



Norwegian  
Business School

This file was downloaded from BI Open, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <https://biopen.bi.no>

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Connelly, C. E., Fieseler, C., Černe, M., Giessner, S. R., & Wong, S. I. (2021). Working in the digitized economy: HRM theory & practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), 100762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100762>

Copyright policy of Elsevier, the publisher of this journal.  
The author retains the right to post the accepted author manuscript on open web sites operated by author or author's institution for scholarly purposes, with an embargo period of 0-36 months after first view online.  
<http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/sharing-your-article#>



## **HRMR Introduction to the special issue: Human resource management in the gig economy**

Catherine Connelly

McMaster University

Matej Cerne

University of Ljubljana

Christian Fieseler

BI Norwegian Business School

Steffen Robert Giessner

Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

Sut I Wong

BI Norwegian Business School

Work and Human Resources (HR) are experiencing a period of rapid change. As digital and social technologies advance, organizational processes and the nature and meaning of work continue to evolve, thereby rendering work increasingly granular, modular, and decontextualized (Ashford, Caza, & Reid, 2018; Corporaal et al., 2019; Stone, Deadrick, Lukaszewski, & Johnson, 2015). It is important to understand how digital and mobile technologies are shaping organizational phenomena (Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2007; Butts, Becker & Boswell, 2015; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; van Knippenberg, Dahlander, Haas, & George, 2015). This evolution has led to the emergence of a new “gig economy” that enables both menial tasks (e.g., usability testing, image

tagging) and complex endeavors (e.g., design, user testing, or consultancy work) to be broken down into smaller tasks that can be distributed among an external<sup>1</sup> workforce (Lehdonvirta, Kässi, Hjorth, Barnard, & Graham, 2019; Paolacci, Chandler & Ipeirotis, 2010; Wood, Graham, Lehdonvirta, & Hjorth, 2019). These external work relationships are frequently known as gig work, platform work, digital / digitized work, crowdwork / crowdsourced work, and eLancing, and they are largely a product of technological innovation. Moreover, these new external work arrangements are accompanied by other recent technological innovations that have led to the development of internal platforms designed to influence the work attitudes and performance of traditional, internal employees.

The development of these internal platforms has resulted in several HR challenges. The boundaries between the internal labor market of an organization and the external workforce is becoming blurred, and questions arise about the appropriate role of HR management in shaping the function of information technology in hiring decisions and how technology influences the way work is structured and carried out (Colbert, Yee & George, 2016; Kellogg, Valentine, & Christian, 2019; Stone & Deadrick, 2015). It is not yet clear how these traditionally internal HR functions may interact effectively with the realm of external work. One might therefore wonder whether and how existing HR theories are relevant in the current gig economy.

A reconsideration of traditional HR theories may be useful in determining how HR management systems and practices can respond to the potential opportunities and challenges associated with these changes. For instance, gig work is a recent addition to corporate labor and traditional employment formats; it has emerged in response to an increasingly digitized economy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some platforms that facilitate this type of work include mTurk, Lyft, Uber, fiverr, and Upwork, but many new ones emerge regularly.

Gig work such as platform labor, (e.g., individuals complete tasks posted on digital platforms like Uber and TaskRabbit) and aspirational labor (e.g., individuals using social media such as Instagram and Tiktok as a channel for personal or product branding), come with different employment expectations and conventions, and it is not yet fully known how organizations, platforms, and clients may use and develop these talents ethically and sustainably (Kost, Fieseler & Wong, 2019).

It is important to advance our understanding of how traditional employees' competences, experiences, collaborative and relational practices, as well as their need for sensory and emotional engagement are being affected by the gig economy and an increased reliance on new technologies such as automation and artificial intelligence (Briggs & Makice, 2012; Gilson, Maynard, Young, Vartiainen, & Hakonen, 2015; Gruber, Leon, George, & Thompson, 2015). This need for advanced understanding stems from the idea that individuals entering the workforce with varying levels technological exposure, reliance, and competence will also differ in their expectations of work and work practices, all of which influence the future workplace (Colbert et al., 2016).

