

Understanding technostress in the gig economy -- A Job Demands-Resources analysis of Chinese couriers

Authors: Hua Wei¹, Huiyue Shi², Yilin Kou², Mengke Yu², Yanzhuo Wang², Shugang Li³, Sheng Li⁴, , Christopher J. Armitage⁵, Tarani Chandola⁶, Pauline Whelan⁷, Yanchun Zhang⁸, Yan Xu², Martie van Tongeren¹

Affiliations:

1 Division of Population Health, Health Services Research & Primary Care, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK;

2 Faculty of Psychology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China;

3 Department of Maternal and Children Health, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China;

4 Department of Public Health, School of Medicine, Shihezi University, Shihezi, China;

5 Division of Psychology & Mental Health, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK; Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, UK; NIHR Greater Manchester Patient Safety Translational Research Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

6 Department of Sociology, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR China;

7 Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK;

8 China National Health Development Research Centre; China Health Economics Association

Correspondence: Hua Wei, The University of Manchester, Ellen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, hua.wei@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has given the global e-commerce market a strong boost and concerns have been raised about intensified work stress and its consequences on health and safety. China has soon become the market leader and the rapid adoption of last-mile technology and app-based work models means that work stress associated with the use of technology (“technostress”) is under-researched. This study set out to explore what work stressors couriers in China experience and how techno-stressors interacted with other work stressors, following the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework. We conducted 14 semi-structured interviews with frontline couriers in May-June 2021 in China. Five major themes were identified: general (working conditions), algorithmic management, customer sovereignty, economic precarity and networked support. A novel contribution of the study is the identification of a new stressor: techno-dominance that we define as technology-induced worker vulnerability when labour relations and managerial functions traditionally fulfilled by humans are replaced by technology systems. It can be characterised as algorithmic controls, opaque system logic, extended social controls and lack of organizational (human) support. Technology associated benefits were categorised as techno-resource, including flexible hours, intelligent systems and app-based information & trainings. Some benefits were conditional, e.g. gamification where participants became motivated or frustrated depending on their job skills, suggesting potential moderators for the demands-stress relationship. Interactions between techno-stressors and other working conditions were also found, as techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity and techno-dominance intensified work stress.

Keywords: Couriers, gig economy, technostress, Job Demand-Resources model, China

Introduction

Despite the fast expansion of the gig economy and the increasingly prevalent use of managerial algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) at work in all sectors, our understanding about how algorithms and AI shape everyday work experiences in the gig economy is so far limited (Bondanini et al., 2020; Borle, Reichel, & Voelter-Mahlknecht, 2021; Richardson, 2017; Rohwer et al., 2022). Central to the concern is that the ongoing changes driven by managerial algorithms may have tipped the balance between positive (resources) and negative (demands) job characteristics for the workers and thereby generate harmful effects (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). Existing research about the impact of workplace telepressure or Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) demands were mostly limited to participants of higher socio-economic positions, e.g. university degree, and focused on employees in standard employment and organizational settings (Borle, Reichel, Niebuhr, et al., 2021; Borle, Reichel, & Voelter-Mahlknecht, 2021). However, the gig workers population, especially the location-based jobs, e.g. couriers and taxi drivers, is known for relatively low socio-economic background and characterised by a high levels of self-employment (ILO, 2021). Much less is known about the impact of technology such as managerial algorithms and AI in these occupations and sectors that are subject to radical casualization and adoption. In traditional employment or organizational context, technology was mostly adopted incrementally, for example, launching new IT systems, upgrading systems or increasing connectivity (e.g. emails or messaging applications). While in the gig economy, work *per se* and all conditions of work are mandated by labour platform technologies that are deliberately designed to reduce human contacts. Almost all labour relations and communications between the gig workers and platforms are initiated and maintained through technological measures (Ivanova et al., 2018). The difference between the traditional and gig mode in terms of how managerial algorithms are used has important implications for worker health outcomes. First, the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has become much more powerful and controlling with the advance of AI and algorithmic systems, as well as the proliferation of mobile devices and wireless connections (Bondanini et al., 2020). It has created a sense, that it is not the workers who *use* the technology, but that workers are *used* by the technology. Second, this has meant that existing technostress models may not have fully captured workers' experiences. The omnipresence and

omnipotence of AI and algorithmic systems in this sector suggest techno-stressors may not work in isolation but could interact with other work stressors that are traditionally associated with the occupation to amplify their effects (Möhlmann et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2021). Third, when workers need social support at work, they will need to set up their own networks as traditional channels for collective voice are often absent from the platforms' design (Tassinari & Maccarrone, 2020). In other words, it is unclear, within the gig economy, whether a new type(s) of stressor has emerged, whether the demands-resources balance has been re-set by technological innovations and whether existing stressors are intensified or alleviated by the use of AI and algorithmic systems. It is necessary to carry out explorative, qualitative research to understand how technostress work in the gig economy especially in developing countries where labour protection is relatively under-developed (Zhou, 2020).

Technostress

The term technostress was first coined by clinical psychologist Craig Brod in 1984, who described it as 'a modern disease caused by one's inability to cope or deal with ICTs in a healthy manner' (Ayyagari et al., 2011, p. 832; La Torre et al., 2019). Techno-stressors present challenges including techno-overload (technology forces workers to work more and faster); techno-invasion (invasion of private life due to technology that creates pressures of constant connectivity); techno-complexity (technology is complex, leading to a sense of inadequate computer skills); techno-insecurity (workers feel threatened about losing their jobs because of new technologies); techno-uncertainty (constant technological changes that may impose stress on workers) (Borle, Reichel, Niebuhr, et al., 2021; Tarafdar et al., 2017). Systematic reviews found that technostress as a theoretical construct was fast developing and had been operationalised as both exposures and outcomes in various disciplines (Bondanini et al., 2020; Borle, Reichel, Niebuhr, et al., 2021). In this study, we only considered techno-stressors as exposures that might have effects on mental health outcomes. Techno-stressors have been found consistently associated with adverse health and work outcomes, of which techno-overload and techno-invasion are the most frequently examined techno-stressors (Borle, Reichel, Niebuhr, et al., 2021). Nevertheless, techno-stressors are not necessarily harmful, depending on individuals' personal circumstances (e.g. age, gender and digital literacy), appraisal and available

resources (Rohwer et al., 2022). Digital literacy refers to the necessary skills and competencies that individuals must have to perform tasks and solve problems in digital environments (Reddy et al., 2020). Tarafdar et al. (2017) suggested that individuals can appraise working conditions as threatening (techno - distress) or challenging (techno - eustress), hence the outcomes can be damaging or beneficial (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Furthermore, technostress is considered highly contextual, hence the quality, quantity and intensity of a stressor may determine users' perception and outcomes (Rohwer et al., 2022). When the jobs are completely app-based, managerial algorithms are the "boss" and controls come through automated notifications, monetary incentives (or penalties too in the case of China), competition generated among job seekers and information asymmetry (Ivanova et al., 2018). Such practices can potentially create a range of stressors, technology-induced or -intensified, that are not effectively accounted for by existing technostress models (Borle, Reichel, & Voelter-Mahlknecht, 2021).

Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory

There are a range of popular work stress models built upon this notion of balance, including the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001), the Job Demand-Control (JD-C) model (Karasek, 1979) and the Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) model. Despite the similarity, the JD-R theory appears to be a useful work psychology model for analysing techno-stressors in various job settings because of its flexibility (Rohwer et al., 2022). The JD-R theory is an overarching framework that can be used to categorise any job characteristics into either job demands or job resources. Depending on the design of the technology and how individuals mobilize their resources to cope, the extra job demands may be perceived as *hindrance* or *challenge* job demands and thereof instigate two very different psychological processes: health-impairment or motivational (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). When exposure to job demands depletes workers' physical and mental resources, health-impairment occurs and leads to exhaustion and negative effects on health and productivity. The motivational process occurs when job and personal resources can support the achievement of work goals or satisfy the intrinsic needs for autonomy, relatedness and competence, thus improving well-being and productivity (Roczniewska et al., 2022). These propositions are very much echoing the

person-environment transaction and conservation of resources (ROC) based views of the technostress model (Rohwer et al., 2022). Hence, it is particularly suitable as the theoretical framework for the analysis of Chinese couriers' work experiences.

Some research has been done in the context of traditional employment to understand the role of technology. For example, Day et al. (2012) identified eight ICT demands that affect employee outcomes: (1) everyday hassles in using technology (e.g., losing data; computer crashing); (2) information overload; (3) expectations to be available 24/7; (4) increased workload; (5) a lack of control over technology; (6) expectations for continuous learning; (7) ineffective communication; and (8) use of ICT to monitor employees' behaviours. These were very similar to the construct of technostress (La Torre et al., 2019). Some of the stressors may be applicable to couriers and gig couriers, such as everyday hassles in using technology, a lack of control over technology and use of ICT to monitor employees' behaviours. However, these do not fully address the information and power asymmetry that are structured in the algorithmic systems used by the labour platforms (Rosenblat, 2018; Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

Therefore, in this paper we aim to address the following research questions:

1. What are the main work stressors of Chinese couriers?
2. How are the technology related work stressors perceived by the Chinese couriers (e.g., as job demands, job resources or personal resources)?
3. How have the technology related work stressors interacted with other work stressors?

Methods

We took a qualitative and explorative approach to address the research questions.

Data collection

We conducted 14 semi-structured interviews in May and June 2021 in China using Tencent Meeting software. Each of the interviews lasted about 1.5 hours. We approached both parcel and takeaway food couriers under varying employment terms using phone contacts that was available to the researchers. About half of them refused mainly due to being too busy. At the end, we recruited eight takeaway couriers and six parcel couriers. Recruitment stopped when the interviewers agreed that data

saturation was reached. Two of the interviewees were female and 12 were male. The mean age was 33 and average length of working as a courier was 3.7 years. All interviews were carried out in Chinese. The study was reviewed and approved by the ethics committees in both UK and China (Ref: XXXXX, Ref:XXXXX). Each participant received a Participant Information Sheet and informed consent was confirmed either by verbal consent at the beginning of the session or by written consent. Researchers introduced themselves, their background and the research purpose and encouraged the interviewees to ask questions before starting. Interviews were audio recorded with auto-transcripts generated. Seven researchers conducted the interviews, with each session completed by at least two researchers. All researchers were trained for qualitative research. Two interviewers have PhD degrees and the other researchers were postgraduate students. Four of the interviewers were female. Interview questions included open inquiries about what stressors, including techno-stressors, the interviewees experienced, how they appraised the impact of the stressor and how they were coping with work stress. In developing the questions, we followed an ethnographic approach that saw interviews as interactive conversations between the interviewees and the researchers (Denzin & Lincoln, 2017; Yin, 2015). The questions were used as a guideline for the researchers to focus the conversation, who generally encouraged the interviewees to describe their experiences of and perceptions about work stress without loading them with our research agendas or pre-determined theoretical frameworks (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). The interview schedule is available in Supplementary file 1.

Data analysis

We followed the Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ) to report our findings (Tong et al., 2007). A reporting checklist can be found in Supplementary file 2. Data were analysed in Chinese, with quotes translated into English by one of the bilingual researchers and verified by another. Whenever discrepancy in translation arose, the two bilingual researchers discussed and reached agreement. If disagreement was not resolved, it was referred to other bilingual researchers in the team for discussion until consensus reached. The analysis had two stages. It was first bottom-up when the coders' coded the words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs said by the interviewees and grouped them under emerged sub-themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Castleberry & Nolen, 2018). For example, when "long shifts", "long hours", "No (or rarely) days off" were

repeatedly mentioned or discussed by the participants, new codes were set up and later they were grouped under a sub-theme and named as “long working hours”. Coding was completed using Nvivo12 software. Five researchers edited and anonymised the auto-transcripts and coded the transcripts independently. The five Nvivo files were merged to generate a complete code book when similar codes were grouped into sub-themes. At the second stage, we carried out deductive analysis to first match the sub-themes with the JD-R categories: job demands, job resources and personal resources; and second match the sub-themes that were categorised as job demands with the five techno-stressors: techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity and techno-uncertainty, to look for potentially new techno-stressors.

Results: A JD-R theory informed analysis

In this section, we present the results of analysis in relation to five major themes: general (working conditions), algorithmic management, customer sovereignty, economic precarity and networked support (see Table 1 below for a list of themes and sub-themes). The impact of managerial algorithms were mainly captured by the theme of algorithmic management. Not all working conditions associated with algorithms lead to increased job demands. Interviewees also recognised benefits such as flexible hours, smart (intelligent) systems and instant access to information and trainings provided by the apps. Gamification were reported by some participants as having motivational effect when they appeared to have high level of digital literacy and job skills. Three techno-stressors: techno-overload, techno-invasion and techno-complexity were identified and potentially intensified other work stressors. Four sub-themes: algorithmic controls, opaque system logic, extended social controls and (lack of or poor) organizational support, were associated with a new techno-stressor: techno-dominance. Based on these four characteristics, we defined techno-dominance as technology-induced worker vulnerability when labour relations and managerial functions traditionally fulfilled by humans are replaced by technology systems. The aforementioned benefits of algorithmic management were categorised as job resources and techno-resources. The theme “General” referred to general working conditions that were commonly reported by existing research as work stressors of couriers. Some of the sub-themes only apply to parcel or takeaway couriers. The main difference between the parcel and takeaway

couriers is that parcel couriers are employed either directly by the logistics company or through an employment agent, while takeaway couriers are all app-based.

