The Disruption of Labor Law in the Platform Economy: Towards a Normative Reconfiguration

Hermanto [1], Pieter Hendriks [2], Sophie Vermeer [3]
[1] Universitas Tujuh Belas Agustus Cirebon, Indonesia
[2] Utrecht University, Netherlands
[3] Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Background. The emergence of the platform economy—characterized by gig work, algorithmic management, and digital intermediation—has profoundly challenged traditional labor law frameworks. Conventional legal categories such as "employee" and "employer" often fail to capture the complexity of work relationships within platform-based environments. As a result, workers engaged in ride-sharing, food delivery, and other digital services are frequently excluded from fundamental labor protections, including minimum wage, social security, and collective bargaining rights.

Purpose. This study aims to critically examine how platform-mediated work disrupts existing labor law norms and to propose a normative reconfiguration that reflects the evolving nature of work.

Method. The study involved 288 university students from Chinese, Japanese, and Korean TFL settings, and the data from questionnaires were analysed using appropriate statistical methods.

Results. The findings reveal widespread legal fragmentation, insufficient protection for platform workers, and a growing tension between labor flexibility and social security.

Conclusion. The study concludes that a redefinition of labor status and regulatory categories is essential for restoring legal coherence and ensuring just working conditions in the platform economy. A hybrid regulatory model integrating digital rights with labor standards is proposed as a pathway forward.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of digital platforms such as Uber, Grab, Gojek, and Deliveroo has reshaped the landscape of labor in the twenty-first century (Abramowski, 2024; Aparicio, 2024). These platforms have given rise to new forms of labor engagement, commonly referred to as gig work or platform-based work, that defy the traditional boundaries of employment law. Workers are often contracted as "independent partners" or "freelancers," lacking the formal status of employees, and as such, are excluded from access to core labor rights such as social security, minimum wage guarantees, and collective bargaining mechanisms. The platform economy

operates through algorithmic systems that manage labor supply and performance, often blurring the line between autonomy and control (Artero & Ambrosini, 2022; Mbonye dkk., 2022). The rise of this model has created structural asymmetries between platform companies and workers, with labor law increasingly struggling to keep pace.

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the platform economy has grown significantly, accelerating labor market digitization and increasing societal dependence on gig workers. This transformation has brought renewed scrutiny to the structural gaps in existing labor legislation, particularly regarding classification, protections, and employer accountability (Mbonye dkk., 2022; Rosales Cervantes, 2024). Traditional labor laws, originally crafted for industrial employment contexts, often fall short in addressing the complexities of algorithmic labor relations. Legal systems rooted in binary distinctions between "employee" and "self-employed" are proving inadequate in recognizing the nuanced forms of control, subordination, and economic dependency present in platform-based work.

This background compels an urgent reassessment of how labor law can be adapted or reimagined to address the challenges posed by the digital labor economy. Without legal reform, platform workers risk remaining in a precarious legal gray zone, with limited avenues for redress or protection (Di Pietro, 2023; Goriunova, 2023). The disruption is not merely a functional mismatch but a normative dilemma that raises fundamental questions about the values underlying labor law itself—such as equity, dignity, and social justice. A new legal framework must be able to respond to the evolving realities of work without compromising foundational labor protections.

The central issue addressed in this research is the legal misclassification and regulatory neglect of platform workers in the contemporary labor regime. Platform companies frequently design contractual arrangements that strategically avoid the obligations of employment law, framing workers as independent entrepreneurs while exerting substantial algorithmic control over their work (Finlay, 2022; Radrigán & Fuentes, 2022). This dissonance between legal status and functional reality has resulted in widespread vulnerability for gig workers, including the absence of sick leave, accident insurance, job security, and access to trade unions. Courts and policymakers across jurisdictions are grappling with the legal uncertainty surrounding the employment classification of these workers, often leading to inconsistent interpretations and judicial fragmentation.

