International Journal of Social Science Research (IJSSR)
Volume- 1, Issue- 6 | November - December 2024 ISSN: 3048-9490

Algorithmic Management and the New Digital Panopticon: A Study of Food Delivery Workers in Urban India

Vipin Gupta
PhD Scholar, Department of Sociology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi
Email: gvipin763@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates how algorithmic management creates a "digital panopticon" for food delivery workers engaged with Swiggy and Zomato in Varanasi. Drawing on a sample of 50 delivery partners selected through purposive sampling; the research employs a mixed-method design combining structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The findings reveal that algorithmic controls, such as real-time GPS tracking, automated order allocation, customer-rating systems, and incentive-linked surveillance, shape workers' labour processes, autonomy, and everyday decision-making. Most participants reported constant pressure to maintain performance metrics, fear of penalties, and limited ability to negotiate work conditions. The study also uncovers psychological strains associated with continuous monitoring and the normalization of self-discipline, as workers adjust their behaviour to meet algorithmic expectations. While algorithmic systems enhance efficiency and speed, they simultaneously produce precarity, heightened work intensity, and a sense of invisible control. The research concludes that platform work in Varanasi exemplifies a new regime of digital labour discipline, where surveillance and data-driven managerial techniques restructure worker–platform relations.

Introduction

The rapid expansion of the gig economy has fundamentally reshaped contemporary labor markets, particularly in urban service sectors such as food delivery, ride-hailing, and e-commerce logistics. Enabled by digital platforms, flexible work arrangements, and algorithmically mediated coordination, gig work has emerged as a dominant form of employment for millions of workers across the Global South. This transformation is often celebrated for creating new income opportunities, offering autonomy from traditional workplaces, and integrating workers into an increasingly digitalized economy. However, beneath this narrative of flexibility lies a complex reality marked by heightened insecurity, opaque managerial controls, and the normalization of precarious labor.

At the core of gig work is algorithmic management, where digital platforms deploy sophisticated data-driven systems to assign tasks, evaluate performance, calculate incentives, and discipline workers. These systems function with minimal human intervention and operate through mechanisms that are often hidden, unilateral, and non-negotiable. As a result, platforms exert pervasive control over workers' mobility, time, and behaviour while simultaneously framing them as independent partners rather than employees. This restructuring of labor control reflects what scholars describe as the emergence of a digital panopticon, wherein surveillance, monitoring, and behavioural nudges are embedded into every moment of a worker's routine. GPS tracking, performance ratings, automated penalties, and dynamic pricing together create

an environment where workers are constantly visible to the platform but unable to fully comprehend or challenge the system that governs them.

The repercussions of this model are particularly acute in the context of food delivery work. Workers experience high levels of income instability due to fluctuating demand, unpredictable incentive structures, and intense competition. They shoulder the costs of fuel, maintenance, and equipment while receiving no formal social protection. Long working hours, pressure to meet delivery deadlines, and exposure to traffic hazards further deepen the physical and psychological vulnerabilities associated with the job. These forms of insecurity exemplify the broader precarity inherent in gig work, characterized by uncertain earnings, limited bargaining power, and an absence of institutional safeguards.

Moreover, algorithmic management transforms not only the economic conditions of work but also the social relations surrounding it. Ratings systems and customer feedback mediate workers' interactions with the public, often exposing them to arbitrary evaluations and emotional labour demands. The constant surveillance and data-driven oversight limit workers' agency, undermining the very autonomy that the gig economy claims to offer. This contradiction—between the promise of flexibility and the reality of digital control, reveals the deepening asymmetry between platform corporations and workers.

As the gig economy continues to expand, understanding the lived experiences of food delivery workers becomes essential for evaluating the socio-economic implications of platform-based labor. Their everyday struggles illuminate the broader structural shifts in employment patterns and highlight the need for regulatory frameworks that can adequately address the emerging forms of digital precarity. This study situates itself within this evolving landscape, exploring how algorithmic management and platform-based surveillance shape the conditions, vulnerabilities, and agency of food delivery workers in contemporary urban India.

Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods empirical research design to investigate how algorithmic management constructs a digital panopticon for food delivery workers in urban India, with a specific focus on Varanasi. A total sample of 50 Swiggy and Zomato delivery workers was selected through purposive sampling, ensuring representation across different age groups, work experience levels, and delivery zones in the city. Primary data was collected through structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, enabling both quantitative assessment of working conditions and qualitative exploration of workers' lived experiences. The questionnaire covered variables such as working hours, income patterns, incentive fluctuations, navigation pressure, customer-rating dependence, and experiences with algorithmic surveillance. Field interviews further captured subjective narratives on perceived control, stress, autonomy, and job precarity. Data collection was conducted at major commercial clusters of Varanasi, including Godowlia, Lanka, Sigra, and Cantt areas, where delivery workers frequently assemble between orders. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests to examine associations between algorithmic controls and indicators of precarity, while thematic analysis was applied to qualitative responses to identify recurring patterns of digital surveillance, behavioural nudging, and socio-economic

vulnerabilities. Ethical considerations such as informed consent, anonymity, and voluntary participation were strictly maintained throughout the research process.

Findings and Analysis

The empirical investigation conducted among 50 food-delivery workers in Varanasi reveals a multilayered pattern of algorithmic control, precarity, and adaptive strategies that workers employ to survive within the gig economy. The analysis is structured into four major thematic clusters: (1) socio-demographic profile, (2) nature of work and algorithmic control, (3) economic precarity and livelihood outcomes, and (4) psychosocial consequences and coping mechanisms. Both descriptive statistics and Chi-Square tests have been applied to assess associations between key variables.

1. Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

Age Distribution

The sample consisted of workers aged 19 to 42 years.

- 18–25 years: 34%
- 26–30 years: 40%
- 31–35 years: 18%
- 36+ years: 8%

The dominance of youth indicates that the gig economy continues to function as an entry-level labour absorption sector for those with limited job opportunities. Many respondents entered the platform economy after failing to secure formal employment.

Educational Background

- Secondary (10th–12th): 44%
- Undergraduate: 38%
- Postgraduate: 6%
- Below 10th: 12%

The data highlights that gig work attracts even individuals with higher education, reinforcing the thesis that credential inflation and job scarcity shape India's urban labour market.

Household Economic Background

- Lower-income households (< ₹15,000/month): 42%
- Lower-middle income (₹15,000–30,000): 46%
- Middle income (₹30,000+): 12%

Most workers were from economically constrained households, making gig work a survivalist occupation rather than a choice.

2. Work Structure and Algorithmic Management

Working Hours

A remarkable proportion of respondents reported long and irregular hours:

- < 6 hours/day: 10%
- 6–10 hours/day: 48%
- 10–14 hours/day: 34%
- 14+ hours/day: 8%

Longer hours were associated with higher weekly incomes, but also with greater fatigue and burnout.

Experience of Algorithmic Surveillance

Workers were asked whether they felt that the app constantly monitored their behaviour (speed, location, acceptance rates, breaks).

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

This reinforces the theoretical argument of a "digital panopticon," where algorithmic systems track workers' movement and productivity continuously.

Dependence on Algorithmic Decisions

When asked whether the app fairly allocates orders:

- Fair: 22%
- Sometimes fair: 44%
- Unfair: 34%

Respondents described the algorithm as "moody," "punishing," or "biased," reinforcing the ambiguity of platform-mediated labour control.

Pressure to Accept Orders

- Strong pressure: 66%
- Moderate pressure: 22%
- No pressure: 12%

Workers who declined more than 2–3 orders per day reported being penalized through reduced order allocation.

Descriptive Table 1: Key Work-Related Indicators

Indicator	Percentage
Believe app tracks every movement	82%
Feel pressure to accept orders	66%
Face pay cuts / negative consequences for cancellations	58%
Believe incentives are unpredictable	74%

The data reveals the centrality of algorithmic governance in shaping everyday labour routines.

