

SUBORDINACIÓN ELECTRÓNICA EN EL TRABAJO DIGITAL: REGULACIÓN DEL TELETRABAJO EN LOS EMIRATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS

REDEFINING SUBORDINATION IN THE DIGITAL WORKPLACE: REGULATION OF TELEWORKING IN THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17981/juridcuc.21.1.2025.17>

Fecha de Recepción: 2025/09/15 Fecha de Aceptación: 2025/11/06

Mohammad Khamaysa 

Faculty of Law, Abu Dhabi University, United Arab Emirates
mohammad.alkhamaiesh@adu.ac.ae

Ghazi Ayed Alghathian 

School of Law, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan
g_alghathian@ju.edu.jo

Murad Altarawneh 

Faculty of Law, Abu Dhabi University, United Arab Emirates
Murad.altarawneh@adu.ac.ae

Para citar este artículo:

Khamaysa, M., Alghathian, G. y Altarawneh, M. (2025). Subordinación electrónica en el trabajo digital: regulación del teletrabajo en los Emiratos Árabes Unidos. *Jurídicas CUC*, 21(1), pp. 323 - 335. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.17981/juridcuc.21.1.2025.17>

Resumen

Este estudio analiza críticamente cómo la transformación digital redefine de manera específica los fundamentos doctrinales de la subordinación en el derecho laboral, centrándose en el concepto emergente de subordinación electrónica dentro del sistema jurídico contemporáneo de los Emiratos Árabes Unidos. Mediante una metodología jurídico-comparativa con referencias de Francia, la Unión Europea y Jordania, se examina cómo la autoridad del empleador se ejerce a través de gestión digital, supervisión algorítmica y el control remoto. El análisis determina si esta supervisión tecnológicamente mediada satisface completamente los criterios jurídicos de dependencia y control que caracterizan la relación laboral. La investigación revela que la Ley Federal N.º 33 de 2021 y su Reglamento, si bien reconocen formalmente el trabajo a distancia, no regulan explícitamente el control directivo digital. No obstante, estos marcos admiten implícitamente la subordinación electrónica como paradigma donde las herramientas digitales mantienen la autoridad jerárquica. Los resultados sugieren que los tribunales laborales podrían interpretar estas disposiciones mediante hermenéutica finalista para ampliar las protecciones esenciales a trabajadores bajo supervisión digital. Como contribución esencial, el estudio formula recomendaciones de política pública detalladas para integrar supervisión digital legítima en la regulación laboral de los EAU. Estas directrices se basan en principios fundamentales de transparencia, proporcionalidad y protección de datos. Al conceptualizar la subordinación electrónica como forma delimitada de control, esta investigación propone una vía doctrinal para modernizar el derecho laboral, equilibrando innovación tecnológica con la equidad y la dignidad esencial de los trabajadores.

Palabras clave: Derecho comparado; derecho laboral; algoritmo; gobernanza, regulación, digital.

Abstract

This study examines how digital transformation reshapes the doctrinal foundation of subordination in labor law, focusing on the emerging concept of electronic subordination within the United Arab Emirates (UAE) legal system. Using a doctrinal-comparative methodology, it analyzes how employer authority is exercised through digital management, algorithmic oversight, and remote supervision in contrast to traditional face-to-face control. Comparative references from France, the European Union, and Jordan are employed to evaluate whether electronically mediated supervision satisfies the legal tests of dependency and control that define employment. The analysis reveals that UAE Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021 and its Executive Regulations recognize remote work but do not explicitly regulate digital managerial control. However, these frameworks implicitly accommodate electronic subordination, where employer-issued tools, data tracking, and virtual platforms sustain hierarchical authority. The findings argue that UAE labor courts could interpret these statutory provisions purposively to extend employment protections to digitally monitored workers, thereby harmonizing national practice with European labor standards. In addition to its theoretical contribution, the study provides policy recommendations for embedding lawful digital supervision into UAE labor regulations through transparency, proportionality, and data-protection principles consistent with Federal Decree-Law No. 45 of 2021 and the EU's GDPR. By conceptualizing electronic subordination as a legitimate and bound form of control, the research offers a doctrinal pathway for adapting labor law to technology-mediated work without eroding fairness, accountability, or worker dignity.

Keywords: Comparative law; labour law; algorithm; governance, regulation, digital.



INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation, alongside the use of collaborative technologies, the emergence of platform economies, and the worldwide movement toward flexible working, has changed the nature of employment relations completely. The public and private sector organizations are all going to digitalize to gain agility, productivity, and resilience. Working from home is now the most obvious way of carrying out professional tasks outside the office. The change over, which was hastened by the COVID-19 pandemic and the steady movement towards post-pandemic normalization, has changed the place and time of employment and created new legal and regulatory difficulties ([Al-Manasir, 2019](#); [Karim, 2022](#)). The acceptance of virtual offices and digital processes has made it necessary for legal systems regulating pay to change to be able to deal with the difficulties of non-physical supervision and algorithmic monitoring that come with it.

This change is particularly important in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a nation that digital modernization has been incorporating into its economic strategy to some extent. Initially, in connection with this change, the UAE issued Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021 on the Regulation of Labour Relations and its Executive Regulations in 2022, permitting remote work to be recognized officially as a proper employment model done through electronic communication outside the physical workplace ([United Arab Emirates, 2021](#)). The law's acknowledgment of telecommuting may indicate liberal reform, but it also raises interpretive uncertainty about the doctrine of subordination which is one of the important aspects in distinguishing between employees and independent contractors.

Subordination is traditionally understood as the legal power of the employer to manage and control the workers' activities and is the base of the systems of employment classification and protection of workers' rights. This doctrine was based on aspects such as physical presence, observable behavior, and tangible supervision, and these aspects are quite inadequate in modern workplaces where digital mediation plays a major role. In contrast to freelance arrangements, remote employment generally has far-reaching obligations, accountability to time, and performance assessed, although all these aspects are controlled electronically through monitoring systems instead of face-to-face supervision. [Countouris and De Stefano \(2023b\)](#) have pointed out that, "Remote work has created contractual distancing, allowing employers to exert authority through digital platforms rather than through direct physical oversight. Although these arrangements appear flexible, they reproduce hierarchical structures, shifting the manifestation of subordination without eliminating it.

This shift is supported by the latest empirical evidence. Research in the field of organizational psychology shows that electronic monitoring practices, including keystroke monitoring, video monitoring, and time analysis, have an impact on employee participation and perceived control over their work, leading to the sometimes-negative effects of anxiety and stress ([Peiró et al., 2024](#); [Guglielmo, 2024](#); [König, 2025](#)). Despite this, the empirical findings have so far not been considered in the context of labor law and judicial reasoning, especially in the Gulf region consisting of the UAE and Jordan.

As a result, a disparity still exists in the understanding and regulation of electronically controlled subordination, that is, the question of whether the digital medium through which an employer controls, meets the legal criteria for an employment relationship. This gap has direct impacts on judicial decisions regarding classification of workers, their right to protection and payment for injuries suffered at home while working. Moreover, the lack of a definite legal framework not only restricts

the judges' interpretations but also brings about ambiguity for the companies that are installing the e-supervision system and workers that are raising concerns regarding their privacy and autonomy.

The UAE's goal of being the center of digital governance and innovation makes it very important to deal with the lack of doctrine in the area. Not defining the limits of electronic authority could lead to wrong classification of workers as well as violations of privacy rights. Although flexibility increases productivity, it may still leave electronic management unregulated, that will confuse the limits of autonomy and consent, thus making the ethical bases of employment law more difficult to deal with.

This study is based on two intertwined pillars. In the theoretical realm, it attempts to re-conceptualize the notion of subordination from the perspective of technological mediation, thus contributing to the modern labor-law doctrine. On a practical note, it brings forth comparison of utmost significance, which could ultimately direct the UAE labor policy and nurture the digital-governance framework of the region. The study examines the attitudes of France, the EU, and Jordan towards subordination in remote working situations, and from this, it learns for the UAE, which has a legal system structure and institutions that are comparable to those of these countries.

The study is conducted in line with its purpose, and it employs qualitative, doctrinal, and comparative legal methodology. This critical approach is applied through the interpretation of laws, court decisions, and regulatory texts while the empirical quantification method is left out. The comparative side makes it possible to have a debate on the different legal systems' approach to the same problems of electronic monitoring and control, and it does so by indicating the common principles as well as the differences in the application of the law.

Therefore, the current research acts as a reflective exploration of the transforming doctrine of subordination. Theoretically, doctrinally, and compared with different jurisdictions, it alludes to the power of employer in the digital world and the control through electronic monitoring that is challenging the conventional legal understanding. The research is guided by the following questions:

1. Does electronic oversight in remote work fulfill the legal criteria of subordination under Emirati labor law?
2. What are the legal implications of recognizing electronic subordination for employee classification, rights, and obligations?
3. How do comparative jurisdictions conceptualize subordination in remote work, and what lessons can be drawn for the UAE?

