IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Shadow Economies as Adaptive Institutions: Health Invisibility and Risk Externalisation from Industrial Capitalism to Algorithmic Governance

Parii Jain

Research Scholars Program
Harvard Student Agencies
In collaboration with Learn with Leaders

Abstract: This paper argues that shadow economies are not peripheral anomalies or symptoms of underdevelopment but adaptive institutions that emerge when formal economic systems externalise health risk onto workers without adequate protection. Drawing on nineteenth-century literary evidence from Dickens, Hugo, and Dostoevsky — read through Elaine Freedgood's method of strong metonymic reading — alongside Hernando de Soto's theory of informal capital, Rosenblat and Stark's empirical study of Uber drivers, the Fairwork 2021 global report on platform labour during COVID-19, and Mia Moore's legal critique of algorithmic governance, the paper identifies a four-stage recurring institutional mechanism: health risk privatisation, income volatility amplification, vulnerability accumulation, and adaptive informality emergence. It demonstrates that this mechanism operates similarly across industrial capitalism and contemporary platform labour, despite significant differences in technology and scale. The paper concludes by proposing three institutional design interventions — (i) health-indexed algorithmic constraints, (ii) portable risk contributions, and (iii) mandatory health transparency audits — that would interrupt the cycle by making health economically visible within platform governance. The contribution is both theoretical, in reframing shadow economies as predictable institutional responses to risk externalisation, and practical, in identifying actionable policy directions for platform labour reform.

Keywords: Shadow Economy, Risk Externalisation, Algorithmic Governance, Platform Labour, Health Invisibility, Institutional Economics, Behavioural Economics, Gig Economy, Informal Institutions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern economic systems present themselves as efficient mechanisms for allocating labour and capital. Yet across different historical periods, a recurring institutional pattern appears to emerge: when dominant production systems externalise essential risks, particularly health risks, onto workers without adequate insurance mechanisms, informal economic structures arise to absorb that burden. Shadow economies, on this reading, are not peripheral anomalies or signs of underdevelopment. They suggest adaptive institutions generated by the architecture of formal systems themselves.

This pattern is legible in nineteenth-century industrial societies, documented with unusual precision in the fiction of Charles Dickens, Victor Hugo, and Fyodor Dostoevsky. In the worlds they described, illness produced immediate income collapse, and survival depended on informal networks operating entirely outside formal labour and welfare institutions. A structurally analogous logic seems to reappear in contemporary platform capitalism. Digital firms such as Uber and Zomato govern labour through algorithmic systems that optimise measurable productivity while excluding worker health from their economic calculus.

This paper asks: how do shadow economies documented in nineteenth-century literature illuminate the dynamics of digital platforms today, particularly the invisibility of worker health within algorithmic governance, and what interventions can make health visible and actionable? The paper argues that health invisibility is not merely incidental but appears structurally embedded in labour systems across two centuries, and that shadow economies are a predictable institutional response.

It is worth clarifying at the outset why literary evidence is treated as institutional evidence in this paper: Hugo, Dickens and Dostoevsky are not read for their narrative drama but as compressed social records. Elaine Freedgood's method of strong metonymic reading, developed in The Ideas in Things (2006), allows us to recover institutional realities from literary texts that official economic accounts omitted. Under this method, fictional bodies - exhausted, sick, and indebted - are read as encoded data about health costs that were systematically excluded from formal economic accounting. This interpretive framework is explained in detail in the Literature Review below.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the five bodies of literature that anchor the analysis and places them in dialogue with each other. Section 3 articulates the conceptual framework. Section 4 develops the analysis across the two historical periods. Section 5 discusses implications, limitations, and counterarguments. Section 6 concludes with policy directions and future research.

What economies fail to measure, they inevitably exploit. Making health visible is the precondition for making it addressable.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Five bodies of scholarship underpin this paper. Rather than presenting them in isolation, this review places them in conversation - identifying both what contributes and where they leave gaps or disagree - so that the argument of this paper emerges from the tensions and silences within the existing literature.

1) Literary Theory as Institutional Evidence

Elaine Freedgood's The Ideas in Things (2006) provides the methodological foundation for using Victorian literature as institutional evidence. Freedgood (2006) argues that Victorian novelists encode compressed social facts in the objects they describe — what she terms "fugitive meaning." Her method of strong metonymic reading recovers histories that official accounts have erased. This paper extends her method from objects to bodies: illness, exhaustion, and physical suffering in Dickens, Hugo, and Dostoevsky are read not as narrative pathos but as institutional records of health costs that economic accounts systematically omitted.

