

Mapping Data Labour Supply Chain in Africa in an Era of Digital Apartheid: a Struggle for Recognition

Jessica Pidoux^{1,2}, Sofia Kypraiou^{1,2}, Sonia Kgomo³, Kauna Ibrahim Malgwi^{3,5}, Richard Mwaura Mathenge^{3,4}, Mophat Okinyi^{3,4}, James Oyange³, and Mariame Tighanimine*^{1,2,6}

¹University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland

²PersonalData.IO, Switzerland

³African Content Moderators Union, Kenya

⁴Kenya Techworker Community Africa, Kenya

⁵Kenya Digital Rights and Mental Health Initiative, Kenya

⁶Lise, Cnam CNRS, France

Abstract

Content moderation and data labelling work has shifted to the Global South, particularly Africa, where workers operate under precarious conditions while remaining invisible to users. This study addresses the gap in understanding the scope of this industry and the working conditions of African content moderation workforce through a participatory approach. We collaborated with a union of content moderators to conduct desk research, deploy a questionnaire (n=81), and gather ethnographic observations across nine months that could answer their social needs. Our findings show that content moderation operations span 43 out of 55 African countries, involving 17 major firms serving predominantly North-American and European clients, with workers facing insecurity and inadequate psychological support. We contribute the first comprehensive map of Africa’s content moderation industry, demonstrate a participatory methodology that centers workers’ collective actions in documenting their conditions, and apply Honneth’s “struggle for recognition” framework to understand data workers’ demands for professional acknowledgement.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) applications, including automated content moderation tools, image generation systems, and large language models, which are developed predominantly by North American technology companies such as OpenAI, Meta, and Google, have generated new forms of human labour collectively termed “data work” that is rendered invisible [LCC⁺24, MVB25]. This work encompasses tasks like filtering hate speech, classifying videos, images, or tagging text through data labelling, dataset preparation, and so, performed by workers employed by intermediary outsourcing companies, whose contractual arrangements are often precarious [TCC⁺25]. These organisational structures differ from on-demand crowdwork platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, where individual workers complete micro-tasks for piece-rate compensation without any labour contract [TLLC20].

*correspondance to mariame@tighanimine.com

Sama, a San Francisco-based business process outsourcing (BPO) company operating across the Global South, particularly in Africa, exemplifies these emerging labour arrangements. Despite describing itself as an “ethical AI company” committed to helping workers “escape poverty”, Sama has faced significant scrutiny following investigative reporting. A Time investigation [Per23b] showed that Kenyan employees earned less than two dollars per hour for reviewing and classifying disturbing content—including racist, sexist, and violent material, as well as content depicting child abuse and self-harm—to train ChatGPT’s systems without any professional safeguard. Research by the Fairwork Project corroborated these findings, documenting “unpaid overtime, short-term contracts, dangerous levels of job strain, excessive surveillance, discriminatory management practices, trade union victimisation and a broader culture of fear” within the company [CSBG23]. While Fairwork acknowledges that Sama’s management engaged with their findings and expressed commitment to improving working conditions, ongoing legal challenges and continued worker mobilisation indicate that these systemic problems persist [Agb24]. These conditions exemplify a broader socioeconomic phenomenon wherein the data work industry hires workers within poorly regulated economic and political contexts, while the opacity of outsourcing arrangements and secrecy maintained by both technology companies and BPO firms limit accountability and research insights about working conditions across the industry.

Despite growing recognition of these issues, most research has focused on documenting exploitation and harm rather than understanding how workers themselves navigate and resist these conditions. To address this gap and investigate how the AI industry is fundamentally transforming divisions of labour, work value, and skills recognition, we initiated participatory research in collaboration with an NGO and a union of African data workers specialising in content moderation. Building on recent contributions that foreground workers’ voices and experiences [Mic24], our approach goes further by positioning workers as active co-producers of scientific knowledge and social impact. These workers have been actively denouncing their working conditions following their dismissal and pursuing legal and advocacy actions for professional recognition. Importantly, data workers do not reject the nature of their work itself, but rather contest the exploitative conditions under which they labour. Their struggle centres on gaining recognition for their expertise, qualifications, competencies, and status as essential contributors to the AI pipeline. Through collaborative analysis of their working conditions, our research aims to counter the systematic erasure of their labour and professional identities within current technological hierarchies.

Using mixed methods—desk research, questionnaire data, and qualitative analysis of data accessed through workers’ exercise of data rights—our research had dual objectives: to map industry operations and worker locations, and to examine working conditions with respect to workers’ struggle for recognition that may impact technology design. To our knowledge, only two recent initiatives have attempted related mapping work—one examining data work more generally between France and Madagascar [LLCC23] and another focusing on the United States [Tec25], which drew inspiration from our preliminary findings. Our study represents the first mapping specifically of content moderation and data labelling work across Africa, revealing workflows between the Global South and Global North based on first-hand knowledge from workers themselves. Our research shows that this industry has expanded across the continent, with 43 of 55 African countries hosting at least one BPO centre engaged in this work. Additionally, we present questionnaire results of workers’ underpaid work, short-term contracts and other challenges from a network of content moderators, supported by the first legally-grounded analysis of labour arrangements that workers obtained by exercising their data access rights under the General Data Protection Regulation (EU GDPR).

Our analysis is grounded in Honneth’s concept of “struggle for recognition” [Hon96], which allows us to situate data workers’ mobilisation within a broader tradition of social movements challenging conditions of invisibility and exploitation. This theoretical framework proves particularly

relevant for understanding how data workers in Africa navigate undemocratic national contexts while fighting for recognition of their qualifications and expertise. Rather than viewing these workers solely through the lens of exploitation, Honneth’s framework allows us to examine how workers assert their professional identities and competencies as forms of resistance, encompassing both acknowledgment of their technical skills and demands for dignified working conditions that would enable them to fully exercise their expertise and advance their careers.

This struggle for recognition occurs within a broader political context concerning how labour is divided globally and how workers can participate democratically in shaping their working conditions. As workers, the struggle for recognition means trying to influence the (global) social order and the (international) division of labour that determine differences in talent [NSR56]. However, the current context of information system design in which data workers are a key workforce is affected by a “black tide” that primarily harms the populations of the Horn of Africa [GETM23], who are directly affected by the harmful effects of the tech industry of the Global North. These effects include both the consequences of online mis/disinformation (in the form of calls for genocide, human trafficking, and the spread of unmoderated or poorly moderated hate speech) and the extraction of natural and human resources to guarantee western populations a better experience of the Internet and its potential. African workers, to use the metaphor of researchers Gebru et al. [GETM23] “clean up the oil spill (...) at the expense of their own well being”. This is what AI security researcher El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi has called “digital apartheid” [GETM23, EM21].

In such digital apartheid, mapping work and data flows in relation to their working conditions in Africa helps to illustrate how segregative dynamics that are expressed in different worlds of work [CEM24] are part of the macroeconomic developments of contemporary capitalism beyond the attention that research has given to the issues of data work. Indeed, these macrodynamics draw social, ethnic, and moral boundaries [LM02] between different categories of humans in general and workers in particular.

At the same time, taking a close look at the willingness of a group of workers involved in a participatory study, fighting for recognition (of their qualifications and competences), allows us to identify the effects of these segregative dynamics on a microsociological scale. It also allows us to move beyond dominant media and academic discourse that characterises these workers as “invisible”, relegated to “dirty work” [Hug51], or labels them as “underclass” or “lumpenproletariat”. While such characterisations may capture certain aspects of their situation, this discourse can inadvertently undermine data workers’ struggle for recognition of their professionalism and qualifications. Similarly, regarding the psychological effects of data work, while this labour causes serious mental health problems, workers themselves may view psychological resilience as a form of expertise necessary for data work—and therefore as a skill that should be valued and recognised [AYK⁺25]. Understanding workers’ own acts of denunciation [BT91] as tools of action within their repertoire of contention [Til83] thus becomes essential for supporting rather than undermining their struggle for recognition.

Ultimately, our findings highlight critical issues regarding the working conditions and mental health of data workers that demand attention from the scientific community, particularly within computer science research, as these conditions directly affect the data that fuel AI systems [MSY20, Sam22]. We provide empirical evidence of systemic problems that impact not only worker wellbeing but also the quality of work produced, with implications for scientific outputs in both university research laboratories and technology companies. These findings raise significant ethical concerns and questions about data quality standards, while demonstrating how workers’ struggle for recognition offers pathways toward more equitable and sustainable AI development practices.

2 Related Work

2.1 Business Process Outsourcing and Global South Content Moderation Labour Arrangements

The study of organisations structuring the work of content moderation have started to receive attention in computer science research and digital labour studies, in particular due to the social impact of their technological services. Indeed, “a growing consensus within both the research community and the general public suggests that content moderation systems exhibit unfairness towards vulnerable users and minority groups” [FGP25]. However, these structures have been little studied from the perspective of workers as their operations are often under secrecy protection. Some scholars are putting efforts in technology-oriented solutions to improve product development and avoid the burden of content moderators’ manual labour [FGP25, KSCS24].

When examining content moderation labour arrangements, crowdsourcing platforms are more widely recognised than Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) arrangements. Early forms of “microwork”, “crowdwork”, or “data work” [MCWG24] initially flourished through digital platforms that facilitated online matching between supply and demand for small temporary jobs [RIS⁺10, DHA⁺21, TCC⁺25]. However, the labour supply chains used for AI development have evolved in recent years towards more complex and diverse forms of organisation and workforce provision [MSY20, MP22, Sch22, Lin22, MCGUS25]. BPOs represent one such organisational model.