The present study, finally, removes a necessary conceptual barrier between the former labor laws and the latter digital realities. To look closely at the convergence of technology and authority is the present research's objective and it is expected to give clarifications to both legal and policy spheres, hence becoming part of the Emirati labor law modernization process-in conjunction with the digital transformation.

DISCUSSION

For a long time, the notion of subordination has been a key indicator in labor law that helped to differentiate between the two main forms of workers, i.e., employees and self-employed. The concept has, for the most part, been linked with the right of the employer to supervise, control, and give instructions, hence showing the legal inferiority that is characterized by employee-employer relationships. Some academic writers like [Davidov \(2005\)](#) have argued that subordination should not

only be considered as the absence of autonomy but also as a legal concept that requires the availability of labor law protection to be justified. Positions close to this one are expressed in [Al-Manasir \(2019\)](#) and [Karim \(2022\)](#), who jointly support that digital transformation brings forth the necessity for new perspective on control and dependency in labor relations.

Theological perspectives view subordination as a legal instrument that ensures fairness, accountability, and the provisioning of statutory safeguards for dependent workers. Such reconceptualization is in line with the civil law traditions which regard subordination as a hierarchical institutional relationship with mutual obligations rather than just a temporary state of operations.

Over the years, the understanding of subordination in labor relations has changed from a mere concept of control over workers to a view of the workers' entire organizational power. Though the workers might still possess autonomy in their roles over the methods they apply or the timing they choose, all these happen within structures created by the management, and these could be the algorithmic structures that control the way workers act and the results they get ([Rosenblat & Stark, 2016](#)). In empirical studies conducted by [Jeske \(2022\)](#) and [ILO \(2020\)](#), it was found that algorithmic supervision is one of the most significant components of modern employment control. The very supervision that the workers are subjected to today comes mainly through digital systems that manage their activities, the data they produce, and the way they communicate, thus, making algorithmic governance the most important representation of the power that the managers have.

The ability to shift concepts is very important in today's world where tasks are being done in new unconventional ways where the presence of the workers or direct interaction with them is not necessary, but the managers are still having control through the use of technology. If we look at it from a reflective point of view, one can say that subordination is both a descriptive test of control and a doctrinal lens through which the dynamic of the worker-manager relationship is viewed. It is through technological mediation where the meanings of control and dependence are being constantly re-negotiated, thus showing that subordination is a doctrine that lives and flourishes by adapting to the changing circumstances and the digital and algorithmic transformations in the employment relations.

The remote working system has put the traditional legal concepts of visibility, temporality, and spatiality of control to the test. [Countouris and De Stefano \(2023a\)](#) claim that the legal parameter of a subordinate relationship should change in order to include digitally mediated supervision in noncentralized work areas. The conduct of control through fixed hours, physical presence, or visible oversight is becoming increasingly insufficient considering that digital interfaces impose hierarchical authority through algorithmic tools and remote platforms. According to [Porter \(2023\)](#), legal tests that focus on temporal and spatial control are also failing in hybrid work scenarios.

[Adăscăliței and Riso \(2024\)](#) and [Jeske \(2022\)](#) have pointed out similar trends where the intensity of monitoring and the workers' perception depend more on the design of the platform than on the location. The use of software-based task allocation, cloud-time tracking, and performance dashboards leads to new surveillance methods that are powerful enough to digitally replicate hierarchical authority. These changes reveal that the doctrinal assumptions regarding the presence of management are not adequate for legal classification anymore; hence, digital supervision should be regarded as a change in the control concept.

The proof from empirical studies in organizational psychology strongly supports this argument: the application of large-scale or non-transparent electronic surveillance has a negative impact on engagement and trust as well as a positive impact on stress ([Guglielmo, 2024](#); [König, 2025](#)). [Li and Wang \(2024\)](#) categorize monitoring into two types, interactive and unidirectional, and they have

shown that the two types have different impacts on efficacy and anxiety. When the privacy policy is very strict, monitoring is more accepted; when there are no regulatory policies, monitoring causes alienation (Ball, 2021).

The International Labour Organization (ILO,2020) concurs that teleworking without regulations increases managers' power and makes it harder to obtain the legal protection required. The law should not only take into account control's existence but also its aim, proportionality, and legitimacy while defining supervision.

