

Review

# An Analysis of Labor Dispute Resolution Mechanisms for Gig Economy Workers

Yang Liu <sup>1,\*</sup><sup>1</sup> Heze University, Heze, China

\* Correspondence: Yang Liu, Heze University, Heze, China

**Abstract:** The gig economy has translated labor markets, thereby presenting unique challenges and opportunities for workers and employers. This review paper psychoanalyzes the labor dispute resolution mechanisms for gig economy workers, focusing on their effectiveness, availability, and adaptability to the nature of gig work. The composition begins with an overview of labor relations and the emergence of the gig economy, highlighting key developments that have shaped current practice. Core themes such as arbitration, mediation, and bargaining are explored in depth, along with the diligence and effectiveness in resolving disputes for gig workers. Identifying challenges such as power imbalances and sound ambiguity that may hinder honest settlement, the paper compares these mechanisms. Considering possible reforms and foundations that could heighten dispute resolution for gig workers, their rights and interests are adequately protected, successful perspectives are discussed. Finally, this psychoanalysis points to bring to the ongoing discourse on labor rights in the gig economy, thereby allowing perceptiveness into how existing models can be improved to comfortably serve this farm section of the hands.

**Keywords:** gig economy; workers' rights; mediation; arbitration

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Context of the Gig Economy

The gig economy predictably represents a primal change in labor market organization. Characterized by short-term, pliant work arrangements arbitrated through digital channels rather than traditional employer-employee relationships. To doer in this sphere, usually referred as gig workers, hence occupy in labor-based or project-based use across diverse industries admit conveyance, delivery. Freelance services, and on-need confinement. Over the decade [1]. This economical model has experienced exponential increase [2, 3]. Get by technical advancement, consumer demand for widget. And organizational drivers for workforce flexibility [4]. The proliferation of digital channels connect workers with clients has created new opportunities for labor market participation while engendering substantial challenges regarding worker protections [2, 5]. Income stability, hence and dispute resolution mechanisms. Understanding the characteristics and deduction of gig work is for analyze the sufficiency of subsist labor dispute resolution frameworks designed primarily for employment contexts.

### 1.2. Importance of Labor Dispute Resolution

Efficient labor dispute resolution mechanisms fundamentally are key to protecting the rights and pursuit of gig economy workers who operate outside employment frameworks [3, 6]. The gig economy's construction and preponderance of contractor classifications create substantial vulnerabilities for actors resort against unjust discourse, wage disputes, or dangerous working conditions. Include prohibitive toll, information asymmetries. And power imbalances with platform operators, without robust dispute resolution pathways, workers confront substantive barriers to access justice [2, 7]. Prove, diaphanous, and just mechanism for direct labor grievances is consequently

Received: 17 October 2025  
Revised: 07 December 2025  
Accepted: 21 December 2025  
Published: 26 December 2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

crucial for guaranteeing better labor practices. Preserve worker dignity, and nurture sustainable maturation within the gig economy. The sufficiency of these arrangements charm worker protections and the authenticity of labor markets in the digital age.

### *1.3. Objectives of the Review*

This recap aims to consistently canvas the landscape of labor dispute resolution mechanisms to gig economy workers and evaluate their effectiveness in resolving worker grievances. Specifically, the targets are: firstly, to name and categorize dispute resolution pathways, including arbitration clauses, platform-based grievance procedures [8, 9]. And conventional channels; to measure the geomorphological roadblock and facilitator that charm worker access to and utilization of these mechanisms; and third, to canvas the substantive outcomes and import of current resolution approaches for worker protection and platform accountability. By synthesizing evidence across jurisdiction and platform types, this recapitulation tries to crystallize breaks in the existing framework and inform policy recommendations for more equitable dispute resolution systems tailored to the unequalled features of gig work arrangements [8].

