The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management
Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026
Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

LEADING WITHOUT A ROOM: ALGORITHMIC MANAGEMENT AND THE FUTURE OF LABOUR LAW IN INDIA'S GIG ECONOMY

Mohammed Mustafa

INTRODUCTION

A few minutes before midnight, a food delivery rider in Bengaluru waits outside a restaurant for an order that has not yet been packed. The customer is tracking his location through an application. The platform knows how long he has been waiting. The restaurant can see the delay. If the order reaches late, a poor customer rating may follow. If his ratings decline consistently, his future earnings and access to incentives may be affected. Yet throughout this entire process, there is no supervisor standing beside him, no manager giving instructions, and no traditional workplace where his performance is being evaluated. His work is controlled through a device in his hand.

This ordinary moment captures a major transformation taking place in the world of work. The growth of the gig economy has often been discussed as a question of flexibility, innovation, and employment creation. However, beneath these familiar narratives lies a deeper legal and managerial challenge. The platform economy has changed not only the nature of employment but also the manner in which authority is exercised. Work that was once organized through offices, supervisors, and direct human interaction is increasingly being coordinated through digital platforms, automated systems, and algorithmic decisions.

India provides one of the most important contexts in which to examine this transformation. The country's rapidly expanding platform economy has created opportunities for millions of workers in sectors such as food delivery, transportation, logistics, domestic services, and online freelancing. At the same time, it has generated difficult questions regarding worker classification, social security, accountability, and the limits of existing labour law. The central challenge is not merely whether gig workers should receive legal protection. It is whether legal frameworks designed for traditional employment relationships are capable of governing a workplace where managerial authority is increasingly invisible.

The expression “leading without a room” captures this changing reality. Traditional management theory has generally assumed that leadership requires some form of human relationship between those who exercise authority and those who follow it. Managers allocate tasks, provide feedback, resolve disputes, and evaluate performance. Platform work challenges this model. A worker may never meet the person who determines his incentives, monitors his productivity, or influences his continued access to the platform. Yet management continues to exist. It simply operates through technology.

The question that emerges is therefore both legal and managerial: when an algorithm performs functions traditionally associated with a manager, who is responsible for the consequences of those decisions?

THE RISE OF THE PLATFORM WORKPLACE

The gig economy is not entirely new. Temporary, contract-based, and task-oriented work existed long before digital platforms became common. What distinguishes the modern gig economy is the central role played by technology. Digital platforms do not merely connect workers and consumers; they structure the entire process through which work is performed. They determine how tasks are allocated, how performance is measured, how payments are calculated, and how workers interact with customers.

In India, this model has expanded rapidly. Companies operating in food delivery, ride-hailing, logistics, and household services have transformed urban labour markets. The appeal of platform work is clear. For workers, it may provide immediate access to income without lengthy recruitment processes. For consumers, it offers convenience and availability. For businesses, it provides a scalable model of service delivery.

However, the language of flexibility often hides the complexity of platform control. A worker may technically decide when to log in, but once connected to the platform, his conduct is influenced by numerous digital systems. A delivery worker may be encouraged to complete a certain number of orders to qualify for incentives. A driver may receive fewer opportunities because of customer ratings. A service provider may lose access to the platform after automated assessments of performance.

The result is a paradox. Gig workers are often described as independent entrepreneurs, but many experience forms of control similar to those found in traditional employment relationships. The difference is that control is exercised indirectly.

This distinction matters because labour law has historically relied on the concept of control to determine employment relationships. Courts have often examined whether an organization controls not only the result of work but also the manner in which work is performed. In traditional workplaces, this question was relatively straightforward. A factory owner, office manager, or supervisor could usually be identified. In platform work, control is dispersed across contracts, software systems, rating mechanisms, and automated processes.

This creates a difficult legal problem. If a company exercises significant influence over a worker's economic activity but does so through technology rather than direct supervision, should the legal consequences be different?

The answer to this question has become one of the defining labour law debates of the twenty-first century. The challenge is particularly significant in India because the country's labour market has always contained large numbers of informal workers. Platform work does not replace informality; it modernizes and digitizes it. Many gig workers enter platforms because they offer accessible income opportunities, but these opportunities often exist alongside uncertainty regarding earnings, benefits, and long-term security.

