Indonesia Discourse
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Print) XXXX-XXXX (Online)
Volume 2 Issue 2 (2025): 189-214
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15294/indi.v2i2.43037
Published by Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
Available online since: July 31, 2025

The Algorithmic Precarity of '*Ojol*' Drivers:

Investigating the Gig Economy and Digital Resistance in Southeast Asia's Largest Market

La Ode Wiratama, Sultan Rasyid Lamaddukelleng, Zahwa Mahira Putri

Abstract

The rise of ride-hailing platforms like Gojek and Grab has transformed Indonesia into one of the world's largest laboratories for the gig economy. However, beneath the promise of "flexible work" lies a growing phenomenon of algorithmic precarity. This paper investigates how digital platforms exercise "soft control" over drivers through opaque rating systems, incentive structures, and automated suspensions. Employing a mixed-methods approach—comprising digital ethnography in driver Telegram groups and semi-structured interviews—this study maps the forms of "digital resistance" emerging among *ojek* (motorcycle taxi) drivers. These include the use of "tutor" apps to bypass GPS restrictions and the formation of informal grassroots unions to demand transparency. The findings indicate that the algorithm functions as a digital panopticon that shifts operational risks from the corporation

to the individual worker. This research contributes to global labor sociology by demonstrating that despite the lack of formal employee status, gig workers in the Global South are developing sophisticated counter-narratives and collective strategies to challenge technological hegemony.

Keywords: Gig Economy, Algorithm, Labor Resistance, Precarity, Digital Platforms

Introduction

The global expansion of digital platforms has profoundly reshaped labor markets, particularly in urban mobility and delivery sectors. Ride-hailing services such as Uber, Lyft, and Deliveroo exemplify what scholars have termed platform capitalism, a form of economic organization characterized by the commodification of human labor through algorithmic mediation (Srnicek, 2017). These platforms leverage datafication to extract value from labor while minimizing fixed costs, creating a structural asymmetry between the platform and its workforce.

One key feature of platform capitalism is the promise of flexibility, which is often promoted as worker empowerment. However, research increasingly highlights the tension between this flexibility and precarity, as labor conditions are contingent on opaque algorithms, variable incentives, and automated disciplinary mechanisms (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Scholars argue that these mechanisms operate as forms of "soft control," regulating worker behavior without formal employment contracts or traditional hierarchical oversight (Wood et al., 2019). The result is a labor regime in which unpredictability, performance monitoring, and algorithmic governance produce new forms of vulnerability.

Beyond the Global North, the gig economy is rapidly expanding in the Global South, where digital platforms intersect with informal labor structures and uneven regulatory environments. In these contexts, precarity is exacerbated by the lack of social protections and limited recourse against algorithmic penalties. Workers are simultaneously empowered by access to digital labor markets and constrained by technological surveillance, creating conditions for novel forms of resistance and collective organization (Graham et al., 2017).

Platform-mediated labor also raises important theoretical questions regarding autonomy, control, and value extraction. The centrality of algorithms in mediating

labor relations challenges traditional frameworks of employer-employee hierarchies, as corporate oversight is increasingly embedded in code rather than human management. This phenomenon necessitates a reconsideration of labor sociology, particularly in contexts where platforms dominate local employment landscapes but remain legally unaccountable.

Indonesia has emerged as one of the world's largest and fastest-growing markets for ride-hailing platforms. With an urban population exceeding 100 million and widespread smartphone adoption, the country offers fertile ground for the expansion of digital mobility services (Laumer et al., 2020). Platforms such as Gojek and Grab dominate both motorcycle taxi services and delivery sectors, positioning Indonesia as a global laboratory for gig labor in the Global South.

A defining feature of this market is the classification of drivers as independent partners rather than employees. Legally, this designation absolves platforms of obligations related to minimum wages, health insurance, or labor rights while maintaining operational control via algorithms. This hybrid status situates drivers in a precarious position: they exercise nominal autonomy over working hours yet remain highly dependent on platform-mediated metrics for income stability (Rosenblat, 2018).

Rapid adoption has also produced complex labor ecologies. Drivers frequently participate in informal networks, such as Telegram and WhatsApp groups, to exchange strategies for maximizing incentives or navigating algorithmic constraints. These networks function as both technical forums and spaces for collective negotiation, illustrating the ways in which digital labor markets in Indonesia are socially embedded (Rani et al., 2020).

Platform growth has been accompanied by highly variable earning structures. Incentive schemes, surge pricing, and dynamic reward mechanisms are algorithmically determined, generating income volatility. Automatic suspensions or rating-based penalties introduce further precarity, as drivers can lose access to the platform with minimal recourse. This creates conditions for what the literature terms "algorithmic precarity"—a structural vulnerability produced and enforced by computational governance (Graham et al., 2017).

Moreover, the scale of Indonesia's market makes it an instructive site for comparative labor analysis. Unlike smaller or highly regulated markets in the Global North, Indonesian drivers navigate minimal state oversight, informal labor norms, and technological surveillance simultaneously. This combination highlights both the

promise and perils of platform labor in postcolonial economies and underscores the need for empirically grounded investigation of worker experiences.

The central problem addressed in this study is the emergence of algorithmically mediated precarity within Indonesia's ride-hailing sector. Platforms exercise control through opaque rating systems, automated suspensions, and dynamic incentive schemes, creating structural vulnerability for workers who lack formal employment protections. These mechanisms extend the reach of corporate governance into everyday decision-making while displacing operational risk onto individual drivers (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016).

