ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

The Flexibility Myth: How Gig Work Undermines Security and Shifts Public Costs

Shiheon Lee[1]

[1]St Johnsbury Academy Jeju

Publication Date: 2025/08/18

Abstract: This paper argues that the structure of the gig economy, despite its branding as flexible and empowering, is designed to offload risk and responsibility from companies onto workers and public systems. Platforms rely on legal ambiguity, strategic misclassification, and algorithmic control to avoid providing basic protections such as health insurance, paid leave, retirement contributions, and unemployment support. The result is a labor model that reduces costs for corporations while exposing workers to chronic income volatility, delayed healthcare, and long-term insecurity. These harms fall disproportionately on marginalized communities, including racial minorities, immigrants, and low-income individuals, many of whom turn to gig work due to exclusion from traditional employment. The paper traces these impacts across three core domains: economic instability, physical and psychological health risks, and systemic public costs. It draws on recent data, legal cases, and policy analysis to show how platform design choices deepen inequality and undermine the social safety net. Reform is not only possible but necessary. The paper concludes by proposing structural interventions, including clearer worker classification standards, the creation of portable benefits, and the decoupling of healthcare from employment status, that would preserve job flexibility while restoring fairness and dignity to contingent labor. Without these changes, the gig model threatens to normalize insecurity as a default condition of modern work.

How to Cite: Shiheon Lee (2025) The Flexibility Myth: How Gig Work Undermines Security and Shifts Public Costs. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(8), 487-493. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

I. INTRODUCTION

The gig economy has upended what it means to hold a job. In this paper, the term refers to app-based, on-demand work such as rides, deliveries, and digital freelancing (Harris and Krueger 5). Companies like Uber, DoorDash, and Instacart sell the idea as pure freedom: set your own hours, be your own boss. But this pitch conceals a system of forced volatility and absent safeguards. When firms classify drivers, couriers, and coders as independent contractors, they dodge the costs of health insurance, paid leave, pensions, and unemployment protection. The bill doesn't vanish; it lands first on workers and, when they can't absorb it, on taxpayers who finance the safety net.

This essay argues that such cost-shifting is no accident. Legal loopholes, strategic misclassification, and lax oversight let platforms capture profit while pushing risk onto those with the least power. I begin by showing how companies save money through this model, then trace the economic, physical, and psychological toll on workers. Next, I demonstrate how these harms fall heaviest on marginalized groups and why public systems end up paying the price. Finally, I offer reforms that would keep flexibility intact while restoring basic fairness and dignity.

➢ *Gig Work as a Cost-Saving Strategy*

While companies often present gig work as a flexible alternative to traditional employment, their deeper motivation lies in minimizing costs. According to Pew data, sixteen percent of U.S. adults have earned income through online gig platforms, and nearly a third of them report relying on that income for basic necessities (Anderson et al.). The flexibility these platforms advertise is real, but partial. What's often left unsaid is how that flexibility comes at the cost of labor protections. When companies label workers as independent contractors or part-time hires, they avoid obligations like employer-provided health insurance, retirement contributions, paid leave, and unemployment insurance. These exclusions aren't marginal details. They're the core of the model. The UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment estimates that companies save between 29 and 39 cents on every dollar they pay to independent contractors (Habans). For workers, this means living without a safety net. For companies, it means a business strategy built not just on efficiency, but on evasion.

The financial burden of this evasion is staggering. The average employer contribution to family health coverage exceeds $16,000 per year (Kaiser Family Foundation). A gig worker, lacking employer support, must either absorb that cost alone or go without coverage altogether. Retirement planning suffers similarly. Without employer-sponsored

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

accounts, gig workers are left to save on their own, if they can.

Major companies have embraced this labor model not out of necessity, but because it serves their bottom line. Amazon, for instance, operates through third-party "Delivery Service Partners." Workers wear Amazon uniforms and follow Amazon protocols, but remain legally separate from the corporation. Investigative reports show that this structure allows Amazon to claim no formal employment relationship while still controlling daily operations (Soper and Gu). It's an arrangement that offloads risk while preserving authority.

