BALANCING SPEED AND SECURITY: KEY INFLUENCES ON FOOD-DELIVERY PARTNER MORALE

S R LAKSHMI DEVARAKONDA
Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam.
E-Mail: dsrl.1981@yahoo.com

UMA DEVI M
Professor, Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam.
E-Mail: umadevi.dcms@gmail.com

I. ABSTRACT

India's app-based food-delivery surge has transformed mealtime habits, yet evidence on the working lives of delivery partners in medium-sized cities remains scarce. This study assesses overall job satisfaction among 200 delivery partners in Rajamahendravaram by examining six job dimensions: Financial Compensation & Support, Work Flexibility & Operational Pressure, Technological Efficiency & Communication, Personal Safety & Job Security, Delivery Performance & Operational Challenges, and Health, Recognition & Career Aspirations. A 27-item questionnaire was validated through principal-component analysis, which confirmed the four-factor structure and accounted for 68.51 percent of total variance. Multiple regression revealed that every dimension had a significant, positive effect on overall perception, Health, Recognition & Career Aspirations followed by Personal Safety & Job security, Financial Compensation & Support and Work Flexibility & Operational Pressure.

Keywords: #Delivery partners #Job satisfaction #Food-delivery

II. INTRODUCTION

Online food ordering has become woven into daily life across India. Convenience, competitive prices, and fast-growing digital habits drive this change. Statista estimates the country's food-delivery market at US $7.2 billion in 2024 and expects it to expand by about 10 percent each year. The pandemic accelerated adoption as many people turned to contact-free deliveries. Platforms such as Swiggy and Zomato now reach even small towns, bringing a wide range of cuisines through hyper-local networks. Cheap data plans, rising smartphone use, and eye-catching offers—discounts, subscriptions, loyalty points—have pulled in ever more customers. Together these factors blend modern technology with India's long-standing love of good food delivered to the doorstep. Food-delivery firms in India face several linked hurdles. As more diners choose ordering in over eating out, apps must cope with sudden traffic spikes, while small operators struggle to win and keep customers in a fast-changing market. Costs add pressure: ingredient prices rise and fall with inflation, supply swings and policy shifts, forcing

platforms either to lift menu prices or see margins shrink. Keeping food fresh is another test, because meals travel through heat, traffic and delays; temperature swings and varied restaurant standards can spoil quality and hurt a brand's image. At the same time, customers now expect real-time order tracking, instant digital payments, and customised, healthier menus—demands that require heavy spending on technology, logistics and support, and push users to rivals if unmet. High order volumes make safe food handling harder; careless packing or hygiene lapses quickly lead to illness complaints and damaging reviews. Logistics planning is complex too, as hot meals and chilled items must reach homes quickly and at correct temperatures, even during peak traffic or bad weather. Finally, smaller start-ups compete with national giants that enjoy lower unit costs, bigger marketing budgets and wider restaurant networks, making it difficult for newcomers to match prices, secure partnerships or gain visibility.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A rapidly growing body of Scopus-indexed research now sketches an almost 360-degree view of the stresses that frame an Indian (and wider Asian) delivery boy's typical shift. Income instability emerged as the arch-problem. Using three months of transaction traces, Bajaj and Kumar (2023) showed Delhi riders' weekly earnings swung by one-third because surge multipliers and "quest targets" were altered late the previous night; riders who supported families therefore logged on for every surge window, recreating fixed shifts and reporting sleep disruption. The fuel pass-through study by Kumar and Sharma (2022) added another cost dimension: a ₹10-per-litre price jump wiped out four per cent of monthly net pay, forcing twelve-hour days that raised measured cortisol. Even when bonuses were abundant, loyalty remained fragile—Gandhi and Lahiri (2018) recorded an 18 per cent spike in post-campaign churn because riders recalibrated their "fair wage" upward. Where liquidity improved, stress eased: the Jordan study by Al-Qudah et al. (2022) found that instant e-wallet settlement cut pawn-shop borrowing 22 per cent and trimmed voluntary log-offs.Income pressure bled directly into road safety. Drawing on 600 Shanghai questionnaires, Cao et al. (2024) calculated that rider whose households relied on delivery for more than four-fifths of income doubled the rate of speeding and red-light jumps, with police crash logs mirroring the spike. A similar mechanism appeared in Bengaluru: heart-rate-variability dips tracked by Rahman and Nair (2023) coincided with 42 per cent congestion delays yet static pay—evidence that the body literally registers algorithmic mismatch between effort and reward. Infrastructure could partly offset risk. Beijing's protected cycle lanes cut courier collision reports by 26 per cent (Li & Wang, 2022), while Sydney's curb-side "rider hubs" studied by Jones and McNeil (2022) shaved eleven per cent off restaurant wait time by providing legal parking, toilets and USB charging.Physical health burdens ran parallel. Infra-red scans in Mumbai revealed core temperatures ≥38 °C after three hours because 71 per cent of riders avoided drinking water—no toilets were available mid-route (Bhat & Gupta, 2023). Jaipur field tests showed breathable jerseys and algorithm-scheduled water breaks cut heat complaints 33 per cent (Meena & Roy, 2023). Musculoskeletal pain remained endemic—64 per cent prevalence in early Chinese data (Wang & Chen, 2015) and replicated informally by Indian medical camps. Quarterly platform-funded screenings flagged silent hypertension in one rider in five (Vasan & Dey, 2021).Digital systems acted as both help and hazard. When transparent dashboards replaced opaque star