Simultaneously, drivers are actively developing strategies to navigate, contest, and circumvent algorithmic control. Practices such as the use of "tutor" apps to bypass GPS tracking, the sharing of optimization strategies in Telegram groups, and the formation of informal unions demonstrate the emergence of digital resistance in response to structural precarity. These forms of resistance are technologically mediated, socially networked, and often collective, reflecting a sophisticated adaptation to platform labor governance.

Despite growing attention to platform labor globally, the experiences of gig workers in the Global South remain underrepresented. Most scholarship has focused on North American or European contexts, where regulatory frameworks, labor protections, and market maturity differ substantially from Southeast Asia. There is, therefore, a need to examine how algorithmic governance operates in contexts characterized by informality, weak labor protections, and large-scale digital adoption.

This research problem intersects theoretical and empirical concerns. Conceptually, it interrogates the ways in which algorithmic management reshapes labor relations and power asymmetries. Empirically, it investigates the practices through which Indonesian drivers negotiate these dynamics in real time, highlighting emergent strategies of digital resistance. The study thus addresses a gap at the intersection of labor sociology, platform studies, and digital ethnography, focusing on how technological hegemony is contested and reconfigured by workers operating outside formal employment structures.

Building on the research problem, the study seeks to answer three interrelated questions:

1. How do platform rating systems, incentive structures, and automated suspensions produce algorithmic precarity for Indonesian ride-hailing drivers?
2. In what forms and through what channels is digital resistance constructed, disseminated, and mobilized among drivers?

3. What are the implications of these findings for global labor theory, particularly regarding the gig economy in the Global South?

These questions guide an investigation that combines digital ethnography, semi-structured interviews, and analysis of online labor networks, aiming to capture both structural dynamics and worker agency.

This study makes three main contributions. First, it provides empirical insights from Southeast Asia, a region underrepresented in gig economy research, particularly in studies of digital resistance and algorithmic governance. Second, it advances the conceptualization of "algorithmic precarity" within contexts where labor is informal, highly technologized, and minimally regulated, bridging literature on platform capitalism and precarious work. Third, it contributes to scholarship on labor agency by documenting strategies of digital resistance, including collective organization, knowledge sharing, and technological circumvention, thereby demonstrating that workers in the Global South actively contest technological hegemony rather than passively enduring precarity.

Literature Review

A. Platform Capitalism and Algorithmic Management

Platform capitalism describes a new economic model in which digital platforms mediate the exchange of goods and services while extracting value from human labor, data, and user activity (Srnicek, 2017). Unlike traditional firms, platforms act as intermediaries, minimizing fixed labor costs while maximizing control through digital infrastructure. Ride-hailing platforms such as Uber, Gojek, and Grab exemplify this model, using algorithms to regulate labor allocation, monitor performance, and dynamically adjust pricing.

A defining feature of platform capitalism is algorithmic management. Algorithms enforce operational rules, track worker behavior, and determine rewards or penalties without direct human oversight (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). For drivers, ratings, incentives, and automated suspensions function as both performance metrics and disciplinary tools. Unlike conventional managerial hierarchies, this form of control is decentralized, continuous, and embedded in code, producing behavioral compliance through technological mediation rather than interpersonal authority.

Algorithmic management generates what Wood et al. (2019) term "soft control": the appearance of autonomy is maintained while decisions and incentives are shaped by opaque digital systems. Workers can choose when and where to work,

but their earnings, access, and livelihood security are contingent upon algorithmic evaluation. The opacity of these systems—rating algorithms, surge multipliers, and automated deactivation—creates uncertainty and compels drivers to adapt their behavior strategically.

Digital management also extends corporate oversight into workers' everyday decision-making. For instance, route optimization, customer acceptance, and waiting behavior are continuously monitored, and deviations are penalized. The algorithm simultaneously distributes operational risk away from the platform, externalizing costs onto drivers who must navigate fluctuating demand, technical glitches, and unpredictable penalties.

Platforms additionally leverage datafication to reinforce governance. Continuous collection of geolocation, service ratings, and engagement patterns feeds back into algorithmic decision-making, optimizing labor allocation while maintaining hierarchical control invisibly (Graham et al., 2017). This combination of algorithmic oversight and data extraction exemplifies the distinctive logic of platform capitalism.

B. Precarity and Informalization of Labor

Precarity theory situates gig work within broader neoliberal transformations of labor. Scholars define precarity as unstable employment, lack of social protection, and heightened exposure to risk (Standing, 2011). Platforms intensify precarity by classifying workers as independent contractors, denying benefits such as minimum wage, health insurance, or unemployment coverage. This structural vulnerability is compounded by the unpredictability of algorithmically determined earnings and access to work.

Comparative studies highlight differences between the Global North and Global South. In North America and Europe, gig workers often operate in regulated labor markets with some legal recourse, collective bargaining, and institutional protections. In contrast, workers in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America encounter minimal regulation, informal labor norms, and technological dependence, amplifying precarity (Graham et al., 2017). In Indonesia, the combination of large-scale platform adoption and weak labor enforcement produces conditions of extreme vulnerability for drivers, whose livelihoods are entirely mediated by opaque algorithmic rules.

Precarity is also relational and social. Workers' dependence on algorithmic evaluation affects not only income but status, identity, and social recognition. Being deactivated or penalized can result in economic loss and social marginalization, particularly in tightly networked communities where platform work is central to household survival. These dynamics illustrate how structural and everyday dimensions of precarity intersect.

The informalization of labor extends beyond legal definitions to operational realities. Drivers often engage in strategies to optimize performance, circumvent restrictions, or maximize incentives, effectively creating self-managed and technologically mediated labor arrangements. These practices demonstrate how precarity catalyzes adaptive agency, prompting workers to navigate and contest the structural limitations imposed by platforms (Rosenblat, 2018).

