TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

www.techniumscience.com

Vol. 66/2024

A New Decade for Social Changes

PLUS COMMUNICATION
International Communication & PR

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

Algorithmic Management. Theoretical Perspectives and Implications for Organizational Development

Lucian Sfetcu

Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania

lucian.sfetcu@gmail.com

Abstract. Algorithmic management leverages data-driven algorithms and artificial intelligence to automate managerial functions traditionally executed by human managers. This paper provides a comprehensive overview of algorithmic management, exploring its definitions and emergence in gig economy platforms and traditional workplaces. It delves into key sociological and organizational theories—including Weber's bureaucracy, Critical Management Studies (CMS), and technological rationality—to frame the discussion. The impact of algorithmic management on employee autonomy, digital surveillance, and forms of worker resistance is examined, alongside its role in shaping organizational structures, enhancing efficiency, and driving innovation. Ethical implications, particularly concerning fairness, transparency, and bias, are critically analyzed. While algorithmic management offers potential benefits such as improved efficiency and decision-making, it also raises significant concerns about worker autonomy, power imbalances, and ethical considerations. The paper underscores the need for a nuanced understanding and responsible implementation of algorithmic management to harness its advantages while mitigating its drawbacks.

Keywords. Algorithmic management, artificial intelligence, gig economy, employee autonomy, organizational development, ethical implications

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed various aspects of work, leading to the emergence of algorithmic management. This paradigm shift involves leveraging data-driven algorithms to automate managerial functions traditionally executed by human managers (Lee et al., 2015). Algorithmic management is particularly prominent in gig economy platforms, where companies rely on algorithms to coordinate, control, and evaluate the activities of gig workers (Rosenblat & Stark, 2015).

While algorithmic management offers significant potential benefits in terms of efficiency, decision-making, and innovation, it also presents substantial challenges related to worker autonomy, ethical considerations, and organizational dynamics. A nuanced understanding of both its advantages and drawbacks is essential for responsible implementation that aligns with organizational goals and employee well-being.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive overview of algorithmic management by exploring its definitions, theoretical foundations, impact on employees, role in

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

organizational development, and ethical implications. By critically engaging with existing literature and identifying gaps, the paper hopes to contribute to a deeper understanding of algorithmic management's multifaceted effects on modern organizations.

2. Methodology

This paper employs a narrative literature review to synthesize existing research on algorithmic management. The review focuses on scholarly articles, books and institutional reports. We searched in databases such as SSRN, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect using keywords including "algorithmic management," "gig economy," "employee autonomy," "organizational development," and "ethical implications."

The selection criteria included peer-reviewed publications that contribute to the understanding of algorithmic management's definitions, theoretical foundations, impact on employees, organizational development, and ethical considerations. Articles were excluded if they did not directly address these topics or were not available in English. The literature was critically analyzed to identify key themes, theoretical perspectives, and gaps in current research.

3. Defining Algorithmic Management and Its Emergence

Algorithmic management can be seen as an evolution of traditional management theories, such as scientific management and bureaucracy.

Scientific management, introduced by Frederick Taylor, focused on optimizing processes through task specialization and efficiency (Taylor, 2012). Algorithmic management extends this by using algorithms to automate decision-making, potentially increasing efficiency beyond human capabilities. However, unlike scientific management, which relied on human managers, algorithmic management shifts decision-making to machines, raising concerns about worker autonomy and ethical implications.

Weber's bureaucracy emphasized formal rules and hierarchical structures for efficient administration (Weber, 2019). Algorithmic management aligns with bureaucracy by enforcing standardized procedures through algorithms. However, it may also exacerbate the impersonality and rigidity of bureaucratic systems, affecting employee morale and adaptability.

Algorithmic management represents a significant shift in organizational practices, utilizing data-driven algorithms to automate managerial functions (Kellogg et al., 2020). This system is especially prevalent in gig economy platforms like Uber and Bolt, where algorithms coordinate and control gig workers (Adekoya et al., 2023). The concept is rooted in advances in information technology, data analytics, and AI, enabling unprecedented levels of oversight and efficiency (Duggan et al., 2023).

Adekoya et al. (2023) explore the implications of algorithmic management on careers and employment relationships within the Nigerian gig economy. Their study highlights the dual nature of algorithmic management: offering job flexibility and autonomy while engendering precarious working conditions characterized by persistent uncertainties. Despite challenges, algorithmic management fosters transactional exchanges between platform providers and drivers, showcasing the nuanced interaction between human labor and digital algorithms.

