

# Redefining Professional Inclusion for Gig Economy Independent Workers

**Majda DALAL, (Doctoral Candidate)**

*Laboratory of Research in Economics and Organizational Management (LAREMO)  
National School of Commerce and Management of Beni Mellal, Sultan Moulay Slimane  
University of Beni Mellal, Morocco*

**Soukaina MAZZAR, (Doctoral Candidate)**

*Laboratory of Research in Economics and Organizational Management (LAREMO)  
National School of Commerce and Management of Beni Mellal, Sultan Moulay Slimane  
University of Beni Mellal, Morocco*

**Raja CHAKRA, (Doctor, PhD)**

*Laboratory of Economic Sciences and Public Policy,  
Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Ibn Tofail University of Kenitra, Morocco*

**Asmaa ABYRE, (Associate Professor)**

*Laboratory of Research in Economics and Organizational Management (LAREMO)  
National School of Commerce and Management of Beni Mellal, Sultan Moulay Slimane  
University of Beni Mellal, Morocco*

**Ridouane MESSAOUDI, (Associate Professor)**

*Laboratory of Research in Economics and Organizational Management (LAREMO)  
National School of Commerce and Management of Beni Mellal, Sultan Moulay Slimane  
University of Beni Mellal, Morocco*

|                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Correspondence address :</b> | National School of Commerce and Management of Beni Mellal, Sultan Moulay Slimane University of Beni Mellal, Morocco<br>+2125 23 42 84 44<br>encgbmcontact@usms.ma                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Disclosure Statement :</b>   | The authors declare that they have not received any financial support that could have influenced the objectivity of this study. They take full responsibility for any potential plagiarism, the use of artificial intelligence in the writing process, as well as for the results presented in this article.                        |
| <b>Conflict of Interest :</b>   | The authors report no conflicts of interest.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Cite this article :</b>      | DALAL, M., MAZZAR, S., CHAKRA, R., ABYRE, A., & MESSAOUDI, R. (2026). Redefining Professional Inclusion for Gig Economy Independent Workers. <i>International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics</i> , 7(3), 616–628. <a href="https://doi.org/zenodo.19172037">https://doi.org/zenodo.19172037</a> |
| <b>License</b>                  | <b>This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Received: 13/01/2025

Accepted: 21/03/2026

**International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics - IJAFAME**

**ISSN: 2658-8455**

**Volume 7, Issue 03 (2026)**

## Redefining Professional Inclusion for Gig Economy Independent Workers

### Abstract:

The expansion of the gig economy has profoundly transformed work arrangements, challenging traditional approaches to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) that are largely grounded in stable employment relationships and centralized organizational structures. Independent workers operating through digital platforms increasingly face precarious working conditions, limited access to social protection, and a lack of professional recognition, exacerbated by algorithmic management and opaque governance mechanisms. Drawing on an integrative and critical review of the literature, this article develops a conceptual framework for understanding professional inclusion in the platform economy. The proposed framework distinguishes professional inclusion, centered on the recognition of skills, autonomy, and procedural fairness, from social inclusion, which relates to belonging and network integration. The analysis highlights the complementary roles of managers, digital platforms, and public policies in fostering inclusive work environments beyond organizational boundaries. By articulating issues of algorithmic transparency, benefit portability, and participatory governance, this study contributes to the advancement of DEI theory in non-standard work contexts. The article concludes by outlining avenues for operationalization and future empirical research aimed at testing and refining the proposed framework.

**Keywords:** Gig economy; Independent workers; Professional inclusion; Algorithmic management; Diversity, equity, and inclusion; Digital platforms; Social protection

**Classification JEL:** J24

**Paper type:** Theoretical paper

## 1. Introduction

The rise of the gig economy has profoundly transformed traditional work relationships by fostering the growth of a significant number of independent workers who, by choosing to operate outside classical organizational structures, find themselves beyond the protective scope of traditional Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion (DEI) policies (Manyika et al., 2016; Pilatti et al., 2023). While classic DEI approaches rely on employee-employer relationship models characterized by benefits, structured career paths, and robust internal policies, IWs face economic precarity, a lack of social protection, and opaque algorithmic systems that obstruct their bargaining power (Bae, 2024; Pilatti et al., 2023).

