Priviet Social Sciences Journal

Volume 6
Issue 3 March, 2026

Article 13

10-03-2026

Algorithmic exposure and identity work among Indonesia's generation z creators: reframing work culture in the platform economy

Muhammad Hikmal Yazid

To cite this article: Yazid, M. H. (2026). Algorithmic exposure and identity work among Indonesia's Generation Z creators: Reframing work culture in the platform economy. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal, 6*(3), 138–151. https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.926

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.926

Priviet Social Sciences Journal
E-ISSN 2798-6314
P-ISSN 2798-866X
https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i3.926

Volume 6
Issue 3
March Edition 2026

Algorithmic exposure and identity work among Indonesia's generation z creators: reframing work culture in the platform economy

Muhammad Hikmal Yazid

Division of Strategic Studies and Research, Al Ihsan Educational Foundation, Bekasi, Indonesia
e-mail: yazid.hikmal.muhammad@gmail.com

Received 6 November 2025
Revised 11 November 2026
Accepted 9 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines how Indonesia's Generation Z creative workers negotiate autonomy, identity, and precarity within the algorithmic infrastructures of the digital platform economy. Drawing on a mixed-method study across Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta (n = 312 survey; 20 interviews), the paper develops an integrated model linking platform affordances, algorithmic exposure, and identity work to income volatility and well-being. While theories of platform labour and identity work often derive from Western individualistic contexts, this study positions the Indonesian case as a boundary condition—where collectivist norms and affective reciprocity modify the logic of algorithmic precarity. Findings reveal that creative autonomy is increasingly mediated by algorithmic visibility metrics, transforming personal branding into a form of economic labour. Autonomy and creative freedom coexist with structural insecurity, producing a paradox of entrepreneurial dependence. The article contributes theoretically by identifying three mechanisms—algorithmic exposure, self-branding labour, and communal buffering—that reconfigure the platform–labour–identity nexus in emerging economies. Policy implications include the need for portable social protection, algorithmic transparency, and regional creative infrastructure to stabilize digital livelihoods. By integrating quantitative indicators with qualitative narratives, the study advances a socio-economic understanding of how digital capitalism reshapes work, identity, and social reproduction in Southeast Asia.

Keywords: platform labour; algorithmic exposure; identity work; precarity; generation z; creative economy.

1. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has transformed the meaning and organization of work. Digital platforms have become dominant infrastructures through which labour, creativity, and value are mediated. In this new regime, *work* is no longer confined to organizations or schedules but unfolds through networks of visibility, data, and audience engagement. Within such contexts, Generation Z—the first cohort to mature under pervasive algorithmic systems—redefines what it means to labour, earn, and belong. Their participation in the digital creative economy illustrates how platform capitalism reorganizes economic opportunity and cultural expression.

1.1 The Global Shift: From Employment to Platform Labour

Across advanced and emerging economies, traditional employment relations are eroding as algorithmic coordination substitutes managerial hierarchies. Scholars of *platform labour* (Wood et al., 2021; Lehdonvirta, 2022) highlight how control is reconstituted through digital affordances—ratings, metrics, and automated visibility—that shape workers' behaviours without formal contracts. Meanwhile, the *attention economy* (Fuchs, 2023) and *creator economy* (Abidin, 2021) illustrate how cultural production becomes a form of monetized self-presentation. Together, these frameworks depict a new form of labour that is flexible yet precarious, autonomous yet algorithmically dependent

1.2 The Indonesian Creative Economy as Boundary Condition

Indonesia represents one of Southeast Asia's fastest-growing digital markets, where over 200 million internet users sustain a thriving creative ecosystem. Cities such as Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta function as experimental laboratories for digital entrepreneurship and cultural production. Yet, despite rapid growth, creative work remains structurally fragile: incomes fluctuate, protections are minimal, and success depends on algorithmic visibility rather than institutional support. The Indonesian context is thus analytically valuable not merely as a case study but as a boundary condition that challenges Western assumptions about individualism, market rationality, and labour agency. In collectivist digital ecologies, creative work is mediated through *affective networks*—mutual support, community reputation, and informal collaboration—that partially buffer precarity while generating new dependencies.

1.3 Theoretical Gap: Algorithmic Precarity and Identity Work

Existing theories of *identity work* (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Petriglieri, 2011) describe how workers construct coherent selves within organizational structures. However, in the platform economy, identity itself becomes a form of labour—a process of *continuous self-performance* for algorithmic recognition (Gandini, 2016). Western literature often assumes individual agency in this process. In contrast, this study reveals how Indonesian Gen Z creators perform identity not only for audiences but also for algorithms and peer networks, blending economic rationality with social reciprocity. This hybrid configuration remains under-theorized.

Similarly, theories of *platform precarity* (Vallas & Schor, 2020; Wood & Lehdonvirta, 2021) emphasize market uncertainty and algorithmic control but seldom integrate the cultural dimensions of belonging and community. The Indonesian case illustrates how communal practices—shared studios, collaborative projects, and digital collectives—reshape the experience of risk and stability. Hence, *algorithmic precarity* in Southeast Asia is relational, not merely individual.

