Article

AI-Enabled Macroeconomic Governance in Tourism: A Market-Failure Perspective Using Machine Learning and Big Data Analytics

Zhen Li[1,*]

[1]Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050000, Kazakhstan

*Corresponding author: Zhen Li, 853712433@qq.com

Abstract: The deepening of the digital economy is reshaping tourism markets in fundamental ways, particularly in transaction architectures, algorithm-driven price formation, and platform-centered governance. While platformization and algorithmization can improve allocative efficiency, they also intensify classic market failures—such as information asymmetries, discriminatory pricing, and credibility deficits—by making them more scalable, dynamic, and difficult to observe. Conventional macroeconomic regulation, which relies primarily on manual inspections and ex post enforcement, is increasingly mismatched with high-frequency, data-intensive market environments.

This paper develops a governance-oriented analysis of how artificial intelligence (AI), with a focus on machine learning and big data analytics, can support tourism macroeconomic regulation. It explains the mechanisms through which AI contributes to identifying market-failure patterns, enabling risk early warning and regulatory prioritization, strengthening credit governance and market discipline, and improving policy evaluation through data-driven feedback. Rather than treating AI as a substitute for public authority, the paper conceptualizes AI as capacity-enhancing infrastructure that expands regulatory cognition by improving information processing, detection precision, and response timeliness.

Integrating market failure theory with perspectives on algorithmic regulation and digital governance, this paper proposes a "technical support–institutional embedding–policy feedback" framework. The analysis suggests that, under appropriate legal safeguards and ethical constraints, AI can mitigate structural failures in tourism markets and enhance the resilience and effectiveness of macroeconomic governance. The study provides theoretical grounding for building data-driven, precision-oriented tourism regulation and offers actionable implications for upgrading regulatory toolkits in digital markets.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; tourism regulation; market failure; machine learning; big data analytics; macroeconomic governance; algorithmic regulation

1. Introduction

1.1. Digital transformation of tourism and growing governance complexity

Tourism is an information-intensive and service-intensive sector. In the digital economy, its operational logic and organizational form are being reshaped by online travel platforms, mobile payment systems, algorithmic recommendation engines, and social media (Buhalis and Law, 2008; Vial, 2019). Across the entire consumption process—trip planning, booking, destination experience, and post-trip evaluation—tourists continuously generate and feedback behavioral data, which are aggregated and processed by platforms at scale (Einav and Levin, 2014).

Digital technologies can reduce search costs, expand market boundaries, and improve matching efficiency (Varian, 2014). At the same time, they restructure market power by concentrating control over traffic allocation, information display, and the "rules of visibility" that shape competition among suppliers (Pasquale, 2015). Consequently, the market's reliance on price signals and competition to allocate resources is partly replaced by algorithmic mediation and platform-centered governance (Zuboff, 2015).

Crucially, digitalization does not eliminate classic economic problems in tourism. Tourism products are experience goods, meaning that consumers cannot accurately verify quality prior to consumption, resulting in persistent information asymmetry

(Stiglitz, 1975). In addition, dynamic pricing, personalized recommendations, and user profiling may render discriminatory pricing, information manipulation, and credibility deficits more concealed and systematic (Shiller, 2014). These changes raise new challenges for fairness, consumer protection, and market order.

1.2. Limits of traditional macroeconomic regulation

Tourism macroeconomic regulation has long relied on administrative approvals, periodic inspections, and complaint-driven enforcement. Such approaches were workable in offline and small-scale markets but show clear limitations in digital settings (Baldwin, 2019).

First, regulatory costs increase sharply because a human-centered supervision model cannot monitor millions of transactions and rapidly changing prices in real time. Second, regulatory responses are often delayed, as intervention is typically triggered only after harm is realized through consumer complaints or media exposure. Third, misconduct in algorithmic environments is difficult to attribute, because outcomes such as discriminatory pricing or ranking manipulation may be generated by interacting technical subsystems rather than by explicit rule violations (Pasquale, 2015).

These constraints indicate a growing mismatch between traditional macroeconomic regulatory instruments and the operating logic of platformized tourism markets.