Themes	Sub-themes	JD-R categories	Techno-stressors
General	Long working hours (P&T)	Job demands	Techno-overload
	Heavy workload (P&T)		
	Road conditions (P&T)		
	Declining fees (P&T)		
Algorithmic management	Algorithmic controls (P&T)	Job demands	Techno-dominance
	Opaque system logic (P&T)		
	Flexible hours (T)		
	Intelligent systems (P&T)	Job resources	Techno-resource
	App-based information & trainings (P&T)		
	Gamification (T)	Conditional personal resources*	Techno-resource or techno-complexity
Customer sovereignty	Customer incivility (P&T)	Job demands	Techno-overload
	Customer appreciation (P&T)	Personal resources	
Economic precarity	Penalties (P&T)	Job demands	Techno-overload
	Bonus & rewards (P&T)	Job resources	
Networked support	Extended social controls (T)	Job demands	Techno-dominance/ Techno-invasion
	Organizational support (P&T)	Conditional job resources**	Techno-dominance
	Worker networks (P&T)	Personal resources	

Table 1 List of themes and sub-themes -- A JD-R analysis of Chinese couriers' working conditions

Abbreviations: P: Parcel couriers, T: Takeaway couriers. *if highly skilled; **if supportive

General

The general theme included working conditions that had been commonly studied about courier occupation, such as long working hours, heavy workload, road traffic and declining fees. The overall work environment was stressful because there were “all sorts of triggers for mental breakdowns” (0604-takeaway). Long working hours appeared to be a norm in the industry. Most of the parcel interviewees mentioned starting work from 6 or 7am in the morning and finishing shifts after 7pm. Takeaway couriers normally started later in the day, i.e. 10am, but would carry on working until late i.e. 10pm into the night. Parcel couriers typically worked six days a week and took no days off during

peak seasons, such as the Single's day festival (11th Nov), Double-12 festival (12th Dec) and pre-Chinese New Year peak. Such seasons meant dramatic increase of workload and could last somewhere between 15 days to a month (0509-parcel). During peak seasons they often worked 15-16 hours a day (0529-parcel, 0523-parcel, 0607-parcel). Takeaway couriers faced irregular hours and unpredictable workload. Their busy hours mostly corresponded with mealtime and evenings. Traffic on the road and declining fees per delivery over the years were general conditions that concerned both parcel and takeaway couriers.

The effect of techno-overload was evident. The app or the algorithmic systems behind it was certainly intensifying work stress for the takeaway couriers, as “late delivery” was mentioned 79 times as a source of stress by all interviewees, of which 78 were from takeaway couriers whose orders were allocated by the apps, with driving routes planned and delivery time set. According to the interviewees (0517-takeaway, 0525-takeaway), the system was learning from the delivery data and was able to adjust estimated delivery time based on completed orders. They explained how the algorithms worked. For example, from point A to B, it would normally take, say 20 minutes to complete an order. When one or two couriers found a shortcut and were able to complete orders of similar route within 15 minutes, the system would shorten the estimated delivery time for future orders, forcing the other couriers to either find the same shortcut or simply work faster.

Algorithmic management

The logistics sector uses advanced algorithmic systems and couriers who fulfil the last-mile deliveries are used to working with an end point of such systems, which can be a dedicated device, e.g. handheld terminals (HHT) or an app on their smartphones (Wei et al., 2022). The interviewees often called it “the system” that represented an important feature of their working life. On the one hand, it embodied a myriad of rules, controls and business logics dictated by the platforms or companies, such as order allocation, route planning, customer satisfaction, pay, performance and incentives. On the other hand, it functioned as a supporting mechanism that provided information, guidance, training and some form of organizational support. Organizational support and social support at work were categorised under the “Networked support” sub-theme, which will be elaborated later. The other characteristics of algorithmic management will be discussed as job demands (techno-dominance), job resources

(techno-resource) and conditional personal resources. Being conditional meant that whether the characteristic was perceived as a challenge or a threat depended on individual circumstance, such as job skills and digital literacy. If highly skilled, it became a source of job satisfaction, e.g. techno-resource; if not, it could lead to frustration or a sense of inadequate skills, e.g. techno-complexity.

Flexible hours -- techno-resource

For some app-based takeaway couriers, autonomy and freedom did exist, but outside of the system, as described by an interviewee (0517-takeaway).

To a certain extent, freedom means that you can decide whether to do it or not, whether to work or not to work today, but once you started working, the system dictates everything.

Among app-based takeaway couriers, there were two managerial modes: specialised and crowd sourced. Specialised couriers worked in fixed delivery areas and had human site managers who would gather them every morning at a site office for briefing. They were expected to sign in during busy hours and leaves needed to be approved by site managers. On the contrary, crowd couriers were truly gig workers who could sign in or out at any time and in any area of their choice. They could also define the size of their areas, such as rejecting orders that would go beyond certain radius. Crowd couriers were managed by area managers who overlooked larger areas. Communications between them were social media based. How crowd couriers were supported will be explained in more details in later section about networked support.

Algorithmic controls – Techno-dominance

For the app-based couriers, the system or managerial algorithms dictated who get the jobs, and how the jobs should be completed, evaluated and paid, with limited opportunity for communication.

One interviewee (0517–takeaway) put it simply as:

No matter we have been working [for the app] for a few months or a few years, we all have to listen to the system, no matter who. Nobody can interfere with the system. The system is the boss. It decides.

Or as interviewee (0525–takeaway) put it:

The system determines whether you are busy or can take it easy.

After an interviewee (0510-takeaway) described a range of stressors, such as restaurant delays, customer behaviours and road traffic, the researcher followed:

Would it be helpful if you could make some adjustment in the app, to report some of the situations?

Courier: it would but they [the system] don't have it. They would not allow couriers to do such thing, right? It only allows one voice. Whatever the algorithm tells you to do, you just have to do it. If you were late, penalties on you...Even the customer service would not be able to interfere [with the algorithms]. If you phone them up, they could only put a note in so you don't get penalties, say you were late because of the customers.

Customer service is the phone line support provided by the platforms. As we understood from our interviewees, it was the human interface between the platforms and all the technology users, which including end customers (e.g. who order the food), clients (e.g. restaurants that provide the food) and couriers (e.g. who deliver the food). In other words, customer service served as the mediator among the three type of users whenever disputes arose and a source of manned organizational support to couriers.