Comparative analysis provides a clearer view of these changes. In accordance with UAE Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021, remote work is acknowledged, but the law does not express which digital supervision still equates with the inferior position of the worker.

Judicially speaking, the labor courts of the UAE would adopt the principle of electronic subordination to be the subject of Article 10(4) of Cabinet Decision No. 1 of 2022 (United Arab Emirates, 2022). The provision in the decision acknowledges teleworking "under employer supervision" and thus gives the judges the power to consider digital performance management, productivity tracking, or virtual attendance tools as signs of employer authority. If the courts choose to interpret the law in this way, they could offer statutory rights such as wage guarantee, working-hours control, and disciplinary measures to the employees who are monitored remotely. Such a move would bring UAE judicial practice closer to the French Cour de Cassation's functional approach under Article L1222-9 of the Code du Travail, thereby enhancing the doctrinal continuity among different civil law jurisdictions.

A purposive interpretation indicates that the control of the employer through surveillance by means of issued tools such as time trackers or performance portals is still substantial. This is in harmony with French labor law Code du Travail Art. L1222-9, which recognizes the employer's right to organize, give instruction and evaluate the worker's performance irrespective of distance (France, 2023). The example of Al-Manasir (2019) and Countouris and De Stefano (2023b) is very telling; such purposive interpretation is indeed a bridge between Emirati and European labor standards. The opponents of the view might say that digital control lacks the nature of direct control, yet the jurisprudence of the EU is indicative that even the indirect supervision entails the establishment of subordination where employees must submit the tasks under defined conditions. Jordan's Flexible Work Regulation No. 44 of 2024) Jordan, 2024), on the other hand, recognizes the remote working but is silent on the standards for electronic control.

From a pointing out differences point of view, the level of enforcement is quite different in the three systems. The European Union, influenced by the GDPR and national labor inspectorates, places binding proportionality and transparency obligations on employers (Adăscăliței & Riso, 2024). Similarly, the French labor inspectorate carries out workplace inspections and penalizes unauthorized monitoring (France, 2019). On the other hand, the UAE counts mainly on contractual disclosure and post-complaint resolution, while Jordan's regulation is mostly limited to administrative actions within the Ministry of Labour. These dissimilarities point out that the Emirati rules are undergoing a big change, raised to the level of the European standards as to their substance but still not fully incorporated in the procedures, therefore it is unavoidable to set up formal enforcement mechanisms that will be at least comparable to those in the EU and French models.

The normative gap that often appears in the case of digital economies under development brings about the need for doctrinal evolution, not the creation of empirical certainty, which is the main argument of this paper. Supporting this reading are empirical studies, such as Smite et al. (2025) who concluded that "location of work" decisions are still looked upon as being the employer's prerogative,

whereas [Matyjas-Łysakowska and Kyselova \(2024\)](#) noticed that Poland and Ukraine are redefining subordination to involve remote control without surrendering the right to enforce. These comparative findings are in line with [Karim's \(2022\)](#) early regional analyses who pointed out that Arab jurisdictions need to reform labor concepts in accordance with the reality of algorithmic supervision. All these factors together create a scenario in which electronic subordination is recognized as a common doctrinal denominator, and it is still explicitly or implicitly acknowledged by different legal systems.

The use of such technologies has indeed caused the intense legal and ethical debate surrounding digital surveillance tools like keystroke recording, webcam monitoring, and GPS tracking to a large extent. Such technologies can pose issues on privacy, autonomy, and even psychological well-being, all the while increasing productivity ([Ball, 2021](#)).

The literature both from academia and regulation observes that the legal frameworks are always one step behind technological advancements. As a result, employers find themselves in a situation of legal uncertainty while their employees suffer from intrusive algorithmic monitoring that lacks clear statutory boundaries ([Felix, 2023](#)). Both [Jeske \(2022\)](#) and [ILO \(2020\)](#) have reported on this regulatory delay, and they have called on governments to refresh the privacy rules for teleworkers.

To tackle the issue of electronically observed but managerial independent work, some European jurisdictions have created intermediary categories, such as “dependent contractors” or “relationships of subjection”. Nevertheless, such classifications are still missing in Gulf countries like UAE and Jordan, where courts are still applying the strict differentiation between employee and contractor ([Dvouletý & Nikulin, 2023](#)). In the UAE, Federal Decree-Law No. 45 of 2021 on Personal Data Protection is the law that stipulates emphasis on consent, transparency, and purpose limitation. When this is viewed together with the EU's GDPR, this alignment highlights the notion that monitoring must be necessary, clear, and reasonable.

