

# İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi

Editorial

Open Access

## Subjectivities in the Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure, Contingency, and the Reconfiguration of Everyday



M. Fatih Karakaya<sup>1</sup>   & Hairuo Jin<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Toplumsal Yapı ve Değişme Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup> Bielefeld Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Fakültesi, Bielefeld, Almanya

### Investigating the digital economy

The digital economy is not just about online transactions or the role of technology in economic activities; it is a broader transformation of how value is created, distributed, and experienced in society. It encompasses how digital infrastructures, platforms, data, and algorithmic system reshape labour, consumption, finance, governance, and, eventually, social relations. It is also a space deeply intertwined with human subjectivities, shaping and being shaped by our individual experiences, perceptions, and identities. From a sociological perspective, the digital economy is embedded in specific cultural, political, and historical contexts, meaning that it cannot be understood purely in terms of efficiency, productivity, or growth. Instead, digital economies create new forms of labour (e.g., gig work, influencer economies, and livestreaming as an economic activity), redefine notions of ownership (e.g., digital goods, NFTs, and platform enclosures), and alter power structures (e.g., the role of Big Tech in shaping economic policies and individual agency).



“ Citation: Karakaya, M. F. & Jin, H. (2025). Subjectivities in the Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure, Contingency, and the Reconfiguration of Everyday. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 45(2), 423-432. <https://doi.org/10.26650/SJ.2025.45.2.0001>

© This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. 

© 2025. Karakaya, M. F. & Jin, H.

✉ Corresponding author: M. Fatih Karakaya [muhammed.karakaya@istanbul.edu.tr](mailto:muhammed.karakaya@istanbul.edu.tr)



In a way, the expansion of digital technologies went beyond transforming economic activities. It has introduced a condition of instability into everyday social life. Individuals increasingly navigate work, care, creativity, mobility, and self-presentation within technological environments that are continuously updated, reconfigured, and rendered opaque. Rather than encountering a stable “digital economy,” social actors experience a rushing and complicating infrastructural landscape in which norms, expectations, and responsibilities are constantly shifting (Larkin 2013). In this context, subjectivity is not simply shaped by the economic structure of digitalisation but is continuously negotiated under conditions of uncertainty, acceleration, and uneven power. In this special issue, we approach subjectivity in the digital economy not as a stable product of technological transformation but as a contingent and ongoing process formed within rapidly shifting, opaque, and uneven digital infrastructures that reorganise everyday life faster than social norms, rights, and institutions can adapt.

The diverse forms and consequences of digitalisation in everyday life across different societies, as highlighted in *Digital Anthropology* (Horst & Miller, 2012), have since developed into a new research branch. It builds on studies of social media and online communities that examine how the internet reshapes social relations, identity formation, and suggests new ways of living (Codagnone et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2016; Woldoff & Litchfield, 2021). Therefore, we must understand the question of how digital technologies are reshaping human relationships, trust, and exploitation as part of the data-driven, algorithm-accelerated, tech-giant-led form of capitalism (Guyer, 2016; Knox & Nafus, 2018; Sadowski, 2020; Williams, 2018; Zuboff, 2019; MacKenzie & Caliskan, 2026).

One of the most significant shifts in the digital economy is the emergence of the “entrepreneurial self” (Bröckling, 2015). Digital platforms, such as Uber, Airbnb, and Etsy, encourage individuals to see themselves as independent entrepreneurs, responsible for their own success (Foucault, 2008). This subjectivity is rooted in the neoliberal ethos of self-reliance and individualism, where workers are expected to market their skills, optimise their productivity, and navigate precarious labour conditions (Harvey, 2005; Standing, 2011). While this model offers flexibility, it often obscures the power dynamics between platform owners and workers, leaving individuals to bear the risks and uncertainties of the gig economy (Srnicsek, 2016; De Stefano, 2016). Crucially, this form of subjectivity is less of a fixed identity than an ongoing process of adjustment, produced under conditions in which



individuals are held responsible for outcomes shaped by opaque and asymmetrical technological landscapes.