This reality sharply contrasts with traditional work contexts and demands a re-evaluation of inclusion strategies to design institutional, managerial, and technological mechanisms adapted to the specific needs of independent workers (Bae, 2024). Furthermore, the rapid evolution of digital platforms as intermediaries for matching and managing tasks accentuates the need to rethink professional inclusion by integrating dimensions of autonomy, flexibility, and diversity of employment statuses (Bae, 2024). The objective of this article is threefold: to identify the limits of traditional inclusion approaches applied to IWs, to propose an expanded conceptualization of professional inclusion, and to examine the respective roles of managers, digital platforms, and public policies in building an inclusive framework adapted to the peculiarities of the gig economy (Bae, 2024).

Recent statistics highlight the structural importance of self-employment and informal work in Morocco's labor market, underscoring the urgency of adapting inclusion frameworks for gig workers. In 2022, nearly half of Morocco's employed population (48.15%) was self-employed, with rates rising to 53.7% in rural areas (The Global Economy, 2023; Statista, 2021). Informal employment accounted for approximately 77% of total jobs in 2018, contributing around 30% of GDP, though projections suggest this share may decline to 18% by 2043 (Institute for Security Studies, 2018). Despite this prevalence, formal employment represented only 39.7% of the labor force in 2021, while self-employment and caregiving comprised 29.6% and 13.7% respectively (Morocco World News, 2022). Moreover, research by Fair work (2023) shows that among five major digital labor platforms assessed in Morocco, only two delivery platforms met minimum fairness criteria regarding pay and contracts, revealing the vulnerability of platform-based workers. These figures demonstrate that while gig and informal work sustain a significant share of Morocco's economy, they remain largely excluded from regulatory protections and professional inclusion policies, making the development of portable benefits and transparent platform governance mechanisms particularly pressing.

Independent workers in the gig economy are characterized by a work modality marked by short assignments, the absence of formal employment contracts, and loosely hierarchical organizational structures (Barley et al., 2017; Fitzsimmons et al., 2023). Consequently, traditional DEI tools and practices, which rely on integration into a stable organizational system, prove inadequate to address the specific challenges of these workers. These challenges notably include economic precarity, a lack of social protections, limited transparency of algorithmic management systems, and difficulties in establishing genuine professional recognition in decentralized environments (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023). Thus, this work's main objectives are to identify the limitations of classic social inclusion approaches when applied to IWs, to develop a new conceptual framework for professional inclusion that considers the heterogeneity and fragmentation of independent work, and to examine the role of managers, digital platforms, and public policies in implementing new forms of inclusion that transcend traditional organizational models (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023).

## 2. Gig Economy

### 2.1. Definition of the Gig economy

Artificial intelligence has made possible the emergence of a new economy in the form of division of labor, now commonly called the Gig economy. We can also talk about it through the on-demand economy or platform (O'Neill, 2021). The Internet has greatly facilitated these new practices aimed at dividing and making work more flexible in order to offer a very short-term contract focused on the task, often very low paid, to workers who are constantly changing. This situation is well summed up by Beiwald (2010): Before the internet, it would have been really difficult to find someone, sit them down for ten minutes, manage to make them work for you and then fire them after these ten minutes. But with technology, you can indeed find them, pay them a tiny amount of money, and then get rid of them when you no longer need them. (Beiwald, 2010, cited in Marvit, 2014). To name the workers from this economy, the terms gig workers or freelancers are now commonly used (Tronsor, 2018). It is difficult to determine precisely how many workers are in this sector since several biases must be taken into account. First of all, it is difficult to access company data. Then, the same worker could work in several companies at the same time (De Stefano, 2016).

O'Neill (2021) explains that the closure of companies during the Covid-19 pandemic would have resulted in workers largely turning to the platform economy in search of additional income (89% of respondents) (O'Neill, 2021).

One of the reasons mentioned is that it is easier to access gig economy jobs than in the traditional employment environment. To this end, several workers have therefore seen gig work as a social safety net (O'Neill, 2021). If the current rate of growth is maintained, gig workers will be the majority group of workers.

Several authors (Cardon and Casilli, 2015; Smith and Leberstein, 2015, cited in De Stefano, 2016) separate the gig economy into two distinct forms of work, namely 'crowd work' and 'work on-demand'. Crowd work therefore includes work done online and generally involves repetitive and well-defined "micro-tasks" such as identifying photos or filling out digital surveys (De Stefano, 2016). The WODA represents the supply and demand of work through applications in order to offer more traditional services or tasks (De Stefano, 2016). Although the authors have separated the gig economy into two subgroups, it should be mentioned that these are not monolithic or homogeneous categories (De Stefano, 2016). Among the advantages of this model, we find flexible schedules for employers as well as for workers (De Stefano, 2016). Also, some companies can thus afford to benefit from the services of a highly specialized worker for a short duration, which they could not necessarily do if they had to hire this person. However, this also induces a conception of work such as a «commodity market» (De Stefano, 2016). Amazon's CEO who owned Amazon Mechanical Turk, a crowd work platform, had described these practices as "human-as-service" (Irani and Silberman, 2013, cited in De Stefano, 2016, p.4). The human is therefore instrumentalized here to offer a service while minimizing operating and operational costs for the company. However, De Stefano (2016) brings nuance to the fact that, in crowd work, humans work almost exclusively behind a screen, which makes them invisible. He also compares this invisible work to that of other sectors, notably domestic work, while insisting that domestic work is also work. He warns about the risk of dehumanizing these workers that the client does not see, which would have practical and theoretical impacts (De Stefano, 2016).