1.3. Why AI matters: the case for capacity-enhancing regulation

Artificial intelligence (AI), especially machine learning and big data analytics, offers new governance opportunities by enabling pattern recognition and risk identification without relying exclusively on predefined rules (Varian, 2014). In tourism regulation, AI can support anomaly detection, market-failure pattern identification, and systemic risk early-warning by processing large volumes of high-frequency transaction and behavioral data (OECD, 2020).

AI-driven analytics reflect a broader transformation in economic organization brought about by digital technologies and intelligent systems (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014). This transformation underscores the growing importance of data, computation, and automation in shaping market structures and regulatory challenges.

Importantly, AI should not be framed as replacing public authority. Its governance value lies in expanding regulatory cognition by improving information-processing capacity, detection precision, and response timeliness under human oversight (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021). Under appropriate legal safeguards and ethical constraints, AI functions as capacity-enhancing infrastructure embedded within public governance rather than as an autonomous decision-maker.

1.4. Research objective, approach, and contributions

This study aims to explain how AI can support tourism macroeconomic governance in mitigating market failures in platformized digital markets. It adopts a mechanism-based and normative approach, synthesizing market failure theory, regulation economics, and digital governance literature (Laffont and Tirole, 1993).

The paper makes three main contributions. First, it conceptualizes AI as governance capacity rather than as a purely technical tool, emphasizing its role in expanding regulatory cognition. Second, it integrates market failure theory with perspectives on algorithmic regulation to explain why pattern-based detection and risk-oriented governance are increasingly necessary in tourism markets. Third, it highlights the importance of institutional embedding and accountability to avoid technological determinism in AI-enabled regulation.

1.5. Structure of the paper

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 develops the theoretical foundations of market failure, platform governance, and algorithmic regulation. Section 3 explains the core mechanisms through which AI supports macroeconomic regulation. Section 4 examines policy and governance applications in tourism markets. Section 5 discusses governance risks, ethical concerns, and institutional safeguards. Section 6 concludes with theoretical and policy implications.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Market failures in tourism: economic foundations

Market failure refers to situations in which decentralized market mechanisms cannot achieve efficient resource allocation (Stiglitz, 1975). In tourism markets, such failures are amplified by the sector's product characteristics and transaction structures.

First, tourism products are typically experience goods, and in some cases credence goods, for which consumers cannot reliably evaluate quality prior to consumption. This structural information asymmetry weakens the disciplining role of market competition and creates scope for opportunistic behavior (Stiglitz, 1975). Second, tourism markets exhibit significant externalities. Misconduct by individual operators can damage destination reputation and impose costs on other market participants that are not fully internalized (UNWTO, 2021). Third, platformization introduces new forms of market power. Rather than controlling prices directly, dominant platforms influence competition through ranking mechanisms, information visibility, and rule-setting authority, which can be opaquer and more institutionalized than traditional monopoly power (Baldwin, 2019).

These characteristics provide a strong normative justification for government intervention in tourism markets.

2.2. Market failures under digital platforms: new manifestations

Digitalization reshapes traditional market failures in tourism in several important ways. First, market failures become algorithmically embedded. Practices such as differential pricing, personalized recommendations, and dynamic ranking are increasingly generated by automated systems and may persist over time without explicit human intent (Zuboff, 2015).

Second, market failures become more scalable and contagious. Platform mechanisms and network effects can rapidly amplify localized misconduct into systemic risks affecting large numbers of consumers and suppliers (Kitchin, 2014). Third, responsibility attribution becomes blurred. Harmful outcomes may arise from interactions among multiple technical subsystems, including pricing modules, recommendation engines, and reputation systems, making it difficult to identify discrete violations using traditional enforcement approaches (Pasquale, 2015).

These features suggest that regulation in digital tourism markets must shift from case-based enforcement toward pattern-based and risk-oriented governance.

2.3. Platform-based private authority and regulatory capture risks

Regulatory capture theory emphasizes the risk that regulators may be influenced or constrained by the regulated entities (Laffont and Tirole, 1993). In digital platform markets, a modern variant of this problem emerges. Large platforms possess superior data resources, technical expertise, and analytic infrastructure, which can translate into platform-based private authority over market coordination.