ratings in Seoul, quits fell 12 per cent (Kang & Park, 2017), yet 64 per cent of Indian couriers in Singh and Patel (2021) still could not work out how cancellations hurt scores, breeding what Shetty and Thomas (2023) called "deactivation anxiety." Cheap fixes worked: ten, two-minute vernacular videos improved Chennai recruits' navigation accuracy 18 per cent (Ganesh et al., 2022); Hindi–English audio snippets boosted Ahmedabad riders' ratings within a fortnight (Patel & Sinha, 2023); step-by-step update guides halved support calls from riders aged over forty-five (Oberoi & Jain, 2019). Conversely, Jakarta GPS pin errors—responsible for 14 per cent of late drops—were halved once AI nudged customers to reconfirm addresses (Utami & Choiruddin, 2021).Social protection and identity formed the final layer. Only eight per cent of 280 Bengaluru women who applied actually joined, and those who did earned 22 per cent less because daylight slots received fewer orders (Tripathi et al., 2022). Graduate riders felt equally stalled: two-thirds of the 350 degree holders in Bose and Prasad (2023) expected to quit within a year unless supervisor tracks or skill certificates appeared. Awareness was a hurdle too—just 19 per cent of Bengaluru riders even knew of Karnataka's gig-worker welfare board until an in-app banner lifted registrations twelve points (Joshi & Chatterjee, 2022). Meanwhile, simple human gestures mattered: transparent tip pass-through lifted job-satisfaction scores nine per cent (Iqbal & Bhandari, 2020), and branded reputation itself acted as a "trust wage," extending online hours 11 per cent until one payroll glitch erased goodwill (Al-Hadi & Rahaman, 2022). Large qualitative and survey studies show that opaque digital control sits at the root of many stresses. Sigroha and Kapoor (2024) reveal how dynamic quotas, hidden penalties and one-sided rating systems strip riders of control and create "illusory autonomy" in Indian cities. A China-wide burnout study by Dong, Zhang and Wu (2025) confirms that punishment loops and live tracking intensify emotional exhaustion far more than long hours alone. From a corporate angle, Longoni et al. (2024) find that poor pay and weak rights on six Spanish platforms translate into lower social-sustainability scores, signalling reputational risk for firms that ignore labour standards. A cross-national study by Zhao et al. (2025) links tight algorithmic control to reduced engagement and higher quit intent but shows that well-designed gamified feedback can soften some of the damage.Body-centred evidence is now robust. A Tamil-Nadu cross-section by Benson et al. (2025) finds that 49 % of riders report chronic lower-back pain, strongly predicted by dehydration and ten-hour shifts. Using street-level heat-mapping, Jiang et al. (2024) show that routing riders through shaded corridors and scheduling water breaks can cut cumulative heat strain by 13 %. Taiwan data from Chen (2023) tie work stress directly to risky riding through heightened physiological distraction, while a tri-country accident study by Useche, Robayo and Orozco-Fontalvo (2024) demonstrates that fatigue fully mediates the link between job stressors and crash involvement. Safety research is sharpening the causal chain from pay pressure to crashes. In Vietnam, Nguyen-Phuoc, Truong and Nguyen (2023) show that burnout predicts red-light violations more strongly than delivery-time targets. A Thai decision-tree model by Molo et al. (2024) identifies rain riding, modified bikes and short sleep as the top accident predictors, achieving 66 % classification accuracy. Organisational factors matter too: a 401-rider study links a positive safety climate—clear communication and adequate equipment—to higher compliance scores (Zhang, Li & Hou, 2024). An OSH survey in Milan by Ricci, Ferri and Vignale (2025) flags gaps in protective gear and post-crash medical follow-up. Two further Chinese studies extend

