The Impact of the Digital Economy on Labor-Market Structure: Evidence and Governance from the Platform Economy

Tangyong Zhou
Economic in Social Science, University of Ottawa, K1N 6N5, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Abstract: In the last ten years, digitally mediated platforms have changed the way that work is matched, tracked, and paid for in ride-hailing, last-mile deliveries, online freelancing, and creative economies. This study integrates international scholarship, comparative regulation, and illustrative instances (Meituan, Didi, Uber, and Douyin/TikTok) to evaluate the impact of platformization on labor market structure. I contend that platforms expedite a transition from conventional employment to varied non-standard arrangements, facilitated by algorithmic management and two-sided market principles that redistribute risk from employers to employees. The effects are mixed: platforms make it easier to get started and create more flexible income opportunities, but they also make it harder for employers to take responsibility, make income less stable, and put workers under opaque, data-driven control. A review of policies in the EU, the U.S., China, Singapore, Spain, and the U.K. shows that there is more agreement on five regulatory levers: (1) presumptions of employment or intermediate dependent contractor statuses; (2) portability of social protection with shared financing; (3) transparency and human oversight for algorithmic systems; (4) data access to enable enforcement and collective bargaining; and (5) targeted inclusion of youth, women, and migrants. The paper ends with a macro-structural framework that connects platform governance to labor market segmentation. It also suggests a policy mix for China (quasi-employment pilots, co-financed social insurance, algorithmic audits, and sectoral dialog) to improve job quality without hurting the growth benefits of the digital economy.

Keywords: Digital Economy; Platform Labor; Algorithmic Management; Non-standard Employment; Labor Market Governance; China

1. Introduction

Why platform labor matters to labor-market structure

Digitally mediated platforms are becoming a key part of modern job marketplaces. In 2022, China's digital economy was worth 50.2 trillion yuan, or 41.5% of GDP. Platform companies were important in areas including e-commerce, on-demand transportation, delivery, and content [1]. This growth has brought tens of millions of people into platform-mediated jobs, including drivers, couriers, livestreamers, and online freelancers. The consequences on growth are evident, but the repercussions on the structure of the labor market, including types of jobs, bargaining power, risk distribution, and social protection coverage, are still being debated and are changing [2]. In theory, platforms are two-sided markets that provide value by managing interactions and data flows between different groups of users, like drivers and passengers or merchants and customers. This governance system's rules, prices, and algorithmic suggestions affect how people choose to participate and how they operate [3]. In terms of management, platforms use code and regulations to bring together large groups of workers who are spread out across a wide area [4]. These characteristics are collectively steering labor markets from a paradigm characterized by conventional employment toward a hybrid domain of contracts, evaluations, automated determinations, and reputational metrics [5-6]. Although task-based or gig work mediated through digital platforms is the common definition of platform labor, this definition can be further refined by highlighting its implications for worker rights. Because they usually don't have standard employment contracts, platform workers have a harder time getting benefits like paid time off, health insurance, and collective bargaining. Therefore, a more accurate definition should specifically

take into consideration the limited legal safeguards and structural precarity that set platform work apart from traditional employment arrangements. This article responds to four enquiries according to the study brief: (1) What are the primary methods by which platforms transform labor-market structure? (2) How do the effects differ for different types of workers, such as young people, women, and rural migrants? (3) What new governance models are coming up, like the EU, the US, China, and Singapore, and what do they mean? (4) What policy alternatives can harmonize efficiency with equality in China? Methodologically, I integrate a critical literature synthesis with comparative policy analysis and case studies (Meituan, Didi, Uber, Douyin/TikTok).