BPOs are long-established organisations that provide a wide range of services, including human resources, finance, accounting, and after-sales support. BPOs can be understood as a subset of outsourcing arrangements, with call centres representing one of the most prominent examples of this model [AM95, Mil18]. An important distinction between BPOs and crowdsourcing platforms lies in their management structures: BPOs involve human management [LLCC23], while crowdsourcing platforms rely on algorithmic management of workers. This difference becomes particularly relevant as AI systems increasingly depend on intensive manual labour for training and refinement, with content moderation representing a significant component of this work. Given the growing scale of manual work required to support AI development, understanding how different organisational arrangements affect worker conditions becomes increasingly critical for protecting those who perform this essential but often invisible labour.

Within the AI industry, the BPO model is regarded as an effective approach to integrate workers into production processes [MSY20, LLCC23]. This integration is particularly valued given the dynamic nature of data annotation work, especially content moderation, and BPOs’ established experience in delivering diverse services to tertiary sector companies. However, this BPO model is not effective with respect to the professionalisation of workers. Content moderation work generates value for platforms beyond its primary function of managing user-generated content. The decisions made by content moderators - determining what constitutes violations, identifying emerging harmful behaviours, and categorising content types - create structured datasets that are used to train automated detection systems and machine learning models [Geb24, AYK⁺25]. These AI systems become integral to platforms’ ability to scale content management and form the foundation for algorithmic recommendation systems that drive user engagement and advertising revenue [Gil18]. The metadata generated through moderation processes provides valuable insights for platform optimisation and product development [BB25]. Content moderators working within BPO arrangements often receive limited recognition for these contributions within formal organisational structures, despite their work being essential to multiple revenue-generating activities. At the same time, improvements in working conditions appear to be possible within BPOs, provided that there is third-party intervention, particularly from clients who can demand changes [MCGUS25].

BPOs geographical locations are often selected based on labour costs [Bor06] and historical ties between contracting companies and host countries, frequently reflecting colonial relationships. France and Madagascar exemplify this pattern [LLCC23]. Yet, studies focusing on how these organisations affect minority groups disadvantaged by platform moderation mechanisms [HDNW21] or countries in the Global South [SV23] remain limited. These populations face particular challenges, as they have fewer moderation resources despite being disproportionately affected by disinformation, hate speech, and incitement to violence, as witnessed in Myanmar and Tigray [Fin18, Bro20, NSBE22, WTD21, Cry23, AYK⁺25].

These organisational characteristics of BPOs - including the undervaluation of workers’ expertise, the lack of recognition for their contributions to AI development, and the influence of colonial economic relationships - create particular working conditions that directly affect content moderators upskilling and recognition. Within BPOs, the exercise of expertise (e.g., linguistic and cultural expertise) is not valued, and content moderators, although competent, are encouraged to remain superficial in the expression of their knowledge [AYK⁺25]. This limitation reflects the organisational constraints within BPOs that form a central focus of our analysis.

2.2 The Broad Scope of Content Moderation Tasks and its Consequences on Working Conditions

Content moderation can be generally defined as “the organized practice of screening user-generated content posted to Internet sites, social media and other online outlets, in order to determine the appropriateness of the content for a given site, locality, or jurisdiction” ([Rob14], cited in [MSBS25]) conceptualise content moderation as encompassing “the practices and processes used by online platforms to identify, evaluate, and manage user-generated content that may violate community standards or cause harm”. Other authors explain that content moderation represents an applied and specialised form of data annotation activity that occurs in near real-time [AYK⁺25]. However, authors highlight that content moderation extends beyond traditional data labelling, typically referring to the process of assigning labels or tags to data (e.g. marking an image as containing a cat, or labelling text as positive/negative sentiment), by requiring workers to navigate dynamic, uncertain, and complex textual, technical, and social contexts [KTW23, Geb24, JPSA⁺24, Wra25]. This makes moderation work inherently unpredictable, as situations frequently exceed the frameworks established by platform guidelines. In short, we agree with an extended definition of data work which includes content moderation, in the continuity of the Data Worker’s Inquiry project and its participatory methodology, Workers’ Inquiry as a Research Methodology (WIRM) [MDK⁺25]. We also believe that this extended definition is consistent in the era of massive development of LLMs, which are claimed to be an important step towards AGI [BHGH⁺25, EMHT25]. In addition, dominant models such as Llama (Meta), Gemini (Google), or ChatGPT (Open AI and Microsoft) belong to companies that own social media platforms that use the work of content moderators via BPOs [Hel23]. Social media data is used as training data for those LLMs [Reu24, Tay25, Con25, Val25]. Thus, the work of content moderators, initially intended for social media, is being reused in the training of LLMs.

Content moderation workers often perform content processing tasks, even going so far as to carry out editorial work, ensuring that content complies with legislation and safeguards the platforms with regard to laws and advertisers [Rob14, Gil18, GBK20]. Indeed, frontline moderators operate within a broader ecosystem of Trust & Safety (T&S) work, which includes strategic activities such as content policy design, product development, research and data analysis, and legal compliance [MSBS25]. However, while T&S professionals at the strategic level may receive recognition for policy development and system design, the operational work of content moderators - who implement

these policies through daily content review - remains undervalued and poorly defined in formal job specifications [MSBS25].

Consequently, workers' responsibilities extend well beyond the poorly defined formal job descriptions that platforms typically provide to content moderators, which may result in deteriorating working conditions, encompassing both uncompensated labour and adverse psychological health outcomes. Historically, content moderation has relied on unpaid volunteer labour, establishing a pattern of uncompensated digital work that persists today. This precedent was set in the 1990s when tens of thousands of AOL volunteer community leaders managed chatrooms without payment, eventually leading to protests and a class action lawsuit that was settled in 2011 for 15 million USD [Mat16]. Contemporary platforms like Reddit continue this model through volunteer moderators who, while classified as independent volunteers rather than employees, perform substantial work to create, promote, and maintain social relations online without compensation. This historical reliance on unpaid labour has created ongoing tensions between platforms and moderators, as evidenced by collective action such as the Reddit moderator blackout, where volunteers protested changes to platform policies that affected their ability to perform moderation work effectively [Mat16].

Recent scholarship has proposed methods to improve moderation work by highlighting moderators' skills and the benefits their recognition could bring to platforms and society [Gri15, WL20, VXHK21, FBKT24]. However, the psychological effects of content moderation work, particularly when moderating violent and hateful content, remain largely uncompensated and unrecognised [SBV⁺21, MCWG24, Geb24].

The growing organisation of content moderation workers and data workers into unions [Per23a] or guilds [YM24] represents a crucial step towards recognising their professional identity and improving working conditions. While the lack of recognition of the expertise constantly mobilized by content moderation workers is increasingly being highlighted in research [AYK⁺25], it is more broadly the lack of recognition of the qualities and professionalism of workers that we seek to characterise in this article. Indeed, expertise is one of several elements that compose the professional identity of workers.

3 Participatory Methodology and Positionality

Participatory approaches in research have different definitions and empirical practices according to discipline and context [HFGT⁺21]. Two transversal commonalities of this type of research were applied in this study: to place the social concerns of the public at the center of the research study, and by doing so, we make this public part of the research process. We involved workers during the research objectives' formulation, data collection and interpretation phases. The union's main concerns were to gain visibility over the content moderation industry they were working at, as well as broaden their networks for grouping with others that were experiencing the same working conditions' problems.

Adopting a reflexive ethnographic stance [AE17], the authors recognise the influence of their positionalities on the research process, advocating for respecting the rights of affected communities marked by uneven power relations and regulatory asymmetries. We sought to make these dynamics visible. Our engagement aimed not only at knowledge production but at producing practical means for workers to collect new information that would contribute to the union's collective strategies for improved working conditions.

3.1 Authors’ Positionality

This study is grounded in a reflexive and participatory research approach, shaped by the authors’ engagement in the sociopolitical conditions of platform labour and data rights. Three authors are affiliated with the same university and NGO, approaching this work through their respective roles in research and advocacy. The first author holds a dual position as a researcher and director of PersonalData.IO. This study forms part of the NGO’s *Data4Mods* project, which the first author led in direct engagement with content moderation workers and their organisation, the African Content Moderators Union (ACMU). The second author is a data scientist at PersonalData.IO and contributed with data processing and analysis of the project. The authors from third to seventh are members of ACMU. The last author brought an external perspective from sociology to this study as she was not involved in the data collection but has joined the NGO before the writing of this manuscript. Her position allowed for critical distance in the analysis and interpretation of the data on working conditions and the broader structural dynamics of global platform labour.

3.2 The African Content Moderators Union Struggle

ACMU is a collective of workers denouncing abusive working conditions such as job insecurity, surveillance, arbitrary dismissal, and wellbeing harms in the content moderation industry. While lacking legal entity registration due to governmental barriers that impede formal union establishment, they united with hundreds of other content moderators in Africa and globally, pursuing legal cases against Meta for exploitative conditions via their subcontractors’ companies like Sama [Sie23, Hel23, BK24, Mus24].

The union is now recognised for speaking out publicly and claiming social justice after being isolated and censured by confidentiality clauses at their subcontracting companies. Hence, this union and their struggle represent a major social movement of emerging workers in the AI sector that are crucial for technology development but have not been recognised as such.

3.3 Union Structure and Workers’ Organisational Background

The union has a steering committee comprising five members: Kauna Ibrahim Malgwi serves as both steering committee member and wellness and mental health lead; Mophat Okinyi functions as educational trainer coordinator; Richard Mwaura Mathenge holds the position of committee administrator; James Oyange acts as secretary; and Sonia Kgomo serves as treasurer.

