it in the protective category. Conversely, India’s 2020 Code on Social Security recognizes gig workers but makes participation voluntary for platforms, placing it in the permissive category.

This review revealed a global policy vacuum in which most gig workers operate without formal protections. While some jurisdictions like the EU and California have enacted gig-specific legislation, enforcement remains inconsistent, and legal loopholes abound. Many developing countries lack the institutional capacity to regulate digital platforms effectively, leaving millions of workers in legal limbo.

3.5 Limitations

Despite its strengths, the study faces several limitations. First, reliance on self-reported data in interviews may introduce response bias or inaccuracies. Second, the cross-national policy review may not fully capture sub-national or regional variations in gig regulation. Third, the sample size, while diverse, may not represent the full heterogeneity of gig workers worldwide.

Furthermore, the evolving nature of platform policies and labor laws means that some data may become outdated quickly. Future research could expand on this work by conducting longitudinal studies or incorporating experimental designs to assess policy interventions' effectiveness.

4. Results and Discussions

The findings of this mixed-methods study—comprising statistical analysis, semi-structured interviews, and a policy review—reveal substantial variation in experiences across the gig economy. The data illustrate stark contrasts between high-skilled and low-skilled gig workers in terms of income, job security, and benefits access. Additionally, they expose systemic gaps in regulatory frameworks and highlight promising policy innovations.

4.1 Dual Labor Market Effects

The gig economy has produced a fragmented labor market, effectively creating a dual structure: one that rewards high-skilled freelancers and marginalizes low-skilled, task-based workers. This duality aligns with Kalleberg’s (2018) theory of labor market segmentation, which posits that modern economies are increasingly divided into secure "primary" and insecure "secondary" employment sectors.

High-Skilled Workers: Autonomy and Earnings

Quantitative data analysis shows that high-skilled gig workers, such as software developers, graphic designers, and data analysts, reported average hourly earnings 30% higher than their traditionally employed counterparts in similar sectors (OECD, 2023). Respondents cited greater control over work hours, choice of projects, and geographic flexibility as primary motivators.

Interviews further confirmed this trend. A 34-year-old freelance UX designer from Germany stated:

This positive experience is consistent with Kässi and Lehdonvirta’s (2018) study, which found that digital freelancing can enhance labor market efficiency and match specialized skills with global demand.

Low-Skilled Workers: Wage Stagnation and Multiplatform Dependency

In contrast, low-skilled gig workers—such as delivery riders, cleaners, and ride-hail drivers—reported wage stagnation and financial precarity. The study found that 42% of these workers rely on multiple platforms (e.g., Uber, DoorDash, and Instacart) to sustain a livable income. Earnings were inconsistent, often falling below minimum wage thresholds when accounting for time spent waiting or completing unpaid tasks.

4.2 Lack of Benefits and Protections

The growing prevalence of gig work in the digital age has introduced new dynamics into the labor market, emphasizing flexibility and autonomy. However, behind the promise of independence lies a stark absence of social protection, labor rights, and job stability. This section delves into the lived experiences of gig workers, underscoring the systemic neglect they endure, particularly with regard to employment benefits, exposure to risks, and the pervasive use of algorithmic management.

Economic Insecurity and Wage Volatility

A driver in São Paulo vividly captured the precariousness of gig work when he explained, “I work for three apps just to survive. One day I make enough, the next day I make nothing.” This sentiment echoes across numerous interviews conducted in the study, highlighting the fluctuating income patterns and economic instability that plague gig workers. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2023) reported that 72% of gig workers in ride-hailing and delivery services earn below minimum wage after deducting expenses such as fuel, maintenance, and equipment.

These findings illustrate how digital platforms, while offering opportunities for income generation, also entrench labor stratification. Workers from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to be engaged in physically demanding, low-paid gig jobs, often without the means to transition into more secure forms of employment (Berg et al., 2023). This reinforces pre-existing inequalities, particularly in developing regions where labor laws are less stringent and social safety nets are limited.

Benefits Deprivation

One of the most pressing concerns uncovered through the qualitative interviews was the widespread lack of access to employment benefits. A staggering 68% of respondents reported having no health insurance, retirement savings plans, or paid sick leave. This deprivation significantly undermines the quality of life for gig workers, especially during emergencies or periods of illness.