The management implications are equally important. Leadership scholars have traditionally emphasized trust, communication, motivation, and organizational identity. Employees are not merely economic actors; they are members of institutions. They develop relationships with colleagues, receive recognition from supervisors, and understand their role within a larger organization. Platform workers often experience a very different reality. Their relationship with the organization is mediated through an application. Their performance may be represented through numbers rather than conversations. Their success may depend on ratings rather than recognition. Their difficulties may be addressed through automated responses rather than personal discussions. This does not mean that management disappears in the gig economy. Instead, management becomes embedded within technological systems.

The term “algorithmic management” has emerged to describe this process. It refers to the use of automated systems to organize labour, monitor performance, allocate tasks, and influence worker behaviour. While human decisions remain involved in designing and operating these systems, workers frequently experience the platform itself as the source of authority. This development raises an important concern: law has traditionally regulated human decision-makers, but modern workplaces increasingly rely on technological decision-making systems.

LABOUR LAW MEETS THE GIG ECONOMY

The difficulty faced by labour law is rooted in its historical foundations. Most employment protections were developed around the assumption of a clear relationship between employer and employee. The employer provided work, exercised supervision, and carried responsibility for workplace conditions. The employee performed services in exchange for compensation and received legal protections because of the unequal bargaining relationship between the two.

The platform economy disrupts this structure. Many platforms argue that they merely provide a marketplace where independent workers and consumers interact. Under this argument, the platform does not employ workers; it simply facilitates transactions.

Workers and labour advocates, however, argue that this description ignores the practical realities of platform control. They contend that when a company determines pricing, monitors performance, controls access to customers, and imposes consequences for non-compliance, the relationship resembles employment regardless of contractual terminology. This debate has appeared across jurisdictions. Courts have increasingly recognized that legal classification cannot depend solely on written agreements. Instead, they have examined the actual relationship between the platform and the worker.

India’s approach has developed differently from many other countries. Rather than immediately classifying platform workers as employees, Indian legislation has created a separate category.

The Code on Social Security, 2020 represents the first major legislative recognition of gig workers and platform workers in India. The Code defines these categories and provides a framework for extending social security benefits to workers outside traditional employment structures. It contemplates schemes relating to life insurance, accident coverage, health protection, and other welfare measures.

The importance of the Code lies in its recognition that vulnerability is not limited to traditional employees. A worker may lack employment status while still facing economic insecurity. By acknowledging gig workers as a distinct category, Indian law has taken an important step toward adapting to changing labour markets.

However, significant issues remain unresolved.

The primary limitation of the Code is that it focuses largely on welfare rather than power. It addresses what protections workers should receive but does not fully address how platform companies exercise authority over workers. Questions relating to algorithmic decision-making, transparency of ratings systems, account deactivation, and automated discipline remain largely outside the existing framework.

This gap is becoming increasingly important because, for many gig workers, the platform itself functions as the workplace. Losing access to a platform may have consequences comparable to dismissal from traditional employment. Yet the procedural protections associated with dismissal, such as explanation, hearing, and appeal, may not exist in the same form. The issue is particularly visible in cases involving account suspension. A worker may suddenly find himself unable to access the platform that provides his livelihood. The reason may be unclear. The decision may have been influenced by customer complaints, automated risk assessments, or internal performance metrics. Unlike a traditional employee who can approach a supervisor or human resources department, the platform worker may encounter only automated communication. This creates a fundamental question for modern labour regulation: should decisions that significantly affect a worker's livelihood be subject to minimum standards of transparency and review even when they are made through technological systems?

India has begun moving toward greater recognition of platform workers through state-level initiatives as well. The Rajasthan Platform Based Gig Workers (Registration and Welfare) Act, 2023, represents one of the most significant attempts to create a dedicated regulatory framework for platform workers. The legislation establishes mechanisms for registration, welfare measures, and institutional representation.

The Rajasthan initiative is important because it demonstrates that platform work requires specialized legal attention. It recognizes that gig workers occupy a distinct position within the labour market and cannot simply be ignored because they fall outside traditional employment categories.

However, the future of gig regulation will depend on whether legal frameworks move beyond welfare protection and begin addressing the deeper issue of managerial control.

LESSONS FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The legal uncertainty surrounding platform work is not unique to India. Around the world, courts and regulators have struggled with the same fundamental question: should legal protection depend upon the contractual label assigned by a company, or should it depend upon the reality of the relationship between the worker and the platform?