Kadolkar et al. (2024) conduct a systematic review to analyze how algorithmic management in the gig economy is conceptualized and measured across various disciplines. Employing natural language processing-based topic modeling, they identify twelve distinct topics revolving around algorithmic management. Their comprehensive definition encompasses key dimensions and mediating pathways, crucial for future academic endeavors aimed at unifying this divergent domain.

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

Duggan et al. (2023) introduce the concept of algorithmic human resource management (HRM) control within app-based gig work. They describe it as an omnipresent system that diverges significantly from traditional forms of control, operating through pervasive algorithmic technologies and involving significant influence from non-organizational parties. Their findings illuminate the rigidities and complexities experienced by gig workers under this control system, highlighting concerns such as reduced worker autonomy and the duality of algorithmic HRM's impact.

Algorithmic management has gained significant attention across multiple disciplines, including sociology, organizational studies, and information systems. Lee et al. (2015) first introduced the term while examining how ride-sharing platforms employ algorithms to manage drivers, assigning tasks and evaluating performance. This marked the emergence of a new form of managerial control in the gig economy, where traditional human oversight is supplanted by data-driven algorithms.

Rosenblat and Stark (2015) further analyzed how Uber's driver-facing app enforces behavioral standards and monitors performance, effectively substituting traditional managerial roles. They argued that this shift has profound implications for worker autonomy and the nature of employment relationships.

4. Theoretical Foundations

Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy provides a foundational understanding of structured organizational operations characterized by clear hierarchies and formal rules (Weber, 2019). Bureaucracy aims for efficiency and predictability through standardized procedures. Algorithms can enhance bureaucratic efficiency by streamlining processes and ensuring compliance with organizational guidelines (Kulal et al., 2024). However, they may also reinforce rigidities and fail to adapt to non-routine situations, potentially exacerbating issues of impersonality and worker disenchantment.

Critical Management Studies offer a lens to critique algorithmic management by focusing on issues of power, control, and worker autonomy. CMS scholars argue that algorithmic management can perpetuate existing power dynamics and reduce opportunities for worker resistance (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). For instance, algorithms may intensify surveillance and data collection, leading to a "panopticon" effect where workers self-regulate due to constant monitoring (Sewell, 2012).

Technological rationality, as discussed by Marcuse (1964), suggests that technology serves as an instrument of control, shaping human behavior and social relations. Barley (2015) extends this concept to organizational contexts, positing that technology can redefine roles and relationships within organizations. In algorithmic management, algorithms not only automate tasks but also influence how workers perceive their roles and interact with management (Faraj et al., 2018).

5. Impact on Worker Autonomy and Surveillance

Algorithmic management has a dual impact on worker autonomy. Some studies argue that algorithms can enhance autonomy by providing workers with more flexibility in scheduling and task selection (Möhlmann et al., 2021). However, others contend that algorithms often reduce autonomy due to strict performance metrics and automated decision-making that limit workers' discretion (Wood et al., 2019). Kellogg et al. (2020) note that algorithmic management creates a paradox where workers have flexibility in some aspects but face rigid controls in others.

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

Sharifah et al. (2024) found that algorithmic management positively impacts job autonomy and satisfaction in the Indonesian higher education sector. Employees reported feeling more empowered when job autonomy was high, suggesting that thoughtful implementation of algorithms can enhance autonomy.

Algorithmic management often entails increased digital surveillance, raising concerns about privacy and ethical implications (Moore, 2018). Ball (2010) discusses how surveillance technologies can induce stress and anxiety, affecting employee well-being. The opaque nature of algorithms exacerbates these issues, as workers may not fully understand how data is collected and used (Ananny & Crawford, 2018).

Digital surveillance and automated decision-making raise concerns about worker autonomy and privacy (Bucher et al., 2021; Heemsbergen et al., 2024). While algorithmic management can optimize productivity, it also risks creating a digital form of Taylorism, potentially intensifying work and reducing job quality (Noponen et al., 2023; Wood, 2021). The impact extends beyond gig economy platforms to traditional workplaces, affecting hiring practices and performance evaluations (Adams-Prassl et al., 2024). Workers are not entirely passive in this process; some develop strategies to understand and navigate algorithmic systems (Jarrahi & Sutherland, 2019). However, the widespread adoption of algorithmic management necessitates new regulatory frameworks to address emerging risks and protect workers' rights (Adams-Prassl et al., 2024; Baiocco et al., 2022).