Uber, DoorDash, and Instacart take a similar approach. Their workers are responsible for vehicle costs, insurance, maintenance, and fuel. Add to this the lack of guaranteed minimums or paid waiting time, and it becomes clear that the worker shoulders nearly all of the financial risk, while the platform takes a cut of the reward. After expenses, the median net earnings for U.S. Uber drivers amount to just $11 per hour, which falls below minimum wage in many jurisdictions (Mishel).

These platforms aren't marginal players. They're reshaping the labor market. A 2019 analysis by Mastercard estimated that the gig economy generated $204 billion in gross payment volume (Illuzzi and Tang). That number doesn't reflect worker earnings; it reflects the size and success of the system itself. It's profitable precisely because it's structured to extract value while minimizing accountability.

➢ *Legal Exploitation*

The cost-saving structure of the gig economy isn't just a matter of business efficiency. It's made possible by legal loopholes and uneven regulatory enforcement. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), workers classified as independent contractors are excluded from protections like minimum wage, overtime pay, and benefits. The IRS's criteria for determining employment status are vague enough to allow widespread misclassification (Internal Revenue Service). The U.S. Department of Labor applies what it calls the "economic reality test," a flexible standard that considers several factors, such as how much control a company has over a worker's schedule, tools, and income. But because these factors aren't clearly defined or uniformly enforced, the test leaves room for interpretation, which companies exploit.

California's "ABC test" attempts to correct this ambiguity. It presumes that a worker is an employee unless the hiring entity can prove three things: the worker operates independently, performs work outside the usual course of the business, and maintains an independent trade or business (White). This stricter framework has faced intense corporate resistance.

Gig companies claim that workers choose their schedules freely, but reality tells a different story. Platforms set pay rates, assign tasks, and penalize workers for rejecting too many offers. Apps track response times, completion rates, and customer ratings. Fall below certain thresholds and you risk suspension or deactivation. The supposed freedom to "be your own boss" becomes a performance under constant surveillance.

Misclassification isn't an oversight. Companies have designed their operations to blur the lines between employee and contractor status deliberately. They want the benefits of direct control over workers without the corresponding legal obligations. The ambiguity surrounding worker classification has allowed gig companies to construct labor models that shield them from accountability while maintaining operational authority.

When courts or legislators attempt to intervene, companies respond with massive lobbying efforts. After California's 2018 Dynamex decision required many gig workers to be classified as employees, companies like Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash spent over $200 million to support Proposition 22. This ballot initiative created a new category of worker that allowed companies to continue avoiding full employment responsibilities while offering only minimal benefits (Poydock). In 2023, a California appellate court largely upheld the measure, and legal challenges remain ongoing. The case shows how far gig companies will go to preserve a business model that reduces costs by limiting accountability.

Beyond the battle over classification laws, companies also use third-party staffing agencies to distance themselves from their labor force. These agencies supply workers who may wear the company's uniform, follow its rules, and work exclusively on its tasks, but are legally employed by a separate entity. This creates a category of "perma-temp" workers who appear to be part of the company while remaining excluded from direct employment protections. A 2022 study by the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that about seventeen percent of warehouse workers in major logistics hubs are employed through temporary staffing agencies (United States, Government Accountability Office). These workers face reduced access to healthcare, paid leave, and workplace protections. The structure allows companies to shift both financial and legal responsibilities onto individual workers and public programs, a fact confirmed by the UCLA Labor Center (Habans).

➢ *Worker Health and Well-Being*

The human costs of gig work extend far beyond missing paychecks. When basic protections disappear, so does worker health. The consequences show up in emergency rooms, mental health statistics, and public assistance rolls. This isn't coincidental. The gig economy's business model depends on transferring health risks from companies to individuals.

➢ *Mental Health Under Pressure*

Workers in temporary or nontraditional roles report much higher levels of anxiety, burnout, and chronic stress compared to those in stable employment. A study published in BMJ Open found that gig workers scored 2.65 on the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12), a widely used measure of psychological distress. By comparison, full-time employees averaged 1.89, while unemployed individuals scored 3.47 (Wang et al.). The mental health gap between gig

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

and full-time workers was largely attributed to two core factors: financial insecurity, which explained 28 percent of the disparity, and social isolation, which accounted for 39 percent.