2. Literature Review

From algorithmic coordination to labor governance

Entrepreneurship, low barriers to entry, and consumer surplus were highlighted in the early platform discourse [4]. The organizational control built into algorithms and applications is increasingly described in more critical literature. Information asymmetries and indirect control were seen in Rosenblat and Stark's (2016) fieldwork on Uber, where drivers' decisions are guided by ratings, nudges, and surge triggers while preserving an appearance of autonomy [7]. Kellogg et al., drawing on organizational theory, describe algorithmic management as a disputed terrain of control where power and discretion are rearranged both on and off the platform by surveillance, evaluation metrics, and automated decision systems [5]. According to Vallas and Schor, platforms serve as "permissive potentates," externalizing responsibilities while exerting market power over transactions [8]. They synthesize four interpretive frames: platforms as digital cages, as accelerants of precarity, as chameleons adapting to regulation, and as entrepreneurial incubators. In addition to on-demand work, internet freelancing has grown significantly. Remote platform employment has been steadily increasing, especially in software and creative services, according to the Online Labor Index (OLI), which monitors posts on key platforms [9]. According to follow-up research, the division of labor is becoming more globalized and is mediated by reputation capital and platform intermediation. This has consequences for jurisdiction, payment security, and skill development [10]. These studies show that platformization extends beyond low-paying gig work to professionalized, international services with unique governance issues. The perspective is widened by international organizations. While acknowledging the positives of income and involvement, the ILO's World Employment and Social Outlook 2021 on digital labor platforms details gaps in social protection, excessive working hours, and earnings fluctuation [2]. The policy implication is a need for institutional adaptation that restores risk-sharing and voice in a re-intermediated labor market, rather than a binary judgment on platforms [2].

3. Analytical Framework: Mechanisms Linking Platforms to Labor-Market Structure

3.1 Reintermediation and Disintermediation

Although platforms are supposed to disintermediate conventional enterprises, they instead reintermediate through code. They influence access to demand and working conditions by establishing matching rules, pricing (or price ranges), and visibility hierarchies [3-4]. Unless regulators step in, platform rules will regulate remedies instead of labor law under this centralized rule-setting, which transfers authority from the employment contract to terms-of-service governance.

3.2 The Decline of Traditional Jobs Due to Algorithmic Management

According to Rosenblat and Stark, automatic deactivation, ratings, and algorithmic allocation provide highly standardized yet officially unemployed connections [7]. Although they have the ability to set their own hours, workers must contend with inconsistent compensation, ambiguous punishments, and restricted contestation rights-aspects that are often lessened in regular employment through collective bargaining and due process [5]. As a result, the protective package associated with conventional employment is weakened, leading to a de facto servitude through code.

3.3 Income Volatility and Risk Shifting

Platforms usually transfer price risk (dynamic pricing), demand risk (idle time, cancelations), and capital expenditures (devices, cars) to

employees. According to the ILO, there are gaps in social insurance coverage and significant wage unpredictability, particularly in task- and location-based jobs [2]. This leads to labor-market dualization on a larger scale, with a core of steady employment and a peripheral of contingent workers whose bargaining power is mediated by app rules and ratings [8].

3.4 Platform-type Segmentation

Heterogeneity is important. Online freelancing prioritizes reputation capital and cross-border pricing competition. Creative platforms rely on algorithmic distribution and brand relationships. Ride-hailing and delivery prioritize real-time logistics, strict service-level agreements, and location-based monitoring [11]. Different occupational trends across regions are revealed by measurement techniques like the OLI, which can guide targeted regulation [9-10].

4. Methods and Cases

This research employs literature synthesis, comparative policy analysis, and case illustrations. Cases are chosen based on their usual characteristics and policy importance: Meituan and Didi (China), Uber (U.S. U.K. EU exposure), and Douyin/TikTok (creative work). The EU Platform Work Directive, the U.S. AB5/Proposition 22 trajectory, and the 2024 U.S. Department of Labor classification rule under the FLSA are all examples of policy comparisons [12]. Other examples are China's 2021 Guiding Opinions on "new-form employment," Singapore's Platform Workers Act (with CPF and injury-compensation reforms), Spain's Rider Law, and the U.K. Supreme Court's Uber BV v. Aslam decision. The goal is analytical generalization, which is to find processes and governance levers that work in different situations-rather than statistical inference.

