
Evaluating Fairness in Black-box Algorithmic Markets: A Case Study of Ride Sharing in Chicago

Yuhan Liu¹ Yuhan Zheng¹ Siyuan Zhang¹ Lydia T. Liu¹

Abstract

This study examines fairness within the rideshare industry, focusing on both drivers' wages and riders' trip fares. Through quantitative analysis, we found that drivers' hourly wages are significantly influenced by factors such as race/ethnicity, health insurance status, tenure to the platform, and working hours. Despite platforms' policies not intentionally embedding biases, disparities persist based on these characteristics. For ride fares, we propose a method to audit the pricing policy of a proprietary algorithm by replicating it; we conduct a hypothesis test to determine if the predicted rideshare fare is greater than the taxi fare, taking into account the approximation error in the replicated model. Challenges in accessing data and transparency hinder our ability to isolate discrimination from other factors, underscoring the need for collaboration with rideshare platforms and drivers to enhance fairness in algorithmic wage determination and pricing.

1. Introduction

Rideshare platforms such as Uber and Lyft serve as algorithmic market intermediaries, matching drivers and riders (Chan & Shaheen, 2012; Agatz et al., 2010). In addition to providing a matchmaking service, they determine the pricing for riders and the earnings for drivers for each trip, via a dynamic pricing strategy to manage the balance between rider demand and driver availability (Shapiro, 2018; Pandit et al., 2019; Dong & Leng, 2021). The algorithms driving this process optimize complex objectives, operating as black-box to both riders and drivers, which leads to large information asymmetry. Moreover, the algorithmic decisions regarding pricing and wages

¹Department of Computer Science, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA. Correspondence to: Yuhan Liu <yuhanl@princeton.edu>, Lydia T. Liu <ltliu@princeton.edu>.

Accepted to the *Humans, Algorithmic Decision-Making and Society: Modeling Interactions and Impact*, co-located with the *International Conference on Machine Learning*, Vienna, Austria, 2024. Copyright 2024 by the author(s).

exacerbate the power imbalances (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016; Yao et al., 2021; Jarrahi & Sutherland, 2019; Jarrahi et al., 2020). This power asymmetry undermines the emotional, physical, and financial well-being of both riders and drivers (Dubal, 2023; Woodcock & Johnson, 2018; Watkins, 2023).

Given significant information and power imbalance, stakeholders of gig platforms have raised concerns regarding algorithm fairness (Zhang et al., 2022; Hsieh et al., 2023). While prior research has explored the individual drivers' perceptions and expectations of fairness through qualitative approaches, there remains a gap in quantitatively assessing these issues. This paper aims to fill that gap by analyzing the fairness of AI algorithms used in rideshare platforms, specifically focusing on their role in pricing and wage decisions. In this study, we employ publicly available data to measure the following: 1. Fairness in compensating drivers and 2. Fairness in charging riders.

We use the Chicago Transportation Network Provider Dataset, including the [Public Passenger Vehicle Chauffeur Survey](#), [Transportation Network Providers Trips](#), and [Taxi Trips](#) to measure the aforementioned areas. The Public Passenger Vehicle Chauffeur Survey Dataset is used to evaluate the compensation bias of drivers in terms of different aspects e.g. age, race, etc. The other two datasets are used to evaluate the fairness of the pricing algorithms of the rideshare platforms compared to the taxi companies in Chicago.

The main contribution of this work is a quantitative, empirical investigation of algorithmic fairness in the two-sided market for ride-sharing, examining it from both the drivers' and the passengers' perspectives. We tackle a key challenge for performing a comparative audit of fares: given the AI algorithms are not open-sourced in most commercial settings, we attempt to replicate the pricing algorithm via machine learning in order to generate counterfactual fares, and account for the prediction error of the replicated algorithm in our hypothesis test. Finally, the study highlights the need for policy interventions to increase transparency in AI dynamic pricing algorithms used by rideshare platforms.