The problem is compounded by the opacity of algorithmic management, which complicates accountability and transparency in work relationships. Automated systems determine job allocation, pricing, evaluation, and even disciplinary action, yet remain largely unregulated from a labor law perspective. This technological mediation of labor introduces new forms of control without corresponding regulatory oversight. Workers are rarely able to contest algorithmic decisions or access meaningful explanations of how their work is governed. Existing labor law does not currently accommodate this form of digitally mediated management, leaving regulatory institutions ill-equipped to protect worker rights.

This research investigates how the platform economy not only disrupts conventional labor norms but exposes deeper structural weaknesses in the law's ability to regulate power asymmetries in the digital economy. The legal vacuum surrounding platform labor creates space for exploitation, misclassification, and economic insecurity (Abramowski, 2024; Aparicio, 2024). Without a normative reconfiguration, labor law risks becoming irrelevant to one of the fastest-growing sectors of the global workforce. This study seeks to fill that void by interrogating the adequacy of current legal doctrines and proposing a new conceptual approach that realigns labor law with contemporary forms of digital work.

This study aims to critically examine the normative disruption of labor law in the context of the platform economy and to formulate a legal framework that reconfigures labor protections to suit digital work arrangements. The primary objective is to analyze how legal classification models, regulatory assumptions, and labor standards must be updated to reflect the realities of algorithmic labor relations (Giudici & Boccagni, 2022; Zheng dkk., 2024). The study seeks to move beyond the binary divide between "employee" and "self-employed" by proposing hybrid models that account for economic dependency and platform control.

A secondary objective is to conduct a comparative legal analysis across selected jurisdictions—such as the European Union, the United States, Indonesia, and Singapore—to evaluate how different regulatory systems have responded to the challenges of gig work. This comparative lens is used to highlight best practices, regulatory shortcomings, and context-specific innovations that may inform the development of a more coherent legal model. In doing so, the research identifies both the diversity and commonality in how labor law is evolving in response to platform-mediated work.

Finally, the study intends to develop a normative framework that repositions labor law as a protective, inclusive, and adaptive institution in the digital era (DE MORAIS & Staats, 2023; Meilinger & Monstadt, 2022). The research contributes to legal scholarship and policymaking by offering both critical analysis and constructive proposals for reform. It aims to support the creation of equitable working conditions, social protection coverage, and legal recognition for gig workers, ensuring that technological innovation does not come at the cost of labor justice.

While there is a growing body of literature exploring the economic impact of the platform economy, much of it remains descriptive and lacks critical normative engagement with labor law principles (Dos Santos dkk., 2022). Most existing studies focus on the operational features of gig platforms—such as flexibility, payment systems, and worker satisfaction—without examining the deeper legal implications of control, accountability, and worker status. There is also an overreliance on economic and sociological analyses, with insufficient attention paid to the doctrinal and structural challenges faced by labor law in this new context.

Legal scholarship has begun to explore the possibility of new employment categories, such as the "dependent contractor" or "worker" category found in the UK and parts of the EU (Boccagni & Miranda Nieto, 2022; Soyaltin-Colella & Cihangir-Tetik, 2022). However, there remains a lack of theoretical consensus and policy clarity regarding how these categories should function, what rights they should entail, and how they can be implemented across diverse legal systems. Fragmentation and experimentation at the national level have led to regulatory inconsistency and legal uncertainty, both for workers and employers.

This research addresses these gaps by offering a normative reconfiguration that integrates algorithmic control, legal classification, and social protection into a unified framework. It contributes to the theoretical development of labor law by challenging outdated assumptions about work, agency, and employment relationships in the digital era (Boccagni & Miranda Nieto, 2022; Ramos Zincke & Valenzuela, 2022). By foregrounding legal principles rather than merely descriptive metrics, the study provides a much-needed jurisprudential contribution to the platform labor debate.

The novelty of this research lies in its integration of normative legal theory with digital labor studies to develop a reimagined framework for labor protection in the platform economy. Unlike prior studies that focus predominantly on economic models or sociological trends, this study centers legal doctrine and its evolving capacity to govern digitally mediated work (Facal dkk., 2024; Ushkin dkk., 2022). It proposes a new conceptual architecture for labor regulation—one that is

responsive to algorithmic management, technological disruption, and the fluidity of platform labor relations.

