

The Rise of the Gig Economy and Its Implications for Organizational Structures and Leadership

Ahmad Faiz Mohd Ezanee¹, *Nomahaza Mahadi², Siti Azreen Habeeb Rahuman²

¹ Hospital Sultanah Bahiyah

²Azman Hashim International Business School (AHIBS), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91100463>

Received: 04 December 2025; Accepted: 10 December 2025; Published: 18 December 2025

ABSTRACT

The gig economy is changing the way organisations work, and the shift is becoming too significant to ignore. This paper explores how the rise of flexible and independent work arrangements is reshaping leadership approaches and traditional organisational structures. The discussion looks at how technology, worker expectations, and market demands have opened the door for project-based work that gives people more freedom but also brings new challenges for businesses. Using Self Determination Theory as a guide, the paper highlights how autonomy, competence, and a sense of connection are important in keeping gig workers motivated, especially when they operate with limited security and little attachment to one employer. The review of recent literature shows a mix of opportunities and concerns. There is potential for organisations to gain more agility and access to specialised skills, but there are also issues linked to regulation, wellbeing, and fair treatment. This paper concludes that organisations need to adapt by rethinking leadership styles, strengthening collaboration between mixed workforces, and investing in continuous learning for everyone involved. Those willing to adjust and embrace the reality of gig work will be better prepared for the future of employment.

Keywords: Gig economy, organisational structure, leadership, worker motivation, flexible work arrangements

INTRODUCTION

The gig economy's growth is changing the face of traditional work, with profound effects on leadership, organisational culture, and management education (Caza, 2020; Thomas, 2022). Globalisation, technology, and changing labour demands are some of the causes causing this change (Agrawal, 2022; Scully-Russ, 2020). Therefore, further study is required to comprehend how the gig economy affects several facets of employment, such as dedication, job satisfaction, and human resource development.

The structure of the workplace has undergone seismic alterations from what began as little waves of change. There are now more options available to both employers and employees for providing value to the market. It is only a question of time if you have not personally noticed these changes.

Although the phrases "gig economy" and "sharing economy" are frequently used synonymously and have quickly entered common business discourse, they differ greatly from one another in several aspects. In the gig economy, the emphasis is on work related flexibility. Utilising an asset to start a job is common in the sharing economy. Two prime examples include renting out a house or room for a brief period or utilising a car for delivery or other transportation services.

The traditional "organization man" function that served as the basis for most of the modern theory and practice is gradually disappearing from the roles of managers and subordinates (Barley et al., 2017; Whyte, 1956). The complexity of the "gig" category, which encompasses several jobs, independent contracting, temporary labour, and many other types of employment interactions, further complicates our understanding efforts (Keith et al., 2019). Since the primary characteristic of gig labour is not having a typical job, each gig experience is different

(Spreitzer et al., 2017), and each one has its own set of advantages and disadvantages (Ashford et al., 2018). As others have previously noted, basic research is necessary to advance existing management theory (Ashford et al., 2018; Best, 2017; Bucher et al., 2019; Duggan et al., 2019; Kaine & Josserand, 2019). Employment law is lagging behind (Bimman, 2019; Gonzales, 2019). For instance, as noted by Ashford et al. (2018), the majority of structural changes associated with gig work, such as increased autonomy, instability, uncertainty, transience, and separation, have a significant impact on people's sense of self, sense of security, sense of agency, and interpersonal relationships (Bellesia et al., 2019).

The purpose of this paper is to investigate how leadership and organisational structures are being reshaped by the rise of gig-based labour, focusing on both the opportunities and challenges emerging from flexible, technology-mediated work arrangements. In extending this purpose, the review examines how gig work reconfigures organisational design, redistributes managerial authority, and alters expectations placed on leaders managing fluid, nontraditional workforces. It also draws on Self-Determination Theory to understand how autonomy, competence, and relational attachment shape motivation and continuity among gig workers who navigate unstable, high-autonomy employment systems with limited organisational belonging. In doing so, the paper evaluates the shift from fixed hierarchies to hybrid workforce models, considers how leadership styles must adapt to sustain commitment and performance, and interrogates the psychological conditions underpinning engagement and well-being in modern gig-enabled employment.