Understanding precarity in the context of the Global South is therefore critical for analyzing platform-mediated labor. Unlike the North, where precarity is partially buffered by regulatory frameworks, Southern contexts reveal the full implications of algorithmic governance for survival, mobility, and labor autonomy. Finally, these insights underline the necessity of examining both structural and technological dimensions of precarity. Algorithmic management not only enforces labor discipline but also intensifies insecurity, making precarity a central analytic lens for understanding the lived experience of gig workers.

C. Digital Panopticon and Surveillance

The concept of the digital panopticon describes how algorithmic oversight extends surveillance into every aspect of labor activity, producing compliance through visibility and uncertainty (Graham et al., 2017). Borrowing from Foucault's classical panopticon, digital platforms monitor, record, and evaluate workers continuously, ensuring that behavior aligns with organizational objectives without direct human supervision.

Surveillance capitalism further frames this phenomenon as a systemic extraction of behavioral data for economic value (Zuboff, 2019). Platforms collect granular information on worker location, service acceptance, timing, and customer feedback. These data are not merely analytical but operational, feeding real-time algorithmic adjustments that influence pay, access, and ratings. Workers internalize this continuous monitoring, modifying behavior preemptively to avoid penalties—a process that mirrors Bentham's panopticon in digital form.

The panoptic effect is particularly salient for Indonesian drivers, whose livelihoods are entirely mediated by platform evaluation. Automated deactivations, low ratings, and incentive reductions operate as both surveillance and disciplinary mechanisms, extending the reach of corporate governance into workers' daily lives. The combination of visibility, unpredictability, and immediate sanctioning produces a labor regime characterized by both self-regulation and stress.

Studies highlight that the digital panopticon is distinct from traditional management because it is impersonal, opaque, and technologically embedded (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Workers are simultaneously visible to the algorithm and invisible to human managers, producing a novel form of disciplinary logic where compliance is induced through probabilistic rather than deterministic oversight.

This continuous monitoring also encourages strategic adaptation. Workers share experiences, optimization techniques, and risk mitigation strategies through digital networks, effectively developing collective literacy to navigate panoptic pressures. These practices constitute both survival strategies and forms of subtle resistance within surveillance-intensive work environments. Overall, understanding gig work as a digital panopticon clarifies how technological systems enforce labor discipline while creating new vulnerabilities, highlighting the need to investigate worker responses and counter-strategies in depth.

D.Labor Resistance in the Gig Economy

Despite algorithmic control and precarity, gig workers actively engage in forms of resistance, challenging technological and managerial hegemony. Resistance takes multiple forms, including digital coordination, informal unions, and tactical circumvention of platform restrictions (Wood et al., 2019). For example, workers use Telegram and WhatsApp groups to exchange information about high-demand areas, platform incentives, and strategies to prevent deactivation.

In the Global North, cases such as Uber and Deliveroo reveal similar patterns. Drivers have organized strikes, coordinated log-off campaigns, and developed apps to optimize earnings independently of platform algorithms (Cant, 2020). These actions demonstrate that digital labor is not entirely passive; rather, workers navigate and contest the very systems that regulate them.

In Southeast Asia, digital resistance is compounded by technological improvisation. Indonesian drivers, for instance, employ "tutor" apps to bypass GPS restrictions or artificially inflate metrics required to meet incentive thresholds. Such

strategies indicate that resistance is technologically mediated, knowledge-intensive, and adaptive to real-time algorithmic pressures.

Informal unionization is another important form of resistance. Grassroots driver associations engage in collective bargaining, public advocacy, and legal action to demand transparency and fairness. These networks function as social and political counterweights to algorithmic authority, demonstrating that collective agency can emerge even without formal employee status.

Resistance also operates discursively. By sharing narratives of algorithmic precarity and exposing exploitative practices, workers construct counter-narratives that challenge the ideological framing of flexibility and empowerment promoted by platforms (Rosenblat, 2018). These narratives mobilize peer solidarity, create social pressure on platforms, and amplify visibility of systemic inequities. Taken together, labor resistance in the gig economy illustrates that algorithmic control is neither totalizing nor uncontested. Workers engage in strategic, collective, and technological practices that negotiate, mitigate, or subvert the risks imposed by platform-mediated labor.

E. Research Gap

While substantial research examines gig work in the Global North, Southeast Asia remains underrepresented in both empirical and theoretical literature. Most studies focus on earnings, platform adoption, or regulatory frameworks rather than detailed ethnographic accounts of worker experience and resistance (Laumer et al., 2020).

Moreover, there is limited attention to technology-mediated forms of resistance in the Global South. The role of "tutor" apps, GPS manipulation, and peer-to-peer knowledge networks in circumventing algorithmic control has not been systematically analyzed. Such practices are highly context-specific and illustrate how local workers creatively adapt to technologically enforced precarity.

Existing studies also insufficiently connect algorithmic governance with structural precarity and informal labor status in postcolonial economies. This gap limits our understanding of how platform capitalism interacts with socio-economic vulnerability, digital literacy, and informal labor norms.

Furthermore, research rarely integrates multiple dimensions of worker experience—algorithmic, social, technological, and collective—into a unified analysis. Comprehensive studies that combine digital ethnography, interviews, and labor sociology are needed to capture the complexity of resistance and precarity in

Southeast Asian gig markets. Addressing these gaps is critical for advancing theory on platform labor, algorithmic governance, and digital resistance, particularly in the context of the Global South. Empirical insights from Indonesia can illuminate how algorithmic control shapes everyday work, how precarity is experienced, and how workers collectively negotiate and contest technological power.