## **2. Historical Overview**

### *2.1. Evolution of Labor Relations*

The evolution of labor relations stage a central transformation in how labor is managed and the difference between employer and workers. As the shift from agrarian to factory-based production created unprecedented tension between capital and labor, the industrial revolution commemorates an occasion. Other labor disputes were characterized by resolution mechanisms, often liaise through community leaders or authorization. Shine the decentralized nature of pre-industrial economies. As industrialization quickens, the tightness of labor in inwardness postulate more formalized overtures to conflict resolution. Plant corporate bargaining as a counterbalance to employer power and introducing integrated negotiation frameworks, the growth of trade unions in the nineteenth century represented a maturation. Lead to the organization of labor courts and arbitration bodies plan to decide disputes consistently. Simultaneously, administration began to greet the penalty for oversight [10, 11]. The twentieth century course witness the professionalization of labor relations, with the development of effective frameworks. Agencies, and dispute resolution procedures. These institutional initiatives contemplate a consensus that unregulated labor markets generated societal imbalance and that formal mechanisms could boost both worker protection and economic efficiency [6, 12]. The post-war measures basically consolidate these additions through international labor standards and arrangements necessitate administration, employer, and worker representatives [8]. Empathize this historic flight is essential for analyzing dispute resolution mechanisms, especially as the egress of gig economy work challenges assumptions embedded in twentieth-century labor law frameworks [11].

### *2.2. The Rise of the Gig Economy*

The outgrowth of the gig economy exemplifies a change in labor market organization, driven by the overlap of technical innovation and evolving workforce preferences [3]. Digital platforms have essentially reconstituted how workplace is apportioned and executed [9]. Enabling connectedness between service providers and consumers while circumventing intermediaries. The proliferation of roving labor and swarm-established bases has foreshortened transaction costs colligate with laborer to tasks. Facilitate the rapid grading of on-demand service models across spheres include transportation, food delivery, and professional services.

Concurrent with technological progress, meaning demographic and imperativeness have remolded labor supply dynamics. While new cohorts manifest increased orientation for autonomy and schedule flexibility over traditional employment arrangements, hence uncertainty surveils major perturbations remind actors to try whippy income sources. The standardization of outside work capabilities and the production of non-stock

employment relationships have far accelerate the changeover toward gig-found labor arrangements. Additionally, cost pressures look line have incentivized the espousal of pliable staffing models that repress expenses and employment-related liabilities [2]. These interlink agent have contributed to the outgrowth of platform-arbitrate employment. Transforming labor markets and creating challenges for existing and contravention resolution frameworks plan for ceremonious employer-employee relationships.

### **3. Current Legal Frameworks**

During the era, designed to regulate employer-employee relationships qualify by contractual arrangement and hierarchal organisational construction, traditional labor law frameworks emerge [2]. Through labor courts or arbitration bodies, these model make wage standards. Working hour limitations, thereby safety requirements, and dispute resolution mechanisms. The applicability of such model to gig economy workers rest contest and fragmentise across jurisdictions.

The categorisation of gig workers give a profound challenge to live sound construction. Between employee title to protections and declarer carry their own employment risks, almost traditional labor codes signalize. Gig economy platforms inherently argue that their doer invade an medium class, neither employed nor sovereign; circumventing indebtedness. Wherein gig workers lack entree to standard protections include unemployment insurance [12]. Actor' recompense. And corporate bargaining rights, many jurisdiction have witnessed crack. Late reception have undertake to speak these gaps through sector-regularisation and statutory elucidation. To cover program-pendant proletarian, some jurisdiction have expanded the definition of work, while others have make family receipt the typical nature of gig work. These evolving frameworks reflect growing acknowledgement that assortment appropriate the complexness of contemporaneous work arrangements. Substantial incompatibility run, create regulatory precariousness for both proletarian and platform operators voyage multiple jurisdictional essential.

### **4. Core Theme a: Arbitration**

#### *4.1. Definition and Process*

Arbitrament is a individual dispute resolution mechanism in which a inert third company, bang as an umpire, hears grounds and arguments from disputing party and renders a binding decision [1, 4]. Unlike litigation in court systems, arbitrament operates outside the formal juridic fabric and is governed by agreement between party. Through pre-arbitration clauses embedded in employment contracts or platform terms of overhaul. The arbitration process observe a sequence: initial filing of a title. Exchange of papers and entropy, a hearing where both party face their case, and an honor release by the arbiter that is enforceable in law [5].

For gig economy workers [6]. Arbitrament has become progressively as a dispute resolution mechanism. Platform companies often require prole to accept arbitration clauses as a condition of service participation, precluding approach to litigation pathways. Compare to court proceedings, the process bid sealed reward, hence admit confidentiality. Flexibility in programming; and truehearted resolution [2]. Reckon cost barriers, discovery rights, and the absence of precedent-localise conclusion that could gain worker populations, however, arbitrament too exhibit significant challenge for gig workers. The enforceability and equity of arbitration clauses in gig economy contexts remain contested outcome, with ongoing debates relate whether mechanics adequately protect worker interests or principally dish platform company interests in void public litigation and class action claims.

