Research Article

# Algorithmic Management as Private Labour Regulation: A Framework for Standards, Monitoring, Sanctions, and Worker Due Process

**Dinesh Kumar[1], Nidhi Suthar[1]**

1. Woxsen University, Hyderabad, India

**This theoretical paper explains how digital control systems act as private labour regulations in employment relationships. It builds on algorithmic management, private regulations and procedural justice scholarship. This paper defines four constitutive functions: standard setting, detection and audit, sanctioning and escalation and contestability. The framework separates regulatory authority from performance analytics and from discretionary supervision. It also identifies negative cases where monitoring intensifies yet regulatory authority does not emerge. A typology maps enforcement intensity against contestability strength and then derives propositions based on conflict, compliance, exit, and voice. Finally, the paper proposes indicators for comparison and policy evaluation across firms and jurisdictions. These include audit couplings, overriding discretion, reversal rates, and the scope of remedies.**

**Corresponding author:** Dinesh Kumar, dineshairwarrior@gmail.com

Algorithmic systems now facilitate task allocation and discipline across many workplaces. In some settings, software decides who receives work and how performance scores form[1][2]. It can also cut access to work or end it. These decisions arrive fast and carry real economic consequences. Yet workers often cannot see the grounds for decisions. They also struggle to correct errors when they arise. This spread changes governance in firms and across fissured work arrangements[3][4].

Scholarship often frames these systems as intensified surveillance and managerial control. It links conflict to opacity, informational asymmetry, and a constricted voice[5][6]. That account captures key

 doi.org/10.32388/12EWOY 

dynamics and it fits many sites. However, it may overlook an additional change that is currently evident in some workplaces. Some systems do more than measure performance. They set rules and detect violations throughout the employment relationship.

This paper develops a framework to identify private labour regulations enacted through algorithmic management. This paper treats a system as regulatory when four functions operate together and shape economic security. They also matter when they condition continued access to work. The functions include standard setting, detection and audit, sanctioning and escalation, and contestability[7][8]. Contestability operates through appeals and remedies embedded in organisational processes. These processes anchor procedural and informational justice judgements[9]. The framework separates regulatory authority from performance analytics and strict supervision. This distinction matters because analytics can inform decisions without making rules. It also clarifies when algorithmic control becomes rulemaking with enforceable consequences. This paper also specifies negative cases where monitoring intensifies yet authority does not emerge. This guardrail avoids relabelling surveillance as regulation[6]. On this foundation, the paper derives propositions about conflict, compliance, exit and voice. These propositions draw from works on responses to dissatisfaction and voice behaviour[10][11][12]. This paper then proposes indicators for comparative research and policy evaluation across jurisdictions. They include audit couplings, override discretion, reversal rates and remedy scopes. These indicators align with private governance theory on monitoring and enforcement[7][8].

These arguments matter for theory and policy debates on workplace governance. They explain when decision support under strict monitoring differs from the system-based rulemaking. They also show why enforcement intensity and contestability strength require joint analysis. Worker reactions depend on sanction strength and the perceived quality of procedures[9][11]. This pairing sharpens predictions about conflict, compliance, exit and voice[10][12]. The paper also offers a typology of regulatory designs and a measurement scaffold. This study responds to calls to clarify how algorithmic control operates and how workers respond[6][13]. The aim is to make systematic comparisons across firms, sectors, and jurisdictions.

## Theory and Propositions

### *Conceptual Foundations*

Algorithmic management delegates core supervision to digital systems. They rely on data and model-based inferences[6]. Labour process research treats control as technical and organisational[14][15]. Rules and tools influence efforts, discipline, and vulnerability in the workplace. Digital platform studies indicate vast informational gaps and ambiguity of implementation. Employees may be shut down, have their salaries changed, or be deprived of employment[16] (Rosenblat and Stark, 2016). Researchers reveal the functionality of these levers in reality[17][18]. Economic data connects the platform design to the labour supply and earnings pattern[19]. Also, additional studies reveal the emergence of such mechanisms in the retail and service industries[20][21]. The implementation of such systems is increasing in a number of industries and nations[22][23][24]. These systems have the capacity to enhance monitoring and discipline which is based on metrics. That intensity raises concerns about privacy and due process[25].

This paper shifts the analytic focus from surveillance to governance. Some algorithmic systems operate as rule-making regimes inside employment relations. Private regulation scholarship shows that non-state actors can build binding standards. It also shows they can construct enforcement architectures[26][27]. Legitimacy debates in private governance scholarship emphasise accountability arrangements and avenues for challenge[28]. Supply chain studies make this dynamic visible in practice[29].

Private regulation provides a useful organisational framework inside firms. Algorithmic governance can separate rule writing, monitoring and enforcement from work. It can also separate decision authority from accountability for consequences. That split mirrors a core claim in private regulation research. Standards and monitoring are often discussed alongside accountability arrangements, including review processes and corrective options[28]. Employment relations research adds a parallel emphasis on due process and voice. This technique moves attention from monitoring volume to contestation structure.

This framing yields two theoretical payoffs. First, this approach enables comparisons among standard jobs and fissured workplaces. Governance functions become the unit of analysis. Second, it focuses on accountability through contestability as a constitutive function. This feature separates transparency and explanation from remedy availability. It also aligns governance design with longstanding concerns in employment relations and justice research about voice, due process, and reactions to authority[28][30][31].