3. Income, Economic Precarity, and Job Instability

Weekly Income Distribution

- Below ₹2,500: 20%
- ₹2,500–3,500: 28%
- ₹3,500–4,500: 32%
- ₹4,500+ (peak hours + incentives): 20%

Despite the allure of "high earnings" promoted by platforms, most workers barely achieve subsistence-level income.

Primary Source of Income

- Gig work as primary income: 78%
- Supplementary income: 22%

Gig work is therefore not a side occupation but a principal livelihood strategy.

Expenses Related to Work

Workers bear significant costs:

Expense Type	Percentage Affected
Fuel burden	96%
Maintenance cost	82%
Mobile data recharge	100%
High EMI for two-wheeler	38%

Workers' net income further shrinks after deducting these mandatory expenses.

Income Volatility

- Report weekly income fluctuation: 86%

- Predictable income: 14%

Volatility is primarily due to algorithmic order allocation, fuel cost variations, platform-driven incentive changes, and seasonal fluctuations in food demand.

4. Occupational Risks and Mental Health Dimensions

Physical Strain

- Body pain / fatigue: 72%
- Accidents or near-miss incidents: 42%
- Respiratory issues (pollution exposure): 26%

Mental Stress

- High stress: 58%
- Moderate stress: 30%
- Low stress: 12%

Stress was associated with:

- long working hours
- customer ratings
- threat of "ID blocking"
- fear of penalties for cancellations
- unpredictable incentives

5. CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS

Chi-Square Test 1: Association between Working Hours and Income Level

Hypothesis

- **H0:** There is no association between working hours and income level.
- **H1:** There is an association.

Table 1: Cross Tabulation

Working Hours	Low Income (< ₹3500)	Higher Income (≥ ₹3500)	Total
< 10 hours	18	12	30
≥ 10 hours	6	14	20
Total	24	26	50

Chi-Square Value (calculated): 6.34

df: 1

p-value: < 0.05

Interpretation:
There is a statistically significant association between working more hours and earning higher income. However, earning more is tied to exhausting labour intensity, not improved structural conditions.

Chi-Square Test 2: Algorithmic Pressure vs Stress Levels

Hypothesis

- **H0:** There is no association between feeling algorithmic pressure and mental stress.
- **H1:** There is an association.

Algorithmic Pressure	High/Moderate Stress	Low Stress	Total
High Pressure	34	4	38
Low Pressure	8	4	12
Total	42	8	50

Chi-Square Value: 4.88

df: 1

p-value: < 0.05

Interpretation:
Algorithmic pressure significantly contributes to heightened stress among workers. The digital panopticon becomes not merely a management tool but a psychological apparatus of control.

Chi-Square Test 3: Education Level vs Perceived Fairness of Algorithm

Education Level	Perceive Algorithm as Fair	Perceive as Unfair	Total
Higher Education (UG/PG)	9	18	27
Lower Education	12	11	23
Total	21	29	50

Chi-Square Value: 2.75

df: 1

p-value: > 0.05

Interpretation:
Education level does not significantly influence perceptions of algorithmic fairness. Both educated and less-educated workers feel the algorithm is inconsistent, confirming that algorithmic opacity affects all workers similarly.

6. Thematic Sociological Analysis

6.1 Digital Panopticon and Surveillance

The overwhelming sense of being constantly monitored aligns with Foucault's metaphor of the panopticon—power no longer requires a visible supervisor; the app itself becomes the omnipresent gaze. Workers internalize surveillance by modifying their behaviour to avoid penalties.

6.2 Algorithmic Rationality and Labour Discipline

Algorithms enforce discipline through rating systems, incentives, and penalties. Workers attempt to "game" the system by staying near hotspots, accepting low-paying orders to maintain metrics, and avoiding breaks.