Algorithmic controls were stronger with the crowd couriers where management by human was minimal. For example, late delivery penalty started from the second passed the estimated delivery time for crowd couriers (0510-takeaway), whilst for specialised couriers, there were 7 or 8 minutes leeway (0525-takeaway, 0604-takeaway). Specialised couriers were not able to reject orders allocated by the system whilst crowd couriers could. However, it was believed that control was still maintained by the system:

Yes, we can reject orders but not too many. If rejected too many [orders], they [the system] will restrict orders your can get. (0510-takeaway-Y)

In terms of occupational safety, checks on wearing helmet and uniforms, and the use of platform branded equipment were done through the app. The request would appear as a new task in the app with notification,

requiring the couriers to face the camera and complete facial recognition, approximately twice a day (0510-takeaway-Y, 0518-takeaway, 0525-takeaway). Couriers needed to respond within minutes and it was usually immediately after an order was delivered, as our interviewees figured out. When non-compliance was found, their account would be blocked for one day. It seemed the technology was designed to maintain a firm control even in the absence of human managers.

Opaque system logic -- Techno-dominance

How the system was designed or how individual couriers' data were used to develop the managerial algorithms were not clear to the couriers. However, we did not hear direct complaints about this lack of transparency from our interviewees, perhaps because they did not think that developers of the technology were obliged to be transparent with them. We obtained the meaning through their description about how they guessed the system logic, analysed the situations and tried to make the system work for them. Interviewees who were experienced with the system believed that they could figure out the system logic and would adjust their behaviour accordingly to avoid being disadvantaged. Being disadvantaged meant being allocated orders that were longer distance or more difficult to deliver.

Couriers generally preferred orders concentrated in a dense built environment so that they could combine multiple orders with a convenient route and deliver them in one go. Multi-ordering in central areas was considered efficient and profitable for the couriers, although it could also result in more work stress, as described by one of the interviewees (0525-takeaway).

You can't afford to be stuck [if you deliver within the central area and multi-ordering]. You run all the time. If one order gets stuck, all the other orders down the line will be delayed. You'd be nervous.

Hence, couriers could be disadvantaged by the system for several reasons. First, couriers could be disadvantaged by the location of the delivery address. For example, orders that need to be delivered away from central areas, make it much more difficult to combine orders, as customers and restaurants are more widely dispersed (0510-takeaway, 0525-takeaway, 0604-takeaway). Second, certain delivery addresses, such as high rise buildings or gated areas, could increase the time to complete a delivery

(0517-takeaway, 0525-takeaway, 0528-takeaway). These situations will reduce efficiency and hence profitability of deliveries. However, it was not clear to many couriers how the system worked in terms of order allocation.

No one knows how exactly the system works. It is really not clear how on earth the situations are. But the system did sometimes work this way: if your data is good, it gives you good orders, it gives them to you quickly and the orders are near each other. (0517-takeaway)

Here “your data” meant the couriers’ historical performance, e.g. rate of on-time delivery and customer rating. One interviewee (0525-takeaway) summarized his understanding about the criteria when the system would allocate “good” orders:

The first is luck, the second is customer satisfaction of [your performance on] the previous day, the other is your grade...if you are lucky, like if you are near the restaurant and no other couriers nearby [then you will receive many orders]...it also depends on how busy it gets.

Intelligent systems -- Techno-resource

Some couriers just believed the system was smart and would do a fair job. One interviewee (0528-takeaway), for example, believed the algorithm would balance the workload for the specialised couriers who would normally sign up for shifts six days a week.

The system will allocate [orders]. Where we should go or the distance of our orders will be proportionate to the total amount of orders that we deliver every month. The system will decide, based on each individual’s workload, that where we deliver to. It won’t be too far [from the supposed ratio]. It [the system] will balance the overall workload.

It seemed to many that the system knew it all, as described by an interviewee (0517-takeaway).

The system, you can't imagine, the system is really smart, like it knows everything. I'd say they even know whether the restaurants are slow or quick in preparing food. The system is just smart.

The system has intelligence, which is based on historical data. It would also know the conditions on the road and at the locations. All other conditions were included and computed too.

This interviewee also thought the system had the data to determine whether the orders were easier to complete. For example, deliveries to hotels and office buildings generally take less time because takeaways were usually left at the reception on the ground floor. If it was delivered to residential buildings, it often involves taking lifts or stairs, which would increase the time it takes to complete the delivery.

Gamification -- Techno-resource or Techno-complexity

Gamification refers to system features that are designed using game elements to increase user interaction on a product or a software application by making it more interesting and challenging (Prabowo et al., 2019). The younger interviewees (0604-takeaway, 0528-takeaway, 0529-takeaway; age 22, 28 and 29) seemed to be used to such features. They liked the gamification design and found it to be fulfilling experiences. Two takeaway couriers (0528-takeaway and 0529-takeaway) were very motivated to be at the top of the publicised ranking systems for the number of orders delivered in a day and to benefit from the rewards that came with this.

The highest number I achieved was 92 orders [a day]...I worked normal amount of hours [that day] but it was a festival so lots of orders...there were people who could complete 100 more orders most of the days...12 o'clock [midnight] came too early [on that day]. I was 8 orders short of 100...the system did not give me the chance [to reach 100]. It's a shame. After summer, there are fewer orders. I only get 50 to 60 orders per day now. (0529-takeaway)

When they could not win the game, they certainly felt the frustration and a sense of techno-complexity that they might not be able to overcome.

You'd be running all day but still not as good as others. They [the more experienced ones] could deliver 40, 50 orders per day. You work for a whole day but only delivered 20, 30 orders. Your data will never look as good as theirs'. (0517-takeaway, age 42)

In addition to the daily rankings, they also receive points from completing tasks, which accumulate on their account so that they can move up grades. Couriers are graded as bronze (beginner level), silver, gold, diamond and king (the highest level), similar to some popular online games. Another motivation to do well was the belief that the system might allocate them better orders if their grades were higher.