## *Defining Private Labour Regulation in the Employment Relationship*

We define private labour regulation as firm-led governance with four features. First, it sets generalised behavioural or performance standards for a worker class. Second, it monitors compliance at scale through structured detection and audit. Third, it enforces standards through sanctions that shape economic security or work access. Fourth, it supplies defined pathways for contestability through appeal and remedy. This definition is functional and it rests on what the system does. It does not depend on the worker's legal status. Legal status shapes contestability strength and its institutional form. Yet it does not exhaust the governance mechanisms that constrain worker options. The concept does not equate private governance with public regulation. It captures functional governance inside employment relations[30] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This definition also implies a key boundary condition. Monitoring can intensify without private labour regulation taking hold. Performance analytics can supply dashboards that heighten scrutiny and pressure, yet the regime is not regulatory when supervisors retain primary decision authority and audit signals remain advisory or easily overridden[6]. Private labour regulation becomes more likely when rules are codified, detection and audit are continuous, and sanctions are system triggered or system constrained, while a defined pathway for notice, review, and remedy is also present. Contestability strength then differentiates regulatory designs. Weak contestability yields coercive regulation, while robust contestability yields legitimated regulation. Robust contestability does not weaken the regulatory character of the regime. It changes its form by increasing the scope for review and correction, which is often discussed as relevant to legitimacy in governance and justice literatures[28][27][31][32].

## *Four Constitutive Functions*

*Standards as Rule-Making.* The first function is a standard setting. It is defined as the codification of general rules that travel across people or locations. Standards can be explicit, such as acceptance thresholds, response time targets, productivity quotas, conduct categories or safety protocols. They can also be implicit, such as rankings or ratings that shape continued access to work (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Standards are regulatory when they apply broadly and are treated as binding. Standards are linked to consequences. When standards include personalised coaching goals or flexible guidelines then the regulatory claim weakens.

*Detection and Audit as Compliance Monitoring.* The second function is detection and audit. It is defined as the continuous capture of behavioural and output data, the conversion of those data into compliance

signals, and periodic or ongoing review processes that treat algorithmic outputs as authoritative. Detection can draw on location, productivity traces, clickstream data, customer ratings, or sensor-based monitoring[33] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Audit refers to how the system flags deviations, corroborates signals, and escalates cases for action. In practice, an audit may be automated (fully or partly) or human-mediated but system-led. This role matters because audit design shapes error rates and opportunities for strategic contestation.

*Sanctions and Escalation as Enforcement*. The third function is sanctioning and escalation. It is defined as consequences that materially affect pay, hours, access to tasks, scheduling priorities, discipline or dismissal. Sanctions can range from direct consequences, such as loss of task access or pay reductions, to indirect consequences, such as reduced visibility or less favourable assignments (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Enforcement is considered regulatory when the system automatically applies sanctions or limits what managers can change, meaning they have little choice but to follow the system's recommendations.

*Contestability and Remedy as Due Process*. The fourth function is contestability. It is defined as the availability and effectiveness of pathways through which workers can (a) receive notice and intelligible reasons for decisions, (b) access relevant evidence or a credible explanation of how a decision was reached, (c) present counter-evidence, and (d) obtain correction, compensation, or reinstatement when decisions are wrong. Procedural justice research links perceived procedural fairness with evaluations of legitimacy and workplace conflict[34][31][32]. It is also central to employment relations where due process protections are institutionalised[35][36][30][37][38][39][13].

Contestability varies widely across algorithmic systems. Some provide only automated messages with limited explanation and little human review. Others embed structured appeals, human adjudication, documentation requirements, and time-bound resolution. Contestability is therefore an empirical variable, not a normative aspiration. Its position in the framework is analytical. Without it, it is difficult to distinguish regulatory authority from raw control. In regulatory systems, the capacity to challenge and correct is part of what constitutes rule-governed legitimacy, even if those pathways are weak in practice[28][31].

## *Boundary Conditions and Negative Cases*

The four functions work together to define private labour regulations. This joint definition implies two negative case classes that protect discriminant validity. First, consider high monitoring with low enforcement. Firms may deploy intense measurement and surveillance. Yet systems may lack binding

thresholds or system-triggered sanctions. In these settings, outputs guide coaching or discretionary decisions. Outcomes then hinge on local managerial judgement. Such cases resemble the enhanced performance management[6]. Second, think about high enforcement as well as plausible contestability. There are also working environments that combine severe penalties and strong appeals and monitoring. Representation and formal review are still available. Notices and explanations may be necessary in the grievance systems and collective bargaining, progressive discipline may be mandatory, and independent review may be established. A regulatory label is still applicable in such settings but the meaning is changed. Employment relations scholarship commonly treats due process and formal review arrangements as relevant to legitimacy and conflict in discipline systems[30][32]. The development of the institutional context also influences the way that the private labour regulations are formed. Fissured arrangements can increase reliance on standard systems across boundaries. Fissured arrangements are often discussed as reshaping accountability and voice channels across organisational boundaries[40]. Jurisdictional protections and representation regimes shape contestability strength. The same technical system can operate as harsher regulation when safeguards are thin. It can operate as more contestable governance when safeguards are strong[30].

### *Discriminant Tests and Non-Cases*

The private labour regulation label is warranted only when three tests are met. First, binding authority: standards are linked to consequences that materially affect pay, hours, task access, schedule priorities, discipline or dismissal. If consequences are optional or dependent mainly on local managerial judgements then the system is not functioning as a private labour regulation. Second, enforcement coupling: audit signals are considered important signals for making decisions and are linked to penalties through standard rules, steps for escalation or expectations for supervisor performance. If audit signals are mainly advisory inputs then the enforcement claim is weak. Third, defined contestability: workers have an identifiable pathway for notice, review, and remedy, even if it is thin in practice. Contestability strength varies and differentiates coercive from legitimated designs. A complete absence of notice, review, or remedy points to arbitrary discipline or informal coercion, not a rule based regulatory regime. These tests distinguish private labour regulation from intensified performance management and discretionary supervision under high monitoring[28][30][6][31].