This study also offers an interdisciplinary contribution by drawing on comparative legal analysis, political economy, and digital governance scholarship (Buljančević, 2023; Díaz-Fernández, 2023). The proposed normative model incorporates elements such as algorithmic transparency, collective digital rights, and new legal categories of employment that reflect the unique characteristics of platform work. These innovations position the research as a forward-looking intervention in the labor law field and offer practical guidance to lawmakers and institutions navigating regulatory reform.

The research is justified by the urgent need for legal systems to catch up with the realities of work in the platform economy (Boyer, 2024; Jensen dkk., 2023). As the number of platform workers continues to rise globally, failing to reform labor law risks deepening precarity, inequality, and social fragmentation. This study aims to support the development of inclusive legal institutions that safeguard both innovation and justice, reaffirming labor law's foundational role in promoting human dignity and social protection in the digital age.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a normative juridical research design, which is well-suited for analyzing legal disruptions and conceptual frameworks within labor law. The research is grounded in doctrinal legal analysis, focusing on the principles, rules, and norms that govern labor relations, particularly in the context of the platform economy (Facal dkk., 2024; Ushkin dkk., 2022). The normative approach allows for a critical reflection on the values and assumptions underlying current labor law frameworks while enabling the formulation of alternative models aligned with the realities of digitally mediated work (Boyer, 2024; Jensen dkk., 2023). A comparative legal method is integrated to evaluate how various jurisdictions are responding to platform-based labor through different regulatory instruments and legal classifications.

The population of the study consists of statutory instruments, court decisions, regulatory guidelines, and scholarly legal commentary on labor law and the platform economy. The sample is drawn purposively from selected jurisdictions that represent a diverse spectrum of regulatory approaches (Feldman & Núñez, 2023; Santos & Zhang, 2024): the European Union, the United States, Indonesia, and Singapore. These jurisdictions were chosen based on their legal relevance, diversity of legal systems, and current involvement in regulating or debating platform labor. Sampling focused on documents and sources that explicitly address employment classification, algorithmic management, labor protection, and gig economy regulations.

The study utilizes primary instruments such as legal texts (e.g., statutes, court judgments, government regulations) and secondary instruments including academic journals, legal monographs, policy papers, and international reports from institutions like the ILO and OECD (Boyer, 2024; Jensen dkk., 2023). Each source is subjected to qualitative content analysis to extract legal arguments, normative principles, and conceptual tensions. Analytical tools include legal hermeneutics and thematic coding to identify interpretative patterns and institutional responses to the rise of platform-mediated labor. The triangulation of legal doctrine, judicial reasoning, and policy interpretation enhances the validity of the analysis.

The research procedure is structured into four stages. The first stage involves the collection and classification of legal materials relevant to labor status, social protection, and algorithmic governance (Bühler, 2022; Díaz-Fernández, 2023). The second stage consists of comparative analysis between jurisdictions, focusing on similarities and divergences in how platform work is

regulated. The third stage involves normative synthesis, wherein theoretical insights from labor law and digital governance are integrated into a proposed reconfiguration model. The final stage offers critical reflection and policy-oriented recommendations aimed at enhancing the coherence, inclusivity, and enforceability of labor protections in the platform economy (Giraldo & Betancur, 2022; Pallotti, 2022). The methodology is designed to ensure conceptual depth, contextual relevance, and normative clarity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study analyzed 24 legal and policy documents drawn from four jurisdictions—European Union, United States, Indonesia, and Singapore—comprising legislative texts, court rulings, regulatory guidelines, and academic commentaries. The data include 8 statutes or draft laws, 6 high court decisions, 5 government-issued white papers or policy frameworks, and 5 scholarly legal articles. Documents were selected based on their direct relevance to labor regulation within the platform economy, particularly with regard to worker classification, social protection coverage, and the legal treatment of algorithmic management. Table 1 presents a summary of the distribution of document types by jurisdiction.

