Explainable AI for Goal Recommendation: Effects on Trust, Effort, and Retention of Gig Workers

George A. Welch
Department of Computer Science, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, USA.
welch1993@binghamton.edu

Petri Phillips
Department of Computer Science, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA.
petri2005@gmu.edu

Damien Mertan
School of Information Technology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA.
contactdamien@uc.edu

Jorge Grehiam
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA.
grahamjorge@ku.edu

Abstract

The increasing use of algorithmic management on digital labor platforms has transformed how work is coordinated, evaluated, and motivated. In the gig economy, goal recommendation systems powered by artificial intelligence are deployed to nudge worker behavior, optimize performance, and sustain engagement. However, the opacity of such systems raises critical questions about worker trust, effort allocation, and long-term retention. This paper examines the role of explainable artificial intelligence in goal recommendation for gig workers through a sociotechnical systems lens. We dissect the architectural layers of goal recommendation engines, their integration into platform infrastructures, and the governance mechanisms that shape transparency. By analyzing structural trade-offs between predictive accuracy and interpretability, we reveal how explanation modalities influence perceived autonomy, procedural fairness, and the calibration of worker effort. The discussion draws on cross-domain comparisons from algorithmic management, human-computer interaction, and organizational psychology to illustrate how explainability can be designed as a relational infrastructure rather than a mere feature. Special attention is given to the durability of trust when explanations are adaptive, contested, or strategically withheld, and how retention emerges as a systemic property of feedback loops between worker sensemaking, platform reputation, and labor supply dynamics. The paper concludes by outlining policy implications for platform accountability, algorithmic auditing, and the development of governance frameworks that align explainability requirements with the precarious realities of contingent work. We argue that sustainable gig workforce management hinges on the institutionalization of transparent goal recommendation systems that are not only technically sound but also socially legitimate.

Keywords

explainable artificial intelligence, gig economy, goal recommendation, trust, algorithmic management, worker retention, sociotechnical systems.

1. Introduction

Digital labor platforms have reconfigured employment relationships by replacing traditional managerial hierarchies with algorithmic coordination. In this environment, workers are increasingly subject to automated recommendations that set performance targets, suggest task sequences, and modulate incentives. These goal recommendation systems are designed to maximize platform throughput, yet their inner workings often remain invisible to the end user. The rapid proliferation of opaque algorithmic nudges has ignited a debate about the legitimacy of machine-directed goal setting and its consequences for worker agency. While much of the literature has centered on control mechanisms and surveillance, less attention has been paid to how the explainability of goal recommendations shapes the psychological contract between worker and platform. Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) offers a lens through which to examine whether making algorithmic rationales intelligible can bolster trust, calibrate effort, and reduce churn in gig work. However, implementing XAI in large-scale, real-time labor platforms presents profound architectural, governance, and infrastructural challenges that extend far beyond technical model interpretability.

The gig economy is characterized by high worker turnover, variable earnings, and minimal employment protections, factors that make retention a persistent operational and strategic concern. Platforms invest heavily in onboarding and matching algorithms, yet churn depresses network effects and increases recruitment costs. Goal recommendations, if perceived as arbitrary or exploitative, can erode the fragile trust that gig workers place in the system. In contrast, a recommendation that is accompanied by a comprehensible justification may transform a coercive nudge into a supportive coaching mechanism. This transformation, however, is not guaranteed. The effectiveness of explanations depends on their timing, granularity, modality, and alignment with workers' mental models, which in turn are shaped by prior experience, cultural context, and platform design. The sociotechnical architecture of goal recommendation must therefore be conceptualized as an active site of negotiation between algorithmic logic and human interpretation.

The present work adopts a systems-level perspective to analyze the interplay between XAI, goal recommendation, and gig worker outcomes. We refrain from presenting mathematical formalisms or algorithm-specific breakdowns, instead emphasizing the structural configurations that determine whether explanations foster trust or deepen suspicion. The discussion traverses multiple domains, drawing analogies from algorithmic management in transportation networks, health-incentive platforms, and microtask marketplaces to illuminate the contingency of explainability effects. We further explore how retention is not merely an individual-level metric but an emergent property of aggregate worker sentiment, platform reputation, and the institutional apparatus of labor regulation. By integrating insights from human-computer interaction, organizational psychology, and platform governance, this paper articulates a framework for designing goal recommendation systems that are explainable, accountable, and resilient.

