

1 **How algorithms make the workplace -- A qualitative analysis of** 2 **Chinese couriers**

3 **Hua Wei^{1*}, Huiyue Shi², Yilin Kou^{2, 8}, Mengke Yu^{2, 9}, Shugang Li³, Thomas O'Toole¹,**
4 **Christopher J. Armitage⁴, Tarani Chandola⁵, Pauline Whelan⁶, Yanchun Zhang⁷, Yan Xu²,**
5 **Martie van Tongeren¹**

6 ¹Division of Population Health, Health Services Research & Primary Care, School of Health
7 Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK;

8 ²Faculty of Psychology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China;

9 ³Department of Maternal and Children Health, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University,
10 Beijing, China;

11 ⁴Manchester Centre for Health Psychology, Division of Psychology & Mental Health, School of
12 Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK; NIHR Greater Manchester Patient
13 Safety Research Collaboration, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

14 ⁵Department of Sociology, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR China;

15 ⁶Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, University of
16 Manchester, Manchester, UK;

17 ⁷China National Health Development Research Centre; China Health Economics Association

18 ⁸Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR
19 China

20 ⁹Gender Studies Programme and Department of Psychology, Chinese University of Hong Kong,
21 Hong Kong SAR China

22 *** Correspondence:**

23 Hua Wei

24 hua.wei@manchester.ac.uk

25 **Keywords: Couriers, Algorithmic management, China, Dehumanization, Datafication**

26 **Abstract**

27 **Introduction** Algorithmic management (AM) is rapidly changing how work is organized and
28 managed globally. Courier work is one of the most affected occupations due to the common use of
29 digital labour platforms. Existing research about AM has predominantly focused on its functionalities
30 and failed to capture the underlying mechanism of AM as a potential source of work stress. This
31 study aimed to fill the gap and explore how AM change Chinese couriers' work experience.

32 **Method** We conducted 15 in-depth interviews with couriers in May-June 2021 in China. Thematic
33 analysis was completed using Nvivo 12.

34 **Results** Couriers’ responses to AM and its effects varied as some felt motivated while others
35 frustrated. AM can introduce new work stressors and interact with existing factors to alleviate or
36 intensify work stress. Key themes emerged from the interviews included ‘App the “boss”’, ‘Unequal
37 exposure to AM and the role of human support’, ‘New work stressors of AM – Dehumanization and
38 Datafication’, ‘Job stressors intensified by AM’ and ‘Varying individual response to AM’. App ‘the
39 boss’ described how the couriers felt when managed by algorithms. Employed, gig and agency
40 couriers had different exposure to AM and human support of different quality. Dehumanization
41 characterizes how algorithmic systems fulfil managerial functions in ways that differ from managers
42 qualitatively or quantitatively. Datafication refers to the conversion of real-world information and
43 user behaviour into data and being input in the system to assist automated decision-making. Couriers
44 also reported that the use of digital methods could intensify some work stressors, e.g. time pressure
45 and customer behavior. Nevertheless, some couriers reported that AM provided new job resources,
46 e.g. flexible hours, job opportunities, pay transparency, and bypassing office politics.

47 **Conclusion** This paper identified key work stressors of AM and explored how AM interacts with
48 existing work stressors to shape Chinese couriers’ work experience. Dehumanization could reduce
49 the quality of support and their sense of relatedness to the workplace. Datafication or extraction of
50 data from workers and lack of transparency led to concerns about potential discrimination, workplace
51 unfairness and power imbalance. Couriers’ responses to AM varied and future research should take
52 such heterogeneity into account.

53

54 1 Introduction

55 Despite the increasing prevalence of managerial algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) at work in
56 all sectors, our understanding about how algorithmic management shapes everyday work experiences
57 is limited (Mökander et al., 2022). Algorithmic Management (AM) has been defined by Möhlmann et
58 al. (2021, p. 2001) as: “the large-scale collection and use of data on a platform to develop and
59 improve learning algorithms that carry out coordination and control functions traditionally performed
60 by managers”. It reveals three key elements of AM, data inputs, system logics and management
61 outputs (Cheng & Hackett, 2021). In addition to the data process that executes managerial functions,
62 it also highlights the key feature of AM that is the substitution of managers. This is an essential part
63 of digitalization and it revolutionizes the workplaces beyond the gig economy because it is highly
64 replicable and scalable (Brennen & Kreiss, 2016; Mäntymäki et al., 2019; Parviainen et al., 2017). A
65 typical case of AM at work are digital labour platforms, such as Uber and Deliveroo (Möhlmann &
66 Zalmanson, 2017; Veen et al., 2020), or their equivalents in China: Meituan, Ele.me and Didi (Chen
67 & Qiu, 2019; C. Zhang, S. P. Cheung, et al., 2022). Although AM is transforming almost every
68 sector of the economy, the logistics sector is one of the most advanced and couriers are the key
69 workforce in this sector (Wei et al., 2022).