At the theoretical level, the risk is therefore that the work done by workers is no longer considered as real work. Moreover, these invisibilities of work and the dehumanization that results from it represent risks for workers. From these two issues stems a loss of protection, notably caused by the 'pay as you go' as well as the 'goes-a-service' (De Stefano, 2016). From a practical point of view, these companies, through applications and technologies, do not take on the role of employer and do not offer the protections that go with it. This therefore keeps the employees in a state of precariousness. There are risks at the legislative level, given the perception of the legal concept of subordination. Moreover, this

differs greatly from one country to another as several trials have been underway in recent years to clarify the status of these workers (De Stefano et al., 2021).

## **2.2. Fundamental principles of the International Labor Organization**

Moreover, according to the fundamental principles of the International Labor Organization (hereinafter ILO), labor rights should be linked to fundamental human rights. These include freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining and the elimination of discrimination based on employment status (De Stefano, 2016). These rights are not always respected in the gig economy. Workers in this sector are often victimized in both cases. A first important point concerns workers' rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining. In the gig economy, these two rights are hardly accessible (De Stefano, 2016). First of all, since in several legislations it is imperative to be an employee in order to access unionization. Not being employees, they cannot organize themselves and collectively negotiate their employment contracts.

According to De Stefano (2016), several other reasons explain this difficulty of access. Since the workers are in competition in this sector, it can be difficult to get them to show solidarity and lead common struggles. Moreover, digital platforms discourage this organization of workers. Employers frequently use anti-union tactics, which is facilitated with the use of information technology. Some employees fear the impact on their reputation if they tend to unionize. Finally, since workers are easily dismissed in this field, employers can get rid of organic leaders who would try to unionize their colleagues. All these reasons make unionization difficult in the gig economy. Without access to unionization or public policy protections, workers remain in a precarious situation.

The second point concerns the case of discrimination concerning employment status. In the broad sense, regarding employment discrimination, there can be positive effects in crowd work, including working remotely on the internet. This provides anonymity and makes it possible to accommodate people with disabilities (De Stefano, 2016). Conversely, certain risks of discrimination are present. First, companies can geolocate workers and promote the granting of contracts to people from certain countries, without being able to verify that it is not another reason than linguistic one, among others. Also, the fact that performance evaluation is done via clients in applications can be a reason why a worker could experience discrimination, as the client does not always rely on objective criteria. This evaluation may have impacts on the employability of the worker (De Stefano, 2016). However, regarding discrimination related to employment status, there is a real risk since social protections are only offered to employees. The employment status of self-employed worker harms the worker, since he is kept in a state of precariousness. This last point is essential regarding the principles of the ILO, since the worker experiences discrimination through their employment status.

## **3. The nature of self-employed workers in the platform economy**

### **3.1. Self-employed workers**

The interest of organizations in the social and professional situation of self-employed workers is based on a series of recent findings, which raise the question of the reconciliation between the work situations experienced respectively by employees and self-employed, in the same branches of activity.

Diversification and expansion of self-employment. The employment of self-employed workers today takes various names: freelance worker, independent professional, self-entrepreneur, independent contractor, independent consultant, etc. The range of professions concerned is constantly expanding, well beyond the traditional 'liberal professions'. A growing number of professions, in the paramedical or medico-social field, in media and information technology, in

leisure and culture, in technical services to businesses, are exercised both by employees and by self-employed workers. The impression that these forms of self-employment are on the rise is widespread among wage earners, although it is difficult to quantify precisely, as we shall see in the second part of this report.

Moreover, the multiplication of work collectives that bring together employees and self-employed workers. Not only are a growing number of professions being carried out by employees and the self-employed, but they are also in the same work teams, at the same workplaces, in carrying out the same projects. It is not a simple coexistence, but a structured collaboration. Such "mixed" work collectives frequently meet in care institutions (hospitals, polyclinics, medical houses, nursing homes), in social assistance institutions (disabled people, youth aid, reception structures), in the media and IT (especially the press and everything related to internet services), in transport and delivery (parcels, meals at home), in specialized maintenance, in consultancy, on construction sites, etc.