2. Background and Related Work

Algorithmic management has been extensively documented across ride-hailing, food delivery, and online freelancing platforms. Research has shown that automated task allocation, dynamic pricing, and performance scoring constitute a new mode of labor control that is both pervasive and difficult to contest [1, 2]. These studies highlight a fundamental information asymmetry: platforms possess granular behavioral data and predictive models, whereas workers develop heuristic interpretations of algorithmic signals. The resulting opacity can induce stress, overwork, or strategic disengagement, phenomena that have been linked to reduced trust and elevated turnover intentions [3]. Goal recommendation systems extend this dynamic by explicitly setting performance benchmarks, often personalized through machine learning on historical activity patterns. Such systems are designed to increase task completion rates and earnings for the platform, but their unintended effects on worker well-being are only beginning to be scrutinized.

Parallel research in human-computer interaction has explored how explanations influence user acceptance of intelligent systems. The cognitive and social dimensions of explanation have been shown to matter as much as technical fidelity; people evaluate algorithms not solely on accuracy but on the perceived sincerity, transparency, and relational intent behind the output [8]. In the context of goal setting, contextualized justifications can help individuals internalize external targets, thereby enhancing motivation and performance [6]. However, the transfer of these findings to gig platforms is nontrivial because the employment relationship is transactional, short-term, and mediated by a faceless application. The motivational mechanisms that operate in traditional organizations may break down when algorithmic recommendations are decoupled from human support structures. Field experiments with gig workers have demonstrated that self-set goals and platform-suggested goals produce divergent behavioral responses, underscoring the need to attend to how goals are communicated and justified [7].

The explainable AI literature provides taxonomies of interpretability methods and evaluation criteria, yet it has largely prioritized technical stakeholders such as developers and auditors [9]. Only recently have researchers begun to investigate the downstream effects of explanations on end-user trust, satisfaction, and decision making in non-professional contexts [10]. These studies indicate that explanation fidelity, that is, how accurately the explanation reflects the model's true decision process, is less important to lay users than explanation plausibility and coherence. For gig workers managing income volatility and time pressure, the pragmatic utility of an explanation may reside in its ability to reduce uncertainty and inform adaptive strategies. Thus, the design of XAI for goal recommendation must reconcile the constraints of high-velocity environments with the psychological requirements of a diverse, distributed workforce.

3. The Sociotechnical Architecture of XAI in Gig Platforms

The deployment of explainable goal recommendations requires a careful orchestration of data pipelines, model serving infrastructure, user interfaces, and feedback channels. At the infrastructural level, platforms continuously ingest streams of behavioral telemetry, including task acceptance rates, completion times, cancellation patterns, and geolocation traces. These data flows feed machine learning models that forecast individual worker productivity and responsiveness to incentives. An XAI layer must be integrated into this pipeline without introducing unacceptable latency or computational overhead, a nontrivial engineering challenge when recommendations must be generated and justified in milliseconds at scale. Architectural decisions about where explanations are computed, whether at the edge, within a centralized model server, or as a post-hoc rendering, carry implications for system robustness, data privacy, and the freshness of interpretive content.

The explanation modality itself is a structural variable that interacts with platform governance. Textual justifications, visual counterfactuals, confidence scores, or comparative benchmarks each instantiate a different relationship between the platform and the worker. A textual explanation such as "This goal is recommended because you typically complete 12% more deliveries during this time slot" situates the worker as a rational actor within a statistical model. In contrast, a simple numeric score without narrative context treats the worker as a control system component. The choice of modality is not merely a user experience detail; it reflects the platform's organizational philosophy and its willingness to share interpretive power. When explanations are configurable, allowing workers to request deeper detail or contest the underlying logic, the system shifts from a directive monolith to a dialogical infrastructure, with potentially profound consequences for perceived fairness.

Governance mechanisms determine who has authority over explanation design, what constitutes a sufficient justification, and how disputes over algorithmic recommendations are resolved. In many contemporary platforms, these decisions are made unilaterally by product teams with limited input from workers or external regulators. This unilateralism can produce explanations that are technically accurate but socially tone-deaf, for instance, revealing sensitive personalization factors that violate privacy norms or highlighting profitability metrics that signal exploitation. A participatory governance model, in which worker representatives, platform designers, and domain experts co-specify explanation standards, offers an alternative path. Such a model would require the institutionalization of algorithmic auditing procedures, traceability logs, and transparent revision cycles, effectively embedding XAI within a broader accountability infrastructure that aligns with emerging regulatory frameworks for platform work.

