Page 652- 664 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1111133*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 6

2025

Employment Law Evolution: From Industrial Relations to Algorithmic Management

NITESH KUMAR DUBEY[1]

ABSTRACT

The trajectory of employment law has historically mirrored the dominant modes of production, evolving from the master-servant doctrines of the pre-industrial era to the collective bargaining frameworks of the Fordist industrial age. However, the contemporary workplace is undergoing a seismic shift driven by the datafication of labor and the ascendancy of Algorithmic Management (AM). This article provides an exhaustive analysis of this legal and operational evolution, tracing the lineage from scientific management (Taylorism) to its digital reincarnation ("Digital Taylorism"). It critically examines how the rise of algorithmic control- characterized by pervasive surveillance, automated decision-making (ADM), and the fissuring of the workplace- challenges the foundational assumptions of industrial relations systems designed for human-centric hierarchies. Through a comparative legal analysis of the European Union, the United States, and emerging economies such as India and China, the article explores the regulatory lag in addressing algorithmic bias, automated termination, and the classification of platform workers. Furthermore, it posits that the future of labor law lies in the reconceptualization of data rights as collective labor rights, necessitating a new paradigm of "algorithmic collective action" and co-enforcement mechanisms to bridge the widening gap between technological capability and worker protection.

Keywords: *Employment Law, Algorithmic Management, Industrial Relations, Digital Taylorism, Platform Work Directive, Collective Bargaining, Workplace Surveillance, Artificial Intelligence, Data Rights, Fissured Workplace.*

I. INTRODUCTION: THE STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION OF LABOR CONTROL

The history of labor law is, in many respects, the history of the clock. In the 19th century, the factory whistle demarcated the boundary between the employer's time and the worker's time, establishing a temporal binary that underpinned the Standard Employment Relationship (SER) (Fudge, 2017). Today, that whistle has been replaced by the notification ping- a relentless, asynchronous digital summons that respects no boundaries. We are witnessing a transition not merely of technology, but of ontology; the very nature of "subordination," the legal cornerstone

[1] Author is an Assistant Professor at School of Legal Studies, Babu Banarasi Das University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

of employment, is being rewritten by code.

This paper argues that we are currently adrift in a regulatory interregnum. We have left the shores of the Fordist industrial compromise- where stability was traded for subordination- but have not yet arrived at a coherent legal framework for the digital age. Instead, we inhabit what David Weil (2014) presciently termed the "fissured workplace," where the legal liabilities of employment are shed while the granular control of the worker is intensified through Algorithmic Management (AM).

While the "gig economy" serves as the visible tip of this iceberg, the phenomenon of AM has permeated the "regular" workplace- from the logistics warehouse to the white-collar home office (Adams-Prassl, 2019; Eurofound, 2020). Algorithms now hire, fire, discipline, and direct, often with an opacity that makes the "black box" of the human mind seem transparent by comparison. As we navigate this shift from Industrial Relations (IR) to Algorithmic Management, we must ask: can legal concepts forged in the steam age survive in the era of generative AI?

II. THE GHOST OF TAYLOR: FROM SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT TO DIGITAL PANOPTICON

To understand the present crisis in employment law, one must first situate algorithmic management within the history of capitalist labor control. The current obsession with efficiency is not novel; it is the digital resurrection of Frederick Winslow Taylor's *Principles of Scientific Management* (1911). Taylor sought to strip the worker of discretion, breaking tasks into their smallest constituent atoms to maximize output (Wright, 1993). Legally, this cemented the "managerial prerogative"- the employer's common law right to dictate the "manner and means" of work.

A. Analog vs. Digital Taylorism

In the Fordist era, Taylorism was limited by the fallibility of human oversight. The foreman could only watch one line at a time. Today, **Digital Taylorism** has obliterated these physical limits (Parent-Rocheleau & Parker, 2022). Modern workplace technologies- wearables, keystroke loggers, and biometric sensors- enable a "panoptic" gaze that is continuous, invisible, and total.