Theory Overview

One theory that best relates to the topic of the rise of the gig economy and its implications for organizational structures and leadership is the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Self-Determination Theory emphasizes people's internal drive as well as their fundamental psychological demands on competence, relatedness, and autonomy. SDT may assist in the explanation of how businesses might promote the motivation and wellbeing of gig workers in the setting of the gig economy, wherein individuals have more freedom and influence over their working conditions.

SDT can aid in the explanation of how businesses might promote the motivation and wellbeing of gig workers in the setting of the gig economy, wherein individuals have more freedom and influence over their working conditions.

Firstly, SDT is emphasize on autonomy. In the gig economy, employees have a great deal of freedom when it comes to selecting their projects, creating their own timetables, and picking their workspace. By giving gig workers, the freedom to decide for themselves and encouraging a sense of control and ownership over their work, organisations that uphold SDT values may empower these individuals.

Secondly, SDT is emphasize on competency. SDT focuses a strong emphasis on how crucial it is for people to feel capable and productive at work. By offering chances for skill development, training, and feedback to improve performance and self-assurance, employers may boost the competency of gig workers.

Thirdly, SDT is emphasize on sense of relatedness. Even while gig work may appear isolating, companies can help gig workers feel more connected by encouraging a positive work environment, assisting team members in communicating and working together, and providing chances for networking and social interaction.

Considering the gig economy's changing dynamics, Self-Determination Theory provides insightful guidance on how businesses may create work environments, leadership styles, and organizational structures that promote gig workers' intrinsic motivation and well-being. Although SDT offers insightful information, it does not cover each component of the gig economy. For instance, it does not specifically address the difficulties that many gig workers confront in terms of job security and benefits. It's crucial to consider other elements when examining worker motivation in the gig economy, such as financial strain and economic reality. All things considered, SDT provides a useful foundation for comprehending employee engagement and motivation in the context of the gig economy. Businesses could create a more appealing and effective work environment for gig workers by concentrating on meeting their psychological requirements. This rising workforce segment can be served by these initiatives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the gig economy has expanded rapidly, driven by intersecting debates on technological disruption, labour flexibility, economic precarity, regulatory ambiguity and shifting cultural expectations of work. Digital platforms remain the principal accelerator of these transformations, as advances in mobile applications and online marketplaces allow labour to be transacted globally and instantaneously, forming what has been labelled the “platform,” “on-demand,” or “gig” economy (Minifie and Wiltshire, 2016; OECD, 2019; Prudential, 2018). Within this mediated infrastructure, work is no longer anchored in continuous employment but organised through task-specific assignments, algorithmic matching and customer-driven scoring systems (US Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2018). This shift foreshadows the motivational volatility and relational detachment explored in the Discussion, where autonomy, competence and relatedness are no longer institutionally guaranteed but structurally conditional.

Flexibility remains the dominant attraction for both workers and organisations. Gig workers value self-determined scheduling, while firms benefit from reduced fixed labour commitments and rapid talent scaling. Yet, this autonomy is regularly undercut by irregular hours, income instability and extended availability demands that intrude on sleep patterns, family arrangements and psychological well-being (Tucker and Folkard, 2012). As later examined through Self-Determination Theory, the tension between volitional autonomy and economic vulnerability becomes central to explaining why intrinsic motivation weakens despite nominal freedom. Autonomy in gig work thus diverges from traditional motivational theory: reduced managerial oversight coexists with intensified platform dependency.

Economic pressures further shape gig participation. Many workers enter platform labour not as a lifestyle preference but as a strategic response to financial uncertainty, underemployment or wage stagnation. While firms leverage global skill access, workers experience emotional turbulence—oscillating between independence and insecurity—which is highly documented across creative freelancers, rideshare drivers and independent contractors (Malin and Chandler, 2017; Butler and Stoyanova Russell, 2018; Petriglieri et al., 2019; Grandey and Gabriel, 2015). This emotional oscillation aligns with SDT’s claim that competence without stability and autonomy without security fails to produce sustained engagement. The gig model therefore heightens adaptability while diluting identity continuity.

Regulation remains one of the most destabilising domains. Employment classification—whether workers are categorized as employees or independent contractors—determines access to social insurance, benefits, legal safeguards and collective bargaining (Donovan, Bradley, and Shimabukuro, 2016). Labelling workers as contractors enables cost flexibility but displaces relational belonging, structured development and welfare entitlements, reinforcing the relational deficit highlighted in the Discussion. Calls for portable benefits, platform accountability and taxation clarity reflect not only economic justice but the psychological need for predictable security, conditions SDT identifies as essential for sustained motivation rather than episodic participation.

