Inddonesian Economic Justice Review
ISSN: XXXX-XXXXX (Online)
Vol. 3, No. 2, 2026, pp. 103-116
Published online since May 18, 2026

From Partnership to Precarity: Economic Justice and Labor Protection in Indonesia's Platform-Based Transport Sector

Imam Ahmad Hanafi*
Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia
imamahmadhanafi@students.unnes.ac.id

DOI: https://doi.org/10.65815/sh3b1845

Submitted: 08-11-2025	Revised: 21-01-2026, 25-03-2026	Accepted: 02-05-2026

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Platform-based transport services have expanded rapidly in Indonesia, creating flexible income opportunities while simultaneously generating concerns regarding income instability, unilateral platform governance, and limited labor protection. This study examines the extent to which partnership-based contractual arrangements contribute to economic precarity among platform transport workers. The research adopts an interdisciplinary framework combining labor law, political economy, and economic justice. It analyzes contractual structures, platform governance mechanisms, social protection arrangements, and the allocation of economic risks between drivers and digital platforms. Secondary literature, regulatory documents, and publicly available evidence concerning platform work are examined to identify institutional gaps in worker protection. The study argues that the concept of partnership may produce an asymmetrical relationship when workers remain economically dependent on platforms while lacking the legal protections associated with conventional employment. From an economic justice perspective, flexibility should not be considered sufficient justification for transferring market, operational, and income risks disproportionately to workers. The study proposes that regulatory reform should focus on substantive economic dependence rather than contractual labels alone. Its contribution lies in linking the legal structure of platform work with distributive and procedural dimensions of justice. The analysis provides policy implications for developing a more balanced regulatory framework for Indonesia's platform-based transport economy.

[*Layanan transportasi berbasis platform telah berkembang pesat di Indonesia, menciptakan peluang pendapatan yang fleksibel sekaligus menimbulkan kekhawatiran terkait ketidakstabilan pendapatan, tata kelola platform yang sepihak, dan perlindungan tenaga kerja yang terbatas. Studi ini meneliti sejauh mana pengaturan kontrak berbasis kemitraan berkontribusi terhadap kerentanan ekonomi di kalangan pekerja transportasi platform. Penelitian ini* *mengadopsi kerangka kerja interdisipliner yang menggabungkan hukum ketenagakerjaan, ekonomi politik, dan keadilan ekonomi. Penelitian ini menganalisis struktur kontrak, mekanisme tata kelola platform, pengaturan perlindungan sosial, dan alokasi risiko ekonomi antara pengemudi dan platform digital. Literatur sekunder, dokumen peraturan, dan bukti yang tersedia untuk umum mengenai pekerjaan platform diperiksa untuk mengidentifikasi kesenjangan kelembagaan dalam perlindungan pekerja. Studi ini berpendapat bahwa konsep kemitraan dapat menghasilkan hubungan asimetris ketika pekerja tetap bergantung secara ekonomi pada platform sementara tidak memiliki perlindungan hukum yang terkait dengan pekerjaan konvensional. Dari perspektif keadilan ekonomi, fleksibilitas tidak boleh dianggap sebagai pembenaran yang cukup untuk mentransfer risiko pasar, operasional, dan pendapatan secara tidak proporsional kepada pekerja. Studi ini mengusulkan bahwa reformasi peraturan harus fokus pada ketergantungan ekonomi substantif daripada hanya label kontrak saja. Kontribusinya terletak pada keterkaitan struktur hukum kerja platform dengan dimensi distributif dan prosedural keadilan. Analisis ini memberikan implikasi kebijakan untuk mengembangkan kerangka peraturan yang lebih seimbang bagi ekonomi transportasi berbasis platform di Indonesia.*]

Keywords: platform economy, labor protection, economic precarity, partnership model, Indonesia

Introduction

The rapid expansion of the digital platform economy has fundamentally transformed the structural dynamics of urban mobility and labor markets across Southeast Asia, with Indonesia serving as one of its most prominent empirical arenas. The proliferation of ride-hailing and platform-based delivery services, dominated by corporate entities such as Gojek and Grab, has redefined traditional modalities of employment by substituting formal wage-labor contracts with flexible, algorithmically managed arrangements (Ford and Honan 2019). Millions of Indonesian workers have entered the platform ecosystem, lured by low barriers to entry and the promise of self-directed schedule management. However, this transition has raised fundamental questions regarding the socio-economic sustainability of digital labor and the efficacy of existing regulatory regimes in safeguarding fundamental worker rights (Titin and Purwanto 2020).