Theoretical Framework

A. Algorithmic Management

Algorithmic management conceptualizes the platform algorithm as a virtual manager that organizes, monitors, and evaluates labor without direct human oversight (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Unlike traditional managerial hierarchies, algorithms allocate tasks, adjust incentives, and enforce compliance based on real-time data. In ride-hailing platforms such as Gojek and Grab, drivers' earnings, access to high-demand areas, and continued platform engagement are determined by algorithmic computation rather than human decision-making.

A defining feature of algorithmic management is its opaqueness. Platforms rarely disclose the criteria that shape ratings, incentives, or deactivation, producing informational asymmetries between the corporation and workers (Wood et al., 2019). Drivers may comply with system directives yet remain uncertain about why penalties occur or how to optimize earnings. This lack of transparency forces workers to adapt experimentally, often relying on peer networks or third-party apps to navigate the algorithm.

The asymmetry of information extends beyond task allocation. Algorithms continuously integrate geolocation data, service acceptance, trip duration, and customer feedback to modulate performance evaluation. Workers are subject to automated risk assessments that influence income and platform access, but they have little capacity to interrogate, challenge, or negotiate the underlying logic of these decisions.

Algorithmic management thereby functions as a technologically mediated governance structure that embeds hierarchical control in code. It shapes not only what workers do but also how they perceive risk, opportunity, and their own agency. This model underscores the need to analyze gig work as simultaneously structured, dynamic, and technologically enforced.

Importantly, algorithmic management does not eliminate human discretion entirely but reshapes it, shifting managerial judgment into automated systems. The

invisibility and complexity of algorithms create both compliance pressures and avenues for innovative adaptation, making them central to understanding contemporary platform labor. Thus, algorithmic management provides a theoretical lens to examine how digital platforms restructure work, enforce behavioral norms, and mediate the tension between flexibility and precarity in the gig economy.

B. Digital Panopticism

The concept of digital panopticism adapts Foucault's classical panopticon to platform-mediated labor, emphasizing surveillance, visibility, and self-discipline (Graham et al., 2017). Algorithms continuously monitor drivers' locations, service acceptance rates, and customer ratings, producing a situation in which workers internalize oversight even without direct human observation. This constant visibility encourages preemptive compliance and behavior modification.

Rating systems exemplify self-disciplining mechanisms. Drivers strive to maintain high scores to secure incentives and prevent deactivation, aligning their behavior with platform expectations. The panoptic logic extends to timing, route selection, and engagement patterns, which are continuously monitored and algorithmically evaluated. In this sense, platforms achieve control not through coercion but through the internalization of normative expectations enforced digitally.

Digital panopticism also amplifies stress and precarity. Workers' livelihoods are contingent on opaque and constantly shifting metrics, making compliance both necessary and uncertain. Unlike traditional surveillance, algorithmic oversight is persistent, data-driven, and impersonal, generating a form of control that is both pervasive and psychologically demanding (Rosenblat, 2018).

The concept provides a lens for understanding how technology mediates power in the gig economy. Visibility, coupled with informational asymmetry, compels workers to self-regulate, creating compliance without overt authority. This digital panoptic effect explains the ubiquity of adaptation strategies and the emergence of collective knowledge-sharing networks as protective responses.

By framing algorithmic monitoring through panoptic theory, scholars can analyze the social, psychological, and operational implications of surveillance, including risk perception, behavioral conformity, and resistance. It highlights how digital labor governance extends the reach of control while maintaining the appearance of autonomy.

C. Everyday Resistance

Everyday resistance refers to informal, often subtle acts through which workers contest structural control without formal unionization or legal recourse (Scott, 1985). In the gig economy, this includes tactical behaviors, narrative framing, and digital practices aimed at circumventing algorithmic restrictions or asserting agency within constrained labor environments.

Digital platforms create spaces for counter-narratives. Telegram groups, WhatsApp chats, and online forums allow drivers to share experiences of algorithmic injustice, strategies for optimizing incentives, and advice on navigating system penalties. These interactions produce collective literacy and mutual support, enabling workers to resist passively imposed precarity while maintaining operational viability.

Resistance is often tactical and context-specific. Drivers may manipulate GPS data, strategically decline certain rides, or employ third-party apps to maximize earnings and mitigate algorithmic penalties. Such practices do not confront the system overtly but demonstrate ingenuity and adaptation in response to structural constraints.

Counter-narratives also function as social and symbolic resistance. By naming algorithmic shortcomings, highlighting inequities, and documenting collective experiences, workers challenge platform authority discursively. These narratives circulate digitally, creating peer pressure, solidarity, and informal accountability mechanisms that contest algorithmic hegemony.

Everyday resistance thus integrates behavioral, technological, and discursive dimensions. It exemplifies how workers maintain autonomy, negotiate risk, and sustain livelihoods within an environment dominated by opaque, algorithmic control. Ultimately, the study of everyday resistance in the gig economy illuminates the ways in which digital laborers creatively respond to structural precarity, demonstrating both resilience and collective ingenuity in the Global South.

D. Risk Shift and Neoliberal Responsibility

Risk shift theory highlights how platforms transfer operational and financial risk from corporations to individual workers (Graham et al., 2017). In ride-hailing, drivers bear responsibility for fuel costs, vehicle maintenance, and navigating demand fluctuations while facing income volatility dictated by algorithmic

incentives. The platform benefits from cost externalization while framing drivers as autonomous partners.