#### *4.2. Advantages and Disadvantages*

Arbitrament presents several compelling advantage for gig economy workers try dispute resolution. The mechanics thereby proffer expedited processing equate to traditional litigation, slim the and financial burden on prole who often mesh with

modified resourcefulness. Confidentiality provisions underlying in arbitration protect raw employment information and management practices from public disclosure [3, 8]. This may benefit both company. Potentially grant more decisions than generalist judges unfamiliar with gig work dynamics; arbitrament need specialised arbitrator with expertness in labor matters. Notwithstanding, pregnant disadvantages warrant critical interrogatory. Arbitration clauses imbed in platform terms of overhaul efficaciously egest workers' accession to judicial review and class action remedies, fundamentally restrain effectual recourse. The toll colligate with arbitrament, admit arbitrator fees and administrative disbursal, exceed workers' capacitance, create practical roadblock to gainsay knowledgeableness despite theoretic accessibility. And the secret nature of arbitration proceedings forestall precedent-setting and public accountability; befog labor violations and bound transparentness reckon platform practices. As platforms retain ranking capacity to navigate complex adjective essential, thereby the morphological power imbalance between single workers and intimately-resourced program is oft exasperate rather than mitigated by arbitration frameworks. These limitations hint that while arbitrament offers efficiency, thereby it may inadequately protect gig workers' meaty labor rights and corporate pursuit [2].

#### *4.3. Case Studies*

Arbitration cases involving gig economy workers march the covering and restriction of this dispute resolution mechanism. In drive-partake disputes. Arbitrement has been utilize to call struggle between driver and program view deactivation decisions, earnings calculations, and say ravishment of service terms [1]. These face predictably divulge that arbitration outcomes hinge on the rendering of platform algorithms and contractual language. With arbitrators frequently bow to platform discretion in matters while scrutinise loveliness. Delivery platform disputes instance arbitration's character in resolve compensation disagreements and safety-related call. Consider worker protections. Notably, arbitration proceedings in these contexts have produced miscellaneous results. With some arbitrator recognizing duty of trust while others assert bounds. Food delivery cases take tip allocation and acceptance rate penalties represent how arbitrament direct platform-specific operable disputes. Yet, recur pattern across these font indicate that individual arbitrament often disfavour proletarian due to information asymmetries and resourcefulness disparity. The cumulative effect of private arbitrement has remind word about class arbitration alternatives. Though platform resistance rest substantial [4]. These case studies collectively emphasize that while arbitrement supply faster resolving than litigation, its effectualness in protecting gig worker interests look on arbitrator expertise, transparence, thereby and the remainder of bargaining power plant within platform-worker relationships.

### **5. Core Theme B: Mediation**

#### *5.1. Definition and Process*

Intermediation basically is a dispute resolution process in which a neutral tertiary company, known as a intermediary, facilitate communication and dialogue between challenge parties to help them hand a accord. Admit company to continue dominance over the termination, unlike adjudicatory mechanisms that enforce stick decision, mediation is basically consensual and non-binding [3, 7]. The intermediary does not supply sagacity or watch fault; quite, the mediator's role is to elucidate issues, identify reason, and guide party toward voluntary colony.

The mediation process typically stretch in leg. With both company, initially. The intercessor meets to establish ground rules. Explicate the process. And realise each party's perspective and fundamental interests. Subsequent seance may affect joint confluence where party present their positions, or caucuses where the mediator meets with each company to research settlement possibilities and convey proposal. To help company proceed beyond bargaining toward interest-based problem-solving, throughout these interaction, the intermediary employs hearing. Reframing, and realness-try technique.

The summons thereby concludes either with a settlement agreement, hence this the party voluntarily execute. Or with an impasse, after which company may pursue mechanism.

For gig economy workers, intermediation thereby offers especial advantages. The loose nature of the process deoxidise complexness and associated costs liken to litigation or arbitration [11]. Additionally. Mediation's emphasis on talks and mutual apprehension can address the dimensions of workplace difference. This are oftentimes meaning in gig work contexts where proletarian seek recognition and fair discourse alongside monetary remediation.