These members worked at the same or different companies. Kauna Ibrahim Malgwi [Per24a] worked as a Facebook content moderator for four years (2019-2023) through Sama Limited Kenya. Mophat Okinyi’s employment (2019-2022) [Per24b] with Sama as a subcontractor involved dual roles: initially as a data labeller controlling datasets of video, images, and text for ChatGPT, and subsequently as a quality analyst supervising other workers’ compliance with operational standards. James Oyange [Per23c] worked as a TikTok content moderator through Majorel (now Teleperformance) under a one-year contract (2022-2023). Sonia Kgomo [Kgo25] worked alongside Kauna Ibrahim Malgwi on Facebook content moderation through Sama for 2 years (2021-2023). Richard Mwaura Mathenge [Per23d] was employed by Majorel, working there for three months in 2022.

All ACMU members have left these companies. They claim their contract terminations reveal patterns of retaliation and corporate restructuring linked to their advocacy for improved conditions. For instance, James Oyange’s dismissal was ostensibly attributed to restructuring and downsizing, yet occurred shortly after his advocacy efforts. Both Kauna Ibrahim Malgwi and Sonia Kgomo experienced simultaneous termination when their project was deemed redundant and transferred from Sama to Majorel, occurring just before their three-month contracts expired.

3.4 The Research Project

This research results from a project between ACMU and PersonalData.IO for seven months (August 2024 - March 2025). A union member and the NGO’s director met at an international forum of data workers at the European Parliament in Brussels. Their discussion led to establishing a common project that would address the union’s concerns. The project was conceived together and developed as partners, avoiding the traditional researcher-participant model, and received funding successfully. Grant resources were distributed upon budget agreement between the two organisations.

Together, with the NGO’s expertise on data protection and the workers’ expertise on content moderation, the project sought to support workers in accessing their personal data from companies where they had previously been employed using the European General Data Protection Regulation (see4). Personal data could serve as evidence of working conditions: a new means to defend their labour rights as they have encountered significant challenges in proving their working conditions due to opacity and workers’ isolation practices under secrecy clauses on the part of these companies.

4 Data Collection Methods

This research combines four types of methods (Table 1) that were complementary, connecting the global industry development [MVB25, WMX25] with systematic problems of workers beyond personal experiences [YM24]. These methods work together to expose and document content moderation labour from multiple angles. The mapping reveals the structural conditions that obscure workers’ experiences: subcontracting chains that diffuse accountability, corporate name changes that hide continuity, and geographical dispersion that prevents collective organising. Understanding this fragmented landscape is essential for the questionnaire, which systematically documents whether the working conditions faced by union members are isolated incidents or industry-wide patterns across this dispersed workforce. The GDPR data access requests then provide documentary corroboration, using employers’ own records—contracts, offer letters, extensions—to verify both the corporate relationships mapped and the exploitative conditions reported in questionnaires. This methodological triangulation moves from revealing hidden structures, to amplifying silenced experiences, to securing legal evidence, thereby supporting the union’s claims with multiple forms of proof that are difficult for companies to dismiss.

4.1 Desk Research and Map Visualisation

The first data collection method employed desk research through the systematic collection of publicly available information from corporate websites and platforms where workers had previously been employed. Initial data gathering drew upon workers’ experiential knowledge and testimonies, which were subsequently verified and supplemented by researchers. Workers’ knowledge was key as companies often operate under different names, changing throughout time, and keeping in secrecy the type of operations they make, which obscures the work being conducted by content moderators.

The aggregated information was processed to create a map through data visualisation using kepler.gl, a web-based geospatial data analysis tool. The tool facilitated the construction of a comprehensive mapping framework that delineates the complex workflows and data flows between corporate headquarters, subcontracting locations where workers are stationed, and client companies that receive content moderation services. Thus, we combined qualitative analysis and data visualisation techniques in alignment with new mixed methods used to better understand the emerging digital labour platform market and their organisational structures in Europe and Africa. This systematic approach to mapping corporate networks ultimately serves to address the ACMU’s social

Table 1: Overview of Data Collection Methods and Analysis

Method	Goals	Data Collected	Analysis
1. Desk Research and Map Visualisation	Map corporate networks and workflows; provide visibility of hidden industry; identify potential union membership bases	Publicly available information from corporate websites and platforms; workers’ testimonies	Data visualisation using kepler.gl; qualitative analysis of corporate structures
2. Cross-Sectional Online Questionnaire	Understand if workers’ experiences were isolated or general in the industry; give voice to workers constrained from speaking publicly	Responses on occupational classification, employment structure, working conditions, compensation, workplace challenges, institutional support	Descriptive statistics using Python; univariate and bivariate analyses; frequency distributions and percentages
3. GDPR Data Access Rights	Recover personal data held by companies; demonstrate cross-continental applicability of GDPR	Offer letters, employment contracts, contract extensions from Sama and Teleperformance	Qualitative analysis of employment documents
4. Participant Observation	Situate group dynamics and personal experiences within project goals; incorporate union perspectives	Fieldnotes from online meetings (May 2024–February 2025)	Qualitative analysis of meetings and discussions

concerns. To the ACMU, mapping content moderation companies was a first resource to support their claims because it first provided visibility of a hidden industry where they belong and then, it provided the foundational information necessary for their union for establishing a transnational labour movement that could effectively represent workers across multiple jurisdictions and corporate entities within the growing content moderation sector. They wanted to strategically identify potential membership bases—particularly crucial given that content moderation workers are often isolated and dispersed across various companies—to work towards organised collective action and advocacy.

4.2 Questionnaire

The second method chosen was a cross-sectional online questionnaire to collect working conditions in the industry as experienced by other workers. The questionnaire ensured anonymity, reaching out data content moderators within ACMU networks who were not remunerated by their participation and accepted voluntarily to answer for contributing to research and the union’s collective actions. The questionnaire represented a second means contributing to the union’s concerns. These workers are often constrained to talk in public spaces about their conditions and besides leaders advocating in media, the rest of the workers, and their experiences, remain silent. The questionnaire was designed by researchers with closed questions, multiple choices available, according to the ACMU workers experiences with the goal of understanding if these experiences were isolated

cases or general ones in the industry. The questionnaire covered six primary themes: occupational classification, employment structure and contract conditions, working conditions, compensation, workplace challenges, and institutional support mechanisms.

Data analysis was conducted by a data scientist (second author) using Python programming language and Jupyter notebooks. The analytical approach focused on descriptive statistics to characterise the sample and examine key variables of interest. Univariate analyses were performed to describe the distribution of individual variables such as employment status, contract duration, working hours, salary ranges, and reported workplace challenges. One bivariate analysis was conducted to explore relationships between salary and challenges' variables. Results were presented through frequency distributions, percentages, and data visualisations to illustrate patterns within the content moderation workforce. All analyses were descriptive in nature, providing a comprehensive overview of working conditions and challenges faced by participants without inferential statistics.

4.3 Data Protection

The final method chosen was the use of a legal tool for recovering personal data of the union's members held by the companies through the exercise of data access rights under the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Under this law, any person is a data subject with specific rights vis-à-vis companies processing their information. We are pioneers of its application in this context.

The GDPR provides for two forms of data restitution that we have focused on. First, access (Article 15): This covers personal data relating to the data subject, including data provided by the individual, data supplied by third parties, and data inferred by the platform. Second, portability (Article 20): This applies to personal data relating to the data subject which they have provided themselves. The right to portability states that data subjects shall have the right to receive the personal data concerning them, which they have provided to a controller, in a structured, commonly used and machine-readable format and have the right to transmit those data to another controller without hindrance from the controller to which the personal data have been provided,

Although this is an European law, we proved its applicability cross-continental jurisdictions in which global data flows are being embedded. Despite the Kenyan data protection legislation—'The Data Protection Act of 2019'—transposes key principles of the GDPR, the companies in question have refused at first stance to acknowledge the applicability of the GDPR, arguing that its territorial scope is limited to European citizens. However, with this project, we were able to demonstrate, firstly, that the transfer of data to third parties located within the European Union results in the de facto application of the GDPR, as provided under Article 3(1), and secondly, that these entities, acting as data controllers, have their registered office, place of business, or a permanent establishment within the European Union.

As Teleperformance and Sama have operations in Europe, and transfer personal data across countries and continents, this regulation applies and protects Kenyan workers. Thanks to the recovery of their personal data, we found valuable insights about their working conditions. Specifically, we analysed documents recovered by two employees, one from Sama and another one from Teleperformance: offer letters, employment contracts and extension contracts.

4.4 Participant Observation

Finally, we conducted qualitative analysis of the project's meetings through participant observation. The meetings allowed researchers situating the group dynamics and their personal experiences of

the ACMU in the project goals to complete the data analysis of the legal evidence recovered via GDPR with their perspectives. The first author took fieldnotes of online meetings and discussions throughout the project between May 2024 and February 2025. The meetings and discussions were between two researchers and five members of the ACMU, the average duration was one hour.

4.5 Research Ethics

This research ethical framework addressed both questionnaire and data protection application within its broader participatory study design.

Questionnaire: Research information sheets and consent forms were developed collaboratively by PersonalData.IO and ACMU, ensuring participants were fully informed about the study purpose, their data rights, and data collection procedures. All participation was voluntary and uncompensated. Questionnaire data was collected using an online tool. Subsequently, data was transferred to the NGO’s secured cloud server in Switzerland, accessible only to project members for analysis purposes.

Data Protection: All authors except the last one were co-designers of the data collection project. The union actively participated in designing the personal data collection protocol and members exercised their rights individually as former workers of outsourcing companies. After receiving their data, members shared and analysed it with researchers. This participatory approach ensured full knowledge of the purpose and consent regarding the collection of personal data obtained through these rights, as well as the use of selected information for analysis and research publication. Privacy protection of personal data was maintained through individual file storage systems where members could only access their own data, with selected information shared with the NGO and other union members for collective analysis only with explicit consent of every member.