70 Working conditions of couriers, particularly in China, appear to be highly stressful and unsafe (Wang
71 et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2021). Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, media reports of
72 sudden death of young couriers due to overwork emerged in South Korea, China, and Singapore.¹
73 Karoshi or sudden death from overwork is often caused by stroke, resulted from a repeated triggering
74 of stress responses (Li, 2016). Lin et al developed a couriers’ overwork scale to investigate risks of
75 Karoshi among Chinese takeaway and parcel couriers. They found that among takeaway couriers,

¹ See for example, [Delivery workers in South Korea say they’re dying of ‘overwork’ \(sanjuandaily.com\)](https://www.sanjuandaily.com/news/delivery-workers-in-south-korea-say-they-re-dying-of-overwork/).

76 about 41.7% of respondents (n=1114) were at high risk of overwork, 35.9% were at very high risk
77 and only 7.9% were considered risk-free (Lin & Li, 2021). The situation was similarly severe among
78 parcel couriers (n=1214), where 40.1% were at high risk, 38.6% were at very high risk and only 3.7%
79 were risk-free (Lin et al., 2018). Road safety is another major concern among couriers. A recent
80 cross-sectional study of road safety situations among Chinese parcel and food couriers revealed that
81 76.5% of interviewed couriers (n=480) had been involved in a traffic crash at least once, despite the
82 average length of staying in this occupation was only about 1.5 years (Wang et al., 2021). The same
83 study also conducted 600 roadside observations and found that traffic violations were very common,
84 such as speeding, riding in the motor vehicle lane, and use of a cell phone whilst riding. The authors
85 believed that the tight delivery schedule set by the platforms was one of the main reason for these
86 traffic violations. Other studies found that high job demands, long working hours etc among Chinese
87 couriers are associated with poor job satisfaction and health outcomes (Hong et al., 2022; C. Zhang,
88 S. Sitar, et al., 2022). Although AM was not explicitly considered in these studies, the authors
89 highlighted the potential impact of digitalized work arrangement.

90 The situation is alarming, suggesting Chinese couriers may be at high risk of worsened work
91 environment driven by AM. Nevertheless, health researchers are not equipped to measure
92 occupational risks against AM due to the absence of a working definition of the key stressors and
93 measurement. Research that have made attempts to measure AM [e.g. Cram et al. (2022), Sun (2023),
94 and Rani et al. (2024)] have either avoided defining work stressors inherent to the process of AM or
95 ignored the underlying mechanism of health impacts. (Cheng & Hackett, 2021; Meijerink &
96 Bondarouk, 2021). It must be recognized that AM reverses the relationship between artefacts and
97 users (Schuetz & Venkatesh, 2020). In other words, our understanding about the role of technology
98 and how it impacted people's life were based on the assumption that the technology was a tool
99 without cognitive capacity. When AM begins to substitute managers and make decisions about
100 people, it has become 'the boss' (Ivanova et al., 2018). It creates a new path of impact and renders
101 models built on the old assumptions obsolete (Schuetz & Venkatesh, 2020). Hence, it is necessary to
102 explore from the workers' perspective, or those 'being managed', to understand whether AM has
103 introduced new work stressors that differ from stressors under human management. This research set
104 out to improve our understanding about the underlying mechanisms of AM in relation to health and
105 safety outcomes among couriers in China.

106 **2 Materials and methods**

107 We took a qualitative and explorative approach to address the research questions.

108 **2.1 Data collection**

109 We conducted 15 semi-structured interviews in May and June 2021 in China using Tencent Meeting
110 software. Each of the interviews lasted about 90 minutes. We approached potential participants
111 through snowballing, started by approaching couriers working in the researchers' vicinity. About half
112 of those we contacted refused to participate mainly due to being too busy. Recruitment stopped when
113 the seven interviewees agreed that data saturation was reached. All interviews were carried out in
114 Chinese.

115 The study was reviewed and approved by ethics committees in both the UK and China (Ref:
116 XXXXX, Ref:XXXXX). Each participant received a Participant Information Sheet and informed
117 consent was confirmed either by verbal consent at the beginning of the session or by written consent.
118 Compensation were provided for participants' time. Researchers introduced themselves and the
119 research purpose to the interviewees. Seven researchers conducted the interviews, with each session

120 completed by at least two researchers. All researchers were trained for qualitative research. Two
121 interviewers have PhD degrees and the other researchers were postgraduate students. Four of the
122 interviewers were female. Interview questions included open inquiries about work stress, individual
123 response and coping methods. The role of technology was elicited or probed during the conversation
124 to allow the interviewees form their perspectives and makes sense of the phenomenon (Denzin &
125 Lincoln, 2017; Fairclough, 2005). The interview schedule is available in Supplementary file.

126 **2.2 Data analysis**

127 We followed the consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ) to report our
128 findings (Tong et al., 2007). A reporting checklist can be found in Supplementary file. Data were
129 analysed in Chinese, with quotes translated into English by the bilingual researchers. Coding was
130 completed using Nvivo12 software, with codes generated inductively (Braun & Clarke, 2006;
131 Castleberry & Nolen, 2018). Researchers first pilot coded three transcripts to generate codes.
132 Relevant codes were grouped to form themes and the initial codebook. The initial codebook was
133 discussed with the rest of the research team and revised based on the feedback. The researchers then
134 coded all the transcripts based on the final codebook. Five researchers each coded two same
135 transcripts independently. Coding results were merged to assess inter-coder reliability. The average
136 Kappa coefficient of each coder against the second coder worked on the same documents ranged
137 from 0.54 to 0.63 (0.41–0.75 is considered fair to good (Fleiss et al., 2013)). The percentage of
138 agreement between the two coders was generally very high (>90%). Disagreements were discussed
139 until consensus reached.

