

Reimagining Social Mobility in the Platform Economy and Automation-Driven Labor Landscape

¹Sulaksono, ²Rommy Hardyansah, ²Didit Darmawan

¹Universitas Negeri Surabaya, ²Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Email: dr.rommyhardyansah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT – This study examines how digital labor structures and automation technologies are reshaping the conditions for vertical social mobility, particularly among informal workers and young professionals. Through a qualitative literature-based approach, the research explores how gig platforms, algorithmic labor markets, and technological displacement are transforming traditional trajectories of advancement. The findings reveal that the erosion of stable employment, the rise of opaque performance metrics, and the spread of precarious digital work have significantly weakened conventional pathways to economic elevation. Informal workers face structural barriers intensified by algorithmic governance, while young professionals encounter diminishing returns from educational investment. The promise of flexibility and entrepreneurial independence often masks the persistence of inequality and institutional inertia. The study demonstrates that new determinants of social status—digital reputation, access to technology, and platform fluency—have emerged, but remain unevenly distributed. These dynamics call for a reevaluation of how mobility is conceptualized in the context of digitally mediated capitalism. By synthesizing insights from labor sociology, political economy, and technology studies, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of social stratification in the twenty-first century.

Keywords: gig economy, automation, vertical mobility, digital labor, informal workers, platform work, precarity.

A. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of digital platforms has significantly reshaped labor dynamics and redefined how individuals access opportunities for advancement. The emergence of the gig economy, marked by short-term, freelance, and platform-based employment, has expanded the meaning of work beyond traditional organizational structures (Cropanzano et al, 2023). At the same time, automation continues to replace tasks previously held by human labor, introducing efficiency gains while displacing routine

occupations (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019). These changes create both new possibilities and structural uncertainties for upward social movement, particularly among those who are newly entering the workforce or operating in precarious employment conditions.

Traditional models of social mobility often relied on predictable educational trajectories, stable job progression, and institutionalized career ladders. However, these foundations have been disrupted by algorithmic labor markets and decentralized employment systems that emphasize flexibility and output-based performance. The erosion of long-term contracts and the rise of platform dependency complicate established pathways to class mobility. In this environment, individuals are required to constantly reskill, reposition, and revalidate their worth within volatile markets (Zhang, 2022).

Young professionals and informal workers now navigate systems where social status and economic advancement are increasingly determined by digital visibility, data metrics, and client ratings (Graham et al., 2017). These new determinants lack transparency, are vulnerable to algorithmic bias, and often exclude traditional forms of merit. The promises of autonomy and self-determination offered by gig platforms are frequently offset by instability, wage unpredictability, and limited legal protections. The question arises: can these new economies sustain vertical mobility in any meaningful way?

This paper explores vertical social mobility within the dual transformations of the gig economy and automation. The aim is to understand how modern workers, particularly those without institutional support, adapt to shifting employment landscapes. By examining the literature across sociology of work, digital labor, and social stratification, this study offers insight into the adaptive strategies and structural barriers shaping contemporary mobility patterns.

One major concern is the mismatch between the fluidity of digital work and the rigidity of social stratification systems. Esping-Andersen (1999) observed that welfare regimes historically cushioned the volatility of labor markets, but platform labor now often falls outside such institutional coverage. As a result, precarious workers may cycle between informal gigs without gaining long-term economic security or status elevation (Zhang, 2022). This fragmentation weakens the mobility promise historically attached to labor force participation.

Another issue involves the redefinition of value in digital marketplaces. According to Standing (2011), the rise of a "precariat" class reflects how gig-based labor devalues stability and turns labor into a commodified service with fluctuating worth. Workers are incentivized to accept lower pay in exchange for access and flexibility, creating a downward pressure on wages and social capital accumulation (Sevcenko et al., 2022). The institutional absence of collective bargaining or standardized career metrics further deepens inequality.

A third issue concerns the intergenerational implications of gig-based survival strategies. Goldthorpe (2000) emphasized that class mobility is not only a matter of individual effort but is closely tied to institutional structures and opportunity distribution. When digital labor systems concentrate uncertainty and short-termism among the young, future prospects for socioeconomic movement become more volatile (Beerepoot et al., 2023). This raises questions about the sustainability of work as a vehicle for advancement in a digitized economy.