Related work Recent research has revealed inequality in the gig economy across different genders, races, and socioeconomic statuses (Hsieh et al., 2023). Like traditional

industries, the pay gap exists in crowdsourcing and freelancing platforms as prior work has shown (Dubey et al., 2017; Dunn et al., 2021; Foong & Gerber, 2021). In these platforms, compensation is often decided by service requesters (Jarrahi & Sutherland, 2019; Jarrahi et al., 2020). However, in the rideshare industry, drivers' wages are determined by algorithms instead of humans, which raised people's attention to whether the pay gap still exists. Prior work by Cook and colleagues revealed a significant gender pay gap in Uber with the Chicago dataset (Cook et al., 2021). Our study aims to evaluate the fairness of drivers' wages by examining other demographic factors like age and gender, socioeconomic factors like insurance coverage, and working factors such as tenure to the platform and average working hours.

In addition to determining wages, algorithms also set the prices paid by riders. Unlike taxis, which use a transparent and fixed pricing strategy, ridesharing services have dynamic pricing influenced by trip distance, time, and demand-supply status (Shapiro, 2018; Pandit et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2021). Prior works (Ge et al., 2020; Brown, 2018) have revealed discrimination in ridesharing, such as unequal wait times and cancellation rates across different demographic groups using simulated requests. Recent research also pointed out that price discrimination exists in different neighborhoods (Pandey & Caliskan, 2021). According to recent reports, customers showed dissatisfaction with rideshare services and perceived them as overpriced (Roberts & Crane, 2023; Horowitz, 2021; Abraham, 2023). In this project, we aim to explore whether riders are fairly charged for the services they receive, addressing potential unfairness from the perspective of fair competition in the market.

2. Data & Method

Dataset We used the Public Passenger Vehicle Chauffeur Survey Dataset to evaluate fairness in compensating drivers. The dataset contains 7021 self-reported data points during 2021 in response to 73 questions. The survey asked about drivers' basic demographic information and also drivers' working experience, including their working schedule and average earnings. We filtered the dataset to exclude empty datapoints for each feature we were interested in. For most features, excluding education level and health insurance status, the filtered dataset has nearly 3000 non-empty self-reported data points. Both education level and health insurance status only have up to 1600 non-empty rows.

For fairness in charging riders, we selected the Transportation Network Providers (TNP) Trips and Taxi Trips datasets. The TNP Trips monthly updates all the trips reported by rideshare companies, starting from Jan 1, 2023, to the current time, in Chicago. Each trip contains information such as pick-up/drop-off location, trip miles, trip length, trip fare breakdown, etc. We filtered out all carpool trips and all the

trips after January 2024, resulting in **81,274,469** rows in the dataset. The Taxi Trips dataset contains data from 2013 to 2023 reported by taxi companies in Chicago. Each trip contains the same information as the TNP Trips Dataset. We filtered out all trips that happened before 2023 to make the time consistent, as well as trips reported in the invalid distance or incurring toll fees, resulting in **5,808,081** rows in the dataset.

Evaluating fairness in driver's compensation For fairness in drivers' compensation, we measure the bias in the following aspects regarding their self-reported earnings with statistical tests and visualization: 1. age of the driver, 2. race/ethnicity of the driver, 3. highest level of education of the driver, 4. health insurance status, 5. how long the driver has been driving for the platform, 6. on average how long the driver drives per day.

We hypothesize that certain demographic factors, such as age, race, and level of education, may influence the compensation received by rideshare drivers on the platform. Age-related bias may be introduced to prefer older drivers for safety (McCart et al., 2009; Guo et al., 2017). Similarly, biases related to race may manifest through discriminatory user behavior, such as riders canceling trips or giving lower ratings based on the driver's race (Ge et al., 2020). Regarding the level of education, discrimination may occur if the platform perceives drivers with higher education levels as being more competent or trustworthy, leading to preferential treatment and potentially higher earnings. Access to benefits such as health insurance could also contribute to disparities in earnings, as well as factors related to drivers' working conditions, such as the number of hours driven per day and part-time or full-time status. These hypotheses reflect concerns about potential biases within the rideshare platform, such as the possibility of favoring certain groups of drivers over others.