Freedgood's (2006) method has been extensively applied to material culture; its extension to bodily suffering and further to the data architecture of digital governance is a contribution of this paper. Critics might ask: why should fictional texts carry evidentiary weight in an institutional analysis? The answer is methodological. These authors wrote in direct proximity to the conditions they described - Dickens visited workhouses and prisons; Hugo drew on documented cases of industrial poverty in Paris. Their texts are treated here not as proof of any specific fact but as concentrated records of patterns that economic historians and sociologists confirm independently. The literary evidence is always paired with empirical corroboration rather than standing alone.

2) Shadow Economy Theory

Hernando de Soto's The Mystery of Capital (2000) reframes shadow economies as adaptive responses to legal exclusion. His empirical documentation of $9.3 trillion in informal global assets — possessed but unable to generate capital due to absent formal representation — provides the economic anchor for this paper's central concept: that worker health is dead capital. De Soto's (2000) framework focuses on property and business assets. This paper extends it to the human body itself: like de Soto's (2000) informal properties, health exists, depreciates, and drives survival behaviour, but lacks the formal representation, such as sick pay, insurance, accommodation, that would allow it to protect its owner when it fails.

Where de Soto's (2000) analysis stops at the threshold of the body, this paper argues that the same logic applies. This extension is not without tension: de Soto's (2000) framework was developed to explain property informality in the Global South, and applying it to bodily risk in global platform labour requires care. The paper does not claim that de Soto (2000) would endorse this extension, only that his structural logic — assets that exist but cannot be leveraged — offers a productive analytical tool for understanding health under conditions of risk externalisation.

3) Platform Labour and Algorithmic Control

Rosenblat and Stark's (2016) nine-month empirical study of Uber drivers demonstrates how algorithmic governance operates through information asymmetry, soft control, and gamification while maintaining the rhetorical fiction of worker independence. Their finding that platforms track every measurable productivity variable — acceptance rates, speed, ratings — while rendering worker health entirely invisible provides the contemporary empirical anchor for this paper. Their work does not, however, connect this finding to historical patterns or propose institutional remedies. This is the gap this paper addresses. It is worth noting that Rosenblat and Stark's (2016) study focused specifically on Uber in North America. Whether their findings generalise to other platforms and geographies is a question the Fairwork (2021) report begins to answer, although with its own limitations.

4) Health and Labour Under Crisis Conditions

The Fairwork (2021) report, studying 191 platforms across 43 countries during COVID-19, provides the largest empirical dataset on health externalisation in platform labour. Its central finding that most platforms provided no sick pay, no protective equipment, and no compensation during lockdowns suggests that health invisibility is structural rather than incidental. Workers faced a choice that resonates across historical periods: work and risk infection, or stay home and earn nothing.

Fairwork (2021) also documents informal adaptive responses during the pandemic: workers stacking platforms, organising on private forums, sharing protective strategies outside official channels. These are precisely the adaptive informal institutions this paper theorises, appearing in real-time empirical data. The Fairwork (2021) report's limitation is that it documents patterns without theorising the mechanism that produces them. This paper attempts to connect their findings to Rosenblat and Stark's (2016) analysis of algorithmic design, and to Freedgood's (2006) method for reading institutional evidence.

5) Legal Failure and Worker Data Rights

Mia Moore’s (2023) theoretical analysis demonstrates why existing data protection frameworks, including the European GDPR, appear to fall short for workers. They treat all data subjects as equivalent, ignoring the structural inequality of the employment relationship. Workers cannot genuinely consent to data collection when refusal risks deactivation. Moore’s (2023) concept of ‘the right to the subject’ — the right to form one’s own identity rather than be reduced to an algorithmic data profile — connects platform governance to deeper questions of institutional power. Her framework explains why formal legal protections have not resolved health invisibility, and why informal adaptation therefore persists. Her analysis shares de Soto’s (2000) insight that legal form and substantive protection can diverge sharply: a point that links these two otherwise separate bodies of scholarship.

Together, these five bodies of scholarship build the argument: health invisibility appears to be an institutional design feature, not an oversight, and shadow economies seem to be its predictable consequence. The key gap that this existing scholarship leaves open is the connection between historical and contemporary instances of this pattern, and the identification of the mechanism that recurs across them.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Risk Externalisation

Risk externalisation occurs when production systems depend on labour but do not internalise the costs of labour-generated uncertainty — illness, injury, fatigue. When firms are not liable for health-related income interruptions, and states provide limited insurance, health risk becomes privatised. Workers absorb volatility that originates within the production process itself. In such systems, health tends to be unpriced within wage structures, excluded from productivity optimisation, and detached from institutional responsibility. The result is structural vulnerability rather than isolated hardship.