Economic stress hits gig workers relentlessly. Income varies wildly from week to week, making it nearly impossible to budget or plan ahead. A survey by Lee et al. found that 40 percent of respondents cited low income as a primary driver of poor mental health, while 20 percent pointed to a lack of social support (Lee et al. 3). Workers describe feeling exhausted, demoralized, and trapped. The scheduling algorithms that govern their work operate like black boxes, assigning tasks and calculating pay through formulas no one explains. Earnings can tank without warning. One bad rating or technical glitch can mean the difference between making rent and falling behind.

Many workers start gig jobs, optimistic about the flexibility and autonomy they'll gain. The reality hits quickly. Rather than becoming their own boss, they find themselves managed by apps that never sleep, never negotiate, and never explain their decisions. Research from Schanz underscores how platforms use algorithmic management to control worker behavior while maintaining the fiction of independence. Workers must stay perpetually available to maintain their ratings and qualify for bonuses. Being able to choose your hours shouldn't mean losing every safety net.

➢ *Healthcare Gaps and Physical Risks*

The lack of employer-provided healthcare leaves gig workers especially vulnerable. Without access to benefits through their jobs, many are uninsured or underinsured, making it difficult to obtain preventive or routine care. The National Institutes of Health reports that uninsured individuals are more likely to delay treatment and experience worse outcomes, particularly for chronic conditions (Rodriguez et al.). For gig workers whose income is already unstable, healthcare becomes yet another financial burden.

A literature review by Kosmos Publishers found that many gig workers reported skipping medications, delaying appointments, or waiting until symptoms became severe before seeking help (Saputra). These aren't individual failings. They're predictable responses to a system that makes healthcare unaffordable. Emergency rooms end up treating conditions that could have been managed with routine care. Public programs like Medicaid pick up the slack when private insurance isn't available. The costs that companies avoid don't disappear. They just get passed along to taxpayers and public health systems.

Beyond the financial barriers, gig work itself creates health risks. Most workers perform their tasks alone, guided by apps rather than supervisors or colleagues. The Job Demands-Resources model helps explain why this matters. When high demands combine with low control and minimal support, burnout becomes inevitable. Gig workers face exactly this combination daily. They're responsible for their own tools, costs, and schedules, yet they lack protections or recourse when things go wrong.

A study of San Francisco rideshare drivers found that 36 percent smoked, 33 percent did not exercise regularly, and 35 percent had four or more cardiovascular risk factors (Ahn et al.). These patterns don't reflect personal choices so much as job conditions. Gig work rewards hustle, not health. No sick leave. No backup. No room for mistakes. Workers are incentivized to stay online for long hours to chase bonuses or meet performance targets. Taking breaks becomes a luxury few can afford.

The isolation is as damaging as the financial stress. According to the GBMR Journal study, 40 percent of gig workers cited insufficient income as their main source of stress, while 20 percent identified a lack of community or support networks (Lee et al. 3). Workers describe feeling disconnected not only from colleagues but from any sense of purpose or belonging. The app-mediated work environment strips away the social connections that make jobs tolerable.

Over time, these pressures accumulate. Mental health deteriorates. Physical symptoms appear. Healthcare gets delayed until crises force expensive emergency interventions. Workers without insurance rely on public programs or go without treatment entirely. The cycle feeds on itself, creating more costs for both individuals and society.

➢ *Economic Instability and Long-Term Security Risks*

The financial model of gig work wasn't designed to support long-term stability. Most gig workers earn less than traditional employees and face wide fluctuations in pay from week to week. This volatility makes it difficult to plan ahead, build savings, or manage emergencies. According to Morningstar, gig workers earn an average of $36,500 per year, while full-time employees average $62,500 (Miller). On an hourly basis, this amounts to roughly 42 percent less pay for gig workers, despite often working comparable hours or taking on greater financial risk.

Unpredictable income disrupts the most basic financial routines. Budgeting becomes guesswork. Saving becomes nearly impossible. A report from the Center for Economic Policy Research notes that many gig workers turn to high-interest credit cards, payday loans, or informal borrowing to cover shortfalls, which only deepens financial stress (Peetz and Robson). Missed payments and mounting debt become standard rather than exceptional. These money problems feed directly into the health challenges discussed earlier, creating a vicious cycle.