The emerging forms of employment as well as the increased expectation of flexibility in the structure of traditional employment present opportunities for organizations to alter employee experiences, operations, and their entire business models (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2019; Westerman, Bonnet, & McAfee, 2014). However, it is important to also recognize the potential downsides of relying on technology for concentrated work; the potential for close relationships may be eroded and the advantages of traditionally internal HR practices (e.g., fair processes for selection and assessment, training and development, worker well-being) may be diminished for gig workers. Therefore, a more systematic examination of the shaping conditions and effects of the growing use of technology by a digital workforce is needed (Petriglieri, Ashford, & Wrzesniewski, 2019), as

well as guidance for how best to utilize technology in the service of organizational goals (Colbert et al., 2016).

With technology unraveling many traditional forms of employment, many of the newly emerging jobs that might compensate for employment loss due to automation will be in the service economy. These positions include both menial and creative or knowledge-intensive tasks. However, the initial patterns associated with this gig economy suggest that many questions remain about how a society should coordinate fair exchanges between workers and employers. For employers, it is easy to misconstrue the workforce charged with these tasks (be it in the emerging digital freelancing space, such as fiverr or Upwork, or in the digitally-mediated gig work space, such as Uber or foodora) as an amorphous crowd of interchangeable and inexpensive workers instead of a community of skilled and valuable individuals. Positive attributes associated with these new, crowd-based forms of digital labor are “participatory,” “peer-based”, and “accessible.” In fact, gig workers are frequently self-employed, and in the digital sphere, work relationships are becoming more flexible, fluid and short-lived (Hollister, 2011; Meijerink & Keegan, 2019). Most digital service platforms function as spot markets, which impede the establishment of substantial, long-term work relationships. Instead, temporary, part-time, remote, mobile, networked, and other nonstandard work arrangements are on the rise (Gregg, 2011; Rainie & Wellman, 2012).

Platform-mediated self-employed laborers engage in a form of digital piecework largely detached from organizational structures apart from the mediating platform (cf. Ashford et al., 2007). Gig workers are not paid on the basis of an hourly wage or salary, but rather they are paid solely on the basis of timely completion of individual work tasks. Digital platforms allow for the real-time recording of work results, so that “employers” and customers can track exactly which service is provided when, by whom, and with what level of quality. Some scholars fear that

previously lucrative, middle-class jobs associated with cognitive tasks will increasingly become subject to fragmentation, substitution and arbitrage, with technologically induced competitive forces leading to deteriorating wages and working conditions (Scholz, 2012). However, there are also scholars who theorize that this form of temporary employment facilitates the gig economy, where job insecurity is offset by job flexibility and excitement (Ruggieri, Mosconi, Poponi & Silvestri, 2016).

These contrasting theoretical views on gig work, in addition to the lack of empirical studies, pose interesting challenges to our current theories and practices in HR. First of all, established findings on organizational leadership, identity, culture, or commitment may not be easily applicable to an emerging, dispersed, desynchronized, anonymized workforce. For instance, when a client posts a task request on a digital platform as an open call, they may set up filters (e.g., country of origin, platform experience) to recruit suitable candidates, but otherwise not interact with the potential gig workers who complete the task requested. Clients can only accept or reject the task completed and leave limited feedback for the gig worker (e.g., a star rating). There is limited research on recruitment, talent and relationship management, employee motivation, and engagement that may be usefully applied to this context. However, there is some interesting research that considers what motivates gig workers to participate (Boons, Stam, & Barkema, 2015; Deng et al., 2016), the ways in which they construct work meaning (Kost, Fieseler, & Wong, 2018), and how flexibility can be a double-edged sword for their career development (Spreitzer, Cameron, & Garrett, 2017).

Moreover, because gig work is a relatively recent phenomenon, there is currently little theory and research on the nature, desirability, advantages, disadvantages, and fairness of these emerging forms of work (Ryan & Wessel, 2015). Researchers have begun to explore the generation

and distribution of value in gig-worker-based businesses (Gehl, 2011). Some studies examine the desirability and fairness of piecework performed in crowdsourcing systems (Fish & Srinivasan, 2011; Fieseler, Bucher, & Hoffman, 2019). Other studies develop the taxonomy of gig work based on task complexity as well as different forms of crowdsourcing (e.g., contractual, distributed problem-solving, solo, and reciprocal coordination) that fit different kinds of tasks (Nakatsu, Grossman & Iacovou, 2014). Moreover, studies have investigated certain practices, such as networked mobile crowdsourcing tools (Sasao, Konomi, Arikawa & Fujita, 2015) and resource allocation and task division (Dissanayake, Zhang & Gu, 2015) for task- and attitude-related benefits. Nonetheless, despite its importance in regards to how we might better advance our understanding for the future of work, HR research on this new form of labor relationship is scant.