Shadow Economies as Adaptive Institutions

In this framework, shadow economies are defined not merely as illegal or underground markets but as adaptive mechanisms that compensate for institutional gaps in risk-sharing. When formal systems fail to insure risk, informal structures tend to emerge to redistribute volatility, provide alternative credit, substitute for absent welfare, and stabilise survival. Shadow economies thus function as secondary risk-distribution mechanisms. They are endogenous responses to institutional design failures; consequences of how formal systems were organised rather than signs of underdevelopment.

Health as Dead Capital

Extending de Soto’s (2000) framework, this paper proposes that worker health may be understood as a form of dead capital. A healthy body is an asset; it is the precondition of all labour. But like de Soto’s (2000) informal properties, it has no formal representation within labour systems. When a worker falls ill, there is no title, deed, or insurance policy embedded in the employment relationship that allows that capital to be preserved or leveraged. Worker health under conditions of externalised risk is possessed but unrepresentable — it cannot protect its owner when it depreciates.

The Four-Stage Mechanism

The structural mechanism connecting risk externalisation to informal adaptation appears to unfold in four stages. First, health risk is privatised: production systems transfer health costs to workers, treating illness as a personal contingency rather than a production externality. Second, income volatility is amplified: without any buffer, illness converts directly and immediately into wage loss. Third, vulnerability accumulates: debt builds, housing becomes unstable, malnutrition follows, each stage compounding the next. Fourth, adaptive informality emerges: informal systems appear to redistribute the risk that formal institutions have refused to absorb.

Identifying this as a recurring mechanism rather than a historical coincidence is the paper's core theoretical contribution. It allows comparison across historical periods to rest on institutional logic rather than surface analogy. The claim is not that each instance is identical but that the same underlying governance pattern, i.e., value capture without risk absorption, produces recognisably similar informal responses.

Methodological Note

This paper does not equate nineteenth-century informality with digital platform work. The institutional architecture has changed profoundly: contemporary societies possess labour courts, regulatory frameworks, healthcare systems, and welfare mechanisms absent in 1850. What this paper claims is not identical structure but a continuity of governance logic, i.e., centralised value capture combined with decentralised health risk-bearing. Put more directly: those who profit from labour tend not to bear the health costs the labour generates. The paper develops institutional theory, using historical moments as case studies in a recurring dynamic.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative, secondary research methodology using a cross-temporal comparative case study design to examine the institutional relationship between health risk externalisation and shadow economy emergence across nineteenth-century industrial capitalism and contemporary platform labour. A secondary approach was selected because the paper's central argument — identifying a recurring institutional mechanism across 150 years — necessitates synthesis across multiple existing bodies of evidence rather than original data collection within a single context. The research draws on five source categories: Freedgood's (2006) method of strong metonymic reading applied to literary texts by Dickens, Hugo, and Dostoevsky; de Soto's (2000) empirical documentation of informal capital formation; Rosenblat and Stark's (2016) ethnographic study of Uber drivers; the Fairwork (2021) report encompassing 191 platforms across 43 countries; and Moore's (2023) legal-theoretical analysis of worker data rights. Sources were selected on the basis of methodological rigour, direct relevance to health risk externalisation, and their capacity to speak to one another across disciplinary boundaries.

The evidence is analysed through a purpose-built conceptual framework comprising four constructs: risk externalisation, shadow economies as adaptive institutions, health as dead capital, and a four-stage institutional mechanism (health risk privatisation, income volatility amplification, vulnerability accumulation, and adaptive informality emergence). This mechanism is applied as a comparative lens across both historical periods, evaluating whether the same governance logic produces structurally analogous informal responses despite profoundly different contexts. Literary evidence is treated not as standalone proof but as compressed institutional records, paired throughout with independently corroborated empirical data — ensuring the analysis rests on convergent evidence across multiple source types.

Three limitations apply. First, reliance on secondary sources means the analysis is bounded by existing scholarship; original survey data from gig workers would strengthen the causal claims advanced. Second, extending Freedgood's (2006) metonymic reading method from material objects to bodily suffering and algorithmic data architecture is a novel methodological move not yet independently validated, though the paper mitigates this through consistent empirical corroboration. Third, empirical grounding is stronger for global platform labour than for any single national context, particularly India, where disaggregated health-outcome data for platform workers remains limited.