The United Kingdom has produced one of the most influential judicial responses to this question. In *Uber BV v. Aslam*, the United Kingdom Supreme Court examined whether Uber drivers could genuinely be considered independent contractors. Uber argued that it merely provided a platform connecting drivers with passengers. The Court rejected this approach and focused instead on the level of control exercised by the company. It considered factors such as Uber's control over fares, contractual terms, performance monitoring, and the conditions under which drivers provided services.

The importance of the judgment extends beyond the specific dispute between Uber and its drivers. The Court recognized that contractual freedom cannot be examined separately from economic reality. A worker may formally agree to operate as an independent contractor, but if the practical relationship reflects significant organizational control, the law may need to look beyond contractual language.

This reasoning offers an important lesson for India. The classification of gig workers cannot be resolved merely by examining the agreements drafted by platform companies. A modern labour analysis must examine the actual distribution of power. The central issue is not whether a platform calls someone a "partner" or an "independent service provider." The more important question is whether the worker has meaningful independence in determining the conditions under which work is performed.

European developments have moved further toward addressing the broader problem of algorithmic management. The European Union's Platform Work Directive represents one of the most significant attempts to regulate digital labour platforms. The Directive recognizes that platform workers are affected not only by employment classification issues but also by automated decision-making systems that influence their working conditions. A significant feature of the European approach is its focus on transparency. Workers affected by algorithmic management systems require information about how decisions are made and what factors influence their evaluation. The concern is not that technology should be removed from workplaces. Rather, the concern is that technology should not become a mechanism through which organizations avoid responsibility.

The European experience highlights a distinction that is particularly relevant for India. Social security and employment classification address only one dimension of platform work. A worker may receive benefits and still face problems relating to unfair algorithmic decisions. Conversely, a worker may have flexibility and still experience significant dependence on a platform. The future of regulation must therefore address both economic protection and institutional accountability.

The United States presents a different approach. The American debate has largely focused on worker classification, particularly the distinction between employees and independent contractors. California's Assembly Bill 5 attempted to establish stricter criteria for determining whether workers should be considered employees. The legislation generated significant controversy because of concerns that stricter classification rules could affect business models built around independent contracting.

The American experience demonstrates the difficulty of designing a universal solution. A legal system must balance multiple interests: worker protection, economic opportunity, innovation, and business flexibility. However, one lesson emerges consistently across jurisdictions. Platform companies cannot avoid legal responsibility simply because control is exercised through technology rather than traditional management structures.

For India, comparative experience does not provide a model that can be copied directly. The Indian labour market is different in terms of scale, informality, economic conditions, and social realities. Millions of workers depend on platform opportunities as a source of income, and policymakers must therefore avoid regulatory approaches that unintentionally eliminate opportunities for vulnerable workers.

At the same time, the absence of regulation creates its own risks. A labour market based entirely on digital platforms may create new forms of insecurity if workers lack meaningful protections against arbitrary decisions. The challenge is not choosing between innovation and regulation.

The challenge is developing a framework in which innovation operates within principles of fairness and accountability.

GOVERNING ALGORITHMIC AUTHORITY

The most significant question raised by the gig economy may not ultimately concern employment classification. It may concern the nature of authority itself.

For decades, management scholars have examined leadership through the relationship between individuals within organizations. Managers influence behaviour through communication, incentives, supervision, and organizational culture. Even when management systems become more sophisticated, the assumption has generally remained that human beings exercise authority over other human beings. Algorithmic management changes this relationship. When a platform determines which worker receives an order, how performance is evaluated, whether incentives are available, or whether an account remains active, managerial functions are being performed through technological systems. The algorithm does not simply support management; it increasingly becomes part of the management structure itself. This transformation creates what may be described as invisible managerial authority. The traditional manager was visible. Workers knew who supervised them, who evaluated them, and who could be approached when disputes arose. Algorithmic management creates a different environment. Workers interact with a system rather than a person. Decisions appear objective because they are generated through data, but the criteria behind those decisions may remain unclear.

The assumption that algorithms are neutral is itself problematic. Algorithms are created by organizations. They reflect choices about what information matters, how performance should be measured, and what outcomes should be prioritized. A rating system, for example, is not simply recording performance; it is creating a particular definition of good performance. An incentive structure is not merely rewarding productivity; it is shaping worker behaviour. Therefore, algorithmic management cannot be understood as the absence of human management. It is a different form of management. This distinction has important legal consequences. If a company uses technology to perform managerial functions, it should not be able to avoid responsibility by arguing that decisions are made by software. Accountability must follow authority. Where an organization designs and relies upon systems that influence workers' livelihoods, it must also accept responsibility for ensuring that those systems operate fairly.