Analyzing the relationship between platform labor, automation, and class advancement helps clarify how contemporary workers confront transformation. It sheds light on whether new systems of production and distribution can support equitable progression or further entrench status divides. Understanding these dynamics is critical for grasping the evolving meaning of success, autonomy, and merit in digital capitalism.

Observing these transformations also reveals how informal and fragmented work patterns interact with institutional inertia. As employment categories blur, policy, education, and social safety nets struggle to adapt. Mapping these intersections provides a foundation for future empirical studies and for rethinking what social elevation requires in this emerging landscape.

This study seeks to investigate how the transformations brought by the gig economy and automation influence the potential for upward social mobility among modern workers. Focusing on informal and early-career participants in digitally mediated labor markets, this research aims to unpack structural constraints and behavioral adaptations. The results contribute to a deeper understanding of how digital economies reshape social stratification and challenge long-standing assumptions about labor, success, and social advancement.

B. METHOD

This study adopts a literature-based research method with a qualitative orientation to examine how digital labor systems and automation impact vertical social mobility in the current economic landscape. The method focuses on interpretive analysis of scholarly sources from sociology, labor studies, and political economy, particularly those that explore transformations in employment structures, work identities, and class dynamics. The goal is to identify conceptual patterns and analytical frameworks that reveal how mobility is negotiated and obstructed in a platform-driven economy. As described by Denzin and Lincoln (2005), qualitative research involves interpreting phenomena through the meanings individuals and groups assign to them, making it especially suited to understanding the subjective and structural dimensions of mobility in a shifting labor environment.

The data for this study consist of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and policy analyses that address the intersections between gig labor, algorithmic governance, and social stratification. The method aligns with the literature review approach outlined by Hart (1998), which emphasizes critical engagement, thematic organization, and conceptual synthesis. Sources are selected based on their relevance to the research question and their contribution to debates on employment precarity, occupational change, and institutional support. The analytical process involves coding recurring themes, comparing theoretical propositions, and constructing a coherent narrative that traces how digital economies reconfigure the rules and pathways of social elevation. This method allows for a reflective understanding of how workers navigate uncertainty, opportunity, and systemic constraint in a rapidly transforming economic order.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The landscape of work has undergone a structural realignment, spurred by the acceleration of digital platforms that mediate labor relations (Amri et al., 2021). As these systems proliferate, they not only introduce new formats of employment but also dismantle the foundational expectations surrounding job stability and career development (Arseienko, 2021). In this emerging paradigm, the boundaries between self-employment and organizational affiliation blur, leaving individuals to navigate fragmented pathways with fewer guarantees and greater exposure to volatility (De Stefano, 2015).

Platform economies prioritize flexibility, speed, and scalability, often at the expense of institutional loyalty and worker protection. Instead of receiving long-term contracts, mentorship, or internal promotion, workers are expected to continuously perform, adapt, and self-invest (Hajkowicz et al., 2016). These shifting expectations reposition labor as an ongoing contest of visibility and productivity, governed by algorithms and metrics rather than human oversight or organizational planning. This recalibration upends the inherited model of employment as a vehicle for gradual ascent (Kellogg et al., 2020).

With risk increasingly shifted onto individuals, the metrics of advancement are no longer dictated by institutional tenure but by transient indicators such as ratings, completion speed, and user feedback (Moher et al., 2018). The emphasis on output over development erodes opportunities for upward mobility, especially for those without prior access to training or reputational capital. Such conditions foster competition without cohesion and productivity without permanence, leaving many adrift in an economy of perpetual hustle (Thieme, 2018).

The detachment of work from institutional frameworks introduces new modes of economic insecurity that are deeply structural in nature. Without clear ladders or defined roles, individuals are tasked with building their own trajectories from a position of precarity. While digital platforms offer entry, they rarely provide elevation. The transactional nature of these exchanges reduces employment to a momentary alignment of interests, severing ties to long-term professional identity or communal support (Matsumura, 2020).