A Nairobi-based delivery rider shared a harrowing account: “When I broke my leg in an accident, I was off the app. No pay, no support—just gone.” Such stories reflect the reality that gig workers bear the full brunt of employment risks. In contrast to traditional employment, where employers are required to offer certain benefits and protections, platform companies avoid these responsibilities by classifying workers as independent contractors.

De Stefano (2016) noted that the platform economy systematically externalizes risk to workers while minimizing the legal and financial obligations of employers. This legal loophole enables companies to reduce operational costs at the expense of worker welfare. As a result, workers must manage their own insurance, retirement planning, and income stability—tasks that many are neither prepared nor financially equipped to handle.

Legal Classification and its Implications

The classification of gig workers as independent contractors rather than employees has far-reaching implications. This legal distinction allows companies to bypass labor laws that would otherwise require them to offer minimum wages, unemployment benefits, health insurance, and safe working conditions (Cherry & Aloisi, 2017). It also limits workers' ability to unionize or collectively bargain, thereby weakening their negotiating power.

For instance, a study by Berg et al. (2023) found that gig workers classified as independent contractors had significantly less job security and lower access to dispute resolution mechanisms. In many cases, workers were unaware of their rights or lacked the resources to challenge unfair treatment. This legal grey area has become a focal point in labor advocacy circles, with calls for the reevaluation of labor laws to better reflect the realities of digital employment.

Algorithmic Management and Precarity

Beyond the absence of benefits, the study revealed that gig workers are subject to a form of algorithmic management that further compounds their vulnerability. Algorithms now perform tasks traditionally managed by human supervisors: assigning jobs, tracking performance, rating service quality, and even initiating disciplinary actions such as deactivation.

One U.S.-based gig worker recounted: “I got a one-star review because of something outside my control. Next thing I know, I’m deactivated. No warning, no chance to explain.” This narrative highlights the lack of transparency and accountability in algorithmic systems. Workers are often unaware of the specific criteria used to evaluate them and have no formal channels to contest negative ratings or deactivation decisions.

Rosenblat (2018) discusses how algorithmic management removes human oversight and due process from employment relationships. Instead of fostering fairness, these systems can exacerbate precarity by making job security contingent upon opaque and impersonal calculations. Workers are incentivized to adapt their behavior to please algorithms, often at the cost of safety and mental health.

Woodcock and Graham (2020) refer to this phenomenon as "digital Taylorism" — a hyper-efficient, surveillance-based approach to labor management. Unlike traditional Taylorism, which involved human supervisors and a degree of personal oversight, digital Taylorism relies entirely on data analytics and automation. The result is a labor environment that prioritizes efficiency and customer satisfaction over worker rights and well-being.

Psychological Impact and Burnout

The precarious nature of gig work and the pressures of algorithmic management have significant psychological consequences. Interviews revealed high levels of stress, anxiety, and burnout among workers who felt they were constantly being monitored and rated. Many reported feeling isolated, as platform-based work often lacks the social interaction and camaraderie found in traditional workplaces.

Moreover, the fear of deactivation creates a climate of insecurity. Workers may go to great lengths to avoid bad reviews, including tolerating abusive customers or unsafe working conditions. This culture of constant evaluation can erode self-esteem and contribute to a decline in mental health, particularly when workers lack access to psychological support services (Huws et al., 2018).

Global Inequities

The findings also point to stark global disparities in gig work experiences. In developed countries, some protections exist, albeit inconsistently. For example, Seattle's "Gig Worker Paid Sick Leave" ordinance mandates that platform companies offer sick leave to their workers (City of Seattle, 2023). However, such policies are exceptions rather than the norm.

In contrast, developing countries often lack any regulatory framework for gig work. This absence of oversight leaves workers even more vulnerable to exploitation. Companies are incentivized to operate in regions with minimal labor regulations, further entrenching global inequalities (Vallas & Schor, 2020). Workers in these contexts have little hope for redress, as labor laws either do not apply or are not enforced.

The Path Forward

The lack of benefits and protections for gig workers is not an inevitable feature of the platform economy. Rather, it is a consequence of specific legal and organizational choices. Policymakers have an opportunity—and a responsibility—to reimagine labor laws that reflect the changing nature of work.

Potential solutions include the introduction of portable benefits systems that are tied to the worker rather than the employer. This would allow workers to accrue benefits regardless of the number of platforms they engage with. Additionally, increased transparency and accountability in algorithmic management systems could help ensure fairer treatment and due process.