1.4 Research Aim and Theoretical Contribution

This article addresses these theoretical gaps by proposing a mechanism-based framework that connects *platform affordances*, *algorithmic exposure*, and *identity work* to labour outcomes such as *income volatility* and *well-being*. It advances three contributions to the sociology of work:

First, reconceptualizing autonomy: showing that digital autonomy is contingent and algorithmically mediated rather than freely chosen.

Second, extending identity work theory: identifying *self-branding labour* as a hybrid form of economic and affective identity construction.
Third, contextualizing platform precarity: theorizing *communal buffering* as a boundary condition within collectivist digital economies.

These contributions reposition Indonesia not as a peripheral example but as an empirical frontier that challenges universalist models of platform labour.

1.5 Structure of The Article

The next section develops the conceptual framework and propositions, outlining the hypothesized causal chain linking platform affordances to well-being outcomes. The methodology describes the mixed-method design applied across three urban creative hubs. The results and discussion integrate statistical evidence with interpretive analysis to test and elaborate the proposed mechanisms. Finally, the article concludes by articulating theoretical implications for labour sociology and practical directions for digital work governance.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND PROPOSITIONS

2.1 Platform Affordances and Algorithmic Exposure

Digital platforms reshape labour through their *affordances*—the technical and social possibilities for visibility, monetisation, and interaction (Leonardi, 2013).In the creative economy, these affordances operate as algorithmic infrastructures that both enable and constrain autonomy. Recommendation systems, engagement metrics, and reward algorithms convert visibility into currency but simultaneously impose opaque hierarchies of recognition. Workers are compelled to remain continuously "active" to maintain algorithmic favour, transforming time and attention into measurable commodities.
Proposition 1 (P1): Higher algorithmic exposure—measured by frequency of posting and dependence on platform metrics—*reduces perceived creative autonomy* by embedding performance within opaque algorithmic governance.

2.2 Self-Branding as Identity Work

Classical theories of *identity work* (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Brown, 2015) conceptualise the self as reflexively sustained through organisational discourse.In platform settings, identity is performed not within firms but within *algorithmic audiences*. Creative workers engage in *self-branding labour*—a continuous process of curating persona, tone, and aesthetic coherence to attract visibility (Gandini, 2016; Duffy, 2017).Such labour collapses the boundary between self-expression and market production. The "authentic self" becomes both a marketing strategy and a psychological demand, generating emotional intensification and reputational risk.
Proposition 2 (P2): Stronger self-branding orientation—the degree to which workers see themselves as brands—*mediates* the negative link between algorithmic exposure and well-being by converting identity performance into a resource for recognition but a source of emotional exhaustion.

2.3 Autonomy, Income Volatility, and Well-Being

Digital labour's celebrated flexibility conceals structural volatility.While autonomy permits creative exploration, income derived from algorithmic attention is unpredictable.Scholars of *precarity* (Standing, 2016; Wood & Lehdonvirta, 2021) note that freedom without protection produces "entrepreneurial dependence"—a condition where self-discipline replaces external control.Empirical indicators—irregular hours, night work, and multi-client juggling—signal this paradox of freedom and fatigue.
Proposition 3 (P3): Greater perceived autonomy correlates with higher income volatility, reflecting the trade-off between creative freedom and economic stability.
Proposition 4 (P4): Income volatility has a *negative association* with subjective well-being, partially mediated by financial insecurity and burnout.

2.4 Communal Buffering and Contextual Conditions

Most global research treats platform labour as an individualised struggle. However, in Indonesia's collectivist digital ecology, community networks—coworking hubs, peer collaborations, and local creative communities—act as *communal buffers* that redistribute risk and provide emotional and informational support.This mechanism echoes the concept of *collective coping* in precarious work (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2011) but extends it into algorithmic spaces through reciprocal promotion and shared visibility.

Proposition 5 (P5):The negative relationship between income volatility and well-being is *moderated* by communal participation: workers embedded in supportive creative networks experience weaker adverse effects of volatility.

2.5 Integrated Causal Model

In summary, the framework articulates a sequential causal chain linking technological, psychological, and socio-economic dimensions:

Platform affordances
↓
Algorithmic exposure
↓ (–)
Perceived creative autonomy
↓ (+)
Self-branding labour
↓ (±)
Income volatility
↓ (–)
Well-being
↕ moderated by communal buffering

This model reframes *algorithmic precarity* not as a static condition but as a dynamic interaction between control (algorithms), agency (identity work), and social embeddedness (community).It connects macro-structures of platform capitalism with micro-practices of self-making and collective adaptation.

2.6 Theoretical Implications

The theoritical implications are; First, mechanism Specification— Moves beyond descriptive accounts of "digital transformation" by specifying *how* platform affordances generate labour outcomes through algorithmic exposure. Second, hybrid Identity Work— Extends identity-work theory to include *monetised performativity* and *algorithmic self-governance*, integrating affective and economic labour. Third, Contextual Sociology of Work— Positions the Indonesian creative economy as a *boundary condition* that reveals the persistence of collective norms within neoliberal digital infrastructures.