Then, the very recent development of work for online platforms (crowd working) favors forms of subordination that are situated in a no man's land between the wage relationship – whether or not it is accompanied by various provisions for flexibility of time and place of work – and the classic status of a professional self-employed worker. The driver who rides for Uber or the courier who makes deliveries for Deliveroo are in this case. As most online platforms offload any social or fiscal responsibility and shift the burden onto their service providers, they have no choice but to adopt a self-employed status on a complementary basis, if they want to avoid the dive into undeclared work and social fraud.

In this context, collective action needs are starting to emerge among self-employed workers. They can be of four types:

- The need to redefine or specify regulations governing access to and practice of the profession, or to influence the setting of certain regulated rates (one thinks in particular of the medical-mutualist conventions, in the case of health professionals) ;
- The need to influence the negotiation of social protection schemes applied to them (social contributions, social insurance, combination of part-time employment and self-employment, etc.), to the extent that the traditional regime of the self-employed no longer seems satisfactory in relation to new situations;
- Needs for collective services (legal advice and assistance, insurance advice, access to continuing training);
- The need to create solidarity between independent workers who share common concerns. All these elements, which concern both the evolution of the labor market, the modernization of social protection and the expansion of collective representation needs, amply justifies that the trade union organizations take a closer interest in the situation of self-employed and, to varying degrees, dependent workers. It is now necessary to specify the forms and conditions of this dependence.

### **3.2. The risks arising from the platform economy for workers**

Ulrich Beck analyzes the role of science in risk production. He maintains that technoscience is not limited to supporting progress, but also generates new risks. Moreover, given their consequences, it is no longer only the individual who is threatened, but society as a whole. Ibid He observes that with the globalization of markets, marked by the flexibilization of work and the rise of underemployment, risk management is increasingly transferred to the individual, now solely responsible for his own protection. Ulrich Beck, 2001.

To illustrate this risk among platform workers, let's take the example of compensation. According to the ILO, compensation issues - including earnings unpredictability - vary across workers and platforms. The determination of compensation by algorithms implies that it varies according to demand levels and the time at which the task is assigned. Sara Baiocco, Enrique

Fernandez-Macías, 2022. Platforms usually charge an additional commission on each transaction made. This commission is levied both on the remuneration of the workers and on the amount paid by the clients once the task is completed.

The so-called flexibility of work is undermined by the inability of workers to truly control their schedules, which has an impact on their income. Mohammad Amir Anwar, 2023 Algorithms do have an impact on working time, especially when used to evaluate workers' performance and assign new tasks. Sacha Garben, 2017 the second risk identified by Martine D'Amours is that related to health damage either from accident, illness or disability, which refers to the possibility for the worker to suffer a loss of income due to a physical or mental inability to ensure his usual workload.

In the context of platforms, this risk includes both damage to health not related to professional activity and insufficient protection in terms of health and safety at work, particularly in cases of occupational accidents or diseases.

The third risk identified by D'Amours is that related to advancement in age, understood as the gradual decrease in the ability to provide work or generate income, as the worker ages. In the context of platforms, the risk related to age advancement is aggravated by the lack of job retention schemes. The conditions for termination of the contractual relationship or deactivation of accounts depend on the employment status and clauses provided by the platforms, often drafted unilaterally. In practice, the suspension or deactivation of an account may occur without prior notification or effective possibility of recourse to a human manager. This lack of transparency and recourse weakens the ability of workers to assert their rights before the competent courts, in the absence of a clear contractual basis or evidence of arbitrary treatment. Jeremias Adams-Prassl, Haleform Abraha, 2023. Therefore, at the ILO some participants in the expert meeting on decent work in the digital platform economy considered that the lack of effective access for platform workers to redress and dispute settlement mechanisms constituted a generalized normative gap.

Finally, the last risk concerns security of representation, a concept that can be defined as the ability of workers to be collectively represented, to participate in collective bargaining and to assert their rights within representative institutions. In the platform economy, this right remains largely hindered. According to the ILO, this limitation is explained on the one hand by the status of self-employed workers: legally assimilated to «companies», their collective approaches can be considered anticompetitive. On the other hand, many of them find themselves in a situation of economic dependence vis-à-vis the platforms, which significantly reduces their negotiation capacity. It should also be noted that the strategies for building a collective protest movement depend heavily on migratory status.