5. Findings: How Platforms Reshape Labor-market Structure

5.1 Platformization on a Large Scale: China's Big Picture and the Shift to Risk Re-Internalization

China's digital economy offers a distinct macro environment where platformization has attained structural significance. According to government estimates, China's digital economy will be worth around 50.2 trillion yuan, or about 41.5% of GDP, by 2022. This shows that platforms are not just a passing trend, but a key way to produce, trade, and assign labor [1]. In this larger digital world, ride-hailing, rapid delivery, and creator/intermediated services have taken up a lot of urban workers. But the same methods that make platforms more efficient, such as tight service-level goals, predictive despatch, dynamic pricing, and ratings, change how risk is shared between businesses and labor. In 2021, Chinese regulators tried to fix this distribution directly by issuing the Guiding Opinions on Safeguarding the Labor Security Rights and Interests of Workers in New Forms of Employment. These opinions called for reasonable delivery times, rest periods, participation in social insurance, and limits on punitive, unclear algorithmic rules [13]. The practical impact has been that platforms have been able to readjust their internal views on time and safety risk without losing the flexibility that allows for consumer excess and worker admission. Reports show that big companies like Meituan shared parts of their ETA and despatch logic and changed the strictest timing thresholds after policy review. They also announced plans to make late-delivery penalties less severe [14-15]. The importance of these actions is structural rather than symbolic. By changing the parameters of algorithmic targets, regulators and companies effectively change the macro unit of risk that workers, especially riders and drivers who used to take on a lot of the volatility caused by idling, congestion, and cancelations, have to deal with. In China, platformization on a large scale has been followed by a gradual shift in governance that tries to preserve the matching function of platforms intact while putting up guardrails around exposure to time pressure and income shocks [16].

5.2 Algorithmic Management as the Organizing Principle of Structural Transformation

Algorithmic management is the thing that connects micro-level incentives to macro-level changes in the labor market across different industries and countries. A strong body of empirical research demonstrates that grading systems, automated nudges, dynamic pay cues, and deactivation policies may significantly influence worker behavior, even when individuals maintain formal contractor status [7]. Organizational research views this as a novel,

contentious domain of control: algorithmic dashboards and performance metrics shift discretion from frontline workers to the platform's code, thereby standardizing outcomes while preserving the facade of autonomy [5]. The new setup changes three main hazards. First, demand risk, which is the unpredictability of orders and rides, is partly passed on to workers through unpaid waiting and acceptance algorithms that are set up to keep service levels high. Second, pricing risk, which comes from surge and discount cycles, is controlled by real-time cues that make profits depend on decisions about time and place that many workers cannot readily optimize around. Third, capital risk, including devices, automobiles, and consumables, remains largely individualized, increasing vulnerability for lower-income workers. Because these risk shifts are made through code and not only contracts, the legal line between employment and independent contracting is frequently not the same as the line between experienced control. That imbalance is why policy arguments are starting to focus more on how code assigns risk, discretion, and voice than on how status is labeled. It also explains why small design changes, like adding ETA buffers, changing the unit of working time that is counted, or giving people a chance to review bad automated decisions, can have big effects: they change who pays for volatility and how predictable earnings become at scale [5,7].

5.3 Different Regulatory Pathways that are Coming Together: EU Re-Standardization, U.S. Pluralism, and Singaporean Portability

Comparative developments reveal various legal approaches to the identical structural issue, such as how to safeguard workers while maintaining the productive matching facilitated by platforms. The European Union's Directive (EU) 2024/2831 is the most complete system-level approach. It sets up a presumption of employment when control criteria are met, requires algorithmic transparency and human oversight, limits some automated monitoring and decisions, and expands data-access rights to make enforcement and collective representation easier. The Directive's transposition will probably bring high-control parts of platform labor back to regular employment while still requiring due process and explainability, even where employment is not assumed [17]. In comparison, the United States has several different rules. California's AB5 made the strict ABC test law, but Proposition 22 made a separate set of rules for app-based drivers that the California Supreme Court upheld in 2024. At the federal level, the U.S. Department of Labor's 2024 rule brought back a multifactor "totality-of-circumstances" test under the FLSA to stop misclassification without making the ABC standard law everywhere [18-19]. The structural effect is a patchwork where the unit of paid time (en-route minutes vs. log-in time), who is eligible for stipends or benefits, and how to fight automatic punishment all change a lot from one jurisdiction to the next. Singapore is going for a different balance. The Platform Workers Act (starting January 1, 2025) requires CPF contributions, expands Work Injury Compensation coverage, and makes representation rights clearer while keeping contractor status and scheduling flexibility. Most importantly, obligations are phased in and co-financed to limit shocks and to anchor portability of social protection in the individual account rather than the employment relationship [20]. Even though they are different, all three paths use similar tools-status presumptions or intermediate categories, portable benefits, algorithmic transparency and human review, and data access for regulators and worker bodies. This suggests that there is a growing agreement on the tools that really make a difference in earnings stability and procedural fairness [12] [19-20].