## *A Typology of Regulatory Designs*

The four functions can combine into distinct governance designs. Two dimensions are especially consequential for work and employment outcomes. The first is enforcement intensity which reflects the coupling of standards, detection and sanctions. The second is contestability strength which reflects the availability and effectiveness of notice, review and remedy. The combination of them yields four ideal types. Table 1 summarises the four ideal types created by crossing enforcement intensity with contestability strength and lists their expected workplace patterns. In this typology, the high enforcement row captures private labour regulation designs that differ mainly in contestability strength. The low enforcement row contains boundary cases used to test discriminant validity and should not be coded as private labour regulation.

| ***Intensity*** | ***Weak contestability*** | ***Strong contestability*** |
|---|---|---|
| High enforcement intensity | Coercive regulation involves binding thresholds, continuous detection, automated sanctions or those that are strongly system-constrained, and a limited review process with narrow remedies. Expected patterns include defensive compliance, greater conflict over error correction, and higher exit. | Legitimated regulation: binding thresholds and strong enforcement with credible review and remedy, including timely reversals and meaningful correction. Expected patterns include higher perceived legitimacy, less conflict than in coercive designs, and a more institutionalised voice. |
| Low enforcement intensity | Opaque control: a boundary case with high monitoring but discretionary enforcement, where audit signals create daily pressure yet sanction triggers are inconsistent, override discretion is high, and formal review and remedy are limited. Expected patterns include uncertainty, risk avoidance, and reliance on informal workarounds. | Symbolic regulation: rules and review processes exist but have limited bite because sanctions are weakly coupled or easily overridden. Expected patterns include limited behavioural change and greater managerial discretion in outcomes. |

**Table 1.** Typology of regulatory designs crossing enforcement intensity and contestability strength

*Note. These are the ideal types used for comparison. Under the paper's definition, private labour regulation is present in the two high enforcement cells because all four functions are jointly present including a defined*

*pathway for contestability through notice, review and remedy. Contestability is weak in coercive regulation and strong in legitimated regulation. Opaque control and symbolic regulation are boundary cases included to support discriminant validity. Real cases can mix features or move between cells over time as thresholds and appeal pathways change.*

*Coercive Regulation.* High enforcement intensity and weak contestability.

*Legitimated Regulation.* High enforcement intensity and strong contestability.

*Symbolic Regulation.* Low enforcement intensity and strong contestability where rules exist but have limited bite.

*Opaque Control.* A boundary case with high monitoring and discretionary enforcement. Audit signals create daily pressure, but sanction triggers are inconsistent, override discretion is high and formal review and remedy are limited.

These types are not exhaustive but support comparative theorising and measurement. They also create a basis for propositions that separate the regulation lens from generic control accounts.

Working examples illustrate how typologies can be operationalised without asserting representativeness. Ride-hail research is often used to illustrate how platform rules, monitoring, and access decisions can interact in ways that workers experience as difficult to contest[17] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Legitimised regulation occurs when the discipline results of algorithmic monitoring are accompanied by institutional review, i.e. documentation, representation, time-limited adjudication and substantial remedies. These features are intended to boost the coverage of remedies and enhance the reversal rates[36][30][23].

Opaque control is illustrated by monitoring dashboards and scores that shape daily pressure while enforcement remains managerially discretionary. Audit signals inform supervisors but sanction triggers are inconsistent and override discretion is high. Formal review and remedy are limited. Symbolic regulation is illustrated by the presence of official rules and appeal channels that have limited bite because sanctions are weakly coupled to monitoring outputs or are routinely overridden. As a result, outcomes change little even though procedures appear formal. We intend these examples to guide measurement using the indicators in Table 2[6].

| *Constitutive function* | *What counts as present* | *Observable indicators* | *Typical data sources* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Standard setting | Generalised rules apply across workers, locations, or clients and are treated as binding | Explicit thresholds (acceptance, response time, productivity); rating or ranking thresholds that determine access; codified conduct categories; rule updates that apply to a worker class | Workers facing rule communications; policy manuals; in-app messages; training materials; code of conduct; system documentation; collective agreements where applicable |
| Detection and audit | Continuous or routine capture of behaviour or outputs is converted into compliance signals treated as authoritative | Data capture scope (location, clickstream, sensors, ratings); anomaly flags; audit trails; escalation logs; frequency of reviews; quality checks and corroboration procedures | System logs; audit trails; platform support records; HRIS records; supervisor dashboards; worker help tickets; compliance reviews |
| Sanctions and escalation | Consequences materially affect pay, hours, task access, scheduling priority, discipline, or dismissal and are system triggered or system constrained | Automated or quasi-automatic penalties; suspension or deactivation triggers; reduced visibility or task allocation; pay adjustments tied to metrics; override discretion frequency; progressive discipline pathways and thresholds | Deactivation or termination protocols; discipline records; pay and scheduling records; task allocation histories; override records; sanction decision documentation |
| Contestability and remedy | Workers can receive notice and reasons, access relevant evidence, present counter-evidence, and obtain timely correction or remedy | Notice quality; reasons provided; access to evidence; human review availability; time to resolution; reversal rates; remedy scope (reinstatement, compensation); representation access; third-party oversight | Appeals and grievance records; arbitration outcomes; worker support transcripts; case management systems; collective bargaining documentation; ombuds or compliance reports |

**Table 2.** Constitutive functions of private labour regulation: observable indicators and typical data sources

*Note. Indicators are illustrative and should be adapted to the sector and institutional context. Enforcement intensity is reflected in how tightly standards, detection and sanctions are coupled. Contestability strength is reflected in the accessibility and effectiveness of review and remedy including timelines and reversal rates.*

According to the paper's definition, private labour regulation is present only when all four functions are jointly present including a defined pathway for contestability. Coercive regulation and legitimated regulation meet this threshold and differ in contestability strength. Opaque control and symbolic regulation are special cases included to help clarify differences and to avoid mislabelling strong monitoring as regulation.

## *Propositions*

*Proposition 1: Threshold Proposition.* Algorithmic management constitutes private labour regulation when standard setting, detection and audit, sanctioning and escalation, and contestability through appeal and remedy are jointly present and materially bind workers' economic security or continued access to work. When one or more functions are absent, weakly enacted, or readily overridden, workers are more likely to experience the system as intensified performance management or decision support, even if monitoring is extensive[28][27][6].