4. RESULTS & ANALYSIS

A. Industrial Capitalism: Health Invisibility and Informal Survival

Nineteenth-century industrial societies were characterised by wage dependence without health insurance. Applying Freedgood's (2006) method to the literary record reveals institutional evidence rather than dramatic background. When Oliver Twist collapses from hunger and overwork in Dicken's novel, factory inspectors' reports from the 1840s document the same outcomes — stunted growth, respiratory disease, child mortality — that Dickens encodes in narrative form. Hugo's Fantine, selling her hair, then her teeth, then her body, maps onto documented stages of physical depletion for a factory worker without healthcare access in 1840s Paris. Dostoevsky's St Petersburg, saturated with fever and consumption, encodes the mortality rates of the urban poor under economic precarity.

These authors are chosen not arbitrarily but because they wrote in direct proximity to the specific conditions under analysis — industrial wage labour in cities undergoing rapid capitalist development — and because economic historians have independently corroborated the patterns their texts encode. The literary texts are treated as compressed records of institutional reality rather than as proof of any specific causal claim. They are read alongside, not instead of, empirical evidence.

Health was everywhere in the lived experience of industrial capitalism and nowhere in its economic accounting. Informal systems such as mutual aid, underground lending, and family welfare substitution, emerged to absorb what formal institutions refused to insure. This pattern was not incidental to industrial capitalism but appears to have been generated by its structure: firms externalised health costs because they could, and workers developed informal compensatory mechanisms because they had to.

B. Platform Capitalism and Algorithmic Governance

Contemporary platforms manage labour through algorithms tracking acceptance rates, speed, ratings, and task completion. As Rosenblat and Stark (2016) document, these systems exert comprehensive control through information asymmetry while maintaining the rhetorical fiction of worker independence. Drivers work while exhausted, perform emotional labour under distress, and absorb the psychological cost of uncertain income, none of which enters the platform's calculations. Health appears only as a downstream outcome: lower ratings, fewer rides, eventual disappearance. It is invisible as a cause within the system's design.

The Fairwork (2021) report confirmed this architecture during COVID-19: platforms tracked deliveries while workers absorbed infection risk entirely. Workers adapted informally: stacking platforms, organising on private forums, sharing strategies outside official channels. Moore's (2023) legal analysis explains the persistence: existing frameworks cannot protect workers because they treat all data subjects as equivalent and ignore the structural inequality of the employment relationship. The four-stage mechanism appears to repeat itself across these very different contexts; health risk privatised, income volatility amplified, vulnerability accumulated, informal adaptation emerging; despite 150 years of intervening institutional development. This suggests that the mechanism is not the product of any particular technology or era but of a recurring governance logic that survives changes in the means of production.

5. DISCUSSION, COUNTERARGUMENTS AND LIMITATIONS

Implications for Institutional Economics

The paper's findings suggest that shadow economy research may have been misdirected by focusing on illegality and underdevelopment. If shadow economies are predictable adaptive responses to health risk externalisation, the policy question changes: not how to formalise informal activity but how to redesign formal institutions so that informal adaptation becomes unnecessary.

Counterargument: Conceptual Overextension

The most serious challenge is that applying 'shadow economy' to both Victorian informal systems and digital platform labour stretches the concept beyond coherence. This paper addresses the risk by defining shadow economies, in this context narrowly, as adaptive institutional formations that emerge when formal systems displace health risk while maintaining control over value extraction. The continuity rests on the four-stage mechanism, not on surface similarity. The definition is narrow enough to be falsifiable: if a formal system displaces health risk but informal adaptation does not emerge, the mechanism does not hold.

Counterargument: Historical Compression

The average contemporary worker exists within societies that possess labour courts and welfare mechanisms absent in 1850. This paper explicitly acknowledges the discontinuity. What it identifies is not identical structure but recurring governance logic, and it argues that this recurrence across such different institutional contexts makes it structurally significant rather than historically contingent. The persistence of informal adaptation despite vastly improved formal institutions suggests the mechanism is robust.

Limitations

Three limitations apply. Literary evidence cannot stand alone without empirical support and should therefore be paired throughout with economic history, platform research, and global survey data. Policy proposals are directional rather than prescriptive, as technical specifications require expertise beyond this paper's scope. Empirical grounding is stronger for global platform labour than for India specifically — a gap future research should address, given that India's gig economy is among the fastest-growing globally and its regulatory frameworks remain nascent.