140 **3 Results**

141 Of the 15 interviewees, 11 were Beijing-based, two based in a second-tier city and another two based
142 in a smaller city. Two of the interviewees were female and 13 were male. The mean age was 33 (22-
143 57 years old) and average length of working as a courier was 3.5 years (2 months-9 years). We
144 interviewed six parcel couriers and nine takeaway food couriers. There were three employment types,
145 directly employed, agency worker and gig worker. We interviewed six employed couriers (0509e,
146 0523e, 0524e, 0529e, 0601e, 0607e), three agency couriers (0525a, 0528s, 0529a) and six gig
147 couriers (0510g, 0510-Yg, 0517g, 0518g, 0522g, 0604g). Employed couriers were all parcel couriers.

148 **3.1 App ‘the boss’**

149 **App ‘the boss’** describes how the interviewees felt when managed by algorithms. The app or the
150 system functioned like a manager and dictated who got the job, and how the job should be
151 completed, evaluated and paid. One interviewee (0517g) put it simply as:

152 *No matter how long we have been working [for the app], a few months or a few years, we all have*
153 *to listen to the system, no matter who. Nobody can interfere with the system. The system is the*
154 *boss. It decides.*

155 Or as another interviewee (0525a) put it:

156 *The system determines whether you are busy or can take it easy.*

157 As the couriers seemingly accept the app or the system as a dictating boss, there was a strong sense
158 of powerlessness. Some interviewees described the system just like a manager. One interviewee
159 (0528a), for example, believed the algorithm would balance the workload for the couriers.

160 *The system will allocate [orders]. Where we should go or the distance of our orders would be*
161 *proportionate to the total amount of orders that we deliver every month. The system will decide,*
162 *based on each individual's workload, that where we deliver to. It won't be too far [from the*
163 *supposed ratio]. It [the system] will balance the overall workload.*

164 Interviewees also noted the system's learning capacity. It was believed that the system was intelligent
165 and learning from multiple data sources, as described by an interviewee (0517g).

166 *The system, you can't imagine, the system is really smart, like it knows everything. I'd say they*
167 *even know whether the restaurants are slow or quick in preparing food. The system is just smart.*

168 Nevertheless, a key problem associated with app the boss was that although this 'boss' could learn
169 from data and make decisions based on average, predictable situations, it lacked the capability to
170 listen, process and respond to individual cases. After an interviewee (0510g) described a range of
171 stressors, such as restaurant delays, customer behaviors and road traffic, the researcher asked whether
172 there were any ways for the system to accommodate unusual situations or challenges beyond
173 couriers' control.

174 *They would not allow couriers to have voices (in the system). Whatever the algorithm tells you to*
175 *do, you just have to do it. If you were late, penalties on you... Even the customer service would not*
176 *be able to interfere [with the algorithms]. If you phone them up, and they support you, they could*
177 *only put a note in so you don't get penalties. (0510g)*

178 **3.2 Unequal exposure to AM and the role of human support**

179 Although AM techniques were commonly used but not equally distributed within the occupation. It
180 appeared to us that employment types may be an indicator of the intensity of exposure to AM. Gig
181 couriers appeared to be the most algorithmically managed, employed couriers appeared to be the
182 least, with agency couriers somewhere in between. Employed couriers had employment contract with
183 their companies and were hired or fired through the HR department. They had frontline managers and
184 access to other parts of the organization. They also had a depot to report to on daily basis. For
185 employed couriers, job allocation, route planning and partially performance were managed by
186 algorithms and their managers played an important role in mediating relations between the couriers
187 and the organization and sometimes customers. For example, 0607e told us how his manager
188 mediated the relationships when he faced with aggressive customer behavior following three failed
189 attempts of delivery.

190 *When my colleague arrived at the address, the customer came out with a knife and chased him.*
191 *The police was called and the site manager got involved to investigate. We had a long chat. He*
192 *arranged for me to apologize and buy some small presents for the customer. I was extremely upset*
193 *that I had to apologize. I was so reluctant. But the site manager said if the customer made a*
194 *complaint, I would be fined for ¥2000 by the company and possibly fired. He suggested the*
195 *presents would appease the customer and wouldn't cost much.*

196 In this case, if the customer issued a formal complaint, automatically the courier would face a hefty
197 fine. If the complaint was too serious, it would cost him the job. The manager provided his support
198 based on his understanding what was the best solution for the courier. We also sensed that the courier
199 did not like the solution as he felt it was unfair. Hence, the role of manager in this case was two-fold.
200 On the one hand, he moderated the impact of AM by advising the courier how to avoid the fine as the
201 system's logic automatically equates customer complaint to fines on couriers. On the other hand, he

202 reinforced the system logic by persuading the courier to accept a solution that was considered unfair
203 by the courier.