*Proposition 2: Contestability as a Legitimacy Moderator.* Holding enforcement intensity constant, weaker contestability is expected to be associated with a lower perceived legitimacy of algorithmic authority and higher levels of worker conflict, avoidance behaviour and exit. Stronger contestability is expected to be associated with higher legitimacy and more stable compliance[31][32].

*Proposition 3: Error Sensitivity under Coercive Regulation.* In coercive regulation frameworks characterised by stringent sanctions and diminished contestability, both perceived and actual error rates in detection and auditing are anticipated to exert a greater influence on turnover intentions, stress levels and workplace conflict than in frameworks with robust contestability[31] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

*Proposition 4: Substitution Between Exit and Voice.* Stronger contestability is expected to be associated with greater use of voice channels, while weaker contestability is expected to be associated with greater reliance on exit responses, particularly when sanctions are consequential[30][41][32].

*Proposition 5: Fissured Governance Intensifies Private Labour Regulation.* Coercive regulation designs are expected to be more prevalent in fissured employment settings where labour is mediated through

platform intermediation and where lead firms seek scalable discipline while distancing themselves from employment responsibilities. This prevalence is expected to be strongest where legal protections for due process and collective representation are weak[40].

*Proposition 6: Institutional Embedding of Contestability.* Combined strong enforcement and credible contestability regulations are likely to be perceived to be more legitimate and result in less conflict than coercive designs when monitoring intensity is similar and sanctions are similar. The effect of contestability on legitimacy is expected to be stronger in settings where sanction reversals and remedies are visible and timely[30][31][32].

*Proposition 7: Differential Effects on Inequality.* Coercive regulation designs are anticipated to exacerbate inequality among worker groups by amplifying income volatility, increasing exclusion risks, and creating disparities in access to reversal and remedy. The inequality mechanism is a differential capacity to meet standards, detect and correct errors, and mobilise representation or third-party review which should be reflected in reversal rates and remedy scope[14][15][40] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Unequal access can be observed as group differences in the probability of reversal and in remedy scope, conditional on comparable performance signals.

## *Disconfirmation Cues*

Proposition 1 would be challenged if settings in which all four functions are jointly present cannot be distinguished from high-monitoring support settings on the indicators in Table 2. Proposition 2 would be challenged if contestability strength is unrelated to perceived legitimacy or conflict when enforcement intensity is held constant. Proposition 3 would be challenged if detection and audit error rates show weaker associations with stress or exit under weaker contestability than under strong contestability. Proposition 4 would be challenged if improvements in contestability do not coincide with greater use of voice channels and lower exit, conditional on enforcement intensity. Proposition 5 would be questioned if broken-up arrangements lead to fewer forceful designs when considering the structure of the sector and tasks. Proposition 6 would be challenged if strong contestability does not reduce conflict or increase perceived legitimacy in high enforcement settings. Proposition 7 would be challenged if coercive designs are associated with lower income volatility, less exclusion risk, and more equal access to reversal and remedy. These propositions are intended as testable expectations about governance design. They do not assume that algorithmic enforcement improves performance outcomes.

### *Summary*

Together, the framework and propositions reposition algorithmic management as a variable regulatory regime within employment relations. The next sections will turn these ideas into measurable signs and describe research plans that can test the propositions in different companies, industries, and settings.

## Analytical Approach

This paper is conceptual. It develops a framework by integrating three types of literature that are usually treated in parallel: research on algorithmic management and digital control in organisations, scholarship on private regulation and governance, and work on procedural justice and due process in employment relations[28][27][6][31]. The goal is to produce a discriminating set of constructs, boundary conditions and propositions that support cumulative empirical work in the world of work.

### *Scope of Synthesis*

The synthesis prioritises settings in which algorithms allocate work, evaluate performance, and trigger material consequences for pay, hours, task access or continued employment including platform-mediated labour and fissured workplaces[40] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). It also includes organisational contexts in which algorithmic tools are embedded in standard employment relationships, because regulatory functions can operate even when legal protections and representation vary[30][6]. Across these settings, the synthesis treats governance design as the object of explanation.

### *Construct Development and Boundary Conditions*

The framework is built through a stepwise conceptual development process consistent with integrative review and theory-building guidance[42][43]. First, it identified common governance elements found in earlier research on algorithmic management such as setting standards, monitoring, ranking and applying penalties. Second, it mapped these elements to core functions in private regulation and governance scholarship: rule making, monitoring, enforcement and accountability arrangements[28][27]. Third, it specified boundary conditions that separate private labour regulations from adjacent constructions especially intensive performance management and decision support under discretionary supervision.

A key design choice is discriminant validity. The framework therefore specifies negative cases where monitoring is intense yet regulatory authority does not arise. This situation arises when the system does not constrain sanctions, leave them open to managerial discretion. Contestability is also evident whereby it is backed up by institutions of established employment-relations[30][6]. These negative cases help avoid treating monitoring intensity alone as evidence of regulation[6].

### *Typology Development*

The typology rests on two dimensions that are analytically separable and empirically observable. Enforcement intensity captures how tightly standards link to detection, audit, and sanctioning and escalation. Strength of contestability indicates the effectiveness and availability of notices, explanations, review procedures, representations and remedies. Combining these dimensions yields ideal forms of comparative analysis across firms. The typology serves as a measurement scaffold. It does not assume any case will match an ideal type perfectly.