Platform workers are scattered in terms of schedule and workplace. Jeremias Adams-Prassl, 2018 Working hours can be very different from one worker to another. The doctrine also reveals a geographical dispersion of platform workers. This risk can be accentuated on the one hand by the individual capacity of platform workers to be able to bear the costs to file a lawsuit. Kurt Vandaele and Silvia Rainone, 2025 On the other hand, workers in an irregular administrative situation in the country of exercise are often deprived of any effective access to legal remedies, which prevents them from contesting adverse decisions or asserting their rights.

Beyond the risks identified by the typology of Martine D'Amours, the doctrine highlights two particularly relevant risks in the context of work on platforms. On the one hand, algorithmic management constitutes a central lever of control exercised by platforms. Pierre Bérastégui, 2021. It should also be noted the use of psychological incentives used, for example, by Uber in order to gamify its work platform. "The drivers are like in a video game with a point system that conditions them and guides the way they practice their profession," explains Lucie Enel as part of her thesis. These mechanisms may induce them to accept risky tasks, under penalty of penalties or negative assessments. The analysis of work-related risks in the platform economy

highlights a weakening of workers' economic, social and legal protections. Whether it is a question of income instability, the lack of coverage in case of an accident, or even the difficulty of asserting collective rights, these risks reveal the limits of the current normative framework. This situation highlights the relevance of the normativity under discussion at the ILO and leads to an interest in regional responses, sometimes contradictory, which have been put in place to frame work in the platform economy. This naturally leads us to look at the regulatory initiatives adopted at the regional level.

## **4. Professional Inclusion for Independent Workers**

### **4.1. Inclusion: a flagship concept**

The notion of inclusion is rarely used alone Bouquet, B. (2015). Indeed, other key concepts are employed in the discourse of self-employed workers, namely: integration and integration. As for the concept of insertion, it consists of placing an object between two others, it is a social science concept designating the action of leading an individual to no longer live on the margins of society. It is in fact a process that leads him to find a recognized place in society. The etymological meaning of the concept 'integration' means to restore, that is to say, to put back the person in his entirety. The term 'integration' (used in the 90s), consists of bringing something or someone into a whole, with the meaning of assimilation, fusion, in order to form a unified whole. The use of the two terms 'insertion' and 'integration' is also very common in political and administrative language, particularly with regard to immigration, but also when it comes to addressing the issue of school care, social and professional of disabled people. Integration or insertion testifies to the state of the social bond between a society and its members Edito (2016): the fact of recognizing that a person participates in the life of society and holds a legitimate place in it. But this implies a process of appropriation: ingesting dominant social norms and values, which constitutes the price to pay for gaining citizenship Pillaging Y., (2016).

This appropriation involves a dynamic of exchange, interrelations, interactions between people, to fit into a group, an environment: "participatory strategies for insertion" CHEVALIER D., (2003). The term 'inclusion» means 'the state of something that is included in a whole, a set'. This term comes from the Latin inclusion: imprisonment. After a long absence of use, it is taken up again in the 19th century in the sense of inserting, that is to say, «making an element enter into a whole» Alain rey a., (2012). It is a concept that is increasingly used in the media, by politicians, and is part of the associative environment and social work. It is seen as heralding an evolution of values and practices, even a change in the social paradigm. For a person with disabilities to have their place in all places of social life, with all their characteristics, they must be welcomed into their 'otherness' pillaging y., (2016). Indeed, the concept of "inclusion" is in line with this logic and bears witness to this change of paradigm: "a society which is conceived for all, adapts to all, whatever their differences, and which allows and requires each citizen to participate". Inclusion introduces a reversal of perspective: it refers both to the potentialities and needs of people, but also to the adaptation of the environment and the participation of different actors in society Bouquet b., (2015).

### **4.2. Professional Inclusion of Independent Workers: Challenges and Determinants**

The literature on diversity, equity, and inclusion has historically focused on traditional organizational environments, emphasizing static categories such as gender, ethnicity, and nationality, while neglecting power dynamics and the fluidity of identities (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023).

Recent research on international relations and organizational behavior has highlighted the importance of institutional mechanisms and managerial approaches to fostering inclusion. However, much of this work relies on formal working relationships (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023).

The rise of freelance workers, operating on digital platforms and enjoying great independence, challenges these traditional paradigms by introducing flexible, fragmented and frequently temporary forms of work (Friedland & Balkin, 2023).