5 Findings

5.1 Mapping the Content Moderation Industry

This section provides a perspective on the content moderation industry and its related labour market: A map (Figure 1) providing the first visualisation where content moderators and data labelers operate across Africa and the geographical distribution of the companies that employ them. We identified 17 firms engaged in content moderation and data labeling operations and characterised them according to five variables: Location of HQ (city and country), office locations in rest of the world, office locations in Africa, size of company and clients. While we refer to these entities as companies, it is important to note that through ethnographic observations, the ACMU clarified that content moderation services are frequently embedded within broader Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) operations, where workers may be officially designated as “customer service representatives” while actually performing data labelling and content moderation tasks under conditions of operational secrecy. This corporate structure creates a deliberate obfuscation whereby “call centre services” serve as a façade for more sensitive content moderation work, with different departments handling distinct aspects of data processing—some focused on customer care support, others on content moderation, and still others on data labelling—all operating under the umbrella of seemingly conventional customer service operations.

5.1.1 Global Spread of the Industry and Location of Content Moderation Workforce

Company headquarters are distributed globally across four main regions: North America (n=5, 29.4%), Africa (n=6, 35.3%), Europe (n=4, 23.5%), the Middle East (n=1, 5.9%) and South-east




Figure 1: Map of the content moderation industry.

Asia ($n=1$, 5.9%). This distribution reflects the global nature of the content moderation industry, with a notable concentration of headquarters within African markets themselves, suggesting international corporations establishing regional presence alongside the emergence of locally-based firms.

Operational presence patterns, i.e. where work is being performed, differ from headquarters distribution, revealing strategic workforce placement decisions. 10 out of the 17 companies analysed (52.9%) currently maintain active operations in Africa. Collectively, these companies operate across 43 of Africa’s 55 countries, representing 79.6% of the continent. Among the eight companies operating in Africa (remote and in person), headquarters location shows an even split: four companies (50%) maintain African headquarters (Kenya, Republic of Mauritius, and South Africa), while four companies (50%) operate from non-African headquarters (United States, UAE, France, and Spain). Concurrently, 11 companies (64.7%) operate workforce centers in regions outside Africa, primarily concentrated in the Americas. This operational geography indicates that workforce location often extends beyond headquarters placement, with both locally-headquartered African firms and international corporations establishing African operational centers to serve global content moderation demands. For instance, Africashore has a pan-African focus, operating across 36 African countries without maintaining physical offices outside Africa. In contrast, Teleperformance Nigeria (operating in 8 African countries) combines its African operations with workforce centres in multiple countries across North, Central, and South America. Additionally, some companies adopt remote work models: Sigma AI operates entirely through remote arrangements both within Africa and globally. Toloka AI, with offices in Amsterdam, US, Israel, Switzerland and Serbia, outsources the data labelling to remote workers in Africa.

5.1.2 Company Size Distribution

Analysis of company size shows significant heterogeneity within the content moderation industry. Among firms with available size data ($n=10$), the largest operation is Africashore (3,047,956 employ-

ees), followed by Teleperformance Nigeria (410,000 employees), Majorel Kenya (82,000 employees), and Sigma AI (25,000 employees). Medium to large-scale operations include Hugo (3,800 employees) and StepWise (reported as 1,001-5,000 employees). Smaller firms comprise Realm Digital (100 employees), Oasis Outsourcing (51-200 employees), Melio AI (50 employees), and AfricaAI (11-50 employees). This size distribution indicates that the industry is dominated by very large multinational corporations alongside a smaller segment of specialised medium and small-scale providers. However, it is important to note that these are the companies' estimates and for companies with remote task force, it is unclear the number of employees.

5.1.3 AI Sectoral Demand for Content Moderation Services

Data available for seven companies show the integration of the content moderation outsourcing industry within major AI-technology platforms for diverse sectoral applications. Hugo maintains contracts with prominent social media and technology companies, including Google and Meta, alongside e-commerce and educational platforms. Sigma AI serves major cloud computing and AI infrastructure providers (Google Cloud, AWS, NVIDIA) as well as specialised AI development tools. The client base extends beyond technology platforms to include traditional sectors: Africashore serves automotive (Lear Corporation), consulting (PwC), and technology services clients, whilst Realm Digital provides services to banking (Standard Bank), telecommunications (Vodafone), and retail (Spar) sectors. This demand diversity demonstrates that content moderation and data labelling services extend across multiple economic sectors beyond social media platforms. Moreover, when looking at location of this client base, we can observe a North-South service flow where content moderation providers (regardless of their headquarters location) predominantly serve clients from developed economies (US, Europe) with some local/regional service provision. This suggests that African-based operations primarily serve as offshore service centres for Global North corporations rather than serving local African markets.

5.2 Working Conditions

This section provides the worker's perspective: The working conditions of the content moderation workforce. A total of 81 individuals answered the questionnaire. We excluded from our sample three participants that were exclusively working as data labellers as our analysis focuses on content moderation workers (Figure 2). Among them, 78 (96%) identified as content moderators, and 18 (23%) also reported engaging in data labelling. Respondents who performed both content moderation and data labelling are referred to throughout this article as hybrid workers or hybrid roles. At the time of data collection, 67 participants (83%) were unemployed, while 14 (17%) reported current employment. Of those employed, nine worked solely as content moderators, and two held hybrid roles.

5.2.1 In Which Locations Do Content Moderators Operate?

Most respondents (n=37, 55.2%) worked exclusively on-site at company facilities, while 27 (40.9%) split time between remote and in-person work (Figure 3). Only 3 (4.5%) worked fully remotely. Among content moderators, 28 (57.1%) were fully on-site, and 20 (40.8%) split locations. Hybrid workers had slightly more remote flexibility: 8 (47%) worked only on-site, 7 (41.1%) in mixed settings, and 2 (11.7%) worked fully remotely. These patterns reflect both infrastructure needs and monitoring demands in moderation work.

The majority of respondents (n=62, 93.9%) were based in Kenya, with a small number from Uganda (n=2, 3%) and Ethiopia (n=2). Both Ugandan participants worked in hybrid roles, while




Figure 2: The principal occupation of survey participants.




Figure 3: Participants' work locations.

the Ethiopians were content moderators. Among Kenyans, 47 (75.8%) were content moderators and 15 (24.2%) held hybrid roles, reflecting a concentration of this labour in Nairobi-based outsourcing centres.

The analysis of workers' contracts provided additional insights into the geographical mobility requirements and relocation practices within the content moderation sector. The Teleperformance contract for a worker already located in Kenya includes provisions for potential relocation, stating that "in the course of your duties you may be called upon to work at such other places as may be designated by management from time to time." This clause establishes employer discretion over workplace location changes without specifying geographical limitations. The Sama contract for a worker originally from Nigeria who was relocated to Kenya by the company stipulated relocation provisions, including requirements for travel "to such other places whether in or outside Kenya by such means and on such occasions as the Company may from time to time reasonably require". The contract establishes structured relocation: a one-time relocation allowance equivalent to the first month's gross pay, temporary accommodation for one month in company-selected apartments, economy class airfare from the worker's nearest international airport to Nairobi, and annual return tickets after one year of continuous service. This last condition was not ensured by the company according to the worker's testimony. Significantly, the contract grants the company unilateral authority to change workplace locations "as may be reasonably necessary to respond to changing business needs." These contractual provisions explain the concentration of workers in Kenya identified in questionnaire responses, where 93.9% of respondents were based in Kenya, with smaller numbers from Uganda and Ethiopia. The predominantly on-site work arrangements—with 55.2% working exclusively at company facilities—reflect both the infrastructural requirements for content moderation and the monitoring demands inherent in this form of digital labour. The relocation provisions demonstrate how companies leverage geographical arbitrage while maintaining operational control through strategic worker placement in specific regional hubs.

5.2.2 What Are the Contractual Arrangements and Working Hours for Content Moderators?

Content moderators generally had longer contracts than hybrid workers: the most common duration for content moderators was 6–12 months ($n=18$, 40%), followed by contracts over 12 months ($n=12$, 26.6%). In contrast, hybrid workers most frequently reported contracts under 3 months ($n=7$, 41.1%), suggesting less job stability.

Contract renewals followed similar trends (Figure 4). Across the sample, 20 (36.3%) had contracts renewed three or more times, while 13 (23.6%) received no renewal. Among content moderators, 28 (70%) reported at least one renewal, with 13 (32.5%) being renewed three or more times. Among hybrid workers, the renewal rate was 66.6%, though renewals were tied to shorter original contract periods, which suggests these types of workers are the most affected by precarious contractual conditions when assuming multiple tasks.

Our examination of employment contracts from two major outsourcing firms confirms the predominant pattern of one-year contract durations, which emerged as the most frequent response in our questionnaire data where workers reported contract lengths ranging between six and 12 months. Analysis of the Sama contract demonstrates a pattern of successive one-year fixed-term agreements: the initial contract (incorporating a three-month probationary period) was renewed twice for annual terms, with the final renewal occurring merely one week prior to termination. Similarly, the Teleperformance contract follows a one-year fixed-term structure, explicitly contingent upon business requirements and performance metrics, coupled with an extended six-month probationary period requiring only 15 days' notice for contract termination by either party. These contractual




Figure 4: Participants’ work locations.

frameworks exemplify the precarious employment conditions characteristic of the content moderation sector with short-term contracts, wherein workers face recurring uncertainty regarding contract renewal.