### *Proposition Development*

The paper derives propositions by linking design features to mechanisms in procedural justice and employment relations. The procedural-justice studies indicate that individuals embrace rules when they believe that procedures are just. Fairness entails having a voice and rectifying errors. These factors are the most important at the time when the authorities are able to enforce costs. Employment relations research embeds fairness in complaint handling and representation systems. Arbitration and legal rules also shape how authority operates in practice. These institutions set limits on discipline and they structure credible reviews. Private regulation scholarship adds a parallel logic about rule-based regimes. Such regimes depend on accountability arrangements that sustain legitimacy. The crises of legitimacy occur when enforcing exceeds the possibility of challenging and receiving redress[28][27][44]. Together, these mechanisms yield testable predictions about workplace reactions. They influence conflict and turnover. They also determine how voice itself assumes form in case of more or less contestable algorithmic authority.

### *Operational Blueprint for Empirical Adjudication*

To offer empirical testing, this paper aligns the framework to an operational blueprint. The blueprint specifies observable indicators for each regulatory function and typical data sources. Standards are

observable in written policies and worker-facing rule communications. They also appear in codes of conduct and in the logic of thresholds and rankings. Detection and audit are observable in data capture practices and anomaly flags. They also appear on audit trails, escalation logs and case histories. Sanctions are observable in policy-linked consequences and decision protocols. They include deactivation or termination rules, shift allocation rules; and pay adjustments. They also include patterns of progressive discipline and escalation. Contestability is observable in notice practices and the depth of explanations. It is also visible in access to evidence and review timelines. Reversal rates provide a direct indicator. The availability of human adjudication also serves as an important indicator. Representation and third-party oversight also signal stronger contestability. These indicators support within-firm research designs and comparative studies. They travel across institutional contexts with different procedural protections. They also travel across regimes of collective representation[30][40]. Table 2 summarises the indicators and typical data sources for each function.

The framework supports test designs that are feasible in ILR settings. The first design links organisational records with contest outcomes. It combines thresholds, audit flags and sanctions with overrides and escalation logs. It then links these records to grievance or appeal outcomes. Key outcomes include reversal rates, remedy types and time to resolution. A second design uses worker surveys tied to identified system features. The measures can capture the quality of notice, access to evidence and the time it takes to make a decision. These features can then predict perceived legitimacy, conflict and exit intentions. A third design exploits variation across firms, regions or worksites. Cases differ in representation and in procedural safeguards. Using Table 2 indicators, researchers can classify governance designs and compare outcomes. This approach fits fissured arrangements and cross-jurisdiction contrasts[30][40].

## Theoretical Insights

The framework yields three core insights about how algorithmic management reshapes authority in the employment relationship. This paper uses these insights to compare various industries, companies and legal domains and to elucidate the research questions that arise from examining regulation.

### *Regulatory Authority is a Design Bundle*

The first insight treats private labour regulation as a bundle of governance functions. Different firms can integrate these functions. Performance analytics can be based on the same technology when used in one

location and something else in another. It can also become a regulatory authority in another workplace. The difference lies in how rules are codified. It also lies in how monitoring signals are interpreted and how consequences trigger[6]. This makes simple judgements of “good” or “bad” analytically premature. The better question asks which functions exist and how tightly they couple. It also asks which actors can contest rules and outcomes. This bundling lens also qualifies claims built on monitoring intensity alone. High measurement can coexist with stable employment relations. That can happen when supervisors retain discretion and contestation channels remain credible. Conversely, moderate measurement can still produce strong regulatory effects. Such an outcome occurs when thresholds bind and sanctions resist challenge. The empirical object is regulatory design.

### *Discriminant Predictions that Separate Regulation from Control*

A second insight is that using a regulatory lens provides discriminant predictions that are not implied by control intensity accounts. Three predictions matter most for cumulative research. First, contestability indicators such as time to resolution, reversals, and remedy scope are relevant for studying legitimacy and retention in contested governance systems. Procedural justice research motivates attention to how workers evaluate the fairness and credibility of review processes, including under consequential enforcement[32].

Second, the coupling between audit signals and sanctions should predict adaptation form. In tightly coupled regimes, small deviations can trigger large consequences. Workers should then prioritise rules gaming. In loosely coupled regimes, supervisors can interpret signals and adjust outcomes. The workers should then prioritise negotiation and relational influence. This concept separates system-constrained enforcement from discretionary enforcement which anchors the regulation claim[6].

Third, institutional embedding should explain why similar systems operate differently across contexts. Where procedural protections and representation are stronger then enforcement should be more contestable. Limiting sanctions should be based on notices, documentation, reviews and proportionality requirements. When these institutions are weak, contestability should decrease, and coercive designs are likely to proliferate[30]. This prediction supports a governance explanation. It aligns with private regulation research that treats accountability as a condition for legitimacy[28][27].

### *From Typology to Measurement*

A third insight is that the typology offers a pragmatic measurement scaffold. It treats private labour regulations as observable configurations. That choice helps researchers move from concept to variables. The level of enforcement can be gauged by codified levels and unremitting detection. It can also be measured by the degree to which outputs of the system will result in sanctions. Contestability strength is measurable through notice quality and explanation depth. It also includes evidence access, human review and representation. Time to decision, reversal rates and remedy scope further capture effectiveness. Together, these indicators translate claims into measures for mixed-methods designs[30][31]. Negative cases are central for measurement and discriminant validity. High monitoring with discretionary enforcement should load control measures. It should not depend on private labour regulation measures. High enforcement with strong contestability should load regulation measures. However, it should lead to different outcomes compared to coercive regulation. The exit should be lower and the voice should be more institutionalised[32]. Sampling both negative cases strengthens discriminant validity. The scaffold also opens a further line of inquiry. It can test how collective voice and third-party oversight reshape design choices. These mechanisms can impose documentation rules and mandate human review. They can also constrain which audit signals firms may rely on. These questions connect workplace technology to labour regulation[22][45][6][40].

## Discussion

This paper argues that algorithmic management can serve as private labour regulation. That claim holds when four functions operate together. The four functions are: standard setting, detection and audit, sanctioning, escalation, and contestability. Contestability operates through appeals and remedies within an organisational process. The discussion clarifies what this reframing adds and where it reaches its limits. It also explains why the framework matters for research and policy on work governance[28][6].