Even in the absence of intentional manipulation, regulators may face "indirect capture" when they lack the technical capacity to interpret algorithmic behavior and complex market outcomes. This asymmetry can limit the effectiveness of oversight and weaken substantive regulatory control (Baldwin, 2019). Enhancing the government's analytical and technical cognition is therefore a prerequisite for meaningful regulation in platformized tourism markets.

2.4. Algorithmic regulation and governing technology with technology

Algorithmic regulation refers to regulatory approaches that use data analytics and computational tools to monitor market outcomes, identify risks, and support evidence-based intervention (Baldwin, 2019). Rather than relying exclusively on command-and-control instruments, algorithmic regulation emphasizes continuous monitoring, risk prioritization, and adaptive response.

In tourism markets, this perspective suggests that regulators need not directly rewrite or control platform algorithms. Instead, they can develop independent analytic capacity to observe market outcomes, validate risk signals, and trigger institutional interventions when abnormal patterns emerge (OECD, 2020). In this sense, regulation shifts from ex post punishment toward anticipatory governance grounded in data-driven evidence.

2.5. AI as a governance capacity: conceptual positioning

In the context of public governance, artificial intelligence is best understood as capacity-enhancing infrastructure rather than as an autonomous decision-maker. AI systems support governance by improving information integration, pattern recognition, and policy feedback while leaving normative judgment and responsibility with public institutions (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

This conceptual positioning is critical for avoiding technological determinism. Treating AI as governance capacity emphasizes the continued importance of legal safeguards, ethical constraints, and human oversight. Under this framework, AI expands regulatory cognition and precision without displacing institutional accountability, providing a foundation for responsible and effective macroeconomic governance in tourism markets.

3. Mechanisms: How AI Supports Macroeconomic Regulation

3.1. From rule-based enforcement to pattern-based detection

Traditional macroeconomic regulation prioritizes explicit rule violations and ex post sanctions. However, in algorithm-driven tourism markets, many harmful practices are manifested not as isolated breaches but as persistent or systematic deviations from normal market patterns (Baldwin, 2019). Consequently, effective governance increasingly requires pattern-based detection that models "normal" market behavior and identifies anomalies through statistical regularities rather than through predefined legal thresholds (Varian, 2014).

3.2. Machine learning for identifying abnormal market patterns

Machine learning enables regulators to identify abnormal market patterns without specifying every possible violation ex ante. By learning from historical transaction data, models can estimate expected relationships among price, demand, seasonality, geographic location, and product attributes (Einav and Levin, 2014).

From a governance perspective, anomalies are defined not as single outliers but as persistent or high-frequency deviations from expected distributions. This approach reduces the risk of over-intervention caused by random fluctuations while enabling the detection of structural problems that may be concealed within formally legitimate transactions (Varian, 2014). Importantly, outputs generated by machine learning models should be interpreted as risk signals rather than as direct evidence of misconduct.

3.3. Detecting discriminatory pricing in algorithmic markets

Differential pricing is not inherently inefficient and may reflect rational responses to demand heterogeneity or capacity constraints. However, it becomes problematic when algorithmic user profiling produces systematically adverse outcomes for specific groups after controlling for relevant cost and quality factors (Shiller, 2014).

Machine learning supports regulatory detection by estimating a benchmark "reasonable price" conditional on contextual variables such as seasonality, supply conditions, and product characteristics. Persistent deviations correlated with user attributes or behavioral profiles may indicate elevated discriminatory pricing risk (Varian, 2014). The regulatory value lies in group-level pattern identification, which enables targeted investigation without presuming that every price difference constitutes misconduct.

3.4. Big-data correlation analysis and systemic risk signals

Tourism market failures often propagate through platform dynamics and network effects. Big data analytics allows regulators to integrate multi-source information, including transaction records, cancellations, refunds, consumer complaints, review sentiment, mobility indicators, and holiday calendars (Kitchin, 2014).

By analyzing correlations and clustering across these data streams, regulators can identify convergence of risk signals within specific regions, platforms, or market segments. When multiple indicators deteriorate simultaneously, this convergence can serve as an early warning of systemic risk, enabling preemptive intervention before localized problems escalate into widespread market disorder (OECD, 2020).