In particular, article 2 of Federal Decree Law No. 45 of 2021 echoes GDPR Articles 5 and 6 by insisting on legitimate, open, and restricted-purpose processing of personal information. Hence, UAE regulators might appeal to the European courts' decisions, like [Barbulescu v. Romania \(ECtHR, 2017\)](#), to clarify the conditions of proportionality and employee-consent. This similarity in legal comparison emphasizes that the UAE's data protection law can still be considered to offer the same high level of protection if viewed through a rights-based perspective in court.

The right to a worker's dignity and privacy continues to be the paramount consideration that electronic monitoring cannot legally override. Therefore, the consideration of remote control being lawful has to go hand in hand with the rights mentioned above. Staff control and personal data protection do not oppose each other but instead they coexist; if monitoring is very heavy or done in a secretive way, it would be contrary to the legal privacy rights and control would be rendered ineffective.

The legal implications of electronic hierarchy affect the classification of workers, their responsibilities, and management. Electronic subordination has become important in law as courts are increasingly facing remote-work classification conflicts. Employment in both France and the UAE is determined more by control and economic ties than by the actual work done. The use of digital tools provided by the employer, performance evaluation, and the possibility of disciplinary action are all signs of employer-employee relationship. This argument is similar to the French Cour de Cassation and the EU Court of Justice, which maintain that the true nature of the relationship should be considered rather than the legal form.

Jeske (2022) and the ILO (2020) have also pointed out similar functional reasoning in terms of accountability in virtual employment relations. Such an understanding of the functions ensures that electronic monitoring does not result in the classifying of remote workers as independent contractors just because of spatial flexibility. Misclassification leads to the erosion of workers' rights and puts employers at risk of retroactive liability. Electronic monitoring, regardless of the technology used, keeps the subordinate character of the relationship. Consequently, labor law shifts its approach to technological mediation but still relies on its protective rationale.

Doctrinal reinterpretation should also cover liability at the workplace in the context of remote working. To illustrate, French legislation sees work-related incidents during remote work that is authorized as liable for compensation (France, 2001). There are no such provisions in the Emirati law directly comparable, but by legalizing telecommuting, the employers are, so to say, extending their protection, and hence, liability, to remote workers, who now work in the employers' unofficial premises. It can be inferred that if the concept of employer responsibility is applied, then incidents happening during remote work with the permission of the employer and within official hours should be recognized as liable for compensation. That being said, the courts in the UAE have not yet articulated this stance; rather, the uncertainty reflects a labor law phase where the interpretation must come first and lead to the creation of new laws that will ensure that the legal framework is updated with the new developments in the digital world. The interpretation given is congruent with Adăscăliței and Riso's (2024) observation that working from home involves liability issues that remain unaddressed and thus require the intervention of the legislatures for clarification.

For management, the consequences are also very important. HR departments are required to set the limits and the validity of digital monitoring by means of transparent governance mechanisms. Employment contracts need to clearly define lawful surveillance practices and state the reasons, time, and technical means used. Good communication not only helps to comply with data protection rules but also establishes trust between employers and employees. The aforementioned measures are in conformity with the principles of lawfulness, openness, and proportionality (Peiró et al., 2024). In agreement with Whitsitt (2025) and the American Bar Association (2018), revealing monitoring arrangements brings about accountability and increases legitimacy of the organization as it turns compliance into a pillar of ethical governance. The ILO (2020) additionally suggests that open digital-monitoring systems are not only productive but also mentally safe, thus corroborating the practicality of these legal recommendations.

Theoretical integration proposed in this research shows that electronic subordination is a doctrinal development rather than a conceptual break. It is the interpretative flexibility of civil-law systems which is mainly responsible for it, as at times judicial reasoning is ahead of the law. Electronic subordination is synonymous with traditional management structures, the only condition being that the employers observe the law on data handling and the risk management protocols.

An accurately designed digital management system can meet the necessary requirements for supervising and ensuring correct classification of employees, as well as maintaining protection in telecommuting environments. The critique unmasks the ambiguous character of subordination, re-evaluates the point where workers' rights and data privacy meet, and analyses the legal results of remote working. It gives thereby a consistent picture of technology-supported employment that does not overstep the rights of workers. This is in line with the comparative insights of the European Trade Union Confederation et al. (2022) Framework Agreement on Telework, which also advocates for equal oversight and worker protection in remote work scenarios.