### **The Role of HR in the Gig Economy: Changes and Challenges**

**Worker Retention.** The role of HR in the effective management of workers in the gig economy is complicated by several factors. Gig workers typically have relationships with multiple client organizations; this enables them to maintain a steadier income despite fluctuations in their clients' demands for their services; indeed, the average income of gig workers in the United States exceeds \$50,000 and 40% of gig workers are said to earn at least \$100,000 per year (Muhammed, 2019). Although gig workers' diverse income sources reduce their dependency on maintaining any single relationship, these relationships may be short and sporadic, and lack predictability depending on the workers' availability and the task supply (Kost, Fieseler & Wong, 2019).

The match or balance between clients' task supply and workers' participation is known to be a classic challenge for platform management (Reillier & Reillier, 2017). Unlike most traditional organizations, platform organizations utilize the network effect, such as providing incentives to

recruit a large pool of crowdworkers, clients, or both, to make their platform attractive. However, the unpredictability of either the workers' availability or the clients' task demands can make such networks ineffective. For example, many rideshare drivers work for both Uber and Lyft in order to receive enough work to allow them to generate a reasonable income. As a result, they may indicate on both platforms that they are available, but this may not be accurate. Furthermore, depending on the type of work being performed, gig workers may be more likely to be geographically dispersed, and work at a distance from their clients and platform organizations. These factors contribute to a work environment where traditional means of fostering worker engagement (e.g., high quality relationships with supervisors, meaningful work where the long-term impact on others is apparent, team/department activities, training/development) are difficult to implement. Some gig workers may still see the immediate benefit that they provide to their clients (e.g., drivers for Uber or Deliveroo), but in instances where this is not the case, new systems must be developed to retain these workers.

**Employment Status.** The issue of employee engagement is particularly fraught because organizations must continue to ensure that their contracted workers are not treated as though they are employees. In many jurisdictions (e.g., Australia, Canada, US, the EU), organizations must pay specific employment-related taxes and other deductions for all employees, but not contracted workers. If a worker successfully challenges his or her legal status as a contractor (rather than an employee), then the organization must pay the worker and the government significant fines and damages. A clear distinction between different employment statuses is contentious yet crucial (Connelly & Gallagher, 2006).

The exact criteria for what constitutes an employee versus a "contracted worker" such as a gig worker varies considerably by jurisdiction, but generally the worker must own his or her own



tools for work (e.g., their own car or computer), be permitted to subcontract the work to others, take a profit or loss on each assignment, work for several clients simultaneously, not be dependent on the client for training on how to accomplish the required tasks, and exercise considerable authority over when and how tasks are completed (Fragoso, & Kleiner, 2005; McKeown & Hanley, 2009). This last criterion is perhaps the most contentious; if the organization provides supervision in an effort to increase engagement or to improve job performance, it may have the unintended consequence of having the gig workers reclassified as employees (Wears & Fisher, 2012). HR departments may therefore focus their efforts on accounting for and monitoring compensation, benefits, training and development, job design, recruitment and selection, rather than enabling and encouraging higher performance.

Organizational HR systems and technologies are in place to facilitate the performance of all workers, including employees (part-time or full-time) as well as those who work for the organization in other capacities. In this regard, gig workers have statuses that are similar to those of traditional contingent workers (e.g., temps). Even though these workers may (or may not) be closely supervised by a manager, their relationship with the organization must still be managed by HR. However, the nature of this relationship will change depending on the type of employment. Whereas gig workers have the infrastructure of a temporary agency that manages payroll deductions and placements at client organizations, they may need to take responsibility for more of these tasks than traditional workers. Because organizations often do not see gig workers as employees, HR systems can be used to reinforce the differences between workers of different status rather than to provide a general umbrella of worker support. In particular, some internal HR systems are developed to track the usage of different gig workers, note patterns in demand for their

services as well as their performance, and help to determine when it would be more efficient to hire additional permanent employees.