From an organisational lens, the gig model has become both a cost strategy and a governance experiment. Firms increasingly deploy dual labour systems, combining core full-time employees with contingent digital labour pools to achieve agility and scale. Emerging arrangements—worker cooperatives, platform unions, modular training ecosystems—anticipate the distributed leadership, adaptive coordination and e-leadership competencies required in hybrid workforce systems (Tug, 2023). These models confirm the structural turn discussed later: organisational identity is no longer contained within hierarchical boundaries but diffused across platform-mediated contributors who lack conventional organisational membership yet fulfil critical operational functions. Boundaries between gig and full-time roles thus blur, producing new expectations of leadership presence without physical proximity, cultural reinforcement without co-location and motivation without traditional belonging.

Taken collectively, the literature demonstrates that the gig economy is not merely a labour alternative but a systemic realignment of work, authority and identity. While it promises autonomy, mobility and organisational agility, it simultaneously intensifies structural inequities, motivational fragility and relational thinning. This intersection sets the foundation for the paper’s Discussion, where SDT’s psychological conditions and contemporary leadership frameworks become essential to explaining why gig work remains economically efficient yet motivationally unstable and organisationally unanchored.

METHODOLOGY / REVIEW APPROACH

This paper adopts a structured literature review approach in which relevant studies were located through Google Scholar, Emerald, ScienceDirect and Scopus, reflecting both multidisciplinary breadth and indexed publication quality. Searches were conducted using key terms including “gig economy,” “platform work,” “digital labour,” “hybrid workforce,” and “algorithmic management,” covering the period 2015–2024 to capture the accelerated expansion of technology-mediated flexible work systems. Only peer-reviewed journal articles and reputable institutional reports were included, while dissertations, non-refereed commentary pieces and non-indexed materials were excluded to ensure scholarly rigour. The selected literature was then synthesised through thematic mapping to identify conceptual intersections between organisational restructuring, leadership adaptation and worker motivation, with specific attention to how Self-Determination Theory explains gig workers’ experiences of autonomy, competence and relatedness within precarious yet flexible employment settings.

DISCUSSION

The accelerating expansion of the gig economy requires organisations to reconsider not only how work is structured but how motivation, authority and belonging are sustained when labour is decentralised, digitally mediated and individually fragmented. Self-Determination Theory provides a critical interpretive lens for this shift because the gig model disrupts the three psychological conditions which are, autonomy, competence and relatedness, that underpin intrinsic motivation and long-term work commitment.

Gig work is commonly framed as autonomy-enhancing, yet SDT clarifies that this autonomy is conditional rather than sovereign. Workers choose when to log in, but their earning stability is governed by platform algorithms, dynamic pricing, customer ratings and constantly shifting task allocation systems. The outcome is *apparent independence under economic insecurity*. Autonomy therefore becomes transactional: flexibility enables scheduling control, but the absence of guaranteed income, portable benefits and predictable task flow steadily erodes the sense of volitional agency that SDT identifies as the foundation of self-directed motivation.

Competence follows a similar paradox. Gig workers continuously acquire platform-specific know-how, micro-interaction skills and digital customer management abilities, yet these capabilities remain fragmented across assignments, applications and industries. Competence grows in tactical bursts rather than holistic progression, creating what may be described as *functional capability without identity consolidation*. Without organisational mentorship, structured development pathways or leadership-driven reinforcement, skill acquisition is episodic rather than developmental, weakening the motivational payoff SDT associates with mastery.

Relatedness is the most structurally compromised SDT pillar. Platform environments replace collegial interaction with numerical visibility such as, ratings, completion scores, customer reviews and algorithmic matching functions. Work becomes a sequence of transactions rather than relational exchanges, and workers engage more with platforms than with people. Limited social contact, absence of supervisor dialogue and negligible peer community create relational detachment, reducing affective belonging, psychological safety and long-term loyalty. In this sense, gig work redefines labour participation as *performance without interpersonal anchoring*.