### *What the Private Labour Regulation Lens Adds*

A core contribution of the framework is conceptual precision. Scholars often use algorithmic management as a broad label for digital oversight. The label also covers data-driven scheduling and automated evaluation. This breadth yields rich description, yet it hinders comparison across settings. Settings vary in terms of enforcement and channels for redress. The lens of the private labour regulation

helps to deal with this issue through mandatory functions and limits. It disaggregates governance and supervisor support which are governed by rules and performance analytics which is data-driven.

It also separates them from regimes that impose material consequences for noncompliance. This distinction matters because it changes the causal mechanism. Under a regulation lens, conflict does not follow surveillance alone. It follows the interaction between enforcement and contestability. Workers may accept strict standards when they can understand decisions. They must also have authentic avenues where employees can question errors and request amendments. Even when moderate standards shake workplaces, sanctions remain arbitrary and difficult to challenge. This logic aligns with due process accounts of legitimacy and compliance[30][31][32].

The framework also offers a comparative governance language. It connects workplace algorithms to debates in private regulation research. That scholarship stresses accountability as a condition for rule-based legitimacy. The recurrence of a legitimacy crisis occurs when the enforcement is higher than the challenge and redress[28][27]. This research expounds on the reasons why algorithmic systems generate mobilisation within the labour relations. The problem is not only visibility and monitoring. Workers face rules that remain difficult to see and costly to contest. Those rules can also determine livelihoods. A reasonable counterargument sees these dynamics as managerial control with new tools. The private labour regulation lens does not deny control. It isolates a governance configuration with systematised rule-making and enforcement. In this configuration, accountability hinges on contestability. Control accounts predict more monitoring and less discretion will raise conflict. The regulation lens predicts variation under similar monitoring intensity. Conflict and compliance depend on sanction coupling and remedy effectiveness. Researchers can observe these variables through audit linkages, override discretion, reversal rates and remedy scopes[28][6].

### *How the Framework Reshapes Key Debates*

The first debate concerns transparency. Many proposals treat transparency as the main remedy for algorithmic harms. The framework treats transparency as necessary yet insufficient. Knowing a rule exists differs from contesting its application. It also differs from challenging the data used in a decision. It differs again from securing a remedy when a system is wrong. Empirically, researchers should separate informational transparency from procedural contestability. They should then test which element shifts legitimacy and conflict.

To keep concepts distinct, transparency means access to the rule set and updates. Explanation means intelligible reasons for a specific decision. It includes which inputs mattered and how they mattered. Remedy means the capacity to secure correction or compensation through a review. A system can be transparent without being contestable. A system can also offer explanations without a meaningful remedy. Measures can capture transparency through documented rules and change logs.

They can capture explanations through reason codes and access to evidence. They can capture remedies by measuring the time to resolution, reversal rates, and the scope of remedies[31][32]. A second debate concerns automation versus discretion. Some critics argue automation removes discretion and increases domination. Some organisational reports stress the fact that discretion can embed bias and arbitrariness. The private labour regulation lens reframes the dispute. The key issue is not whether humans or machines decide. The key issue is whether governance includes notice and proportionality. It also requires credible correction when errors occur. Contestability strength and institutional embedding become the decisive variables[30][31].

A third debate concerns platform work versus standard employment. The framework predicts similarities when regulatory functions operate in both settings. It also predicts differences where contestability diverges. Platform-driven work is more likely to be sanctioned with minimum review. The law has the power to restrict access to statutory protection. Grievance procedures and arbitration often entrench the competitiveness of employment in traditional settings. These contrasts are legal distinctions and governance differences that shape conflict and inequality outcomes[30] (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

### *Institutional Context and the Politics of Design*

A major implication is that regulatory design is not only a managerial choice. Institutions constrain it and they also shape its feasible forms. Fissured employment encourages standardised control systems across organisational boundaries. The private labour regulation solves this issue by establishing functions and boundaries for adherence. The private labour regulation separates the rule-based governance and supervisor support from the data-driven performance analytics. They condition whether the review and remedy remain robust or thin[46][47].

Therefore, algorithmic management becomes a place where institutional power materialises through design. The design choices include documentation rules, audit trails, human review mandates, and appeal rights.

Policy and design levers follow directly from the four functions. When thresholds and change logs are published, it is possible to contest the standards. Audit trails and worker data access may be used as a detection and audit tool. Punishments are implemented according to the regulations reported on proportionality and escalation. Arbitrary enforcement is restricted by recording override decisions. Time-limited human review and access to representation also enhance competitiveness. Penalties should involve compensation or reinstatement in case of proven errors. The assessment of these levers does not presuppose that the improvement of performance through algorithmic enforcement occurs[28][30].

The framework also suggests firms can allocate accountability strategically. They may claim that the system made decisions while restricting access to evidence. This direction produces a unique type of accountability that passes in the area of organisation governance. The concept of private regulation suggests that the person bearing the burden and the rule-setter should be different[28][27]. Empirical work should therefore trace who sets thresholds and who can revise them. It should also identify who can override sanctions and on what grounds. Finally, it should specify who bears accountability when errors generate harm.

## Limitations and Boundary Conditions

The framework has limits that should be acknowledged to avoid overreach. First, the framework is functional which may lead to the collapse of distinct normative and legal categories. Algorithms offer an alternative form of governance of workers as opposed to public regulation in terms of sources of legitimacy, power to enforce, and democratic accountability. The idea explains the roles of internal governance; they are not comparable to firms and states. The framework works best when algorithmic systems drive the allocation of work and enforce discipline. In a professional setting where employees enjoy high autonomy and algorithms serve as recommendations, the framework may not be as helpful. Third, contestability is multi-dimensional. Some workers may have access to appeal but lack informational resources or time to use it. Future research should therefore treat contestability as both formal design and lived accessibility.