Empirical evidence shows that hierarchical power still works in distant party situations. [Rosenblat and Stark's \(2016\)](#) investigation shows that visual supervision control is still there and even surpasses it due to algorithmic architecture, performance metrics, and closed management systems. This gives powerful evidence to the argument of the study that technology through digital channels feeds hierarchical power and hence continues the doctrinal validation of subordination.

The same trends can be observed in the UAE, which is a clear indication of the need to quickly revise labor doctrines in order to detect remote employment structures and to provide workers with legal protection. [Countouris and De Stefano \(2023a, 2023b\)](#) characterize this situation as “contractual distancing,” in which the authority of the employers is exerted through digital means instead of being directly supervised. Also, [Smite et al. \(2025\)](#) find out that even in flexible arrangements, the employer has the power to decide when and how the work is done. The [ILO's \(2020\)](#) global observations that remote work does not end power imbalances but rather shifts them into algorithmic systems are echoed in these findings.

[König, 2025](#) brings forward comprehensive meta-analytic proof from a psychological standpoint that electronic monitoring, despite being very efficient, causes stress and takes away the user's authority. [Li and Wang \(2024\)](#) make a differentiation between interactive and passive monitoring and state that only the former increases engagement. [Guglielmo \(2024\)](#) establish a connection between digital monitoring and job burnout, while [Glavin et al. \(2024\)](#) claim that heavy supervision has a negative impact on the overall quality of life. [Sum et al. \(2024\)](#) uncover fresh varieties of employee defiance that are gradually gaining ground. The mentioned papers, taken together, highlight the necessity to strike a compromise between the observance and safeguard of human dignity and the maintenance of high efficiency. [Jeske \(2022\)](#) has shown the presence of these psychosocial impacts during the periods of teleworking that were enforced by the pandemic, thereby emphasizing the need for legal proportionality standards. Taking these understandings and revelations together with the labor-law paradigm requires the creation of a mediating doctrine that will align efficiency with dignity and place the empirical realities into the normative reasoning.

The study utilizes multiple research methods of doctrinal analysis, comparative reasoning, and interdisciplinary evidence, thereby adopting a multi-faceted academic approach. It does not stop at the traditional doctrinal inquiry; rather, it goes further by taking the contemporary work realities into account and at the same time recognizing its interpretative limitation, the lack of empirical or judicial case data, which is especially true for the UAE context where published labor jurisprudence is still very limited. To the contrary, the next studies are to put such theoretical claims into an empirical test by looking at the ways digital surveillance is being used in the Emirati organizations, the ways courts are interpreting the electronic oversight, and the ways comparative fieldwork across Gulf and European jurisdictions is disclosing enforcement divergences.

Future empirical research can, for instance, carry out pilot examinations with UAE firms that are applying digital-monitoring software or make comparative case studies of labor courts in the UAE, France, and Jordan. The mixed-methods approaches with the combination of the doctrinal review, employer surveys, and semi-structured interviews with inspectors would confirm the doctrinal propositions that are presented here. This kind of research would give a solid foundation for evidence-based policymaking and allow for the bridging of the gap between theoretical labor jurisprudence and actual enforcement ([ILO, 2020](#); [Adăscăliței & Riso, 2024](#))

One of the ways to get more light on the electronic subordination's moral and cultural issues is to conduct interdisciplinary studies that combine law, sociology, and information ethics. The [ILO](#)

(2020) and Adăscăliței and Riso (2024) stress that empirical validation is indispensable for turning doctrinal theory into labor-governance standards that can be enforced.

UAE policymakers could embed digital-supervision standards in the executive regulations under Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021 to make these findings reformable. After looking at the 2002 EU Framework Agreement on Telework and France's decree No. 2020-524, regulators should: (a) require written telework agreements indicating monitoring tools allowed and data-protection measures; (b) demand transparency audits conducted by the Ministry of Human Resources and Emiratization; and (c) set up proportionality benchmarks according to GDPR Article 5 principles. With such harmonization the legal certainty for employers would be guaranteed and workers' rights in digital mediation would be protected.

To sum it up, electronic subordination is the legal and technical tool that guarantees an equitable, accountable, and secure digital working environment. This study has proved that labor law can be modified according to technological transformation not by data growth but by interpretive mixing, thus keeping its normative core during digital evolution through the alignment of theory with policy.