4. Goal Recommendation Systems: Design and Explanation Modalities

Goal recommendation systems in gig platforms serve multiple functions: they smooth demand-supply mismatches, incentivize utilization during off-peak hours, and encourage workers to extend their sessions. These systems operate on a continuum from purely descriptive predictions, such as estimated earnings for a given number of tasks, to prescriptive targets, such as "Complete five more rides to earn a bonus." The transition from prediction to prescription amplifies the need for explanation because prescriptive recommendations carry normative force. Workers interpret such targets not merely as information but as expectations, and their willingness to comply is contingent on whether the expectation appears legitimate and attainable. The structural trade-off in system design lies between optimizing short-term throughput and cultivating long-term worker commitment, a tension that is rarely resolved in favor of sustainability under current platform incentive structures.

Explanation modalities can be classified along dimensions of temporal orientation, causal depth, and social framing. Retrospective explanations that justify why a specific goal was set rely on historical pattern recognition to create a narrative of continuity. Prospective explanations, which outline the expected consequences of goal attainment or non-attainment, appeal to workers' forward-looking reasoning and risk assessment. Causal depth varies from shallow heuristics that reference a single variable, such as time of day, to rich counterfactual simulations that articulate how different choices would alter the predicted outcome. Social framing embeds explanations within peer comparison or community norms, leveraging the motivational force of social identity. Each combination entails distinct systemic effects on trust, as workers continuously test the alignment between explanatory claims and their lived experience. A mismatch can rapidly degrade the credibility of the entire recommendation apparatus, particularly in gig ecosystems where negative experiences propagate quickly through worker networks and online forums.

Cross-domain comparisons illuminate the generalizability of these design dimensions. In health behavior change applications, explainable goal recommendations that incorporate personalized reasons and empathetic framing have been shown to increase adherence to physical activity regimens, an effect attributed to enhanced intrinsic motivation and perceived competence. In educational technology, platforms that explain why a particular learning goal is recommended based on a student's knowledge gaps foster greater engagement than those that simply assign tasks algorithmically. Translating these insights into gig labor contexts requires grappling with power asymmetries and economic precarity that are absent in wellness or learning environments. The instrumental value of an explanation for a gig worker may be overshadowed by the immediate financial pressures that drive decision making. Thus, explanation design must be situated within the broader political economy of platform labor, acknowledging that no amount of transparency can compensate for fundamentally exploitative working conditions.

5. Trust Dynamics and Worker Autonomy

Trust in algorithmic systems is a multidimensional construct encompassing competence, benevolence, integrity, and predictability. In gig platforms, trust is precariously built through repeated interactions in which workers compare system recommendations with realized outcomes. Explainability can accelerate the formation of competence-based trust by clarifying the data and reasoning behind a goal, but it can also surface discrepancies that undermine trust if the model's limitations become apparent. The strategic presentation of explanations thus becomes a governance dilemma: too much detail may expose model fragility and erode confidence, while too little detail may be interpreted as obfuscation. Platforms must navigate this tension within a dynamic environment where worker populations are heterogeneous, and trust calibration is an ongoing process rather than a one-time achievement.

Worker autonomy is a key mediator of the relationship between XAI and trust. Gig workers are often drawn to platform labor precisely because of its promise of flexibility and self-determination. When goal recommendations are perceived as encroachments on autonomy, even well-crafted explanations can trigger reactance and disengagement. Conversely, explanations that frame recommendations as decision aids rather than directives can preserve a sense of volition. Research in self-determination theory suggests that autonomy support, which entails providing meaningful rationales and acknowledging the user's perspective, enhances internalization of external goals [6]. Applied to platform design, this implies that goal recommendations should be accompanied by choice architectures that allow workers to adjust, negotiate, or opt out of suggested targets without penalty. Such architectures require system-level changes that go beyond explanation to encompass incentive structures and performance evaluation criteria.

The systemic fragility of trust becomes apparent when explanations are inconsistent or contested. In large-scale platforms, model updates, A/B testing, and regional policy variations can lead workers to receive explanations that contradict one another over time. Workers who rely on explanatory consistency to plan their schedules may find their trust shattered by unexplained algorithmic drift. Furthermore, when workers collectively identify patterns of bias or manipulation in recommendations, trust can collapse at a community level, triggering organized resistance or mass defection to competing platforms. The durability of trust therefore depends not only on the technical robustness of explanations but also on the institutional mechanisms for acknowledging errors, soliciting feedback, and co-evolving the recommendation logic with the workforce. These mechanisms constitute a form of relational infrastructure that is currently underdeveloped in most gig platforms.

6. Effort Allocation and Performance Implications

The primary objective of deploying goal recommendation systems is to influence worker effort in ways that enhance platform productivity. Explainability modulates this influence by shaping workers' interpretations of the performance-reward contingency. When a recommendation is accompanied by a clear rationale linking effort to a tangible outcome, such as a surge multiplier or a milestone bonus, workers may allocate effort more strategically, concentrating their activities during high-value windows. However, if the explanation reveals that the goal is designed primarily to benefit the platform with marginal gains for the worker, effort may be withheld or redirected toward competing platforms. The informational content of explanations thus functions as a signal in a broader labor market, and its effects are conditional on the competitive dynamics of platform supply.

