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Motivation

Is new technology producing an accelerated pace of change in the organization of work?

- Popular perception of dramatic growth in number of workers with no long-term connection to a particular business ("gig workers")
- Short duration employment opportunities facilitated by the internet

Any significant changes are likely to have important implications

- Worker welfare (both positive and negative)
- Policy (health insurance, retirement savings, legal rights & protections, ...)
- Economic measurement
Big Questions

1) Do we know the level and trend of gig employment?
   - from household survey data
   - from business data
   - from administrative (tax) data

2) Is gig employment large enough to matter for measures of employment and earnings?

3) Are productivity statistics accurately capturing labor input and allocating output and labor to the appropriate industries?

4) Are there suggestions for better measurement?
Defining & quantifying gig employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work arrangement type</th>
<th>Work Arrangement Characteristic</th>
<th>How Work Arrangement Reported</th>
<th>Temporary or Gig Worker?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional employee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-call worker/worker with irregular schedule</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-hire temporary worker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract company workers</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary help agency worker</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED worker</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contract company worker</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed business owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated business owner</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>W2, K1 or 1099-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner in a partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Div</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated sole proprietor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional contractor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day laborer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-demand/platform worker</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining & quantifying gig employment

Gig workers do not have an implicit or explicit contract for a continuing work relationship → they are a subset of contingent workers.

But this doesn’t help us quantify the number of gig workers:

• CPS Contingent Worker Supplement (CWS) was asked in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2005, & 2017, so missing important years when gig employment has been increasing.

• CWS primarily asks about main jobs, so misses secondary work.
Defining & quantifying gig employment

Gig workers are a subset of the unincorporated self-employed

• Unincorporated SE are measured in household surveys
  -- need to be aware of the distinction between main job and second jobs
• Most unincorporated SE should receive a 1099 and should file a Schedule C and Schedule SE

Trends in unincorporated self-employment from both household surveys and tax data are a first place to look for trends in gig employment
Self-employment levels and trends

- Nonemployers
- DER Self Employed
- 1099-MISC, Individuals
- 1099-MISC, Indiv + Business
- CPS Monthly, Main Job Last Week
- CPS ASEC, All Jobs Last Year
- CPS ASEC, Longest Job Last Year
- ACS, Main Job Last Week
- Nonemployer Sole Proprietors
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Self-employment levels and trends

Can we say that household survey data or administrative tax data are more accurate? No

- CPS & ACS don’t probe deeply about non-traditional work arrangements, leading to reporting errors
- Tax data only captures what is reported to the tax authorities

The best way to understand discrepancies between household survey data and administrative tax data is to compare information from the two sources for the same set of people

- We link the CPS-ASEC and the DER microdata, 1996-2012
  (DER is “Detailed Earnings Record,” with information from Schedule SE)
Self-employment in CPS-ASEC and DER

- CPS-ASEC self-employed only
- DER self-employed only
- Both CPS-ASEC and DER self-employed
Self-employment in CPS-ASEC and DER

- DER Self Employed
- CPS ASEC, All Jobs Last Year

Graph showing the trend of self-employment from 1996 to 2012.
## Self-employment in CPS-ASEC and DER
### Average 1996-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not SE in DER</th>
<th>SE in DER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not SE in CPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>202,311,037</td>
<td>10,459,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Share</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Share</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE in CPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5,776,887</td>
<td>5,531,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Share</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Share</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis
- **Row Share** C: SE in DER = 4.9% vs. Not SE in DER = 95.1%
- **Column Share** C: SE in DER = 65.4% vs. Not SE in DER = 97.2%
- **SE in CPS**
  - **Row Share** A: SE = 48.9% vs. Not SE in CPS = 51.1%
  - **Column Share** A: SE = 34.6% vs. Not SE in CPS = 2.8%
- **Column Share** B: SE in DER = 34.6% vs. SE in CPS = 2.8%
## Self-employment in CPS-ASEC and DER