These developments signal a profound shift in how societies define success, belonging, and labor value (Marsal et al., 2021). The transition from structured employment to decentralized, self-managed engagements re-orient the social meaning of work itself. As digital labor structures proliferate, they challenge not only existing economic models but the very assumptions that once underpinned career progression, class movement, and institutional trust. In this environment, stability becomes the exception, and mobility a contested pursuit (O'Reilly et al., 2018).

Digital labor structures have redefined the meaning of employment by dissolving the traditional relationship between worker and institution (Doellgast & Wagner, 2022; Darmawan, 2025). In platform-mediated environments, employment is often reconfigured as a transaction rather than a long-term engagement, with workers assuming full responsibility for risk management, skill acquisition, and performance tracking. This individualization of labor challenges the conventional foundations of mobility, where structured progression and employer-sponsored advancement once played a central role (Siddique, 2022). According to Benanav (2011), the decoupling of employment from institutional pathways has fragmented the conditions necessary for stable upward movement.

Automation intensifies this instability by continuously recalibrating which human skills are valuable. Tasks once considered safe within the professional domain, such as data analysis, customer service, or legal drafting, are increasingly subject to algorithmic substitution (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Frey and Osborne (2013) identified a significant share of white-collar jobs as vulnerable to automation, undermining the presumption that higher education and cognitive labor ensure insulation from technological displacement. This erosion of security extends to young professionals whose early career stages are now marked by rapid obsolescence and competition with artificial intelligence systems (Rojak & Khayru, 2022).

Informal workers face a compounded disadvantage in this landscape. Already excluded from traditional employment benefits, they now encounter digital systems that amplify their precarity. Platform algorithms often determine job access,

visibility, and pay scales through opaque criteria that workers cannot contest or influence (Möhlmann et al., 2021). As Van Doorn (2017) points out, this data-driven governance reinforces asymmetries of power and obscures the conditions under which labor is evaluated, effectively narrowing the path toward economic advancement.

The gig economy promises flexibility and independence, but such conditions rarely translate into vertical mobility (Anwar & Graham, 2021). Instead, workers often remain trapped in a cycle of low-wage, high-turnover tasks that provide immediate income but few opportunities for skill recognition or upward transition. Schor (2015) argue that platform work fosters horizontal diversification rather than vertical advancement, as workers accumulate varied experiences without accruing institutional leverage or seniority.

Credential inflation further complicates mobility in this setting. As more individuals attain higher education, the scarcity of secure employment opportunities means that degrees no longer guarantee upward mobility (Chan & Zhang, 2021). Brown et al. (2011) describe this phenomenon as the “global auction” of skills, where educated workers are forced to compete for limited professional roles under deteriorating conditions. This dilution of educational value affects both young professionals and gig workers who aspire to leverage credentials for advancement but encounter diminishing returns.

Social networks and digital reputation have emerged as new currencies in platform economies, replacing formal promotions and performance reviews (Perren & Kozinets, 2018). While such metrics offer visibility, they are vulnerable to manipulation, bias, and volatility. A single negative review or algorithmic adjustment can dramatically alter a worker’s trajectory. As Gillespie (2010) noted, platform architectures encode values and norms that shape behavior while remaining largely unaccountable, leaving workers subject to shifting criteria without recourse.

Labor fragmentation weakens collective agency, making it difficult for workers to negotiate better conditions or build pathways toward stability (Benassi et al., 2019). The decline of unions and the rise of independent contracting have undermined traditional mechanisms for institutional representation.

Milkman and Ott (2014) observed that attempts to organize platform workers often face resistance due to legal ambiguity and cultural narratives of entrepreneurial independence, further isolating individuals in their pursuit of mobility.

Gender and racial disparities are also reinforced by digital labor structures. Studies by Gray and Suri (2019) show that marginalized populations are overrepresented in low-paid, crowd-based tasks and underrepresented in roles with upward potential. Algorithmic sorting mechanisms, while seemingly neutral, often reproduce existing inequalities by embedding biased assumptions into automated decision-making processes, thereby constraining the upward trajectories of certain demographic groups (Williams et al., 2018).

