Accounting and Corporate Management (2025)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/acccm.2025.070309
ISSN 2523-5788 Vol. 7 Num. 3

Algorithmic Control in the Gig Economy: Power Reconfiguration, Labor Plight, and Management Implications

Wenkang Luo[1]

[1]*School of Business Administration, Guizhou University of Finance and Economics, 550025, Guiyang, Guizhou, China*

Keywords: Gig economy, Algorithmic control, Digital Taylorism, Algorithmic governance

Abstract: The global expansion of the gig economy, coupled with the deep integration of algorithmic control, has reshaped the labor governance paradigm. This research reveals how algorithms, through mechanisms like dynamic pricing, behavior scoring, and risk transfer, reconstruct the power relations between labor and capital while enhancing platform efficiency. Workers experience an "autonomy paradox," caught by algorithmic black boxes, data surveillance, and systemic exclusion; while superficially enjoying flexibility, they effectively suffer the erosion of their health and rights. The study critically argues that algorithmic control is essentially digital Taylorism masked by "technological empowerment," with its core controversy stemming from the conflict between technological determinism and human-centric values. The article proposes algorithmic transparency, worker participatory governance, and an interdisciplinary research framework to provide a theoretical basis for balancing efficiency logic and labor protection. Future research should examine the disruptive impact of emerging technologies such as Generative AI and the Metaverse on the control models within the gig economy.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the gig economy, relying on its flexibility and scale effects, has rapidly penetrated the global labor market, from ride-hailing, food delivery to freelance platforms, algorithmic control has become platform companies' core tool for coordinating massive gig workers[1]. Through real-time data capture, dynamic task assignment and behavior scoring system, the algorithm not only reconstructed traditional labor management processes (such as Uber's GPS-based driver dispatch, Meituan rider "shortest path" planning), moreover in a hidden and automated way reshaped the labor-management power relationship[2]. However, deep contradictions lie hidden behind this narrative of technological empowerment. Specifically, platforms assert that algorithms enhance efficiency and fairness through "de-humanized" decision-making. Yet, workers are trapped in a "digital predicament" due to mechanisms like algorithmic opacity and unappealable rating systems.

Current academic research on algorithmic control in the gig economy reveals three main research gaps. First, most studies focus on technical functional analysis (e.g., algorithmic matching

efficiency) but overlook its role as a power carrier in reshaping social relations. Second, existing theoretical debates are polarized, either one-sidedly emphasizing algorithmic empowerment (e.g., flexible employment opportunities[3]) or unilaterally criticizing digital exploitation (e.g., labor deskilling[4]), lacking a systematic explanation of the complex interaction between "efficiency" and "ethics." Third, there is a shortage of localized case studies; practices such as the struggles of food delivery riders in emerging markets like China and platform algorithm iterations have not been adequately integrated into international theoretical dialogue.

This research aims to explore the dual nature of algorithmic control in the gig economy by integrating multidisciplinary perspectives from management studies, labor sociology, and digital technology research. On one hand, algorithmic control lowers transaction costs through standardized and scalable rules, facilitating the gig economy's role as an infrastructure for the digital economy. On the other hand, its concealed power dynamics exacerbate inequality between labor and management, potentially leading to "digital Taylorism" under algorithmic hegemony. By clarifying this contradiction, this study seeks to provide theoretical grounding for optimizing platform governance, protecting workers' rights, and developing frameworks for algorithmic social responsibility.

2. Symbiotic mechanisms of gig economy and algorithmic control

The deep coupling between the gig economy and algorithmic control is not accidental; its essence stems from the high degree of fit between the two in terms of structural features and technical functionality. This symbiotic relationship has not only driven the large-scale expansion of the gig economy but has also reshaped the forms and boundaries of labor control. This symbiotic mechanism is primarily reflected in the following aspects:

2.1 Structural demand in the gig economy drives algorithmic control

The core characteristics of the gig economy include a flexible labor supply, detachment from traditional employment relationships, and a quantifiable labor process. Consequently, the gig economy is compelled to rely on algorithms to address the vacuum left by traditional management. Given that platforms must coordinate a large, dispersed workforce with demand that fluctuates instantaneously, traditional human supervision proves unfeasible in terms of both cost and efficiency[5]. Simultaneously, by classifying workers as "independent contractors," platforms circumvent statutory employer responsibilities, necessitating impersonal methods to enforce labor discipline. Algorithms, leveraging their automated decision-making and data-driven nature, are ideally suited to transform worker behaviors (e.g., delivery time, user ratings) into quantifiable metrics that can be monitored and used for punitive measures [2]. This structural dynamic forces platforms to integrate algorithms deeply into the labor process, thereby establishing a form of invisible control.