5.4 Effects on Diverse Groups: Youth, Gender, and Migration

The structural consequences of platformization are not uniformly allocated. Platforms make it easier for young people to get jobs by lowering the criteria for credentials and making the hiring process less stressful. In the case of remote freelancing, they also open up more job opportunities by separating employment from local demand. The Online Labor Index shows that cross-border postings have been steadily increasing, notably in software and creative services. This means that some new entrants really do have opportunities to move forward [9]. But reputation systems based on ratings can create route dependency: early paths generally decide who can get to higher-pay tiers, which makes it hard for people who join late or just sometimes to go up. A distinct process is seen in gendered results. A comprehensive analysis of

Uber drivers indicates a gender earnings disparity of approximately seven percent, attributable to factors such as experience accumulation, locational and temporal sorting, and driving speed, rather than overt price discrimination [21]. The structural lesson is that design and demand may create differences even when platforms say they do not. In China's delivery sector, rural-to-urban migrants make up a large part of the workforce and are more vulnerable because of informal contracts, piece-rate incentives, and time-pressure algorithms that increase the risk of accidents and make earnings less stable. This is the specific problem that the 2021 Guiding Opinions tried to solve by requiring rest buffers, social insurance participation, and algorithmic fairness [2,13]. Distributional analysis thus supports a heterogeneity-aware governance approach: the same lever-say, redefining the counted unit of working time from en-route minutes to log-in time-has larger stabilizing effects for workers whose activity entails substantial unpaid waiting; the same transparency obligation yields greater gains where workers face language or procedural barriers to appeal automated decisions. In every instance, The interplay of code, market dynamics, and social status dictates who gains from flexibility and who suffers from instability.

5.5 Case-inflected Synthesis: Delivery, Ride-Hailing, and Creator Economies as Unique Governance Challenges with Common Design Fundamentals

Different sorts of concrete platforms show how the same governance primitives may work in different ways. In food delivery operations, like Meituan, real-time routeing and tight ETAs are used to maximize use but shorten buffers. This made driving more dangerous and made seconds-level penalties more important. After the policy change in 2021, Meituan shared parts of its rule logic, added more buffers, and started to get rid of some late-delivery penalties. This shifted the risk of delays from riders back to the platform, and then to consumers through slightly longer or more realistic ETAs [14-15]. In ride-hailing, the most important factors are what counts as compensable time and how to prove control. The U.K. Supreme Court's Uber BV v. Aslam ruling said that drivers are "workers" who are entitled to minimum wage and paid time off from when they log in, and it specifically weighed platform control over price, allocation, and performance. The California sequence, including AB5, Prop 22, and the 2024 Supreme Court decision upholding the initiative, landed on a different "third-way" regime in which drivers are still contractors but get limited, conditional benefits, and pay floors are mostly based on active/engaged time rather than the full span of availability [18,22]. These disparities indicate how little decisions about definitions-what qualifies as working time, how automated discipline is assessed, and which data fields must be disclosed-can lead to big changes in earnings stability and risk distribution. The creator economy (like Douyin/TikTok) shows that not all platform work involves logistics. In this case, the governance fulcrum is algorithmic distribution in the feed, not despatch. Income volatility comes from audience exposure, brand regulations, and monetization gateways, not ETAs or spikes. Scholarship describes creator work as unstable and winner-take-most, with success depending on changes to recommendation systems that are hard to understand [23]. Because of this, The most important factors are feed transparency, fair dealing, brand arbitration, harassment protections, and IP/contract clarity, not work-injury insurance or ETA buffers [24]. A simple synthesis comes from putting these situations together. First, algorithmic control is where platform kinds regulate labor, whether that means setting despatch objectives or grading feeds. Second, pay floors and social protection must be based on verifiable exposure units. For availability-driven models, this means log-in time; for on-demand logistics, it means task acceptance/engagement windows; and for creator marketplaces, it means monetization events and brand contracts. Third, due process in code, such as clear standards, understandable reasons for bad judgements, and the ability for people to evaluate decisions, turns nominal freedom into predictable flexibility. Jurisdictions that incorporate these primitives-via employment presumptions in high-control contexts (EU), portable benefits in flexible environments (Singapore), or hybrid categories that combine minimum standards with autonomy (U.K.)-seem more adept at harnessing the productivity of platform matching while mitigating the structural shift towards precarity [13,20-22].