For example, they are Gold [grade], not like us, we're Bronze or Silver, there is quite a bit of difference. Imagine the system allocated six orders (to one courier), they might get places like hotels, or office buildings where the customers will come down and collect the orders. Whilst for someone like me [low grade], they may send me to climb six floors, or take the lift to the 22nd floor. You certainly cannot be as quick as them, because you have to climb up stairs, take lift, wait for lift etc. During peak hours, these take lots of time. (0517-takeaway)

App-based information & training – techno-resource

The apps or handheld terminals (HHT, which are dedicated devices for the apps) were considered an important source of information, guidance and training. The interviewees found app-based training useful with learning outcomes monitored, i.e. tested by a small quiz and they reported that it could also provide a source of digitalised organizational support. For example, an interviewee (0517-takeaway) mentioned there was an in-app resource page for counselling but also said it was probably more of a decoration and nobody used it. They mentioned certain in-app functions, such as recording phone calls with customers or requesting signature that could provide evidence for delivery and communications with customers (0524-parcel, 0529-takeaway). Another interviewee put it this way:

If there were problems with the delivery, and we followed the procedure (requested the customer to scan as a proof of delivery), this is a protection in itself. (0601-parcel)

Customer sovereignty

Customer sovereignty refers to service standard promoted by organizations in the service sectors that made customers believe that when they interact with service workers, they enjoy relational superiority and can assume the position of autonomous choice-maker (Korczynski & Evans, 2013). This is a norm in China's delivery sector, namely "the customer is God" (0607-parcel). Customer incivility can add a great amount of physical and emotional demands to couriers. It also means that when customers show genuine appreciation, it could become a rewarding experience and provide a boost in terms of optimism and resilience.

Customer incivility – Techno-overload

When customer sovereignty works against the couriers and leads to instances of customer abuse, it represents a major source of stress that can trigger strong emotional responses from the couriers. One takeaway courier (0510-takeaway) reported that a customer made a false complaint simply because one of his additional requests was not met. The background is that to improve customer experience, platforms offer extra and optional services. One of them is that customers can add items to the order that can be easily procured from the convenience store downstairs, i.e. a pack of cigarettes.

It was last winter, a snowy day. There were so many orders. This guy, he phoned me and asked me to add a fresh coconut to his food order. It was winter and snowing. There was no way to buy a coconut, so I declined. He then asked me to leave his food order at the reception, which was normally handed over to him in person. Later he phoned me to say the food was missing and he would make a complaint. I got really angry. The thing is he was smacking his lips when talking to me^a. He obviously had the food but claimed it was lost. I was so angry. The customer service called me later asking why my attitude was bad. I explained and said I'm willing to meet the customer and call the police right there, and ask the police to check the CCTV. Let's see who took the food! The customer service said they understood the situation. At the end, I did not get a fine. I took that afternoon off... I mean the food wasn't a big deal, but I felt like how could he do this? It's really upsetting. It's bullying.

^a Talking while smacking lips is a Chinese expression often used to show satisfaction after a meal.

The extra service is optional. It contributed to the interviewee's physical job demand and it should be at his discretion whether to fulfil it or not. However, the belief in customer sovereignty that is created by the platform for marketing purposes can lead to customer disappointment if such additional requests are not accepted (Korczynski & Evans, 2013). Couriers have to put in additional emotional labour to deal with such disappointment and often fail regardless of their efforts (Wharton, 2009). The interviewee described the disruptive effects and the physical and emotional responses triggered by this event. He experienced not only an emotional roller coaster but also felt he was not able to continue working for the rest of the day.

For parcel couriers, it can be a challenge if the customer is not at their address to receive the parcel. Policies on how to deal with this vary in different companies. Three interviewees were full-time employees of relatively big delivery companies that advertised their service as prime quality. Thus, company policy required them to contact the customer on the day to agree a delivery time slot and they could only leave parcels in a locker or a safe place with the customer's agreement. Otherwise, they must hand over the parcel to the recipient. This demands effective communication from both sides, but the customers may not always respond in time, which can create additional stress for the couriers. An extreme case was told by one of the parcel couriers (0607-parcel) when miscommunication led to aggressive customer behaviour.

When I first started I was delivering to Beijing Hutongs.^b There were many households live in a Hutong [and you would not know exactly which door the recipient lives behind]. On the first attempt, the customer wouldn't pick up the phone. I shouted a few times in the courtyard and no one answered. I then left. He phoned back after I had left for a while and said he was busy then. We made an appointment for the next day. The next day I got there at the agreed time, again phoning and shouting but no answer. The same happened three times in a row. On the third time, when he phoned me back after I left, I said, 'Bro, this was the time we agreed.' He then started cursing me. I was provoked and started arguing... I returned to the depot and asked the parcel to be delivered by a colleague on the

^b Traditional courtyard houses

fourth day to avoid meeting the customer face to face. I said we might get into a fight if we saw each other... When my colleague arrived the address, the customer came out with a knife and chased him. The police was called and the site manager got involved to investigate. He then arranged for me to apologise and buy presents for the customer. I was extremely upset that I had to apologise. I was so reluctant. But the site manager said if the customer made a complaint, I would be fined for ¥2000 by the company and fired. He suggested we should appease the customer and the presents didn't cost much... After that incidence, however customers cursed me, I'd never argue back.

Location tracking, one feature of the algorithmic management systems, can intensify the stressor for the app-based couriers by adding another layer of pressure for working even faster. An interviewee (0517-takeaway) shared this story.

Once I was delivering an order, the next customer saw me [location on the app]. I was like a few hundred meters away from him. He saw that I was not moving for like 5 or 6 minutes. But I was just delivering the order before his. He started phoning and rushing me, saying that I saw your location, why were you not moving? I said sorry I'd be quick. After 30 seconds, he phoned again, saying you need to hurry, you are not moving. I told him I'd be with him right away. After a few seconds, he phoned the third time and said he would make a complaint. The moment he hang up, I completed the other order. One minute, I was 300 meters away from him, it took me one minute to get to him. I drove so quickly, was not afraid of danger at all. I wanted to rush and worried I might get a complaint. One complaint then it's all wasted. When I handed the order to him, I sincerely apologized to him and said sorry. He took the order reluctantly and said sorry meant nothing. He then made a complaint.

Customer appreciation

When customer sovereignty becomes a norm among service workers, customer appreciation can go a long way to improve their work experiences. A takeaway interviewee (0529-takeaway) explained it well.

Whatever you do there always are challenges, but there are also lots of heart-warming experiences...I might cry when I talk about these. Once in a winter, it was particularly cold. I only just started [working as a courier] and could not find the address. I phoned the customer to tell her that I was struggling. She said it was okay and could come down to meet me. It was a six-floor building with no lift. And she brought with her a cup of hot water and gave it to me. The moment I drank it, I felt it was so sweet...One positive experience made me feel all the negatives disappeared.

Other customer appreciations that were mentioned included offering a bottle of cool water in summer or a cigarette (0509-parcel, 0524-parcel, 0528-takeaway). During the COVID-19 pandemic, many of the interviewees carried on working and delivered facemasks, medicine and supplies to hospitals. These experiences helped them to see the meaning and importance of their work. An experienced parcel courier (0529-parcel) talked about helping the Police to solve a crime when illegal contents were discovered in parcels. He said these experiences gave him “a strong sense of achievement”.