At the core of the platform transport model is the classification of workers as "independent partners" (*mitra*) rather than formal employees, a legal framing that fundamentally alters the distribution of obligations between capital and labor. By designating drivers as self-employed micro-entrepreneurs, platform corporations systematically bypass statutory labor protections guaranteed under Law No. 13/2003 on Manpower, including minimum wage standards, severance pay, paid leave, and employer-funded social security contributions (De Stefano 2016). This legal framing creates an asymmetrical institutional structure where platforms exercise extensive control over labor processes while externalizing operational costs and financial risks onto individual gig workers (Srnicek 2017). Consequently, the rhetoric of partnership conceals an underlying reality of structural dependency and economic vulnerability.

The structural vulnerability experienced by platform workers is directly linked to the broader conceptual framework of precarity, which characterizes the contemporary global labor landscape under neoliberal capitalism. Precarity in gig work manifests not merely as low remuneration, but as an ongoing exposure to market volatility, algorithmic unpredictability, and institutional neglect (Standing 2011). Drivers must navigate fluctuating fare structures, unpredictable demand patterns, and increasing platform commission fees without access to standard safety nets. From an economic justice perspective, this condition reflects a severe imbalance in distributive justice, as the financial gains of platform expansion accrue primarily to corporate shareholders while operational liabilities are shifted to marginalized workers (Graham and Woodcock 2018).

Algorithmic governance serves as the primary mechanism through which platforms exercise control over transport workers without assuming the legal duties of an employer. Algorithms dictate order allocation, route selection, performance metrics, and pricing structures, functioning as invisible yet pervasive managerial supervisors (Wood et al. 2019). Drivers are subjected to automated evaluation systems, such as customer rating thresholds and acceptance rate benchmarks, which directly dictate their earning potential and access to work. When performance metrics drop below platform-set standards, drivers face unilateral suspension or permanent account deactivation without clear channels for appeal, exemplifying a severe deficit in procedural justice (Graham and Woodcock 2018).

The institutional gaps in Indonesia's regulatory landscape further exacerbate the precarious position of platform transport workers. Existing transportation regulations, such as Ministry of Transportation Regulation No. PM 12/2019, focus primarily on operational safety, vehicle standards, and consumer protection rather than labor rights or economic justice (Minister of Transportation 2019). Because statutory labor law remains strictly anchored to the traditional binary distinction between employee and independent contractor, regulatory bodies have struggled to address the realities of hybrid labor relationships. This regulatory void enables digital platforms to maintain unilateral authority over working conditions, leaving drivers without formal institutional mechanisms for collective bargaining or dispute resolution (Titin and Purwanto 2020).

The concept of economic justice requires that economic institutions be structured to ensure fair distribution of resources, equitable risk sharing, and meaningful worker agency. In the context of platform transport, current arrangements fail to meet these normative criteria because the flexibility afforded to workers is heavily outweighed by systemic financial insecurity and institutional subordination (Wood et al. 2019). While flexibility allows drivers to choose their working hours, economic necessity forces many to work excessively long shifts—often exceeding twelve hours per day—to cover fixed operating costs and secure a subsistence income. Thus, autonomy within the gig economy operates largely as a structural illusion, constrained by algorithmic discipline and economic pressure (Standing 2011).

Addressing the precarity of platform transport work in Indonesia requires an interdisciplinary analytical framework that integrates labor law, political economy, and theories of economic justice. Legal analysis must move beyond formal contractual labels to evaluate the substantive economic dependence of workers on platform capital (De Stefano 2016). Simultaneously, a political economy approach illuminates how platform governance mechanisms extract surplus value while shifting capital depreciation, fuel expenses, and health risks onto individual labor force participants (Srnicek 2017). Linking these perspectives reveals that regulatory interventions must address both distributive outcomes, such as income floors and social protection, and procedural rights, such as algorithmic transparency and collective representation.

This study examines the extent to which partnership-based contractual arrangements contribute to economic precarity among platform transport workers in Indonesia. By investigating the alignment between legal classifications, platform governance practices, and socio-economic outcomes, the paper aims to formulate a comprehensive framework for regulatory reform. The ultimate objective is to propose legal and policy mechanisms that reconcile the dynamic efficiencies of the platform economy with principles of economic justice and labor protection, ensuring that technological advancement does not come at the expense of human dignity and social well-being.

