AI-Assisted Goal Setting and Income Variability among Ride-Hailing and Delivery Workers

Xavier C. Riley
Department of Computer Science, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA.
xavier1995@gmu.edu

Kevin Cox
Department of Computer Science, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA.
kevinmail@unh.edu

Ransheng Zou
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA.
ranshengzou@missouri.edu

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence into the operational infrastructure of ride-hailing and delivery platforms has introduced novel mechanisms for worker self-regulation, most notably through AI-assisted goal setting systems. These systems, which leverage predictive algorithms and behavioral nudges, allow workers to set daily or weekly earnings targets, receive real-time progress updates, and adjust their labor supply in response to algorithmic suggestions. While such tools ostensibly empower workers by enhancing autonomy and financial planning, they simultaneously introduce new forms of algorithmic control and income variability. This paper examines the structural trade-offs embedded in AI-assisted goal setting within gig economy platforms, focusing on the architectural design of these systems, their governance implications, and their effects on worker welfare. We argue that goal setting algorithms, by optimizing for platform engagement metrics, often exacerbate income volatility rather than mitigate it, particularly under conditions of demand uncertainty and algorithmic opacity. Drawing on interdisciplinary frameworks from socio-technical systems theory, labor economics, and critical algorithm studies, we analyze how goal setting interfaces function as both cognitive aids and disciplinary mechanisms. We further explore the implications for platform governance, regulatory oversight, and the design of fairer algorithmic infrastructures. The paper concludes with recommendations for embedding robustness, transparency, and worker-centered fairness into the design of AI-assisted goal setting systems, emphasizing the need for multi-stakeholder governance models that account for the inherent asymmetries of platform labor markets.

Keywords

artificial intelligence, goal setting, gig economy, ride-hailing, delivery workers, income variability, algorithmic governance, platform labor, socio-technical systems, fairness.

1. Introduction

The rapid expansion of platform-mediated labor markets has fundamentally restructured the relationship between workers, technology, and economic security. Ride-hailing and delivery platforms, such as Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, and Grubhub, now employ millions of workers globally, operating under flexible but precarious employment models that lack traditional labor protections [1]. Central to the operation of these platforms is the use of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms to allocate work, set dynamic pricing, and manage worker behavior. Among the more recent innovations in this space is the deployment of AI-assisted goal setting tools, which allow workers to define personal earnings targets and receive algorithmic feedback on their progress [2]. These tools are ostensibly designed to enhance worker autonomy by enabling more structured work schedules and providing real-time performance data. However, the underlying architecture of these systems is deeply embedded in the platform's broader incentive structure, which prioritizes worker availability and platform liquidity over individual welfare [3].

The phenomenon of AI-assisted goal setting raises critical questions about the nature of algorithmic control in digital labor markets. Traditional goal setting theory, rooted in organizational psychology, posits that specific and challenging goals can enhance motivation and performance when individuals have sufficient control over their work processes [4]. In the context of gig work, however, the translation of this theory into algorithmic practice is complicated by the platform's control over demand allocation, pricing, and information asymmetry. Workers set goals based on historical earnings data and algorithmic predictions, but these predictions are often opaque and subject to manipulation by the platform's dynamic systems [5]. This creates a feedback loop in which worker behavior is shaped not only by personal aspirations but also by the platform's algorithmic nudges, potentially leading to overwork, inefficient scheduling, and increased income variability.

This paper adopts a systems-level perspective to analyze the structural trade-offs inherent in AI-assisted goal setting for ride-hailing and delivery workers. We examine the architectural components of these systems, including data collection, predictive modeling, user interface design, and feedback mechanisms, and assess how each component contributes to or mitigates income variability. We further explore the governance and policy implications of these systems, considering how regulatory frameworks might be adapted to ensure algorithmic fairness and worker protection. By integrating insights from computer science, labor economics, and socio-technical systems theory, we aim to provide a comprehensive analysis that informs both academic discourse and practical system design.