Economic precarity

The majority of Chinese couriers are migrant workers and the average level of education is not particularly high (Huang et al., 2021). The economic precarity means that they are generally highly responsive to the punitive or incentive measures set by the platforms or companies.

Penalties – Techno-overload

In addition to penalties due to loss of packages, late delivery or customer complaints, which have previously been reported in existing literature (Chan, 2021; Huang, 2022; Liu & Friedman, 2021), the interviewees reported many other situations when the couriers can be fined. These include cancelling orders, rejecting orders, clicked “Delivered” on the app before it was actually delivered, or not meeting dress code (uniform, helmet and food bag) etc. The fines were also considered to be disproportionately high in comparison to the delivery fees. For example, the delivery fee for one takeaway order was in the range of ¥3-8 while the fine for a bad customer review could be ¥50 and a customer complaint ¥500 or more (0525-taekaway). In addition to taking all sorts of actions, including reckless driving to avoid fines, some of them (0517-takeaway, 0525-takeaway, 0510-takeaway) reportedly repaid the customer part of the food bill in exchange for the customer dropping

complaints caused by minor issues, such as soup spilled or coriander gone yellow (due to the temperature in the food bag), as the fine for the complaint would cost more. Monitoring technologies appear to play a role in intensifying the stress associated with penalties as measuring delivery time by seconds or requesting photos in full uniform to be uploaded within minutes may not always be possible.

Bonus and awards

Most of the interviewees considered that the income level was reasonable and many reported that their income was higher than in their previous jobs. In addition, they appreciated that hard work is rewarded, for example, attendance bonus, workload and service quality related bonus, and weather subsidy (additional fees they receive when delivering in bad weathers). When asked whether it was a hardship to go out in bad weather, he replied, “*not at all, as long as I can see money in my account*” (0604-takeaway). Some also liked pay transparency and speed especially when payments came into his account the next day – this always cheered him up (0509-parcel).

Networked support

Networked support refers to support that arise through the workers' own collective actions or agency, as well as organised social networks initiated by the companies or platforms.

Worker networks

Networks such as those that have developed organically among the couriers can provide important sources of social support that can boost their personal resources such as optimism and the sense of self-efficacy. Many interviewees came to the city to do the job based on recommendations from their relatives or friends who were already working as couriers in the city. The relatives or friends would help them to settle in with the job and sometimes even shared accommodations. Naturally they became part of same workers' network.

We have a WeChat group. We chat every day, send messages during breaks. We eat together, start shifts together and come back together [to their shared accommodation]... There are all sorts of screenshots in our [WeChat] group, sometimes it's unit price [delivery fee goes up when they achieved

certain goals], sometime it's how much they made that day, all sorts screenshots, anyway, all sorts of show-off...we are all very good friends, came from the same home town. (0604-takeaway)

Some also reported that how they connected with the communities they serve, through which they found a sense of community based on fellow couriers as well as customers. When organizational support was deemed to be inadequate, especially when working in the gig mode, some interviewees reported that these personal social networks can play an important role in providing information, solutions, and support.

I can't leave this place [his delivery area] any more. We have known each other. We [his team] don't just deliver parcels, sometimes we helped customers to look after their kids, like a family. It's been a long time, I'm part of the community. It feels great. (0529-parcel)

The interviewees mentioned a range of things they would do if they felt unhappy or stressed, including social and recreational activities, taking time off, sleep or rest. Social and recreational activities with friends and colleagues were the most commonly reported stress-release methods.

Extended social controls – Techno-invasion

Organization initiated networks, such as WeChat groups set up by area managers or in-app chat tools, are supposed to be a source of organizational or social support; however, these were mainly described by our interviewees as an invasive, extended controlling mechanism. This was particularly so among the app-based crowd couriers. App-based chat functions allow the platforms or area managers to initiate calls and demand instant response to check upon the couriers in terms of non-compliance behaviour. Crowd courier interviewees (0510-takeaway, 0517-takeaway, 0518-takeaway, 0604-takeaway) reported that they hardly meet their area manager in-person. The main function of the group chat is to receive updates and information from the platforms. Several interviewees reported that they never received a response on any question or request posted in the chat function of the App. Furthermore, interviewees reported that they did not have any other means of contacting area managers, as the managers generally did not share their phone numbers with the couriers.

Organizational support – Techno-dominance (if lack of human support)

Organizational support mainly comes from human site managers and the customer service. Interviewees provided varying appraisal about the quality of any support. For example, on the one hand in the coconut case (customer incivility), the platform's customer service supported the courier and did not impose fines for that complaint. 0528-takeaway and 0529-takeaway were both specialised couriers and both expressed positive views about their site managers who appeared to be understanding and supportive in their description. On the other hand, in the Hutong case, the site manager urged the courier to apologise even though it was not his fault. In this case, neither the company or the site manger offered adequate support to protect the courier against customer abuse. For crowd couriers, although there was an area manager, it was difficult to obtain any support as area managers did not disclose their phone numbers and never responded to couriers requests or answered their questions posted in the group chat (0517-takeaway, 0525-takeaway, 0604-takeaway). They commonly used platforms' customer service to gain some support when faced with customer abuse, restaurants delays and other challenges at work. However, as delivery schedules were so tight, contacting customer service over the phone was considered time consuming and might cause further delay (0510-takeaway, 0517-takeaway, 0522-takeaway). Some couriers believed that customer service took commission from couriers' penalties and were prone to decisions that disadvantaged couriers (0525-takeaway)

Discussion

The main aim of this qualitative study was to obtain lived experiences from couriers in China and to understand the role of technostress as a potential risk factor for adverse health outcomes by carrying out a JD-R analysis. We identified the main work stressors and a range of techno-stressors relevant to the Chinese couriers and potential moderators. A new techno-stressor: **techno-dominance** was identified and defined as technology-induced worker vulnerability when labour relations and managerial functions traditionally fulfilled by humans are replaced by technology systems. It can be characterised as algorithmic controls, opaque system logic, extended social controls and lack of organizational support provided by human agents.