This psychological restructuring is inseparable from the organisational transformation occurring simultaneously. The rise of gig labour signals not just labour flexibility but an architectural shift from vertically integrated hierarchies to hybrid, networked workforce ecosystems where permanent and contingent workers interact without traditional boundaries. Project-based models, digital task allocation, algorithmic management systems and flatter structures reduce managerial proximity, requiring new leadership competencies and governance forms.

Leadership responses must therefore transition beyond classical supervision. Adaptive leadership becomes essential because leaders must navigate fluctuating workforce composition, temporal project cycles and uneven worker commitment. Transformational leadership, previously tied to internal culture-building, must evolve to inspire discretionary effort among contributors who are organisationally peripheral yet operationally central. Distributed leadership is increasingly relevant as authority and task ownership are dispersed through platforms rather than imposed through fixed line-management roles. Finally, e-leadership emerges as a dominant

requirement: communication, monitoring, feedback and culture transmission now occur through digital systems rather than physical managerial presence.

Algorithmic management intensifies these leadership challenges by transferring supervisory functions like, task allocation, performance monitoring, behavioural nudges, from human managers to platform logic. Leadership, therefore, becomes interpretive rather than directive, focused on enabling inclusion, negotiating fairness, supporting wellbeing and stabilising motivation rather than commanding physical teams. What organisations gain in agility, they risk losing in continuity, identity formation and psychological attachment.

Taken together, SDT and contemporary leadership theory demonstrate that the future of organisational effectiveness will depend not merely on digital efficiency but on moral and motivational stewardship. If gig workers are to remain productive contributors, organisational systems must reconstruct autonomy as stability rather than exposure, competence as cumulative rather than episodic, and relatedness as meaningful connection rather than platform-mediated anonymity. Where leadership shifts from control to facilitation and structures shift from hierarchy to collaborative ecosystems, the gig economy may evolve from precarious flexibility into sustainable participation.

CONCLUSION

The rise of the gig economy signifies not merely a shift in employment patterns but a structural and psychological redefinition of work, calling for a re-examination of leadership, organisational design and motivation frameworks. Situated within Self-Determination Theory, this paper underscores that autonomy in platform-mediated labour, while appearing liberating, is often entangled with volatile remuneration cycles and algorithmic unpredictability; competence development remains incremental yet fragmented, and relatedness is structurally weakened through digitalised transactional systems rather than collegial interaction. These findings deepen theoretical understanding by moving SDT from a peripheral explanatory model to a central diagnostic mechanism that illustrates how motivational fragility is embedded in gig work's architecture rather than in individual preference. Leadership implications also extend theory beyond traditional hierarchical assumptions, as adaptive leadership, distributed authority, transformational engagement and e-leadership competencies become essential to sustain belonging and performance within hybrid labour ecosystems.

Despite expanding scholarship, notable gaps remain. Empirical evidence on emerging gig economies in regions such as Southeast Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America is limited, particularly where informal employment, religious norms and state welfare constraints interact with platform work. Equally, research has yet to fully interrogate hybrid workforce functioning: how full-time and gig contributors coexist in digitally governed structures, how identity and equity tensions unfold, and how leadership distributes recognition to workers who are operationally central yet institutionally peripheral. Moreover, gig work's psychological toll—loneliness, exhaustion, uncertainty, identity diffusion and digital surveillance—remains insufficiently measured through longitudinal and cross-industry comparisons, preventing a fuller understanding of motivation decline and mental health consequences within algorithmically managed labour markets. These gaps point toward future research directions that must integrate SDT's intrinsic needs with structural-economic conditions to explain not only motivational activation but motivational depletion.

Practical implications are equally pressing. Organisations must invest in stable earning models, transparent task allocation logic and developmental support rather than assuming flexibility itself guarantees motivation. Human resource leaders must extend inclusion practices, learning access and feedback channels to independent workers rather than restricting professional growth to payroll employees. Algorithmic scoring and customer evaluation should be redesigned with fairness, appeals mechanisms and data visibility, recognising that ratings shape identity security and not merely service efficiency. Finally, policy makers need to advance benefit portability, social protection access, taxation clarity and platform accountability so that workforce fluidity does not rationalise insecurity as choice.