6. Policy Implications for China: A Structural,

Multi-lever Approach

Based on China's regulatory path since 2021 and supported by comparable facts, I suggest five changes that will work together to improve the macro-structure:

Pilots for quasi-employment ("dependent contractor"): For high-control, location-based systems like delivery and ride-hailing, try out an intermediate status that provides (a) minimum earnings based on log-in time (not just "en route" minutes), (b) compensated rest and safety buffers, and (c) due-process rights for deactivation. The U.K. worker model and EU presumption criteria provide us with ways to define coverage and control [12,22].

Portable social insurance with shared funding: Through a portable benefits account connected to a national ID, you may make payments to pension, medical, work-injury, and unemployment insurance that are the same for everyone. Use experience-rated contributions to reward platforms that keep hours steady and lower the number of accidents. The phased CPF model and WICA coverage in Singapore show how to share contributions and implement them in stages [20].

Algorithmic risk management: Set ETA safety margins, explainable despatch reasoning, and ways for people to examine fines and deactivations. Require yearly algorithmic impact evaluations for high-risk systems, including notification to regulators and worker representatives, in line with the EU Directive's requirements for openness and supervision [12].

Data rights for negotiating and enforcing: Set up common data APIs (for wages, working hours, cancelations, and reasons for deactivation) that only authorized authorities and legally recognized worker groups may access. This will help with audits, pay-floor enforcement, and evidence-based bargaining [12].

Paths to upgrading that include everyone: Fund skills portals linked to platform profiles (micro-credentials in safety, customer service, and digital marketing) and make transition vouchers for young people and immigrants to help them migrate from low-paying jobs to higher-skill online freelancing or logistical supervisory jobs. Use OLI-style analytics to find the most in-demand training areas (software and data activities) [9-10].

China could take three steps to make these suggestions both practical and equitable while maintaining efficiency. First, mandate that major ride-hailing and delivery platforms provide an hourly floor of at least 80% of the local minimum wage, as determined by log-in time. Smaller platforms should be given a two-year grace period to meet this goal. Second, implement portable insurance accounts in Beijing and Shenzhen. In these accounts, platform companies pay a set 6% of employee earnings toward dual insurance, which progressively increases to 10% over the course of five years thanks to government subsidies. Third, introduce compulsory 15-minute rest breaks after every four logged-in hours and require algorithmic dispatch systems to keep delivery times under 5% of existing benchmarks. By tying labor laws to quantifiable criteria, these tangible steps enable authorities to test and modify without compromising effectiveness.

7. Conclusion

Platformization is not a fleeting oddity nor a homogeneous race to the bottom. It is a new way for the market to be run, with two-sided pricing, data extraction, and algorithmic management. This changes the way risks are shared and the structure of the labor market [3,5]. Comparative evidence indicates that intelligent regulation, such as employment presumptions, intermediate categories with high control, portable benefits, algorithmic oversight, and collective data rights, can maintain flexibility while reinstating fundamental protections and macroeconomic stability [2,12,20]. For China, which has both large-scale platforms and fast-changing policies, the border between employee and contractor is not the most important one. Instead, it is the line between opaque, one-sided code and clear, responsible coordination that respects human labor as more than just a variable in an optimization pipeline.