**Performance Management.** A key role performed by HR, with the assistance of algorithms and other technologies, is the monitoring of worker activity and performance (Kellogg, et al., 2019). This monitoring entails the overt or covert surveillance of the time that workers spend on tasks, specific behaviors (e.g., interactions with customers or other workers), customer or client reactions, and other elements of work effort and task performance. The Cheung and Hackett (2019) paper describes how the growth of new algorithms can facilitate the monitoring of workers and employees. As they note, a key element of HR use of algorithms and related technologies is that they be used transparently; employees must know that this data is being collected about them, and they must also have the right to verify that it is accurate. The HR department must also be accountable for how the technology is being used; employees must have the ability to challenge how the information collected has affected their employment outcomes. However, by relying on technological systems instead of personal relationships, the differentiation between workers and employees is clearer.

**Compensation and Benefits.** The compensation and benefits responsibilities of HR departments are significantly affected by the advent of new algorithmic technologies. Indeed, the paper by Cheung and Hackett (2019) describes how algorithms make it easier to track employee performance and to determine the value-added by individual employees (as well as their likelihood of leaving). However, these technologies pose similar capabilities in terms of optimizing the compensation offered to gig workers. Although companies may assume that the hiring of contingent workers is more cost-effective, this in fact depends on the particular context of the organization. Turnover can be disruptive, and the costs associated with it may not be

counterbalanced by the low wages offered to the workers (Fisher & Connelly, 2017; De Stefano, Bonet, & Camuffo, 2019).

New technologies also offer the opportunities for organizations to introduce the “gamification” of work, where organizations use game design elements in non-game-contexts (Deterding, Dixon, Khaled & Nacke, 2011). Although this technology has implications for employee monitoring, it is primarily intended to be a motivational tool that promotes learning. This is a more elaborate and nuanced version of traditional “sales floor” games (e.g., Darr, 2019). Küper, Klein, and Völckner (2019) describe how the gamification of work has significant implications for the attraction, motivation, and retention of workers. Decisions about how to redesign work (e.g., gamification or other similar processes) must involve HR because they have implications for how employees’ performance is managed, in terms of their compensation and training. The gamification of work can apply to gig workers as well as employees. Because the offering of traditional training programs can blur the boundaries between employees and other types of workers, the gamification of work offers an opportunity for the organization to facilitate on-the-job learning without encountering potential legal ramifications.

**Job Design.** HR plays a significant part in developing appropriate job design for all roles within an organization. However, as Bush and Balven (2019) note, this is an important consideration for crowdsourced work as well. Because gig workers’ engagement cannot be encouraged through close relationships with supervisors or even a long-standing employment relationship, work characteristics (e.g., task characteristics, meaningfulness) play a crucial role. Likewise, Bricka and Shroeder (2019) describes how job crafting can be used to create a job with the characteristics that best match the needs and personal considerations of the gig worker.

Although there will be organizational constraints in terms of the content of the tasks themselves, the ultimate goal is to provide a work environment that is as inherently motivating as possible.

Some recent statistics indicate that the use of external labor to enable organizational agility is on the rise (Popper, Power & Stanton, 2013). A 2017 study by Deloitte suggests that the divide between external and internal labor was around 40/60 in larger corporations in the United States. Although the use of gig workers may be considered by some to be an alternative to the recruitment and selection of an internal labor market of versatile employees who will work within the organization, HR departments should still consider their optimal roles in the recruitment and selection of non-employees. Rather than relying on individual managers to determine which roles are appropriate for gig workers, and which digital platforms to use, HR departments can develop policies or guidelines for what tasks are appropriate to outsource and which are more suitable for in-house employees. Indeed, Popper and colleagues (2013) suggest that in most organizations there are short-term executions of work as well as a deep system sensing and responding to the market for long-term strategic work. Even for the most agile organizations, the work of the deep system is too important to be outsourced. To manage this balance between different types of work, HR departments should therefore also monitor the continued use of non-employees; in a large organization it may be more efficient for a permanent employee to be hired in lieu of a series of gig workers, depending on the tasks (Fisher & Connelly, 2017). Moreover, depending on the nature of the organization, the HR department may also facilitate the transitioning of some gig workers to more traditional contract work or to permanent employment.