204 Both gig couriers and agency couriers we interviewed worked for food and grocery delivery
205 platforms. Being platform-based meant gig couriers and agency couriers were both highly
206 algorithmically managed with limited human support. Nevertheless, there were some differences in
207 terms of their exposure to AM. Gig couriers signed up freely on the app and were not obliged to sign
208 in at any time. They were added to a chat group that ran by a manager who only released group
209 notices but never replied to their enquiries nor disclosed a contact number. The only non-digitalized
210 support gig couriers getting was through the ‘customer service hotline’ provided by the platform,
211 which was responding to customers (who placed the orders), merchants (restaurants and shops) and
212 couriers as they were all users of the platform.

213 In contrast, agency couriers had zero-hour type contracts with an agency company that was different
214 from the name of the platform. Agency couriers had a site manager and needed to report to a depot
215 on daily basis. They were expected to work for certain number of hours per day and number of days
216 per week. During busy hours, they were obliged to sign in and take orders. They also needed
217 approval from the manager if they wanted to take more leaves. Although rules were tight, an agency
218 courier interviewee reported how her manager were considerate of health conditions.

219 *Yes it is required to work during weekends, all riders. But like today I took the afternoon off. It’s*
220 *not too difficult for me [to ask for leave]. Because it was raining and I took a vaccination shot this*
221 *morning and I can’t be rained up or catch a cold. Situations like this, if you explain to him [the*
222 *manager], he will let you off. (0528a)*

223 In this case, the manager provided some negotiating space between the system and the agency
224 courier. In comparison, gig couriers who did not have access to managers also did not have
225 commitment to log in or work for set hours. In this aspect, they were genuinely their own boss.

226 **3.3 New work stressors of AM – Dehumanization and Datafication**

227 We identified two themes as they were repeatedly brought up by the interviewees when we probed
228 into the role of technology: Dehumanization and Datafication

229 **Dehumanization** characterizes how algorithmic systems fulfil managerial functions in ways that
230 differ from managers qualitatively or quantitatively. Gig courier interviewees described their
231 manager as the “*virtual manager*” who they had never met in person, who merely disseminated
232 notices or information in a group chat but rarely responded to anyone in the group chat and called
233 them using virtual numbers, meaning they would never be able to trace the manager’s number or call
234 back (0510g, 0517g). It led to difficulties in seeking support when they had accidents, for example.
235 Gig couriers reported they were not clear about what was covered by the insurance, or that they were
236 not familiar with the claim procedures (0518g, 0604g).

237 Since the “virtual manager” was inaccessible, gig couriers turned to the platforms’ customer service
238 hotline to gain support when faced with customer abuse, restaurants delays or other challenges at
239 work. However, as delivery schedules were so tight, contacting customer service over the phone was
240 considered time consuming and might cause further delay (0510g, 0517g, 0522g). As described
241 above, customer service hotline serve all types of platform users, some couriers were concerned the
242 hotline had too much power to decide which party was at fault for any disputes with customers and

243 might not judge fairly. One interviewee (0517g) reported a case about customer behavior. When the
244 researcher asked whether he sought support from the hotline, he said:

245 *It won't work. Once the customer made a complaint, or wrote a bad review, nothing works. It's*
246 *fines and money deducted (by the platform).*

247 When the researcher asked whether he could appeal against customer complaints or penalties, he
248 answered:

249 *Of course you can. But whether they would approve is another issue. The chance is normally*
250 *small.*

251 The absence of manager support meant gig couriers often had to navigate the system without
252 guidance. This led to frustration and emotional responses. One of the interviewees (0604g) told us he
253 was screaming at the sky one night because he was so frustrated:

254 *... It was near the end of my shift, normally 10pm... Although they say 10pm, we could never*
255 *finish at 10pm. Orders often came in near 10, like 9:50 and it could be a few kilometers away. We*
256 *(fellow couriers) said we'd go for dinner together that night. So I tried to cancel, tried to transfer*
257 *it to other couriers, but no way... I wanted to curse someone, but didn't know who.*

258 **Datafication** refers to the conversion of real-world information and user behaviour into data and
259 being input in the system to assist automated decision-making. Gamification, for example, is a
260 typical example of datafication and dehumanization. It uses game elements to increase user
261 interaction on a product or a software application by making it more interesting and challenging
262 (Prabowo et al., 2019). It is commonly used to engage and motivate platform-based workers.
263 Couriers may see gamification as a challenge or hindrance stressor. This will be elaborated with
264 examples in later section about individual response.

265 Although interviewees were not data experts, they were able to understand what data means when
266 being managed by algorithmic systems.

267 *That is to say they have worked for long enough to see the result, hence their data looks good. My*
268 *data does not look good because I've only done it for a few months. Even though you're like*
269 *running all day but you can't beat them [the more experienced ones]. They could deliver 40, 50*
270 *orders per day. You work for a whole day but could only deliver 20, 30 orders. Your data will*
271 *never look as good as theirs. (0517g)*

272 They were also able to make sense of how the system use the data and figure out the rules embedded
273 in the system.