The psychological dimension of mobility in the digital economy deserves attention. The illusion of opportunity, maintained through gamified interfaces and motivational language, can obscure structural limitations (González-González & Navarro-Adelantado, 2021). Workers are encouraged to persevere through hustle culture and self-optimization narratives, yet these discourses deflect attention from systemic barriers. As Illouz (2007) argues, neoliberal emotional regimes frame personal failure as individual weakness rather than structural imbalance, impeding collective awareness and critique.

Access to digital infrastructure and technological literacy also determines mobility outcomes. Those with advanced devices, fast internet, and algorithmic fluency can navigate platforms more efficiently, while others remain disadvantaged by technological constraints (Kozyreva et al., 2020). Warschauer (2004) highlights how the digital divide reinforces educational and income inequalities, making upward mobility increasingly contingent on technical proficiency and resource access.

Intergenerational inequality is magnified in the platform economy. Younger cohorts entering the labor market during economic precarity find themselves competing in systems that reward short-term output over cumulative experience (Kalleberg, 2020). Kalleberg (2009) describes this as a shift toward “nonstandard employment,” where career coherence and long-term planning are displaced by short-term adaptability. This

volatility limits the accumulation of economic and social capital necessary for enduring upward movement.

Geographic inequality intersects with digital labor structures in important ways. While platforms claim to offer global access, opportunities are often concentrated in urban centers with established digital economies. Workers in peripheral regions may face limited demand, lower wages, and reduced platform support, creating regional stratification in access to mobility (Acs et al., 2021). As Graham et al. (2017) argue, the geography of digital labor reflects uneven development patterns and mirrors traditional global inequalities.

Cultural narratives around success and entrepreneurship further complicate perceptions of mobility (Korhonen & Leppaaho, 2019). The glorification of self-made digital influencers or gig-based millionaires creates aspirational benchmarks that are statistically rare. These narratives obscure the structural barriers faced by the majority, who lack capital, networks, or time to convert digital labor into sustainable advancement. Such myths reinforce unrealistic expectations and normalize systemic exclusion (Noh, 2018).

The normalization of insecurity alters how individuals plan for the future (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2021). Without predictable income, benefits, or progression, workers adapt by adopting survival strategies that prioritize immediate solvency over long-term investment. This reactive posture, while rational under unstable conditions, inhibits the accumulation of resources that support upward movement such as homeownership, continued education, or retirement planning (Yost et al., 2021).

Despite the challenges, some forms of resilience and adaptation emerge. Workers engage in skill stacking, portfolio careers, and micro-entrepreneurship as ways to stabilize income and build reputation (Bashir, 2018). However, these efforts are often insufficient to overcome the structural limitations of algorithmic labor. The question remains whether such strategies represent innovation or desperation, and to what extent they truly foster upward social mobility in an increasingly fragmented economic order.

The contemporary labor terrain, shaped by platforms and automation, has compelled workers to reconfigure how they sustain

livelihoods and pursue progression (Rotz et al., 2019). Within this shifting matrix, adaptation becomes less of a choice and more of a condition for survival. Individuals build patchwork careers through continuous learning and diversified engagements, yet these efforts often yield inconsistent returns. Stability becomes elusive, and aspiration must be recalibrated in light of systemic volatility that undermines linear professional development (Bemme, 2019).

While agency persists in the form of strategic maneuvering, the broader structure in which these actions unfold remains rigid and uneven (Heidemann, 2018). The appearance of autonomy conceals persistent constraints, as digital infrastructures impose unseen limitations through opaque governance and performance metrics. The expansion of freelance work and entrepreneurial efforts, although celebrated rhetorically, often emerge in response to exclusion rather than opportunity. For many, flexibility serves as a euphemism for the absence of security (Salamon, 2020).

Institutional support mechanisms have lagged behind these transformations, leaving workers to absorb the risks of an unpredictable economy. Traditional markers of progression, such as promotion, pension, or permanence, are increasingly replaced by short-term gains and symbolic recognition. The notion of career has been diluted into fragmented endeavors, stitched together by necessity rather than coherent vision. This condition raises critical questions about the sustainability of progress when built upon individualized navigation of structural constraint (Brewer, 2018).