Labor classification reforms, such as California's AB5 and the European Union's proposed Platform Work Directive, indicate a growing recognition of the need for change. These policies aim to extend labor protections to gig workers by reclassifying them as employees under certain conditions. However, resistance from platform companies and legal ambiguities continue to pose challenges.

4.3 Policy Gaps

The rise of gig work has outpaced the evolution of policy, creating a complex global landscape of partial regulations, untested frameworks, and widespread legal ambiguity. The findings of this study reveal that while some regions have introduced targeted protections for gig workers, many nations—especially in the Global South—lack meaningful legislative and institutional mechanisms to safeguard gig labor rights, leaving workers vulnerable to systemic exploitation.

Developing Nations: Regulatory Absence

In developing economies such as India, Nigeria, and Brazil, where digital labor platforms have proliferated, gig workers frequently operate in a legal gray zone. In India, for example, the 2020 Social Security Code nominally includes gig and platform workers in social protection schemes. However, in practice, the code suffers from significant enforcement gaps, unclear platform responsibilities, and minimal worker awareness. One Indian delivery driver shared:

This statement encapsulates a broader trend identified by Berg et al. (2023), who argue that legal recognition of gig workers is often symbolic without the infrastructure or political will to support actual implementation. The lack of strong labor unions, worker collectives, or government oversight further exacerbates this enforcement gap.

Similarly, in Nigeria and Brazil, where unemployment drives many to gig platforms, there is little to no regulatory oversight. Workers are routinely subject to arbitrary deactivations, unsafe working conditions, and algorithmic opacity without any viable legal recourse (ILO, 2023). These environments promote a race to the bottom in labor standards, driven by platform competition and government inaction.

Innovative Responses: Portable Benefits

In contrast, some jurisdictions have begun experimenting with policy innovations that seek to reconcile the flexible nature of gig work with the need for labor protections. One such initiative is Seattle’s Gig Worker Paid Sick Leave Ordinance, which mandates paid leave for food delivery and ride-hailing workers, regardless of their classification (City of Seattle, 2023). This local regulation emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic, when public health necessitated support for gig workers who were otherwise excluded from employer-based benefits.

Though imperfect in its reach and uptake, Seattle’s policy represents a growing recognition that worker protections must be decoupled from traditional employment status. The concept of portable benefits—benefits that follow workers across jobs and platforms—is gaining traction in public discourse and policy circles. For example, the European Union’s Platform Work Directive (2024) proposes a rebuttable presumption of employment for platform workers, shifting the legal burden of proof onto the platforms to demonstrate that their workers are genuinely independent contractors.

Moreover, Denmark’s well-known "flexicurity" model—combining labor market flexibility with strong social protections—has been referenced as a viable framework for reimagining gig worker protections in an age of fluid employment. While such models require high levels of institutional support and public investment, they illustrate that inclusive and adaptive policies are possible.

4.4 Worker Agency and Resistance

Despite the significant structural disadvantages faced by gig workers globally, this study found numerous examples of growing worker agency, resistance, and digital labor activism. Contrary to popular portrayals of gig workers as isolated or powerless, many are organizing—both informally through digital platforms and formally through labor movements—to demand improved working conditions and greater accountability from platform companies.

In Spain, the Riders x Derechos (Riders for Rights) movement successfully pressured lawmakers to pass the 2021 Riders Law, which mandated employee classification for delivery workers previously labeled as independent contractors (Prassl, 2022). This landmark legislation was the result of sustained protests, media campaigns, and political lobbying by gig workers and their allies.

Likewise, in the Philippines, driver cooperatives have emerged as a form of economic resistance to exploitative platform practices. These cooperatives aim to create worker-owned alternatives where drivers share profits, make collective decisions, and set fair work conditions (Scholz, 2017). Though still limited in scope, such grassroots models demonstrate the potential for more equitable gig economies through worker empowerment.

Technology itself is becoming a tool for organizing. Workers use WhatsApp groups, Reddit forums, and Facebook pages to share strategies, protest against deactivations, and collectively negotiate with platforms. While such networks often lack the formal legal power of traditional unions, they serve as incubators for resistance and solidarity, often filling the gap left by the absence of institutional support.

Digital labor activism is thus evolving, blending old forms of labor resistance with new tools of organization and communication. However, its success often hinges on local legal contexts, platform responses, and the availability of external support from NGOs, labor lawyers, and sympathetic policymakers.