274 *No one knows how exactly the system works. It is really not clear what the situations are. But the*
275 *system appeared to be working this way: if your data is good, it gives you good orders. You get*
276 *orders quickly, the orders are close to each other and easier to complete... For example, if they*
277 *are Gold [grade], not like us, we're Bronze or Silver, there can be quite a bit of difference.*
278 *Imagine the system allocated six orders (to one courier), they might get places like hotels, or*
279 *office buildings where you just drop the orders at the reception and the customers will come down*
280 *to collect them. Whilst for someone like me [low grades, e.g. Bronze], they may send me to climb*
281 *six floors, or take the lift to the 22nd floor in a residential building. You certainly cannot be as*

282 *quick as them, because you have to climb up stairs, take lift, wait for lift etc. During peak hours,*
283 *these take lots of time. (0517g)*

284 The interviewee certainly sensed the discrimination against their performance and the lack of
285 transparency as he declared ‘no one knows how exactly the system works’. Nevertheless, they form
286 their own strategies to deal with incidents that would affect their data. For example, one interviewee
287 mentioned one day he was very upset because of the behavior of a customer, he then rejected all the
288 orders allocated to him for the rest of the day. High rejection rate would negatively affect his record
289 or ‘his data’. He then carried on to tell us:

290 *You’ll just have to carry on. I just carried on delivering orders the next day. The worst would be*
291 *the orders will take longer, the distance [between orders] become longer, and more difficult to*
292 *complete. You’ll just have to build your data again. You re-build it with a positive attitude, if you*
293 *want to continue doing it. If you want to do it do it well. (0525a)*

294 Performance data were undoubtedly being collected, analyzed and ranked, so that the system could
295 give them grades (gold, silver, bronze), as described by the interviewees above. The interviewees
296 tried to make sense about the process of datafication and learn to deal with discriminating rules such
297 as ‘good data’ is associated with ‘good orders’.

298 The platforms seemed be able to collect personal information from platform-based couriers without
299 much restriction. For example, the platforms were under pressure to ensure couriers safety. Hence,
300 couriers often received requests initiated by the app, normally within minutes or sometimes seconds
301 of completing an order, to check whether they were in full uniform and wearing helmet. When they
302 responded, the app would use facial recognition technology to verify their identity and took photo
303 shots of their images (0510Yg, 0518g, 0525a). The situation is the same for both agency and gig
304 couriers. On the contrary, the employed couriers did not have to face this. Their companies took a
305 different approach and sent inspectors on the road to check compliance and safety behavior (0509e,
306 0524e).

307 **3.4 Job stressors intensified by AM**

308 The overall work environment was stressful as one of the interviewees described there were “all sorts
309 of triggers for mental breakdowns” (0604g). We found that AM played a role to intensify other
310 stressors.

311 Time pressure was extremely high among the platform-based couriers.

312 *You can’t afford to be stuck. You run all the time. If one order gets stuck, all the other orders*
313 *down the line will be delayed. You’d be nervous. (0525a)*

314 “Late delivery” is a situation when order was not delivered within the time scale set by the AM or
315 “the system”. It was a major source of stress and mentioned 79 times by 10 interviewees (one
316 employed and 9 platform-based), of which 78 were from platform-based couriers whose orders were
317 allocated by the apps, with driving routes planned and delivery time set. It was believed that the
318 algorithms were designed to push couriers to work faster (0517g, 0525a).

319 Customer incivility represents a major source of stress. Location tracking and customer rating landed
320 some power to customer (who place and receive the orders) to pressurize couriers further. An
321 interviewee (0517g) shared this experience:

322 *Once I was delivering an order, the next customer saw me [location on the app]. I was like a few*
323 *hundred meters away from him. He saw that I was not moving for like 5 or 6 minutes. But I was*
324 *just delivering the order before his. He started phoning and rushing me, saying ‘I saw your*
325 *location, why were you not moving?’ I said sorry I’d be quick. After 30 seconds, he phoned again,*
326 *saying ‘you need to hurry, you are not moving’. I explained and told him I’d be with him right*
327 *away. He saw me [location] not moving, then phoned the third time and said he would make a*
328 *complaint. The moment he hang up, I completed the other order. One minute, I was 300 meters*
329 *away from him, it took me one minute to get to him. I drove so quickly, was not afraid of accidents*
330 *at all. I wanted to rush and worried I might get a complaint. One complaint then it’s all wasted*
331 *[as fine due to customer complaint is the worth of delivery fees from several orders]. When I*
332 *handed the order to him, I sincerely apologized to him and said sorry. He took the order*
333 *reluctantly and said ‘sorry meant nothing’. He then made a complaint. (0517g)*

334 **3.5 Varying individual response to AM**

335 Interviewees reported varying responses and perceptions about the same feature of AM. Using
336 gamification as an example, some of the interviewees said they enjoyed it. One interviewee talked
337 proudly about the day when she delivered a record number of orders and regretted that she could not
338 achieve a higher number.