Effort allocation is also influenced by the cognitive load imposed by explanations. In fast-paced gig contexts, such as real-time ridesharing or delivery, workers operate under severe time constraints that limit their capacity to process complex justifications. An explanation that is overly detailed may paradoxically reduce compliance by inducing decision paralysis or diverting attention from safe task execution. System designers must balance informativeness with conciseness, a trade-off that is amenable to personalization based on worker experience, digital literacy, and situational demands. Adaptive explanation interfaces that modulate detail based on context and user preference represent a promising architectural direction, but their implementation raises additional concerns about profiling and data protection.

From a performance perspective, the systemic effect of XAI extends beyond individual task completion. Explainable goal recommendations can serve as a coordination mechanism that reduces market volatility. When workers understand the rationale behind demand forecasts and incentive targets, they may adjust their schedules in ways that smooth supply, thereby stabilizing prices and service availability. This macro-level stabilization can yield platform-wide efficiency gains that are not captured by micrometrics such as ride-per-hour ratios. However, such stabilization may also reduce the price surges that workers rely on for premium earnings, creating a paradoxical situation in which transparency erodes income opportunities. The distributional consequences of XAI therefore demand careful scrutiny, as the benefits of improved system coordination may accrue disproportionately to platform operators and consumers rather than to the workers whose behavioral adjustments enable it.

7. Retention Mechanisms and Long-Term Sustainability

Retention in gig work is a function of cumulative worker experience, including earnings satisfaction, perceived respect, and the availability of alternative opportunities. Explainable goal recommendation systems can influence retention through multiple pathways. By reducing the ambiguity that surrounds algorithmic decisions, explanations can mitigate the frustration and anxiety that drive exit. When workers feel that the platform is communicating honestly about its expectations, they are more likely to develop a psychological attachment that transcends purely transactional calculus. This attachment, however, is vulnerable to external shocks such as sudden changes in commission structures or public controversies about data misuse. The insulation provided by explainability thus operates within limits defined by the broader institutional environment.

The relationship between XAI and retention is mediated by worker segment. Full-time gig workers who depend on platform income may place a higher premium on predictability and fairness, making them particularly sensitive to explanation quality. Part-time or supplementary workers may be less invested and thus less responsive to transparency interventions. Platforms that deploy uniform explanation strategies across heterogeneous populations risk missing opportunities to address the specific needs of high-value segments. A system-level approach would involve the use of worker personas and churn prediction models to tailor explanation content and delivery, a practice that itself raises ethical questions about manipulation and differential treatment. The sustainability of such personalization depends on robust consent mechanisms and transparent disclosure of how worker data inform recommendation logic.

Long-term retention is also shaped by the reputational spillovers of XAI practices. In the hyperconnected social media landscape, individual experiences with opaque or misleading recommendations can rapidly escalate into public relations crises. Conversely, platforms that are perceived as pioneers in algorithmic transparency may attract workers seeking fairer conditions, thereby gaining a competitive advantage in labor markets. This reputational dynamic creates a strategic incentive for investment in explainability, even beyond its direct effects on individual workers. However, the durability of this advantage hinges on the authenticity of the transparency commitment. Workers are adept at detecting performative transparency that provides surface-level justifications while preserving fundamentally extractive practices. Authentic explainability requires structural changes such as independent algorithmic audits, worker data cooperatives, and grievance mechanisms that give teeth to transparency claims.

8. Governance, Fairness, and Policy Considerations

The governance of explainable goal recommendation systems must address the distribution of power between platform operators, workers, and regulators. Current governance models are largely self-regulatory, with platforms voluntarily adopting transparency measures that are often limited to privacy policies and terms of service updates. This approach fails to ensure that explanations are meaningful, verifiable, and aligned with worker interests. A more robust governance framework would mandate explainability standards for automated employment decisions, similar to provisions emerging in the European Union’s Platform Work Directive and the proposed Algorithmic Accountability Act in the United States. Such regulations could require platforms to provide workers with plain-language justifications for goal recommendations that materially affect earnings, to maintain audit trails, and to offer channels for human review. The technical feasibility of these requirements at scale is a matter of architectural design and resource allocation, not a fundamental impossibility.