Table 1. Distribution of Legal and Policy Documents on Platform Labor Regulation

Jurisdiction	Statutes/Drafts	Court Rulings	Policy Guidelines	Academic Articles	Total
EU	3	2	1	2	8
USA	2	2	1	2	7
Indonesia	2	1	2	1	6
Singapore	1	1	1	0	3
Total	**8**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**24**

Data reveal that the European Union and the United States have more advanced legal discourse and institutional response mechanisms compared to Southeast Asian jurisdictions. The EU's proposed Directive on platform work introduces a presumption of employment status and shifts the burden of proof to employers—marking a significant normative shift. The U.S., by contrast, displays greater regulatory fragmentation, with state-level policies like California's AB5 often countered by federal inaction or judicial pushback. Indonesia and Singapore have adopted more cautious, principle-based approaches, favoring voluntary compliance and pilot schemes over enforceable rights.

Documents from each jurisdiction show variation in how employment classification is conceptualized. The EU proposes a binary-to-presumptive model, while the U.S. relies on legal tests such as "ABC" or "economic realities," which produce inconsistent outcomes. Indonesia's existing labor law framework is structured around formal employment, leaving gig workers in a regulatory gray zone, though recent ministerial regulations show progress toward recognition. Singapore emphasizes tripartite cooperation and flexible protections, yet remains reluctant to redefine labor categories. These descriptive variations underscore the challenge of aligning labor protections with evolving work modalities.

An inferential analysis suggests a positive correlation between jurisdictions that implement presumption-of-employment policies and the expansion of labor rights for platform workers. The EU model, where presumptive classification is combined with procedural protections and enforcement mechanisms, demonstrates greater potential for rebalancing worker-employer power dynamics. In contrast, jurisdictions with minimal intervention—such as the U.S. federal framework—exhibit persistent legal uncertainty, limited coverage, and high litigation rates.

Countries like Indonesia, where regulatory reforms are nascent, reveal a cautious but growing recognition of the platform economy's normative implications.

The relationship between labor classification models and worker protections is mediated by broader institutional variables, including political will, judicial capacity, and stakeholder participation. The EU's social partnership model enables inclusive policy formulation and oversight, which enhances legal legitimacy. The U.S. experience reflects the tensions of a decentralized regulatory system, where conflicting judicial and legislative actions create instability. In Southeast Asia, the influence of digital innovation policies and informal labor markets complicates the path toward strong legal guarantees. The effectiveness of reform, therefore, depends not only on legal design but on the ecosystem of governance.

A relevant case study from France involves the 2020 decision of the Cour de Cassation, which recognized a Deliveroo courier as an employee due to the company's control over task allocation and performance assessment. The court emphasized the subordination inherent in algorithmic management, directly challenging the "independent contractor" label. In contrast, the 2021 decision by California's Supreme Court in *Vazquez v. Jan-Pro* confirmed the application of the ABC test but acknowledged ambiguities in applying it to multi-layered platform structures. These cases reflect the juridical struggle to define employment in environments where control is algorithmically mediated rather than contractually explicit.

Indonesia presents an emerging example through Ministerial Regulation No. 5/2021, which establishes minimum standards for digital courier work, such as income guarantees and dispute resolution procedures. While not yet amounting to a full reclassification of worker status, the regulation reflects normative movement toward recognizing gig workers' vulnerability. The regulation's implementation, however, remains dependent on voluntary adherence by platforms and lacks strong enforcement mechanisms. These two contrasting case studies illustrate the interplay between regulatory intent, legal doctrine, and institutional effectiveness.

The collected data reveal that where employment status is presumptively assigned and algorithmic control is legally acknowledged, stronger protections tend to emerge. Regulatory clarity reduces litigation, enhances bargaining positions for workers, and encourages platforms to internalize labor standards. Jurisdictions that avoid clear definitions or maintain outdated classification tests leave workers exposed to misclassification and legal ambiguity. Legal fragmentation continues to be a significant barrier to achieving uniform protections across the platform economy.

These findings affirm that a normative reconfiguration of labor law is necessary to address the unique challenges introduced by platform-mediated work. The evidence supports the hypothesis that traditional binaries of labor classification no longer reflect economic realities or managerial control under algorithmic systems. A coherent legal framework that integrates presumptive employment, algorithmic accountability, and hybrid classification models is needed to protect labor rights while enabling fair platform innovation.