Workers have developed strategies to resist or adapt to algorithmic management. Graham et al. (2017) found that gig workers engage in "algorithmic gamesmanship," manipulating the system to their advantage. Vasudevan and Chan (2022) observed that Uber drivers developed "work games" as resistance strategies against the platform's gamified management system. This includes "grinding" (reluctant compliance) and "oppositional play" (active subversion). Such resistance reflects workers' agency in responding to algorithmic controls and highlights the importance of considering employee perspectives in system design.

Algorithms play a pivotal role in reshaping organizational structures by enabling more decentralized and flexible operations (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Companies leverage algorithms to optimize workflows, manage supply chains, and enhance customer experiences (Agrawal et al., 2018). Liu (2024) demonstrates how AI integration into financial management transforms personal financial advising, creating more flexible organizational structures that transcend traditional boundaries.

Algorithmic management can lead to significant efficiency gains by automating routine tasks and reducing the need for middle management (Kellogg et al., 2020). Koval et al. (2022) show the effectiveness of bio-inspired algorithms in decision support systems, leading to substantial increases in data processing efficiency. Such enhancements are critical for organizations requiring rapid and reliable data analysis, enabling optimized resource allocation and improved operational efficiency.

Algorithms drive innovation by providing novel solutions to complex problems. Kozinets (2022) discusses "algorithmic branding," where algorithms revolutionize branding and customer engagement through platform assemblages. By activating and customizing brand messages, algorithms foster innovative interactions between organizations and consumers. This capability allows organizations to uncover hidden patterns and insights, leading to innovative products and services that meet emerging customer needs.

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

6. Ethical Considerations and Criticisms

Algorithmic bias is a significant ethical concern, where models may produce discriminatory outcomes due to biased training data (Noble, 2018). Adomavicius and Yang (2022) highlight that algorithmic bias often stems from historical inequalities, perpetuating existing disparities. For example, hiring algorithms trained on biased data may disadvantage certain demographic groups, reinforcing systemic discrimination.

Kubiak et al. (2023) suggest that incorporating personality-based algorithms in hiring can reduce gender bias but caution that careful design is essential. Without intentional efforts to mitigate bias, algorithms can inadvertently reinforce stereotypes and inequalities.

This paper acknowledges the potential for selection bias, as much of the literature focuses on Western contexts and the gig economy. Efforts have been made to include studies from diverse geographical regions and industries, such as Adekoya et al. (2023) on the Nigerian gig economy and Sharifah et al. (2024) on the Indonesian higher education sector. However, the representation may still be limited, and findings may not be universally applicable.

Moreover, while critical perspectives highlight the challenges of algorithmic management, positive outcomes are also considered to provide a balanced analysis. Recognizing both the benefits and drawbacks helps avoid confirmation bias and presents a more objective view.

The opaque nature of algorithms poses challenges for transparency and accountability (Pasquale, 2015). Workers may not understand how decisions affecting them are made, leading to perceptions of unfairness and erosion of trust (Burrell, 2015). Herzog (2021) argues that organizations have a responsibility to address structural injustices embedded within algorithmic systems.

Potential solutions include developing fairness-aware algorithms and integrating human oversight throughout the decision-making process (Adomavicius & Yang, 2022). Ensuring that algorithms are transparent and that there are avenues for feedback and redress is essential for ethical implementation.

7. Implications for Organizational Development

Algorithmic management significantly influences organizational development, presenting both opportunities and challenges that organizations must navigate thoughtfully. On one hand, its potential benefits are notable. The automation of managerial tasks, for instance, streamlines operations and reduces costs by eliminating inefficiencies and reallocating resources to strategic initiatives (Kellogg et al., 2020). Additionally, algorithmic systems support objective decision-making by relying on data-driven insights, thereby reducing the impact of human biases and ensuring consistency in managerial processes (Kinowska & Sienkiewicz, 2022). Beyond these operational improvements, algorithmic management also fosters innovation. By leveraging algorithms to identify patterns, generate insights, and create predictive models, organizations can develop novel solutions and enhance their product and service offerings, leading to greater competitiveness in dynamic markets (Kozinets, 2022).