Retirement planning reveals the starkest long-term costs. While many full-time employees receive retirement plans that include employer contributions, only 16 percent of gig workers have access to employer-sponsored retirement accounts (Miller). Even among those who try to save independently, irregular income makes consistent contributions nearly impossible. Some misclassified workers may not even contribute to Social Security, either by mistake or because their status exempts them from payroll tax deductions. A lifetime of insecure work often leads to poverty in old age.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

Companies benefit from this arrangement. They get the labor they need without offering stability in return. Workers absorb all the risks of employment while receiving few of its long-term rewards. Without employer support, they must manage everything from health emergencies to retirement planning on their own. For most, this means living paycheck to paycheck indefinitely.

➢ *Public Costs and Systemic Reform Imperatives*

When companies avoid providing essential benefits, the needs of workers don't vanish. They get transferred to the public. Gig workers without employer-sponsored health insurance often turn to Medicaid or delay care until they require treatment in emergency rooms (Saputra). Those without paid leave or unemployment protection may rely on food stamps, public housing programs, or other forms of social assistance. The costs that corporations refuse to cover get picked up by taxpayers. As the UCLA Labor Center notes, "These costs are shifted onto workers and the public sector" (Habans).

This wasn't an accident. Companies have deliberately structured their operations to avoid formal employment relationships while maintaining operational control. They bypass legal frameworks designed to ensure workers receive basic protections. The system isn't broken. It was designed to serve companies, not workers.

Rather than offering secure jobs with healthcare, paid leave, or retirement support, gig platforms rely on temporary arrangements that provide none of those guarantees. Workers are treated as disposable and replaceable, while public systems are expected to fill the gaps. This model may boost short-term profits, but it strains the institutions meant to protect collective well-being. It also undermines public trust in the idea that hard work leads to stability.

The economic risks faced by gig workers today won't remain isolated. As more industries adopt similar models, the effects will scale. Without reform, growing numbers of workers will lack health insurance, predictable income, or retirement security. Public programs will be stretched further. Taxpayers will subsidize a system designed to protect private interests. The instability defining gig work is already spilling beyond individual workers. It's becoming a broader social and economic liability.

Reform must begin with clearer worker classification, stronger benefit access, and preventing corporations from externalizing costs that should be part of doing business. Without change, the burden will continue falling on the people and programs least equipped to bear it.

➢ *Systemic Exclusion and Economic Harm*

The gig economy markets itself as an open marketplace that rewards individual effort, but its impacts fall unevenly across different groups. Marginalized communities end up overrepresented in app-based work, not because it offers a genuine opportunity, but because traditional employment often remains out of reach. Data from the Pew Research Center reveals sharp disparities: Hispanic adults make up 30 percent of gig workers, Black adults 20 percent, and White adults just 16 percent. People from lower-income households are also overrepresented, with 21 percent engaged in gig work compared to only 12 percent of higher-income individuals (Anderson et al.).

These patterns reflect deeper exclusions in the broader labor market. Systemic bias in hiring practices blocks access to secure, benefit-providing jobs for racial and ethnic minorities. Many immigrants, women, and young people turn to gig work because they need flexible hours to juggle caregiving, education, or multiple jobs. Others lack the credentials often required in formal employment. Gig platforms present themselves as providing opportunity, but they often function as a catch basin for those pushed out of more stable roles.

The promise of flexibility can't overcome the reality of limited options. For people excluded from traditional employment, gig work becomes less a choice than a necessity. According to Schanz, platforms structure work in ways that limit advancement and trap workers in fragmented, low-paid roles. Rather than offering escape from inequality, the system often reinforces existing barriers.

The financial consequences compound over time. Gig workers without access to employer-sponsored benefits struggle to save, invest, or build long-term wealth. Many don't receive paid time off or retirement contributions, and their fluctuating earnings make steady financial planning nearly impossible. While Lusardi (2017) argues that financial literacy can help reduce wealth gaps, this assumes workers have stable income and access to supportive systems, conditions that gig work rarely provides (Peetz and Robson). For marginalized workers, the burden becomes even heavier: they must navigate both present insecurity and reduced future prospects.