Consider the modern logistics center. Workers are equipped with handheld scanners that track "Time Off Task" (TOT) down to the second. If a worker pauses to stretch or use the restroom, the algorithm logs this as a deviation (Lecher, 2019). This is not merely a difference in degree,

but in kind. The "porosity" of the working day- those small moments of human respite- has been filled with productive intensity. The legal implications are profound: existing health and safety laws, designed for physical hazards, struggle to conceptualize the "psychosocial risks" of being managed by a machine that knows no fatigue (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2025).

Table 1: Comparative Evolution of Management Regimes

Feature	Scientific Management (Taylorism)	Algorithmic Management (Digital Taylorism)
Primary Mechanism	Stopwatch, physical clipboard, human foreman	Digital sensors, wearables, API calls, "Bossware"
Surveillance Scope	Visible, intermittent, task-specific	Invisible, continuous, comprehensive (behavioral & biometric)
Decision Authority	Human Manager (delegated hierarchy)	Automated Decision-Making (ADM) & "Black Box" Algorithms
Worker Status	Standard Employment Relationship (SER)	Fissured (Independent Contractor, Gig Worker, Platform)
Legal Focus	Physical safety, working hours, collective bargaining	Data privacy, discrimination, classification, mental health

B. The Datafication of the Soul

This surveillance extends beyond the warehouse. In the white-collar sector, "bossware" analyzes email sentiment, takes random screenshots, and even utilizes webcam facial analysis to gauge "attentiveness" (Aloisi & De Stefano, 2022; Scherer, 2021). We are seeing the emergence of what Zuboff (2019) terms "surveillance capitalism" turned inward. The worker

is no longer just a producer of goods, but a "quantified worker," reduced to a data double that determines their employability and retention (Ajunwa, 2023). This creates a profound information asymmetry: the algorithm knows everything about the worker, but the worker knows nothing about the algorithm (Möhlmann et al., 2021).

III. THE MECHANICS OF CONTROL AND THE "6 RS"

To regulate algorithmic management, one must understand its operational mechanisms. Kellogg et al. (2020) identify six primary levers of algorithmic control, known as the **"6 Rs"**:

1. **Recording:** The continuous capture of data (keystrokes, GPS location, biometrics) to create a granular record of worker activity.
2. **Rating:** The aggregation of customer feedback and performance metrics into scores that determine future access to work (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).
3. **Restricting:** The use of software constraints to limit worker autonomy, such as geofencing or preventing log-outs during high demand.
4. **Recommending:** Providing algorithmic "nudges" or route suggestions that, while ostensibly optional, are heavily penalized if ignored.
5. **Replacing:** The automated termination or "deactivation" of workers who fall below algorithmic thresholds (Duggan et al., 2020).
6. **Rewarding:** The use of gamification and dynamic pricing (bonuses, surge pricing) to incentivize behavior without direct command.

This "soft control" relies on the illusion of autonomy, masking the coercive nature of the algorithm (Wood et al., 2019). Drivers might see a "quest" to complete a certain number of rides for a bonus, a design choice rooted in behavioral economics to extend working hours (Scheiber, 2017).

IV. THE LEGAL FISSURE: EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND THE CONTROL PARADOX

The central legal paradox of our time is this: never has the employer possessed more control over the worker, yet never has the employer been more legally distant.

A. The Erosion of the Standard Employment Relationship

The SER was built on a bilateral contract: a specific employer, a specific employee, and a mutual set of obligations. David Weil's (2014) concept of the "fissured workplace" describes how lead firms have systematically shed these obligations through subcontracting, franchising, and now, platformization. By interposing an app between capital and labor, platforms like Uber

and Deliveroo claim to be mere technology intermediaries, connecting independent "entrepreneurs" with customers.

B. The Reality of Algorithmic Control: *Uber v Aslam*

Courts are increasingly skeptical of this fiction. In the landmark case *Uber BV v Aslam* (2021), the UK Supreme Court pierced the veil of the "independent contractor" defense. The Court's reasoning pivoted on **control**. It noted that the drivers were not true entrepreneurs because the platform:

1. Dictated the price (fare).
2. Defined the contractual terms.
3. Constrained the driver's freedom to decline work through algorithmic penalties.
4. Monitored performance through a rating system that acted as a disciplinary mechanism (Supreme Court of the United Kingdom, 2021).