The proliferation of coping strategies reflects both resilience and systemic neglect. While adaptation demonstrates resourcefulness, it also signals institutional failure to accommodate the realities of evolving labor forms. Efforts to thrive within such an environment are commendable, yet they cannot substitute for systemic equity or structural transformation. Without a collective recalibration of values and policies, the promise of upward movement risks becoming a mirage—visible, but unreachable for many (Dolan & Rajak, 2018).

In considering these developments, it becomes clear that social mobility in the age of digital labor requires more than individual ingenuity. It calls for a deeper reckoning with how value is assigned, how opportunity is structured, and

how institutions can evolve to support more inclusive trajectories. Only through such reflection can societies move beyond improvisation and begin to cultivate genuine frameworks for advancement that are both viable and just.

D. CONCLUSION

The rise of platform-based employment and automation technologies has dramatically altered the landscape of vertical social mobility. Informal workers and young professionals face increasingly fragmented and uncertain trajectories as traditional pathways to economic stability erode. The structural foundations that once supported predictable career advancement have been replaced by systems that emphasize flexibility, competition, and self-optimization. This shift has made upward movement more elusive, particularly for those excluded from institutional support or digital infrastructure. Mobility is no longer a matter of linear progression but of navigating volatile algorithms, precarious income streams, and shifting definitions of value.

The findings of this study highlight the urgent need for a reframing of how societies understand success, stability, and class movement in the digital age. As gig work and automation continue to restructure labor markets, institutions must reconsider outdated assumptions about employment and mobility. Social structures, policy frameworks, and educational systems that remain grounded in industrial-era logic struggle to respond to the realities of digitally mediated labor. Without critical inquiry and systemic reform, these conditions may reinforce existing inequalities and deepen intergenerational stagnation.

Future research and policymaking should engage with the lived experiences of workers navigating this environment and seek to create adaptive frameworks that align with the fluidity of modern labor. Rather than relying solely on traditional indicators of advancement, new models must account for digital capital, algorithmic governance, and evolving notions of value. Scholarship that bridges sociology, labor studies, and technology can offer much-needed clarity and contribute to the development of more equitable and resilient mobility structures in an increasingly automated and platform-driven world.

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., & P. Restrepo. 2019. Automation and New Tasks: How Technology Displaces and Reinforces Labor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(2), 3-30.

Acs, Z. J., A. K. Song, L. Szerb, D. B. Audretsch, & É. Komlósi. 2021. The Evolution of the Global Digital Platform Economy: 1971–2021. *Small Business Economics*, 57, 1629-1659.

Amri, M. W., M. Tahir, A. R. Putra, & I. Setiawan. 2021. Time Management Strategies to Improve Labor Productivity and Work Quality, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 153 – 158.

Anwar, M. A., & M. Graham. 2021. Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Freedom, Flexibility, Precarity and Vulnerability in the Gig Economy in Africa. *Competition & Change*, 25(2), 237-258.

Arseienko, A. G. 2021. Employment Transformation in Digital Capitalism: Myths and Realities of the Social Consequences of the Global Economy Digitalization. *Семиотические исследования*, 1(2), 98-110.

Bemme, D. 2019. Finding "What Works": Theory of Change, Contingent Universals, and Virtuous Failure in Global Mental Health. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 43(4), 574-595.

Benanav, A. 2011. Precarity Rising: Employment in the Age of Disruption. *Historical Materialism*, 19(2), 3-27.

Benassi, C., L. Dorigatti, & E. Pannini. 2019. Explaining Divergent Bargaining Outcomes for Agency Workers: The Role of Labour Divides and Labour Market Reforms. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 25(2), 163-179.

Brewer, A., Brewer, & Chatterjee. 2018. *Encountering, Experiencing and Shaping Careers*. Springer, Sydney, New South Wales.