339 *The highest number I achieved was 92 orders [in a day]...I worked normal amount of hours [that*
340 *day] but it was a festival so lots of orders...there were people who could complete 100 more*
341 *orders most of the days... 12 o’clock [midnight] came too early [on that day]. I was 8 orders short*
342 *of 100...the system did not give me the chance [to reach 100]. It’s a shame. After summer, there*
343 *are fewer orders. I only get 50 to 60 orders per day now. (0529a)*

344 Another interviewee (0528a) stated that her desire to win kept her in this job, and that she preferred
345 this job to her previous office-based one, because both her physical health and sleep quality improved
346 since she switched. On the other hand, there was an interviewee who felt they could never be as good
347 as those more experienced couriers (see quotes from the Datafication 0517g).

348 Because AM made performance measures highly transparent, voluntary competition among couriers
349 were stimulated as some would show off on social media or in group chats, inducing pressure on the
350 other couriers.

351 *There are all sorts of screenshots in our [WeChat] group, sometimes it’s unit price [delivery fee*
352 *goes up when they achieved certain goals], sometime it’s how much they made that day, all sorts*
353 *screenshots, anyway, all sorts of show-off, all sorts of psychological attack.(0604g)*

354 AM and digital labour platforms undoubtedly provided more job **opportunities and flexibility**. Gig
355 couriers found the process straightforward. They just needed to download the app, register and verify
356 identity, and there was no contract binding except for insurance where the platform paid ¥3 daily for
357 their safety (0517g, 0518g, 0604g). They agreed that there was autonomy and freedom but outside of
358 the system, as described by the interviewees:

359 *To a certain extent, freedom means that you can decide whether to do it or not, whether to work or not to work*
360 *today, but once you started working, the system dictates everything. (0517g)*

361 *Yes, we can reject orders but not too many. If rejected too many [orders], they [the system] will restrict orders*
362 *your can get. (0510Yg)*

363 Most of the interviewees considered it good pay and many said that their income was higher,
364 compared to their previous jobs. In addition, they appreciated that hard work was rewarded for
365 example, attendance bonus, workload and service quality related bonus, and weather subsidy
366 (additional fees they receive when delivering in bad weathers), without the need to deal with office
367 politics (0528a). We found that younger interviewees (0604g, 0528a, 0529a; aged in their twenties)
368 tended to have a more positive response to AM and were often motivated to be competitive in
369 algorithm-driven incentive programs, e.g. gamification and ranking, or voluntarily engaged social
370 networks, e.g. chat groups.

371 **4 Discussion**

372 AM is a paradigm-shifting force as it challenges our long-held beliefs about what is human ability
373 and what is machine capability (Schuetz & Venkatesh, 2020). The human-like characteristics of
374 algorithmic systems thus created a new artefact-user relationship that necessitates new definitions
375 and models. Coming from the worker users' perspective, or those 'being managed', we identified two
376 key stressors introduced by AM: Dehumanization and Datafication. Dehumanization is fundamental
377 to AM but the withdrawal of organizational support, e.g. an inaccessible virtual manager or a generic
378 hotline with whom the couriers had no confidence whether they would be supported, might reduce
379 the perceived quality of support and the sense of relatedness to the digitalized workplace.
380 Datafication or extraction of data from workers, is the foundational process of AM as the system
381 cannot deliver management outputs without the data inputs. Features such as gamification, ranking
382 and job allocation are based on behavioral data collected from the workers. Digital labour platforms
383 also had the power to collect biometric data from the couriers, e.g. facial images. The interviewees
384 did not raise the issue of data privacy or surveillance as they accepted the fact that AM is the boss
385 and the boss dictates. There was a strong sense of power imbalance and reluctant acceptance of
386 unfairness and discrimination. It must be recognized that datafication can function alone to deliver
387 such effects without dehumanization. Because the lack of transparency about how workers' data are
388 being collected, analyzed and used against them plaques the workplaces, even when decision-making
389 remains in the hands of human managers, datafication lends great power to them to judge those
390 'being managed'. (Cheng & Hackett, 2021; Tan et al., 2021; Veen et al., 2020)

391 Couriers' exposure to AM was not equally distributed cross employment types and work
392 organization mode. This is consistent with finding from qualitative research that compared
393 experience of Uber drivers working in London, New York and multiple other cities (Karanović et al.,
394 2021). The identification of key stressors of AM can assist future study to develop a typology in
395 relation to the extent of Dehumanization and Datafication and the perceived effects on, for example,
396 quality of support, sense of relatedness, data transparency, discrimination, workplace unfairness and
397 power imbalance. In terms of dehumanization and quality of support, organizational support provided
398 through human, e.g. managers and customer service hotlines, should be taken into account, as they
399 can reinforce system rules or provide some negotiating space for worker users. These findings are
400 consistent with literature from Human-factor in Computing Systems (Chen & Qiu, 2019; Gal et al.,
401 2020; Schuetz & Venkatesh, 2020; A. Zhang et al., 2022) but were not articulated to explain the
402 mechanisms of AM for health researchers.

403 Another key finding of this study is the interaction between AM and other psychosocial factors, e.g.
404 time pressure and customer behavior. Although several studies on Chinese couriers' occupational
405 stress, mental health and safety have highlighted the highly stressful working conditions, they did not
406 evaluate the role of AM in intensifying the effects of relevant factors (Hong et al., 2022; Sun, 2023;

407 Xie et al., 2021; C. Zhang, S. P. Cheung, et al., 2022). Future studies should take into account the
408 interactive effects between AM and other work stress factors.