Evaluating fairness in customer's payment For fairness in charging riders, we make the assumption that the amount riders pay is the sum of the trip fare and additional charges (such as taxes, tolls, and service fees). Under this assumption, we evaluate only the pricing algorithm in rideshare platforms, assessing whether the trip fare charged is fair and reasonable compared to that of taxi companies. In other words, we do not consider the impact of additional charges like taxes, tolls, and service fees. We chose to compare with taxi companies because their pricing strategy is more transparent and fixed compared to that of rideshare platforms. By excluding the additional charges, we can also explore how dynamic or peak pricing impacts trip fares. Based on recent reports about the "skyrocketed" rideshare fares, we hypothesize that the rideshare platforms overcharged their riders.

For fare charging, we use the distance of the trip (in miles), the time length of the trip (in seconds), the trip starting timestamp, and the pick-up/drop-off location as inputs, with the

trip fare as the output, to replicate the algorithms used by the platforms to calculate fares. Building a replicated algorithm is necessary for this project because we do not (and no one does) have access to the algorithms and training data used by rideshare platforms. We then use the replicated algorithm to calculate how much each trip in the Taxi Trips dataset would cost if the trip were fulfilled on rideshare platforms. Subsequently, we conducted data analysis to interpret the results.

3. Results

Fairness in driver’s compensation Our analysis found no significant difference in rideshare drivers’ hourly wages based on age or education level. However, race/ethnicity, health insurance status, driver’s tenure, and weekly working hours significantly impacted wages. This conclusion is supported by Chi-square test results for each feature.

- **Race/ethnicity:** Asian/Asian American drivers had the lowest median and mode hourly wage (\$12-13). The distribution of their wages was skewed towards lower categories, confirmed by a pairwise Chi-square test. Figure 2 (displayed in Appendix A) illustrates the distribution of wages in each reported race and ethnicity group.
- **Health Insurance Status:** Drivers with Medicaid and Medicare had the lowest wages (median and mode: \$12-13 and <\$10, respectively). Their wage distribution was also skewed towards lower categories, with statistical significance confirmed by Chi-square tests (Figure 3 in Appendix A).
- **Tenure:** Drivers with less than 1 year or more than 10 years of tenure earned lower wages (mode: <\$10, median: \$12-13) as shown in Figure 4, in Appendix A. This finding contradicted our hypothesis that longer tenure correlates with higher wages as observed in other industries. The result of a pairwise Chi-square test demonstrated that the hourly wage distribution for drivers who stayed the shortest and the longest with the platform was statistically significant compared to drivers who lay in the middle.
- **Working Hours:** Hourly wage increased as their weekly working hours increased (Figure 5, in Appendix A). Our initial hypothesis was that when drivers drive longer, their earnings won’t increase due to gamification in the gig economy mentioned in previous literature (Nagaraj Rao et al., 2024; Woodcock & Johnson, 2018). However, our analysis shows proof against this hypothesis since there was a positive correlation between working hours and wage, and a pairwise Chi-square test showed statistical significance among different groups.

Additionally, by examining the coefficients of the linear regression model that took all features above as inputs, we observed that race/ethnicity had the strongest effect on hourly wage. The effect magnitude of health insurance

status, driver’s tenure and weekly working hours were similar and ranked just below the effect of race/ethnicity.

Fairness in customer’s payment Consider the hypothesis that a customer is charged systematically differently for a ride taken by taxi vis-a-vis rideshare. A challenge to testing this hypothesis is that each ride is either taken via taxi or rideshare, but not both. Since each ride is different and may be more or less expensive due to its length and duration (even in the case of taxi rides), such differences must be taken into account. We take the following strategy: For each ride X , we model $f(X)$ as the rideshare fare and $g(X)$ as the taxi fare. We train a model to predict the rideshare fare function, resulting in an approximation $\hat{f}(X)$. Our best linear regression model had an RMSE of 5.35 and a R^2 of 0.70 when tested with the holdout test data from the TNP dataset. We take the taxi rides in our dataset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$, making the assumption that it is a representative sample of rides, and compute the *counterfactual* rideshare fares $\hat{f}(X_i)$ ’s (see Figure 1). An initial Mann–Whitney U test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the distribution of predicted ride share trip fares and actual taxi fares (rejected the H_0 hypothesis with p value = 0.000). Further analysis revealed that 14.83% of the 95% confidence intervals for the counterfactual rideshare fares were below than actual taxi fares predicted, while 0.89% were higher.