the sequence: labour intensity mediates health decline (Chen et al., 2022), and income dependence raises injury risk via heavier workloads (Jing, Yuru & Zhao, 2023).

IV. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Most past reports focus on Delhi, Mumbai or other very large cities. Mid-tier cities now handle a big share of online orders but lack the same roads, public toilets, and bike lanes. Riders there may face different troubles, yet we have little data. Second, many papers study only one issue—such as pay or safety. A full picture that shows how pay, app design, safety gear, waiting time, and career hopes link together is missing. Third, new social-security rules for gig workers are being planned, but policy makers need proof from smaller cities before setting one-size-fits-all rules. Our survey meets these three needs.

V. RESEARCH GAP

Evidence from tier-II Indian cities is almost absent; only a few earnings figures exist. No study so far has tested six job areas in one model to see which matters most. Also, earlier work notes that riders often want to quit but does not explain which exact factors push them toward that decision. This project fills these three gaps by using a broad, six-factor scale and linking each factor to the rider's total view of the job.

VI. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Food-delivery riders in Rajamahendravaram report long hours, changing pay rules, traffic fines, heat stress and fear of sudden account blocks. At the same time, customers and restaurants rely on their quick service. If rider problems remain unsolved, turnover will rise, orders will slow, and the city's food-tech growth will stall. Managers and city leaders need clear numbers on which job issues hurt rider mood the most so they can act first on high-impact fixes. Without such proof, money and effort may be wasted on low-value changes while real pain points stay open.

VII. METHODOLOGY

Primary Data: Primary data is collected directly from 200 respondents in Rajamahendravaram city.

Secondary Data: Secondary data is collected from various journals, text books and other secondary sources.

Research Objective: The study seeks to evaluate the dimensions Financial Compensation & Support, Work Flexibility & Operational Pressure, Technological Efficiency & Communication, Personal Safety & Job Security, Delivery Performance & Operational Challenges, and Health, Recognition & Career Aspiration on the overall job satisfaction of food-delivery partners.

ANALYTICAL PROCESS

Instrument design and pilot check

The 27-item questionnaire was adapted from earlier studies for research work. A pilot run with 30 delivery partners tested clarity and minor re-phrasing followed. Pilot data produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.74, confirming acceptable reliability before main data collection.

Sampling and data entry

Convenience sampling was adopted for the data collection from 200 respondents. Completed questionnaires were double-entered into SPSS 25 to avoid transcription error and mismatches were checked.

Reliability and sampling adequacy

- For the full sample, Cronbach's alpha reached 0.771, exceeding the 0.70 threshold for social-science scales.
- The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.760, indicating meritorious adequacy for factor analysis.
- Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at $p < 0.001$, showing that the correlation matrix was suitable for dimension reduction.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

- Extraction used Principal Component Analysis.
- Factors with eigenvalues above one and items with loadings ≥ 0.60 were retained.
- Varimax rotation improved interpretability; four clean factors emerged and jointly explained 68.51 per cent of total variance.
- Communality values ranged from 0.591 to 0.864, confirming that all retained items contributed meaningfully.

Regression preparation

- Factor scores were saved as composite variables (HRCA, FCS, WFOP, PSJS).
- Normality of residuals was inspected through P–P plots; no major departure was seen.
- Multicollinearity was checked: VIF values stayed between 1.01 and 1.19, well below the cut-off of 5.
- Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.815 suggested no serial correlation.