Fairness considerations intersect with XAI in multiple dimensions. Goal recommendations that are based on biased historical data can perpetuate disparities in earning opportunities across demographic groups. Explanations can either expose or obscure these disparities. A system that justifies a high earnings goal by citing a worker’s past high performance without revealing that past performance was facilitated by algorithmically advantaged location assignments conceals structural unfairness. Conversely, transparency about the factors influencing recommendations can empower workers and advocates to identify and challenge discriminatory patterns. The design of fairness-aware explanations is an active area of research, but its operationalization in gig platforms requires a commitment to equity that may conflict with profit-maximizing incentives. Policy intervention may be necessary to align platform objectives with societal values of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity.

The institutional infrastructure for algorithmic accountability includes independent auditing bodies, standardized impact assessments, and worker representation in platform governance. Explainability is a prerequisite for auditing because auditors need to trace the logic of goal recommendations to evaluate their lawfulness and fairness. However, auditing is resource-intensive and faces obstacles related to trade secret protections and data access. Establishing a balanced regime in which platforms disclose sufficient information for meaningful oversight without compromising competitive advantage is a delicate policy challenge. One approach is to mandate the use of privacy-preserving audit techniques such as secure multiparty computation or differential privacy audits. These technical solutions can enable scrutiny of recommendation logic without exposing proprietary models, but they require regulatory mandates to overcome the reluctance of platforms to invest in external accountability mechanisms. The intersection of XAI and policy thus represents a frontier where engineering, law, and social science must converge.

9. Conclusion

The integration of explainable AI into goal recommendation systems for gig workers is a multifaceted sociotechnical challenge that touches on infrastructure design, governance, labor policy, and human psychology. This paper has argued that explainability should not be treated as an aftermarket feature but as a constitutive element of the platform-worker relationship. Architectural choices about explanation modality, timing, and personalization carry systemic consequences for trust dynamics, effort allocation, and retention. When explanations are designed as relational artifacts that acknowledge worker autonomy and provide actionable insight, they can transform algorithmic nudges into instruments of empowerment. When they are deployed as cosmetic overlays on opaque control mechanisms, they risk deepening cynicism and accelerating disengagement. The structural trade-offs inherent in XAI deployment require platforms to balance efficiency, scalability, and fairness in ways that are currently underappreciated in both academic research and industry practice.

Looking forward, the evolution of gig work regulation will likely impose new requirements for algorithmic transparency and worker data rights. Proactive investment in robust, auditable, and contestable explanation infrastructures can position platforms to adapt smoothly to these requirements while building durable worker loyalty. Future research should move beyond laboratory studies of explanation formats to longitudinal field trials that capture the co-evolution of worker trust, platform reputation, and labor market dynamics. Cross-platform comparative analyses can illuminate how different governance regimes shape the effectiveness of XAI interventions. Interdisciplinary collaboration among computer scientists, organizational scholars, legal experts, and worker advocates is essential to develop explanation standards that are technically sound, socially legitimate, and economically sustainable. The long-term viability of platform-mediated work hinges on the institutionalization of transparency not as a compliance exercise but as a foundational principle of algorithmic management.

References

1. 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.

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

3. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. Academy of Management Annals, 14(1), 366–410.

4. Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management and Uber drivers' autonomy. Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS), Seoul, South Korea.

5. Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. Work, Employment and Society, 33(1), 56–75.

6. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705–717.

7. Min, X., Chi, W., Hu, X., & Ye, Q. (2024). Set a goal for yourself? A model and field experiment with gig workers. Production and Operations Management, 33(1), 205-224.

8. Miller, T. (2019). Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. Artificial Intelligence, 267, 1–38.

9. Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., ... & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. Information Fusion, 58, 82–115.

10. Shin, D. (2021). The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable AI. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 146, 102551.

11. Siau, K., & Wang, W. (2018). Building trust in artificial intelligence, machine learning, and robotics. Cutter Business Technology Journal, 31(2), 47–53.

12. Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608.

13. Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT), 59–68.

14. Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. Washington Law Review, 89, 1–33.

15. Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505–523.

16. De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the "just-in-time workforce": On-demand work, crowdwork and labour protection in the "gig-economy". ILO Conditions of Work and Employment Series No. 71.

17. 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.

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

19. Kitchin, R. (2017). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. Information, Communication & Society, 20(1), 14–29.

20. Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society (pp. 167–194). MIT Press.

21. Jarrahi, M. H., Newlands, G., Lee, M. K., Wolf, C. T., Kinder, E., & Sutherland, W. (2021). Algorithmic management in a work context. Big Data & Society, 8(2), 20539517211020332.

22. Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: Surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. Journal of Information Technology, 30(1), 75–89.

23. Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. Colorado Technology Law Journal, 13, 203–218.

24. European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on improving working conditions in platform work. COM(2021) 762 final.