Taken together, the gig economy's future will depend less on technological acceleration than on the ethical and psychological reforms that accompany it. If organisations and policy systems can reconstitute autonomy as assured rather than exposed, competence as cumulative rather than episodic and relatedness as relational rather

than algorithmically symbolic, gig work can mature from precarious participation into sustainable engagement. Until then, leadership will need to act not as a mechanism of oversight but as a stabilising presence that anchors identity, wellbeing and motivation amid an employment system increasingly defined by transience, data-driven supervision and decentralised belonging.

REFERENCES

1. Agrawal, D., & Bhukya, R. (2022). Effects of the gig economy on the workplace: A contemporary Indian perspective study. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S3), 2701–2718. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS3.6176>
2. Ashford, S. J., Caza, B. B., & Reid, E. M. (2018). From surviving to thriving in the gig economy: A research agenda for individuals in the new world of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2018.11.001>
3. Barley, S. R., Bechky, B. A., & Milliken, F. J. (2017). The changing nature of work: Careers, identities, and work lives in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 3(2), 111–115. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2017.0034>
4. Bellesia, F., Mattarelli, E., Bertolotti, F., & Sobrero, M. (2019). Platforms as entrepreneurial incubators? How online labor markets shape work identity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(4), 246–268. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0269>
5. Best, S. (2017). The U.S. gig economy: Economic imposition or economic choice? *Business and Management Review*, 8(4), 60–67. https://cberuk.com/cdn/conference_proceedings/conference_93744.pdf
6. Bimman, A. (2019, August 9). Push to unionize Foodora could be “watershed moment” for Canadian gig economy: Employment lawyer. *Global News*. <https://globalnews.ca/news/5746926/foodora-union-drive/>
7. Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., & Lutz, C. (2019). Mattering in digital labor. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(4), 307–324. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0265>
8. Butler, N., & Stoyanova Russell, D. (2018). No funny business: Precarious work and emotional labour in stand-up comedy. *Human Relations*, 71(12), 1666–1686. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718754999>
9. Caza, A. (2020). The gig economy’s implications for management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 44(5), 594–604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562920934150>
10. Donovan, S., Bradley, D., & Shimabukuro, J. (2016). What does the gig economy mean for workers? Congressional Research Service. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44365.pdf>
11. Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2019). Algorithmic management and app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations and HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12258>
12. Gonzales, R. (2019, September 18). California governor signs law protecting gig economy workers. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/2019/09/18/762108954/california-governor-signs-law-protecting-gig-economy-workers>
13. Grandey, A. A., & Gabriel, A. S. (2015). Emotional labor at a crossroads: Where do we go from here? *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 323–349. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113316>
14. Kaine, S., & Jossierand, E. (2019). The organisation and experience of work in the gig economy. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 61(4), 479–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185619865480>
15. Keith, M. G., Harms, P., & Tay, L. (2019). Mechanical Turk and the gig economy: Exploring differences between gig workers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(4), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0228>
16. Malin, B. J., & Chandler, C. (2017). Free to work anxiously: Splintering precarity among drivers for Uber and Lyft. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 10(2), 382–400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cccr.12153>
17. Minifie, J., & Wiltshire, T. (2016). Peer to peer pressure: Policy for the sharing economy (Report No. 2016–7). Grattan Institute.
18. Petriglieri, G., Ashford, S. J., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2019). Agony and ecstasy in the gig economy: Cultivating holding environments for precarious and personalized work identities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(1), 124–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839218759646>
19. Prudential. (2018). Gig economy impact by generation. Prudential Insurance Company of America.

20. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
21. Scully-Russ, E., & Torraco, R. (2020). The changing nature and organization of work: An integrative review of the literature. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(1), 66–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484319886394>
22. Spreitzer, G. M., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 473–499. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113332>
23. Thomas, S. M., & Baddipudi, V. (2022). Changing nature of work and employment in the gig economy: The role of culture building and leadership in sustaining commitment and job satisfaction. *NHRD Network Journal*, 15(1), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26314541211064735>
24. Tucker, P., & Folkard, S. (2012). Working time, health and safety (Conditions of Work and Employment Series No. 31). International Labour Office.
25. Tug, M. A., & Başar, P. (2023). Future of the gig economy. *PressAcademia Procedia*, 17(1), 230–231. <https://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2023.1796>
26. US Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). Labor force statistics from the current population survey. <https://www.bls.gov/cps/electronically-mediated-employment.htm>
27. Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. Simon & Schuster.