- A) **Algorithmic controls:** managerial algorithms dictate who get the job, and how the jobs should be completed, evaluated and paid, with limited interactions with the worker users.
- B) **Opaque system logic:** system logics remain opaque to worker users. As a result, workers engage with guessing, analysing and gaming the system in an attempt to make it work for them.
- C) **Extended social controls:** social media functions integrated within the app are used to further managerial controls.
- D) **Lack of organizational (human) support:** the difficulties encountered by app-based workers in obtaining support provided by human agents, who can genuinely understand the challenges faced with the workers

The finding of these characteristics are consistent with existing literature on the impact of data analytics, algorithmic systems and artificial intelligence (AI) that are used to replace human line management in the workplaces (Chen et al., 2022; Möhlmann et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the dominating effects were not fully captured by existing technostress or work psychology models (Borle, Reichel, & Voelter-Mahlknecht, 2021; Meijerink & Bondarouk, 2021; Rohwer et al., 2022). The gig economy is largely built on these technologies and is thriving. It is urgent and necessary to conceptualise a new techno-stressor for a more contemporary understanding of the most impacted sectors, e.g. the last-mile delivery in developing countries. For couriers, algorithmic controls are dominant (Kellogg et al., 2020). The identification of techno-dominance as a new techno-stressor should contribute to fill the gap and allow further research and understanding of structured information and power asymmetry and their consequences for health and wellbeing of workers.

Couriers in China are at the forefront of experiencing and coping with these new working conditions and hence provide a great starting point for investigating impacts of stressors on their health and wellbeing. Similar to other gig workers in the world, Chinese couriers have also tried to figure out what the decision making rules were and how they might benefit by following the logic of the system (McDonald et al., 2021; Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). Economic incentives, whether penalties or

rewards, appear to be highly effective behavioural nudges for this occupation due to Chinese couriers' multifaceted precarity. However, this could lead to burnout in the long-run and unsafe driving behaviour, even though they willingly accepted the challenges due to economic reasons (Davis & Hoyt, 2020). Workers' social networks are not limited to colleagues but extended into a much bigger social group who shared similar work and / or living experiences. These could potentially form the basis for collective actions such as strikes or boycotting certain platforms as described in the literature about solidarity among gig workers in multiple countries including China (Chen, 2018; Lei, 2021; Tassinari & Maccarrone, 2020).

Similar to technostress literature, we also found technology associated benefits (Tarafdar et al., 2017). They were categorised as techno-resource, including flexible hours, intelligent systems and app-based information & trainings. Gamification is a conditional personal resource and the conditions are high level of job skills and digital literacy. Another conditional resource we identified are organizational support and the conditions are the quality of the support. These lead to another key finding of the study: potential moderators for the job demands-stress relationships. If the couriers were highly skilled and had high level of digital literacy, gamification could become a source of motivation and improve job engagement and satisfaction. This finding is consistent with several other publications that studied antecedents of technostress (Ayyagari et al., 2011; Tarafdar et al., 2017). Similarly, support to boost personal resources may need to be customised for different groups. For example, younger participants in our study tend to see gamification as motivating and engaging whilst older participants expressed frustration. Perceived organizational support can moderate the relationship between job demands and poor mental health outcomes, such as burnout (Jabagi et al., 2020; Lin & Li, 2021; Yoon et al., 2021). Feedback from our interviewees about the organizational support was inconsistent. The crowd couriers who work strictly with algorithmic management with limited human support were generally negative about the support provided by the platform. A key proposition of JD-R theory is the moderating effect of job and personal resources on the relationship between job demands and adverse outcomes (Bakker et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2022). Future intervention studies may focus on boosting personal resources, such as job skills and digital literacy, and increase job

resources, such as provide quality organizational support, in order to mitigate the negative impact of techno-stressors.

Techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity and techno-dominance were found to intensify work stress among Chinese couriers. It is conceivable that the effects of job demands interact with each other (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), especially with the presence of techno-stressors. For example, van Woerkom et al. (2016) found that workload strengthened the positive relationship between emotional job demands and sickness absenteeism in a study of workers in a mental health care organisation, indicating that emotional demands may be more detrimental under conditions of high workload. Bearing this in mind, we identified the role of techno-stressors in several sub-themes. The impact of techno-overload was present in general (working conditions), customer incivility and penalties. Techno-dominance was found in extended social control and (lack of) organizational support. Techno-complexity was experienced by interviewees who could not win in gamification. Extended social controls was evidently enabled by technologies that were invading couriers' personal lives.

The JD-R theory as a heuristic and flexible conceptual model provided a useful approach for this study (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). We used it as a framework for the interviews as well as data analysis.

Limitations and future research

This was an explorative study based on a relatively small number of interviews. The understanding may be nuanced and insightful about Chinese couriers, whereas it is unclear to what extent the findings are generalizable to other countries. However, the results appear to be broadly inline with existing sociology and psychology literature of this topic.. Future research can continue to develop the model and apply it to research designed with more predictive power.

Conclusions

In conclusion, courier jobs in the gig economy can be stressful involving multiple stressors. In addition to the risk factors traditionally attributed to this occupation, we propose that technostress can

be a dominant risk factor among app-based workers. However, the impact of these risk factors may differ greatly depending on design features of the algorithm systems and on the personality and socio-demographic background of the gig workers. It is important for future developers of to consider these factors and involve worker users in the design process. Theoretically, the study has the potential to contribute to the JD-R theory empirically by analyzing the role of technology as job demands, job resources and personal resources in the context of courier occupation that is an integral part of the global gig economy. It may also contribute to the technostress literature or information system research by identifying existing and emerging techno-stressors in this work context. Furthermore, it may contribute to both theories by informing future quantitative research the potential interactive effects between the stressors and possible moderators.

References

- Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological Antecedents and Implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 831-858. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41409963>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job Resources Buffer the Impact of Job Demands on Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), 170-180. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170>
- Bondanini, G., Giorgi, G., Ariza-Montes, A., Vega-Muñoz, A., & Andreucci-Annunziata, P. (2020). Technostress Dark Side of Technology in the Workplace: A Scientometric Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 8013. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/21/8013>
- Borle, P., Reichel, K., Niebuhr, F., & Voelter-Mahlknecht, S. (2021). How are techno-stressors associated with mental health and work outcomes? A systematic review of occupational exposure to information and communication technologies within the technostress model [Review]. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(16) (no pagination)(8673). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168673>
- Borle, P., Reichel, K., & Voelter-Mahlknecht, S. (2021). Is There a Sampling Bias in Research on Work-Related Technostress? A Systematic Review of Occupational Exposure to Technostress and the Role of Socioeconomic Position. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 2071. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/4/2071>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Castleberry, A., & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 10(6), 807-815. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019>
- Chan, J. W.-I. (2021). Hunger for profit: how food delivery platforms manage couriers in China. *Sociologies*, 23(57), 58-82.