A lack of protections today translates into fewer opportunities tomorrow. Workers without insurance avoid doctors. Workers without retirement plans age into poverty. Those without legal protections can't push back when conditions become exploitative. The gig economy doesn't just mirror existing inequalities. It amplifies them.

➢ *Policy Proposals*

If gig work is to remain part of the modern economy, its structure must change. Three major policy directions represent essential steps toward a more stable and equitable labor system.

The first priority is decoupling healthcare from full-time employment. In the United States, access to medical care remains largely tied to job status, leaving millions of gig workers either uninsured or forced to rely on expensive private plans. Expanding public programs like Medicare or creating a public option that allows individuals to buy affordable coverage regardless of employment status would help close this gap. Countries with universal healthcare demonstrate that workers don't need to sacrifice security to maintain job flexibility (Rodriguez et al.).

Second, creating portable benefits that move with workers from one platform or job to another would provide essential protections like paid sick leave, retirement savings plans, and health coverage. Legislation like the Portable Benefits for Independent Workers Pilot Program Act has already proposed a framework for this approach. If expanded, such systems would allow workers to retain protections without relying on a single employer or losing benefits each time they switch platforms. As gig work becomes more common, portability becomes essential for reducing labor market fragmentation.

Third, worker classification needs urgent reform. Under current federal standards, many companies misclassify employees as independent contractors, allowing them to avoid paying minimum wage, overtime, and payroll taxes (U.S. Department of Labor). The economic reality test used by the Department of Labor is too vague and inconsistently applied, creating opportunities for strategic misclassification. Clearer definitions, stronger penalties for violations, and broader adoption of the ABC test used in California would help restore the intent behind labor protections.

These reforms wouldn't eliminate the flexibility that draws people to gig work. They would establish a baseline of dignity and protection. Being able to choose your hours shouldn't require giving up healthcare, fair pay, or long-term security. A just future for labor depends on designing systems that reflect the changing nature of work while safeguarding the people doing it.

II. IMPLEMENTATION EXAMPLES & WORKER ADVOCACY

Recent legal and policy developments reveal both progress and resistance. In 2019, California passed AB5, which required many gig workers to be classified as employees under the ABC test (Conger and Scheiber). The law aimed to provide access to benefits, minimum wage protections, and greater legal security. In response, major gig companies spent over $200 million campaigning for Proposition 22, a 2020 ballot initiative that carved out a separate legal category allowing companies to preserve the contractor model while offering limited benefits. Though it passed, legal challenges have continued. In 2023, a California appellate court upheld much of the measure, but the debate remains unsettled.

Outside the United States, innovation is happening. In Denmark, some gig platforms have voluntarily contributed to pension and sick pay funds, recognizing that retention improves when workers feel supported (Schanz). Canada has explored a dependent contractor status that provides core labor protections while maintaining some flexibility. These examples suggest that reforms can be mutually beneficial when implemented with both worker welfare and business continuity in mind.

Worker advocacy plays an equally important role. Groups like Gig Workers Rising and Fight for $15 have raised public awareness about misclassification, wage theft, and the need for collective bargaining rights. These movements amplify the voices of those most affected and have helped shape local and national conversations around labor law. Worker-led organizing ensures that policies reflect lived realities rather than just corporate interests.

Building equity into the gig economy requires more than policy changes. It requires worker participation in decision-making. A future where gig work is fair and sustainable must be driven by the people who understand its costs best. Reforms will be more effective when they're shaped by those who have been most harmed by the current system.

III. CONCLUSION

The gig economy presents itself as a flexible and modern solution to the changing world of work, but its structure reveals different priorities. Beneath the promise of autonomy lies a system built on economic insecurity, legal loopholes, and unequal burdens. Gig workers are left without access to basic protections like health insurance, paid leave, and retirement savings. These gaps reflect a deliberate design that prioritizes profit over people.

The consequences are serious and far-reaching. Workers face financial instability, deteriorating mental and physical health, and limited prospects for long-term security. Marginalized groups bear the heaviest costs, reinforcing existing inequalities. Meanwhile, the public absorbs the expenses that companies avoid, from emergency healthcare to social assistance. Without change, this model will continue eroding individual well-being and the broader safety net that supports a stable society.