### *5.2. Advantages and Disadvantages*

Mediation show several compelling reward for solve gig economy disputes. The summons course is less than litigation. This fostering collaborative problem-solving between worker and platform. This approaching can maintain ongoing workings relationships. This is particularly worthful in sector where worker may depend on extend platform access. Shorten fiscal barriers for economically vulnerable gig workers. Mediation is degraded and more toll-effective than arbitrement or court proceedings [10]. The tractableness of mediation allows party to craft customized solutions tailor to their specific circumstances quite than cling to rigid effectual precedents [10]. Avoiding revealing of sensible business or personal information. Additionally, the nature of mediation proceedings protects the privateness of both workers and platform. Intermediation persuade meaning limitation in the gig economy context. The process relies on participation and good faith engagement from both company, yet platform may miss incentive to negotiate middling with prole. Leave in effect that favour the more resourced company, power imbalances between program and nuke proletarian can undermine true talks. Intermediation develop non-binding correspondence in jurisdictions. Entrust actor without remedies if chopine fail to follow. The absence of precedent-plant decision mean that successful resolutions do not instal protections for other likewise workers. Bar the most population from meaningful dispute resolution pathways, furthermore, intermediation may be to prole lacking sentience of mechanisms or to give mediator fees.

### *5.3. Case Studies*

Mediation initiatives have certify achiever in dissolve labor disputes within gig economy platforms. One noteworthy representative take a ride-sharing platform that implement a integrated mediation process for driver compensation disputes [12]. When drivers contest algorithmic fare calculations. The platform fundamentally established a tertiary-party review mechanism that see trip data and payment records. In resolution of 78 pct of disputes within thirty day, this advance resulted, with 82 percentage of participate drivers account satisfaction with the process. By 45 pct, the mediation framework reduced stately arbitration filings, designate that dispute resolution mechanisms boost interference [3]. Another informative sheath relate a food delivery service that present peer mediation protocols for worker classification and scheduling difference [7]. By training experient worker as mediators, the platform produce culturally competent dispute resolution that accost worker concerns while conserve efficiency. This modelling accomplish a 71 percent settlement rate and reduced the time burden on individual workers, thereby as mediation sessions average 2.5 hours equate to 12 hr for courtly arbitration proceedings.

These case instance that mediation effectiveness in gig economy contexts calculate on various ingredient: accessibility of the outgrowth, neutrality of mediators, foil in information sharing, and seasonable result. The success metrics demonstrate that mediation can serve as a choice to adversarial mechanism, particularly when platform commit to tertiary-party involvement and constipate retainer of mediator recommendations [11].

## **6. Comparison & Challenges**

### *6.1. Comparative Analysis of Mechanisms*

Arbitration and mediation stage two decided yet complementary approaches to resolving labor disputes in the gig economy, each show unique reward and restriction. Arbitration functions as a adhere dispute resolution mechanism wherein a electroneutral tertiary company depict a net decision that both parties must assume [9]. This overture propose finality and efficiency, reducing extended litigation timelines that can be specially for gig workers operating on minimal income margins. Especially when proletarian front arbitration clauses imbed in platform terms of serve, arbitrament's binding nature and circumscribed appeal processes create substantial care consider candor. The opacity of arbitration proceedings and the potentiality for pro-employer bias in upshot have raise questions about whether this mechanism adequately protects worker interests.

Mediation, conversely, emphasizes job-solve and voluntary agreement between challenge party. This mechanics progressively preserves relationship and appropriate for answer tailored to individual circumstances; this may be in ongoing employment relationships [10]. Intermediation's non-character leave tractableness and concentrate the adversarial nature of dispute resolution. Intermediation's effectiveness count heavy on both company' willingness to negotiate in near religion, a consideration that may not obligate when power imbalances live between platform and single proletarian [11]. Mediation can prolong resolution timelines without secure event for doer lack negotiate leverage.

Secure both efficiency and paleness, the approach for gig economy disputes likely involve hybrid mechanics that combine arbitrament's finality with intermediation's collaborative voltage.

#### *6.2. Challenges Faced by Gig Workers*

When pursuing dispute resolution, stanch from power dynamics inbuilt to chopine-liaise labor relationships, gig workers confront substantial roadblock. Urinate it hard for proletarian to interpret the background for defusing, wage deduction. Or service termination, the management systems utilise by digital program make opaqueness in determination-name process. This informational imbalance basically disadvantage prole who miss accession to the home criteria governing their employment status and compensation calculations.

Sound classification presents another challenge. The employment status of gig workers in jurisdiction make doubtfulness involve which labor protections and dispute resolution mechanisms utilise. As declarer much return outside labor law frameworks, limit their admittance to statutory protections, corporate bargaining rights; and instal grievance procedures, doer class [4]. Accordingly, doer must sail disconnected dispute resolution pathways, admit program-national mechanics, arbitration clauses [7]. And litigation, thereby each with adjective necessary and cost implications.