2. The Architecture of AI-Assisted Goal Setting Systems

The design of AI-assisted goal setting systems in gig economy platforms typically involves several interconnected layers: a data ingestion layer, a predictive modeling layer, a user interface layer, and a feedback loop layer. The data ingestion layer continuously collects worker-level data, including trip histories, earnings per hour, acceptance rates, cancellation rates, and geographic patterns of activity [6]. This data is used to train predictive models that estimate future earnings potential under various scenarios, such as different times of day, weather conditions, or local events. The predictive modeling layer employs techniques such as time series forecasting, reinforcement learning, and Bayesian inference to generate personalized earnings projections and goal recommendations [7]. These models are updated in real time as new data streams in, allowing the system to adapt to changing conditions.

The user interface layer presents the worker with a goal setting dashboard, typically embedded within the platform's mobile application. This dashboard displays the worker's current earnings relative to their goal, a time remaining indicator, and often a visual representation of progress, such as a progress bar or a circular gauge [8]. Some systems also incorporate gamification elements, such as badges or streaks, to encourage continued engagement. The feedback loop layer uses the worker's response to goal setting as input for further model refinement. For example, if a worker consistently sets high goals but fails to achieve them, the system may adjust its recommendations downward, or conversely, if a worker frequently exceeds their goals, the system may nudge them to set more ambitious targets [9]. This closed-loop architecture enables the platform to dynamically influence worker behavior while maintaining the appearance of user autonomy.

From a systems engineering perspective, the key trade-off in this architecture lies between personalization and control. Highly personalized goal recommendations can improve worker satisfaction and retention by aligning with individual preferences and constraints [10]. However, personalization also allows the platform to fine-tune its influence over worker behavior, potentially leading to outcomes that benefit the platform at the expense of the worker. For instance, if the algorithm predicts that a worker is likely to accept more trips when presented with a goal that is slightly out of reach, the system may bias its recommendations toward such challenging goals, increasing the worker's labor supply without corresponding increases in earnings [11]. This dynamic raises concerns about the ethical boundaries of algorithmic persuasion in labor contexts.

3. Income Variability and Algorithmic Feedback

Income variability is a defining characteristic of gig economy work, and AI-assisted goal setting systems can both mitigate and exacerbate this variability depending on their design and implementation. On one hand, goal setting can provide workers with a cognitive framework for managing irregular earnings, helping them to plan their work hours and allocate effort more efficiently [12]. By setting a daily earnings target, workers can make informed decisions about when to log on, when to log off, and how to respond to surges in demand. This can reduce the psychological burden of uncertainty and improve overall financial planning. On the other hand, the algorithmic feedback embedded in goal setting systems can introduce new sources of variability by encouraging workers to chase targets that are misaligned with actual market conditions [13].

Consider a scenario in which a delivery worker sets a goal of earning one hundred dollars in four hours based on the platform's historical earnings data. The algorithm, however, may have been trained on data from periods of high demand, and the current demand may be significantly lower due to a local holiday or adverse weather. The worker, unaware of this discrepancy, may work longer hours than necessary to achieve the goal, resulting in lower effective hourly earnings and increased fatigue [14]. Alternatively, the algorithm may detect that the worker is close to achieving their goal and reduce the number of trip offers it sends, thereby slowing the worker's progress and extending their shift. This type of algorithmic manipulation, often referred to as "goal throttling," has been documented in several platform contexts and represents a significant source of income variability [15].

Furthermore, the feedback loop between worker behavior and algorithmic recommendations can create path dependencies that lock workers into suboptimal patterns. For example, a worker who consistently works late at night to achieve their goals may receive recommendations that reinforce this behavior, even if daytime hours offer higher earnings potential [16]. Over time, the worker's goal setting becomes increasingly detached from objective market conditions, leading to persistent inefficiencies and income instability. This phenomenon is compounded by the lack of transparency in algorithmic decision-making, which prevents workers from understanding why certain recommendations are made and how they might adjust their strategies [17].