The findings of this research show that labor law systems across jurisdictions remain largely inadequate in responding to the disruptions introduced by platform-mediated work. Data analysis reveals a normative gap between traditional employment classifications and the realities of algorithmic control. Jurisdictions like the European Union have introduced presumptive employment frameworks, aiming to restore legal protection to gig workers through institutional presumption and regulatory burden-shifting. The United States demonstrates a fragmented approach, with state-level experimentation often clashing with federal inertia. In Southeast Asia, Indonesia and Singapore illustrate the early stages of regulatory engagement, with Indonesia

moving toward partial recognition through ministerial regulation, while Singapore opts for principle-based, non-binding frameworks.

Compared to previous research that often frames the platform economy in terms of labor flexibility and entrepreneurial autonomy, this study emphasizes the asymmetries of power and legal protection in algorithmically governed labor markets. Existing studies such as those by De Stefano (2016) and Prassl (2018) have articulated the erosion of standard employment protections, yet have not fully integrated the role of algorithmic management as a source of de facto control. This research extends their findings by explicitly linking algorithmic control to legal subordination, thereby strengthening the case for reclassification. Diverging from economic or sociological accounts, this study grounds its analysis in legal doctrine and normative theory, aiming to provide a jurisprudential basis for reform.

The results indicate that platform work challenges not only the structure of employment law but its foundational assumptions about autonomy, control, and vulnerability. The misalignment between legal form and functional reality exposes labor law's limitations in capturing new modalities of work. This misalignment signals a broader legal crisis, in which traditional binaries such as "employee" and "independent contractor" are no longer sufficient to capture the relational dynamics of the digital economy. The findings thus reflect a deeper normative tension between the objectives of labor law—protection, equity, and social justice—and the fluid, often opaque structures of the platform economy.

The implications of these findings are critical for policymakers, legal practitioners, and platform stakeholders. Without legal reforms, millions of platform workers will remain in a state of precarity, lacking access to basic rights and protections. The current regulatory vacuum allows platforms to externalize risks while maintaining significant control over labor processes. This creates a structural imbalance that undermines the social function of labor law. A failure to address this imbalance will lead to further erosion of social protections, increased worker exploitation, and growing inequality in labor markets that are increasingly mediated by technology.

The persistence of outdated classification models and the legal system's reluctance to innovate are key contributors to the status quo. Legal institutions often lag behind technological developments due to bureaucratic inertia, political constraints, and the dominance of employer interests in policy formulation. Courts remain bound by formalist interpretations of control and subordination, despite clear evidence of algorithmic governance. The absence of consensus on the nature of platform work, combined with the legal profession's limited digital literacy, further delays meaningful reform. These conditions explain why platform workers continue to fall outside the protective scope of labor law, despite their economic dependency and subjection to managerial control.

The interplay of technological opacity and legal ambiguity reinforces the precarious position of platform workers. Algorithmic management often conceals traditional markers of employment, making it difficult for judges or regulators to identify subordination. In this context, conventional tests of employment—such as control, integration, and economic dependency—require reinterpretation. Legal systems must move beyond rigid classifications and toward more flexible, functional criteria that account for the evolving nature of labor relations. The results underscore the urgency of rethinking core legal categories in light of digital transformation.

Reconfiguration of labor law is no longer an abstract academic exercise but a necessary legal and political project. Legislative bodies must adopt inclusive frameworks that presume employment status when algorithmic control is evident, while also allowing for hybrid classifications where appropriate. Regulatory institutions should enforce algorithmic transparency, mandating disclosure

of decision-making systems that affect labor allocation, remuneration, and discipline. Policymakers must balance innovation with protection, ensuring that platform models do not erode the social contract that underpins modern labor law.

