Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Hannah Chong April 13, 2022

Gendered Labor and Entrepreneurship in the Gig Economy

by

Hannah Chong

Cassidy Puckett
Adviser

Sociology

Cassidy Puckett

Adviser

Hugo Mialon

Committee Member

Tracy Scott

Committee Member

Giacomo Negro

Committee Member

2022

Gendered Labor and Entrepreneurship in the Gig Economy

By

Hannah Chong

Cassidy Puckett

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Sociology

2022

Abstract

Gendered Labor and Entrepreneurship in the Gig Economy
By Hannah Chong

Since 1999, the U.S. labor market has seen a steady surge in gig work, characterized by short and temporary contract work. Furthermore, what started as a form of labor carried out by a small sect of people has come to encompass a large and diverse demographic. However, the rapid shift at which precarious labor has become a staple ofthe modern economy has caused alarm amongst social scientists and politicians alike, citing concerns of a trend toward neoliberal labor values. One example of such a trend has been the emergence of an entrepreneurial culture within the gig economy. Sociological studies on the platform economy have surged in recent years, exploring how factors such as gender, identity, and emotional labor influence and manifest withinthe gig economy. Currently, research shows that gender and emotional labor play a rolein defining the experiences of gig workers. Research also shows that entrepreneurial framing within the gig economy is reminiscent of a shift towards neoliberal labor values.However, while research has been conducted on the interplay of these individual components, scholarship exploring these factors' interplay in the gig economy is non- existent. Thus, my research seeks to fill this gap by conducting a secondary analysis of interviews that were conducted with gig workers in 2019. My research found that gendered differences in the gig economy exist beyond wage gaps. I find that female gig workers cited flexibility as a reason for entering the gig work sector, especially when taking care of children. Second, I found that female gig workers were more often than their male counterparts to perform emotional labor in framing their work in a positive light despite giving negative work accounts that would indicate otherwise. Third, I foundthat contrary to current research, women were more likely to identify their job as entrepreneurial in nature. The implications for my research are broad but largely centeraround providing more insight into a large labor population in the United States as well as how a potential lack of social safety nets is driving caretakers of children into performing precarious labor.

Gendered Labor and Entrepreneurship in the Gig Economy

By

Hannah Chong

Cassidy Puckett

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Sociology

2022

Acknowledgements

My many thanks to Dr. Cassidy Puckett, Dr. Michael Vaughn, Dr. Diana Enriquez, Dr. Timothy Dowd, Dr. Jeff Mullis, Grace Lewis, Katelyn Hoang, Justin Chong, my mother, father, and sister for the support they have provided me through this process. I am forever indebted to you all.

Table of Contents

Introduction

My research explores the intersections between gender, entrepreneurial framing, identity construction, and emotional labor in the modern-day gig economy. The topic of gig work has become especially relevant in today's society. Given the near-ubiquitous presence of gig work in today's (global) economy and the (in)direct impact it has had on shaping current socioeconomic conditions, its relevance comes as no surprise. Gig work itself is not a novel concept. Its origins date back to the 19th century when "matchgirls," or teenage women in London who, because of the shortage of men due to WWII, took up temporary labor making matchsticks (Alkhatib et al. 2017).

However, the modern-day gig economy is novel in two distinct ways. First, the rate at which gig work has risen in the past decade has led to a labor economy with a larger portion of laborers doing short-term, temporary work now than ever before. Second, the gig economy is unique in that the broad definition and categories of gig work led to a diverse labor demographic that permeates racial, gender, and class boundaries. Third, the rapid rise of the modern-day gig economy signals a larger issue at hand-one of a society shifting towards neoliberal values that will only exacerbate and further class divides.

Given the apparent social implications of the gig economy, research on the gig economy has surged in recent years. In the past decade alone, sociologists have researched a broad range of topics relating to the gig economy, from shifting power dynamics amongst gig workers to how workers are fighting against algorithms that direct the platforms that they work on. However, while there is an abundance of research on the aforementioned topics, scholarship on the interplay between gender, identity construction, and entrepreneurial

framing within the gig economy remains painfully sparse. Yet, given that modern-day gig work is widely known for its precarity, the repercussions of such a gap are costly for the well-being of workers.