### **Overview of the four studies in the special issue**

This special issue aims to shed light on the opportunities and challenges of the gig workforce. All four papers provide a refreshing new perspective on the role of Human Resource Management and its role in the digitized economy.

The first article in this Special Issue section is by Cheng and Hackett (2019) who critically review the current discussion surrounding the uses of algorithms in HR, both in the academic and practitioner discourse. The authors note and problematize an ongoing shift in HR Management, which is becoming increasingly data-driven through the growing adoption of algorithmic technologies. Cheng and Hackett explain the concept of an algorithm as a statistical model and data-mining technique for the purpose of predicting new or future observations surrounding key HR, such as future performance, competency gaps, or turnover intentions. They argue that the key innovation that this adoption will bring is that such algorithms will go beyond deterministic models which are already employed broadly to optimize efficiency, and towards increasingly probabilistic applications for predicting complex associations behind markers (for instance the connection between conscientiousness and job success), based on hitherto unused unstructured data. Unstructured data, they note, could range from the quality of writing displayed in a job application, to helping behavior in collaboration via social media, among others. Cheng and Hackett argue that these probabilistic, algorithmic approaches may open new opportunities within HR, such as the use of screening techniques that are less influenced by unconscious human bias, and predictive algorithms that may help make flexible adjustments to compensation packages before an employee even formulates his or her wish to look for more lucrative postings. Despite the optimism surrounding the use of algorithms in HR management, they also warn against HR algorithms that ultimately do not rely on dependable theory and causal inference. Cheng and Hackett propose an

ethical approach that would require organizations to disclose any algorithmic decision-making and provide employees with the right to contest these decisions.

The second article, by Küpper and colleagues (2019) is an exploration of gamification's potential to attract, motivate, and retain employees. The authors make a compelling claim that the workforce is increasingly becoming "digitally native," beyond mere demographic predictors, and that employees share a desire to enrich the workplace with digital technology. Against this development, the authors make the argument that gamification can set an organization apart from others by proactively and promptly adopting this new work practice, while making employees more engaged in their daily activities. Here, the authors are particularly interested in the psychology of such engagement and how a gamified workplace experience might be a simple technique to foster learning. To this end, they present an adaptation of affective events theory and argue that gamification may foster both affective and cognitive engagement with work, that in turn may lead not only to better learning outcomes, but also to generally higher satisfaction with work. While presenting their theory, the authors propose several important caveats to gamification's overall potential for employer branding and talent management. The authors argue that the success of gamification depends on personality factors such as innovativeness and achievement mindedness, which have to be considered in order to effectively design gamified experiences in the workplace that will engage employees to their fullest potential.

In the third article, Shroeder, Bricka and Whitaker (2019) discuss a work design model of gig workers from a bottom-up job crafting perspective. After exploring the opportunities of gig work for both organizations and employees, the authors discuss challenges introduced by this new form of labor. In light of the reviewed features of gig work, Shroeder and colleagues provide a framework for this type of work and proposes a gig work design model based on standard work

design framework, incorporating the concept of job crafting and personal factors linked to job crafting tendencies, as well as structural factors. Work design characteristics include social influences, such as new sources of social cues, (e.g., reputation), structural characteristics (e.g., the availability of a home office), and personal influences (e.g., goals regarding preferred work characteristics and self-efficacy). Schroeder and colleagues argue that HR managers may want to examine whether traditional employee screening approaches can be modified to better match potential gig workers with available work assignments. Relevant work characteristics include task characteristics (e.g., autonomy and feedback from the job), knowledge characteristics (e.g., such as job complexity and skill variety) and social characteristics (e.g., support provided by supervisors and coworkers). The authors suggest that the applicability of these characteristics to the gig work context must be empirically tested, given the structural differences between gig work and traditional employment. When considered as a whole framework, both work design and work characteristics likely involve mediating influences, and have important implications for work outcomes. Because of the relevance of gig work research to current patterns of employment, Schroeder highlights various avenues for future research as well as for current practice.