409 Couriers in China are at the forefront of experiencing and coping with these new job stressors and
410 hence provide an important starting point for conceptualizing the AM and understanding the
411 underlying mechanisms. Similar to other gig workers in the world, Chinese couriers have also tried to
412 figure out how the system works, what it means to their work life and have developed coping
413 strategies (McDonald et al., 2021; Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). However, studies focusing solely
414 on platform-based workers, e.g. Uber or Deliveroo, provided limited insights into how workers
415 negotiate with automated management through the limited human support provided by the system.
416 As we talked to couriers with varying exposure to AM, the importance of human-factor was
417 identified.

418 Individuals responded to AM in different ways. For example, some participants in our study enjoyed
419 gamification and found it a fulfilling experience, whilst some other participants expressed concerns
420 about discrimination. Some preferred the flexibility and pay transparency provided by the system
421 while some found navigating the system without guidance frustrating. These findings are consistent
422 with sociological research of AM (Li, 2022; Prabowo et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2023). However,
423 previous studies tend to focus on either positive or negative impacts of AM without taking into
424 account that variations due to individual circumstances. Future research should further identify
425 individual factors that predict work experience and outcomes.

426 **4.1 Limitations and future research**

427 This is an exploratory study based on a relatively small number of interviews. The insights may be
428 nuanced and insightful about Chinese couriers, although it is unclear to what extent the findings are
429 generalizable to other countries. However, the results appear to be broadly in line with existing
430 sociology and psychology literature of this topic. Future research can continue to develop the
431 concepts of Dehumanization and Datafication and utilize it for larger studies on AM.

432

433

434 **5 Reference**

435 Brennen, J. S., & Kreiss, D. (2016). Digitalization. *The international encyclopedia of communication*
436 *theory and philosophy*, 1-11.

437 Chen, J. Y., & Qiu, J. L. (2019). Digital utility: Datafication, regulation, labor, and DiDi's
438 platformization of urban transport in China. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 12(3), 274-
439 289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2019.1614964>

440 Cheng, M. M., & Hackett, R. D. (2021). A critical review of algorithms in HRM: Definition, theory,
441 and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), 100698.
442 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmmr.2019.100698>

443 Cram, W. A., Wiener, M., Tarafdar, M., & Benlian, A. (2022). Examining the Impact of Algorithmic
444 Control on Uber Drivers' Technostress. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 39(2),
445 426-453. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2022.2063556>

- 446 Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (Fifth ed.).
447 SAGE.
- 448 Fairclough, N. (2005). Peripheral Vision: Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for
449 Critical Realism. *Organization Studies*, 26(6), 915-939.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605054610>
- 451 Fleiss, J. L., Levin, B., & Paik, M. C. (2013). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*. John
452 Wiley & Sons.
- 453 Gal, U., Jensen, T. B., & Stein, M.-K. (2020). Breaking the vicious cycle of algorithmic
454 management: A virtue ethics approach to people analytics. *Information and Organization*,
455 30(2), 100301. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2020.100301>
- 456 Hong, Y., Zhang, Y., Xue, P., Fang, X., Zhou, L., Wei, F., . . . Zou, H. (2022). The Influence of Long
457 Working Hours, Occupational Stress, and Well-Being on Depression Among Couriers in
458 Zhejiang, China [Original Research]. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13.
459 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.928928>
- 460 Ivanova, M., Bronowicka, J., Kocher, E., & Degner, A. (2018). The App as a Boss? Control and
461 Autonomy in Application-Based Management. [https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-](https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-euv/frontdoor/index/index/docId/388)
462 [euv/frontdoor/index/index/docId/388](https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-euv/frontdoor/index/index/docId/388)
- 463 <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:521-opus4-3889> (Arbeit | Grenze | Fluss - 2)
- 464 Karanović, J., Berends, H., & Engel, Y. (2021). Regulated Dependence: Platform Workers'
465 Responses to New Forms of Organizing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(4), 1070-1106.
466 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12577>
- 467 Li, A. K. (2022). Beyond algorithmic control: flexibility, intermediaries, and paradox in the on-
468 demand economy. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(14), 2012-2027.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1924225>
- 470 Li, J. (2016). Karoshi: An international work-related hazard? *International Journal of Cardiology*,
471 206, 139-140. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.01.092>
- 472 Lin, Y. 林., Li, X. 李., & Li, Y. 李. (2018). 北京市快递员过劳现状及其影响因素—基于 1214 名
473 快递员的调查 (Empirical Research on Employment and Overwork Situation of Couriers—
474 Based on the Investigation of 1214 Couriers in Beijing). *中国流通经济 (China Business
475 And Market)*, 32(08), 79-88. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.14089/j.cnki.cn11-3664/f.2018.08.009>
- 476 Lin, Y. 林., & Li, Y. 李. (2021). 心理资本、组织支持感在职业紧张与过度劳动关系中的作用—
477 基于北京地区外卖骑手的调查 (The Role of Psychological Capital and Organizational
478 Support in the Relationship between Occupational Stress and Overwork—Based on a Survey
479 of Take-out Riders in Beijing). *中国流通经济 (China Business And Market)*, 35(4), 116-
480 126. <https://doi.org/doi> : 10.14089/j.cnki.cn11-3664/f.2021.04.011
- 481 Mäntymäki, M., Baiyere, A., & Islam, A. K. M. N. (2019). Digital platforms and the changing nature
482 of physical work: Insights from ride-hailing. *International Journal of Information
483 Management*, 49, 452-460. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.007>