**Average 1996-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not SE in DER</th>
<th>SE in DER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not SE in CPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>202,311,037</td>
<td>10,459,170</td>
<td>212,770,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Share</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Share</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE in CPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5,776,887</td>
<td>5,531,764</td>
<td>11,308,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Share</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Share</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Row Share:  
- **A**: Not SE in CPS
- **B**: SE in CPS
- **C**: Not SE in DER

Column Share:  
- **A**: Not SE in CPS
- **B**: SE in CPS
- **C**: Not SE in DER
Self-employment in CPS-ASEC and DER

- A: SE in CPS, SE in DER
- B: SE in CPS, Not SE in DER
- C: Not SE in CPS, SE in DER
“C: Not SE in CPS, SE in DER”

The rising off-diagonal is “C: Not SE in CPS, SE in DER.”

Each of the following
“Missing 2nd job: W&S in both, SE in DER”
“Misclassification: W&S in CPS, SE in DER”
“No CPS employment, SE in DER”

contributes roughly one-third to the growth of the “C” off-diagonal.
Interesting Tangent

The DER is measuring a substantial amount of self-employment that is not measured in the CPS.

Does this non-measured SE help us understand the declining E/P ratio?
Interesting Tangent

The DER is measuring a substantial amount of self-employment that is not measured in the CPS.

Does this non-measured SE help us understand the declining E/P ratio?

Not really, because much missed SE in the CPS is misclassification or 2nd job of persons already employed.
Suggestions for better measurement: 1) Improving household survey measures

Would probing for non-traditional work arrangements improve their measurement on household surveys?

Probing about gig employment (Abraham & Amaya) leads to:
  • Higher employment rates
  • Much higher multiple job holding rates

We recommend:
  • More probing questions should be asked at regular intervals (supplements) to measure non-traditional work
  • Probes should focus on both primary and secondary jobs
  • Probes can be tailored differently for self versus proxy respondents
Suggestions for better measurement:
2) More timely data

Our CPS-DER linked microdata covers the years 1996-2012
   -- Data currently not available for more recent years

The increase in the gig economy likely occurred after 2012
   -- Both Farrell & Grieg and Hall & Krueger show the steep rise begins in 2014
Suggestions for better measurement:

2) More timely data

Our CPS-DER linked microdata covers the years 1996-2012
-- Data currently not available for more recent years

The increase in the gig economy likely occurred after 2012
-- Both Farrell & Grieg and Hall & Krueger show the steep rise begins in 2014

The Nonemployer data is only published through 2015
Suggestions for better measurement:
3) More effective use of administrative data

Information about non-employee work could be derived from:

- Tax data, particularly 1099s (Jackson, Looney, & Ramnath)
- Financial data (Farrell and Greig)
- Private sector company data – obtain personnel data from companies in the online platform sector (Hall & Krueger)

Data integration has the potential to add new insights:

- primary or supplemental source of earnings
- the career path of individuals
- family circumstances, particularly health insurance coverage
Example of Data Integration (I)

Published nonemployer statistics from the Census Bureau show the number of self-employed individuals operating unincorporated businesses. We can add value by linking these data:

- to demographics (age, gender, . . .)
- to wage and salary data (from the LEHD)
- longitudinally over time

New insights regarding self-employed taxi drivers (AHSS 2018):

- this industry’s growth is unique in the Nonemployer data
- entrants are different than incumbents
- on average, self-employment earnings of entrants incompletely mitigates their reduction in wage and salary earnings
- no evidence that incumbent taxi drivers are hurt by industry growth
Example of Data Integration (II)

We are able to link the 2012-2015 nonemployers to their responses in the CPS-ASEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-employers</th>
<th>Nonemployers SE in CPS-ASEC</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Big Questions

1) Do we know the level and trend of gig employment?
   - Gig workers are contingent workers, but missing important years in the time series and concerned about missing second jobs
   - Gig workers are self-employed, but published levels and trends of self-employment differ dramatically across HH surveys and admin (tax) data

2) Is gig employment large enough to matter for measures of employment and earnings?

3) Are productivity statistics accurately capturing labor input and allocating output and labor to the appropriate industries?

4) Are there suggestions for better measurement?
   - Survey modules that probe more deeply about non-employee work
   - More timely data from the Federal Statistical System
   - Integration of survey and administrative data