Regarding contracted working hours (Figure 5), most respondents were expected to work either 6–8 hours per day ($n=32$, 52.5%) or over 8 hours ($n=27$, 44.2%). Content moderators more often had 8-hour contracts ($n=25$, 56.8%), while hybrid workers were more likely to be assigned more than 8 hours ($n=10$, 58.8%). Yet, 38 (62.3%) of all respondents reported actually working more than 8 hours per day, suggesting that extended workdays are routine. Among those contracted for 6–8 hours, 12 (38.7%) worked overtime—including 8 content moderators (33.3%) and 4 hybrid workers (57.1%) (Figure 6). For reference, the standard working day was considered to be 8 hours across all countries included in the survey [ken, Eth, Uga]. The data highlight the discrepancy between formal expectations and actual workloads. Both types of workers experience an extension of working time, but hybrid workers are additionally constrained by longer contractual working hours.

Our observations additionally show that there was an important difference in the problems faced by workers according to their position in the company. Sonia, content moderator, reported arbitrary schedule changes, nine-hour working days with breaks limited to five minutes, making adequate meals or rest impossible under intense operational pressure. In contrast, Mophat with a managerial position worked 9 hours per day with breaks totaling to an hour. He afforded better working breaks but required him to enforce productivity pressures on his team, for instance he was responsible to enforce a quota of 50 tasks per day and maintain team productivity through direct pressure on subordinates.

Analysis of working hour provisions in contracts demonstrates both companies’ emphasis on

According to the terms of your current or most recent contract, how many hours per day were you expected to work?




Figure 5: Contractual working hours.

In practice, how many hours per day did you actually work during your current or most recent working period?




Figure 6: Actual working hours.

operational flexibility and intensive labour availability, confirming the trend identified in questionnaire responses regarding extended working hours and overtime practices. Both Teleperformance and Sama contracts mandate continuous 24/7 availability with compulsory shift assignments determined by supervisors. The Teleperformance agreement stipulates 45-48 hours weekly across five days, with provision for additional hours “based on business requirements”, while Sama’s contract requires 45 hours weekly with employees expected to work “whichever shift assigned” and “devote the whole of their time and attention during business hours and at such other times as may be necessary”. These contractual provisions use a vague language regarding “additional hours” and “necessary” overtime. The contracts place temporal availability obligations entirely upon workers, thereby validating survey findings that revealed widespread overtime work beyond contracted hours and discrepancies between formal contractual expectations and actual working patterns.

5.2.3 What Are the Wage Arrangements for Content Moderators?

Most respondents (n=34, 59.6%) reported earning 251–500 USD per month (Figure 7). Fewer participants reported earning 501–1000 USD (n = 8, 14%) or 100–250 USD (n = 8, 14%), while 5 participants (8.8%) earned under 100 USD, and 2 participants (3.5%) preferred not to disclose their income. In comparison to Kenya’s (as the majority of workers are based in Kenya) average monthly earnings of 590 USD [cei], most participants earned below national benchmarks.




Figure 7: Monthly salary rate.

Among content moderators, 28 (65.1%) earned monthly 251–500 USD, with smaller shares earning more than 500 USD (n=6, 13.9%) or less than 250 USD (n=7, 16.2%). Hybrid workers had a more variable income profile: 6 (42.8%) earned 251–500 USD, but 4 (28.5%) earned 100–250 USD and 2 (14.3%) earned under 100 USD. Only 2 (14.3%) earned more than 500 USD. This variability reflects the less stable and more fragmented nature of hybrid work arrangements.

When analysing the worker’s contracts, Teleperformance stipulates a gross monthly consolidated salary of thirty thousand KSh (approximately \$232 USD) inclusive of housing allowance, with potential performance bonuses of up to twenty percent contingent upon achieving predetermined targets. Payment is structured monthly in arrears, subject to income tax and statutory deductions. The Sama offer letter indicates a higher base salary of 40,000 KSh plus a 20,000 KSh allowance, totalling 60,000 KSh monthly (approximately \$464 USD). Both companies employ performance-based remuneration models where base salaries are supplemented by discretionary bonuses tied to productivity metrics. These wage structures confirm questionnaire findings regarding the concentration of earnings within the 251-500 USD monthly range for most workers, positioning the majority of respondents below Kenya’s national average monthly earnings. The contractual salary levels correspond with survey responses indicating limited earning potential within the sector, particularly for content moderators who demonstrated more stable but constrained income patterns compared to hybrid workers’ more variable earnings profiles.

5.2.4 What Challenges Do Content Moderators Face?

Participants reported a range of challenges, with low pay (n=56) and emotional stress (n=54) being the most frequently cited (Figure 8). Other concerns included fear of reprisal for speaking up (n=52), sudden contract termination (n=47), lack of psychological support (n=47), and weak

labor protections (n=45). Structural and institutional issues—such as unclear expectations (n=40) and strict NDAs (n=42)—were also common.




Figure 8: Reported challenges among all workers

Content moderators were particularly affected by emotional stress (n=40), low pay (n=39), fear of speaking out (n=38), and insufficient psychological support (n=37), pointing to both emotional and structural strain. Hybrid workers, while also reporting low pay (n=16) and stress (n=14), gave more emphasis to inconsistent hours (n=13), unclear roles (n=13), and limited advancement (n=13). They also highlighted gaps in institutional support across multiple dimensions (n=12) (absence of social and labour rights, unjustified or sudden contract termination, lack of collective support).

5.2.5 What Are the Wages of Workers Who Identify Low Pay as a Challenge?

A cross-reference of those who reported low pay with their income level supports a direct link between economic dissatisfaction and actual earnings (Figure 9).

Among those citing low pay (n=56), most earned 251–500 USD per month (n=31, 60%), while others earned 100–250 USD (n=6, 11.7%) or less than 100 USD (n=5, 9.8%). Only 7 (13.7%) earned 501–1000 USD—underscoring that even workers earning closer to global minimums still felt underpaid. For reference, the minimum wage in Kenya is 15,201.65 KES (117.66 USD) [min].

25 content moderators (67.5%) earned 251–500 USD, while smaller portions earned 100–250 USD (n=3, 8.1%) or less than 100 USD (n=3, 8.1%). Interestingly, 4 (10.8%) content moderators who cited low pay earned more than 500 USD, suggesting that perceived underpayment may also be tied to job demands or expectations.




Figure 9: Reported challenges among all workers

Hybrid workers citing low pay were more likely to earn below 250 USD: 3 (23%) earned 100–250 USD, and 2 (15.4%) earned under 100 USD. Only 2 (15.4%) of hybrid respondents citing low pay earned above 500 USD. These trends reinforce the association between hybrid roles and greater income precarity, supporting broader concerns around financial sustainability in outsourced moderation work.

6 Discussion

6.1 The Struggle for Recognition

The struggle for recognition is a useful concept for understanding the demands for professional identity recognition made by content moderators and data workers in Africa, where they operate under exploitative conditions while remaining invisible to the world [Rob14, Kgo25]. This struggle materialises in their interest of forming a union, on the public denunciation of working conditions in media, and the development of this project (see 3).

Following this theoretical framework, the quest for recognition can be seen as a “total social fact” [Mau13, Cai07], i.e. a social fact which concerns or may concern all members of a society, and which crosses a whole set of social institutions simultaneously. Since the end of the 20th century, recognition has been expressed in numerous social struggles and has been the subject of interest in social sciences, particularly those related to labour. From the very beginning, scholarship on recognition has postulated that the transition to a post-Fordist and post-socialist world has led to a shift beyond simple criticism of the economic structure of society to consider social injustices, particularly cultural ones. Adopting this approach helps us to understand why certain identities are more widely recognised than others. Recognition has become an important concept for understanding

the social and political transformations of the 20th century [But02, Tay21, Fra20, Kym95]. These authors share a common approach: they interrogate the notion of multiculturalism while focusing on dominated identities, particularly in the United States context.

We go further by adopting Honneth’s concept of recognition [Hon92], namely a systemic update of the Hegelian idea of the struggle for recognition as the foundation of our relationship with others and ourselves. Honneth’s approach focuses specifically on work and its importance in the social world as we experience it [Hon13]. In other words, the social esteem received by the participants in a work process determines the possibility of self-esteem and awareness of one’s own value. This shift in focus, from identity to the recognition of work, qualities, and ultimately workers themselves, raises questions about the definition and nature of qualifications. These questions are relevant for both the sociology of work and computer science, as they allow us to shed light on certain developments in the nature of work, workspaces, and the future of work following the development of automation, particularly with the rise of AI. In our study, this framework translates into data workers fighting for recognition of their work and qualifications, and ultimately society (and particularly researchers, policy makers, journalists, consumers, etc.) supporting their collective claims for better working conditions, which are overall improved material conditions of existence.

Beyond the recognition of their qualifications, at the heart of data workers’ struggle, their *competences* are claimed to be recognised. Qualification can be defined as the result of a process of attributing a quality, and competence as a capacity recognised as such [Str07]. Qualifications place workers within a professional hierarchy. It helps to establish the link between the definition and development of the qualities expected in the workplace and the factors that contribute to determining salary recognition [Mon18]. Therefore, an analytical shift from qualification to competence can help to understand and perceive workers as “authors of their own careers” [Lal07], allowing them to make projections about the qualities and competences they may have in the future and that may be recognised. This emphasis on data workers’ professional qualities is a way of making more evident the phenomena of “surplus labour”, i.e. labour produced by human data workers and that is not recognised for its true worth [Sam22]) and “precision labor”, i.e. “the hidden and excessive labor involved in erasing the messy, ambiguous, and uncertain aspects of technology production” [ZYM⁺25]).

In sum, linking the working conditions of content moderators, and more broadly those of data workers, to the necessary consideration of their qualifications and competencies goes beyond existing studies [AYK⁺25]. While such studies provide a necessary overview of data work’s harmful effects on workers, they do not fully address questions of skill and recognition. Our framework could, in particular, allow workers to express their multiple areas of expertise and ultimately produce higher-quality moderation work for technology design and application.