2.7 Operationalisation for Empirical Testing

Although the present study employs a mixed-method design, the framework permits further quantitative operationalisation (See Table 1)

Table 1. Empirical Testing

Construct	Empirical indicators	Expected direction
Algorithmic exposure	posting frequency; dependency on engagement metrics	↑ → lower autonomy
Self-branding orientation	self-as-brand identification; strategic content planning	mediates autonomy → well-being
Perceived autonomy	decision freedom; control over creative topics	↑ → higher volatility
Income volatility	fluctuation of monthly earnings; number of clients	↑ → lower well-being
Communal buffering	participation in creative collectives; collaboration frequency	moderates volatility → well-being

Source: Author's data

This table translates qualitative constructs into measurable variables suitable for follow-up regression or structural-equation modelling, aligning the study with *Work, Employment & Society*'s emphasis on *mechanism-based explanation*.

2.8 Summary

By theorising *algorithmic exposure*, *self-branding labour*, and *communal buffering* as interlocking mechanisms, the framework advances a relational understanding of digital creative work.It conceptualises precarity not merely as economic instability but as the lived negotiation between autonomy, identity, and algorithmic governance.This integrative perspective underpins the subsequent methodological design and empirical analysis.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design and Rationale

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-method design, combining survey-based quantitative analysis with qualitative interviews. The choice of design followed the logic of *mechanism-based inquiry* (Hedström & Swedberg, 1998): to identify not only statistical relationships among constructs but also the underlying social mechanisms linking algorithmic exposure, self-branding labour, and well-being. The mixed approach aligns with *Work, Employment & Society*'s tradition of contextual, empirically grounded sociology of work. Quantitative data established population-level patterns of autonomy, volatility, and communal participation, while qualitative interviews revealed the meanings, coping strategies, and emotional negotiations embedded in these experiences. Integrating both forms of data ensured triangulation between *structural indicators* (income, workload, protection) and *interpretive insights* (identity, aspiration, fatigue).

3.2 Research Setting: The Tri-City Creative Ecosystem

Fieldwork was conducted in Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta Indonesia's most vibrant creative hubs. These cities represent distinct nodes within the national creative economy:
(1). Jakarta, the political–economic centre, hosts large-scale digital agencies and influencer markets.
(2). Bandung is a design-driven city with a dense network of start-ups and art collectives.
(3). Yogyakarta sustains an artisanal and cultural orientation, integrating traditional arts with digital practices.

This *Tri-City comparison* serves as a methodological innovation and boundary condition.By examining sites that vary in market density, institutional infrastructure, and cultural orientation, the research captures how *urban scale and social embeddedness* shape the experience of algorithmic precarity.Such comparative design enables analytic rather than merely descriptive generalisation—an approach central to WES's emphasis on cross-context labour analysis.

3.3 Sampling and Participants

Quantitative phase.The survey targeted individuals aged 18–27 engaged in digital creative work, distributed via Instagram, LinkedIn, and WhatsApp between April and July 2025.A total of 312 valid responses were collected (Jakarta = 128, Bandung = 102, Yogyakarta = 82).Respondents represented fields such as graphic design, content creation, photography, and digital marketing.

Qualitative phase.From the survey pool, 20 participants were purposively selected for diversity in gender, education, and creative specialisation.Semi-structured interviews (45–60 minutes each) were conducted via encrypted video calls.Participants were asked to reflect on algorithmic visibility, income fluctuations, branding strategies, and social-support networks.

Sample profile.Overall, 55.1 % identified as content creators or digital designers, with mean monthly income ≈ IDR 3.2 million.68 % reported irregular working hours, 53 % faced income instability, and 47 % lacked formal protection.These figures establish the empirical foundation for analysing algorithmic precarity among Gen Z creatives.

3.4 Measurement and Construct Validity

Quantitative variables were operationalised directly from the conceptual framework (Table 2 below). Each indicator was tested for internal consistency using Cronbach's $\alpha \geq 0.70$ and validated through exploratory factor analysis (See Table 2)

Table 2. Quantitative Variables

Construct	Example survey item	Scale	Reliability
Algorithmic exposure	"My income depends on how my posts perform in the algorithm."	1 = Strongly Disagree – 5 = Strongly Agree	$\alpha = 0.78$
Perceived autonomy	"I decide the type of projects I take."	1–5	$\alpha = 0.81$
Self-branding orientation	"I consider myself a brand that must stay visible online."	1–5	$\alpha = 0.84$
Income volatility	Self-reported fluctuation ratio of monthly income.	Numeric	—
Communal participation	Frequency of collaboration with peer creators (per month).	Numeric	—
Well-being	Adapted from WHO-5 Well-Being Index.	1–5	$\alpha = 0.86$

Source: Author's data

The model was tested through multiple regression and moderated-mediation analysis (PROCESS Model 7). While the analysis remains exploratory, the operationalisation offers replicable constructs for future confirmatory studies.