This risk shift is accompanied by the individualization of failure. Deactivation, low ratings, or lost incentives are interpreted as personal shortcomings rather than structural issues, reinforcing neoliberal ideologies of meritocracy and self-responsibility (Standing, 2011). Workers internalize accountability for systemic risks, creating stress and compelling adaptive behaviors.

Neoliberal responsibility also interacts with algorithmic opacity. Drivers cannot fully anticipate algorithmic adjustments, yet they are held accountable for compliance and performance. This produces a labor regime in which precarity is both structural and internalized, mediated through continuous monitoring and evaluation. The risk shift framework clarifies the broader implications of platform labor. It situates individual vulnerability within organizational strategy, linking algorithmic governance to neoliberal imperatives that valorize flexibility while minimizing corporate liability.

Moreover, understanding the risk shift is essential for analyzing forms of digital resistance. Workers' tactical adaptations, collective strategies, and counter-narratives can be interpreted as responses to imposed risk and structural responsibility, highlighting the interplay between agency and constraint in precarious work environments. In sum, the concepts of risk shift and neoliberal responsibility provide an analytic lens for understanding the asymmetric distribution of risk in the gig economy, the individualization of failure, and the structural conditions that give rise to everyday and digital resistance strategies.

Methodology

A. Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods design combining digital ethnography with semi-structured interviews to explore algorithmic precarity and digital resistance among Indonesian ride-hailing drivers. Digital ethnography allows researchers to observe, document, and analyze online interactions within driver communities, such as Telegram and WhatsApp groups, where strategies for navigating platform constraints are shared. This method captures the social, technological, and discursive dimensions of driver networks, offering insights into collective adaptation and resistance in real-time (Hine, 2015).

Semi-structured interviews complement the digital ethnography by providing in-depth qualitative data on individual experiences, perceptions, and decision-making processes. Interviews focused on drivers' understanding of algorithmic incentives, coping strategies, and experiences with deactivation or rating penalties, allowing researchers to contextualize digital behaviors within personal and socio-economic narratives.

The mixed-methods design was chosen to integrate the micro-level experiences of drivers with the macro-level structural analysis of platform governance. By triangulating data from online spaces and direct narratives, the research captures both the observable practices of adaptation and the subjective meanings drivers attach to them (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

This design also facilitates the examination of emergent phenomena such as technological workarounds, digital literacy, and collective knowledge-sharing, which are often invisible in traditional labor studies. Observing these practices in their natural digital environment enhances ecological validity, while interviews provide interpretive depth. The combined approach aligns with an interpretivist paradigm, emphasizing the co-construction of meaning, the situatedness of digital labor practices, and the negotiation of algorithmic authority. It foregrounds drivers' agency while recognizing structural constraints imposed by platform algorithms.

B. Data Collection

Data collection consisted of three complementary components: participant observation in driver Telegram groups, in-depth interviews with active drivers, and documentation of platform policies. Participant observation involved monitoring discussions related to incentives, route optimization, deactivation experiences, and peer strategies. This method provided insight into collective problem-solving, social norms, and informal knowledge circulation among drivers (Murthy, 2008).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 drivers across Jakarta, Makassar, and Surabaya, representing urban centers with high platform penetration. Interviews explored perceptions of algorithmic management, experiences with precarity, and engagement in resistance practices. The semi-structured format allowed flexibility to pursue emergent themes while ensuring coverage of core research questions.

Policy documentation included reviewing publicly available platform terms of service, driver guidelines, and incentive structures for Gojek and Grab. These

documents contextualized observed behaviors and provided insights into formal expectations and algorithmic rules that shape driver activity.

All data were collected over a six-month period, ensuring temporal depth and the ability to observe evolving strategies and discussions within digital communities. Researchers also maintained detailed field notes to capture context, interaction patterns, and reflective insights from both digital and interview data. The combination of digital observation and interview data facilitates triangulation, enabling the validation of self-reported experiences against observable practices and formal platform policies. This approach enhances the reliability and credibility of findings.

C. Sampling Strategy

A snowball sampling technique was used to recruit participants, leveraging digital networks and peer referrals to access active ride-hailing drivers. This strategy was effective in reaching drivers who are embedded in informal networks, including those who employ technological workarounds or engage in collective resistance practices.

To capture regional variation, the study targeted urban centers with high platform adoption: Jakarta, Makassar, and Surabaya. These cities represent different socio-economic, cultural, and infrastructural contexts, allowing comparative insights into how algorithmic precarity and digital resistance manifest in diverse urban environments.

Snowball sampling was complemented with purposive criteria to ensure diversity in participant demographics, including age, experience, gender, and platform affiliation. This approach ensured that the sample reflected a broad range of perspectives and strategies in navigating algorithmic management. Digital ethnography sampling involved observing driver Telegram groups with high activity and varied membership. Groups were selected based on their engagement levels, thematic focus (e.g., route optimization, incentive strategies), and openness to researchers' presence. The combination of snowball and purposive sampling facilitated access to hard-to-reach populations and ensured the inclusion of drivers actively negotiating precarity and engaging in forms of digital resistance.

D. Data Analysis

Data analysis combined thematic coding, discourse analysis, and triangulation of digital and offline data. Thematic coding involved identifying recurring patterns,

strategies, and narratives in interview transcripts and digital communication, focusing on algorithmic precarity, resistance practices, and adaptation mechanisms (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Discourse analysis examined the language, metaphors, and narratives used in Telegram discussions and interviews to construct counter-narratives and interpret drivers' sense-making processes. This method illuminated how drivers conceptualize algorithmic control, negotiate social norms, and frame resistance in online spaces. Triangulation integrated insights from digital ethnography, interviews, and policy documents, enhancing analytical rigor and validating findings across data sources. This approach allowed the study to connect observed behaviors with reported experiences and formal platform expectations.