6.2 Unrecognised Competencies in South to North data workflows

A first finding shows that content moderators face a recognition problem rooted in how the industry is being developed in the Global North and how their tasks are treated as unqualified.

Our analysis of 17 companies reveals a globally distributed industry with extensive African operations: while headquarters are spread across regions, 35.3% are based in Africa itself, suggesting the emergence of local companies alongside international firms establishing regional operations. These companies collectively operate across 43 of Africa’s 55 countries (79.6% of the continent), demonstrating the widespread geographic reach of content moderation work across Africa. We demonstrate that content moderation work flows from Global South to Global North, with African-based operations primarily serving as offshore outsourcing centers for North American and European companies. These outsourcing firms then provide content moderation and data labelling services

for major AI applications developed by western technology companies, rather than serving local African markets. Our results confirm through quantitative data segregative patterns of work provision in the Global South for Global North’s AI development and consumption [GETM23, EM21].

Content moderation demand is diversified across multiple economic sectors, demonstrating that these services are not limited to social media content filtering where most research focuses attention, but are integral to AI applications across various industries. Our analysis identifies clients spanning automotive (Lear Corporation via Africashore), financial services (Standard Bank via Realm Digital), telecommunications (Vodacom via Realm Digital), retail (Spar via Realm Digital), consulting (PwC via Africashore), and cloud computing infrastructure (AWS, NVIDIA via Sigma AI), alongside traditional technology platforms (Google, Meta via Hugo and Sigma AI). This demonstrates how pervasive AI-driven content processing has become across the broader economy, requiring human labour for training systems in sectors ranging from automotive to financial services. This sectoral diversification reinforces the North-South service flow pattern, where African-based operations serve as offshore centres for companies across these various sectors, mainly in developed economies where such sectoral AI services are being developed.

Moreover, our qualitative observations and the data collected from subject access requests (SARs) show that the union members of this project never received transparent job descriptions, clear role specification, nor adapted training to the tasks to be carried. This has also been the experience of their peers. Overall, employers in this industry treat content moderators’ skills as universally transferable across any commercial sector, requiring no domain specialisation.

A second finding reveals that workers’ qualities expected in the workplace bear no relation to salary determination. Despite the skills required, workers are underpaid and routinely work extra hours.

Indeed, based on the data analysis of questionnaire responses from 81 workers, mainly in Kenya, and 2 employment contracts from Teleperformance and Sama recovered through data access rights, our findings also provide detailed information about the working conditions that exist within these BPOs, and particularly related to working hours and wages. The data confirms and extends previous research showing systematic precarity: short-term contracts with uncertain renewal, wages below national averages, routine overtime beyond contracted hours, and significant psychological and economic stress with limited institutional support. In particular, the analysis of working hours demonstrates that BPOs consistently demand round-the-clock worker availability. Temporal availability represents one manifestation of flexible working arrangements, contributing to the unpredictability of work patterns and ultimately to workers’ precarious employment conditions. Nevertheless, this temporal availability can be considered an unrecognised competence. As studies focusing on service sector workers in direct contact with the public have demonstrated [MV05], time availability signals commitment and motivation at work. It also demonstrates workers’ ability to adapt to multiple tasks, take initiative, and exercise responsibility, without this having any impact on their wages. Although problematic, workers’ temporal availability could be recognised by employers as a valuable competence and appropriately compensated. This parallels another undervalued competence that both ACMU in this research project and content moderators in previous research [AYK⁺25] advocate for: mental resilience. While commercial content moderation work frequently causes psychological problems amongst those who perform it, workers regard mental resilience as “crucial expertise” that should be recognised and prioritised by social media platforms [AYK⁺25].

These results prompt us to advocate for closer ties between computer science and social science (and particularly sociology of work) community, given how central data has been to the development of AI, leading to an international economic upheaval and the emergence of infrastructures and workforces to support it. Thus, the technical operations that result from this must be analysed,

which can no longer be done without also estimating their social value (and therefore the value of the workers who carry out these operations). We propose examining qualifications and competencies from a sociological of work perspective which requires analysing both the workplace structure and the individual workers within it. Authors [ZYM⁺25] have recently advocated for “re-imagining labour management practices that not only better account for workers’ time and labour but also actively incorporate their expertise”. The social and historical sciences of work offer valuable frameworks for advancing this agenda.

6.3 Integrating Sociology of Work in Technology Design

Attention to the sociological literature on work and occupations is important because the qualities, qualifications, and competences of data workers [BCW08], including their recognition constitute a central dimension of data work research. This remains an understudied area that could illuminate the structural dynamics of contemporary computing design and its commercial applications.

Qualification has historically been associated with individuals engaged in activities recognised as occupations, endowed with specific qualities, that distinguish them from unqualified workers. This distinction separates qualified professionals or contemporary workers like content moderators from those associated with earlier economic periods (odd-job workers, labourers, day labourers) who, as Sennett [Sen98] argues, have experienced qualification erosion through workplace flexibility. We can consider that data workers are currently treated by the companies that employ them as low-skilled workers, occupying positions with poorly defined tasks, as we have seen from data collected in the field. Thus, we can understand and analyse their struggle for recognition as a way of gaining recognition for the professionalisation of their activity, or even of establishing it as an occupation. For an occupation to emerge from a position, at least three parameters must be required: specific training, recognition of the occupation by others, and the grouping of the people concerned [Lat80]. It is therefore through the grouping of people from the same field who agree on the determination of tasks, roles, knowledge, and expected skills that a profession can emerge.

Since the establishment of BPOs, countries in the Global South are currently experiencing what countries in the Global North experienced in the 1980s with the rise of the service sector and service relationships, i.e. a shift in labour conditions from an industrial model of work — characterised by horizontal and vertical division of labour and continuous, direct supervision by first-level management—, to forms of organisation that impose both greater autonomy and constraints, marking a new stage in the “movement toward individuation in modern societies” [Lal07]. BPOs are pure expressions of the tertiary industry of the Global North, now spread to countries in the South where labour laws and protections are less stringent or even non-existent, and where the tasks delegated to workers are considered to require little or no qualifications in the IT domain. However, these companies may hire university graduates in other domains from Global South countries to perform such work, revealing that offshoring is primarily motivated by labour cost arbitrage rather than actual skill requirements.

Our findings demonstrate how this individuation, i.e. the expression of modernity’s effects on workers [Mar19], manifests in the working conditions of data workers. Specifically, our analysis shows that BPOs maintain constant control over worker availability through contractual provisions requiring 24/7 availability, mandatory shift assignments, and clauses allowing unilateral workplace relocation. For instance, both Teleperformance and Sama contracts stipulate continuous availability with workers expected to work “whichever shift assigned” and “at such other times as may be necessary”. Additionally, 62.3% of questionnaire respondents reported working more than 8 hours daily despite shorter contracted hours, demonstrating how temporal demands extend beyond formal agreements.

Furthermore, examining these working conditions (offered by companies as unskilled and unqualified work) illuminates the systematic devaluation of data workers’ competencies through wages below national averages (59.6% of respondents earned \$251-500 monthly compared to Kenya’s \$590 average) and precarious employment conditions characterised by short-term contracts and uncertain renewal prospects.

7 Limitations and Future Research

Three key limitations highlight opportunities for further investigation. First, the participatory methodology between researchers in Switzerland and the *African Content Moderators Union* workers in Nigeria and Kenya was constrained by geographic distance, with collaborations made only online. The union’s participation in data collection was further constrained by reliance on mobile telephones, as not all members had access to computers. However, their proficiency with mobile technology facilitated outreach to other content moderators within their networks. Moreover, there were frequent power outages, and political manifestations that ACMU was actively participating in. Consequently, while their availability was limited, their engagement in the field provided new insights for analysis. We ensured regular meetings weekly with recurrent adjustments, but a closer collaboration in the fieldwork would be beneficiary for future research. Second, the map contains information gathered from corporate websites which provide marketing presentations published by the company themselves. For instance, an ethnographic study on operational realities would be complementary if possible, given the industry secrecy. Moreover, the map reflects a predominantly African perspective facilitated by ACMU knowledge and advocacy work that researchers completed. While this approach foregrounds typically marginalised knowledge in communities, it requires further research to enable generalisability beyond sub-Saharan contexts. Finally, the questionnaire data collection faced participation barriers from workers under contract, as workers were afraid of reprisal, resulting in questionnaire responses predominantly from former employees. We ensured a consequent participation thanks to ACMU networks but future research could put efforts into recruiting current employees in content moderation to compare these results with current conditions.

8 Conclusion. More than Participatory Research: Anomie and Professional Groups Duties

Data work, the workers who perform it, and the social, political, and economic contexts in which it takes place, have prompted researchers in recent years to be concerned about it through publications, inquiries, and participatory projects [GS19, AAI⁺21, WMG22, SKH⁺21, Whi23, DRS⁺24, Mic24], giving rise to what could be called “engaged research” in computer science. Our present work is part of this approach. However, from a sociological perspective, the fact that researchers are addressing these issues, some of whose consequences give rise to what Emile Durkheim called “anomie” [Dur19], is less a matter of engagement (which can discredit researchers when it is assimilated to activism) than of professional duty. Anomie is one of the pathological forms of the division of labour resulting from a lack of rules and regulation within an economic system, making it impossible to create solidarity, which should be at the heart of modern social division of labour. This concept was used at the beginning of the 20th century, when liberal economic doctrine was spreading and destabilising the social order, without political power intervening to regulate it. Durkheim considered professional groups, corporations, and intermediate bodies as the environments within

which professional morality, law, and rules must be developed. In recent years, technological developments related to AI and driven by major technology corporations appear to challenge political, social, and economic systems in multiple ways, e.g. the destabilisation of democratic elections, adverse effects on individual health, contribution to ethnic violence, and mass surveillance practices. These developments suggest the emergence of forms of anomie within contemporary technological governance.