## Implications for Future Research

The paper refers to a research agenda organised around three questions. First, when do firms choose coercive regulatory designs, and what organisational and market conditions predict that choice? Second, what institutional arrangements increase contestability strength in practice, including representation,

legal mandates, and third-party audits? Third, how do different regulatory designs shape inequality especially through income volatility and differential capacity to contest sanctions? These questions invite interdisciplinary work across industrial relations, management, sociology and law.

## Contributions

This paper makes three contributions to research on work and employment relations. First, it offers a discriminating concept that clarifies when algorithmic management becomes a governance regime inside the employment relationship. The paper specifies necessary functions and clears boundary conditions by defining private labour regulation as the joint presence of standard setting, detection and audit, sanctioning and escalation, and contestability through appeal and remedy. This separates private labour regulation from adjacent constructs such as intensified performance management and supervisor decision support and strengthens cumulative comparison across sectors and jurisdictions[28][45][6].

Second, it theorises that contestability is a core design feature of private labour regulation. The framework argues that the legitimacy and conflict implications of algorithmic enforcement depend on whether workers can obtain meaningful review and remedy. This yields testable predictions that differentiate regulatory designs with similar monitoring and sanction intensity[30][31][32].

Third, the paper offers a measurement scaffold for empirical research and policy evaluation by separating enforcement intensity from contestability strength. It specifies observable indicators that support organisational record studies, qualitative comparison, surveys, and cross-jurisdictional research. In policy terms, the framework identifies design levers for accountability that go beyond transparency alone.

## About Authors

**Dr. Dinesh Kumar** is the David De Cremer Professor of the Future of Work at Woxsen University, India, where he leads the Strategic Enforcement and Technology Intelligence Lab. He holds a PhD from IIT Roorkee and has prior experience as a CEO and military officer. His research focuses on the future of work and technology-enabled organisational systems.

**Dr. Nidhi Suthar** is an academic and entrepreneur with a PhD in industrial psychology. She also holds master's degrees in education, sociology and resource management. Her work involves workforce development and applied behavioural research.

## References


1. ^Bernhardt A, Kresge L, Suleiman R (2023). "The Data-Driven Workplace and the Case for Worker Technology Rights." ILR Rev. **76**(1):3–29. doi:10.1177/00197939221131558.
2. ^Tarafdar M, Page X, Marabelli M (2023). "Algorithms as Co-Workers: Human-Algorithm Role Interactions in Algorithmic Work." Inf Syst J. **33**(2):232–267. doi:10.1111/isj.12389.
3. ^Lindebaum D, Vesa M, Den Hond F (2020). "Insights from "The Machine Stops" to Better Understand Rational Assumptions in Algorithmic Decision Making and Its Implications for Organizations." Acad Manag Rev. **45**(1):247–263. doi:10.5465/amr.2018.0181.
4. ^Möhlmann M, Salge CAL, Marabelli M (2023). "Algorithm Sensemaking: How Platform Workers Make Sense of Algorithmic Management." J Assoc Inf Syst. **24**(1):35–64. doi:10.17705/1jais.00774.
5. ^Buhmann A, Paßmann J, Fieseler C (2020). "Managing Algorithmic Accountability: Balancing Reputational Concerns, Engagement Strategies, and the Potential of Rational Discourse." J Bus Ethics. **163**(2):265–280. doi:10.1007/s10551-019-04226-4.
6. a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, sKellogg KC, Valentine MA, Christin A (2020). "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control." Acad Manag Ann. **14**(1):366–410. doi:10.5465/annals.2018.0174.
7. a, bCampbell JL (2007). "Why Would Corporations Behave in Socially Responsible Ways? An Institutional Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility." Acad Manag Rev. **32**(3):946–967. doi:10.5465/amr.2007.25275684.
8. a, bWijen F (2014). "Means Versus Ends in Opaque Institutional Fields: Trading Off Compliance and Achievement in Sustainability Standard Adoption." Acad Manag Rev. **39**(3):302–323. doi:10.5465/amr.2012.0218.
9. a, bColquitt JA (2001). "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure." J Appl Psychol. **86**(3):386–400. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386.
10. a, bFarrell D (1983). "Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect as Responses to Job Dissatisfaction: A Multidimensional Scaling Study." Acad Manag J. **26**(4):596–607. doi:10.2307/255909.
11. a, bMorrison EW (2011). "Employee Voice Behavior: Integration and Directions for Future Research." Acad Manag Ann. **5**(1):373–412. doi:10.5465/19416520.2011.574506.
12. a, bRusbult CE, Farrell D, Rogers G, Mainous AG III (1988). "Impact of Exchange Variables on Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect: An Integrative Model of Responses to Declining Job Satisfaction." Acad Manag J. **31**(3):599–627. doi:10.2307/256461.
13. a, bYang D (2020). "Why Don't They Complain? The Social Determinants of Chinese Migrant Workers' Grievance Behaviors." ILR Rev. **73**(2):366–392. doi:10.1177/0019793919872471.