Furthermore, the algorithmic management of these platforms generates an opacity in the assignment of tasks, the assessment of performance and the modifications of working conditions, which intensifies disparities and hinders the implementation of traditional DEI policies. (Jain, 2024; Friedland & Balkin, 2023). In the context of the WI, many researchers highlight the gap between inclusion ambitions based on a common professional identity and the fragmented reality of the precarious job market, where workers enjoy neither a shared environment nor an institutional support framework (Jain, 2024).

Furthermore, recent research has highlighted that the organizational elimination of self-employed workers leads not only to a deterioration of their economic situation, but also to a lack of recognition and endorsement of their professional identity, which complicates their integration into traditional DEI systems. This review emphasizes the need for a new model of inclusion that reflects the diversity of forms of self-employment, taking into account the particularities of platform work and the absence of classical hierarchical relationships (Manyika et al., 2016).

In order to transcend the constraints of classical methods, we suggest an interpretation of professional inclusion that is distinct from social inclusion. While social inclusion generally seeks to integrate people into existing networks and structures, the professional integration of IMs must be based on recognition of their independence, appreciation of their knowledge-do, and the implementation of mechanisms ensuring a fair distribution of opportunities and resources. The concepts of professional identity, recognition at work and organizational equity provide a relevant theoretical framework for understanding this dynamic. Thus, we integrate the notion of "professional recognition" which goes beyond formal organizational affiliation by valuing the skills and expertise acquired by independent workers (Manyika et al., 2016).

Furthermore, organizational justice, which focuses on procedural and distributive fairness, is severely challenged in environments where traditional hierarchical controls are absent and governance is delegated to opaque algorithmic systems. Our theoretical framework also proposes adapting work identity theories by recognizing the fluid and transnational nature of IWs' identities who, unlike traditional employees, construct their professional identity outside fixed organizational contexts (Manyika et al., 2016). This model integrates measurable parameters such as algorithmic transparency, portability of benefits, and flexibility of career paths, in order to design specific indicators of professional inclusion for independent workers. The synthesis of results from our literature review and theoretical framework highlights that traditional DEI approaches, based on stable employment relationships and centralized organizational structures, do not take into account the specificities of independent work in the gig economy (Bae, 2024). The absence of formal contracts, management by opaque algorithms, and the high variability of work modalities all represent challenges for the application of an inclusion model based on standard human resources policies (Barley et al., 2017; Fitzsimmons et al., 2023). Furthermore, the diversity of IW profiles – ranging from highly skilled professionals to workers in less secure sectors – implies the need for a differentiated model of professional inclusion, capable of reflecting this heterogeneity rather than imposing a uniform approach.

In this perspective, we propose a new paradigm of inclusion that clearly distinguishes social inclusion, focused on the articulation of networks and belonging, from professional inclusion, which aims to recognize and value the expertise and autonomy of independent workers (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023). This new framework rests on several axes: on the one hand, the establishment of specific indicators to measure algorithmic transparency and fairness in task allocation; on the other hand, the implementation of professional recognition mechanisms that

allow IWs to assert their skills based on objective referential, independently of their affiliation with a fixed organizational structure. The data emerged in our research and the literature confirm that in the absence of robust institutional frameworks, economic precarity and lack of recognition result in low IW participation in decision-making structures and difficulty accessing continuous training (Fitzsimmons et al., 2023). This observation justifies the need to reinvent inclusion mechanisms by relying on multi-stakeholder partnerships, integrating innovative managerial arrangements, reformed digital platform policies, and adapted public policies (Friedland & Balkin, 2023).

The analysis of the complementary roles of managers, platforms, and public policies shows that the articulation of an effective inclusive framework relies on the ability to adapt traditional managerial tools to the realities of digital mobility. Managers must develop a distributed and facilitative leadership approach, rather than hierarchical control, to create a learning and exchange environment that strengthens the sense of belonging of independent workers (Jain, 2024; Friedland & Balkin, 2023). In parallel, digital platforms, at the heart of the gig economy business model, must commit to transparency and accountability towards their users by implementing participatory governance practices. Finally, public policies must evolve by rethinking the notion of social protection for IWs by introducing portability and risk mutualization mechanisms, thereby compensating for the lack of coverage offered by the traditional employment model (Manyika et al., 2016).