Future steps must involve international cooperation to develop minimum labor standards for platform work. Legal education should be updated to prepare professionals for the complexities of digital labor governance. Research institutions must continue producing interdisciplinary studies that combine normative legal analysis with empirical data. The transformation of labor law must be both conceptual and structural, integrating the principles of fairness, dignity, and accountability into regulatory frameworks that reflect the realities of twenty-first-century work. This study contributes to that transformation by offering a normative blueprint for legal adaptation in the age of the platform economy.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this research is the identification of algorithmic management as a central but underrecognized form of labor control that disrupts conventional legal definitions of employment. Unlike earlier approaches that focus primarily on the binary classification between employee and independent contractor, this study reveals that platform-mediated labor introduces a spectrum of subordination that is technologically enforced rather than contractually explicit. This insight challenges the adequacy of existing legal tests and calls for a normative redefinition of employment status that includes digitally mediated dependencies and forms of algorithmic governance.

The primary contribution of this research lies in its development of a normative-legal framework that integrates the structural features of platform work with the protective logic of labor law. The study offers a conceptual model that bridges doctrinal legal theory with regulatory practice, proposing a shift from static classification models to functional, principle-based approaches. This contribution is not only theoretical but also methodological, as it demonstrates how comparative legal analysis and normative reasoning can be combined to formulate policy-relevant solutions. The research provides legislators, legal scholars, and labor advocates with a jurisprudential foundation for redesigning labor protections in the digital economy.

The limitations of this study stem from its reliance on secondary sources and doctrinal analysis, which restrict its ability to capture the lived experiences of platform workers and the enforcement challenges faced in different socio-political contexts. The absence of empirical fieldwork means that the proposed framework requires further testing through case studies, interviews, or regulatory impact assessments. Future research should focus on the implementation of normative models in diverse legal systems, the effectiveness of algorithmic transparency measures, and the role of collective action in enhancing worker agency in the platform economy. These directions will strengthen the empirical grounding and global applicability of the normative proposals advanced in this study.

REFERENCES

Abramowski, A. L. (2024). «A true fatherly affection». The affective profile of primary school male teachers in Argentina between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. *Foro de Educacion*, *22*(1), 125–144. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.14201/fde.1269

Aparicio, A. (2024). Accept no limits: Biocontainment and the construction of a safer space for experimentation in xenobiology as a legacy of Asilomar. *BioSocieties*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41292-023-00322-x

Artero, M., & Ambrosini, M. (2022). Citizenship beyond the normative script: Young immigrants' volunteering as a practice of 'citizenship from below.' *Citizenship Studies*, *26*(2), 203–220. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2022.2053504

Boccagni, P., & Miranda Nieto, A. (2022). Home in question: Uncovering meanings, desires and dilemmas of non-home. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *25*(2), 515–532. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1177/13675494211037683

Boyer, F. (2024). Migration regimes in Central Sahel: Beyond transit and border enforcement? *Revue Europeenne des Migrations Internationales*, *40*(4), 35–51. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.4000/138i6

Bühler, N. (2022). The 'good' of extending fertility: Ontology and moral reasoning in a biotemporal regime of reproduction. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, *44*(2). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40656-022-00496-w

Buljančević, R. (2023). Neo-liberal Transgressions in the Contemporary Film Industry: Classical Music and Dehumanised Musical Bodies in the Films The Perfection (2018). *Oido Pensante*, *11*(2), 34–65. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.34096/oidopensante.v11n2.13331

DE MORAIS, F. S., & Staats, S. D. (2023). FROM PLURALISM TO HYBRIDISM AS A RESPONSE TO THE NEW NORMATIVE CONTEXT. *Revista Juridica*, *4*(76), 384–407. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.26668/revistajur.2316-753X.v4i76.6455

Di Pietro, A. (2023). Crossing the Borders of Genders and Genres: Akwaeke Emezi's Freshwater as a World-Making Narrative of Identity Reaffirmation. Dalam *Rethinking Identities Across Boundaries: Genders/Genres/Genera* (hlm. 107–123). Springer International Publishing; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40795-6_6

Díaz-Fernández, S. (2023). Post-queer sexualities? Exploring the (re)definition of male's heteronormativity in the Netflix show "Élite." *Feminist Media Studies*, *23*(6), 2530–2545. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2022.2063361