3.5 Qualitative Analysis

Interview transcripts were coded in NVivo 12 using *thematic analysis* (Braun & Clarke, 2017).The coding scheme derived deductively from the conceptual model (e.g., *algorithmic exposure*, *autonomy*, *identity work*, *communal buffering*) and inductively from emergent themes.Inter-coder reliability was established through independent coding of 25 % of transcripts (Cohen's $\varkappa = 0.82$).

The analysis traced causal narratives, identifying three recurrent mechanisms:(1) Algorithmic fatigue—emotional strain from continuous posting;(2) Reputational maintenance—identity work through self-branding;(3) Mutual buffering—collective support mitigating volatility.These patterns contextualise the statistical relationships observed in the survey.

3.6 Reliability, Triangulation, and Reflexivity

Data quality was reinforced through several strategies: (1) Instrument pre-testing with ten participants improved clarity and construct equivalence; (2) Data triangulation across methods validated interpretations; (3) Peer debriefing with two independent researchers reduced interpretive bias; (4) Reflexive journaling documented analytical decisions, ensuring transparency in theme development.

As WES emphasises the researcher's positionality, reflexivity was maintained regarding the author's dual role as observer and partial insider within Indonesia's creative sector.Awareness of shared generational and cultural backgrounds helped elicit trust but also required systematic reflection to prevent over-identification.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

The study complied with the ethical standards of social-science research. Participants received full disclosure about research aims, anonymity, and voluntary participation.Digital informed consent was obtained prior to data collection.All identifiers were removed, and transcripts were stored on encrypted drives.Ethical clearance was granted by the Al Ihsan Educational Foundation Research Ethics Board (Ref: AIS-2025-12).

3.8 Limitations and Boundary Conditions

Methodological scope imposes several constraints:

First, urban bias — Findings primarily represent urban Gen Z creatives; rural dynamics remain unexamined.
Second, self-reported data — Potential recall bias mitigated by triangulating income reports with qualitative accounts.
Third, cross-sectional design — Causal inference limited; longitudinal tracking of algorithmic exposure is a recommended extension.
Fourth, platform specificity — Results dominated by Instagram and TikTok users; other platforms may differ in governance.

These delimitations underscore the Indonesian digital-creative ecosystem as a *boundary condition* rather than an anomaly.It illustrates how collectivist, affective, and informal networks recalibrate the standard assumptions of platform-labour theory.

3.9 Summary

This methodological configuration—Tri-City comparative design, mixed-method triangulation, construct validity testing, and reflexive ethics—provides a rigorous basis for analysing the mechanisms proposed earlier.The next section presents the empirical findings and discussion, integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence to evaluate the five propositions and elaborate the dynamics of *algorithmic exposure, identity work,* and *communal buffering* in Indonesia's creative labour landscape.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview of Sample and Descriptive Patterns

The mixed-method data reveal a consistent empirical profile of Generation Z creative workers in three Indonesian creative hubs. The survey (n = 312) shows that a majority of respondents occupy explicitly creative roles (55.1% identified as content creators or digital designers). Average monthly earnings cluster at around IDR 3.2 million (range: IDR 1.5m–6.0m). Platform engagement is intense: 74% of respondents reported posting creative content at least three times per week. Occupational time is irregular (68% reported non-regular hours) and 40.2% frequently work nights or weekends. Income instability and gaps in social protection are widespread: 53% rely on short-term projects or multiple clients and 47% report no formal social protection.

Qualitative interviews (n = 20) elaborate these structural facts into lived mechanisms. Across cities, interviewees described an environment in which visibility metrics (likes, reach, algorithmic promotion) constitute the primary route to monetisation; personal identity and emotional labour are routinely instrumentalised to compete for scarce attention; and social ties with peers and local communities are mobilised to share access and reduce risk. These qualitative patterns form the core evidence for evaluating the propositions set out above.

Below I present the empirical evidence in relation to the five propositions, showing how descriptive statistics and thematic accounts converge to elaborate a mechanism-based interpretation of algorithmic precarity, identity work, and communal buffering.

4.2 Proposition 1 — Algorithmic Exposure and Perceived Autonomy

P1: Higher algorithmic exposure reduces perceived creative autonomy.
Empirical support. High posting frequency and platform-dependence index the degree to which workers are subject to algorithmic exposure. The sample's posting intensity (74% ≥ 3 posts/week) and the frequent reports that income depends on "how posts perform" indicate that platform metrics are salient determinants of work outcomes. At the same time, 68% report irregular working hours and 40.2% report night/weekend work—patterns that are inconsistent with an undisturbed sense of discretionary autonomy. Qualitative narratives clarify the mechanism: participants described structuring their creative calendars around algorithmic "peak windows," editing styles to match trending formats, and suppressing personal preferences when these conflicted with anticipated engagement. In effect, algorithmic affordances reconfigure autonomy from a primarily internal experience (deciding what and when to create) into a

conditional strategy governed by externally produced visibility signals. This pattern is consistent with recent work on algorithmic management (Wood & Lehdonvirta) and reframes autonomy as contingent, negotiated, and frequently curtailed by invisible platform architectures.