CONCLUSIONS

This research was originally intended to be an examination of the acknowledgment and management of hierarchy, in digitally mediated remote work, by different judicial systems, with the main focus on the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Apart from making clear how different courts set legal frameworks for technology-based workplaces, the study also considered if the control measures that are electronically implemented, like performance-management software and virtual communication protocols, are in line with the legal requirement of subordination in employment relations.

The investigation showed that UAE labor law, although it does not explicitly give a definition for electronic subordination, implicitly recognizes the latter's impact by allowing telework under the supervision of the employer. Found comparisons with France, the EU, and Jordan point to the fact that there is still room for digital mediation to maintain hierarchical authority even when there is no physical closeness. It means that control, rather than the place, is the decisive legal factor to determine employment. The paper thus suggests electronic subordination as a new doctrinal concept that marks the shift of labor law principles towards technology-mediated management.

Technological and organizational change have always been the factors to develop subordination. The study conducted presents a view that digital management reshapes but does not eliminate managerial power. The courts in the UAE might interpret Article 10(4) of Cabinet Decision No. 1 of 2022, which acknowledges remote work "under employer supervision," as a legal pathway to extend labor laws to workers whose activities are monitored electronically. If the court adopts this interpretation, it will be in line with the existing legal principles and at the same time, it will be taking care of the current use of virtual supervision.

Emirati legislators, from a policy point of view, need to reinforce the judicial approach with the inclusion of clear provisions for digital supervision in the executive regulations of Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021. The provisions could: (a) specify the monitoring tools that are allowed and set limits for data retention; (b) call for transparency notices that are in line with Federal Decree Law No. 45 of 2021 governing Personal Data Protection; and (c) synchronize enforcement actions with GDPR-like proportionality tests that are used in France and the EU. By implementing such measures, privacy would be protected but at the same time legal managerial control would be possible.

The discussion indicates that monitoring too much or doing it secretly is a sure way to infringe upon the rights of people to be treated with dignity and to have their personal data kept private. So, the UAE regulators, for instance, the Ministry of Human Resources and Emiratization, are expected to come up with circulars that explain how far the digital supervision that is allowed goes and at what point it becomes an invasion of privacy using EU case law (e.g., *Barbulescu v. Romania*, 2017) as reference. These interpretive aids would enhance the uniformity of court decisions and assist in bargaining between management's rights and workers' protection.

Moreover, the changing dimension of subordination affects liability in teleworking situations. The French courts have shown that an occupational accident that happened during the time of permitted telework could still be compensated. By analogy, the courts in the UAE could slowly allow an employer to be responsible for injuries occurring when the employee is doing remote work, thus the area of due care would be expanded beyond the physical place of work.

The need for policymakers and managers to mix legal compliance with ethical digital-governance practices is clearly shown by the findings. Organizations are expected to set up internal "digital-monitoring charters" that detail the permissible methods of monitoring, the required consent of employees, and adherence to labor as well as data-protection laws. Open and clear communication regarding the reasons for surveillance builds trust and lowers the risk of legal action.

This research, despite presenting a strong doctrinal and comparative structure, still suffers the drawback of its non-empirical nature. Subsequent research should encompass small-scale studies to see how UAE companies put electronic supervision into practice and also hold discussions with judges or inspectors to evaluate their ways of interpreting the laws. Additionally, comparative studies across countries would not only confirm the theoretical model of electronic subordination but also contribute to the alignment of policies in the region.

In reflective conclusion, this research reaffirms that subordination continues to be the basis of employment law, even if it takes the forms of digital and algorithmic. Acceptance of electronic surveillance as a proper means of employer authority permits labor law to grow without losing its protective core. By making electronic subordination a norm through the application of the judicial system and changes in legislation, the UAE can guarantee that the future workplace would be characterized by fairness, accountability, and human dignity which, rather than being eroded, would be enhanced through technological innovation.

REFERENCES

- Adăscăliței, D., & Riso, S. (2024). Effects of employee monitoring on remote work: An empirical study from Germany and Spain using AMPWork survey data (2021–2022). *Sinapsi*, 14(2), 93–112. Inapp. <https://oa.inapp.gov.it/handle/20.500.12916/4428>
- Al-Manasir, M. A. H. (2019). The legal system for remote work contracts: A study in comparative law [al-nizām al-qānūnī li-'aqd al-'amal 'an bu'd: dirāsah fī al-qānūn al-muqāran]. *Dirasat: Sharia and Law Sciences*, 46(1). Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://archives.ju.edu.jo/index.php/law/article/view/103631>
- American Bar Association. (2018, January). How much employee monitoring is too much? YourABA. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/publications/youraba/2018/january-2018/how-much-employee-monitoring-is-too-much/>