3.5. NLP-driven quantification of credibility risks

Credibility deficits are a central source of market failure in tourism markets characterized by experience goods. Online reviews and feedback provide rich information but are typically unstructured and high-volume. NLP techniques enable regulators to extract sentiment trends, recurring topics, and abnormal shifts in service-quality perceptions from textual data (Kitchin, 2014; OECD, 2020).

Short-term concentration of negative sentiment or repeated mentions of specific issues across multiple suppliers can indicate escalation of credibility risks at the market or platform level (Janssen et al., 2008). At the same time, processing

high-volume consumer text data raises privacy and legitimacy concerns that require careful governance design (Acquisti et al., 2016; European Commission, 2019). These capabilities support a shift from reactive punishment toward continuous process monitoring and data-driven credit governance.

3.6. Policy evaluation and adaptive regulatory feedback

AI strengthens policy evaluation by enabling systematic comparison of market outcomes before and after regulatory interventions, such as pricing guidance, disclosure requirements, or targeted subsidies (OECD, 2020). Data-driven feedback allows regulators to assess whether interventions achieve intended objectives and to adjust policy tools accordingly.

Through iterative evaluation and adjustment, macroeconomic governance becomes more adaptive and resilient. Rather than relying solely on static assumptions, regulators can refine policies based on observed behavioral responses and market dynamics (Sunstein, 2018).

3.7. Institutional boundaries: human oversight and accountability

Although AI enhances detection and evaluation capacity, it cannot replace public governance rationality. Regulatory decisions must remain accountable to authorized public institutions, with AI systems serving as decision-support tools rather than autonomous regulators (European Commission, 2019).

Clear institutional boundaries are therefore essential. AI should inform risk prioritization and evidence gathering, while human authorities ensure due process, proportionality, and responsibility attribution. Maintaining this division of roles preserves legitimacy and prevents the erosion of accountability in AI-enabled macroeconomic governance (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

4. Policy and Governance Applications in Tourism

4.1. Reframing regulatory objectives in platformized tourism markets

In platformized tourism markets, regulatory risks increasingly manifest as structural and systemic deviations rather than as isolated violations. Accordingly, the objective of macroeconomic governance should shift from ex post correction toward risk-oriented management, emphasizing continuous monitoring, anticipatory identification, and targeted intervention to reduce the probability and diffusion of systemic market failures (Baldwin, 2019).

4.2. Price dynamics monitoring and non-intrusive intervention tools

Price is the most visible and politically sensitive indicator in tourism markets, particularly during holidays, peak seasons, or external shocks. AI-enabled monitoring focuses not on judging whether a single price is "too high," but on whether price dynamics persistently deviate from reasonable ranges after controlling for seasonality and supply conditions (Varian, 2014).

Based on risk signals, regulators can apply non-intrusive intervention tools, including targeted warnings, focused inspections, enhanced information disclosure requirements, and compliance dialogues with platforms. This approach preserves price flexibility and market responsiveness while reducing the likelihood of disorderly pricing behavior (OECD, 2020).

4.3. Credit governance and data-driven market discipline

AI supports dynamic credit governance by integrating multi-dimensional indicators such as fulfillment records, refund disputes, consumer complaints, and review-based credibility signals. Rather than relying solely on static qualifications or ex post administrative penalties, regulators can maintain continuous credit profiles and respond to early warnings of credibility deterioration (OECD, 2019).

By strengthening transparency and reputational incentives, data-driven credit governance enhances market discipline while reducing dependence on heavy-handed enforcement, thereby aligning regulatory effectiveness with market vitality (UNWTO, 2021).

4.4. Risk-tiering and precision regulation

Tourism markets are highly heterogeneous across regions, platforms, and supplier types. Uniform regulatory intensity can lead to inefficient allocation of enforcement resources. AI enables risk-tiering by classifying platforms, destinations, or operators according to data-driven risk assessments (OECD, 2020).

High-risk entities receive greater regulatory attention, while low-risk actors face lighter monitoring burdens. This precision-oriented approach improves regulatory efficiency and strengthens compliance incentives by making good behavior institutionally visible (Baldwin, 2019).