While current literature shows that there are gendered labor differences within the gig economy, such as wage gaps, there is relatively little research on how men and women experience and interpret their labor while shouldering societal gender expectations. My research seeks to contribute to bridging this gap by exploring whether there are differences between how male and female gig workers experience, interpret and construct their work identity. Furthermore, my research shows how gig workers perform emotional labor plays a role in work identity construction.

I do so by conducting a secondary data analysis of 39 interviews that sought insight into the lives and experiences of gig workers. My research found that there are differences between how male and female gig workers self-select into, experience, and interpret their labor and roles. Female gig workers are more likely to self-select into the gig economy because of its flexibility when caring for a child. Second, female gig workers were more likely than male gig workers to identify their work as entrepreneurial in nature, expressing that one's success was proportional to how much effort they put in. However, my final finding shows that female gig workers were more likely than male gig workers to frame their work in a positive light despite giving negative accounts of their jobs that would indicate otherwise.

The implications of my findings are two-fold. First, it is the first step in further exploring why these phenomena are occurring. Is it a lack of social safety nets or the burgeoning neoliberal labor values? Second, my research helps to show how platform companies use

narratives at the expense of their laborers and can help prohibit any further exploitation of gig workers.

Theoretical Framework & Past Research

Overview

The current state of research regarding gender, emotional labor, identity construction, and entrepreneurial framing within the gig economy is that research has been done for each individual factor, but research that explores the interplay of all these factors remains sparse. To elaborate, for example, sociologists have researched how gender plays a role in the gig economy or how emotional labor manifests within the gig economy. However, research that explores how gender, emotional labor, identity construction, and entrepreneurial framing interact and manifest within the gig economy remains virtually non-existent. To help readers understand my research, I first give a framework of theories to help readers understand my research. Then, since there is relatively little research on the interplay of my topics, I will introduce what research has been done on the isolated components that make up my research topic. I begin with emotional labor.

Theoretical Framework

Emotional Labor

According to Hochschild (1983), emotional labor refers to how people manage their own feelings as a way to create a particular emotional state in another person, often as a result of institutional or organizational guidelines. (Wharton 2009; Hochschild 1938). This concept is often used to explain emotion management and performative behavior in the workplace, especially in service-oriented industries. For my research, I apply emotional labor to explain (1)

the performative behavior of gig workers in enacting customer service and (2) the emotional management that gig workers perform when there is a disconnect between the way they experience and interpret their work.

While gig workers may explicitly state that they view their job positively, a deeper analysis of the interview will reveal experiences of dismal working conditions such as job insecurity. Gender comes into play when considering that entrepreneurship (gig-work) is a traditionally male-dominated field and is associated with masculine gender traits (Giazitzoglu and Down 2015; Strawser 2021). Next, I speak about identity construction.

Identity Construction

The concept of identity spans multiple social science fields, from economics to psychology. Each discipline develops its theories on how identity is constructed and plays a role in our lives. However, from a sociological standpoint, the first major introduction to the study of "identity" came from Cooley's (1902) theory of the looking-glass self which refers to how "The ideas and feelings that people have about themselves — their self-concept or self-image — are developed in response to their perception and internalization of how others perceive and evaluate them (Nickerson 2021; Chandler and Munday, 2011)." Since 1902, research on identity construction has expanded to include the influences of a myriad of social factors and how organizations and collective settings contribute to identity construction (Cerulo 1997).

This paradigm pertains to my research in that I will use it to help frame 1) the phenomenon of entrepreneurial agency within the gig economy and the subsequent gendered differences and 2) how the construction of work identity amongst gig workers differs by gender. Next, I speak on entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial Framing

I do not use the modern-day platform economy and entrepreneurship synonymously. While they do intersect, entrepreneurship is defined as "the creation of new organizations… which occurs as a context-dependent, social and economic process" (Gartner 1988; Reynolds 1991; Low & Abrahamson 1997; Thornton 1999). The modern-day gig-economy, or the platform economy, is defined as a space where "...work that is transacted via platforms but delivered locally and thus requires the worker to be physically present, and work that is transacted and delivered remotely via platforms [is performed] (Huws et al., 2016). Local gig work includes food delivery, couriering, transport and manual labour" (Wood et al. 2019 (1)). However, despite being separate sociological concepts, they intersect in two main ways.