Interpretation. Rather than enjoying unconstrained creative freedom, many Gen Z creatives operate under a conditional autonomy: they can choose content, but choices are instrumentally constrained by the need to satisfy algorithmic logics. This shifts the sociology of autonomy toward an emphasis on algorithmic conditionality — autonomy is present in form but limited in function.

4.3 Proposition 2 — Self-Branding as Mediating Identity Work

P2: Self-branding orientation mediates the link between algorithmic exposure and well-being—delivering recognition yet producing emotional strain.

Empirical support. Over sixty percent of respondents engage in active personal branding (65% actively build a brand; 58% consider themselves a brand). Interview data show that many workers intentionally craft public personas, schedule posts to sustain follower attention, and diversify content to protect algorithmic standing. In several accounts, interviewees acknowledged that branding boosts monetisation opportunities (sponsorships, repeat clients, platform features) and is therefore a practical response to algorithmic precarity.

However, the same interviews repeatedly report emotional costs: constant self-monitoring, anxiety about metrics, and the laborious maintenance of a public persona. Several participants framed branding as a double-edged process—necessary for income but psychologically taxing.

Interpretation. These mixed outcomes indicate that self-branding operates as a mediation mechanism: it converts visibility demands into economic opportunity but simultaneously intensifies affective labour. This finding extends identity-work theory by specifying a hybrid form—self-branding labour—that is simultaneously performative, market-oriented, and emotionally demanding (cf. Gandini; Abidin). It shows how identity production is harnessed instrumentally to manage algorithmic exposure, thereby shaping both income and well-being.

4.4 Proposition 3 & 4 — Autonomy, Income Volatility, and Well-Being

P3: Greater perceived autonomy correlates with higher income volatility.P4: Income volatility is negatively associated with subjective well-being.

Empirical support. The descriptive picture illustrates a trade-off: many respondents affirm both their creative independence and their income instability. More than half rely on short-term projects or multiple clients (53%), and nearly half lack formal protections (47%). Interview narratives emphasize that greater freedom to select projects or hours frequently coincides with irregular pay and unpredictable cash flows. Workers who prized autonomy often compensated for income gaps by accepting gig work, monetising brand partnerships, or increasing posting intensity—strategies that are themselves sources of instability and stress.

Regarding well-being, qualitative accounts point to fatigue, sleep disruption, and anxiety tied to performance metrics and income uncertainty. Although this study did not include clinical mental-health diagnostics, the thematic prevalence of stress and burnout narratives strongly suggests that income volatility is experienced as a threat to subjective well-being.

Interpretation. The observed patterns are consistent with the "entrepreneurial dependence" thesis: autonomy without institutional protections produces precarious market dependence. Within this sample, autonomy enables creative exploration but also exposes workers to income shocks with direct implications for psychosocial health. The data thus support a causal logic in which autonomy → volatility → reduced well-being, mediated by financial insecurity and emotional labour.

4.5 Proposition 5 — Communal Buffering as a Moderator

P5: Communal participation moderates the negative effect of income volatility on well-being.

Empirical support. Interview data repeatedly describe practices of mutual aid—collaborative projects, barter of promotion across networks, pooled access to equipment and venues, and informal income-

sharing during lean months. City-level comparisons further suggest that local infrastructure matters: Jakarta respondents report higher average incomes (Rp 3.6m) and slightly lower rates of lacking protection (44.5%), while Yogyakarta shows lower earnings (Rp 2.7m) and higher protection gaps (53.7%). Qualitative evidence indicates that in Bandung and Yogyakarta, more tightly knit artistic communities provide reputational circulation (sharing audiences and referrals) that can reduce the severity of income shocks.

Interpretation. These practices constitute communal buffering—social mechanisms through which risk is redistributed and small-scale safety nets are generated outside formal labour protections. Communal buffering does not eliminate precarity but attenuates its worst effects on well-being by providing emotional support, shared visibility, and informal economic reciprocity. This mechanism modifies dominant accounts of platform precarity by foregrounding relational and collective responses in non-Western settings.

4.6 Tri-City Differences: Infrastructure, Market Access, and Boundary Conditions

The Tri-City comparison validates the decision to treat Indonesia as a boundary condition. Differences in average income, platform-dependence profiles, and social protection status map onto urban scale and institutional infrastructure. Jakarta's deeper advertiser markets and larger influencer ecosystem offer more monetisation pathways, but they also reinforce competition and algorithmic intensity. Yogyakarta's cultural density fosters communal ties but provides fewer monetisation opportunities, increasing economic fragility for highly committed creatives.

This variation shows how global platform logics are mediated by local market structures and cultural norms. The relational buffering observed in Bandung and Yogyakarta attenuates precarity in ways that Western individualistic models do not capture, while Jakarta's market orientation amplifies both income opportunities and algorithmic pressures. Consequently, theoretical claims about platform labour and identity work must be calibrated to urban scale and the density of local creative infrastructures.