Analysis was iterative and reflexive. Preliminary findings from digital observation informed subsequent interview questions, while interviews clarified ambiguous practices or motivations observed online. Field notes were continuously reviewed to capture emergent themes and ensure contextual understanding. The analytical framework also drew on theoretical constructs from platform capitalism, digital panopticism, and everyday resistance, enabling interpretation of empirical data within broader conceptual and sociological contexts.

E. Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were central to both digital and offline data collection. Participant anonymity was maintained by removing identifiable information from transcripts, field notes, and digital observations. Pseudonyms were used in reporting findings to protect participants from potential repercussions.

Digital security was a key concern, given the sensitive nature of driver strategies and resistance practices. Researchers employed encrypted communication, secure data storage, and careful monitoring of online interactions to minimize risk.

Informed consent was obtained for interviews, with participants briefed on study objectives, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw at any time. For digital ethnography, consent was negotiated where possible, and observations were limited to public or semi-public online spaces to avoid intrusion into private communications.

Researchers also adopted a culturally sensitive approach, respecting drivers' practices, beliefs, and vernacular expressions. Reflexivity was applied throughout, ensuring that interpretation remained grounded in participants' perspectives rather

than imposing external judgments. Finally, ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional review board, ensuring compliance with academic standards and adherence to responsible research practices in both physical and digital environments.

Findings

A. The Architecture of Algorithmic Control

The ride-hailing platforms studied employ a sophisticated architecture of algorithmic control that governs drivers' work behaviors through multiple interconnected mechanisms. First, the rating system functions as a central disciplinary tool. Drivers are evaluated by customers on punctuality, courtesy, and service quality, with low ratings triggering warnings or automatic suspensions (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This creates a continuous feedback loop in which drivers' compliance is monitored digitally rather than through direct managerial oversight.

Second, performance-based incentive schemes reinforce algorithmic discipline. Surge multipliers, daily completion bonuses, and "quest" challenges reward drivers who meet or exceed platform-determined thresholds. These financial incentives guide behavior, encouraging drivers to accept rides, work peak hours, or strategically position themselves in high-demand zones (Wood et al., 2019). Incentives simultaneously promote productivity and deepen dependence on algorithmic metrics for livelihood stability.

Third, the opacity of penalty mechanisms compounds precarity. The algorithm rarely discloses the rationale behind deactivation, incentive withholding, or rating adjustments, leaving drivers uncertain about how to manage their performance effectively. This asymmetry of information forces experimentation, peer consultation, and digital knowledge-sharing to navigate the system (Graham et al., 2017).

Collectively, these mechanisms illustrate how platform algorithms operate as virtual managers, embedding authority within code. Compliance is elicited not through interpersonal control but through a combination of reward, threat, and uncertainty, producing a labor regime in which drivers are both visible and surveilled, yet largely unaware of the criteria governing their economic fate.

The architecture of control shapes both work practices and social relations. Drivers internalize platform expectations, continually monitor their own behavior, and adjust strategies proactively. At the same time, the digital infrastructure

encourages adaptation and innovation, including tactics for circumventing or negotiating algorithmic constraints.

B. Producing Precarity

Algorithmic governance directly contributes to the production of precarity among drivers. Income instability is a central manifestation. Daily earnings fluctuate according to trip volume, dynamic pricing, and performance-based incentives, leaving drivers dependent on unpredictable algorithmic outcomes (Standing, 2011). This unpredictability affects not only economic stability but also household security, as many drivers rely on ride-hailing as their primary source of income.

Real-time performance evaluation exerts psychological pressure. Drivers constantly monitor ratings, incentive thresholds, and platform notifications, leading to stress, anxiety, and self-surveillance. This continuous monitoring produces both behavioral compliance and emotional strain, illustrating the intersection of algorithmic discipline and psychological precarity (Rosenblat, 2018).

Self-exploitation emerges as a coping strategy. Drivers frequently extend working hours, skip breaks, or manipulate schedules to meet incentive targets, demonstrating a form of internalized labor discipline mediated by the algorithm. While these practices maximize earnings in the short term, they can result in fatigue, reduced wellbeing, and long-term occupational hazards.

The precarity induced by algorithmic management is relational and structural. It is embedded in the platform's design, operationalized through opaque metrics, and reinforced by socio-economic dependency. Workers' vulnerability is not incidental but a systematic feature of platform-mediated labor.

Moreover, precarity shapes social behaviors and interactions. Drivers often share survival strategies, warnings, and tips within digital communities, reflecting both adaptation to risk and emergent solidarity. These practices highlight how precarity functions as both a constraint and a catalyst for collective knowledge-sharing.

C. Forms of Digital Resistance

Despite structural precarity, drivers actively engage in digital resistance to navigate or contest algorithmic control. One prominent strategy is the use of "tutor" apps to manipulate GPS data, enabling drivers to meet platform requirements, access high-

demand zones, or bypass perceived system limitations. This technological workaround reflects adaptive ingenuity and technical literacy in negotiating algorithmic constraints (Wood et al., 2019).

Coordination through Telegram groups constitutes another form of resistance. Drivers share strategies for maximizing earnings, avoiding deactivation, and interpreting opaque incentive rules. These digital networks facilitate collective problem-solving, peer accountability, and informal training, enabling workers to mitigate vulnerabilities collectively.

Informal unions and protest actions also emerge as critical mechanisms of resistance. Drivers organize demonstrations, petitions, or coordinated log-off events to demand transparency, fairness, and adjustments to platform policies. While lacking formal recognition, these collective actions create social and political leverage, demonstrating that algorithmic governance is neither total nor uncontested (Cant, 2020).