4. Governance and Fairness Implications

The deployment of AI-assisted goal setting systems raises fundamental questions about governance and fairness in platform labor markets. From a governance perspective, these systems operate within a regulatory vacuum, as most jurisdictions have not yet established guidelines for algorithmic management in the gig economy [18]. Platforms are largely self-regulating, designing their algorithms to optimize for metrics such as worker engagement, platform liquidity, and revenue generation, with little external oversight. This self-regulatory model creates a conflict of interest, as the platform's incentives are not necessarily aligned with worker welfare. Goal setting algorithms that maximize worker hours may increase platform revenue but also contribute to worker burnout, financial stress, and health problems [19].

Fairness in AI-assisted goal setting can be understood along several dimensions: distributive fairness, procedural fairness, and informational fairness. Distributive fairness concerns the allocation of earnings and opportunities across workers. If goal setting algorithms systematically recommend lower targets to workers in certain demographic groups or geographic areas, this could perpetuate existing inequalities [20]. Procedural fairness relates to the transparency and consistency of the algorithms' decision-making processes. Workers who do not understand how their goals are set are less likely to perceive the system as fair, even if the outcomes are equitable [21]. Informational fairness involves the accuracy and completeness of the data provided to workers. If the algorithm presents earnings projections that are systematically biased upward, workers may make decisions based on false premises, leading to negative outcomes.

Addressing these fairness concerns requires a multi-stakeholder approach to algorithmic governance. One promising avenue is the development of external auditing frameworks for algorithmic management systems, similar to those proposed for credit scoring and hiring algorithms [22]. Independent auditors could assess whether goal setting algorithms produce biased outcomes, whether they are transparent in their operations, and whether they incorporate adequate safeguards against manipulation. Another approach is the establishment of worker data cooperatives, in which workers collectively own and control the data generated by their labor, giving them greater bargaining power over how algorithms are designed and deployed [23]. Such cooperatives could also facilitate the development of worker-facing tools that provide alternative goal setting recommendations based on worker-defined metrics rather than platform-defined metrics.

5. Design Recommendations for Robust and Fair Systems

Based on the analysis presented in the preceding sections, we offer several design recommendations for AI-assisted goal setting systems that prioritize robustness, fairness, and worker welfare. First, goal setting algorithms should incorporate explicit uncertainty quantification, providing workers with not only a point estimate of expected earnings but also a confidence interval or probability distribution [24]. This would allow workers to make more informed decisions and reduce the likelihood of disappointment or overwork due to overly optimistic projections. Second, platforms should implement transparency mechanisms that allow workers to inspect the factors influencing their goal recommendations, such as historical demand patterns, local competition, and algorithmic weightings [25]. This would enhance procedural fairness and enable workers to develop more effective strategies.

Third, goal setting systems should include built-in safeguards against goal throttling and other forms of algorithmic manipulation. For example, platforms could be required to disclose when a worker's goal progress is being deliberately slowed or when trip offers are being withheld, and to provide a mechanism for workers to opt out of algorithmic goal recommendations entirely [26]. Fourth, platforms should adopt participatory design processes that involve workers in the development and refinement of goal setting features. Worker input can help identify unintended consequences and ensure that the system aligns with the diverse needs and preferences of the workforce [27]. Finally, regulatory bodies should consider mandating minimum standards for algorithmic management systems, including requirements for transparency, fairness auditing, and worker consent [28].

6. Conclusion

AI-assisted goal setting represents a significant evolution in the algorithmic management of gig economy workers, offering both opportunities for enhanced worker autonomy and risks of deepened algorithmic control. This paper has examined the structural trade-offs embedded in these systems, focusing on their architectural design, their effects on income variability, and their implications for governance and fairness. We have argued that while goal setting can provide cognitive benefits to workers, the current implementation of these systems often prioritizes platform engagement over worker welfare, leading to increased income volatility and reduced transparency. The closed-loop nature of algorithmic feedback exacerbates these problems by creating path dependencies that lock workers into suboptimal patterns.