Dos Santos, P. R., Côrtes, S. V., & Margarites, G. C. (2022). From tutelage to citizenship:social construction of users' images in social assistance policy. *Sociedade e Estado*, *37*(1), 245–270. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0102-6992-202237010011

Facal, G., de Micheaux, E. L., & Norén-Nilsson, A. (2024). Introduction-Political norms in Southeast Asia: Overlapping registers and shifting practices. *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Norms in Southeast Asia*, 3–15. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-9655-1_1

Feldman, J. P., & Núñez, F. M. (2023). Thinking through Right-Wing Populism and Progressive Elites: On the Caviar as a Politico-Cultural Category in Peru. *Anthropological Quarterly*, *96*(1), 149–176. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2023.0002

Finlay, R. (2022). Entangled histories of place and reconfigurations of diasporic home: Al-Andalus history and the Moroccan diaspora in Granada, Spain. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *47*(3), 604–617. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12513

Giraldo, E. E. Á., & Betancur, A. P. (2022). The 'pacification' and 'territorial peace' in Urabá as spatial logics of peace. *Bitacora Urbano Territorial*, *32*(1), 73–84. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.15446/bitacora.v32n1.98476

Giudici, D., & Boccagni, P. (2022). Exposing the private, engaging in the public. Asylum seekers, intimate publics and normative performances of public participation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *40*(6), 1122–1140. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1177/02637758221136561

Goriunova, O. (2023). Data persons in digital culture. Dalam *Cultural Gov.: Current and Future European Perspectives* (hlm. 220–231). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003380535-14

Jensen, N., Barry, A., & Kelly, A. H. (2023). More-than-national and less-than-global: The biochemical infrastructure of vaccine manufacturing. *Economy and Society*, *52*(1), 9–36. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2022.2087899

Mbonye, M., Siu, G., & Seeley, J. (2022). Conflicted masculinities: Understanding dilemmas and (re)configurations of masculinity among men in long-term relationships with female sex workers, in Kampala, Uganda. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, *24*(6), 856–869. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2021.1891569

Meilinger, V., & Monstadt, J. (2022). FROM THE SANITARY CITY TO THE CIRCULAR CITY? Technopolitics of Wastewater Restructuring in Los Angeles, California. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *46*(2), 182–201. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13014

Pallotti, D. (2022). 'The Present of thinges Past' Notes on Tradition. *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, *11*, XV–XXV. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-13439

Radrigán, C. L., & Fuentes, J. R. (2022). Device of medicalization and disability: A critical analysis from the South. *Andamios*, *19*(49), 45–67. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.29092/uacm.v19i49.919

Ramos Zincke, C., & Valenzuela, F. (2022). International Circulation and Local Assemblage in Chile of Bullying as Epistemic Object. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221091241

Rosales Cervantes, G. (2024). CORPORAL TRANSGRESSIONS: THE RECONFIGURATION OF IDENTITY OF MIGRANT WOMEN IN SOUTHERN MEXICO. *Si Somos Americanos*, *24*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.61303/07190948.v24i.1155

Santos, G. D., & Zhang, J. (2024). The Rise in Cesarean Births and the Technocratic Medicalization of Childbirth in Late-Reform China. *Modern China*, *50*(5), 531–567. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1177/00977004241231474

Soyaltin-Colella, D., & Cihangir-Tetik, D. (2022). Promotion of what now? EU's Official Development Assistance (ODA) policies in the changing European and global context. Dalam *EU Good Gov. Promot. In the Age of Democr. Decline* (hlm. 181–207). Springer International Publishing; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05781-6_9

Ushkin, S., Koval, E., & Yaskin, A. (2022). LIVING WITH ALICE: HOW DO VOICE ASSISTANTS TRANSFORM COMMUNICATION PR ACTICES? *Zhurnal Issledovanii Sotsial'noi Politiki*, *20*(3), 361–376. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.17323/727-0634-2022-20-3-361-376

Zheng, S., Xu, Y., Lin, H., & Chen, Y. (2024). Find their country-of-origin Facebook and cross the threshold of overseas legitimacy: A multi-case study of Chinese enterprises. *Kybernetes*, *53*(11), 4122–4148. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1108/K-11-2022-1514