- 484 Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2021). The duality of algorithmic management: Toward a research
485 agenda on HRM algorithms, autonomy and value creation. *Human Resource Management*
486 *Review*, 100876. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100876](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100876)
- 487 Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management
488 and Uber drivers'. Autonomy', in proceedings of the international conference on information
489 systems (ICIS), Seoul South Korea,
- 490 Möhlmann, M., Zalmanson, L., Henfridsson, O., & Gregory, R. W. (2021). Algorithmic Management
491 of Work on Online Labor Platforms: When Matching Meets Control [Article]. *MIS Quarterly*,
492 45(4), 1999-2022. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/15333>
- 493 Mökander, J., Juneja, P., Watson, D. S., & Floridi, L. (2022). The US Algorithmic Accountability
494 Act of 2022 vs. The EU Artificial Intelligence Act: what can they learn from each other?
495 *Minds and Machines*, 1-8.
- 496 Parviainen, P., Tihinen, M., Kääriäinen, J., & Teppola, S. (2017). Tackling the digitalization
497 challenge: how to benefit from digitalization in practice. *International journal of information*
498 *systems and project management*, 5(1), 63-77.
- 499 Prabowo, R., Sucahyo, Y. G., Gandhi, A., & Ruldeviyani, Y. (2019, 12-13 Oct. 2019). Does
500 Gamification Motivate Gig Workers? A Critical Issue in Ride-Sharing Industries. 2019
501 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and information Systems
502 (ICACISIS),
- 503 Rani, U., Pesole, A., & Gonzalez Vazquez, I. (2024). *Algorithmic Management practices in regular*
504 *workplaces: case studies in logistics and healthcare*.
505 <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/712475>
- 506 Schuetz, S., & Venkatesh, V. (2020). Research Perspectives: The Rise of Human Machines: How
507 Cognitive Computing Systems Challenge Assumptions of User-System Interaction. *Journal*
508 *of the Association for Information Systems*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00608>
- 509 Sun, G. (2023). Quantitative Analysis of Online Labor Platforms' Algorithmic Management
510 Influence on Psychological Health of Workers. *International Journal of Environmental*
511 *Research and Public Health*, 20(5), 4519. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/20/5/4519>
- 512 Tan, Z. M., Aggarwal, N., Cows, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). The ethical debate
513 about the gig economy: A review and critical analysis. *Technology in Society*, 65, 101594.
514 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101594>
- 515 Veen, A., Barratt, T., & Goods, C. (2020). Platform-Capital's 'App-etite' for Control: A Labour
516 Process Analysis of Food-Delivery Work in Australia. *Work, employment and society*, 34(3),
517 388-406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019836911>
- 518 Wang, Z., Neitzel, R. L., Zheng, W., Wang, D., Xue, X., & Jiang, G. (2021). Road safety situation of
519 electric bike riders: A cross-sectional study in courier and take-out food delivery population.
520 *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 22(7), 564-569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2021.1895129>
- 521 Wei, H., Daniels, S., Whitfield, C. A., Han, Y., Denning, D. W., Hall, I., . . . van Tongeren, M.
522 (2022). Agility and Sustainability: A Qualitative Evaluation of COVID-19 Non-
523 pharmaceutical Interventions in the UK Logistics Sector [Original Research]. *Frontiers in*
524 *public health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.864506>

- 525 Xie, Y., Tian, J., Jiao, Y., Liu, Y., Yu, H., & Shi, L. (2021). The Impact of Work Stress on Job
526 Satisfaction and Sleep Quality for Couriers in China: The Role of Psychological Capital
527 [Original Research]. *Frontiers in psychology*, *12*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.730147>
- 528 Zhang, A., Boltz, A., Wang, C. W., & Lee, M. K. (2022). *Algorithmic Management Reimagined For*
529 *Workers and By Workers: Centering Worker Well-Being in Gig Work* Proceedings of the
530 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New Orleans, LA, USA.
531 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501866>
- 532 Zhang, C., Cheung, S. P., & Huang, C. (2022). Job Demands and Resources, Mindfulness, and
533 Burnout Among Delivery Drivers in China [Original Research]. *Frontiers in psychology*, *13*.
534 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.792254>
- 535 Zhang, C., Sitar, S., & Huang, C.-C. (2022). Effects of Job Demands and Resources on Positive and
536 Negative Affect of Delivery Drivers in China. *International Journal of Environmental*
537 *Research and Public Health*, *19*(13), 8140. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/19/13/8140>
- 538 Zhang, L., Yang, J., Zhang, Y., & Xu, G. (2023). Gig worker's perceived algorithmic management,
539 stress appraisal, and destructive deviant behavior. *PLoS ONE*, *18*(11), e0294074.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294074>

541 **6 Tables**