2.2 Adaptation of algorithmic technical functions for gig work governance

Algorithms enable the precise management of the gig economy through three main mechanisms: dynamic pricing, behavioral scoring, and risk transfer. Specifically, Uber's "surge pricing algorithm" not only balances supply and demand in real time but also uses economic incentives to induce drivers to voluntarily extend their working hours. Meanwhile, food delivery platforms' "shortest path planning" compresses rider labor into the optimal solution predetermined by the algorithm, systematically stripping away their decision-making power. The scoring system, exemplified by Didi's service score, further quantifies labor performance as "eligibility for work," compelling

workers into self-regulation to gain priority in dispatching orders. Moreover, platforms use algorithmic black boxes to evade responsibility (for instance, blaming delayed deliveries on riders' "incorrect route choices" while refusing to reveal the logic of the path algorithm), thereby masking the true nature of power under the guise of technological neutrality.

2.3 The technological reshaping of labor control

The nature of algorithmic control within the gig economy is fundamentally a transfer of power from human managers to technical systems. The command relationship characteristic of the traditional "manager-employee" hierarchy is encoded as "if-then" rules, enabling platforms to obscure the identity of the controlling entity and evade legal liability. Via IoT devices, algorithms broaden surveillance beyond labor outcomes to encompass the work process and even private time, establishing a ubiquitous control network[6]. More critically, algorithms exert deep control based on big data profiling. (For instance, assigning longer-distance orders to highly compliant riders, thus segmenting the potential for collective worker resistance). Beneath the guise of "technological empowerment," platforms utilize algorithms to offload labor risks, while workers relinquish fundamental rights for the sake of apparent "autonomy," ultimately intensifying labor-capital asymmetry in the digital era[3].

Algorithm control and the gig economy mutually reinforce each other, creating a positive feedback loop encompassing "data capture - algorithm optimization - scale expansion." However, this cycle comes at the cost of workers ceding their rights, thereby forcing them into an "autonomy paradox."

3. Practical impacts and controversies of algorithmic control

3.1 Dualist paradox: The efficiency myth and the invisible control of platform governance

Algorithm control is presented by platform companies as essential for boosting the efficiency of the gig economy. This is rooted in a core logic of optimizing resource allocation via data-driven, automated decision-making. For instance, on ride-hailing platforms, dynamic pricing algorithms balance supply and demand fluctuations in the short term, thus lowering passenger waiting times. Similarly, the route planning algorithms used by food delivery platforms significantly boost order throughput by reducing delivery duration. Furthermore, algorithms employ gamification features (like points badges for Didi drivers or progress bar prompts on freelance platforms) to turn the work process into a measurable competition, incentivizing workers to proactively work longer hours or intensify their service. However, this perceived efficiency gain fundamentally stems from the cession of control over labor. Specifically, riders are compelled to speed in order to meet algorithmically mandated time targets, while ride-hailing drivers accept low-profit short trips to achieve high ratings. The narrative of efficiency obscures the algorithms' implicit exploitation of labor value, as workers become subservient to algorithms despite the appearance of "autonomous choice" [7].

3.2 Labor's predicament: From algorithmic hegemony to systemic exclusion

The opacity and incontestability of algorithmic control exacerbate the structural vulnerability of gig workers. First, algorithmic black-boxing deprives workers of their right to know and their bargaining power. For instance, when food delivery riders incur fines for delays caused by errors in algorithmic route planning, the platform fails to disclose the underlying logic, leaving workers in a situation where they have grievances but no effective means to voice them. Second, data-driven

surveillance fosters a new form of labor alienation. AI customer service systems use sentiment analysis algorithms to evaluate worker emotional performance, compelling workers to mask their emotional state during service[8]. More alarmingly, algorithms leverage historical data to construct worker profiles and implement discriminatory control, such as assigning female riders a disproportionate number of short-distance, low-value orders or prioritizing highly compliant drivers for more profitable fares. These practices elevate traditional labor-management conflicts to the level of algorithmic discrimination, systematically marginalizing workers through data bias.

3.3 Theoretical debate: Technological utopia and digital taylorism

There is a fundamental disagreement in academia regarding the nature of algorithmic control in the gig economy. The mainstream management perspective emphasizes its role as a governance tool,positing that algorithms reduce transaction costs through standardized rules, enabling a manager-less gig economy[9]. For instance, the Upwork platform automatically matches freelancers with project requirements via algorithms, reducing the friction associated with manual coordination. However, scholars in labor sociology and critical theory unveil its essence as digital Taylorism. Algorithms decompose the labor process into measurable, monitorable discrete units, implementing comprehensive control through real-time data feedback. Yet, technological determinists often neglect power relations, while critical theory frequently underestimates worker agency (e.g., riders sharing algorithm loopholes through App). Future research should move beyond this dichotomy, focusing on the dynamic interplay among algorithms, workers, platforms, and regulators.

4. Managerial implications and future directions

4.1 Corporate practice: From algorithmic hegemony to human-centered governance

Platform companies must address the ethical responsibilities associated with algorithmic control, promoting transparency and worker involvement. For instance, Lyft's driver app has partially disclosed its dispatch logic, providing workers with limited insight; Meituan has piloted a "flexible delivery time" feature, allowing riders to independently extend delivery times during severe weather.Such practices demonstrate that algorithmic design can incorporate fault tolerance and human-centric variables, moving beyond a sole focus on efficiency. More fundamentally, platforms should establish collaborative mechanisms for algorithm negotiation with their workers. Companies ought to recognize that the long-term value of algorithmic control depends on balancing efficiency with the dignity of labor.