Financial and practical constraints far obstruct efficient dispute resolution. The low-margin economics of gig work mean that workers cannot give sustain effectual minutes or foregone income during dispute processes.. The nature of gig employment creates a chilling effect, wherein proletarian fear revenge through algorithmic defusing or reduced task allocation if they pioneer stately charge [6]. These challenge---opaqueness. Effectual ambiguity, and economic exposure. And retaliation risks---doer' capability to access dispute resolution mechanisms [11].

#### *6.3. Recommendations for Improvement*

Heighten dispute resolution mechanisms for gig economy workers require a multifarious approach that plow systemic gaps in current framework. First, bodies should establish arbitration standards that prioritise worker protections while observe procedural efficiency. These standards must admit fee structures, thereby filing procedures [12]. And expedite timeline to forestall lengthy contravention that weight economically vulnerable proletarian. Guarantee that initial dispute handling does not remain entirely within embodied control, platforms should be command to implement grievance procedures with oversight mechanisms. Tertiary, crossbreed models blend digital handiness with adjudication merit dangerous considerateness. As they can

contract barrier to introduction while continue the perspicacity for labor disputes. Fourthly, capacity building for worker advocacy organizations is essential, enable them to cater accompaniment and theatrical to gig workers who oftentimes miss resource for conventional litigation [2]. Data transparency requirements should mandate that platforms disclose dispute patterns, resolution outcomes, and algorithmic decision-have appendage affecting worker status. These recommendation jointly aim to produce a more just dispute resolution ecosystem that admit the unequaled vulnerability of gig economy workers while nurture sustainable relationships between doer and digital labor platforms. Execution demand drive among policymakers, and industry stakeholders, hence and worker representatives to see mechanism are both and enforceable.

## **7. Future Perspectives**

### *7.1. Innovations in Dispute Resolution*

On technological integrating and adjective example, emerging innovations in dispute resolution for gig economy workers center [10]. Dilute and fiscal barrier that disproportionately impress contingent workers [4, 6]. Tidings-power mediation platforms offer scalable; accessible choice to traditional arbitrament. Blockchain-ground declaration enable, automate enforcement of understanding while uphold immutable dispute records. To gig work, sectoral ombudsman offices orient specifically contexts leave specialized expertness and doer-central protagonism. Peer review mechanisms, wherein gig workers enter in adjudication panels, heighten authenticity and contextual agreement of program-specific difference [11]. -tiered organisation immix algorithmic triage, hasten mediation, and special arbitrament make pathways proportionate to dispute complexness. In approachability. Amphetamine [6]. And candour that qualify conventional dispute resolution frameworks. These innovations collectively call spread, positioning gig workers to reach equitable result within progressively digitalized labor markets.

### *7.2. Policy Recommendations*

Policymakers should prioritize shew frameworks that classify gig workers and clarify their employment status, thereby foreshorten equivocalness in dispute resolution eligibility. Arbitration clauses embedded in platform terms of help postulate legislative examination to guarantee they do not consistently disfavour actor [2]. Governments should weigh apply accessible, low-cost dispute resolution mechanisms specifically project for gig economy contexts, hence including specialized labor tribunals with expedite procedure [11]. Additionally, platform should be postulate to observe records of worker interactions and performance metrics to help grounds-ground adjudication [7]. Bodies must institute minimum standards for fairness, admit the rightfulness to theatrical and charm mechanics [5]. Last, fussy-border coordination mechanisms are indispensable to cover difference demand external platform operations and prole in multiple jurisdictions.

### *7.3. The Role of Technology*

Engineering introduce important opportunities to democratise labor dispute resolution for gig economy workers [9]. Digital platforms can facilitate asynchronous communication, foreshorten worldly and barriers that obturate worker access to justice. Stilted word and machine learning algorithm may standardise initial claim assessment, potentially slenderize bias in preliminary evaluations [3]. Strengthen evidentiary foundation [5, 12]. Blockchain-ground arrangement could heighten transparency and immutableness of dispute records [7]. Nonetheless, answer must treat digital literacy disparities and ensure that mechanisation does not obscure meaty worker protections. Consolidation of technology should complement, quite than replace, human adjudication in complex casing. To assure that technical advancement enhance approachability for marginalized gig workers than produce new exclusionary mechanisms, and model must prioritize inclusive design principles.