5. Policy Recommendations

The study’s findings underscore the need for comprehensive reforms that acknowledge the unique challenges of gig work while safeguarding basic worker rights. While no single policy solution can address the multifaceted issues of the platform economy, a combination of regulatory innovation, institutional support, and grassroots mobilization can build a fairer gig economy.

5.1 Portable Benefits Systems

To address the lack of social protections, governments and platforms should adopt portable benefits systems that are detached from employment classification. These systems could include health insurance, paid leave, retirement contributions, and unemployment insurance that follow workers across gigs and platforms. Denmark’s "flexicurity" model provides a template, emphasizing both flexibility and security through strong social safety nets.

Governments could mandate that platforms contribute a percentage of each transaction to a public or semi-public benefits fund. Workers would then accrue benefits based on their hours or earnings, regardless of the number or type of platforms they engage with.

5.2 Algorithmic Transparency

Platforms should be legally required to ensure algorithmic transparency and accountability. Algorithms that assign work, evaluate performance, or deactivate workers must be explainable, auditable, and subject to human review. Uber’s opaque rating system, which can lead to worker deactivation based on customer reviews, is a prime example of algorithmic injustice (Rosenblat, 2018).

Policies similar to the European Union’s AI Act, which regulates high-risk AI systems, could be extended to cover platform algorithms, especially those affecting livelihoods. Workers must also have access to appeals processes and explanations for algorithmic decisions.

5.3 Minimum Earnings Guarantees

To combat wage suppression, governments should set minimum earnings guarantees for platform workers. These guarantees should factor in work-related expenses such as fuel, equipment, and vehicle maintenance. New York City has implemented such policies for ride-hailing drivers, ensuring they receive at least the equivalent of the city’s minimum wage after expenses (Parrott & Reich, 2018).

Such wage floors not only protect worker dignity but also reduce the reliance on multiple platforms and gig stacking, which can lead to burnout and safety risks. Policymakers must work closely with labor economists and gig workers to design fair and enforceable compensation standards.

6. Conclusion

The gig economy, characterized by short-term, on-demand work mediated through digital platforms, is fundamentally transforming global labor markets. While it offers flexibility and the potential for increased income and autonomy, especially for high-skilled workers, it also poses significant challenges related to job security, social protections, and labor rights, particularly for low-skilled workers. This dual reality is evident across regions and industries, highlighting both the promise and the peril of the platform-based economy.

One of the most significant findings of this study is the stratification within the gig economy. High-skilled freelancers, such as software developers and digital consultants, often benefit from higher earnings, flexible schedules, and global market access. These workers frequently view gig work as a viable and fulfilling career path. In contrast, low-skilled gig workers, such as ride-hailing drivers and food delivery personnel, often experience precarious conditions—low and unstable incomes, lack of social benefits, and vulnerability to arbitrary algorithmic decisions. This disparity underscores the urgent need for differentiated policy approaches that account for the varying needs and vulnerabilities of gig workers.

A critical area of concern is the lack of access to traditional employment benefits. The majority of gig workers interviewed for this study lacked health insurance, retirement plans, or paid leave. As highlighted in both interviews and international reports (ILO, 2023), this absence of a safety net places immense pressure on workers, especially in times of illness, economic downturns, or unforeseen personal crises. Many workers recounted experiences of being deactivated without warning or recourse due to algorithmic decisions, emphasizing the psychological and financial instability inherent in such work arrangements (Rosenblat, 2018).

The global policy landscape remains fragmented. While countries like the United States and members of the European Union are experimenting with legislation to extend certain protections to gig workers, many developing countries have yet to implement effective regulatory mechanisms. In nations such as India and Brazil, gig workers may be formally recognized under labor laws, but enforcement remains weak, leaving millions exposed to exploitative conditions (Berg et al., 2023). This regulatory vacuum underscores the need for global coordination and knowledge sharing to build inclusive and enforceable policy frameworks.

Nonetheless, there are promising developments. Municipal initiatives like Seattle’s Gig Worker Paid Sick Leave Ordinance and regional experiments with portable benefits demonstrate that innovative policy solutions are both possible and increasingly necessary (City of Seattle, 2023). These programs help bridge the gap between employment flexibility and security, offering a model for other jurisdictions. Similarly, the European Union’s Platform Work Directive aims to rebalance power between platforms and workers by presuming employment status and mandating algorithmic transparency.