These findings suggest that the success of a new model of professional inclusion will depend on the convergence of innovative managerial strategies, regulatory reforms, and a transformation of governance logics within digital platforms (Manyika et al., 2016). Furthermore, the integration of specific performance indicators, such as job satisfaction, perceived procedural fairness, and recognition of expertise, can serve as a lever for transforming classic DEI policies by adapting them to the requirements of the gig economy.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper illustrates those traditional methods of inclusion, based on rigid organizational structures and employer-employee relationships, are not sufficient to meet the particular requirements of self-employed workers in the demand economy. Independent work, characterized by its fragmentation, flexibility and digitalization, requires the development of a new conceptual framework for professional inclusion. The latter must encompass aspects such as the valuation of skills, clarity of algorithmic processes and the transferability of social benefits. Our theoretical model makes a precise distinction between workplace inclusion and social inclusion. It proposes appropriate indicators for a decentralized work environment and highlights the crucial importance of managers, digital platforms, and government policies in reviewing inclusion mechanisms.

The methodological approaches suggested in this article, accompanied by content analyses, provide a robust basis for assessing and improving FI integration in the gig economy. It is also crucial to review the traditional regulatory structures relating to social protection and ensure clearer management of algorithms, in order to establish genuine and lasting equity in this new professional environment.

The results highlighted highlight the need to adjust diversity, equity and inclusion policies to the specificities of self-employed workers. It is crucial to redefine the mechanisms of professional inclusion while promoting cooperation between private and public stakeholders, as well as with the workers themselves. This study therefore opens new research horizons to better understand the dynamics of inclusion in the economy of small jobs and proposes a theoretical and empirical framework that could be used as a reference for future studies on the transformation of the world of work in the era digital.

We stressed that one of the major reasons justifying research on the normative mobilization of the ILO was to evaluate its ability to frame the changes of self-employed workers. The ambition was to go beyond a strictly legal conception of labor law and to apprehend it as a process of normative construction, crossed by power relations and institutional choices. To meet this objective, we first examined the specific characteristics of the work of localized platforms in order to highlight the social, economic and legal risks that arise from them. Based on the work of different authors related to risks in the platform economy, this analysis has identified several critical dimensions: the precariousness of jobs, the externalization of costs borne by workers and the lingering ambiguity surrounding the legal qualification of their status.

It also highlighted specific risks related to limited collective bargaining, the use of automated systems to supervise and control workers, as well as arbitrary breaks in the contractual relationship, reinforcing the exposure of workers in the platform economy to economic and social insecurity.

In conclusion, access to employment for self-employed workers is a major issue in France as in many other countries. The obstacles to their professional inclusion are numerous, such as the lack of awareness among employers, the absence of appropriate infrastructures and reasonable accommodations, as well as prejudice and discrimination. Despite these challenges, it is essential to emphasize that self-employed workers have skills and talents that can contribute to the country's society and economy. Regarding choice between the public and private sectors, it seems that perceptions and determinants of choice differ depending on individuals and their lived experiences. However, it is important that the two sectors work closely together to offer accessible job opportunities while adopting a holistic approach that involves long-term commitment from all stakeholders: the government, businesses, civil society organizations, trade unions and visually impaired persons themselves. Let us also add that the key to successful inclusion is the implementation of policies and inclusive practices promoting equal opportunities, fair treatment, and an inclusive and accessible work environment for all people.

## References

- (1). Barley, S. R., Bechky, B. A., & Milliken, F. J. (2017). The changing nature of work: Careers, identities, and work lives in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 3(2), 111–115. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2017.0034>
- (2). Bae, J. (2024). The gig economy and social insurance systems: Public opinion, policy analysis, and policy design [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri]. University of Missouri Libraries.
- (3). Fairwork. (2023). Fairwork Morocco ratings 2023: Assessing working conditions in the Moroccan platform economy. Fairwork. <https://fair.work/en/fw/publications/fairwork-morocco-ratings-2023-assessing-working-conditions-in-the-moroccan-platform-economy/>
- (4). Fitzsimmons, S. R., Özbilgin, M. F., Thomas, D. C., & Nkomo, S. (2023). Equality, diversity, and inclusion in international business: A review and research agenda. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 54(8), 1620–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-023-00625-7>
- (5). Friedland, J., & Balkin, D. B. (2023). When gig workers become essential: Leveraging customer moral self-awareness beyond COVID-19. *Business Horizons*, 66(2), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2022.09.006>
- (6). Institute for Security Studies. (2018). Morocco country profile. *African Futures & Innovation*. <https://futures.issafrica.org/geographic/countries/morocco>