The fourth article, by Bush and Balven (2019) focuses on the factors contributing to gig workers' engagement in work tasks. The authors address the lacuna in gig work literature related to a lack of studies targeting this important outcome, and specifically re-conceptualize traditional HR practices to reflect the nature and characteristics of crowd work and crowd workers. The article is founded in the literature on work engagement, but it also brings in ideas from the fields of digital work, HR management, and human capital investment. With the sustainability of such HR practices in mind, the authors present eight propositions that theorize the antecedents of crowd worker engagement, specifying the impact that specific crowd work (i.e., task characteristics,

worker visibility, work setting, and worker recognition) or crowd worker characteristics (worker expectations, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, and meaningfulness) would have on engagement. The authors also offer practical recommendations related to recruitment (framing and methods), selection (worker-task and worker-organization fit), training and development (crowd work design and training characteristics), and retention (work structure and reward structure). Bush and Balven suggest the theoretical implications related to the significance of a firm's human capital decisions and the role of HR in the process of managing crowd workers. The article further theorizes on how HR-supported gig work may increase an organizations' ability and readiness to develop resources externally, allowing for a shift in understanding of how both internal and external employees can contribute to a firm's core competencies and potential sustainable advantage. A theoretical viewpoint that combines ideas from engagement and HR literature helps promote an idea of organizations establishing a long-term relationship with crowd workers who perform complex piecework tasks. In this way, the authors endorse a motivational approach to securing gig workers' engagement by providing them with the opportunity to participate in multiple tasks with varying degrees of difficulty.

### **Avenues for future research**

Based on the research outlined thus far, we encourage future researchers to consider how and when HR systems are used to reinforce the differences between workers of different status. Much of the research on HR practices and employee-employer relationships has taken a managerial approach, perhaps neglecting other types or levels of employees (Liao, Toya, Lepak, & Hong, 2009). This approach, although useful, does not accurately reflect the growing prevalence of gig work (Corporaal et al., 2019), and rather focuses on a smaller and often "higher status" group of workers who tend to receive a different and higher quality set of HR benefits. To develop



an understanding of the entire modern and digitalized workforce, researchers are encouraged to strive for greater breadth in participants.

Moreover, by considering an organization's HR practices as one HR system, researchers neglect this underlying idea that different types of workers experience different types of HR. Future researchers should explore specific practices within organizational HR systems to better understand who these practices benefit, who actually experiences these practices, and how organizations facilitate these patterns (Wright & Boswell, 2002; Joshi, Liao, & Jackson, 2006). Further, researchers may want to explore the fundamental goals and intentions of these discrepancies between HR experienced by different employees. For example, it is possible that financial concern and budgeting is the sole goal of not providing benefits to digital workers. Conversely, it is possible that for organizations such as Amazon, Uber, fiverr or Upwork, perhaps the large number of workers with enormous variance is ideal for immediate and temporary work tasks and high turnover is thus expected. With that, organizational commitment may not be the priority that these organizations are seeking from the gig workers, but rather their short-term engagements. In this case, researchers may want to consider the potential consequences of such HR systems, in this case, working against organizational commitment rather than for it.

In a related note, it would be important to map out how commitment and compliance, for instance, might be encouraged in digital laborers in a fair manner. Currently, the rating-based management that is widely used among platforms, while potentially serving as feedback for digital workers to improve their work, may also create intended or unintended sanctions, (e.g., losing star-status benefits) that hurt the retention of digital workers. Platforms face challenges in retaining digital workers, which diminishes the overall labor supply for the increasing number of digital

tasks. Future research is therefore recommended to look at the potential unintended consequences of such HR practices.

### **Conclusion**

In this special issue, eight authors provide their perspectives on the opportunities and challenges of Human Resource Management in an increasingly digitized economy. Datafication and gamification are becoming increasingly prevalent tools used to manage a workforce that is in danger of falling into two camps, one being highly valuable to platforms and corporations, and one marked by commodification and potential alienation. We witness an increasing turn towards automated, algorithmic workforce management techniques, and it remains unknown whether these can mitigate human bias and offer a welcoming and sustainable work environment for those subjected to algorithmic decision-making. The articles collected in this special issue section stress the agency of workers, who find and craft their work environment to suit their needs. We hope to have opened a discussion with these research contributions about which type of human resource environment we should seek to build for a large part of the workforce.