Brown, P., H. Lauder, & D. Ashton. 2011. *The Global Auction: The Broken Promises of Education, Jobs, and Incomes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Chan, W. K. & J. Zhang. 2021. Can University Qualification Promote Social Mobility? A Review of Higher Education Expansion and Graduate Employment in China. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 84(2021), 102423.

Cropanzano, R., K. Keplinger, B. K. Lambert, B. Caza, & S. J. Ashford. 2023. The Organizational Psychology of Gig Work: An Integrative Conceptual Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(3), 492-519.

Darmawan, D. 2025. Human Capital Development in Knowledge-Based Organizations for Innovation and Continuous Learning, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(1), 1-4.

De Stefano, V. 2015. The Rise of the Just-in-Time Workforce: On-Demand Work, Crowdwork, and Labor Protection in the Gig-Economy. *Comp. Lab. L. & Pol'y J.*, 37, 471.

Denzin, N. K. & Y. S. Lincoln. 2005. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Doellgast, V. & I. Wagner. 2022. Collective Regulation and the Future of Work in the Digital Economy: Insights from Comparative Employment Relations. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 64(3), 438-460.

Dolan, C. & D. Rajak. 2018. Remaking Africa's Informal Economies: Youth, Entrepreneurship and the Promise of Inclusion at the Bottom of the Pyramid. In *Globalization, Economic Inclusion and African Workers*. University of Sussex, Brighton.

Eddine, B. A. S., M. S. H. B. Ishaq, D. Darmawan, & R. Ali. 2021. Employee Well-being and Performance Evaluation: Integrating Quality of Work Life in HR Management, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 97 – 104.

Esping-Andersen, G. 1999. *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Fared, M. A. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Design and Implementation of Cross-Functional Training to Improve Team Collaboration, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 215 – 220.

Freya, C. B. & M. A. Osborne. 2017. The Future of Employment: How Susceptible Are Jobs to Computerization. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 114, 254-280.

Gillespie, T. 2010. The Politics of 'Platforms'. *New Media & Society*, 12(3), 347-364.

Goldthorpe, J. H. 2000. *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives, and the Integration of Research and Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

González-González, C. S. & V. Navarro-Adelantado. 2021. The Limits of Gamification. *Convergence*, 27(3), 787-804.

Graham, M., I. Hjorth, & V. Lehdonvirta. 2017. Digital Labour and Development: Impacts of Global Digital Labour Platforms. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 23(2), 135-162.

Gray, M. L. & S. Suri. 2019. *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston.

Hajkowicz, S., A. Reeson, L. Rudd, A. Bratanova, L. Hodgers, C. Mason, & N. Boughen. 2016. *Tomorrow's Digitally Enabled Workforce: Megatrends and Scenarios for Jobs and Employment in Australia Over the Coming Twenty Years*. Australian Policy Online, Australia.

Hakim, Y. R. A., J. A. Rojak, B. Triono. 2021. Transformation of Cultural Values and Social Practices in the Digital Age, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 173 – 178.

Hart, C. 1998. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Heidemann, K. A. 2018. Overcoming Uncertainty: Agency, Stance, and the Rise of Collective Action in Times of Crisis. *Sociological Focus*, 51(2), 79-96.

Illouz, E. 2007. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Polity Press, UK.

Ishaq, M. S. H. B., D. Darmawan, & Sudjai. 2021. Gig Economy on Workers' Welfare and Labor Market Stability, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 167 – 170.

Kalleberg, A. L. 2009. Precarious Work, Insecure Workers. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 1-22.

Kalleberg, A. L. 2020. Labor Market Uncertainties and Youth Labor Force Experiences: Lessons Learned. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 688(1), 258-270.

Kellogg, K. C., M. A. Valentine, & A. Christin. 2020. Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410.

Korhonen, S. & T. Leppäaho. 2019. Well-Trodden Highways and Roads Less Traveled: Entrepreneurial-Oriented Behavior and Identity Construction in International Entrepreneurship Narratives. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 17(3), 355-388.

Kozyreva, A., S. Lewandowsky, & R. Hertwig. 2020. Citizens Versus the Internet: Confronting Digital Challenges with Cognitive Tools. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 21(3), 103-156.