These outcomes aren't inevitable. Clear paths forward exist. Universal healthcare, portable benefits, and stronger worker classification laws can rebuild the foundation of labor protections for the modern workforce. International examples show that flexibility and security can coexist. Worker advocacy continues pushing for dignity and fairness, ensuring that reforms are informed by those most affected.

The question isn't whether the gig economy can be reformed. It's whether we'll choose to do so. A just labor system must treat workers as more than costs to be managed. It must recognize them as people deserving protection, respect, and the chance to build lives with stability and meaning. That's not asking too much. It's the foundation any fair society should provide.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ahn, Jinhee, et al. "Meteorological Factors and Air Pollutants Contributing to Seasonal Variation of Acute Exacerbation of Atrial Fibrillation: A Population-Based Study." Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, vol. 60, no. 12, Dec. 2018, pp. e617–e623. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, https://journals.lww.com/joem/abstract/2018/12000/meteorological_factors_and_air_pollutants.5.aspx.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

[2]. American Public Health Association. "Decent Work for All." Policy Database, 18 Jan. 2023, American Public Health Association, www.apha.org/policy-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-briefs/policy-database/2023/01/18/decent-work-for-all.
[3]. Anderson, Monica, et al. The State of Gig Work in 2021. Pew Research Center, 8 Dec. 2021, www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/12/08/the-state-of-gig-work-in-2021.
[4]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Social Determinants of Health and Chronic Disease. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 13 May 2024, www.cdc.gov/health-equity-chronic-disease/social-determinants-of-health-and-chronic-disease/index.html.
[5]. Conger, Kate, and Noam Scheiber. "California Bill Makes App-Based Companies Treat Workers as Employees." The New York Times, 11 Sept. 2019, www.nytimes.com/2019/09/11/technology/california-gig-economy-bill.html.
[6]. Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 4 Cal. 5th 903. Supreme Court of California, 30 Apr. 2018. Justia, https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/2018/s222732.html.
[7]. Fight for a Union. fightforaunion.org, https://fightforaunion.org/.
[8]. Habans, Robert. Exploring the Costs of Classifying Workers as Independent Contractors: Four Illustrative Sectors. UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, Dec. 2015, https://irle.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/IndependentContractorCost_20151209-1-2.pdf.
[9]. Harris, Seth D., and Alan B. Krueger. A Proposal for Modernizing Labor Laws for Twenty-First-Century Work: The "Independent Worker." The Hamilton Project, Brookings Institution, Dec. 2015, www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/modernizing_labor_laws_for_twenty_first_century_work_krueger_harris.pdf.
[10]. Illuzzi, Kristy, and Portia Tang. Gig Economy Trends and Impact on Small and Medium Practices. International Federation of Accountants, 4 Oct. 2021, https://www.ifac.org/knowledge-gateway/discussion/gig-economy-trends-and-impact-small-and-medium-practices.
[11]. Kaiser Family Foundation. 2024 Employer Health Benefits Survey. KFF, 2024, www.kff.org/report-section/ehbs-2024-summary-of-findings.
[12]. Lee, Haena, et al. "Meteorological Factors and Air Pollutants Associated with Rideshare Driver Health in San Francisco, California." (Saputra 3 Occupational and Environmental Medicine, vol. 60, no. 12, Dec. 2018, pp. e617–e623. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, https://journals.lww.com/joem/abstract/2018/12000/meteorological_factors_and_air_pollutants.5.aspx.
[13]. Lee, Siew Woon, et al. "Psychological Well-being of Gig Workers: A Preliminary Study." Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal, vol. 15, no. 3s, 2023, pp. 130–138. www.gbmrjournal.com/pdf/v15n3s/V15N3s-10.pdf.
[14]. Miller, Mark. "Why Gig Workers Face Retirement Challenges." Morningstar, Inc., 5 Apr. 2018, www.morningstar.com/retirement/why-gig-workers-face-retirement-challenges.
[15]. Mishel, Lawrence. "Uber Drivers Are Not Entrepreneurs." Economic Policy Institute, 17 Jan. 2018, www.epi.org/publication/uber-drivers-are-not-entrepreneurs.
[16]. Peetz, Johanna, and Jennifer Robson. Living Gig to Gig and Paycheque to Paycheque: How Income Volatility Affects Financial Decisions. Centre for Economic Policy Research, Aug. 2022, https://cepr.org/system/files/2022-08/Living%20Gig%20to%20Gig%20and%20Paycheque%20to%20Paycheque%20How%20Income%20Volatility%20Affects%20Financial%20Decisions%20-%20Johanna%20Peetz%20and%20Jennifer%20Robson.pdf.
[17]. Poydock, Margaret. The Passage of California's Proposition 22 Would Give Digital Platform Companies a Free Pass to Misclassify Their Workers. Economic Policy Institute, 22 Oct. 2020, https://www.epi.org/blog/the-passage-of-californias-proposition-22-would-give-digital-platform-companies-a-free-pass-to-misclassify-their-workers.
[18]. Rodriguez, Fatima et al. "The Gig Economy Worker-A New Social Determinant of Health?." JAMA cardiology vol. 7,2 (2022): 125-126. doi:10.1001/jamacardio.2021.5435
[19]. Saputra, Adi. "The Impact of the Gig Economy on Gig Worker Health Insurance: Literature Review." Advances in Public Health, Community and Tropical Medicine, vol. 2023, article no. APCTM-190, Kosmos Publishers, 22 Sept. 2023, https://kosmospublishers.com/the-impact-of-the-gig-economy-on-gig-worker-health-insurance-literature-review-2/.
[20]. Schanz, Kai-Uwe. The Social and Economic Impacts of the Gig Economy. The Geneva Association, 29 Mar. 2022, www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/ga_gig_economy_report_29_03_2022.pdf.
[21]. Schmitt, John, Heidi Shierholz, Margaret Poydock, and Samantha Sanders. The Economic Costs of Worker Misclassification. Economic Policy Institute, 25 Jan. 2023, https://www.epi.org/publication/cost-of-misclassification.
[22]. Soper, Spencer, and Jackie Gu. "Amazon Delivery Partners Claim 'Treated Like Robots' by Algorithms." Bloomberg, 7 Oct. 2021, www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2021-10-07/amazon-delivery-partners-claim-treated-like-robots-by-algorithms.
[23]. Stewart, Andrew, and Jim Stanford. "Regulating Work in the Gig Economy: What Are the Options?" The Economic and Labour Relations Review, vol. 28, no. 3, 2017, pp. 420–437. Cambridge University Press, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-economic-and-labour-relations-review/article/regulating-work-in-the-gig-economy-