4.5. Policy evaluation, simulation, and continuous adjustment

AI-supported policy evaluation allows regulators to assess the impacts of interventions by comparing market outcomes before and after policy implementation (OECD, 2020). Where feasible, simulation and scenario analysis can be used to support ex ante assessment of policy options, such as pricing disclosure requirements or targeted subsidies (Sunstein, 2018).

Continuous evaluation and adjustment reduce policy uncertainty and enhance governance resilience in dynamic tourism markets.

4.6. Inter-agency coordination and institutional embedding

Tourism macroeconomic regulation typically involves multiple public agencies, including tourism authorities, market supervision departments, pricing regulators, and consumer protection bodies. AI systems should facilitate information sharing, coordinated workflows, and consistent risk assessment across agencies rather than creating technical silos (Janssen et al., 2008).

Effective institutional embedding requires clear data access rules, standardized procedures, and legal clarity regarding how AI-generated outputs translate into lawful governance actions (OECD, 2019).

4.7. Governance boundaries and implementation considerations

AI adoption in tourism governance must respect clear boundaries. It should not replace human decision-making, undermine market vitality, or erode public trust.

Governments should treat AI as an expansion of regulatory capacity rather than an expansion of discretionary power (European Commission, 2019).

Implementation should therefore prioritize transparency, proportionality, accountability, and ethical safeguards to ensure that AI contributes to sustainable and legitimate macroeconomic governance in tourism markets (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

5. Risks, Ethics, and Institutional Safeguards

5.1. Why technical empowerment creates new governance risks

While AI enhances regulatory capacity, it also introduces new governance risks. Increased reliance on algorithmic systems can generate opacity, path dependence, and systemic amplification of errors if models are poorly designed or trained on biased data (Pasquale, 2015). In regulatory contexts, such risks are particularly salient because technical failures can scale rapidly and affect large numbers of market participants.

Accordingly, AI-related risks should be addressed as governance risks rather than treated solely as technical problems (Baldwin, 2019).

5.2. Data security, privacy, and legitimacy constraints

Tourism regulatory data may include sensitive personal information, such as mobility traces, transaction histories, and consumption patterns. Legitimate governance therefore requires strict data governance principles, including data minimization, purpose limitation, retention controls, and robust security safeguards (Acquisti et al., 2016).

Without clear legal boundaries and transparent data practices, expanded data collection can erode public trust and undermine the legitimacy of AI-enabled regulation (European Commission, 2019).

5.3. Algorithmic bias and regulatory fairness

Bias in training data, model design, or feature selection can produce systematically distorted risk assessments. If AI outputs influence regulatory priorities, such bias may translate into unequal treatment of firms, regions, or market segments (Zuboff, 2015).

Safeguards against algorithmic bias include explainability requirements, regular bias audits, diverse training datasets, and mandatory human review in high-stakes regulatory contexts (OECD, 2019). These measures help ensure that AI-supported governance remains fair and proportionate.

5.4. Overreliance on AI and regulatory capacity erosion

Excessive dependence on AI systems may weaken institutional expertise and professional judgment over time. When human regulators defer uncritically to algorithmic outputs, organizational learning and accountability can deteriorate (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

To prevent capacity erosion, governance systems should institutionalize "human-in-the-loop" arrangements and invest continuously in regulatory skill development, ensuring that AI augments rather than substitutes public competence (Baldwin, 2019).

5.5. Accountability, due process, and responsibility attribution

Accountability for regulatory decisions must remain with authorized public institutions. AI-generated outputs should be treated as inputs for risk prioritization and evidence gathering rather than as final determinations (European Commission, 2019).

Due process requires procedural transparency, opportunities for explanation and contestation where appropriate, and clear responsibility attribution. Maintaining these principles is essential for preserving the legitimacy of AI-enabled macroeconomic governance in tourism markets (OECD, 2020).

5.6. A responsible AI regulatory framework for tourism governance

A responsible AI framework for tourism governance should integrate technical, legal, and institutional safeguards. Key elements include clear data governance rules, transparency and explainability standards, regular bias auditing, human review

protocols, accountability and traceability mechanisms, and effective inter-agency coordination (OECD, 2019).

Institutionalizing these safeguards determines whether AI can deliver sustainable governance value while maintaining public trust and regulatory legitimacy (European Commission, 2019).