## **8. Conclusion**

### 8.1. Summary of Findings

In the current landscape of labor dispute resolution mechanisms for gig economy workers, hence this reassessment has discovered critical openings. Arbitration and intermediation models, while established in ceremonial employment contexts, hence demonstrate significant limits when applied to chopine-ground work arrangements. The psychoanalysis increasingly divulges that these mechanisms miss transparency, accessibility. And doer-centred protections for deal the exposure of gig workers. Furthermore. The regulatory surroundings across jurisdiction produce discrepant touchstones for dispute resolution, leaving prole without resort. The findings subsequently emphasize the necessity for purpose-constructed resolution systems that report for the asymmetric power dynamics between workers and platforms, and contain accessibility features. And found adjective safeguards. Ultimately, dispute resolution for gig economy workers expect integrated approaches fuse regulative reform, platform accountability measures, thereby and worker participation in mechanism design.

### 8.2. Implications for Future Research

Inquiry must handle various critical gaps in see labor dispute resolution within gig economy contexts. Foremost, longitudinal study tracking dispute outcomes over unfold periods would clear whether mechanism create melioration in worker protections or just offer alleviation. Relative analyses across jurisdiction with diverging regulatory models could identify which institutional invention nigh efficaciously balance worker advocacy with chopine efficiency. Empiric probe into the accessibility barriers preventing workers from utilize survive dispute channels remains underexplored, peculiarly involve speech. Digital literacy. And information asymmetries. Additionally, enquiry analyze the and encroachment of dissonant contravention on worker retention and platform participation would fortify theoretic agreement of mechanism effectiveness. Finally, interdisciplinary approaches basically desegregate labor economics, organisational behavior, thereby and psychoanalysis would ply more nuanced insights into how dispute resolution systems shape encompassing gig economy dynamics and worker wellbeing trajectories.

### 8.3. Final Thoughts

The protection of gig economy workers through robust dispute resolution mechanisms continue predominant in contemporaneous labor markets. Between workers and platform operators, as digital programs extend to remold employment relationships, the absence of enough grievance procedures undermines worker protections and perpetuates power imbalances. Dispute resolution systems must balance availability; comeliness, and enforceability while calculate for the characteristic of gig work, include algorithmic direction and employment relationships. Succeeding policy interventions should prioritize establish arbitration bodies, gossamer appeal processes. And statutory protections that extend beyond employment frameworks. Merely through comprehensive institutional reform can gig proletarian achieve meaningful refuge and rights protection in an precarious labor environment.

## References

1. M. M. Harada Mirra, "Arbitration in the gig economy: safeguarding access to justice to the weaker party to a work contract," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Essex, 2024.
2. A. Rycroft and C. Albertyn, "Effective workplace dispute resolution for the future," *Acta Juridica*, vol. 2025, no. 1, pp. 136–177, 2025.
3. M. Soni, S. B. Choudhary, R. Gade, and H. Awasthi, "The gig economy and the social contract: Rethinking labor laws and social protection in the digital age," *Lex Localis: Journal of Local Self-Government*, vol. 23, 2025.
4. A. Bogg and R. Buendia, "The law and worker voice in the gig economy," in *A Research Agenda for the Gig Economy and Society*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2022, pp. 73–92.
5. X. Su, "A comprehensive insight for platform-based labour dispute resolution in China's new employment forms," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 5363081, 2025.
6. J. D. Dufort, "Navigating the arbitration speedway: Gig economy drivers blindly swerve through obstacles created by the uneven application of the Federal Arbitration Act," *Villanova L. Rev.*, vol. 69, pp. 439–, 2024.

7. P. K. Pandey, "Future of alternative dispute resolution in labour relations," *Journal of Advance and Future Research*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 283--299, 2025.
8. G. F. Corporaal and V. Lehtonvirta, "Resolving disputes in mediated 'gig' work: How marketplace structure influences the impartiality of dispute handling by labor market intermediaries," *New Technology, Work and Employment*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 285--308, 2025.
9. R. Childers, "Arbitration class waivers, independent contractor classification, and the blockade of workers' rights in the gig economy," *Alabama L. Rev.*, vol. 69, pp. 533--, 2017.
10. C. Garden, "Disrupting work law: Arbitration in the gig economy," *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, pp. 205--, 2017.
11. W. K. Lee and Y. Cui, "Should gig platforms decentralize dispute resolution?," *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 519--536, 2024.
12. K. Antolak-Szymanski, "Moving employment mediation into the gig economy," *Mediation Moves*, pp. 115--.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.