## References

- Ashford, S.J., Caza, B.B., & Reid, E.M. (2019). From surviving to thriving in the gig economy: A research agenda for individuals in the new world of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 38*, 23-41.
- Boons, M., Stam, D., & Barkema, H. G. (2015). Feelings of pride and respect as drivers of ongoing member activity on crowdsourcing platforms. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(6), 717-741.
- Boswell, W. R., & Olson-Buchanan, J. B. (2007). The use of communication technologies after hours: The role of work attitudes and work–life conflict. *Journal of Management, 33*: 592–610.
- Bricka, T. M., & Schroeder, A. N. (2019). What’s the gig deal? Examining contemporary work issues in the gig economy. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12*(4), 491-494.
- Briggs, C. & Makice, K. (2012). *Digital fluency: Building success in the digital age*.  
Bloomington, IN: SocialLens.
- Butts, M. M., Becker, W. J., & Boswell, W. R. (2015). Hot buttons and time sinks: The effects of electronic communication during nonwork time on emotions and work–nonwork conflict. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*: 763–788.
- Cheng, M. M. & Hackett, R. D. (2019). A critical review of algorithms in HRM: Definition, theory, and practice. *Human Resource Management Review, 100698*.
- Colbert, A., Yee, N., & George, G. 2016. The digital workforce and the workplace of the future. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(3): 731-739.

- Connelly, C. E. & Gallagher, D. G. (2006). Independent and dependent contracting: Meaning and implications. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 95-106.
- Corporaal, G.F., Sessions, H., Jarvenpaa, S., Levina, N., Ashford, S.J., Caza, B.B., Karanovic, J., Moehlmann, M., Berends, H., Engel, Y., Gregory, R.W., Henfridsson, O., Lehdonvirta, V., Nahrgang, J., Reid, E.M., & Zalmanson, L. (2019). Changing models of work in the digital platform economy. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2019(1). Retrieved from: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.12309symposium>
- Darr, A. (2019). Automatons, sales-floor control and the constitution of authority. *Human Relations*, 72(5), 889-909.
- De Stefano, F., Bonet, R., & Camuffo, A. (2019). Does losing temporary workers matter? The effects of planned turnover on replacements and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 62(4), 979-1002.
- Deng, X., Joshi, K. D., & Galliers, R. D. (2016). The duality of empowerment and marginalization in microtask crowdsourcing: Giving voice to the less powerful through value sensitive design. *MIS Quarterly*, 40(2), 279-302.
- Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining gamification. In Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> international academic MindTrek conference: Envisioning future media environments (pp. 9-15). New York, NT: Academic MindTrek Conference.

- Dissanayake, I., Zhang, J., & Gu, B. (2015). Task division for team success in crowdsourcing contests: Resource allocation and alignment effects. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 32(2), 8-39.
- Fieseler, C., Bucher, E., & Hoffmann, C. P. (2019). Unfairness by design? The perceived fairness of digital labor on crowdworking platforms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 987-1005.
- Fish, A. & Srinivasan, R. (2011). Digital labor is the new killer app. *New Media & Society*, 14(1), 137–152.
- Fisher, S. & Connelly, C.E. (2017). Lower cost or just lower value? Modeling the organizational costs and benefits of contingent work. *Academy of Management Discoveries*. 3(2), 165-186.
- Fragoso, J. L. & Kleiner, B. H. (2005). How to distinguish between independent contractors and employees. *Management Research News*, 28(2/3), 136-149.
- Gehl, R. W. (2011). The archive and the processor: The internal logic of Web 2.0. *New Media & Society*, 13(8), 1228-1244.
- Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Young, N. C. J., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 41: 1313–1337.
- Gregg, M. (2011). *Work's intimacy*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press Cambridge.

- Gruber, M., Leon, N., George, G., & Thompson, P. (2015). Managing by design. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 1–7.
- Hollister, M. (2011). Employment stability in the U.S. labor market: Rhetoric versus reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 305-324.
- Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Jackson, S. E. (2006). Cross-level effects of workplace diversity on sales performance and pay. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 459-481.
- Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Rulers of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence. *Business Horizons*, doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.09.003
- Kellogg, K., Valentine, M., & Christin, A. (2019). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410.  
doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174.
- Kost, D., Fieseler, C., & Wong, S. I. (2018). Finding meaning in a hopeless place? The construction of meaningfulness in digital microwork. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 82, 101-110.
- Kost, D., Fieseler, C., & Wong, S. I. (2019). Boundaryless careers in the gig economy: An oxymoron? *Human Resource Management Journal*, doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12265.
- Küpper, D. M., Klein, K., & Völckner, F. (2019). Gamifying employer branding: An integrating framework and research propositions for a new HRM approach in the digitized economy. *Human Resource Management Review*.