The Legal Illusion of Partnership: Structural Asymmetry and Contractual Ambiguity

The legal framework governing platform transport work in Indonesia is defined by a fundamental structural contradiction between the formal contract of partnership (*mitra*) and the material realities of platform labor. Under Indonesian civil law, a partnership arrangement presupposes equal bargaining power and mutual autonomy among contracting parties. However, in the ride-hailing sector, corporate platforms draft standard-form contracts unilaterally, leaving prospective drivers with no opportunity to negotiate terms, commission rates, or operational guidelines (Titin and Purwanto 2020). This take-it-or-leave-it dynamic establishes an inherently asymmetrical relationship from the outset, undermining the legal premise of horizontal partnership.

By legalizing the relationship through partnership agreements, digital platforms effectively place drivers outside the protective umbrella of Law No. 13/2003 on Manpower. Formal employment status in Indonesia triggers statutory entitlements such as a guaranteed minimum wage, paid annual leave, sick leave, severance pay, and mandatory employer contributions to social security programs (De Stefano 2016). The contractual framing of workers as independent contractors exempts platform companies from these legal obligations, allowing capital to reduce labor costs significantly while maintaining direct control over labor output.

The ambiguity surrounding the legal status of platform workers is compounded by the binary nature of Indonesian labor jurisprudence. The existing legal framework recognizes only two primary categories of work: formal employees operating under a contract of service, and independent contractors operating under a contract for services (Titin and Purwanto 2020). Ride-hailing drivers fit uncomfortably into this binary model because they exhibit features of both independence and deep structural subordination, creating a grey zone that platforms systematically exploit to evade employer responsibilities.

Substantive economic dependence is the defining feature of the platform driver's relationship with the digital firm, regardless of contractual labels. Most platform drivers rely on ride-hailing as their primary or sole source of income, devoting full-time working hours to platform-assigned tasks (Ford and Honan 2019). When a worker's livelihood is entirely dependent on a single corporate entity that retains exclusive control over customer access and payment processing, the legal assertion that the worker is an independent entrepreneur becomes an unsustainable legal fiction (De Stefano 2016).

Furthermore, standard partnership contracts in Indonesia contain provisions that grant platforms unilateral rights to modify terms of service at any time without prior consultation with drivers. Platforms frequently adjust base fares, incentive structures, and commission deductions overnight, directly altering driver compensation (Wood et al. 2019). This arbitrary power to rewrite contractual terms highlights the profound imbalance of procedural justice inherent in platform work, as drivers possess no institutional recourse to challenge adverse modifications.

The legal framing of partnership also obscures the reality of direct behavioral control exercised by platforms through digital monitoring and instruction. While traditional independent contractors retain discretion over how a service is performed, platform transport drivers must adhere to strict operational standards prescribed by the application (Woodcock and Graham 2018). Guidelines regarding dress codes, customer service protocols, and vehicle specifications demonstrate that platforms exert managerial control comparable to traditional employment relationships, despite disclaiming employer status.

In judicial contexts globally, courts have increasingly recognized that contractual labels cannot overrule the practical reality of labor performance. Precedents in jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have reclassified platform drivers as workers or employees based on the degree of control and economic dependence present in the relationship (De Stefano 2016). However, Indonesian courts have yet to establish a comprehensive legal doctrine that looks behind contractual forms to protect gig workers, leaving drivers vulnerable to corporate legal maneuvers.

The absence of a specific legal definition for platform workers in Indonesian legislation creates severe enforcement bottlenecks for labor inspectors. State agencies responsible for enforcing labor standards frequently claim a lack of jurisdiction over platform transport disputes, viewing them as private civil matters governed by contract law rather than labor law (Titin and Purwanto 2020). This regulatory retreat abdicates state responsibility for protecting vulnerable workers, allowing corporate actors to establish private systems of governance.

The partnership model also shifts the burden of operational compliance onto individual drivers while denying them the privileges of genuine business ownership. Drivers are legally required to maintain vehicle registrations, obtain commercial transport licenses, and comply with state safety standards at their own expense (Minister of Transportation 2019). Yet, unlike true micro-entrepreneurs, drivers cannot set their own prices, build a private customer base, or sell their services on an open market, rendering their "entrepreneurship" purely nominal.