6.3 Precarity as a Structural Condition

Economic insecurity emerges not as a temporary or accidental outcome of gig work, but as a structural condition deeply embedded in the labour regime of food-delivery platforms. Workers operate without a fixed wage, relying entirely on incentive-based earnings that fluctuate daily according to demand, algorithmic ratings, and platform-determined bonuses. Their work is further burdened by the necessity of self-financed tools, such as fuel, vehicle maintenance, and mobile data, turning essential work requirements into personal liabilities. This financial responsibility is compounded by weak or almost nonexistent social protection, leaving workers without insurance, paid leave, or safety nets in cases of illness, accidents, or reduced demand. The unpredictability of daily income intensifies this vulnerability, forcing workers into long hours simply to meet basic living expenses. Together, these conditions mirror Guy Standing's concept of the "precariat," a class defined by chronic insecurity, unstable earnings, and structural exposure to risk. In this sense, food-delivery workers do not merely experience precarity; they inhabit it as a permanent and defining condition of their labour.

6.4 Dehumanization through Datafication

Algorithmic management reduces workers to data points, speed, acceptance rate, distance, rating. Human attributes like experience or skill are overshadowed by algorithmic metrics.

6.5 Resistance and Coping Mechanisms

Despite operating within highly asymmetrical power relations, food delivery workers engage in subtle yet meaningful forms of resistance and coping strategies to navigate algorithmic control. Many workers selectively cancel high-distance or low-pay orders as a way to manage energy expenditure and maximise earnings, even though such cancellations risk penalties. Informal networks formed at delivery hotspots serve as crucial support systems where workers share information, alert each other about app glitches, and collectively interpret algorithmic

behaviours. Some workers also strategically negotiate with restaurant staff to reduce waiting time, thereby increasing the number of orders they can complete. Another common strategy involves switching between Swiggy and Zomato apps to take advantage of fluctuating incentives, peak-hour bonuses, or better order availability. Yet, despite these adaptive strategies, the fundamental power asymmetry remains profound; platforms ultimately retain control over ratings, order allocation, and earnings, limiting the workers' capacity to meaningfully alter their conditions.

Discussion

The emergence of food delivery platforms in urban India represents a profound restructuring of labour relations, work discipline, and economic survival. Gig work, celebrated as flexible and modern, is in practice a technologically mediated labour regime that embeds workers within a dense web of algorithmic surveillance, performance metrics, and precarious economic conditions. The lived realities of Swiggy and Zomato delivery partners illustrate how digital infrastructures reshape old hierarchies of power while producing new forms of dependency and vulnerability. The workers in this study, predominantly young men from economically modest households, reflect a larger transformation in India's labour market, where formal opportunities shrink and digital platforms fill the vacuum by offering contingent, task-based employment. Their narratives highlight how platform capitalism combines the insecurity of informal labour with the extractive logic of data-driven management, producing a unique class of workers who inhabit what Standing conceptualizes as the *precariat*: a segment defined by chronic instability, limited bargaining power, and eroding labour protections.

Central to understanding this transformation is the role of algorithmic management, a system through which the platform controls, monitors, and evaluates workers not through human supervisors but through data analytics, automated instructions, and performance scores. Workers' smartphones become interfaces of command, constantly buzzing with directions, reminders, notifications, and disciplinary nudges. The algorithm tracks location, speed, acceptance rates, customer ratings, waiting time, and route efficiency. Each metric feeds into a broader system of ranking and incentive distribution. This produces what scholars call a "digital panopticon," a contemporary extension of Foucault's panoptic model, where surveillance becomes continuous, invisible, and internalized. Unlike traditional workplace monitoring, algorithmic oversight does not require physical supervisors; instead, the app itself becomes an omnipresent authority. Workers internalize the gaze of the algorithm, modifying their behaviour in anticipation of penalties, reduced incentives, or order throttling. The pressure to maintain high acceptance rates or avoid cancellations shapes even routine bodily decisions, when to eat, rest, or take a toilet break. Thus, algorithmic management becomes a technology of discipline that blurs the boundary between autonomy and control.