We test the hypothesis that the expected rideshare fare is greater than the taxi fare, with a one-tailed t -test. Specifically, the null hypothesis (H_0) is that $\mathbb{E}[f(X) - g(X)] \geq 0$. We calculate $D_i = \hat{f}(X_i) - g(X_i)$, and its variance, taking into account the known variance of the error in \hat{f} in the calculation of the *effective variance* of the t -statistic. Comparing the p -value to a significance level of 0.05, we failed to reject the null hypothesis that the difference between predicted rideshare fare and the actual fare is less than or equal to zero, suggesting insufficient evidence to conclude that rideshare platforms charged higher than taxi platforms. Our initial investigation shows that the differences in taxi and rideshare pricing policies, while significant, are nuanced; we may require more data than as well as further analysis to draw any stronger conclusions. Our approach of replicating an opaque algorithm from public data in order to perform hypothesis tests that are *valid for the opaque algorithm* may be of independent interest.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Disparities in drivers’ compensation calls for policy intervention and more transparency We explore fairness issues regarding drivers’ compensation from three perspectives: demographic features like age and race, other personal information like education level and health insurance, and work-related features like platform tenure and




Figure 1. Comparison between the actual taxi fares and the predicted fares if trips were fulfilled by rideshare platforms. Each data point represents one trip. Points above the red dotted line indicate predicted fares are higher than actual fares, while points below indicate predicted fares are lower than actual fares.

working time. Our results show that there is no significant evidence that age discrimination exists.

However, our data analyses show a strong association between wage and race/ethnicity. Indirect human input like customer ratings can track racial bias and influence drivers' earnings, even if race/ethnicity is not directly used by pricing algorithms; more investigation is needed to understand if this constitutes wage discrimination. Previous work in traditional workplace discrimination discussed the disadvantaged situation faced by African Americans and Hispanics (Hirsh & Lyons, 2010). In the labor market with emerging technologies, the old problems are not eliminated but hidden in other forms. Given that there is no effective technical solution to mitigate hidden bias embedded in user input, negative impact could be mitigated through the platform setting up a compensation policy that balances bias in customer input and its influence on drivers' earnings to ensure the service quality while avoiding discrimination.

Recent investigations into gig platforms have uncovered drivers' perceptions of unfairness, such as algorithms showing favoritism towards newer drivers (Nagaraj Rao et al., 2024) and potentially manipulating task allocations to create challenges in achieving certain Quests (Nagaraj Rao et al., 2024; Krzywdzinski & Gerber, 2021). Building upon previous work, we aligned our hypotheses with these findings. While our results indeed demonstrated a degree of algorithmic favoritism towards new drivers with some experience, we also observed a positive correlation between working time and wages. Interestingly, we found a misalignment between drivers' perceptions shown in previous literature and our quantitative findings, suggesting potential discrepancies in compensation fairness perceptions or limitations in our quantitative data's ability to capture crucial insights. Notably, our analysis relied on publicly available data, and further

investigations are hindered by the lack of specific data. This underscores the critical need for enhanced algorithm transparency—ensuring not only comprehensibility for drivers from non-tech backgrounds but also facilitating data access for algorithm auditing researchers with technical expertise.

Transparency is needed to increase riders' perception of fairness towards dynamic pricing system

The rideshare industry is not the first one, nor is it the only one that introduced a dynamic pricing mechanism. Other transportation industries like airplanes have been adopting similar pricing strategies for decades (Proussaloglou & Koppelman, 1999). However, while price differentiation exists across various transportation modes, the issue of price discrimination within rideshare platforms has garnered particular attention (Pandey & Caliskan, 2021). Riders hold a biased impression that the rideshare service is overpriced (Horowitz, 2021; Roberts & Crane, 2023; Abraham, 2023). Our findings indicate that when compared to taxi service—the most analogous transportation alternative to rideshare—around 15% of rides result in lower expenditures for riders while the overcharging percentage is less than 1%. We attribute the variance in perception between rideshare and the airline industry to two factors: on-demand nature and lack of transparency.