AI systems fundamentally depend on human workers who perform data labelling and model training: work that our research demonstrates requires greater recognition and improved conditions. This presents an opportunity for sociologists of work and computer scientists to collaborate in understanding these human-AI workflows. Our findings identify critical pain points in current working conditions that directly impact the quality of data work, including systematic overtime, precarious contracts, inadequate psychological support, and the devaluation of workers' expertise. These factors not only affect worker career prospects and well-being but also compromise the quality of outputs that AI systems depend upon. If sociologists can contribute socio-political insights into these systemic dysfunctions, then computer scientists could develop future design workflows that account for the full spectrum of human labour in AI development. Such interdisciplinary collaboration could address both the sustainability of AI development practices and the working conditions of the humans whose competencies make these systems possible.

Acknowledgment. We want to thank the anonymous reviewers at ACM CHI'26 for their feedback on our first draft.

References

- [AAI⁺21] Ifeoma Ajunwa, Sareeta Amrute, Lilly Irani, Winifred R Poster, and Meg Stalcup. Tech firms need black ai scholars and labour rights. *Nature*, 590(7846):389–390, 2021.
- [AE17] Mariam Attia and Julian Edge. Be (com) ing a reflexive researcher: a developmental approach to research methodology. *Open review of educational research*, 4(1):33–45, 2017.
- [Agb24] Adekunle Agbetiloye. Meta faces legal action in kenya over layoffs of content moderators. *Business Insiders Africa*, 9, 2024.
- [AM95] Uday M Apte and Richard O Mason. Global disaggregation of information-intensive services. *Management science*, 41(7):1250–1262, 1995.
- [AYK⁺25] Nuredin Ali Abdelkadir, Tianling Yang, Shivani Kapania, Meron Estefanos, Faisa Berhane Gebrekidan, Zecharias Zelalem, Messai Ali, Rishan Berhe, Dylan Baker, Zeerak Talat, et al. The role of expertise in effectively moderating harmful social media content. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–21, 2025.
- [BB25] Romain Badouard and Anne Bellon. Introduction to the special issue on content moderation on digital platforms. *Internet Policy Review*, 14(1):1–24, 2025.
- [BCW08] Michaela Brockmann, Linda Clarke, and Christopher Winch. Knowledge, skills, competence: European divergences in vocational education and training (vet)—the english, german and dutch cases. *Oxford review of education*, 34(5):547–567, 2008.

- [BHGHL⁺25] Borhane Blili-Hamelin, Christopher Graziul, Leif Hancox-Li, Hananel Hazan, El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Avijit Ghosh, Katherine A Heller, Jacob Metcalf, Fabricio Murai, Eryk Salvaggio, Andrew J Smart, Todd Snider, Mariame Tighanimine, Talia Ringer, Margaret Mitchell, and Shiri Dori-Hacohen. Position: Stop treating ‘AGI’ as the north-star goal of AI research. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning Position Paper Track*, 2025.
- [BK24] Robert Booth and Caroline Kimeu. Ptsd, depression and anxiety: why former facebook moderators in kenya are taking legal action. *The Guardian*, 12:2024, 2024.
- [Bor06] Mark Borman. Applying multiple perspectives to the bpo decision: a case study of call centres in australia. *Journal of Information Technology*, 21(2):99–115, 2006.
- [Bro20] Lisa Brooten. When media fuel the crisis: Fighting hate speech and communal violence in myanmar. In *Media, journalism and disaster communities*, pages 215–230. Springer, 2020.
- [BT91] Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot. De la justification: les économies de la grandeur. 1991.
- [But02] Judith Butler. *Gender trouble*. routledge, 2002.
- [Cai07] Alain Caillé. La quête de reconnaissance. *Paris, La Découverte*, 2007.
- [cei]
- [CEM24] Vincent-Arnaud Chappe, Mireille Eberhard, and Sylvie Monchatre. Dynamiques ségrégatives. *La nouvelle revue du travail*, (24), 2024.
- [Con25] Elena Constantinescu. Linkedin will soon use your data to train ai. here’s what you can do to opt out. *Proton.me*, 09:2025, 2025.
- [Cry23] Caroline Crystal. Facebook, telegram, and the ongoing struggle against online hate speech. 2023.
- [CSBG23] Callum Cant, Funda Ustek Spilda, Lola Brittain, and Mark Graham. Fairwork ai ratings 2023: The workers behind ai at sama. report. 2023.
- [DHA⁺21] Emily Denton, Alex Hanna, Razvan Amironesei, Andrew Smart, and Hilary Nicole. On the genealogy of machine learning datasets: A critical history of imagenet. *Big Data & Society*, 8(2):20539517211035955, 2021.
- [DRS⁺24] Carl DiSalvo, Annabel Rothschild, Lara L Schenck, Ben Rydal Shapiro, and Betsy DiSalvo. When workers want to say no: a view into critical consciousness and workplace democracy in data work. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 8(CSCW1):1–24, 2024.
- [Dur19] Emile Durkheim. The division of labor in society. In *Social Stratification, Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective, Second Edition*, pages 178–183. Routledge, 2019.

- [EM21] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi. We live in an era of cognitive/digital apartheid and feudalism. especially humans outside us-canada-europe. these are cold observations, not a passionate feeling, from someone living in the lucky side, in switzerland, english-content consumer with a scientific background, etc. https://twitter.com/L_badikho/status/1363571814258114564, 02 2021. Accessed: 2025-09-09.
- [EMHT25] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Lê-Nguyễn Hoang, and Mariame Tighanimine. A case for specialisation in non-human entities. *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 8(1):824–837, Oct. 2025.
- [Eth]
- [FBKT24] Eve Fleisig, Su Lin Blodgett, Dan Klein, and Zeerak Talat. The perspectivist paradigm shift: Assumptions and challenges of capturing human labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05860*, 2024.
- [FGP25] Mirko Franco, Ombretta Gaggi, and Claudio E Palazzi. Integrating content moderation systems with large language models. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 19(2):1–21, 2025.
- [Fin18] Christina Fink. Dangerous speech, anti-muslim violence, and facebook in myanmar. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1.5):43–52, 2018.
- [Fra20] Nancy Fraser. From redistribution to recognition?: Dilemmas of justice in a ‘postsocialist’ age. In *The new social theory reader*, pages 188–196. Routledge, 2020.
- [GBK20] R Gorwa, R Binns, and C Katzenbach. Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. *big data & society*, 7 (1), 205395171989794, 2020.
- [Geb24] Fasica B Gebrekidan. Content moderation: The harrowing, traumatizing job that left many african data workers with mental health issues and drug dependency. *The Data Workers’ Inquiry*. <https://data-workers.org/fasica>, 2024.
- [GETM23] Timnit Gebru, Meron Estefanos, Asmelash Teka, and Richard Mathenge. Digital apartheid and the horn of africa. In *ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT) 2023, Location: Chicago, 2023*.
- [Gil18] Tarleton Gillespie. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press, 2018.
- [Gri15] James Grimmelman. The virtues of moderation. *Yale JL & Tech.*, 17:42, 2015.
- [GS19] Mary L Gray and Siddharth Suri. *Ghost work: How to stop Silicon Valley from building a new global underclass*. Harper Business, 2019.
- [HDNW21] Oliver L Haimson, Daniel Delmonaco, Peipei Nie, and Andrea Wegner. Disproportionate removals and differing content moderation experiences for conservative, transgender, and black social media users: Marginalization and moderation gray areas. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW2):1–35, 2021.

- [Hel23] Erica Hellerstein. Silicon savanna: The workers taking on africa’s digital sweatshops. *Coda Story*, 10:2023, 2023.
- [HFGT⁺21] Muki Haklay, Dilek Fraisl, Bastian Greshake Tzovaras, Susanne Hecker, Margaret Gold, Gerid Hager, Luigi Ceccaroni, Barbara Kieslinger, Uta Wehn, Sasha Woods, et al. Contours of citizen science: a vignette study. *Royal Society open science*, 8(8):202108, 2021.
- [Hon92] Axel Honneth. Integrity and disrespect: Principles of a conception of morality based on the theory of recognition. *Political theory*, 20(2):187–201, 1992.
- [Hon96] Axel Honneth. *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. MIT press, 1996.
- [Hon13] Axel Honneth. *Das Ich im Wir: Studien zur Anerkennungstheorie*. Suhrkamp Verlag, 2013.
- [Hug51] Everett Cherrington Hughes. Work and the self. 1951.
- [JPSA⁺24] Saurabh Jain, Paramita Panjal, Md Sultan Ahmad, Rafi Ahmad Siddiqi, and Aaditeshwar Seth. Filter-in or filter-out: Complexities and implications of content moderation processes in a voice-based participatory media platform in india. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Information & Communication Technologies and Development*, pages 84–109, 2024.
- [ken]
- [Kgo25] Sonia Kgomo. I was a content moderator for facebook. i saw the real cost of outsourcing digital labour. *The Guardian*, 12:2025, 2025.
- [KSCS24] Mahi Kolla, Siddharth Salunkhe, Eshwar Chandrasekharan, and Koustuv Saha. Llm-mod: Can large language models assist content moderation? In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–8, 2024.
- [KTW23] Shivani Kapania, Alex S Taylor, and Ding Wang. A hunt for the snark: Annotator diversity in data practices. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–15, 2023.
- [Kym95] Will Kymlicka. *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. clarendon Press, 1995.
- [Lal07] Michel Lallement. 4. qualités du travail et critique de la reconnaissance. In *La quête de reconnaissance*, pages 71–88. La Découverte, 2007.
- [Lat80] Geneviève Latreille. *La naissance des métiers en France, 1950-75. Étude psychosociale*. Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1980.
- [LCC⁺24] Airi Lampinen, Rob Comber, Srravya Chandhramowuli, Naja Holten Møller, and Alex S Taylor. The work of ai: Mapping human labour in the ai pipeline. In *Companion Publication of the 2024 Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 728–731, 2024.
- [Lin22] Johan Lindquist. Follower factories in indonesia and beyond: Automation and labor in a transnational market. 2022.