The rise of the gig economy has led to a fragmentation of traditional employment structures, with individuals increasingly relying on short-term contracts and freelance work (Healy, Nicholson, & Pekarek, 2017). This shift can offer flexibility and autonomy, but it also raises concerns about job security, fair wages, and workers' rights (Wood et al., 2019; De Stefano, 2016). The subjectivities of gig workers are often marked by precarity and uncertainty as they navigate a landscape characterised by intense competition and algorithmic management (Standing, 2011; Vallas & Schor, 2020; McDonald & O'Brien, 2021). Work in the digital economy, particularly in gig and platform labour, transforms the experience of employment. Unlike traditional workers with stable roles, gig workers must continuously perform self-branding to seek visibility in algorithmically controlled markets (van Doorn, 2017). Their subjectivity is shaped by platform rating systems, automated feedback, and precarious employment conditions, often fostering an entrepreneurial self-image that masks structural inequalities (Standing, 2011; De Stefano, 2016). The worker is positioned as an independent agent while remaining subject to platform control, blurring the line between autonomy and algorithmic governance (Srnicek, 2016; Zwick et al., 2018). While platform labour offers a particularly visible illustration of these dynamics, similar forms of algorithmic governance and responsabilization extend far beyond paid work, shaping subjectivities across domains such as care, creativity, finance, and self-presentation.

From a sociological perspective, the digital economy cannot be reduced to online markets, platform-based labour, or data-driven business models alone. Rather, it operates through digital infrastructures. We think about platforms, algorithms, data architectures, and interfaces that structure how social life is organised, perceived, and governed. These infrastructures do not simply facilitate economic exchange; they establish the conditions under which economic relations become possible, legitimate, and intelligible. As such, equating digital infrastructure directly with "the economy" risks obscuring the ways in which power, responsibility, and inequality are produced before, and sometimes independently of, formal economic transactions.

Social media and the digital economy further intensified the role of consumption in self-making (Bourdieu, 2006). Social media platforms, for instance, have turned users into “prosumers”—producers and consumers of content (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010). Individuals curate their online personas, commodifying their lives and experiences to gain visibility and validation (Fuchs, 2017; Duffy, 2017). This performative aspect of digital subjectivity blurs the line between authenticity and commodification, as personal identities lean towards commercialisation (Couldry, 2012). The pressure to maintain an idealised online presence can lead to anxiety, self-objectification, and a fragmented sense of self (Goffman, 1959; Turkle, 2011; Marwick, 2013). In these contexts, visibility becomes an economic resource governed by platform metrics and algorithmic recognition, rendering subjectivity increasingly dependent on sustained performance and exposure.

Social media, in this sense, encourages individuals to present themselves as brands (Goffman, 1959). From influencers to freelancers, success in the digital economy often depends on the ability to construct a marketable persona (Duffy, 2017; Marwick, 2013; Hayes & Ben-Shmuel). This shift erodes traditional boundaries between personal and professional life, making self-expression a commercial asset (Gershon, 2017; Hearn, 2008, Miller et al., 2016). In the digital economy, the subject is not only a consumer but also a product—monetised through data extraction and surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019). When the subjects become the producer of data and the targets of its commercialisation, this process of datafication further complicates subjectivities in the digital economy. As individuals generate vast amounts of data through their online activities, they are increasingly reduced to data points (Cheney-Lippold, 2017; Tufekci, 2015). This data-driven subjectivity raises concerns about autonomy and agency, as individuals are shaped by opaque systems—often as part of stack economisation (Çalışkan, MacKenzie, & Callon, 2025) or a megamachine such as Google operating as a prodexchange (Çalışkan, MacKenzie, & McGowan, 2025)—that prioritise corporate interests over personal well-being (Gillespie, 2014; Pasquale, 2015). The commodification of personal data also challenges notions of privacy and ownership, as individuals lose control over how their information is used (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Andrejevic, 2014). In this way, digital subjectivity is increasingly formed under conditions of incomplete knowledge and delegated agency, where individuals are required to act, decide, and self-manage in relation to systems whose logics remain largely inaccessible to them.



Despite the tendency to impose market-driven subjectivities in digital economies, individuals and communities also resist and redefine their roles within them. Alternative economies, such as platform cooperatives and decentralised networks, challenge dominant models by emphasising collective ownership and democratic decision-making (Srnicsek, 2016). Additionally, critical digital literacy movements encourage users to reclaim agency over their data and online identities (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Noble, 2018). Furthermore, the digital economy is characterised by algorithmic governance. Platforms and services employ algorithms to personalise experiences, filter information, and even influence decision-making (Gillespie, 2014; Pasquale, 2015). These algorithms, while designed to enhance efficiency and user satisfaction, can also perpetuate biases and create echo chambers, reinforcing existing social inequalities (Noble, 2018; O’Neil, 2016). Our subjectivities are thus shaped by the invisible hand of algorithms, which can subtly nudge us towards confident choices and limit our exposure to diverse perspectives (Sunstein, 2017; Zuboff, 2019). For example, some argue that credit scoring is a digital market device that reproduces existing inequalities, violates privacy, and legitimises these effects through claims of objectivity and formality (Leyshon & Thrift, 1999; Poon, 2009; Langley, 2014; McClanahan, 2014; Pasquale, 2015; Kear, 2017). Rather than offering a clear outside to digital economies, such practices reveal the contingent and contested nature of subject formation, where compliance and resistance frequently coexist within the same infrastructural arrangements.