This judgment highlights that algorithmic management *is* management, often stricter than human supervision. The "freedom" to work is effectively the freedom to obey the algorithm or face deactivation- a digital version of the "at-will" employment doctrine, but executed at the speed of light.

V. COMPARATIVE REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS: A TALE OF DIVERGENCE

The global response to AM reveals a fracturing of legal philosophy. We see a spectrum ranging from the rights-based regulation of the EU to the fragmented approach of the US and the state-led paternalism of China.

Table 2: Regulatory Frameworks for Algorithmic Management

Jurisdiction	Key Regulatory Instruments	Legal Philosophy & Approach
European Union	Platform Work Directive (2024); AI Act; GDPR	**Rights-Based:** Focus on fundamental rights, human oversight, and a rebuttable "presumption of employment" for platform workers.

United States	State-level (e.g., CA AB 5, NYC Local Law 144); NLRB Memos	**Market-Driven/Fragmented:** Lacks federal AI labor law; relies on agency enforcement (NLRB, EEOC) and state innovation; "ABC Test" vs. Contractor model.
China	Guiding Opinions on New Forms of Employment (2021)	**State-Paternalism:** Focus on social stability and preventing "disorderly expansion of capital"; mandates reasonable algorithms and transparency.
India / Global South	Code on Social Security (2020); Rajasthan Gig Workers Act (2023)	**Welfare-Based:** Recognizes "gig workers" for social security without granting full employment status; emerging "portable benefits" models.

A. The European Union: Pioneering a Rights-Based Framework

The EU has positioned itself as the global regulator of digital labor.

- **The Platform Work Directive (PWD):** Finalized in 2024, this Directive introduces a rebuttable **presumption of employment** if certain control criteria are met. Crucially, Chapter III establishes the first dedicated EU rules on **algorithmic management**, granting workers the right to transparency regarding how decisions are made and banning the processing of certain emotional or biometric data (European Parliament, 2024; Aloisi, 2024).
- **The AI Act:** By classifying employment-related AI as "High Risk," the EU mandates strict conformity assessments and data governance, though critics argue it relies too heavily on

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

self-compliance (Veale & Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2021).

- **GDPR:** Article 22 remains a critical shield against "solely automated" decisions, with recent CJEU jurisprudence (e.g., *Schufa*) reinforcing the right to human intervention (Paal, 2023).

B. The United States: Fragmentation and Agency Activism

The US lacks a federal AI law. The regulatory vacuum is being filled by a patchwork of state laws and agency actions.

- **NLRB Activism:** The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) General Counsel has aggressively argued that intrusive surveillance interferes with Section 7 rights (the right to organize), effectively treating "bossware" as an Unfair Labor Practice (NLRB, 2023; Mignucci, 2025).
- **Local Innovation:** New York City's Local Law 144 requires "bias audits" for automated employment decision tools, a pioneering transparency measure, albeit one with significant loopholes (Scherer, 2024).
- **State Laws:** California and Minnesota have passed legislation targeting warehouse productivity quotas, directly challenging the "digital Taylorism" of companies like Amazon (Gordon, 2021).

C. The Global South: Informality Meets Algorithms

In the Global South, AM interacts with vast informal economies in unique ways.

- **India:** The **Code on Social Security (2020)** recognizes "gig workers" as a distinct category eligible for social security but denies them full employment rights (Kuriakose & Iyer, 2021). The **Rajasthan Platform-Based Gig Workers Act (2023)** establishes a welfare board funded by a transaction fee, a model for "portable benefits" (Roy, 2025).
- **China:** The "Guiding Opinions" issued in 2021 explicitly targeted algorithms that encourage dangerous driving and mandated that platforms earn a "reasonable" profit, effectively capping the extractive power of the algorithm to maintain social stability (Chen, 2020).

VI. DISCRIMINATION, BIAS, AND THE "BLACK BOX"

If the boss is an algorithm, who do you sue for discrimination? Traditional anti-discrimination frameworks rely on proving either "disparate treatment" (intent) or "disparate impact" (outcome). Both are notoriously difficult to pin on a machine learning model.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

A. Automated Hiring and Bias

Algorithms are often sold as "bias-free" alternatives to human prejudice. In reality, they are "prediction machines" trained on historical data saturated with societal biases (Barocas & Selbst, 2016). The infamous case of Amazon's scrapping of its AI recruiting tool, which penalized resumes containing the word "women's," demonstrates how machine learning models optimize for historical patterns of exclusion (Dastin, 2018). Under US Title VII or the UK Equality Act 2010, proving this bias requires access to the data and the logic of the model-access that proprietary trade secret laws often block (Wachter et al., 2017; Kim, 2017).