- (7). Jain, A. (2024). The gig economy: Disruption, innovation, and economic evolution. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2024.002>
- (8). Manyika, J., Lund, S., Bughin, J., Robinson, K., Mischke, J., & Mahajan, D. (2016). Independent work: Choice, necessity, and the gig economy. McKinsey Global Institute. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/employment-and-growth/independent-work-choice-necessity-and-the-gig-economy>
- (9). Morocco World News. (2022, March 3). Morocco's official employment rate reached 39.7% in 2021. <https://www.moroccoworldnews.com/2022/03/49381/morocco-official-employment-rate-reached-39-7-in-2021/>
- (10). Pilatti, L., Ponzellini, A. M., & Armano, E. (2023). Job quality in gig economy: Platforms power versus gig workers resisting strategies. *Journal of Industrial Relations and Labor Studies*, 29(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177>
- (11). Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 176–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003>
- (12). Statista. (2021). Distribution of the employed in rural areas in Morocco by employment type in Q4 2020. Statista Research Department.
- (13). <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1174999/distribution-of-the-employed-in-rural-areas-in-morocco-by-employment-type/>
- (14). TheGlobalEconomy.com. (2023). Morocco: Self-employment, percent of total employment. [https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/morocco/self\\_employment/](https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/morocco/self_employment/)
- (15). Choat, S., Wolf, C., & O'Neill, S. (2024). Decolonizing economics and politics curricula in UK universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(9), 1504-1518.
- (16). Chander, A., Braun, A., Balakrishnan, R., Gilman, A., Stergiou, S., & Marvit, D. (2014). A Mobile Platform for Real-time Continuous Monitoring. *FUJITSU Sci. Tech. J*, 50(1), 84-92.
- (17). Tronsor, W. J. (2018). Unions for Workers in the Gig Economy: Time for a New Labor Movement. *Labor Law Journal*, 69(4).
- (18). De Stefano, V. (2016). Introduction: crowdsourcing, the gig-economy and the law. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3).
- (19). Handke, L., Costa, P. L., Klonek, F. E., O'Neill, T. A., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Team perceived virtuality: An emergent state perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(5), 624-638.
- (20). Cardon, D., & Casilli, A. (2015). Débat. In *Qu'est-ce que le Digital Labor?* (pp. 80-101). Institut National de l'Audiovisuel (INA).
- (21). Smith, R., & Leberstein, S. (2015). Rights on demand. *Ensuring Workplace Standards and Worker Security In the On-Demand Economy, National Employment Law Project, Washington DC*.
- (22). Beck, U. (2001). La politique dans la société du risque. *Revue du MAUSS*, 17(1), 376-392.
- (23). Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2001). Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences.
- (24). Fernández-Macías, E., & Bisello, M. (2022). A comprehensive taxonomy of tasks for assessing the impact of new technologies on work. *Social Indicators Research*, 159(2), 821-841.
- (25). Graham, M., & Anwar, M. A. (2023). The global gig economy: Towards a planetary labor market?. In *Handbook of research on the global political economy of work* (pp. 179-197). Edward Elgar Publishing.

- (26). Garben, S. (2017). The Constitutional (Im) balance between ‘the Market’ and ‘the Social’ in the European Union. *European Constitutional Law Review*, 13(1), 23-61.
- (27). Adams-Prassl, J., Abraha, H., Kelly-Lyth, A., Silberman, M. S., & Rakshita, S. (2023). Regulating algorithmic management: A blueprint. *European Labor Law Journal*, 14(2), 124-151.
- (28). Bérastégui, P. (2021). *Exposure to psychosocial risk factors in the gig economy: a systematic review* (No. 2021.01). Report.
- (29). Gernigon, B., Otero, A., & Guido, H. (2000). Les principes de l'OIT sur la négociation collective. *Revue internationale du Travail*, 139(1), 37-60.
- (30). Bouquet, B. (2015). L'inclusion: approche socio-sémantique. *Vie sociale*, 11(3), 15-25.
- (31). Reeves, V. K., & Garreau, C. (2016). Restitution or pillage?. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 31(5), 418-439.
- (32). Friedland, J., & Balkin, D. B. (2023). When gig workers become essential: Leveraging customer moral self-awareness beyond COVID-19. *Business Horizons*, 66(2), 181-190.
- (33). Jain, S. (2024). Revolutionizing business consulting with generative AI: Exploring transformative models for strategic decision-making, innovation, and operational excellence. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 22, 2273-2284.
- (34). Bae, H., Hur, J., Park, J., Choi, G. W., & Moon, J. (2024). Pre-Service Teachers' Dual Perspectives on Generative AI: Benefits, Challenges, and Integration into their Teaching and Learning. *Online Learning*, 28(3), 131-156.
- (35). Barley, S. R., Bechky, B. A., & Milliken, F. J. (2017). The changing nature of work: Careers, identities, and work lives in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 3(2), 111-115.