Beyond consumption and production in the era of the digital economy, digitalisation also accelerates the process of financialization that orients individuals and households towards risk management and self-reliance in daily life to promote certain narratives of personal success, financial stability, and autonomy (Langley, 2007, 2014; Mulcahy, 2017). It is a spontaneous process in which individuals position themselves as not simply the clients of the financial market but also the participants, the producers of the markets. This kind of financial subjectivity encourages individuals to take responsibility for their own well-being by adopting an entrepreneurial stance towards risk, thereby emerging as the so-called “financial subject” (Langley, 2007, 2014; Leins, 2018). However, financial subjectivity is not limited to laypeople. Just as click-screen trading (Knorr-Cetina & Bruegger, 2000, 2002) transformed trader subjectivity in relation to pit trading (Zaloom, 2006), automated trading similarly reconfigures the amateur trader’s subjectivity through active market

participation (Borch & Lange, 2017; Preda, 2017). Similarly, financial inclusion programmes such as insurance and microfinancing, encourage individuals to be more entrepreneurial and risk-taking (rather than prudent) in personal finance (McFall, 2015; Christophers et al., 2017; Mikuš & Rodik, 2021).

In sum, subjectivities in the digital economy are deeply entangled with new modes of production, including algorithmic governance, platform labour, and the commodification of identity. The transformations of subjectivities further enable the evolution of digital-based capitalism expanding globally and fusing with culturally heterogeneous contexts. It is then important for us to reflect on these latest developments in this form of economy with critical examinations of what these new types of subjectivities bring to the future. In this special issue, we sought contributions that reveal how digital infrastructures not only shape economic life but also intimately participate in the production of selves. We bear in mind that the digital economy is always also a cultural economy; its logics are embedded in norms, fears, desires, and moral expectations.

### **The everyday contestation of subjectivities**

Within these infrastructural arrangements, subjectivity emerges as a contingent and ongoing process rather than a fixed outcome of technological change. Digital infrastructures demand continuous adaptation: workers must remain flexible, parents vigilant, creators visible, investors responsive, and users accountable for outcomes they do not fully control. Subject formation unfolds through partial knowledge, algorithmic mediation, and moralised expectations of responsibility, often without corresponding institutional protections. In this sense, the digital economy produces subjectivities that are simultaneously empowered and exposed, active and constrained. This special issue approaches everyday life not as a secondary arena affected by economic change but as a primary site where digital economic power is enacted and contested.

Parenting practices, childhood performances, cognitive endurance, creative production, identity experimentation, financial decision-making, and forms of mobility all become entangled with digital infrastructures that organise visibility, value, and legitimacy. The issue foregrounds how economic rationalities permeate intimate and routine practices, blurring the boundaries between economic, social, and moral life. This special issue brings together theoretical and empirical contributions



from diverse contexts and advances sociological debates on subjectivities in the digital economy by foregrounding contingency, unevenness, and everyday negotiation. Rather than assuming a unified or coherent digital economic logic, the articles highlight frictions between infrastructure and experience, visibility and vulnerability, autonomy and delegation. Collectively, they demonstrate that digital subjectivities are not merely imposed by technology but are actively produced within asymmetrical and rapidly shifting socio-technical environments.

The articles in this issue trace the formation of subjectivities across multiple digital infrastructures and socioeconomic contexts, revealing how power and dependency are reorganised beyond traditional labour-capital relations. Several contributions examine the structural dimensions of digital economies, focusing on how platforms and states consolidate authority through infrastructural control. Tok conceptualises the platform economy through the lens of technofeudalism (Varoufakis, 2024); illustrating how digital platforms establish hierarchical relations of dependency that extend beyond conventional market dynamics. Çelen's analysis of China's digital transformation highlights how authoritarian governance, platform capitalism, and labour precarity intersect, producing subjectivity conditions marked by vulnerability and collective resistance. Similarly, Kuş, Karakoç Keskin, and Tanir Levendeli examine digitalised migration through e-Residency, showing how digital infrastructures reshape mobility, belonging, and resilience under conditions of poly-crisis.