- Chen, J. Y. (2018). Thrown under the bus and outrunning it! The logic of Didi and taxi drivers' labour and activism in the on-demand economy. *New Media & Society*, 20(8), 2691-2711. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817729149>
- Chen, Z., Lan, X., Piao, J., Zhang, Y., & Li, Y. (2022). A Mixed-Methods Analysis of the Algorithm-Mediated Labor of Online Food Deliverers in China. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*,
- Davis, M. E., & Hoyt, E. (2020). A longitudinal study of piece rate and health: evidence and implications for workers in the US gig economy. *Public Health*, 180, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2019.10.021>
- Day, A., Paquet, S., Scott, N., & Hambley, L. (2012). Perceived Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Demands on Employee Outcomes: The Moderating Effect of Organizational ICT Support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(4), 473-491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029837>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (Fifth ed.). SAGE.
- Huang, H. (2022). Riders on the Storm: Amplified Platform Precarity and the Impact of COVID-19 on Online Food-delivery Drivers in China. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 31(135), 351-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2021.1966895>
- Huang, L., Hao, Z., Tian, Y., & Han, R. (2021). 新 · 从 · 人 · · · · 益保 · 2020 年度 · 研 · 告 (2020 annual research report on labour rights protection of new employment forms). B. Yilian.
- ILO. (2021). *World Employment and Social Outlook: The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work* (Print: 9789220319444[ISBN]
Web PDF: 9789220319413[ISBN]). (World Employment and Social Outlook, Issue. <https://ilo.org/infostories/Campaigns/WESO/World-Employment-Social-Outlook-Report-2021#introduction>
- Ivanova, M., Bronowicka, J., Kocher, E., & Degner, A. (2018). The App as a Boss? Control and Autonomy in Application-Based Management. <https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-euv/frontdoor/index/index/docId/388>
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:521-opus4-3889> (Arbeit | Grenze | Fluss - 2)
- Jabagi, N., Croteau, A.-M., & Audebrand, L. (2020). Perceived organizational support in the face of algorithmic management: a conceptual model. *Proceedings of the 53rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*,
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Korczyński, M., & Evans, C. (2013). Customer abuse to service workers: an analysis of its social creation within the service economy. *Work, employment and society*, 27(5), 768-784. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017012468501>
- La Torre, G., Esposito, A., Sciarra, I., & Chiappetta, M. (2019). Definition, symptoms and risk of techno-stress: a systematic review. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 92(1), 13-35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-018-1352-1>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer publishing company.
- Lei, Y.-W. (2021). Delivering Solidarity: Platform Architecture and Collective Contention in China's Platform Economy. *American Sociological Review*, 86(2), 279-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122420979980>
- Lin, Y. 林., & Li, Y. 李. (2021). 心理 · 本 · · · · 支持感在 · · · · 与 · 度 · · · · 系中的作用-基于北京地区外 · · 手的 · · (The Role of Psychological Capital and Organizational Support in the Relationship between Occupational Stress and Overwork-Based on a Survey

- of Take-out Riders in Beijing) . *中国流通* . (China Business And Market) , 35(4), 116-126. <https://doi.org/doi> : 10.14089/j.cnki.cn11-3664/f.2021.04.011
- Liu, C., & Friedman, E. (2021). Resistance under the Radar: Organization of Work and Collective Action in China's Food Delivery Industry. *The China Journal*, 86, 68-89. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714292>
- Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2021). The duality of algorithmic management: Toward a research agenda on HRM algorithms, autonomy and value creation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 100876. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100876>
- Möhlmann, M., Zalmanson, L., Henfridsson, O., & Gregory, R. W. (2021). Algorithmic Management of Work on Online Labor Platforms: When Matching Meets Control [Article]. *MIS Quarterly*, 45(4), 1999-2022. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/15333>
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(4), 281-307. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp045oa>
- Prabowo, R., Suchahyo, Y. G., Gandhi, A., & Ruldeviyani, Y. (2019, 12-13 Oct. 2019). Does Gamification Motivate Gig Workers? A Critical Issue in Ride-Sharing Industries. 2019 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and information Systems (ICACSIS),
- Reddy, P., Sharma, B., & Chaudhary, K. (2020). Digital Literacy: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Technoethics (IJT)*, 11(2), 65-94. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJT.20200701.oa1>
- Richardson, K. M. (2017). Managing Employee Stress and Wellness in the New Millennium. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 423-428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000066>
- Roczniewska, M., Smoktunowicz, E., Calcagni, C. C., von Thiele Schwarz, U., Hasson, H., & Richter, A. (2022). Beyond the individual: A systematic review of the effects of unit-level demands and resources on employee productivity, health, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(2), 240-257. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000311>
- Rohwer, E., Flöther, J.-C., Harth, V., & Mache, S. (2022). Overcoming the "Dark Side" of Technology-A Scoping Review on Preventing and Coping with Work-Related Technostress. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(6), 3625. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063625>
- Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland*. University of California Press.
- Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers *International Journal of Communication Systems*, 10(27). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2686227>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 43-68).
- Sun, P., Yujie Chen, J., & Rani, U. (2021). From Flexible Labour to 'Sticky Labour': A Tracking Study of Workers in the Food-Delivery Platform Economy of China. *Work, employment and society, August 2021* 09500170211021570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211021570>
- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2017). The technostress trifecta - techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6-42. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12169>
- Tassinari, A., & Maccarrone, V. (2020). Riders on the Storm: Workplace Solidarity among Gig Economy Couriers in Italy and the UK. *Work, employment and society*, 34(1), 35-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019862954>
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349-357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>
- van Woerkom, M., Bakker, A. B., & Nishii, L. H. (2016). Accumulative Job Demands and Support for Strength Use: Fine-Tuning the Job Demands-Resources Model Using Conservation of Resources Theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(1), 141-150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000033>

- Wei, H., Daniels, S., Whitfield, C. A., Han, Y., Denning, D. W., Hall, I., . . . van Tongeren, M. (2022). Agility and Sustainability: A Qualitative Evaluation of COVID-19 Non-pharmaceutical Interventions in the UK Logistics Sector [Original Research]. *Frontiers in public health*, *10*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.864506>
- Wharton, A. S. (2009). The Sociology of Emotional Labor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *35*(1), 147-165. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115944>
- Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. Guilford publications.
- Yoon, K. H., Lee, C. Y., & Peng, N. L. (2021). Burnout and Work Engagement Among Dispatch Workers in Courier Service Organizations. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, *21*(1).
- Zhang, C., Cheung, S. P., & Huang, C. (2022). Job Demands and Resources, Mindfulness, and Burnout Among Delivery Drivers in China [Original Research]. *Frontiers in psychology*, *13*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.792254>
- Zhou, I. (2020). *Digital Labour Platforms and Labour Protection in China*. I. Geneva.