Multiple regression test

- Enter method placed all four factors in a single block.
- The model R^2 was 0.724 and adjusted R^2 0.719.
- ANOVA showed $F(4, 195) = 128.11$, $p < 0.001$, confirming joint predictive power.

- Unstandardised coefficients (B) indicated individual contributions: HRCA = 0.318, PSJS = 0.287, FCS = 0.269, WFOP = 0.251.
- Standardised Betas showed relative strength: PSJS strongest (β = 0.450), then FCS (β = 0.423), WFOP (β = 0.382) and HRCA (β = 0.215).

VIII. DATA ANALYSIS

Table No. 1 Case Processing Summary

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	200	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	200	100.0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Table No.2 Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.771	27

INTERPRETATION: The reliability statistics showed a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.771 for the 27 items used in the analysis. This indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency, confirming that the questionnaire items were suitably correlated and reliable for exploratory factor analysis and regression modelling. The scale was therefore considered stable and appropriate for assessing delivery partners' perceptions.

Table No.3 KMO & Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.760
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1037.000
	df	91
	Sig.	.000

INTERPRETATION: The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was 0.760, which falls in the 'meritorious' range, confirming that the sample size was adequate for factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded a chi-square of 1037.000 (df = 91, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the

correlation matrix was significantly different from an identity matrix. Together, these results validated the suitability of the dataset for dimension reduction through factor analysis.

Table No. 4 Communalities

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
FCS3	1.000	.675
FCS4	1.000	.619
FCS5	1.000	.672
FCS6	1.000	.662
WFOP1	1.000	.607
WFOP2	1.000	.728
WFOP3	1.000	.713
PSJS1	1.000	.591
PSJS2	1.000	.670
PSJS3	1.000	.733
HRCA1	1.000	.749
HRCA2	1.000	.678
HRCA3	1.000	.759
HRCA4	1.000	.736
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

Table No. 5 Total Variance Explained

Total Variance Explained									
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.286	23.468	23.468	3.286	23.468	23.468	2.923	20.881	20.881
2	2.907	20.767	44.235	2.907	20.767	44.235	2.599	18.566	39.447
3	2.008	14.344	58.579	2.008	14.344	58.579	2.060	14.715	54.162
4	1.390	9.931	68.510	1.390	9.931	68.510	2.009	14.348	68.510
5	.670	4.788	73.298						
6	.567	4.047	77.345						
7	.537	3.836	81.181						
8	.506	3.612	84.793						
9	.478	3.416	88.210						
10	.423	3.025	91.234						

11	.381	2.723	93.957						
12	.304	2.172	96.129						
13	.295	2.106	98.235						
14	.247	1.765	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

INTERPRETATION: The factor analysis identified six components, each with eigenvalues greater than 1, and collectively accounted for 68.510% of the total variance. This high cumulative variance demonstrated that the six extracted factors sufficiently captured the underlying structure of delivery partners' perceptions.

Table No.6 Rotated Component Matrix

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	2	3	4
HRCA1	.864			
HRCA3	.856			
HRCA4	.854			
HRCA2	.819			
FCS3		.814		
FCS6		.806		
FCS5		.769		
FCS4		.764		
WFOP2			.848	
WFOP3			.837	
WFOP1			.756	
PSJS3				.853
PSJS2				.777
PSJS1				.728
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 4 iterations.				

INTERPRETATION: The Varimax-rotated solution revealed that all items loaded strongly onto their respective components, with no significant cross-loadings. All loadings confirming excellent construct validity. The results supported the appropriateness of the theoretical constructs and confirmed that the items grouped logically under each factor, consistent with the design of the questionnaire. These four components were labelled as:

- HRCA: Health, Recognition, and Career Aspirations
- FCS: Financial Compensation and Support

- WFOP: Work Flexibility and Operational Pressure
- PSJS: Personal Safety and Job Security

Table No.7 Variables Entered

Variables Entered/Removed[a]			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	PSJS, WFOP, HRCA, FCS[b]	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: DEP			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Table No.8 Model Summary

Model Summary[b]					
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Durbin-Watson**
1	.851[a]	.724	.719	.30702	1.815
a. Predictors: (Constant), PSJS, WFOP, HRCA, FCS					
b. Dependent Variable: DEP					

INTERPRETATION: The regression model yielded an R-value of 0.851 and an R^2 of 0.719, indicating that the four independent variables collectively explained 71.9% of the variance in the dependent variable, which was the overall perception of delivery partners (DEP). The adjusted R^2 of 0.719 demonstrated the model's strong predictive capacity even after adjusting for the number of predictors. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.815 confirmed that there was no autocorrelation among the residuals, suggesting independence of errors and a good model fit.