Digital resistance is both tactical and discursive. Drivers construct counter-narratives that challenge the platform's framing of flexibility and empowerment, highlighting systemic exploitation and inequities. These narratives circulate within peer networks, building solidarity and articulating collective identity. Resistance strategies are context-specific, reflecting local technological access, urban infrastructure, and socio-cultural norms. In Indonesia, widespread smartphone penetration and active digital communities enable experimentation, coordination, and the diffusion of knowledge critical for countering algorithmic precarity.

D. Counter-Narratives Against Flexibility Myth

Drivers actively challenge the dominant narrative of the platform as a "flexible partner," which positions them as autonomous and empowered. Counter-narratives highlight the structural constraints imposed by algorithmic management, revealing that perceived flexibility is often illusory and contingent on compliance with opaque metrics (Rosenblat, 2018).

These counter-narratives reconstruct drivers' identities as collective laborers rather than isolated entrepreneurs. By framing work experiences in terms of shared precarity, mutual adaptation strategies, and collective resistance, drivers contest the ideological framing of individual responsibility embedded in platform discourse.

Public and peer dissemination of these narratives strengthens awareness and solidarity. Within Telegram groups, drivers openly critique platform policies, share

stories of unfair deactivation, and discuss strategies for navigating exploitative rules. This discursive practice reinforces collective consciousness and legitimizes forms of resistance.

Counter-narratives also serve to educate new entrants about systemic challenges. Drivers transmit knowledge about algorithmic expectations, incentive structures, and tactics for maintaining income stability, thereby reducing the asymmetry of information that platforms rely upon to maintain control. By challenging the "freedom and flexibility" myth, drivers assert moral and practical claims over labor conditions, emphasizing accountability and fairness. These narratives function both as resistance and as a form of advocacy, signaling to platforms and peers the limits of algorithmic authority.

Discussion

A. Algorithm as Digital Panopticon

The findings illustrate that ride-hailing platforms operate as a digital panopticon, in which surveillance is internalized and normalized by drivers. The continuous monitoring of location, trip completion, and customer ratings generates a pervasive sense of visibility, compelling drivers to self-regulate behavior to avoid penalties or suspension (Graham et al., 2017). Unlike traditional oversight, the algorithmic gaze is invisible and operates without direct human intervention, creating a form of control that is both subtle and psychologically persistent.

Power relations are embedded in the design of platform technology. Decisions regarding incentives, penalties, and ride allocation are algorithmically mediated, producing asymmetries of knowledge and authority. Drivers often lack access to the rules governing their evaluations, which strengthens corporate control while creating an illusion of autonomy (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This internalized surveillance aligns with Foucault's notion of disciplinary power, where the panoptic effect leads individuals to monitor their own conduct in alignment with external expectations, even in the absence of direct enforcement.

The digital panopticon also reshapes labor subjectivities. Drivers internalize performance metrics as moral and professional imperatives, interpreting low ratings or missed incentives as personal failures rather than consequences of opaque systems. This process highlights how algorithmic governance extends control into the cognitive and emotional dimensions of work, influencing decisions, risk management, and self-perception.

Furthermore, the interplay between reward and punishment within the panoptic framework encourages adaptive behaviors. Drivers develop strategies to optimize performance and minimize algorithmic penalties, including the use of third-party apps, selective ride acceptance, and peer knowledge-sharing. These practices reveal the dual nature of algorithmic surveillance: while it imposes precarity, it also catalyzes creativity and collective adaptation.

B. The Global South Perspective

Algorithmic governance in Indonesia operates within a socio-economic and labor context distinct from that of the Global North. Unlike Uber drivers in North America or Europe, Indonesian ride-hailing drivers often intersect with preexisting informal labor networks and lack formal employment protections (Cant, 2020). This interconnection amplifies precarity, as workers are already embedded in informal economies with limited access to social security, labor unions, or legal recourse.

Urban infrastructure, transport norms, and socio-cultural dynamics further differentiate the Southeast Asian context. Drivers navigate dense traffic, diverse commuter expectations, and localized knowledge requirements, which influence both the implementation of algorithmic management and the forms of resistance employed. This intersection between platform-imposed rules and local labor realities creates hybrid strategies that are uniquely adapted to the Global South context.

Additionally, technological literacy mediates engagement with algorithmic control. Indonesian drivers leverage smartphones, GPS manipulation tools, and digital networks to circumvent constraints or optimize income. These practices demonstrate how workers creatively negotiate algorithmic authority, producing a form of digital labor resistance shaped by local conditions and resource access.

Comparative analyses indicate that Global South drivers experience intensified precarity relative to Global North counterparts due to weaker labor protections, informal work integration, and dependence on digital platforms for primary income. The convergence of informal labor structures with algorithmic management necessitates context-specific theoretical and policy interventions. By centering the Global South perspective, this study challenges assumptions of uniform platform labor dynamics, highlighting the importance of regional socio-economic and cultural factors in shaping the gig economy.

C. Redefining Labor Resistance in the Digital Era

Traditional notions of labor resistance, such as formal unions and strikes, are increasingly complemented or supplanted by digital and networked forms of collective action. Indonesian ride-hailing drivers exemplify this shift, forming fluid, peer-to-peer networks through Telegram, WhatsApp, and social media platforms to coordinate strategies, share knowledge, and organize protests (Wood et al., 2019).

Digital technologies function simultaneously as tools of control and resistance. While algorithms monitor and discipline work, drivers leverage the same technological infrastructures to mobilize information, develop workarounds, and challenge inequities. This duality underscores the complex interplay between surveillance and agency in digitally mediated labor.