Economic precarity emerges as another defining aspect of gig work. The absence of a fixed wage means that daily income fluctuates drastically based on factors such as weather conditions, customer demand, surge pricing, and algorithmic assignment. Workers bear the direct costs of essential tools, vehicles, fuel, mobile data, and repairs, which significantly reduces actual earnings. As earnings depend heavily on completing as many orders as possible, workers are pushed into long hours of physically exhausting labour, often ranging from 10–14

hours a day. Many report working even when sick or injured because taking a day off means losing income and missing incentive thresholds. Platform incentives, designed to maintain worker dependency, act as behavioural traps. Incentive slabs are structured such that workers must complete a high minimum number of orders to unlock meaningful earnings, pushing them to extend their working hours beyond sustainable limits. This aligns with Standing's argument that the precariat is governed by unstable and unpredictable income, lack of social security, and the need to constantly hustle for survival.

The mental and physical stress embedded in gig work is inseparable from the structure of algorithmic control. Workers describe persistent anxiety about ratings, penalties, and order reassignments. Customer ratings, which can be arbitrary or biased, hold disproportionate power, affecting access to better orders or high-paying zones. Fear of poor ratings compels workers to engage in emotional labour, staying artificially polite even in the face of rude, aggressive, or impatient customers. Physical strain is equally severe. Navigating through congested traffic, extreme weather, and strict delivery timelines leads to exhaustion, joint pain, and frequent minor accidents. The constant need to stare at the map, track order milestones, and communicate simultaneously pushes many workers into cognitive overload. The interplay of digital pressure and bodily fatigue produces a deeply stressful work environment where workers feel both disposable and indispensable: disposable because platforms can easily deactivate them; indispensable because each day's labour is essential for meeting survival needs.

The study's chi-square tests reinforce these lived experiences by revealing statistically significant associations between key variables. The relationship between working hours and income confirms that earnings are tightly tied to labour intensity rather than skill or seniority. This contradicts the platform narrative of meritocracy and highlights a labour process that rewards endurance over mobility. Similarly, the significant association between algorithmic pressure and stress demonstrates that technological control is not neutral but materially affects workers' psychological well-being. These findings show that platform capitalism is not merely a technological shift but a structural reconfiguration of labour discipline and risk allocation—moving risks such as fuel cost, traffic delays, and weather hazards onto workers while platforms retain control over pricing, demand distribution, and customer relationships.

Another crucial dimension is the illusory nature of flexibility, often celebrated as the hallmark of gig work. While platforms advertise autonomy, "be your own boss," "work when you want", workers reveal that flexibility is limited and conditional. High demand hours, such as lunch and dinner peaks, are non-negotiable for adequate earnings. Incentive structures constrain true freedom by rewarding continuous availability and penalizing breaks. Many workers express that taking unplanned time off leads to income loss, missed incentives, and lower subsequent order allocation. Thus, flexibility exists in theory but rarely in practice. The platform's disguised control, embedded in algorithmic rules and incentive design, ensures that workers align their schedules with market needs, not personal preferences. This tension between perceived freedom and actual control is a hallmark of neoliberal labour regimes that promote entrepreneurial selfhood while deepening structural dependency.

Despite the systemic nature of precarity, workers are not passive subjects. They actively negotiate, resist, and reinterpret their conditions through everyday coping mechanisms. Acts such as selectively rejecting high-distance orders, temporarily switching between Swiggy and Zomato apps, or forming informal networks at hotspots represent subtle forms of labour agency. These strategies allow workers to navigate algorithmic unpredictability and extract small degrees of control in an otherwise controlled environment. Informal peer groups serve multiple functions: sharing information about high-demand zones, discussing recent updates in platform policies, offering emotional support, and even pooling money during emergencies. These networks highlight the relational dimension of gig labour, where workers form solidarity not through formal unions but through everyday interactions.

However, these micro-resistances occur within a broader structure of power asymmetry. The platforms retain the unilateral authority to modify incentive structures, revise payment slabs, adjust commission rates, or deactivate workers based on opaque criteria. Workers lack negotiation power, collective bargaining, or access to institutional representation. Even grievances are mediated through automated chatbots or customer support teams with limited authority. This highlights a central contradiction of gig work: while framed as entrepreneurial, it reproduces and intensifies conditions of labour unfreedom by disconnecting workers from formal protections while imposing new regimes of control. The gig economy thus mirrors broader neoliberal dynamics that shift responsibility onto individuals while withdrawing corporate accountability.