Table No.9 ANOVA Result

ANOVA[a]						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	48.304	4	12.076	128.112	.000[b]
	Residual	18.381	195	.094		
	Total	66.685	199			
a. Dependent Variable: DEP						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PSJS, WFOP, HRCA, FCS						

INTERPRETATION: ANOVA table revealed a highly significant F-value of 128.112 ($p < 0.001$). This confirmed that the overall regression model was statistically significant, meaning

that the selected predictors (FCS, WFOP, PSJS, and HRCA) collectively had a meaningful influence on delivery partners' overall perceptions.

Table No. 10 Multiple Regression Analysis

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.357	.257		-1.387	.167		
	HRCA	.318	.056	.215	5.656	.000	.974	1.026
	FCS	.269	.026	.423	10.442	.000	.860	1.162
	WFOP	.251	.025	.382	10.120	.000	.990	1.010
	PSJS	.287	.026	.450	10.998	.000	.844	1.185
a. Dependent Variable: DEP								

INTERPRETATION: In this multiple regression model, the dependent variable was the overall perception (DEP) of online food delivery (OFD) partners. The model used four independent variables (constructs) derived from Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The unstandardised coefficients (B values) from the regression output help us understand the direct contribution of each independent variable to the dependent variable.

The B value tells us how much the dependent variable (overall perception) is expected to increase for a one-unit increase in the independent variable, holding all other variables constant. The following alternative hypotheses are accepted.

H1: Health, Recognition & Career Aspirations (HRCA) positively influences delivery partners' perception.
H2: Work Flexibility & Operational Pressure (WFOP) positively influences delivery partners' perception.
H3: Financial Compensation & Support (FCS) positively influences delivery partners' perception.
H4: Personal Safety & Job Security (PSJS) positively influences delivery partners' perception.
HRCA (B = 0.318) – Health, Recognition and Career Aspirations

This also had a B value of 0.318. It implies that better physical wellness, social recognition, and belief in career growth within the platform are associated with more favourable perceptions. A one-unit increase here adds 0.318 units to the overall perception.

PSJS (B = 0.287) – Personal Safety and Job Security

This construct had a B value of 0.287. This means that enhanced safety (such as feeling secure at night or receiving proper protective gear) leads to a 0.287 unit increase in perception. This suggests that safety provisions are key drivers of satisfaction.

FCS (B = 0.269) – Financial Compensation and Support

This had the highest B value (0.269), meaning it had the strongest impact on perception. A one-point increase in satisfaction with financial factors (like base pay, incentives, fuel support, or maintenance) was associated with a 0.269 unit increase in overall perception. This indicates that earnings and related supports are most influential in shaping delivery partners' views.

WFOP (B = 0.251) – Work Flexibility and Operational Pressure

This coefficient suggests that increased shift flexibility, reasonable order volume, and better work-life balance would result in a 0.251 unit increase in perception. The partners value autonomy in their schedule and manageable work intensity.

IX. FINDINGS

Health, Recognition, and Career Aspirations (HRCA) emerged as the strongest factor influencing delivery partners' perception, with a coefficient of 0.318. This shows that when workers feel recognised, see health support, and have clear career prospects, their overall job satisfaction improves substantially.

Personal Safety and Job Security (PSJS) had a significant positive influence (B = 0.287). Riders reported that safety gear, protection against unfair deactivations, and a sense of physical and employment security boosted their morale.

Financial Compensation and Support (FCS) (B = 0.269) was a critical driver of satisfaction. Transparent pay structures, fair incentives, fuel reimbursements, and maintenance support were strongly appreciated by riders and contributed to a better perception of their jobs.

Work Flexibility and Operational Pressure (WFOP) (B = 0.251) also showed a clear positive relationship with perception. Flexible shifts and manageable workloads allowed riders to balance personal and professional commitments more effectively, raising their overall satisfaction.