The legal construction of the partnership model in Indonesia ultimately functions as an institutional mechanism for risk externalization. By shielding platform capital from employment-related liability, the law incentivizes corporations to over-recruit drivers to minimize consumer wait times, regardless of the resulting dilution of driver earnings (Srnicek 2017). The structural excess of labor supply on platform networks depresses individual worker incomes while reinforcing driver submission to platform demands out of fear of losing work.

From a comparative legal perspective, statutory reforms in other emerging economies have begun introducing intermediate legal categories to extend basic protections to gig workers without forcing them into rigid employment models (De Stefano 2016). Such frameworks grant independent workers access to collective bargaining rights, occupational safety standards, and protection against unfair termination. Indonesia's failure to enact similar legislative updates leaves its platform transport sector anchored in an obsolete legal paradigm.

The legal ambiguity of partnership contracts also severely restricts drivers' access to judicial mechanisms for dispute resolution. Standard contracts often include mandatory arbitration clauses or designate specific legal venues that are financially and geographically inaccessible to individual drivers (Titin and Purwanto 2020). Consequently, when drivers face wage withholding, arbitrary account suspension, or contract termination, formal legal remedies remain practically unreachable.

The imbalance in bargaining power is further reinforced by the fragmentation of the driver workforce. Distributed across urban spaces and connected only through individual digital interfaces, drivers face significant structural barriers to formal labor organization (Ford and Honan 2019). Platform companies actively leverage this atomization, framing drivers as individual business partners competing against one another rather than workers with shared collective interests.

Efforts by driver associations to demand formal legal recognition as employees have met persistent corporate resistance. Platform companies argue that applying standard labor laws would eliminate the schedule flexibility that drivers value, presenting a false binary between flexibility and legal protection (Wood et al. 2019). In reality, basic labor protections such as minimum wage guarantees and health insurance are fully compatible with flexible working schedules if appropriately designed into legislation.

The legal illusion of partnership in Indonesia's platform transport sector thus represents a systemic failure to align legal norms with economic realities. Reforming this system requires a fundamental reassessment of how labor protection is triggered under Indonesian law, shifting from a formalist focus on contract labels to a material analysis of control, vulnerability, and economic dependence (De Stefano 2016). Without such statutory evolution, the partnership model will continue to generate structural precarity under the guise of modern, flexible enterprise.

Algorithmic Governance, Risk Transfer, and Economic Precarity

Algorithmic governance forms the operational engine of digital platform capitalism, orchestrating daily labor processes through data extraction and automated decision-making. In Indonesia’s transport sector, platforms utilize proprietary algorithms to dispatch orders, evaluate driver performance, determine route navigation, and dynamically adjust pricing (Wood et al. 2019). This automated architecture replaces human managerial hierarchies with continuous, data-driven surveillance, enabling platforms to exercise precise control over worker behavior while maintaining the legal pretense of worker independence.

The mechanism of dynamic pricing, commonly implemented through algorithmic surge pricing models, introduces severe income volatility for platform drivers. Fares fluctuate continuously based on real-time consumer demand, traffic conditions, and spatial driver density, rendering prospective earnings highly unpredictable (Srnicek 2017). Drivers are unable to calculate their daily or weekly income with certainty, which destabilizes household budgeting and forces workers to prolong their operational hours to meet basic financial requirements.

Central to algorithmic governance is the systematic transfer of operational and market risks from platform corporations directly onto individual drivers. Under traditional employment, firms absorb the costs of capital investment, vehicle maintenance, fuel price surges, insurance, and downtime resulting from low market demand (De Stefano 2016). In contrast, platform drivers must purchase or lease their own vehicles, cover all fuel and repair expenditures, and absorb the financial loss during unpaid waiting periods between rides (Ford and Honan 2019).

The externalization of operational expenses significantly erodes drivers' net income, often reducing nominal earnings below statutory minimum wage thresholds. While gross earnings displayed on application dashboards may appear substantial, net earnings—calculated after deducting platform commissions, fuel costs, vehicle depreciation, phone data plans, and maintenance—frequently reveal a state of severe economic deprivation (Standing 2011). In effect, drivers subsidize the operational infrastructure of multi-billion-dollar platform corporations through their private capital assets.