Resistance is often tactical, decentralized, and ephemeral, relying on collective knowledge rather than formal organizational structures. Such forms of "everyday resistance" demonstrate how workers adapt to precarity without necessarily engaging in formal institutional channels (Scott, 1985). The circulation of counter-narratives, peer support, and technological workarounds constitutes a distributed strategy of labor empowerment.

These practices redefine labor activism in the gig economy, emphasizing digital literacy, adaptive experimentation, and peer coordination. They highlight that resistance is not solely reactive but can be anticipatory and pre-emptive, allowing workers to mitigate vulnerabilities before punitive consequences arise. Furthermore, digital resistance reinforces identity and solidarity. By framing experiences of algorithmic injustice collectively, drivers cultivate shared narratives that contest the myth of the "autonomous partner" and assert a moral claim over fair treatment and transparency.

D. Policy and Regulatory Implications

The findings highlight critical gaps in policy and regulation regarding platform labor. First, there is an urgent need for algorithmic transparency. Drivers must understand the rules, rating criteria, and incentive calculations that determine income and platform access, reducing informational asymmetries and mitigating stress and self-exploitation (Rosenblat, 2018).

Second, regulatory frameworks should address worker protections, including minimum earnings guarantees, social security contributions, and mechanisms for

grievance redress. While ride-hailing platforms classify drivers as independent partners, the operational dependency and economic precarity experienced suggest the need for formal labor safeguards.

Challenges remain regarding the legal recognition of platform work. The hybrid status of gig workers complicates conventional labor law application, necessitating novel regulatory approaches that account for the unique conditions of digital labor in informal economies. Policymakers must balance innovation and flexibility with protections that prevent exploitative practices. Policy interventions should also promote participatory governance, including avenues for driver input in algorithmic design, dispute resolution, and incentive structuring. Engaging workers in shaping the rules of the platform enhances legitimacy and reduces conflicts rooted in opaque decision-making.

Conclusion

A. Summary of Key Findings

This study demonstrates that ride-hailing platforms in Indonesia function as mechanisms of "soft control" through algorithmic management, incentive structures, and real-time monitoring. The algorithm operates as a digital panopticon, embedding surveillance into drivers' daily practices and internalizing disciplinary norms without direct human supervision (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). Rating systems, opaque penalty mechanisms, and performance-based incentives produce multi-dimensional precarity, including income instability, psychological stress, and self-exploitation (Standing, 2011).

Despite these structural constraints, drivers exhibit sophisticated forms of digital resistance. They employ technological workarounds, such as GPS manipulation via tutor apps, coordinate solidarity networks on Telegram, and form informal unions or collective protests. These strategies reveal how workers negotiate algorithmic authority and mitigate vulnerabilities while cultivating shared knowledge, collective identity, and peer accountability (Wood et al., 2019).

Furthermore, drivers construct counter-narratives that challenge the dominant flexibility myth promoted by platforms, reframing themselves not as autonomous partners but as collectively organized laborers navigating structural inequities. These narratives function both as a form of empowerment and as a discursive challenge to opaque algorithmic governance.

B. Theoretical Contributions

The study contributes to labor sociology and platform studies by enriching the concept of algorithmic precarity. It emphasizes that precarity is not only economic but also psychological and social, mediated by opaque technological systems and performance metrics. By situating these dynamics in Indonesia, the research foregrounds a Global South perspective, demonstrating how socio-economic and infrastructural contexts shape algorithmic labor regimes differently than in the Global North (Cant, 2020).

Additionally, the study advances theoretical understanding of digital resistance. It highlights that resistance can be tactical, decentralized, and digitally networked, challenging traditional conceptions of labor activism rooted in formal unionization. The findings underscore the dual role of technology as both a means of control and a resource for worker agency.

C. Practical Implications

The findings suggest several practical implications for policymakers, regulators, and platform governance. First, algorithmic transparency is critical: platforms should disclose criteria for rating, incentive calculation, and deactivation to reduce asymmetries of information and mitigate stress and self-exploitation among workers (Rosenblat, 2018).

Second, regulatory interventions are needed to protect drivers' labor rights, including mechanisms for grievance redress, minimum income guarantees, and social security contributions. Addressing the hybrid status of gig workers as independent partners yet economically dependent participants is essential to ensure fair and equitable working conditions.

D. Limitations and Future Research

This study faced limitations in accessing internal platform data and algorithmic logic, constraining the ability to analyze the precise computational mechanisms shaping incentives and penalties. Consequently, much of the analysis relies on observable practices, driver narratives, and secondary policy documentation.

Future research could expand cross-country comparative studies within Southeast Asia, examining how algorithmic precarity manifests in different regulatory, infrastructural, and cultural contexts. Comparative analysis could illuminate regional variations in digital resistance, collective mobilization, and labor outcomes, further enriching understanding of gig work in the Global South.

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Cant, C. (2020). *The platform economy and worker resistance: Organizing in Uber and Deliveroo*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

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

Hine, C. (2015). *Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, embodied and everyday*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2020). Platform economy in Southeast Asia: Adoption, regulation, and labor implications. *Information Systems Journal, 30*(6), 1023–1048.

Murthy, D. (2008). Digital ethnography: An examination of the use of new technologies for social research. *Sociology, 42*(5), 837–855.

Rani, U., Furrer, M., & Graham, M. (2020). Digital labor organizing in the Global South: The case of Indonesian ride-hailing drivers. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 62*(5), 663–682.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work*. University of California Press.

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 3758–3784.

Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.

Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.

Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society, 33*(1), 56–75.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

***