6. Conclusions and Implications

6.1. Key findings

Digitalization reshapes tourism markets by embedding transactions, information flows, and competition mechanisms within platform-based and algorithm-driven systems. These changes intensify traditional market failures by making them more concealed, scalable, and systemic, thereby increasing the need for effective macroeconomic governance (Baldwin, 2019).

This paper argues that artificial intelligence, particularly machine learning and big data analytics, can enhance regulatory precision, foresight, and resilience by supporting pattern-based detection, risk early-warning, credit governance, and adaptive policy evaluation (OECD, 2020). However, AI does not eliminate the need for public authority. Its governance value lies in expanding regulatory capacity under institutional oversight rather than substituting for human judgment (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

6.2. Theoretical implications

This study extends market failure analysis by incorporating platformization and algorithm-driven mechanisms into the tourism context. By emphasizing how digital platforms reshape information asymmetry, externalities, and market power, the paper contributes to a more contemporary understanding of tourism market failures (Stiglitz, 1975; Zuboff, 2015).

In addition, the paper conceptualizes AI as governance capacity rather than as an autonomous regulator. This perspective highlights the central role of institutions, legal safeguards, and human oversight in AI-enabled governance, enriching existing

literature on algorithmic regulation and public governance (Baldwin, 2019; Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

6.3. Policy implications

For policymakers, the findings suggest several implications. First, governments should accelerate the digital transformation of tourism regulation without adopting assumptions of technological substitution. AI should be deployed to augment regulatory cognition and precision while preserving human-centered decision-making (OECD, 2019).

Second, regulators should prioritize risk-oriented monitoring and early-warning systems that focus on systemic patterns rather than isolated violations (OECD, 2020). Third, data-driven credit governance should be strengthened to enhance market discipline through transparency and reputational incentives (UNWTO, 2021). Fourth, continuous capacity building is essential to ensure that regulatory institutions can effectively interpret and govern algorithmic market environments (Baldwin, 2019). Finally, robust data security, privacy protection, and ethical safeguards must be reinforced to maintain legitimacy and public trust (European Commission, 2019).

6.4. Limitations and future research

This study adopts a conceptual and mechanism-based approach and does not provide empirical testing. Future research could validate the proposed framework using platform-level or regional datasets and conduct cross-national comparisons across different institutional environments (Einav and Levin, 2014).

Longitudinal studies could further examine how AI-enabled regulatory systems evolve over time and how their long-term impacts on market efficiency, fairness, and resilience differ across governance regimes (Varian, 2014).

References

[1] Acquisti, A., Taylor, C., & Wagman, L. (2016). The economics of privacy. *Journal of Economic Literature, 54*(2), 442–492. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.54.2.442

[2] Baldwin, R. (2019). The new regulatory challenge. *Regulation & Governance, 13*(2), 174–183.

[3] Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

[4] Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the Internet—The state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 609–623. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.01.005

[5] Einav, L., & Levin, J. (2014). The data revolution and economic analysis. *Innovation Policy and the Economy, 14*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1086/674019

[6] European Commission. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2759/346720

[7] Janssen, M., Kuk, G., & Wagenaar, R. (2008). A survey of Web-based business models for e-government in the Netherlands. *Government Information Quarterly, 25*(2), 202–220.

[8] Kitchin, R. (2014). *The data revolution: Big data, open data, data infrastructures & their consequences*. SAGE Publications.

[9] Laffont, J.-J., & Tirole, J. (1993). *A theory of incentives in procurement and regulation*. MIT Press.

[10] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in society*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en

[11] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Using digital technologies to improve the design and enforcement of public policies*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/99b9ba70-en

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

[13] Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

[14] Shiller, B. R. (2014). First-degree price discrimination using big data. *Journal of*

Industrial Economics, 62(3), 484–511.

[15] Stiglitz, J. E. (1975). The theory of "screening," education, and the distribution of income. *The American Economic Review, 65*(3), 283–300. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1804834

[16] Sunstein, C. R. (2018). *The cost-benefit revolution*. The MIT Press.

[17] United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2021). *Tourism and digital transformation*. UNWTO.

[18] Varian, H. R. (2014). Big data: New tricks for econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28*(2), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.2.3

[19] Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

[20] Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: Surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology, 30*(1), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2015.5