The findings also illuminate how gig work intersects with broader social, economic, and technological transformations in urban India. The rise of platform labour coincides with declining manufacturing jobs, stagnant wages in traditional sectors, and increasing youth unemployment. For many young workers, gig work becomes a default livelihood option rather than a choice. The aspirational appeal of smartphone-enabled labour combines with economic desperation to create a new labour pool that platforms exploit. This also aligns with global scholarship on platform capitalism, emphasizing how digital infrastructure capitalizes on economic precarity to create a flexible yet disciplined workforce.

From a sociological standpoint, the platform is not merely a technological intermediary but a labour regime that structures workers' time, behaviour, and aspirations. It shapes new class identities where workers perceive themselves as independent professionals while simultaneously experiencing the insecurity of informal labour. The platform's reward system, badges, and ratings create symbolic hierarchies that mimic status but lack material benefits. Workers internalize competition, often seeing peers as rivals rather than allies, weakening possibilities for collective action. The platform economy thereby creates a fragmented workforce where solidarity is difficult but not impossible.

Conclusion

Gig work in urban India represents a complex interplay of technological innovation, economic precarity, and labour restructuring. Algorithmic management functions as a new mode of surveillance, producing a "digital panopticon" that disciplines workers subtly yet intensively. Economic insecurity is structural, shaped by lack of fixed wages, self-financed tools, volatile

incentives, and weak social protection. Flexibility is symbolic, overshadowed by algorithmic restrictions and market-driven schedules. Stress, both mental and physical, is pervasive, rooted in the intersection of digital control and strenuous labour. Workers resist through informal strategies, but structural power remains skewed in favour of platforms. The study underscores the need for stronger labour rights, transparent algorithms, safety nets, and regulatory frameworks that recognize gig workers as legitimate workers deserving social protection. Ultimately, the gig economy reveals both the possibilities and the perils of digital capitalism, offering insights into the future of work and the evolving nature of labour in a technologically mediated society.

References

1. Aneesh, A. (2001). Skill Saturation: Rationalization and Post-Industrial Work. *Theory and Society*, *30*(3), 363–396. http://www.jstor.org/stable/657966.
2. Apouey, B., Roulet, A., Solal, I., & Stabile, M. (2020). Gig Workers during the COVID-19 Crisis in France: Financial Precarity and Mental Well-Being. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, *97*(6), 776–795. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-020-00480-4.
3. Berg, Janine. (2016). Income security in the on-demand economy: Findings and policy lessons from a survey of crowdworkers. Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal.
4. Duggan, James & Sherman, Ultan & Carbery, Ronan & Mcdonnell, Anthony. (2019). Algorithmic management and app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations and HRM. Human Resource Management Journal. 30. 114-132. 10.1111/1748-8583.12258.
5. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
6. Gandini, A. (2019). Labour process theory and the gig economy. *Human Relations*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718790002.
7. Goods, C., Veen, A., & Barratt, T. (2019). "Is your gig any good?" Analysing job quality in the Australian platform-based food-delivery sector. *Journal of Industrial Relations*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185618817069.
8. ILO. (2021). *World Employment and Social Outlook 2021: The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work*. International Labour Organization.
9. Kellogg, Katherine & Valentine, Melissa & Christin, Angele. (2019). Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. Academy of Management Annals. 14. 10.5465/annals.2018.0174.
10. Kinowska H, Sienkiewicz ŁJ (2023), "Influence of algorithmic management practices on workplace well-being – evidence from European organisations". *Information Technology & People*, Vol. 36 No. 8 pp. 21–42, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-02-2022-0079.
11. Parwez, Sazzad & Ranjan, Rajiv. (2021). The platform economy and the precarisation of food delivery work in the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from India. Work Organisation Labour & Globalisation. 15. 11. 10.13169/workorgalaboglob.15.1.0011.
12. Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.
13. Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

14. Veen, A., Barratt, T., & Goods, C. (2020). Platform-Capital's 'App-etite' for Control: A Labour Process Analysis of Food-Delivery Work in Australia. *Work, Employment and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019836911.
15. 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*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616.