- [LLCC23] Clément Le Ludec, Maxime Cornet, and Antonio A Casilli. The problem with annotation. human labour and outsourcing between france and madagascar. *Big Data & Society*, 10(2):20539517231188723, 2023.
- [LM02] Michèle Lamont and Virág Molnár. The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual review of sociology*, 28(1):167–195, 2002.
- [Mar19] Danilo Martuccelli. Individu/individuation. In *Vocabulaire des histoires de vie et de la recherche biographique*, pages 101–103. Érés, 2019.
- [Mat16] J Nathan Matias. Going dark: Social factors in collective action against platform operators in the reddit blackout. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1138–1151, 2016.
- [Mau13] Marcel Mauss. *Essai sur le don: Forme et raison de l’échange dans les sociétés archaïques*. Introduction de Florence Weber. puf, 2013.
- [MCGUS25] James Muldoon, Callum Cant, Mark Graham, and Funda Ustek Spilda. The poverty of ethical ai: impact sourcing and ai supply chains. *AI & society*, 40(2):529–543, 2025.
- [MCWG24] James Muldoon, Callum Cant, Boxi Wu, and Mark Graham. A typology of artificial intelligence data work. *Big data & society*, 11(1):20539517241232632, 2024.
- [MDK⁺25] Milagros Miceli, Adio-Adet Dinika, Krystal Kauffman, Camilla Salim Wagner, Laurenz Sachenbacher, Alex Hanna, and Timnit Gebru. Methodological considerations for centering workers’ epistemic authority in ai research. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, volume 8, pages 1698–1710, 2025.
- [Mic24] Milagros Miceli. How we made data workers’ inquiry, 2024.
- [Mil18] Alonso Miller. Call centers cloud use in call centers. In *Enterprise Cloud Computing for Non-Engineers*, pages 191–194. Auerbach Publications, 2018.
- [min]
- [Mon18] Sylvie Monchatre. De la qualification à la compétence en passant par l’employabilité. *D. Mercure et M. Vultur (Dir.), Dix concepts pour penser le nouveau monde du travail*, 2018.
- [MP22] Milagros Miceli and Julian Posada. The data-production dispositif. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction*, 6(CSCW2):1–37, 2022.
- [MSBS25] Rachel Elizabeth Moran, Joseph Schafer, Mert Bayar, and Kate Starbird. The end of trust and safety?: Examining the future of content moderation and upheavals in professional online safety efforts. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–14, 2025.
- [MSY20] Milagros Miceli, Martin Schuessler, and Tianling Yang. Between subjectivity and imposition: Power dynamics in data annotation for computer vision. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW2):1–25, 2020.
- [Mus24] Evelyne Musambi. Facebook loses jurisdiction appeal in kenyan court paving the way for moderators’ case to proceed. *The Independent*, 09:2024, 2024.

- [MV05] Dominique Méda and Francis Vennat. Le travail non qualifié: permanences et paradoxes. 2005.
- [MVB25] James Muldoon, Ana Valdivia, and Adam Badger. The politics of artificial intelligence supply chains. *AI & SOCIETY*, pages 1–13, 2025.
- [NSBE22] Daniel Nkemelu, Harshil Shah, Michael Best, and Irfan Essa. Tackling hate speech in low-resource languages with context experts. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on information and communication technologies and development*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [NSR56] Pierre Naville, Djaouida Séhili, and Patrick Rozenblatt. Essai sur la qualification du travail. (*No Title*), 1956.
- [Per23a] Billy Perrigo. 150 african workers for chatgpt, tiktok and facebook vote to unionize at landmark nairobi meeting. *Time Magazine*, 1:2023, 2023.
- [Per23b] Billy Perrigo. Exclusive: Openai used kenyan workers on less than \$2 per hour to make chatgpt less toxic. *Time Magazine*, 18:2023, 2023.
- [Per23c] Billy Perrigo. Former tiktok moderator threatens lawsuit in kenya over alleged trauma and unfair dismissal. *Time*, 07:2023, 2023.
- [Per23d] Billy Perrigo. Richard mathenge organizer, african content moderators union. *Time*, Time100 AI 2023:2023, 2023.
- [Per24a] Billy Perrigo. Kauna malgwi chairperson, nigeria chapter, content moderators union. *Time*, Time100 AI 2024:2024, 2024.
- [Per24b] Billy Perrigo. Mophat okinyi chairperson, content moderators union. *Time*, Time100 AI 2024:2024, 2024.
- [Reu24] Reuters. Meta’s ai to train using social media posts from europe. *Reuters*, 06:2024, 2024.
- [RIS⁺10] Joel Ross, Lilly Irani, M Six Silberman, Andrew Zaldivar, and Bill Tomlinson. Who are the crowdworkers? shifting demographics in mechanical turk. In *CHI’10 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems*, pages 2863–2872. 2010.
- [Rob14] Sarah T Roberts. *Behind the screen: The hidden digital labor of commercial content moderation*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2014.
- [Sam22] Nithya Sambasivan. All equation, no human: the myopia of ai models. *Interactions*, 29(2):78–80, 2022.
- [SBV⁺21] Miriah Steiger, Timir J Bharucha, Sukrit Venkatagiri, Martin J Riedl, and Matthew Lease. The psychological well-being of content moderators: the emotional labor of commercial moderation and avenues for improving support. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–14, 2021.
- [Sch22] Florian A Schmidt. The planetary stacking order of multilayered crowd-ai systems. 2022.

- [Sen98] Richard Sennett. *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. WW Norton & Company, 1998.
- [Sie23] Martin Siele. “it’s been tough for us”: Meta’s kenyan content moderators say they’ll keep fighting. *Rest of World*, 05:2023, 2023.
- [SKH⁺21] Nithya Sambasivan, Shivani Kapania, Hannah Highfill, Diana Akrong, Praveen Paritosh, and Lora M Aroyo. “everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work”: Data cascades in high-stakes ai. In *proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–15, 2021.
- [Str07] Marcelle Stroobants. La fabrication des compétences, un processus piloté par l’aval? *Formation emploi*, 99(3):89–94, 2007.
- [SV23] Farhana Shahid and Aditya Vashistha. Decolonizing content moderation: does uniform global community standard resemble utopian equality or western power hegemony? In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18, 2023.
- [Tay21] Charles Taylor. The politics of recognition. In *Campus wars*, pages 249–263. Routledge, 2021.
- [Tay25] Josh Taylor. Meta argues its ai needs personal information from social media posts to learn ‘australian concepts’. *The Guardian*, 07:2025, 2025.
- [TCC⁺25] Paola Tubaro, Antonio A Casilli, Maxime Cornet, Clément Le Ludec, and Juana Torres Cierpe. Where does ai come from? a global case study across europe, africa, and latin america. *New Political Economy*, 30(3):359–372, 2025.
- [Tec25] TechEquity. The data work landscape, 2025.
- [Til83] Charles Tilly. Speaking your mind without elections, surveys, or social movements. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47(4):461–478, 1983.
- [TLLC20] Paola Tubaro, Clément Le Ludec, and Antonio A Casilli. Counting ‘micro-workers’: societal and methodological challenges around new forms of labour. *Work Organisation, Labour & Globalisation*, 14(1):67–82, 2020.
- [Uga]
- [Val25] Zach Vallese. Creators say they didn’t know google uses youtube to train ai. *CNBC*, 06:2025, 2025.
- [VXHK21] Kristen Vaccaro, Ziang Xiao, Kevin Hamilton, and Karrie Karahalios. Contestability for content moderation. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction*, 5(CSCW2):1–28, 2021.
- [Whi23] Meredith Whittaker. Origin stories: Plantations, computers, and industrial control. *Logic (s)*, 19, 2023.
- [WL20] Richard Ashby Wilson and Molly K Land. Hate speech on social media: Content moderation in context. *Conn. L. Rev.*, 52:1029, 2020.

- [WMG22] Adrienne Williams, Milagros Miceli, and Timnit Gebru. The exploited labor behind artificial intelligence. *Noema Magazine*, 13, 2022.
- [WMX25] Tongyu Wu, James Muldoon, and Bingqing Xia. Global data empires: Analysing artificial intelligence data annotation in china and the usa. *Big Data & Society*, 12(2):20539517251340600, 2025.
- [Wra25] HesaMag Ben Wray. Content moderation is what a 21st century hazardous job looks like. *equaltimes.org*, 27, 2025.
- [WTD21] Claire Wilmot, Ellen Tveteraas, and Alexi Drew. Dueling information campaigns: The war over the narrative in tigray. *The Media Manipulation Casebook*, 20, 2021.
- [YM24] Tianling Yang and Milagros Miceli. ” guilds” as worker empowerment and control in a chinese data work platform. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 8(CSCW2):1–27, 2024.
- [ZYM⁺25] Ben Zefeng Zhang, Tianling Yang, Milagros Miceli, Oliver L Haimson, and Michaelanne Thomas. The making of performative accuracy in ai training: Precision labor and its consequences. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–19, 2025.