Worker agency and collective action are also critical components of the gig economy’s future. As shown in the case studies of Riders x Derechos in Spain and driver cooperatives in the Philippines, gig workers are not passive recipients of digital labor trends but active agents shaping their conditions through protests, advocacy, and alternative economic models (Scholz, 2017). The growth of these grassroots movements suggests that despite structural inequalities, collective resistance and innovation can contribute to more equitable outcomes.

Moving forward, a balanced policy approach is imperative. Policymakers should prioritize three key areas: the implementation of portable benefit systems, the enforcement of algorithmic accountability, and the establishment of minimum earning guarantees. Portable benefits would allow workers to accumulate entitlements regardless of platform or job changes, promoting both flexibility and security. Transparency in algorithmic management would ensure due process and protect workers from arbitrary decisions. Minimum wage standards would help curb the race to the bottom often observed in low-skilled gig work.

Furthermore, public awareness and education about workers’ rights in the gig economy should be enhanced. Governments, civil society, and platform companies must collaborate to ensure that gig workers are informed, empowered, and equipped to make strategic decisions about their work. Labor unions and digital advocacy groups also play a pivotal role in this transformation, acting as intermediaries between workers and institutions and amplifying marginalized voices.

Finally, continued academic and policy-oriented research is necessary to monitor the evolving dynamics of the gig economy. As platforms innovate and adapt, so too must our understanding of labor, employment, and economic justice. A cross-disciplinary approach—drawing from sociology, economics, law, and computer science—will be essential in crafting holistic and sustainable solutions.

In conclusion, the gig economy encapsulates the broader tensions of modern capitalism: the push for flexibility versus the need for security, technological innovation versus social protection, and corporate efficiency versus human dignity. The challenge for policymakers, employers, and society at large is to harness the benefits of this new world of work while mitigating its harms. A proactive, inclusive, and rights-based framework is not just desirable but essential to ensure that the future of work is equitable and sustainable for all.

Consent : Informed consent was obtained from all participants in accordance with ethical research protocols (American Psychological Association [APA], 2020). All interviews were anonymized and coded to protect the identity of participants. Participants were informed of their rights, including anonymity, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw at any point without penalty.

Ethical Approval

Given the potential risks associated with researching vulnerable labor populations, the study adhered to strict ethical protocols. It received ethical clearance from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the principal investigator's university.

Data storage followed General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and APA ethical guidelines (APA, 2020). Interview transcripts were stored in encrypted folders with restricted access. No personally identifiable information was retained, and all quotations were paraphrased or anonymized.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc. have been used during the writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

1.

2.

3.

References

De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the “just-in-time workforce”: On-demand work, crowd work, and labor protection in the “gig-economy.” Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 471–504.

Kuhn, K. M., & Maleki, A. (2017). Micro-entrepreneurs, dependent contractors, and instaserfs: Understanding online labor platform workforces. Academy of Management Perspectives, 31(3), 183–200. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0111

Prassl, J. (2018). Humans as a service: The promise and perils of work in the gig economy. Oxford University Press.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Scholz, T. (2017). Uberworked and underpaid: How workers are disrupting the digital economy. Polity.

Sundararajan, A. (2016). The sharing economy: The end of employment and the rise of crowd-based capitalism. MIT Press.

Upwork. (2024). Freelance Forward: 2023 Report. Retrieved from https://www.upwork.com/research/freelance-forward-2023

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity.

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

Asia Foundation. (2022). Digital jobs and the gig economy in Southeast Asia. https://asiafoundation.org

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. (2018). Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world. International Labour Organization.

De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the “just-in-time workforce”: On-demand work, crowd work and labour protection in the “gig-economy”. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 471–504.

Harris, S. D., & Krueger, A. B. (2015). A proposal for modernizing labor laws for twenty-first-century work: The “independent worker”. The Hamilton Project, 2015(10).

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2023). World employment and social outlook: Trends 2023. https://www.ilo.org

Kalleberg, A. L. (2018). Precarious lives: Job insecurity and well-being in rich democracies. Polity Press.

Kalleberg, A. L., & Vallas, S. P. (2017). Precarious work. Emerald Publishing.

Pew Research Center. (2021). The state of gig work in 2021. https://www.pewresearch.org

Prassl, J. (2018). Humans as a service: The promise and perils of work in the gig economy. Oxford University Press.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber’s drivers. International Journal of Communication, 10, 3758–3784.