Algorithmic dispatch systems also create spatial and temporal discipline by deploying behavioral nudges and gamified incentives. Applications use push notifications, streak bonuses, and acceptance rate targets to manipulate driver behavior, encouraging them to work during unsocial hours or in high-risk locations (Wood et al. 2019). These automated nudges restrict authentic worker autonomy, as failure to comply with algorithmically generated suggestions results in reduced order allocation or lower operational priority.

Customer rating systems serve as a primary instrument of automated surveillance and discipline within the platform transport ecosystem. Drivers are subject to continuous evaluation by consumers through five-star rating metrics, transforming passengers into uncompensated micro-supervisors (Graham and Woodcock 2018). Because algorithms automatically penalize drivers whose average scores drop below stringent thresholds, workers are forced to perform emotional labor and accept unreasonable passenger demands to protect their livelihoods.

The opacity of algorithmic governance creates a severe information asymmetry between platform operators and workers. Drivers have no access to the underlying logic, code, or data that govern order assignment or fare calculation (Wood et al. 2019). This structural black box leaves drivers unable to verify whether earnings deductions, bonus calculations, or dispatch decisions are executed fairly, leaving them entirely at the mercy of automated corporate management. Unilateral account deactivation—commonly referred to by drivers as "suspend" or "putus mitra"—represents the most extreme manifestation of algorithmic power. Algorithms can automatically block a driver’s account based on customer complaints, low acceptance rates, or flagged behavioral anomalies without prior warning or formal human review (Graham and Woodcock 2018). This instantaneous loss of access to work strips drivers of their livelihood without basic procedural due process or an adequate right of appeal.

The health and safety risks associated with platform transport work are similarly externalized onto drivers. Long driving hours necessitated by declining piece-rate remuneration lead to severe physical exhaustion, chronic strain, and heightened exposure to traffic accidents (Minister of Transportation 2019). Because platforms do not classify driver fatigue or accidents as occupational injuries, workers must bear the full financial burden of medical treatment and income loss during recovery unless enrolled in personal insurance schemes.

Depreciation of private vehicles represents a hidden economic drain that accelerates driver precarity over time. High daily mileage required to secure sufficient orders accelerates mechanical wear and tears down vehicle asset value (Ford and Honan 2019). Many drivers take out high-interest loans to purchase motorcycles or cars for platform work, finding themselves trapped in cycles of debt as vehicle devaluation outpaces their capacity to service loan principal and interest payments. Market risk is further amplified by platform strategies of market expansion through driver over-saturation. To guarantee immediate response times for consumers, platform algorithms continuously onboarding new drivers, effectively diluting the volume of orders available per worker (Srnicek 2017). Individual drivers bear the full cost of this oversupply through increased unpaid waiting time, while the platform firm captures market dominance and enhanced network effects.

The interaction between algorithmic control and financial vulnerability produces psychological distress among platform workers. Constant exposure to rating fluctuations, the threat of sudden account suspension, unpredictable income streams, and physical hazards creates an environment of pervasive anxiety (Standing 2011). This socio-psychological dimension of precarity reinforces driver powerlessness, making individual resistance or collective organizing psychologically and economically precarious. Efforts by drivers to circumvent algorithmic control—such as using unauthorized location-spoofing applications (*tuyul*) or organizing informal collective boycotts—are met with aggressive algorithmic countermeasures and mass account terminations (Ford and Honan 2019). This cycle of driver resistance and technological counter-surveillance highlights the contentious, adversarial nature of labor relations within algorithmically managed transport platforms.

The economic precarity generated by algorithmic governance extends beyond individual workers to impact household stability and broader socio-economic welfare. Without predictable earnings or formal employment documentation, gig workers are systematically excluded from formal banking systems, mortgage access, and commercial credit facilities (Standing 2011). This financial marginalization traps driver households in persistent economic vulnerability, limiting intergenerational upward mobility. Ultimately, algorithmic governance in Indonesia's platform transport sector operates as an institutional mechanism for maximizing corporate profitability by disaggregating labor and externalizing market risks. Addressing these systemic inequities requires regulatory mandates that enforce algorithmic transparency, establish minimum net income floors, mandate human-in-the-loop review for account terminations, and redistribute operational risks back onto platform companies (Graham and Woodcock 2018).

Reimagining Institutional Protection: Economic Justice and Regulatory Reform

Reimagining labor protection within Indonesia's platform transport sector requires a fundamental shift in theoretical framing, moving away from formalist legal categories toward principles of economic justice. Economic justice posits that economic institutions must be evaluated based on their ability to distribute resources fairly, protect human dignity, and provide meaningful voice to vulnerable participants (Graham and Woodcock 2018). In the gig economy, achieving economic justice necessitates institutional reforms that counteract structural asymmetries and prevent the uncompensated transfer of operational risks onto labor.