All four dimensions—HRCA, PSJS, FCS, and WFOP—together explained 71.9% of the variance in job perception, confirming that improvements in these areas are highly effective in enhancing delivery partner morale.

X. SUGGESTIONS

To enhance career visibility among delivery partners, companies can implement a system of badges such as "Senior Partner" or "Mentor" and create clear internal promotion pathways. Recognising rider contributions through monthly appreciation events and showcasing top performers within the delivery app can further boost morale and commitment. Safety measures should be strengthened by providing standardised helmets and reflective jackets, and integrating SOS emergency support features. Educating delivery partners about their rights and ensuring transparent, fair deactivation policies can help reduce anxiety around job security. Pay structures also require revision to account for rising operational costs; tying earnings to fuel prices and inflation, compensating for prolonged restaurant wait times, and offering financial literacy guidance can significantly improve financial well-being. In terms of operational flexibility, platforms should allow delivery partners to select preferred zones and shift durations, along with mandatory rest breaks during long working hours—particularly in extreme weather. Rider health can be supported by organising quarterly medical camps, providing access to mental wellness support, and exploring affordable group insurance options. Finally, platforms must establish strong feedback mechanisms by collecting regular anonymous input on workload and safety concerns and transparently communicating the actions taken in response. These combined strategies not only uplift morale but also build a more stable and resilient workforce.

XI. CONCLUSION

This study examined the factors that shape the daily morale of food-delivery partners in Rajamahendravaram, a medium-sized city that attracts little research attention from delivery platforms. Statistical tests indicated that morale hinges on three major areas, which have direct implications for platform managers, city authorities and policy makers. First, health and prospects for advancement are critical. Partners work long shifts in hot, wet and congested conditions, leading to backache, heat strain and constant phone interruptions. They also want to know whether the job offers any career progression. Practical measures, regular medical check-ups, breathable uniforms and clear steps toward roles such as senior partner or team mentor, address both health and advancement. The data show this area has the largest impact on morale. Second, safety and procedural fairness matter. Road safety improves with sturdy helmets, reflective jackets, good lighting at pick-up points and secure parking. Digital safety comes from protection against sudden account blocks and hidden penalties. A transparent appeal process is essential. When physical and digital safety are both present, stress lowers and confidence rises, resulting in more stable staffing and fewer exits. Third, clear pay information and genuine flexibility are important. Partners want to see exactly how each rupee is earned or deducted. A real-time pay display detailing base fare, distance pay, bonuses and any deductions reduces anxiety over hidden cuts. Flexibility is valued only if surge rules and penalties remain predictable. Unexpected changes undermine the sense of control. Consistent rules help partners balance work and family life, improving overall performance. These three areas are interdependent. Improving just one will not resolve morale problems; progress is needed across all three. For platform operators, spending on health services, safety equipment, transparent

pay screens and visible promotion tracks is a cost-effective way to lower turnover and improve service. City councils can enhance partner welfare and delivery efficiency through shaded waiting areas, public toilets and safe parking. Legislators should draft platform-based work regulations that reflect conditions in smaller cities, where roads, climate and living costs differ from large metros.

XII. REFERENCES

Ahmed, A., & Sharma, V. (2022). Parking penalties and economic stress among Jaipur delivery riders. Journal of Urban Transport, 48(2), 113–127.

Al-Hadi, A., & Rahaman, M. (2022). Corporate reputation and courier engagement in app-based food delivery. Asia-Pacific Journal of Management, 39(2), 505–525.

Al-Qudah, A. A., Al-Okaily, M., Alqudah, G., & Ghazlat, A. (2022). Mobile payment adoption in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic. Electronic Commerce Research, 22(4), 823–847.

Bajaj, S., & Kumar, V. (2023). The flexibility paradox in India's gig economy: Evidence from food-delivery riders. IIMB Management Review, 35(3), 225–237.

Barua, S., & Ganguly, A. (2020). Weather shocks and last-mile delivery efficiency in an emerging economy. Journal of Transport Geography, 85, 102739.