- Lehdonvirta, V., Kässi, O., Hjorth, I., Barnard, H., & Graham, M. (2019). The global platform economy: A new offshoring institution enabling emerging-economy microproviders. *Journal of Management*, 45(2), 567-599.
- Liao, H., Toya, K., Lepak, D. P., & Hong, Y. (2009). Do they see eye to eye? Management and employee perspectives of high-performance work systems and influence processes on service quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 371.
- McKeown, T. & Hanley, G. (2009). Challenges and changes in the contractor workforce. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47(3), 295-317.
- Meijerink, J., & Keegan, A. (2019). Conceptualizing human resource management in the gig economy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(44), 214-232.
- Muhammed, A. (2019, June 1). Busting the gig economy myths: 40% of gig workers now earn six-figures per year. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/abdullahimuhammed/2019/06/01/busting-the-gig-economy-myths-40-of-gig-workers-now-earn-six-figures-per-year/#585749445426>.
- Nakatsu, R. T., Grossman, E. B., & Iacovou, C. L. (2014). A taxonomy of crowdsourcing based on task complexity. *Journal of Information Science*, 40(6), 823-834.
- Petriglieri, G., Ashford, S.J., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2019). Agony and ecstasy in the gig economy: Cultivating holding environments for precarious and personalized work identities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 64(1), 124-170.

- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on amazon mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision making*, 5(5), 411-419.
- Popper, W., Power, B., & Stanton, S. (2013, January 17). Make agility part of your process. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: <https://hbr.org/2013/01/make-agility-part-of-your-process>
- Rainie, L. & Wellman, B. (2012). *Networked: The New Social Operating System*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ramarajan, L. & Reid, E. (2013). Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork identities at work. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 621–644.
- Reillier, L. C. & Reillier, B. (2017). *Platform strategy: How to unlock the power of communities and networks to grow your business*. Routledge.
- Ruggieri, A., Mosconi, E., Poponi, S., & Silvestri, C. (2016). Digital innovation in the job market: An explorative study on Cloud Working Platforms. In T. Torre, A. M. Braccini & R. Spinelli (Eds.), *Empowering Organizations* (Vol. 11, pp. 273-283): Springer International Publishing.
- Ryan, A. M. & Wessel, J. L. (2015). Implications of a changing workforce and workplace for justice perceptions and expectations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25: 162-175.
- Sasao, T., Konomi, S. I., Arikawa, M., & Fujita, H. (2015). Context Weaver: Awareness and feedback in networked mobile crowdsourcing tools. *Computer Networks*, 90, 74-84.
- Scholz, T. (Ed.). (2012). *Digital labor. The Internet as playground and factory*. New York: Routledge.



- Spreitzer, G., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 473-499.
- Stone, D. & Deadrick, D. L. (2015). Challenges and opportunities affecting the future of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25: 139-145.
- Stone, D., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25: 216-231.
- van Knippenberg, D., Dahlander, L., Haas, M., & George, G. (2015). Information, attention, and decision-making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 649–657.
- Wears, K.H. & Fisher, S.L. (2012). Who is an employer in the triangular employment relationship? How definitional confusion creates risk for employers and minimizes employee rights. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 24(3), 159-176.
- Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation. *Harvard Business Press*.
- Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Networked but commodified: The (dis) embeddedness of digital labour in the gig economy. *Sociology*, 0038038519828906.
- Wright, P. M., & Boswell, W. R. (2002). Desegregating HRM: A review and synthesis of micro and macro human resource management research. *Journal of Management*, 28(3), 247-276.



Norwegian  
Business School

This file was downloaded from BI Open, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <https://biopen.bi.no>

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Connelly, C. E., Fieseler, C., Černe, M., Giessner, S. R., & Wong, S. I. (2021). Working in the digitized economy: HRM theory & practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), 100762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100762>

Copyright policy of Elsevier, the publisher of this journal.  
The author retains the right to post the accepted author manuscript on open web sites operated by author or author's institution for scholarly purposes, with an embargo period of 0-36 months after first view online.  
<http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/sharing-your-article#>