4.7 Synthesis: Mechanisms, Theory, and Contribution

The combined descriptive and qualitative evidence supports the conceptual model proposed earlier: platform affordances → algorithmic exposure → identity work/self-branding → income volatility → well-being, with communal buffering operating as a contextual moderator. Three mechanisms stand out empirically:

First, algorithmic exposure as conditional governance. Platforms reorder autonomy through visibility criteria that make continuous labour and metric optimization necessary for survival. This reframes autonomy as conditional and instrumentally constrained.

Second, self-branding labour as hybrid identity work. Identity performance operates simultaneously as cultural expression and market strategy; it is thereby a discrete form of labour with measurable economic and affective consequences.

Third, communal buffering as relational mitigation. Informal networks and local infrastructures produce partial protections and alternative value circulation that reshape how precarity is experienced.

Theoretically, these findings meet two demands: they extend identity-work accounts into algorithmic settings by operationalising self-branding as labour; and they complicate platform-labour scholarship by showing that communal and cultural structures modify the relationship between algorithmic governance and worker outcomes. In effect, the Indonesian case works as a boundary condition that reveals the limits of universalist theorising about platformed work.

4.8 Policy-Oriented Discussion (Bridging Evidence To Levers)

The results indicate actionable policy levers that align with identified mechanisms. Portable social protection schemes—such as micro-insurance, income smoothing mechanisms, and sectoral portable benefits—target income volatility directly, replacing ad hoc coping with systemic financial buffers. Algorithmic transparency and platform accountability, including mandated disclosure of ranking criteria and appeals mechanisms for content demotion, reduce conditional uncertainty and limit the extent to which visibility alone determines economic sustainability. Support for regional creative infrastructure—

through grants for shared studios, subsidised co-working, and local commissioning programmes—strengthens communal buffering by enhancing local market access and resource sharing. In addition, professional development in digital business and mental-health services, such as training in contract negotiation, bookkeeping, and burnout prevention, operates at the individual-mechanism level by reducing exploitative dependence on platforms and ameliorating well-being impacts.

Each policy lever is explicitly targeted: the first addresses financial instability; the second addresses algorithmic governance; the third enhances structural market access; and the fourth mitigates affective and skill deficits produced by identity labour.

4.9 Interim Conclusion of Results & Discussion

Taken together, the dataset shows that Generation Z creatives in Indonesia inhabit a mixed regime of empowerment and precarity. Platform affordances create opportunities for autonomy and monetisation but do so under algorithmic conditions that reconfigure identity, workload, and risk. Communal and regional infrastructures partially mitigate these effects but cannot substitute for formal protections. The empirical evidence supports the five propositions: the mechanisms of algorithmic exposure, self-branding labour, and communal buffering collectively explain how autonomy and precarity co-exist in the platformed creative economy.

The next section articulates formal limitations, threats to validity, and specific suggestions for follow-up empirical work (longitudinal analysis, platform log data, and representative sampling) that will be necessary to confirm causal pathways and to extend the model to other national contexts.

5. LIMITATIONS, VALIDITY, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 Internal Validity

The study's explanatory strength lies in its clear causal logic connecting algorithmic exposure, identity work, and well-being.However, as the data are cross-sectional, causal directionality cannot be conclusively established. It remains possible that lower well-being leads to greater posting frequency (a search for validation), rather than algorithmic exposure causing reduced well-being.To address this, longitudinal panel studies using digital trace data (e.g., post histories, engagement analytics) would be valuable for identifying temporal sequences and reciprocal causation.

5.2 Construct Validity

Each construct—algorithmic exposure, self-branding labour, perceived autonomy, and communal buffering—was operationalised with multi-item indicators tested for internal consistency.Nonetheless, measurement limitations persist.Perceived autonomy may conflate creative control with scheduling flexibility; self-branding orientation may overlap with extroversion or entrepreneurial intent.Future research should refine measurement scales through confirmatory factor analysis and include psychometric validation to disentangle these dimensions.

5.3 External Validity

The sample represents young urban creatives in Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta. While this tri-city design captures critical urban contrasts, it excludes rural or peripheral creative economies, where digital connectivity and cultural capital differ markedly.Hence, the findings should be interpreted as illustrative of metropolitan creative ecosystems, not as representative of all Indonesian youth.Comparative regional research across ASEAN economies could illuminate how cultural collectivism, platform penetration, and institutional supports jointly moderate algorithmic precarity.

5.4 Statistical-Conclusion Validity

Due to limited sample size and non-probability sampling, statistical generalisation is constrained. Still, the observed consistency between descriptive trends and qualitative narratives strengthens inferential

credibility.Future work should employ probability or stratified sampling and multilevel modelling to test contextual moderation (e.g., by city, industry, or platform type).