References

[1] State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China. (2023). China's digital economy grew to 50.2 trillion yuan in 2022. https://english.www.gov.cn/archive/statistics/202304/27/content_WS644a6152c6d03ffcca6ecb0e.html

[2] International Labour Organization. (2021). World Employment and Social Outlook 2021: The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work. ILO, Geneva.

https://www.ilo.org/publications/flagship-reports/role-digital-labour-platforms-transforming-world-work

[3] Rochet, J.C., Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. J. Eur. Econ. Assoc., 1(4): 990-1029. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40005175

[4] Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M., Choudary, S.P. (2016). Platform Revolution. W. W. Norton, New York.

[5] Kellogg, K.C., Valentine, M.A., Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. Acad. Manage. Ann., 14(1): 366-410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

[6] Murgia, A., Pulignano, V., Doellgast, V., et al. (2020). Hybrid areas of work between employment and self-employment: Emerging challenges and future research directions. Front. Sociol., 4: 86. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2019.00086

[7] Rosenblat, A., Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. Int. J. Commun., 10: 3758-3784. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2686227

[8] Vallas, S., Schor, J.B. (2020). What do platforms do? Understanding the gig economy. Annu. Rev. Sociol., 46: 273-294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857

[9] Kässi, O., Lehdonvirta, V. (2018). Online Labour Index: Measuring the online gig economy for policy and research. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change, 137: 241-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.056

[10] Stephany, F., Kässi, O., Rani, U., Lehdonvirta, V. (2021). Online Labour Index 2020: New ways to measure the world's remote freelancing market. Big Data & Soc., 8(2): 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211043240

[11] Srihita, H.R., Goli, G., M.R., Gobinath, R. (2025). Transformative dynamics of the gig economy: Technological impacts, worker well-being and global research trends. Int. J. Eng. Bus. Manage., 17: 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1177/18479790241310362

[12] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). Directive (EU) 2024/2831 of 23 October 2024 on improving working conditions in platform work. EUR-Lex. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/uri=CELEX:32024L2831

[13] Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security of the People's Republic of China. (2021). Guidelines on Safeguarding the Labor Rights and Interests of Workers in New Forms of Employment. http://www.lawinfochina.com/display.aspx?id=36322&lib=law&EncodingName=big5

[14] Reuters. (2021). Meituan to change delivery algorithm rules as China urges labour protection. https://www.reuters.com/world/china/meituan-change-delivery-algorithm-rules-china-urges-labour-protection-2021-09-13/

[15] South China Morning Post. (2024). Meituan to end late-delivery penalties for couriers amid crackdown on food-delivery industry [by Ben Jiang]. https://www.scmp.com/tech/article/3292643/meituan-end-late-delivery-penalty-amid-regulatory-crackdown-algorithm-misuse

[16] Wang, Y. (2025). Current status and challenges of China's platform economy: A macroeconomic perspective. Adv. Econ. Manage. Polit. Sci., 187: 1-12. https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL23703

[17] Ministry of Manpower (Singapore). (2024). CPF changes for platform workers. https://www.mom.gov.sg/employment-practices/platform-workers-act/cpf-contributions-for-platform-workers

[18] California Supreme Court. (2024). Castellanos v. State of California, No. S279622. https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/2024/s279622.html

[19] U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division. (2024). Employee or independent contractor classification under the Fair Labor Standards Act (Final rule), 89 Fed. Reg. 1638-1743. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/01/10/2024-00067/employee-or-independent-contractor-classification-under-the-fair-labor-standards-act

[20] Ministry of Manpower (Singapore). (2024). Work injury compensation for platform workers. https://www.mom.gov.sg/employment-practices/platform-workers-act/work-injury-compensation-for-platform-workers

[21] Cook, C., Song, J., Horton, J. (2018). The

gender earnings gap in the gig economy: Evidence from over a million rideshare drivers. NBER Working Paper No. 24732. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://www.nber.org/papers/w24732

[22] U.K. Supreme Court. (2021). Uber BV and others v Aslam and others 2021 UKSC 5. https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2019-0029.html

[23] Roy, D., Dutta, M. (2022). A systematic review and research perspective on recommender systems. J. Big Data, 9(1): 59. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-022-00592-5

[24] Poell, T., Nieborg, D.B., Duffy, B.E. (2021). Platforms and Cultural Production. Polity, Cambridge.