A foundational pillar of economic justice in platform work is distributive justice, which focuses on fair compensation and equitable risk sharing. Under current market conditions, platform companies capture disproportionate financial value through commission extractions while transferring operational liabilities onto drivers (Srnicek 2017). Achieving distributive justice requires establishing statutory wage floors specifically calculated after deducting operational costs, ensuring that platform workers earn a living wage for standard working hours (De Stefano 2016). Procedural justice represents an equally critical dimension of reform, focusing on fairness, transparency, and voice in platform governance. Drivers currently operate under opaque algorithmic regimes where decisions regarding order allocation, earnings calculation, and account termination are made without explanation or contestation (Wood et al. 2019). Procedural justice demands legally enforceable rights to algorithmic transparency, requiring platforms to disclose key metrics governing dispatch and rating mechanisms to workers and regulatory bodies (Graham and Woodcock 2018).

To operationalize procedural justice, regulatory frameworks must establish mandatory, independent dispute resolution mechanisms for account suspensions and terminations. Drivers faced with account deactivation should have the statutory right to a timely, human-driven review process, complete with access to evidence and clear avenues for appeal (Graham and Woodcock 2018). Eliminating automated, arbitrary terminations is a crucial step toward restoring basic due process and security within digital labor environments.

Institutionalizing social protection for platform workers requires decoupling access to social safety nets from traditional formal employment contracts. Indonesia's national social security framework (*BPJS Ketenagakerjaan* and *BPJS Kesehatan*) historically relies on formal employment ties for mandatory employer co-contributions (Titin and Purwanto 2020). Regulatory reforms should establish portable social protection schemes funded through mandatory platform levies, ensuring gig workers receive comprehensive coverage for occupational hazards, healthcare, and retirement (De Stefano 2016).

The concept of "substantive economic dependence" should replace formal contractual designation as the primary trigger for labor protection under Indonesian law. Rather than debating whether drivers are employees or partners, legislation should extend core labor protections to any worker who relies on a platform for a substantial portion of their income and operates under algorithmic management

(De Stefano 2016). This approach closes the legal loopholes currently exploited by platform firms to evade statutory duties.

Collective bargaining rights must be legally recognized and facilitated for platform workers, despite their formal status as independent contractors. Existing Indonesian labor legislation restricts union formation and formal collective bargaining primarily to conventional employees working within established enterprises (Titin and Purwanto 2020). Amending legal frameworks to permit platform worker associations to engage in multi-employer collective bargaining would empower drivers to negotiate base fares, commission caps, and safety protocols directly with platform corporations (Ford and Honan 2019). Government intervention must also address the capping of platform commission rates to prevent excessive value extraction. Unregulated commission deductions—which sometimes reach up to 20 to 30 percent per transaction—directly reduce driver margins and incentivize unsustainable working hours (Wood et al. 2019). Imposing statutory caps on platform commissions would ensure a more equitable distribution of revenue between platform corporations and front-line transport workers.

Cross-sectoral regulatory coordination is essential for implementing effective oversight over the platform transport economy. Currently, policy responsibilities are fragmented between the Ministry of Transportation, the Ministry of Manpower, and the Ministry of Communication and Informatics, leading to regulatory inaction (Titin and Purwanto 2020). Establishing an inter-ministerial task force dedicated to digital labor governance would enable holistic policy formulation addressing transportation safety, labor standards, and digital rights simultaneously.

Regulatory frameworks must also establish mandatory maximum driving hours to mitigate physical exhaustion and public safety hazards. While platform flexibility allows drivers to remain logged into applications indefinitely, economic pressure frequently forces them to work dangerous, grueling shifts (Minister of Transportation 2019). Algorithmic guardrails enforced by law should automatically restrict continuous driving time, paired with guaranteed base rates that ensure drivers do not need to work excessive hours to survive. Incorporating international benchmark standards, such as the *Fairwork Principles*, provides a concrete evaluation framework for Indonesian policymakers. The Fairwork framework evaluates platforms based on five principles: fair pay, fair conditions, fair contracts, fair management, and fair representation (Graham and Woodcock 2018). Embedding these benchmark principles into national accreditation and licensing standards for platform operators would incentivize corporate compliance with ethical labor practices.