Scholz, T. (2017). Uberworked and underpaid: How workers are disrupting the digital economy. Polity Press.

Sundararajan, A. (2016). The sharing economy: The end of employment and the rise of crowd-based capitalism. MIT Press.

UK Supreme Court. (2021). Uber BV v Aslam. [2021] UKSC 5.

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity Press.

Aloisi, A. (2021). Commoditized workers: Case study research on labor law issues arising from a set of “on-demand/gig economy” platforms. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 653–690.

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. (2018). Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world. International Labour Organization.

Binns, R., Veale, M., Van Kleek, M., & Shadbolt, N. (2018). 'It's reducing a human being to a percentage': Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–14.

De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the “just-in-time workforce”: On-demand work, crowd work and labour protection in the “gig-economy”. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 471–504.

Eurofound. (2023). Platform work directive: Proposed legislation to protect gig workers. https://www.eurofound.europa.eu

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2021). Regulating for decent work in the gig economy. https://www.ilo.org

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2023). World employment and social outlook: Trends 2023. https://www.ilo.org

Kässi, O., & Lehdonvirta, V. (2018). Online labour index: Measuring the online gig economy for policy and research. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 137, 241–248.

Moore, P. V. (2019). The quantified self in precarity: Work, technology and what counts. Routledge.

Prassl, J. (2018). Humans as a service: The promise and perils of work in the gig economy. Oxford University Press.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber’s drivers. International Journal of Communication, 10, 3758–3784.

Scholz, T. (2017). Uberworked and underpaid: How workers are disrupting the digital economy. Polity Press.

Sundararajan, A. (2016). The sharing economy: The end of employment and the rise of crowd-based capitalism. MIT Press.

Vallas, S., & Schor, J. B. (2020). What do platforms do? Understanding the gig economy. Annual Review of Sociology, 46(1), 273–294.

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity Press.

American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). APA.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). S

Aloisi, A. (2016). Commoditized workers: Case studies of labor law issues in the sharing economy. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 42(3), 509–541.

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. S. (2018). Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world. International Labour Office.

Cherry, M. A., & Aloisi, A. (2017). Dependent contractors in the gig economy: A comparative approach. American University Law Review, 66(3), 635–690.

City of Seattle. (2023). Gig Worker Paid Sick and Safe Time Ordinance. https://www.seattle.gov/laborstandards/ordinances/gig-worker-psst

De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the "just-in-time workforce": On-demand work, crowd work, and labor protection in the gig economy. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 471–504.

Huws, U., Spencer, N., & Joyce, S. (2018). Work in the European gig economy: Research results from the UK, Sweden, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Italy. Foundation for European Progressive Studies.

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2023). The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work. Geneva: ILO.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Vallas, S. P., & Schor, J. B. (2020). What do platforms do? Understanding the gig economy. Annual Review of Sociology, 46, 273–294. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity Press.

Aloisi, A. (2021). Commoditized workers: Case study research on labor law issues arising from a set of "on-demand/gig economy" platforms. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3), 653–690.

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. S. (2018). Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world. International Labour Organization.

City of Seattle. (2023). Gig worker paid sick and safe time. Retrieved from https://www.seattle.gov/laborstandards/ordinances/paid-sick-and-safe-time/gig-workers

ILO. (2021). World employment and social outlook: The role of digital labor platforms in transforming the world of work. International Labour Organization.

Parrott, J. A., & Reich, M. (2018). An earnings standard for New York City’s app-based drivers: Economic analysis and policy assessment. Center for New York City Affairs.

Prassl, J. (2022). Humans as a service: The promise and perils of work in the gig economy. Oxford University Press.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Scholz, T. (2017). Uberworked and underpaid: How workers are disrupting the digital economy. Polity.

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity.

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. S. (2018). Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world. International Labour Organization.

City of Seattle. (2023). Gig worker paid sick and safe time ordinance. https://www.seattle.gov/laborstandards/ordinances/gig-worker-psst

ILO. (2021). World employment and social outlook: The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work. International Labour Organization.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work. University of California Press.

Scholz, T. (2017). Uberworked and underpaid: How workers are disrupting the digital economy. Polity.

Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). The gig economy: A critical introduction. Polity.

Tan, Z. M., Aggarwal, N., Cowls, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). The ethical debate about the gig economy: A review and critical analysis. Technology in Society, 65, 101594.