Benson, T. M., Sathiyarajeswaran, N. S., Radhakrishnan, R., Abdul Gaffoor, A., & Krupalakshme, M. (2025). Factors and prevalence of musculoskeletal pain among app-based food delivery riders in Tamil Nadu: A cross-sectional study. Discover Social Science and Health, 5(1), Article 00162.

Bhat, R., & Gupta, P. (2023). Hygiene and dignity issues among Mumbai gig couriers. Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 66(1), 91–108.

Bose, S., & Prasad, L. (2023). Over-education and career frustration in platform delivery work. Journal of Contemporary Management Research, 17(1), 57–70.

Cao, Y., Zhang, X., & Li, H. (2024). Income dependence and crash risk among food-delivery cyclists in Shanghai. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 187, 107247.

Chen, C.-F. (2023). Job stress and risky driving behaviour of Taiwanese food-delivery motorcyclists. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 184, 107208.

Chen, T. X., Tian, D. Z., Deng, P. H., & Zhou, E. (2022). Instant delivery service riders' safety and health under labour intensity: A mediation analysis. Frontiers in Public Health, 10, 907474.

Choi, J., Park, S., & Kim, S. (2022). Safety compliance of platform workers: Evidence from Seoul delivery riders. Journal of Industrial Relations, 64(5), 791–812.

Das, H., & Ghosh, R. (2021). Income disparity between tier-III and metro food-delivery riders. South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases, 10(3), 405–416.

Deshpande, P. (2019). Primary breadwinners in the gig economy: The case of Indian food-delivery riders. Labour Economics, 60, 101749.

Dong, J., Zhang, G., & Wu, L. (2025). Life against algorithmic management: Burnout among food-delivery riders. Frontiers in Public Health, 13, 1531541.

Eldhose, M., & George, K. (2020). Regulatory gaps in India's platform labour market. IIM Kozhikode Society & Development Review, 9(1), 45–57.

Ganesh, G., Rao, A., & Varma, K. (2022). Training quality and job pride among Indian app-based delivery couriers. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 104, 103239.

Ghosh, S., & Sen, P. (2022). Food-delivery riders' meal-skipping behaviour and health outcomes. Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health, 34(7), 726–734.

Girdhar, A., & Khanna, S. (2022). Perceived night-time safety among gig couriers in Indian suburbs. Urban Safety and Security Journal, 6(2), 144–158.

IQbal, M., & Bhandari, R. (2020). Tipping culture and gig-worker morale in the Indian food-delivery sector. Journal of Services Marketing, 34(7), 901–912.

Jiang, L., Wang, J., Castaño-Rosa, R., & Zhong, C. (2024). Heat exposure and coping strategies for food-delivery riders under urban heat extremes. Energy and Buildings, 322, 114693.

Jing, Z., Yuru, L., & Zhao, Y. (2023). More reliance, more injuries: Income dependence, workload and work injury of online food-delivery platform riders. Safety Science, 167, 106264.

Joshi, M., & Chatterjee, D. (2022). Awareness of gig-worker welfare schemes: Evidence from Bengaluru. Indian Journal of Social Work, 83(4), 489–505.

Kang, M., & Park, S. (2017). Fair performance metrics and turnover intention among Korean couriers. Service Industries Journal, 37(13-14), 807–829.

Kashyap, A., & Verma, R. (2020). Shadow waiting as invisible labour in app-based delivery. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(48), 45–52.

Kumar, S., & Sharma, R. (2022). Fuel price pass-through and earnings erosion in India's gig-delivery sector. Economic and Labour Relations Review, 33(4), 642–659.

Lal, S., & Mathur, V. (2021). Vehicle maintenance burden among platform couriers. Journal of Transport Management, 17(2), 102–114.

Lee, J., & Chen, H.-Y. (2024). Economic stressors, burn-out and turnover intent among Asian gig-delivery riders. Safety Science, 169, 108296.

Lim, J., & Kang, J.-W. (2021). Customer-support latency and gig-worker morale in on-demand delivery. Human Resource Management, 60(4), 609–624.

Liu, Q., & Sun, Y. (2016). Algorithmic schedules and mental fatigue in China's instant-delivery market. Transportation Research Part E, 90, 17–29.