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25aug136

what-are-the-options/247BA28AFB1E727EC28EFCC283757742.

[24]. United States Department of Labor. Fact Sheet #13: Employment Relationship Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), revised Mar. 2024, https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/fact-sheets/13-flsa-employment-relationship.

[25]. United States, Government Accountability Office. Contingent Workforce: Size, Characteristics, Earnings, and Benefits. GAO-22-105113, 2022, www.gao.gov/products/gao-22-105113.

[26]. United States, Internal Revenue Service. Independent Contractor (Self-Employed) or Employee? IRS, www.irs.gov/businesses/small-businesses-self-employed/independent-contractor-self-employed-or-employee.

[27]. Walter, Karla, and Kate Bahn. "Raising Pay and Providing Benefits for Workers in a Disruptive Economy." Center for American Progress, 19 Apr. 2017, https://www.americanprogress.org/article/raising-pay-providing-benefits-workers-disruptive-economy/.

[28]. Wang, Senhu, et al. "National Survey of Mental Health and Life Satisfaction of Gig Workers: The Role of Loneliness and Financial Precarity." BMJ Open, vol. 12, no. 12, Dec. 2022, p. e066389, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-066389.

[29]. White, Jeremy B. Gig Companies Sidestep New California Labor Law after $200M Initiative Passes. Politico, 4 Nov. 2020, https://www.politico.com/states/california/story/2020/11/04/gig-companies-sidestep-new-california-labor-law-after-200m-initiative-passes-1333749.

[30]. Ortolani, Alex. "Gig Workers Uncertain If They Will Retire, Likely to Self-Fund If They Do | PLANADVISER." PLANADVISER, 6 Apr. 2023, https://www.planadviser.com/gig-workers-uncertain-will-retire-likely-self-fund/