In contrast to rideshare, the airline industry implements a comparable pricing model, adjusting fares based on supply, demand, and fuel costs. The primary distinction lies in transparency: flight ticket prices for various dates and times are readily available on airline websites, facilitating advance planning and coordination. Moreover, the abundance of data in the airline sector has spurred advancements in price prediction technologies (Tziridis et al., 2017; Boruah et al., 2019). The on-demand nature of rideshare services makes advance scheduling difficult and complicates price prediction. While AI algorithms are essential to these operations, their proprietary nature prevents full disclosure, leading to decreased rider trust. Our analysis highlights the importance of transparency in building both driver confidence and rider trust.

Conclusion and Future Work

We investigated algorithmic fairness in the rideshare industry from the perspective of both drivers and riders and consequently raised concerns about discrimination in gig worker's labor market and transparency in these platforms' dynamic pricing systems, employing various statistical tests on public datasets. We discovered that race/ethnicity, health insurance status, tenure, and working hours significantly impacted hourly wage. On the other hand, we revealed the difficulty of accessing fairness in customer's payment by replicating rideshare platform's pricing model with features that were traditionally used to calculate trip fares. Given the limited amount of public datasets on worker's wages and limited studies on how drivers interact with rideshare platforms, we faced obstacles

in isolating workforce discrimination from confounding factors. The lack of transparency in their pricing algorithm also posed challenges to justify variations in trip fares.

References

- Abraham, R. Uber and lyft fare hike revenue study. 2023. URL <https://www.vice.com/en/article/qjk7n3/uber-lyft-fare-hike-revenue-study>.
- Agatz, N., Erera, A., Savelsbergh, M., and Wang, X. Sustainable passenger transportation: Dynamic ride-sharing. 2010.
- Boruah, A., Baruah, K., Das, B., Das, M. J., and Gohain, N. B. A bayesian approach for flight fare prediction based on kalman filter. In *Progress in Advanced Computing and Intelligent Engineering: Proceedings of ICACIE 2017, Volume 2*, pp. 191–203. Springer, 2019.
- Brown, A. E. *Ridehail revolution: Ridehail travel and equity in Los Angeles*. University of California, Los Angeles, 2018.
- Chan, N. D. and Shaheen, S. A. Ridesharing in north america: Past, present, and future. *Transport reviews*, 32(1):93–112, 2012.
- Chen, L., Mislove, A., and Wilson, C. Peeking beneath the hood of uber. In *Proceedings of the 2015 internet measurement conference*, pp. 495–508, 2015.
- Cook, C., Diamond, R., Hall, J. V., List, J. A., and Oyer, P. The gender earnings gap in the gig economy: Evidence from over a million rideshare drivers. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(5):2210–2238, 2021.
- Dong, Z. and Leng, M. Managing on-demand ridesharing operations: Optimal pricing decisions for a ridesharing platform. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 232:107958, 2021.
- Dubal, V. On algorithmic wage discrimination. *Available at SSRN 4331080*, 2023.
- Dubey, A., Abhinav, K., Hamilton, M., and Kass, A. Analyzing gender pay gap in freelancing marketplace. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGMIS conference on computers and people research*, pp. 13–19, 2017.
- Dunn, M., Munoz, I., and Sawyer, S. Gender differences and lost flexibility in online freelancing during the covid-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in sociology*, 6:738024, 2021.
- Foong, E. and Gerber, E. Understanding gender differences in pricing strategies in online labor marketplaces. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–16, 2021.
- Ge, Y., Knittel, C. R., MacKenzie, D., and Zoepf, S. Racial discrimination in transportation network companies. *Journal of Public Economics*, 190:104205, 2020.
- Guo, F., Klauer, S. G., Fang, Y., Hankey, J. M., Antin, J. F., Perez, M. A., Lee, S. E., and Dingus, T. A. The effects of age on crash risk associated with driver distraction. *International journal of epidemiology*, 46(1):258–265, 2017.
- Hall, J. V., Horton, J. J., and Knoepfle, D. T. Pricing in designed markets: The case of ride-sharing, 2021.
- Hirsh, E. and Lyons, C. J. Perceiving discrimination on the job: Legal consciousness, workplace context, and the construction of race discrimination. *Law & society review*, 44(2):269–298, 2010.
- Horowitz, D. M. As rideshare prices skyrocket, uber and lyft take a bigger piece of riders' payments. 2021. URL <https://missionlocal.org/2021/07/as-rideshare-prices-skyrocket-uber-and-lyft-take-a-bigger-piece-of-riders-payments/>
- Hsieh, J., Adisa, O., Bafna, S., and Zhu, H. Designing individualized policy and technology interventions to improve gig work conditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12972*, 2023.
- Jarrahi, M. H. and Sutherland, W. Algorithmic management and algorithmic competencies: Understanding and appropriating algorithms in gig work. In *Information in Contemporary Society: 14th International Conference, iConference 2019, Washington, DC, USA, March 31–April 3, 2019, Proceedings 14*, pp. 578–589. Springer, 2019.
- Jarrahi, M. H., Sutherland, W., Nelson, S. B., and Sawyer, S. Platformic management, boundary resources for gig work, and worker autonomy. *Computer supported cooperative work (CSCW)*, 29:153–189, 2020.
- Krzywdzinski, M. and Gerber, C. Between automation and gamification: forms of labour control on crowdwork platforms. *Work in the Global Economy*, 1(1-2):161–184, 2021.
- McCartt, A. T., Mayhew, D. R., Braitman, K. A., Ferguson, S. A., and Simpson, H. M. Effects of age and experience on young driver crashes: review of recent literature. *Traffic injury prevention*, 10(3):209–219, 2009.
- Nagaraj Rao, V., Dalal, S., Agarwal, E., Calacci, D., and Monroy-Hernández, A. Navigating rideshare transparency: Worker insights on ai platform design, 2024. Manuscript in submission.