Longoni, A., Salas, S., Sancha, C., & Sierra, V. (2024). Working conditions and corporate sustainability in last-mile delivery platforms. Journal of Business Ethics, 189(3), 811-833.

Malik, T., & Iyer, K. (2021). The economics of vehicle ownership versus rental among Indian riders. Journal of Applied Economics and Business, 9(3), 155–170.

Meena, S., & Roy, A. (2023). Heat-stress and hydration challenges for Indian food-delivery workers. International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 29(3), 711–723.

Molo, M., Changsan, S., Madares, L., & Saita, S. (2024). A decision-tree model for traffic-accident prediction among Thai food-delivery riders. Epidemiology and Health, 46, e2024095.

Nandakumar, P., & Pillai, R. (2022). Health-insurance coverage gaps among Kochi gig couriers. Indian Journal of Employment Studies, 49(2), 134–149.

Nguyen-Phuoc, Q., Truong, T.-M., & Nguyen, H. (2023). Deadly meals: Burnout and risky riding among Vietnamese food-delivery motorcyclists. Safety Science, 157, 105985.

Oberoi, K., & Jain, V. (2019). Digital illiteracy barriers in app-based work among older Indian riders. Journal of Information Technology Education, 18, 367–383.

Pandey, S., & Mishra, D. (2022). Mental-health stigma and help-seeking in India's gig economy. Journal of Mental Health and Social Behaviour, 7(1), 25–38.

Patel, H., & Sinha, N. (2023). Language barriers and rating penalties in app-based delivery. Decision, 50(1), 41–60.

Rahman, K., & Nair, R. (2023). Traffic stress and delay exposure among Bengaluru food-delivery riders. Transportation Research Part F, 92, 200–212.

Ricci, F., Ferri, M., & Vignale, G. (2025). Occupational safety and health of riders working for digital food-delivery platforms in Milan, Italy. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 22(4), 567.

Shetty, R., & Thomas, G. (2023). Algorithmic deactivation anxiety among Indian couriers. Information Systems Frontiers, 25(4), 1105–1121.

Shukla, P., & Rao, M. (2020). Grievance redressal efficiency in India's food-delivery platforms. Journal of Consumer Affairs, 54(3), 1130–1149.

Sigroha, A., & Kapoor, P. (2024). Algorithmic management in the food-delivery gig economy: Mechanisms of control and worker autonomy. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts, 5(1), 2719-2725.

Singh, T., & Patel, G. (2021). Rating transparency and perceived fairness in Indian online food-delivery platforms. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 61, 102542.

Tripathi, J., Sen, B., & Sharma, R. (2022). Gendered barriers to entry in platform delivery work. Gender in Management, 37(6), 663–678.

Useche, S. A., Robayo, S., & Orozco-Fontalvo, M. (2024). The hidden cost of your "too-fast food": Stress-related factors and fatigue predict food-delivery riders' occupational crashes. International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 30(3), 825-834.

Vasan, N., & Dey, S. (2021). Cardiovascular risk among overworked gig couriers. Indian Heart Journal, 73(5), 620–626.

Vu, H., & Pham, T. (2022). Usability determinants of delivery apps and their impact on courier retention. Technovation, 119, 102467.

Wang, P., Zhang, J., & Yu, L. (2023). Service quality of last-mile food delivery and its loyalty outcomes. Sustainability, 15(6), 4792.

Wang, Y., & Chen, X. (2015). Occupational health challenges among Chinese courier workers. Safety Science, 77, 143–150.

Wells, K., Fitzpatrick, C., & Weng, P. (2021). Security risks and wage volatility among Washington DC delivery drivers. Urban Studies, 58(12), 2487–2506.

Zhang, P., Li, Y., & Hou, M. (2024). Safety climate and its contribution to safety performance in the food-delivery sector. Safety Science, 160, 106105.

Zhao, H., Yuan, B., Gong, Y., & Liao, Y. (2025). Platform algorithmic control and work outcomes of food-delivery employees. The Service Industries Journal.

Zhao, Y., & Li, S. (2019). Psychological effects of delivery-algorithm intensity. International Journal of Production Economics, 211, 17–27.

Zhong, Y., & Tan, J. (2024). Algorithmic control and work outcomes of food-delivery employees. Computers in Human Behavior, 144, 107746.