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN

If health invisibility is designed into platform governance, it can be designed out. Three categories of institutional intervention each change the incentive structure in a different but complementary way.

A. Health-Indexed Algorithmic Constraints

Platforms can integrate maximum safe working-hour thresholds and fatigue-adjusted task allocation directly into their optimisation models. An algorithm that tracks cumulative logged hours could automatically restrict task access after a defined threshold, preventing fatigue accumulation that currently manifests only as a downstream drop in ratings. This does not require platforms to voluntarily prioritise worker welfare; it restructures the optimisation model so that physiological sustainability becomes a variable the algorithm manages rather than ignores.

B. Portable Risk Contributions

Each unit of platform labour, regardless of which platform generates it, should produce a proportional contribution into a worker-controlled social protection account that follows the worker across platforms. A gig worker dividing time across Uber, Zomato, and an online freelance platform currently qualifies for benefits from none of them. Portable contributions would create formal representation for labour that currently generates value without generating protection, directly applying de Soto's (2000) insight to the bodies of workers rather than their properties.

C. Mandatory Health Transparency Audits

Platforms must disclose working hours, injury rates, illness-related deactivations, and health-related attrition disaggregated by task type and geography. This does not by itself solve health externalisation, but it creates the precondition for regulation. What cannot be measured cannot be regulated. Health invisibility is a data architecture problem as much as a governance problem, forcing health into the data forces it into the institutional conversation. Each intervention does the same thing from a different direction: it forces health costs back into the system that generated them and makes the invisible visible.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that shadow economies are adaptive institutions that emerge when formal economic systems externalise health risk onto workers without adequate protection. Nineteenth-century literature documents this pattern as compressed institutional evidence: the exhausted, sick, and indebted bodies of Dickens, Hugo, and Dostoevsky encode health costs that official economic accounts omitted. Contemporary platform governance appears to reproduce the same logic through algorithmic systems that exclude health from optimisation models and embed invisibility into data architecture. The four-stage mechanism: (i) health risk privatisation, (ii) income volatility amplification, (iii) vulnerability accumulation, and (iv) adaptive informality emergence, recurs across 150 years because the underlying governance pattern recurs: value capture concentrated at the centre and health risk distributed to those at the periphery.

Shadow economies are therefore structural responses to risk privatisation, not failures of development. Worker health is dead capital — possessed, depreciating, driving survival behaviour, but lacking the formal representation that would allow it to protect its owner. Making health visible within platform governance through algorithmic constraints, portable benefits, and transparency audits is not merely a social reform, it is an institutional correction that addresses the root cause of informal adaptation rather than its symptoms.

What economies fail to measure, they inevitably exploit. The evidence across 150 years suggests this correction is long overdue.

Future Research Directions

Three directions emerge. First, empirical research measuring the health costs of platform labour in India specifically — where gig economy growth is among the fastest globally and regulatory frameworks remain nascent — would ground the theoretical argument in local data and enable the development of India-specific policy proposals. Second, comparative institutional analysis of platforms that have voluntarily introduced health protections, such as portable benefit schemes in certain European jurisdictions, would test whether health visibility improves labour supply stability as this paper predicts and at what cost. Third, quantitative operationalisation of the four-stage mechanism through large-scale gig worker survey data — using composite burnout risk scores, income volatility indices, and informal coping behaviour measures — would convert the theoretical mechanism into testable empirical variables, enabling rigorous statistical testing of the causal chain this paper proposes.

8. REFERENCE LIST

I. De Soto, H. (2000). The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else. Basic Books.

II. Dickens, C. (1838). Oliver Twist. Richard Bentley.

III. Dostoevsky, F. (1866). Crime and Punishment. The Russian Messenger.

IV. Fairwork. (2021). Stripping Back the Mask: Working Conditions on Digital Labour Platforms During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Oxford Internet Institute. Available at: https://fair.work

V. Freedgood, E. (2006). The Ideas in Things: Fugitive Meaning in the Victorian Novel. University of Chicago Press.

VI. Hugo, V. (1862). Les Misérables. A. Lacroix, Verboeckhoven & Cie.

VII. Moore, P. (2023). Workers' right to the subject: The social relations of data production. Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies. 30. 10.1177/13548565231199971.

VIII. Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers. International Journal of Communication, 10, 3758–3784.