Other contributions focus on how subjectivities are governed through moralisation, care, and self-management in everyday life. Dorn analyzes parental surveillance apps to demonstrate how surveillance capitalism becomes culturally embedded by aligning with neoliberal ideals of responsible parenting. Němeček explores how amateur retail investors make sense of their selfhood in relation to investing apps, oscillating between imaginaries of autonomy and algorithmic delegation. Tekin addresses the cognitive consequences of digital acceleration, reframing "brain decay" as a structural condition produced by attention extraction and unequal access to cognitive resources rather than individual failure.

A further set of articles examines visibility, performance, and creativity as key sites of digital subject formation. Apak and Aygül's ethnographic study of child YouTubers reveals how childhood

becomes commercialised through performance-driven visibility regimes, producing subjectivities oriented towards branding and audience demand. Kaya's study of the Metaverse illustrates how users construct multiple, context-dependent identities, negotiating professional visibility and personal experimentation within platform-mediated environments. Finally, Erbay and Adaş investigate human–AI collaboration in music production, showing how technocentric imaginaries of creativity reproduce broader social forces embedded in digital capitalism, even in ostensibly innovative and artistic domains.

Taken together, these contributions demonstrate that subjectivities in the digital economy are formed not through a singular logic but through continuous engagements with infrastructures that are simultaneously enabling, extractive, and uneven. The issue thus invites further sociological attention to how digital economies are lived, contested, and reworked in everyday life.



Author Details

**M. Fatih Karakaya**

<sup>1</sup> İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Toplumsal Yapı ve Değişme Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul, Türkiye

0000-0002-1578-1896 ✉ muhammed.karakaya@istanbul.edu.tr

**Hairuo Jin**

<sup>2</sup> Bielefeld Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Fakültesi, Bielefeld, Almanya

0009-0008-9317-8284 ✉ hairuo.jin@uni-bielefeld.de

## References

- Andrejevic, M. (2014). Surveillance and alienation in the online economy. *Marketing Theory*, 14(1), 35-49.
- Borch, C. Lange, A. C. (2017). High-frequency trader subjectivity: emotional attachment and discipline in an era of algorithms. *Socio-Economic Review*, 15(2), 283-306.
- Bourdieu, P. (2006). The forms of capital. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J-A. Dillabough & A. H. Halsey (Eds.). *Education, Globalisation and Social Change* (pp. 105-118). Oxford University Press.
- Bröckling, U. (2015). *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject*. Sage.
- Caliskan, K., MacKenzie, D. & Callon, M. (2025). Stacked economization: a research program for the study of platforms. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 18(2), 304-331.
- Caliskan, K., MacKenzie, D. & McGowan, A. (2025). Prodexchange: Digital-industrial economization in Google Search supply chain. *Platforms & Society*, 2, 1-17.