However, these advantages are accompanied by notable drawbacks that merit careful consideration. One critical concern is the potential reduction in worker autonomy. The pervasive use of algorithms for monitoring and control can lead to feelings of surveillance and constraint, which may increase stress and diminish job satisfaction (Wood et al., 2019). Furthermore, algorithmic management raises ethical concerns, particularly regarding transparency, accountability, and fairness. The opacity of many algorithmic systems, often described as "black boxes," can make it difficult for employees to understand or challenge

decisions that significantly impact their work lives, potentially exacerbating issues of discrimination and inequity (Herzog, 2021). In response to these challenges, employees may develop resistance strategies to counteract algorithmic controls. Such resistance can range from subtle subversions of algorithmic expectations to overt attempts at bypassing or challenging the system's authority (Vasudevan & Chan, 2022).

Taken together, these benefits and drawbacks illustrate the dual-edged nature of algorithmic management. While its potential to enhance efficiency, objectivity, and innovation is undeniable, its impact on worker autonomy, ethical considerations, and employee relations necessitates careful implementation and ongoing oversight. Organizations must strive to balance these factors to fully harness the advantages of algorithmic management while mitigating its inherent risks.

8. Conclusion

Algorithmic management signifies a substantial transformation in organizational practices, offering notable benefits in efficiency, decision-making, and innovation. However, it also introduces significant challenges related to worker autonomy, ethical considerations, and organizational culture. This dual-edged nature necessitates a nuanced understanding that balances technological advancements with human-centered perspectives.

Organizations adopting algorithmic management must proactively address ethical implications by ensuring transparency, mitigating biases, and incorporating human oversight. Aligning these practices with both organizational goals and employee well-being can help harness the advantages of algorithmic management while minimizing its drawbacks.

Acknowledging the limitations of this study—including potential gaps due to the focus on certain geographical contexts or industries—highlights the need for ongoing research. As algorithmic management is a rapidly evolving field, advances in technology may outpace current understandings. Future studies should explore its impacts in diverse cultural settings, consider long-term effects, and investigate strategies for enhancing worker agency within algorithmic systems. Interdisciplinary research combining technical, ethical, and social perspectives will be crucial for developing more responsible and effective implementations.

While algorithmic management offers transformative potential for organizations, careful consideration of ethical and human-centered factors is essential. By thoughtfully integrating algorithms into management practices, organizations can foster innovation and efficiency without compromising employee autonomy and organizational culture.

Bibliography

[1] Adams-Prassl, J., Rakshita, S., Abraha, H., & Silberman, M. S. (2024). Towards an International Standard for Regulating Algorithmic Management: A Blueprint. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4684947

[2] Adekoya, O. D., Mordi, C., Ajonbadi, H. A., & Chen, W. (2023). Implications of algorithmic management on careers and employment relationships in the gig economy—A developing country perspective. In *INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & PEOPLE*. EMERALD GROUP PUBLISHING LTD. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-01-2023-0064

[3] Adomavicius, G., & Yang, M. (2022). Integrating Behavioral, Economic, and Technical Insights to Understand and Address Algorithmic Bias: A Human-Centric Perspective. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, *13*(3), 1–27. Crossref. https://doi.org/10.1145/3519420

[4] Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.

[5] Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, *20*(3), 973–989. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816676645

[6] Baiocco, S., Fernández-Macías, E., Rani, U., & Pesole, A. (2022). *The Algorithmic Management of work and its implications in different contexts* (JRC Working Papers on Labour, Education and Technology). Joint Research Centre.

[7] Ball, K. (2010). Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, *51*(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/00236561003654776

[8] Barley, S. R. (2015). Why the Internet Makes Buying a Car Less Loathsome: How Technologies Change Role Relations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, *1*(1), 5–35. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2013.0016

[9] Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies.* (p. 306). W W Norton & Co.

[10] Bucher, E. L., Schou, P. K., & Waldkirch, M. (2021). Pacifying the algorithm – Anticipatory compliance in the face of algorithmic management in the gig economy. *Organization*, *28*(1), 44–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420961531

[11] Burrell, J. (2015). How the Machine "Thinks:" Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2660674

[12] Duggan, J., Carbery, R., McDonnell, A., & Sherman, U. (2023). Algorithmic HRM control in the gig economy: The app-worker perspective. In *HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT* (Vol. 62, Issue 6, pp. 883–899). WILEY PERIODICALS, INC. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22168

[13] Faraj, S., Pachidi, S., & Sayegh, K. (2018). Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. *Information and Organization*, *28*(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005

[14] Graham, M., Hjorth, I., & Lehdonvirta, V. (2017). Digital labour and development: Impacts of global digital labour platforms and the gig economy on worker livelihoods. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, *23*(2), 135–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/1024258916687250