14. ^a, ^b*Braverman H (1974). Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.*

15. ^a, ^b*Edwards R (1979). Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century. New York, NY: Basic Books.*

16. ^*Calo R, Rosenblat A (2017). "The Taking Economy: Uber, Information, and Power." Columbia Law Rev.* ***117*** *(6):1623–1690. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2929643.*

17. ^a, ^b*Maffie MD (2022). "The Perils of Laundering Control Through Customers: A Study of Control and Resistance in the Ride-Hail Industry." ILR Rev.* ***75****(2):348–372. doi:10.1177/0019793920972679.*

18. ^*Vallas SP, Schor JB (2020). "What Do Platforms Do? Understanding the Gig Economy." Annu Rev Sociol.* ***46*** *(1):273–294. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857.*

19. ^*Hall JV, Krueger AB (2018). "An Analysis of the Labor Market for Uber's Driver-Partners in the United States." ILR Rev.* ***71****(3):705–732. doi:10.1177/0019793917717222.*

20. ^*Mateescu A, Nguyen A (2019). "Explainer: Algorithmic Management in the Workplace." Data & Society Research Institute.*

21. ^*Wood AJ, Graham M, Lehdonvirta V, Hjorth I (2019). "Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy." Work Employ Soc.* ***33****(1):56–75. doi:10.1177/0950017018785616.*

22. ^a, ^b*Bailey DE (2022). "Emerging Technologies at Work: Policy Ideas to Address Negative Consequences for Work, Workers, and Society." ILR Rev.* ***75****(3):527–551. doi:10.1177/00197939221076747.*

23. ^a, ^b*Krzywdzinski M, Evers M, Gerber C (2024). "Control and Flexibility: The Use of Wearable Devices in Capital- and Labor-Intensive Work Processes." ILR Rev.* ***77****(4):506–534. doi:10.1177/00197939241258206.*

24. ^*Milanez A, Lemmens A, Ruggiu C (2025). "Algorithmic Management in the Workplace: New Evidence from an OECD Employer Survey" (OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers No. 31). OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/287c13c4-en.*

25. ^*Moore PV, Robinson A (2016). "The Quantified Self: What Counts in the Neoliberal Workplace." New Media Soc.* ***18****(11):2774–2792. doi:10.1177/1461444815604328.*

26. ^*Cashore B (2002). "Legitimacy and the Privatization of Environmental Governance: How Non-State Market-Driven (NSMD) Governance Systems Gain Rule-Making Authority." Governance.* ***15****(4):503–529. doi:10.1111/1468-0491.00199.*

27. ^a, ^b, ^c, ^d, ^e, ^f, ^g, ^h, ^i*Bartley T (2007). "Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions." Am J Sociol.* ***113****(2):297–351. doi:10.1086/518871.*

28. a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q *Abbott KW, Snidal D (2009). "The Governance Triangle: Regulatory Standards Institutions and the Shadow of the State." In Walter Mattli and Ngaire Woods (Eds.), The Politics of Global Regulation, pp. 44–88. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt7rgmj.6.*

29. ^ *Locke R, Amengual M, Mangla A (2009). "Virtue Out of Necessity? Compliance, Commitment, and the Improvement of Labor Conditions in Global Supply Chains." Politics Soc. **37**(3):319–351. doi:10.1177/0032329209338922.*

30. a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t *Budd JW (2004). Employment with a Human Face: Balancing Efficiency, Equity, and Voice. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.*

31. a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n *Lind EA, Tyler TR (1988). The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice. New York, NY: Plenum Press.*

32. a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k *Tyler TR (1990). Why People Obey the Law. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.*

33. ^ *Christin A (2017). "Algorithms in Practice: Comparing Web Journalism and Criminal Justice." Big Data Soc. **4**(2):1–14. doi:10.1177/2053951717718855.*

34. ^ *Fischman-Afori O (2025). "Due Process by Design: Enhancing Fairness and Trust in AI Decision-Making." Soc Sci Humanit Open. **12**:102178. doi:10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102178.*

35. ^ *Avgar AC (2021). "Relational Exchange in Non-Union Firms: A Configurational Framework for Workplace Dispute Resolution and Voice." ILR Rev. **74**(3):607–636. doi:10.1177/0019793921989615.*

36. a, b *Behrens M, Colvin AJS, Dorigatti L, Pekarek AH (2020). "Systems for Conflict Resolution in Comparative Perspective." ILR Rev. **73**(2):312–344. doi:10.1177/0019793919870800.*

37. ^ *Budd JW, Colvin AJS (2008). "Improved Metrics for Workplace Dispute Resolution Procedures: Efficiency, Equity, and Voice." Ind Relat. **47**(3):460–479. doi:10.1111/j.1468-232x.2008.00529.x.*

38. ^ *Kochan TA, Yang D, Kimball WT, Kelly EL (2019). "Worker Voice in America: Is There a Gap between What Workers Expect and What They Experience?" ILR Rev. **72**(1):3–38. doi:10.1177/0019793918806250.*

39. ^ *Lewin D, Peterson RB (1988). The Modern Grievance Procedure in the United States. New York, NY: Quorum Books.*

40. a, b, c, d, e, f, g *Weil D (2014). The Fissured Workplace: Why Work Became So Bad for So Many and What Can Be Done to Improve It. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*

41. ^ *Hirschman AO (1970). Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*

42. ^ *MacInnis DJ (2011). "A Framework for Conceptual Contributions in Marketing." J Mark. **75**(4):136–154. doi:10.1509/jmkg.75.4.136.*

43. ^Torraco RJ (2005). "Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples." Hum Resour Dev Rev. **4**(3):356–367. doi:10.1177/1534484305278283.

44. ^Kuruvilla S, Liu M, Li C, Chen W (2020). "Field Opacity and Practice-Outcome Decoupling: Private Regulation of Labor Standards in Global Supply Chains." ILR Rev. **73**(4):841–872. doi:10.1177/0019793920903278.

45. a, bDoellgast V, Bidwell M, Colvin AJS (2021). "New Directions in Employment Relations Theory: Understanding Fragmentation, Identity, and Legitimacy." ILR Rev. **74**(3):555–579. doi:10.1177/0019793921993445.

46. ^Ilsøe A, Larsen TP, Mathieu C, Rolandsson B (2024). "Negotiating about Algorithms: Social Partner Responses to AI in Denmark and Sweden." ILR Rev. **77**(5):856–868. doi:10.1177/00197939241278956f.

47. ^Litwin AS, Racabi G (2024). "Varieties of AI Regulations: The United States Perspective." ILR Rev. **77**(5):799–812. doi:10.1177/00197939241278956a.

## Declarations

**Funding:** No specific funding was received for this work.

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.