- Cheney-Lippold, J. (2017). *We Are Data: Algorithms and the Making of Our Digital Selves*. NYU Press.
- Christophers, B., Leyshon, A., Mann, G. (2017). Money and finance after the crisis: taking critical stock. In *Money and Finance after the Crisis: Critical Thinking for Uncertain Times*, ed. B. Christophers, A. Leyshon, G. Mann, pp. 1–40. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
- Codagnone, C., Matthews, J., Karatzogianni, A. (2018). *Platform Economics Digital Labour Organization in the Sharing Economy*. Emerald Publishing.
- Couldry, N. (2012). *Media, Society, World: Social Theory and Digital Media Practice*. Polity Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The Costs of Connection: How Data is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the 'just-in-time' workforce: on-demand work, crowdwork, and labor protection in the gig economy. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 471-504.
- Duffy, B. E. (2017). *(Not) Getting Paid to Do What You Love: Gender, Social Media, and Aspirational Work*. Yale University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Michel Foucault on Neoliberal Governmentality*. Lecture Series, 1978-79.
- Fuchs, C. (2017). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*. Sage Publications.
- Gershon, I. (2017). *Down and Out in the New Economy: How People Find (or Don't Find) Work Today*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality, and Society* (pp. 167-194). MIT Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books.
- Guyer, J. I. (2016). *Legacies, Logics, Logistics: Essays in the Anthropology of the Platform Economy*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Haggerty, K., Ericson, R. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, A. S. & Ben-Shmuel, A. T. (2024). Under the finfluence: Financial influencers, economic meaning-making and the financialization of digital life. *Economy and Society*, 53(3), 478-503.
- Healy, J., Nicholson, D., Pekarek, A. (2017). The gig economy: a critical introduction. *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, 27(1), 10-28.
- Hearn, A. (2008). "Meat, mask, burden": probing the contours of the branded self. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8(2), 197-217.
- Horst, H. A., & Miller, D. (2012). *Digital anthropology* (Engl. ed.). Berg.
- Kear, M. (2017). Playing the credit score game: algorithms, 'positive' data and the personification of financial objects. *Economy and Society*, 46(3-4), 346-368.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. Bruegger, U. (2000). The market as an object of attachment: exploring postsocial relations in financial markets. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 25, 141-168.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. & Bruegger, U. (2002). Traders' engagement with markets: a post-social relationship. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19, 161-185.
- Knox, H., Nafus, D. (2018). *Ethnography for a Data-Saturated World*. Manchester University Press.
- Langley, P. (2007). Uncertain subjects of Anglo-American financialization. *Cultural Critique*, 65, 67-91.
- Langley, P. (2014). Equipping entrepreneurs: consuming credit and credit scores. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 17(5), 448-467.
- Larkin, B. 2013. "The politics and poetics of infrastructure." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42: 327-43.
- Leins, S. (2018). *Stories of capitalism: inside the role of financial analysts* (p. 224). University of Chicago Press.
- Leyshon, A. & Thrift, N. (1999). Lists come alive: electronic systems of knowledge and the rise of credit-scoring in retail banking. *Economy and Society*, 28(3), 434-466.
- MacKenzie, D. & Caliskan, K. (2026). *Inside Digital Advertising: Platforms, Power, and Material Politics*. Polity Press.
- Marwick, A. E. (2013). *Status Update: Celebrity, Publicity, and Branding in the Social Media Age*. Yale University Press.
- McClanahan, A. (2014). Bad credit: the character of credit scoring. *Representations*, 126(1), 31-57.
- McDonald, P., & O'Brien, K. (2021). Gig work, precarity, and subjectivity: workers' rights in the age of digital labor. *Journal of Labor and Society*, 24(2), 163-179.
- McFall, L. (2015). *Devising consumption: Cultural economies of insurance, credit and spending*. Routledge.
- Mikuš, M. & Rodik, P. (2021). *Households and Financialization in Europe: Mapping Variegated Patterns in Semi-Peripheries*. New York: Routledge.
- Miller, D., Sinanan, J., Wang, Xinyuan, McDonald, T., Haynes, N., Costa, E., Spyer, J., Venkatraman, S., Nicolescu, R. (2016). *How the World Changed Social Media*. UCL Press.
- Mulcahy, N. (2017). Entrepreneurial subjectivity and the political economy of daily life in the time of finance. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 20(2), 216-235.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. NYU Press.



- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown Publishing.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press.
- Poon, M. (2009). From New Deal institutions to capital markets: commercial consumer risk scores and the making of subprime mortgage finance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 34, 654-674.
- Preda, A. (2017). *Noise: Living and trading in electronic finance*. University of Chicago Press.
- Ritzer, G., & Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, consumption, prosumption: the nature of capitalism in the age of the digital economy. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), 13-36.
- Sadowski, J. (2020). *Too Smart: How Digital Capitalism is Extracting Data, Controlling Our Lives, and Taking Over the World*. MIT Press.
- Srnicek, N. (2016). *Platform Capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton University Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond facebook and google: emergent challenges of computational agency. *Weizenbaum Conference*, 1-12.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. Basic Books.
- van Doorn, N. (2017). Platform labour: on the gendered and racialized exploitation of low-paid workers in the gig economy. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 525-539.
- Vallas, S. P., & Schor, J. B. (2020). What do we know about the gig economy? *Annual Review of Sociology*, 46, 411-430.
- Williams, J. (2018). *Stand Out of Our Light: Freedom and Resistance in the Attention Economy* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Woldoff, R., & Litchfield, R. C. (2021). *Digital Nomads: In Search of Freedom, Community, and Meaningful Work in the New Economy*. Oxford University Press.
- Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), 56-75.
- Varoufakis, Y. (2024). *Technofeudalism: What killed capitalism*. Melville House.
- Zaloom, C. (2006). *Out of the Pits: Traders and Technology from Chicago to London*. University of Chicago Press.
- Zengler, T. (2014). Personalization and algorithms: the changing landscape of how we do business. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.
- Zwick, D., Bonsu, S. K., & Darmody, A. (2018). Putting the "sharing" economy to work: A critical examination of the gig economy and its impacts on employment. *Journal of Business Research*, 87, 49-58.