B. The "Right to Explanation"

A critical evolution in employment law is the demand for a "right to explanation." Recent jurisprudence, such as the *Ola & Uber* judgments in Amsterdam, established that workers have a right under GDPR to access the data used to make management decisions about them (Gellert et al., 2021). This transparency is a prerequisite for challenging unfair dismissal, effectively turning data access into a labor right.

VII. Reclaiming Agency: From Industrial Relations to Data Relations

As individual legal protections struggle to keep pace, collective bargaining is re-emerging as a primary mechanism for regulating AM. The concept of "Industrial Relations" is evolving into "Data Relations."

A. Bargaining for the Algorithm

Trade unions are learning to "bargain over the algorithm" (De Stefano & Taes, 2023).

- **The WGA Strike (2023):** The Writers Guild of America strike explicitly centered on the regulation of Generative AI, setting a global precedent for bargaining over technological displacement and the use of "digital replicas" (Zimmerman, 2025).
- **European Works Councils:** In Germany and Scandinavia, works councils use co-determination rights to negotiate the parameters of algorithmic systems before deployment (Molina et al., 2023).

B. Data Rights as Labor Rights

Scholars like De Stefano (2019) and Calacci (2023) argue that because data is the raw material of algorithmic control, workers must have collective rights to govern this data.

- **Data Trusts:** Concepts like "data trusts" allow workers to pool their data (e.g., via apps like WeClock) to verify pay and working conditions, countering the information

asymmetry of the platform (UNI Global Union, 2025).

- **Algorithmic Collective Action:** Workers are engaging in coordinated data obfuscation or "logging off" to manipulate the algorithm's outputs, essentially a digital strike (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017).

VIII. CONCLUSION: TOWARDS A LAW OF DIGITAL LABOR

The evolution from Industrial Relations to Algorithmic Management represents a crisis of categories. The legal concepts of the 20th century- subordination, the workplace, the shift- are dissolving into the fluid, data-driven realities of the 21st.

The legal response cannot be a nostalgic attempt to rebuild the factory walls. Instead, we need a **Law of Digital Labor** that:

1. **Decouples protection from status:** Basic rights (safety, non-discrimination, privacy) must apply to all workers, regardless of whether they are labeled "employees" or "contractors."
2. **Ensures Algorithmic Due Process:** No worker should be fired by a script. A "right to human review" must be substantive, not procedural window dressing (Adams-Prassl et al., 2023).
3. **Empowers Collective Data Rights:** The power of the algorithm is collective (it learns from the aggregate). The resistance must also be collective. Unions must become data stewards, negotiating not just the price of labor, but the architecture of the systems that direct it.

As we stand on the precipice of the Generative AI era, where the "manager" may soon be a Large Language Model, the stakes could not be higher. We must decide whether the future of work will be a digital panopticon of efficiency or a human-centric economy where technology serves the worker.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

IX. References

1. Adams-Prassl, J. (2019). What if your boss was an algorithm? Economic incentives, legal challenges, and the rise of artificial intelligence at work. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 41*(1), 123–146.
2. Adams-Prassl, J., Abraha, H., Kelly-Lyth, A., Silberman, M., & Rakshita, S. (2023). Regulating algorithmic management: A blueprint. *European Labour Law Journal, 14*(2), 124–151.
3. Ajunwa, I. (2023). *The quantified worker: Law and technology in the modern workplace*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Aloisi, A. (2024). Regulating algorithmic management at work in the European Union: Data protection, non-discrimination and collective rights. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations, 40*(1), 37–70.
5. Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2022). *Your boss is an algorithm: Artificial intelligence, platform work and labour*. Hart Publishing.
6. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*, 671–732.
7. Calacci, D. (2023). *From access to understanding: Collective data governance for workers*. Penn State University.
8. Chen, L. (2020). Labor order under digital control: A study on the labor control of take-out platform riders. *Sociological Studies, 6*, 113–135.
9. Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). *Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women*. Reuters.
10. De Stefano, V. (2019). 'Negotiating the algorithm': Automation, artificial intelligence and labour protection. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 41*(1), 15–46.
11. De Stefano, V., & Taes, S. (2023). Algorithmic management and collective bargaining. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 29*(1), 21–36.
12. Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2020). Algorithmic management and app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations and HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal, 30*(1), 114–132.
13. Eurofound. (2020). *Employee monitoring and surveillance: The challenges of digitalisation*. Publications Office of the European Union.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

14. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. (2025). *Worker participation and representation: The impact on risk prevention of AI worker management systems*. EU-OSHA.

15. European Parliament. (2024). *Directive (EU) 2024/2831 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2024 on improving working conditions in platform work*. Official Journal of the European Union.

16. Fudge, J. (2017). The future of the standard employment relationship: Labour law, new institutional economics and old power resource theory. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 59*(3), 374–392.

17. Gellert, R., van Bekkum, M., & Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. (2021, April 28). The Ola & Uber judgments: For the first time a court recognises a GDPR right to an explanation for algorithmic decision-making. *EU Law Analysis*.

18. Gordon, J. L. (2021). Under pressure: Addressing warehouse productivity quotas and the rise in workplace injuries. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 49*, 150.

19. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–410.

20. Kim, P. T. (2017). Data-driven discrimination at work. *William & Mary Law Review, 58*(3), 857–936.

21. Kuriakose, F., & Iyer, D. K. (2021). *Rights of platform workers in India: Critical questions and policy perspectives*. Center for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania.

22. Lecher, C. (2019, April 25). *How Amazon automatically tracks and fires warehouse workers for 'productivity'*. The Verge.

23. Mignucci, O. (2025). Towards a more human workplace: Remedying algorithmic management via bargaining orders. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems, 58*(3), 386.

24. Möhlmann, M., Zalmanson, L., Henfridsson, O., & Gregory, R. W. (2021). Algorithmic management of work on online labor platforms: When matching meets control. *MIS Quarterly, 45*(4), 1999–2022.

25. Molina, O., Butollo, F., Mako, C., Godino, A., Holtgrewe, U., Ilsøe, A.,... & Wotschak, P. (2023). It takes two to code: A comparative analysis of collective bargaining and

artificial intelligence. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 29*(1), 87–104.

26. National Labor Relations Board. (2023). *Memorandum GC 23-02: Electronic monitoring and algorithmic management of employees interfering with Section 7 rights*.
27. Paal, B. (2023). Case note: Article 22 GDPR: Credit scoring before the CJEU. *Global Privacy Review, 4*, 127.
28. 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), 100838.
29. Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 3758–3784.
30. Roy, S. (2025). Reshaping labour laws in the age of automation: Issues and challenges in algorithmic management. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science, 14*(8), 1690.
31. Scheiber, N. (2017, April 2). *How Uber uses psychological tricks to push its drivers' buttons*. The New York Times.
32. Scherer, M. (2021). *Bossware may be hazardous to your health*. Center for Democracy and Technology.
33. Scherer, M. (2024). *Regulating robo-bosses: Surveying the civil rights policy landscape for automated employment decision systems*. Center for Democracy and Technology.
34. Supreme Court of the United Kingdom. (2021). *Uber BV and others v Aslam and others* UKSC 5.
35. Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.
36. UNI Global Union. (2025). *Algorithmic management: Opportunities for collective action - A guide for workers and trade unions*. UNI Global Union.
37. Veale, M., & Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. (2021). Demystifying the Draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act. *Computer Law Review International, 22*(4), 97–112.
38. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the general data protection regulation. *International Data Privacy Law, 7*(2), 76–99.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

39. Weil, D. (2014). *The fissured workplace: Why work became so bad for so many and what can be done to improve it*. Harvard University Press.

40. Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society, 33*(1), 56–75.

41. Wright, C. (1993). Taylorism reconsidered: The impact of scientific management within the Australian workplace. *Labour History, 64*, 34–53.

42. Zimmerman, S. M. (2025, July 29). *Future script: How generative AI is changing collective bargaining in the entertainment industry*. Jackson Lewis.

43. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]