4.2 Policy and regulation: Establishing a framework for algorithm social responsibility

Governments should mandate algorithm disclosure obligations through legislation to curb the abuse of "technical black boxes" by platforms. The EU's Platform Work Directive, which requires companies to explain the logic of automated decision-making to workers and establish manual appeal channels, serves as a valuable global reference. Within the Chinese context, policies like the "algorithm balancing" policy (mandating longer default delivery times for food delivery platforms) piloted in cities such as Shenzhen offer examples of localized regulation. However, their long-term efficacy requires supporting dynamic evaluation tools. Furthermore, the scope of labor law should be expanded to include algorithm management rights within the purview of employer responsibility, compelling platforms to provide work injury insurance and minimum wage guarantees. Regulatory objectives should shift from ex-post punishment to ex-ante prevention, establishing a national standard system for algorithm ethics review.

4.3 Academic research: Interdisciplinary integration and emerging issues

Academia urgently needs to break down the disciplinary boundaries among management, computer science, and labor sociology, and focus on four main directions. First, there is a need to develop algorithmic explainability techniques and create explainable AI tools, transforming abstract algorithmic rules into a decision basis understandable by workers; Second, attention should be given to worker digital resistance, studying gig workers' "anti-algorithm" strategies and their impact on the power structure of platforms; Meanwhile, future research should also address emerging technology scenarios and the potential risk of Generative AI substituting freelancers' skills. Finally, global disparities should be addressed, comparing algorithmic control patterns in the gig economy of the Global South and North.

5. Conclusion

The core nature of algorithmic control in the gig economy represents a dialectical unity of technological empowerment and the dispossession of power. This study reveals that algorithms enable the high standardization of gig work and the low-cost expansion of platform governance through mechanisms like dynamic pricing, behavioral scoring, and risk transfer. However, the underlying logic of this "efficiency myth" is, in fact, a technological reconstruction of labor control - moving from bureaucratic commands to algorithmic encoding, and from explicit supervision to covert hegemony. In this process, workers encounter an "autonomy paradox": while appearing to enjoy flexible work choices, they are effectively stripped of bargaining power by algorithmic black boxes, data surveillance, and systemic exclusion, even being compelled to forgo fundamental health and safety rights.

The genesis of the current debate stems from the conflict between technological determinism and humanistic values. The field of management needs to move beyond an instrumental rationality perspective and confront the social embeddedness of algorithms. It must be recognized that algorithms are not merely tools for resource allocation but are concrete embodiments of labor-capital power relations. Policy suggestions indicate that algorithmic transparency and worker empowerment can partially mitigate technological tyranny, yet global governance efforts still face significant challenges from platform capital resistance and the rapid iteration of technology.

Future research ought to concentrate on three primary areas: First, investigating synergistic approaches to improve both algorithmic interpretability technologies and workers' digital literacy; Second, tracking how gig workers' "counter-algorithm" strategies serve to reconstruct the balance of power; Third, critically assessing the disruptive influence of emerging technologies such as generative AI and the metaverse on control models within the gig economy. Only by establishing a dynamic equilibrium between technological logic and humanistic values can the gig economy break free from the constraints of "digital Taylorism" and genuinely function as a vehicle for inclusive growth.

References

[1] Yang, Y., Chi, M., Bi, X., & Xu, Y. (2025). Dark sides of algorithmic control in app-based gig work: An objectification perspective. Journal of Business Research, 195, 115407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115407.

[2] Parent-Rocheleau, X., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Algorithms as work designers: How algorithmic management influences the design of jobs. Human Resource Management Review, 32(3), Article 100838. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.hrmr.2021.100838

[3] Rani, U., & Furrer, M. (2021). Digital labour platforms and new forms of flexible work in developing countries: Algorithmic management of work and workers. Competition & Change, 25(2), 212-236. https://doi. org/10. 1177/10245294209051

[4] De Ruyter, A., Brown, M., & Burgess, J. (2018). Gig work and the fourth industrial revolution. Journal of International Affairs, 72(1), 37-50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26588341
[5] De Stefano, V. (2016). Introduction: crowdsourcing, the gig-economy and the law. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 37(3). 461-470. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2767383.
[6] Gandini, A. (2019). Labour process theory and the gig economy. Human Relations, 72(6), 1039–1056. http://journals.sagepub.com/home/hum
[7] Shevchuk, A., Strebkov, D., & Tyulyupo, A. (2021). Always on across time zones: Invisible schedules in the online gig economy. New Technology, Work and Employment, 36(1), 94-113. https://doi.org/10.1111 /ntwe.12191
[8] Zhang, Y., Li, L., Ma, X., Sun, J., Dong, Y., & Yang, Z. (2025). Invisible Algorithms, Visible Outcomes: Roles of Emotional Labor and Work Gamification in Gigs. Computers in Human Behavior, 169, 108681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2025.108681
[9] *Sutherland, W., Jarrahi, M. H., Dunn, M., & Nelson, S. B. (2020). Work precarity and gig literacies in online freelancing. Work, Employment and Society, 34(3), 457–475. https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170198865 11*