To address these challenges, we have proposed a set of design recommendations that emphasize uncertainty quantification, transparency, safeguards against manipulation, participatory design, and regulatory oversight. These recommendations are grounded in a socio-technical systems perspective that recognizes the interdependence of technical design, organizational incentives, and worker agency. As platform labor markets continue to expand, the development of fair and robust algorithmic management systems will be essential for ensuring that the benefits of AI are shared equitably across all stakeholders. Future research should focus on empirical evaluations of goal setting algorithms in real-world settings, longitudinal studies of worker outcomes, and comparative analyses of regulatory approaches across different jurisdictions. Only through interdisciplinary collaboration and sustained critical engagement can we build algorithmic infrastructures that support human flourishing rather than subordinating it to platform imperatives.

References

1. Kalleberg, A. L. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in transition. American Sociological Review, 74(1), 1-22.
2. Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. Work, Employment and Society, 33(1), 56-75.
3. Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. International Journal of Communication, 10, 3758-3784.
4. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705-717.
5. Min, X., Chi, W., Hu, X., & Ye, Q. (2024). Set a goal for yourself? A model and field experiment with gig workers. Production and Operations Management, 33(1), 205-224.

6. Chen, M. K., Chevalier, J. A., Rossi, P. E., & Oehlsen, E. (2019). The value of flexible work: Evidence from Uber drivers. Journal of Political Economy, 127(6), 2735-2794.

7. Lee, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2015). Working with machines: The impact of algorithmic and data-driven management on human workers. In Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1603-1612). ACM.

8. Jarrahi, M. H., & Sutherland, W. (2019). Algorithmic management and algorithmic competencies: Understanding and appropriating algorithms in gig work. In Information in Contemporary Society (pp. 578-589). Springer.

9. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. Academy of Management Annals, 14(1), 366-410.

10. Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2020). Algorithmic management and app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations and HRM. Human Resource Management Journal, 30(1), 114-132.

11. Shapiro, A. (2018). Between autonomy and control: Strategies of arbitrage in the on-demand economy. New Media & Society, 20(8), 2954-2971.

12. Hall, J. V., & Krueger, A. B. (2018). An analysis of the labor market for Uber's driver-partners in the United States. ILR Review, 71(3), 705-732.

13. Scheiber, N. (2017). How Uber uses psychological tricks to push its drivers' buttons. The New York Times.

14. Apouey, B. H., & Stabile, M. (2021). The effects of algorithmic management on worker health and well-being: A review. Social Science & Medicine, 287, 114358.

15. Calo, R., & Rosenblat, A. (2017). The taking economy: Uber, information, and power. Columbia Law Review, 117(6), 1623-1690.

16. Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.

17. Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. Colorado Technology Law Journal, 13(2), 203-218.

18. Dubal, V. B. (2017). Wage slave or entrepreneur? Contesting the dualism of legal worker categories. California Law Review, 105(1), 65-124.

19. Ravenelle, A. J. (2019). Hustle and gig: Struggling and surviving in the sharing economy. University of California Press.

20. Hoffmann, A. L. (2019). Where fairness fails: Data, algorithms, and the limits of antidiscrimination discourse. Information, Communication & Society, 22(7), 900-915.

21. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 149-159). PMLR.

22. Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 59-68). ACM.

23. Scholz, T. (2016). Platform cooperativism: Challenging the corporate sharing economy. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.

24. Bhatt, U., Xiang, A., Sharma, S., Weller, A., Taly, A., Jia, Y., Ghosh, J., Puri, R., Moura, J. M. F., & Eckersley, P. (2020). Explainable machine learning in deployment. In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 648-657). ACM.

25. Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. New Media & Society, 20(3), 973-989.

26. Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165(3), 633-705.

27. Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need. MIT Press.

28. Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505-523.