- Pandey, A. and Caliskan, A. Disparate impact of artificial intelligence bias in ridehailing economy's price discrimination algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 822–833, 2021.
- Pandit, V. N., Mandar, D., Hanawal, M. K., and Moharir, S. Pricing in ride sharing platforms: static vs dynamic strategies. In *2019 11th International Conference on Communication Systems & Networks (COMSNETS)*, pp. 208–215. IEEE, 2019.
- Proussaloglou, K. and Koppelman, F. S. The choice of air carrier, flight, and fare class. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 5(4):193–201, 1999.
- Roberts, E. about ter fare. <https://nypost.com/2023/08/02/new-yorkers-rage-about-hefty-uber-prices-after-ceo-stunned-by-52-fare/>. URL
- Rosenblat, A. and Stark, L. Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of uber's drivers. *International journal of communication*, 10:27, 2016.
- Shapiro, A. Between autonomy and control: Strategies of arbitrage in the “on-demand” economy. *New Media & Society*, 20(8):2954–2971, 2018.
- Tziridis, K., Kalampokas, T., Papakostas, G. A., and Diamantaras, K. I. Airfare prices prediction using machine learning techniques. In *2017 25th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pp. 1036–1039. IEEE, 2017.
- Watkins, E. A. Face work: A human-centered investigation into facial verification in gig work. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW1):1–24, 2023.
- Woodcock, J. and Johnson, M. R. Gamification: What it is, and how to fight it. *The Sociological Review*, 66(3): 542–558, 2018.
- Yao, Z., Weden, S., Emerlyn, L., Zhu, H., and Kraut, R. E. Together but alone: Atomization and peer support among gig workers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW2):1–29, 2021.
- Zhang, A., Boltz, A., Wang, C. W., and Lee, M. K. Algorithmic management reimagined for workers and by workers: Centering worker well-being in gig work. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–20, 2022.

A. Figures




Figure 2. Distribution of race groups in each hourly wage category.




Figure 3. Distribution of insurance groups in each hourly wage category.




Figure 4. Distribution of hourly wage category for each tenure group.




Figure 5. Distribution of hourly wage category for each working hour group.