Municipal and provincial governments in Indonesia can play a proactive role in platform governance through local transport regulations. Local authorities can condition platform operating permits on compliance with regional minimum wage benchmarks, local driver welfare programs, and data-sharing agreements (Ford and Honan 2019). Decentralized regulatory experimentation allows local governments to tailor protection mechanisms to specific urban transportation contexts.

Public digital infrastructure and co-operative platform models represent alternative institutional pathways to counteract corporate platform monopolies. Supporting worker-owned platform cooperatives or municipal ride-hailing applications can create competitive alternatives that prioritize driver welfare and reinvest profits into local communities (Srnicek 2017). State support for digital public goods can challenge corporate dominance and democratize platform governance.

Reforming the legal status of platform workers must also address gender-specific vulnerabilities within the gig economy. Female platform drivers in Indonesia face unique challenges, including personal safety risks during night shifts, lack of access to sanitation facilities, and uncompensated reproductive labor responsibilities (Ford and Honan 2019). Gender-responsive regulatory design should mandate platform safety features, dedicated support channels, and inclusive social security provisions that account for non-standard working patterns. Ultimately, achieving economic justice in Indonesia's platform transport sector requires aligning technological innovation with constitutional mandates for social welfare. Article 27(2) of the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia explicitly guarantees every citizen the right to work and a humanely decent living. Transforming platform transport work from a source of precarity into a sustainable modality of employment demands courageous legislative action that prioritizes human rights and economic fairness over unmitigated corporate expansion (Titin and Purwanto 2020).

Conclusion

This study has examined the structural transformation of labor in Indonesia's platform-based transport sector, demonstrating how the contractual framing of "partnership" (*mitra*) generates systemic economic precarity for platform drivers. By operating outside the boundaries of formal employment law, platform corporations systematically transfer market, operational, and capital depreciation risks onto individual workers while maintaining direct control through opaque algorithmic governance mechanisms. The empirical and legal evidence analyzed indicates that flexibility within the gig economy operates as a double-edged sword: while offering low entry barriers and schedule autonomy, it strips workers of statutory income guarantees, occupational health protections, and procedural due process. Consequently, the rhetoric of entrepreneurial partnership masks a deeply asymmetrical labor relationship defined by structural economic dependence and institutional vulnerability.

Addressing this institutional crisis requires a paradigm shift toward an economic justice framework that prioritizes substantive economic protection over formal contractual labels. Regulatory reform in Indonesia must evolve beyond traditional labor binaries by extending core labor rights, portable social protection, algorithmic transparency, and collective bargaining mechanisms to algorithmically managed workers. Aligning national policy with principles of distributive and procedural justice is essential to ensure that technological innovation enhances human welfare rather than exacerbating social inequality. Ultimately, developing a balanced and equitable regulatory framework for Indonesia's platform economy is not merely a legal necessity, but a constitutional imperative to uphold human dignity and economic fairness for millions of digital workers.

References

De Stefano, Valerio. 2016. "The Rise of the 'Just-in-Time Workforce': On-Demand Work, Crowdwork, and Labour Protection in the 'Gig-Economy'." *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal* 37 (3): 471–504. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2724652.

Ford, Michele, and Vivian Honan. 2019. "The Gig Economy in Indonesia: Making Sense of Platform Work." *Lowy Institute Academic Papers*. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv18b5c98.

Graham, Mark, and Jamie Woodcock. 2018. "Towards a Fairer Platform Economy: Legal and Ethical Considerations." *Competition & Change* 22 (2): 211–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529418758223.

Minister of Transportation. 2019. *Regulation of the Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia Number PM 12 of 2019 concerning Safety Protection of Motorcycle Users Used for the Interest of the Community*. Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia.

Srnicek, Nick. 2017. *Platform Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119293149.

Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350223172.

Titin, Titin, and Agus Purwanto. 2020. "Legal Protection for Gig Economy Workers in Indonesia: Between Flexibility and Exploitation." *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan* 50 (2): 345–360. https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol50.no2.2581.

Wood, Alex J., Mark Graham, Vili Lehdonvirta, and Isis Hjorth. 2019. "Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy." *Work, Employment and Society* 33 (1): 56–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616.

***

Acknowledgment
None

Funding Information
None

Conflicting Interest Statement
The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement
All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement
N/A