[15] Heemsbergen, L., Krebs, S., Gorur, R., & Maddox, A. (2024). Algorithmic Performance Management in Higher Education: Viva! 365 Ways of Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, *22*(2), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v22i2.15776

[16] Herzog, L. (2021). Algorithmic Bias and Access to Opportunities. In C. Véliz (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Digital Ethics* (1st ed., pp. 413–432). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198857815.013.21

[17] Jarrahi, M. H., & Sutherland, W. (2019). Algorithmic Management and Algorithmic Competencies: Understanding and Appropriating Algorithms in Gig Work. In N. G. Taylor, C. Christian-Lamb, M. H. Martin, & B. Nardi (Eds.), *Information in Contemporary Society* (Vol. 11420, pp. 578–589). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15742-5_55

[18] Kadolkar, I., Kepes, S., & Subramony, M. (2024). Algorithmic management in the gig economy: A systematic review and research integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, job.2831. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2831

[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. Crossref. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

[20] Kinowska, H., & Sienkiewicz, Ł. J. (2022). Influence of algorithmic management practices on workplace well-being – evidence from European organisations. *Information Technology & People*, *36*(8), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-02-2022-0079

[21] Koval, M., Sova, O., Shyshatskyi, A., Artabaiev, Y., Garashchuk, N., Yivzhenko, Y., Luscshay, Y., Dovhopoliuk, L., Haidenko, O., & Dorofeev, M. (2022). Improving the method for increasing the efficiency of decision-making based on bio-inspired algorithms. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, *6*(4 (120)), 6–13. https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2022.268621

[22] Kozinets, R. V. (2022). Algorithmic branding through platform assemblages: Core conceptions and research directions for a new era of marketing and service management. *Journal of Service Management*, *33*(3), 437–452. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-07-2021-0263

[23] Kubiak, E., Efremova, M. I., Baron, S., & Frasca, K. J. (2023). Gender equity in hiring: Examining the effectiveness of a personality-based algorithm. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1219865. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1219865

[24] Kulal, A., Rahiman, H. U., Suvarna, H., Abhishek, N., & Dinesh, S. (2024). Enhancing public service delivery efficiency: Exploring the impact of AI. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *10*(3), 100329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100329

[25] Lee, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2015). Working with Machines. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Comp Uting Systems*, 1603–1612. Crossref. https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702548

[26] Liu, Z. (2024). Artificial Intelligence as Personal Financial Advisor in the Future? - A Case Study Based on Algorithmic Innovation Strategies. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, *87*(1), 272–278. https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/87/20241030

[27] Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[28] Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). *Hands on the Wheel: Navigating Algorithmic Management and Uber Drivers' Autonomy*. International Conference on Interaction Sciences. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Hands-on-the-Wheel%3A-Navigating-Algorithmic-and-Uber-M%C3%B6hlmann-Zalmanson/70aa7c8eaacf7bf802ec211123281364cbaf528d

[29] 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.

[30] Moore, P. V. (2018). *The quantified self in precarity: Work, technology and what counts*. Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis group.

[31] Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York university press.

[32] Noponen, N., Feshchenko, P., Auvinen, T., Luoma-aho, V., & Abrahamsson, P. (2023). Taylorism on steroids or enabling autonomy? A systematic review of alg

Technium Social Sciences Journal
Vol. 66, 389-397, December, 2024
ISSN: 2668-7798
www.techniumscience.com

orithmic management. *Management Review Quarterly*, *74*(3), 1695–1721. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00345-5

[33] Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674736061

[34] Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2015). Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2686227

[35] Sewell, G. (2012). Organization, employees and surveillance. In *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies* (1st ed.). Routledge.

[36] Sharifah, N., Wajdi, F., Susila, I., & Achmed, N. (2024). The Impact of Algorithm Management on Employee Job Satisfaction: Exploring the Mediating Role of Job Autonomy and the Moderating Effect of Employee Attitude: A Case Study on Two Premier Universitas Muhammadiyah (UMS and UMY). *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, *6*(3), 233–251. https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2024.6.3.20

[37] Taylor, F. W. (Ed.). (2012). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. The Floating Press.

[38] Vasudevan, K., & Chan, N. K. (2022). Gamification and work games: Examining consent and resistance among Uber drivers. *New Media & Society*, *24*(4), 866–886. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221079028

[39] Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and society: A new translation* (K. Tribe, Ed.). Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674240827

[40] Wood, A. J. (2021). Algorithmic Management Consequences for Work Organisation and Working Conditions. *JRC Working Papers Series on Labour, Education and Technology*, *2021*(07).

[41] 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616