One of the most pressing areas requiring attention is algorithmic transparency. Workers should not necessarily be entitled to access every aspect of a platform's internal technology, as companies may have legitimate concerns regarding security and commercial confidentiality. However, basic principles of fairness require that workers understand the factors that significantly affect their employment opportunities.

A delivery worker whose income depends on ratings should have some understanding of how those ratings influence access to work. A driver whose account is suspended should receive meaningful information about the reason. A worker affected by automated decision-making should have access to a process through which errors can be challenged.

These principles are not incompatible with technological innovation. In fact, transparency and accountability may strengthen platform economies by increasing trust among workers and consumers. The issue also requires a reconsideration of leadership itself. The future of leadership cannot be defined only by technological efficiency. Organizations may become capable of coordinating millions of workers through digital systems, but coordination alone is not leadership. Leadership requires legitimacy. It requires that those affected by decisions believe that those decisions are made through fair and understandable processes.

The platform economy therefore presents a challenge not only to law but also to management practice. Businesses must recognize that workers remain human participants within organizations even when interactions are mediated through technology. Treating workers purely as data points may produce short-term efficiency, but it risks weakening long-term trust and commitment.

For India, this conversation is particularly important because the country stands at a critical stage in the development of its digital economy. The platform sector will likely continue to expand, and technology will become increasingly integrated into workplace decision-making. The choices made today will influence not only gig workers but future generations of workers across multiple industries.

The central lesson is that the future of work cannot be governed only through old categories. The distinction between employee and contractor remains important, but it cannot answer every question raised by digital labour platforms. A worker may not fit neatly within traditional employment categories and still deserve protection from arbitrary exercises of power. Similarly, a platform may not function like a traditional employer and still exercise responsibilities that resemble managerial obligations. Labour law has always evolved in response to changes in the organization of work. Industrialization created the need for factory regulations. The growth of formal employment created the need for social security systems. Globalization created new challenges regarding outsourcing and fragmented workplaces. The platform economy represents the next stage in this evolution.

The challenge before lawmakers is not to prevent technological change. It is to ensure that technological change does not weaken the fundamental principles that have historically guided labour regulation: fairness, accountability, and dignity.

A few minutes before midnight, the delivery rider in Bengaluru continues waiting outside the restaurant. His phone remains the centre of his working life. It tells him where to go, what to deliver, and how his performance will be measured. The technology is efficient. The system is convenient. The platform economy has created opportunities that did not exist before. But behind every algorithm is an institution. Behind every decision is a question of responsibility. The future of work will not be determined only by how advanced technology becomes. It will be determined by whether law and management can ensure that technological progress remains connected to human values.

The rider waiting outside that restaurant represents more than the growth of a new employment model. He represents a fundamental transformation in how authority operates in society. The workplace may no longer always have walls, offices, or visible managers. Yet the need for accountability remains unchanged. The future challenge for India is not simply creating more digital workplaces. It is ensuring that those workplaces remain fair.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Legislation and Legal Materials

1. Code on Social Security, No. 36 of 2020 (India).
2. Rajasthan Platform Based Gig Workers (Registration and Welfare) Act, 2023 (India).
3. Directive (EU) 2024 on Improving Working Conditions in Platform Work.
4. California Assembly Bill No. 5 (AB-5), 2019.

Cases

1. *Uber BV v. Aslam*, [2021] UKSC 5.

Reports and Institutional Publications

1. International Labour Organization, *World Employment and Social Outlook 2021: The Role of Digital Labour Platforms*(2021).
2. NITI Aayog, *India's Booming Gig and Platform Economy: Perspectives and Recommendations on the Future of Work*(2022).
3. World Bank, *World Development Report 2019: The Changing Nature of Work* (2019).

Books and Academic Works

1. Alex Rosenblat, *Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work* (University of California Press, 2018).
2. David Weil, *The Fissured Workplace: Why Work Became So Bad for So Many and What Can Be Done to Improve It*(Harvard University Press, 2014).
3. Jamie Woodcock & Mark Graham, *The Gig Economy: A Critical Introduction* (Polity Press, 2020).
4. Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (PublicAffairs, 2019).
5. Veena B. Dubal, "Wage Slave or Entrepreneur? Contesting the Dualism of Legal Worker Identities," *California Law Review* 105 (2017).
6. Katherine C. Kellogg, Melissa A. Valentine & Angèle Christin, "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control," *Academy of Management Annals* 14 (2020).