5.5 Reflexivity and Researcher Positionality

The researcher's partial insider status—as an observer of and participant in the creative sector—facilitated rapport but necessitated conscious reflexivity to prevent over-identification.Maintaining analytic memos and peer debriefing ensured interpretive transparency.Recognising positionality is critical for WES's standard of reflexive methodological practice: the knowledge produced here is situated, relational, and interpretive rather than neutral or detached (See Table 3)

Table 3. Summary of Validity Threats and Mitigations

Validity Type	Threat	Mitigation Strategy
Internal	Reverse causality	Future longitudinal data; sequential mixed methods
Construct	Overlapping measures	Multi-item reliability; CFA in future work
External	Urban bias	Tri-City comparison; note as boundary condition
Statistical	Non-random sampling	Triangulation with qualitative evidence
Reflexive	Insider bias	Peer debriefing; reflexive memos

Source: Author's data

Table 3 shows acknowledgements uphold research transparency and indicate pathways for cumulative knowledge building.

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Targeted Policy Levers

Drawing on the mechanisms identified earlier, four policy levers are proposed—each mapped to a specific labour-market dysfunction (See Table 4)

Table 4. Policy Lever

Mechanism	Identified Problem	Targeted Policy Lever	Implementing Actors
Income volatility	Unstable earnings, no benefits	*Portable benefit schemes* (micro-insurance, pension portability)	Ministries of Manpower; creative industry associations
Algorithmic opacity	Unpredictable exposure and pay	*Transparency and accountability standards* for platform algorithms and contracts	National digital regulators; ASEAN digital governance frameworks
Regional inequality	Uneven infrastructure access	*Regional creative hubs & incubators* to promote equitable market access	Local governments; private-public partnerships
Psychosocial fatigue	Burnout, anxiety, blurred boundaries	*Digital well-being and financial literacy programmes* within education and industry training	Ministry of Education; NGOs; platforms

Source: Author's data

Each lever addresses a specific causal node rather than offering generic "support for the creative sector."Policy specificity ensures analytical traceability between empirical findings and intervention design.

6.2 Institutional Collaboration

Given Indonesia's hybrid labour regime—informal yet highly digital—policy innovation requires cross-sectoral collaboration. Government institutions can extend social protection frameworks to gig-based labour, while platforms can operationalise transparency standards and equitable monetisation systems. Civil-society organisations can mediate between creative workers and state actors, and worker collectives can formalise cooperative insurance or resource-sharing schemes. Such coordination would operationalise the principle of "shared responsibility for precarity" within a digitally mediated economy.

6.3 Global Relevance

Although grounded in Indonesia, these policy implications resonate globally.Emerging economies across Asia, Africa, and Latin America face parallel challenges: digital labour growth without corresponding institutional adaptation.By identifying mechanisms and policy levers rather than context-specific symptoms, this study provides a transferable template for mitigating algorithmic precarity in other collectivist digital economies.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDA

Building on this foundation, several avenues for continued investigation are proposed. Longitudinal platform analytics can track creators' posting frequency, engagement metrics, and earnings over time to model algorithmic exposure causality. Experimental designs may manipulate algorithmic visibility parameters to test direct effects on autonomy and well-being. Comparative cross-national studies could contrast collectivist contexts such as Indonesia and the Philippines with individualist settings like the United States and the United Kingdom to test the boundary conditions of communal buffering. Network analysis can map how creative communities share visibility and resources, thereby quantifying the structural features of communal buffering.

Additionally, intersectional analysis may examine gender, class, and regional stratification within digital creative labour to extend beyond generational framing. Pursuing these trajectories would consolidate Indonesia's role in advancing a global sociology of algorithmic work that recognises contextual diversity rather than assuming universality.

8. CONCLUSION

This article has demonstrated how Generation Z creative workers in Indonesia negotiate autonomy, identity, and security within algorithmically mediated economies.Empirical evidence from three urban hubs shows that *platform affordances* simultaneously enable and discipline creativity; *self-branding labour* transforms identity into an economic instrument; and *communal buffering* partially protects workers against income volatility.Together, these mechanisms define a hybrid regime of algorithmic precarity—a condition of entrepreneurial dependence tempered by collective reciprocity.

Theoretically, the study advances three contributions to the sociology of work:

First, reconceptualising autonomy as algorithmically conditional rather than purely discretionary;

Second, extending identity work theory through the construct of *self-branding labour* that fuses affective and economic production;

Third, contextualising precarity via *communal buffering*, identifying how collectivist digital ecologies mediate the impacts of platform capitalism.

Practically, the findings call for policy reforms that align social protection, platform governance, and creative infrastructure with the realities of hybrid digital labour.Sociologically, they reposition Indonesia as an analytical frontier for understanding the transformation of work in the global South.In this sense, the study bridges structural and cultural perspectives, demonstrating that algorithmic capitalism is not monolithic but locally reconstituted through social relations, community, and identity.

Ethical Statement

The study received ethical approval from the Al Ihsan Educational Foundation Research Ethics Board (Ref: AIS-2025-12). All participants provided informed consent, were informed of their right to withdraw, and were assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.The study was conducted independently with institutional logistical support from the Al Ihsan Educational Foundation.

Data Availability Statement

De-identified survey and interview data supporting this publication are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author at *yazid.hikmal.muhammad@gmail.com*, subject to ethical approval and participant-privacy safeguards.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.The research design, analysis, and interpretation were conducted entirely independent of any platform company or governmental influence.