Mardikaningsih, R. & M. Hariani. 2021. Realizing Sustainability in Public Policy: Building a Balance between Economy, Social, and Environment, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 191 – 196.

Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Business Sustainability Strategies in the Facing of Regulatory Uncertainty and Managerial Challenges, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 111 – 118.

Marsal, A. P., S. Arifin, & I. Setiawan. 2021. Development of a Legal System to Strengthen the Direction and Structure of Social Welfare Policy, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 197 – 202.

Matsumura, K. T. 2020. Breaking Down Status. *Washington University Law Review*, 98(3), 671-736.

Mendonca, C. N., W. Wahyudi, R. N. K. Kabalmay, M. W. Amri. 2021. Developing Technical and Social Competencies for Future-Ready Education in Digitally Mediated Labor Environments, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 259 – 266.

Milkman, R. & E. Ott. 2014. *New Labor in New York: Precarious Workers and the Future of the Labor Movement*. Cornell University Press, New York.

Moher, D., F. Naudet, I. A. Cristea, F. Miedema, J. P. Ioannidis, & S. N. Goodman. 2018. Assessing Scientists for Hiring, Promotion, and Tenure. *PLoS Biology*, 16(3), 1-20.

Möhlmann, M., L. Zalmanson, O. Henfridsson, & R. W. Gregory. 2021. Algorithmic Management of Work on Online Labor Platforms: When Matching Meets Control. *MIS Quarterly*, 45(4).

Noh, E. 2018. Terror As Usual: The Role of the Model Minority Myth in Asian American Women's Suicidality. *Women & Therapy*, 41(3-4), 316-338.

O'Reilly, J., F. Ranft, M. Neufeind, S. S. Gregory, U. Zierahn, R. Went, & K. Holts. 2018. *Work in the Digital Age: Challenges of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Rowman & Littlefield, USA.

Perren, R. & R. V. Kozinets. 2018. Lateral Exchange Markets: How Social Platforms Operate in a Networked Economy. *Journal of Marketing*, 82(1), 20-36.

Raisch, S. & S. Krakowski. 2021. Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192-210.

Rojak, J. A. & R. K. Khayru. 2022. The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style on Team Performance: Implications for Collaboration, Motivation, and Effectiveness Enhancement Strategies, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 13 – 20.

Rotz, S., E. Gravely, I. Mosby, E. Duncan, E. Finnis, M. Horgan, & E. Fraser. 2019. Automated Pastures and the Digital Divide: How Agricultural Technologies Are Shaping Labour and Rural Communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 68, 112-122.

Salamon, E. 2020. Digitizing Freelance Media Labor: A Class of Workers Negotiates Entrepreneurialism and Activism. *New Media & Society*, 22(1), 105-122.

Schor, J. 2015. *Platform Cooperativism: Challenging the Corporate Sharing Economy*. Roosevelt Institute, New York.

Sevcenko, V., L. Wu, A. Kacperczyk, & S. Ethiraj. 2022. Surplus Division Between Labor and Capital: A Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1), 334-390.

Siddique, A. B. 2023. Job Market Polarization and American Poverty. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 57(1), 1-24.

Standing, G. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury Academic, London.

Thieme, T. A. 2018. The Hustle Economy: Informality, Uncertainty and the Geographies of Getting By. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(4), 529-548.

Van Doorn, N. 2017. Platform Labor: On the Gendered and Racialized Exploitation of Low-Income Service Work in the 'On-Demand' Economy. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(6), 898-914.

Warschauer, M. 2004. *Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Williams, B. A., C. F. Brooks, & Y. Shmargad. 2018. How Algorithms Discriminate Based on Data They Lack: Challenges, Solutions, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Information Policy*, 8(1), 78-115.

Yost, E., M. Kizildag, & J. Ridderstaat. 2021. Financial Recovery Strategies for Restaurants During COVID-19: Evidence from the US Restaurant Industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 47, 408-412.

Zhang, A. H. 2022. Agility Over Stability: China's Great Reversal in Regulating the Platform Economy. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 63(547), 1-55.