- Ball, K. (2021). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: Literature review and policy recommendations (JRC125716). Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/5137>
- Countouris, N., & De Stefano, V. (2023a). The future of remote work: Rethinking subordination in the digital age. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4462532
- Countouris, N., & De Stefano, V. (2023b). Out of sight, out of mind? Remote work and contractual distancing. In S. Leonardi, R. Pedersini, & V. De Stefano (Eds.), *The future of remote work* (pp. 147–160). European Trade Union Institute. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from https://www.etui.org/sites/default/files/2023-05/Chapter8-The%20future%20of%20remote%20work_2023.pdf
- Davidov, G. (2005). Who is a worker? *Industrial Law Journal*, 34(1), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ilj/34.1.57>
- Dvouletý, O., & Nikulin, D. (2023). Dependent self-employed individuals: Are they different from paid employees? *Employee Relations*, 45(5), 704–720. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-11-2022-0502>
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). (2017). *Bărbulescu v. Romania* (Application No. 61496/08), Grand Chamber judgment of 5 September 2017. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-177082>
- European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), UNICE/UEAPME, & CEEP. (2002, July 16). Framework agreement on telework. European Trade Union Confederation. <https://resourcecentre.etuc.org/agreement/framework-agreement-telework>
- Felix, B., Dourado, D., & Nossa, V. (2023). Algorithmic management, preferences for autonomy/security and gig-workers' wellbeing: A matter of fit? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1088183. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1088183>
- France. (2001). Code du travail – Article L411-1 (Version en vigueur du 20 février 2001 au 1 mai 2008). Legifrance. Retrieved November 3, 2025, from https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000006649567
- Glavin, P., Bierman, A., & Schieman, S. (2024). Private eyes, they see your every move: Workplace surveillance and worker well-being. *Social Currents*, 11(4), 327–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294965241228874>
- Guglielmo, M. (2024). Electronic monitoring and the role of perceived purpose on employee motivation, satisfaction, and engagement and their ultimate impact on turnover intention and counterproductive work behaviors for remote workers in the U.S. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida International University). Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://business.fiu.edu/academics/graduate/doctor-of-business-administration/docs/2024/michael-guglielmo-etc.pdf>
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (2020). Teleworking during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond: A practical guide. ILO. Teleworking during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond :

[United Arab Emirates. \(2022\)](#). Cabinet Decision No. 1 of 2022 on the Executive Regulations of Federal Decree-Law No. 33 of 2021 on the Regulation of Labour Relations, Art. 10(4) (3 January 2022). Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://uaelegislation.gov.ae/en/legislations/1547/download>

[Whitsitt, T. \(2025, May 14\)](#). Legal considerations around remote work policies. Vault. Retrieved October 30, 2025, from <https://vault.com/blogs/vaults-law-blog-legal-careers-and-industry-news/legal-considerations-around-remote-work-policies>

FINANCING

Research hasn't received any financing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

CONTRIBUTION AND CREDIT

- Conceptualization, ideas, and evolution of the design of the work: Mohammad Khamaysa
- Collection, review, and analysis of data or categories: Mohammad Khamaysa, Ghazi Ayed Alghathian, Murad Altarawneh
- Writing and presentation of the article: Mohammad Khamaysa, Murad Altarawneh
- Critical review of the content of the manuscript: Ghazi Ayed Alghathian

BIODATA

Mohammad Khamaysa

Ph.D. in Law. Assistant Professor of Civil Law, Faculty of Law, Abu Dhabi University, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Former faculty member at the Faculty of Law, Applied Science University, Bahrain. Research interests include commercial law, artificial intelligence in commercial transactions, electronic agents, consumer protection, and comparative law. Publications available in *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities and Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*.

Ghazi Ayed Alghathian

Ph.D. in Law (Egypt). Lecturer in Private Law, School of Law, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Promoted to Lecturer rank on 19 February 2023. Research interests include private law, intellectual property, and civil liability. Publications available at the University of Jordan profile.

Murad Altarawneh

Ph.D. in Law and Assistant Professor of Private Law at the Faculty of Law, Abu Dhabi University, UAE. His research interests include civil law, commercial law, employment contracts, contractual liability, and comparative legal studies. His publications include *The Impossibility of Implementing Employment Contract and Consequential Impacts in the Bahraini Labor Law: Comparative Study and Contractual Liability on Credit Card Issue in Bahraini Civil Law: Comparative Study*.