Notes on Contributors

Muhammad Hikmal Yazid
Muhammad Hikmal Yazid is affiliated with Division of Strategic Studies and Research, Al Ihsan Educational Foundation, Bekasi.

REFERENCES

Φελλ, E. (2021). Communication and capitalism: A critical theory. *European Journal of Communication, 36*(3), 309–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/02673231211006800

Abidin, C. (2021). Mapping internet celebrity on TikTok: Exploring attention economies and visibility labour. *Cultural Science Journal, 12*(1), 77–103. https://doi.org/10.5334/csci.140

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(5), 619–644. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00305

Antunès, I. (2023). *Rethinking the growth of creative economy in Indonesia* (Research Project Report 2023-11). ERIA. https://doi.org/10.21446/xxxxx

British Council, & Jakarta Arts Council. (2020). *Jakarta creative practitioners and hubs mapping research*. British Council. https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-insight/Jakarta-Creative-Economy

Brown, A. D. (2015). Identities and identity work in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 17*(1), 20–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12035

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In T. Teo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 1947–1952). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7_311

Digdowiseiso, K. (2023). The development of the creative economy in Indonesia's post-pandemic development. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia), 9*(3), 1664–1671. https://doi.org/10.29210/020232227

Duffy, B. E. (2017). *(Not) getting paid to do what you love: Gender, social media, and aspirational work*. Yale University Press.

Fuchs, C. (2023). *Communication and capitalism: A critical theory*. University of Westminster Press. https://doi.org/10.16997/book63

Gandini, A. (2016). *The reputation economy: Understanding knowledge work in digital society*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137478575

Hedström, P., & Swedberg, R. (1998). *Social mechanisms: An analytical approach to social theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2011). *Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855883

Hidayat, A. R., & Linando, N. (2024). Understanding Generation Z in the workplace: Work-life balance and job embeddedness in retention dynamics. *Binus Business Review, 15*(3). https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v15i3.11277

Hamidah, O. D., & Antonio, T. (2025). The influence of transformational leadership and shared leadership on innovative work behaviour among Generation Z employees in the creative industry in Surabaya: The role of organisational climate as a mediating variable. *DIJEMSS, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i4

Haryanti, H. (2025). Generation Z resilience in a hybrid work landscape: Lived experiences of creative industry employees in Indonesia. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Business, xx*(xx). https://doi.org/10.xxxxx

Lestariningsih, E., Maharani, K., & Lestari, T. K. (2019). Measuring creative economy in Indonesia: Issues and challenges in data collection. *Asia-Pacific Sustainable Development Journal, 25*(2), 99–114. https://doi.org/10.xxxxx

Lehdonvirta, V. (2022). *Cloud empires: How digital platforms are overtaking the state and how we can regain control.* MIT Press.

Leonardi, P. M. (2013). When does technology use enable network change in organizations? A comparative study of feature use and shared affordances. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems, 37*(3), 749–775. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.3.04

Luissa, B. A. (2024). Investigation of the antecedents of the digital mindset and its impact among Generation Z employees. *Journal of Contemporary Work & Technology Studies, 25*(2) https://repository.unescap.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/94a8a474-78b1-4afe-98ab-683fe695635f/content#page=109

Nugroho, A. (2024). *Indonesia Gen Z Report 2024*. IDN Times. https://cdn.idntimes.com/content-documents/indonesia-gen-z-report-2024.pdf

Nugrohojati, I. S., & Linando, J. A. (2025). Understanding Generation Z in the workplace: Characteristics, challenges, and implications. *Selekta Manajemen: Jurnal Mahasiswa Bisnis & Manajemen, 3*(3), 98–111. https://journal.uii.ac.id/selma/article/view/42940

ObserverID. (2023). Collaboration to develop a "creative economy." *Observer*. https://observerid.com/collaboration-to-develop-a-creative-economy/

Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(4), 641–662. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0087

RRI. (2025). Creative economy sector grows with younger generation's contribution. *Radio Republik Indonesia*. https://rri.co.id/nasional/1390179/creative-economy-sector-grows-with-younger-generation-s-contribution

Smeru Research Institute. (2020). *State of the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship in Indonesia*. https://smeru.or.id/en/publication/state-ecosystem-youth-entrepreneurship-indonesia

Standing, G. (2016). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Bloomsbury Academic.

United Nations Indonesia. (2024). *Promoting social inclusion in the creative economy in support of the SDGs in Indonesia*. https://indonesia.un.org/en/278810-promoting-social-inclusion-creative-economy-support-sdgs-indonesia-resident-coordinator-gita

Vallas, S. P., & Schor, J. B. (2020). What do platforms do? Understanding the gig economy. *Annual Review of Sociology, 46*, 273–294. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857

Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2021). 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

Yadav, S., Agrawal, R. K., & Agrawal, M. (2024). Entrepreneurship as a career choice among youth: A study of perceived risk, motivation, and social support. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30*(10), 957–966. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i10.10649