First, the platform economy is largely made up of workers that are legally classified as freelancers or independent contractors (Kuhn 2016). While this affords workers more flexibility regarding hours and scheduling, it is also often used by platform companies to skirt labor regulations and benefits that are mandated for salaried employees (Kuhn 2016). As Vallas and Schor (2020) found, "...gig workers must not only assume responsibility for operating costs and risks and forego protections enjoyed by employees but also conform to the temporal rhythms of customer demand, which can reduce their autonomy substantially (Ravenelle 2019, Rosenblat 2018, Schor 2020)" (275). In this sense, Barratt et al. (2020) finds that the rapid growth of the gig-economy "can be viewed as the neoliberalisation of work (Zwick 2018), with work increasingly governed by the market rather than social regulation (Peck, 1996)" (1644).

In addition to the modern-day gig economy being built upon a labor model that promotes insecurity, it has come to be framed as entrepreneurial behavior (Barratt et al. 2020). It is worth noting that there are valid instances of entrepreneurial agency within the gig economy. Barrios et al. (2020) found that the gig economy gave entrepreneurs a fallback that would allow them to supplement their income in the event of failure of their ventures. Webster and Shang (2020) found that in the Nordic platform economy, gig work served as an option for immigrant women to generate income from performing traditionally performed acts in the gendered domestic sphere, such as cooking (Milkman et al. 2020).

However, despite the positive instances that the gig economy may have for budding entrepreneurs, research shows that this is not the case for the majority. Eberhart et al. (2021) found that the emergent entrepreneurial ideology within the gig-economy is based on a "...confluence of neo-liberalism and individual action situated in the discourse of entrepreneurialism, employability and free agency" (1). They also find that conflating entrepreneurship with neo-liberal labor practices "has altered…. how we work and where we work, but also what we believe is appropriate work and what rewards should accompany it" (1). This foundation helps frame how gig workers utilize emotional labor and identity construction.

Entrepreneurship as a Gendered Construct

Extensive scholarship points to entrepreneurship as a masculine practice (Muntean and Ozkazanc-Pan 2015; Ward et al. 2019). Research has shown that those that exhibit entrepreneurial behavior often possess certain personality and environmental traits, such as a high internal locus of control and a social network rich with fiscal means (Kerr et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2020). The existence of hegemonic masculine practices has dictated the historical and

cultural barriers that have restricted women from pursuing and succeeding in entrepreneurial ventures (Bullough 2022, Baughn et al. 2006; Bullough et al. 2017; Jennings and Brush 2013; Welter and Smallbone 2011).

To elaborate, traits that are often associated with entrepreneurship, such as risk-taking, may be expressed as a personality trait, but having the ability and freedom to take risks in the first place is more affordable to men (Ilie et al. 2021; Cardella 2020). Furthermore, if gendered peer effects largely influence entrepreneurial ventures, other characteristics such as networking, competitiveness, and resourcefulness should be more common among men. This is because, historically, the gendered responsibilities of women, gender-performative norms, and opportunities have worked against women having the same liberties as men (Ilie et al. 2021; Cardella 2020)).

These theories will help readers understand the framework I used to conduct and analyze my research. Next, I will discuss what current research exists regarding my topic.

Past Literature

Gender & the Gig Economy

Gendered Differences

Scholarship at the intersection of gender and the gig economy supports two key points. First, despite its precarious nature, modern-day gig work can offer perks such as flexibility and ease of entrance that make it appealing to women with gendered familial responsibilities. Despite the shrinking existence of a nuclear family unit and women entering the workforce at historical rates, Coltrane (2000) finds that women, on average, spend more time on childcare and domestic duties than men. Thus, it comes as no surprise that Milkman et al. (2020), in a

study that examined women in the food delivery-based gig economy, found that women self-selected into this sector for "...[the] scheduling flexibility, which facilitates balancing paid work and family care" (1).

Second, even though women make up nearly half of the modern-day gig economy in the United States, female gig-workers still face gender inequality in the workplace. For example, Barzilay and Ben-David (2017), after an empirical analysis of data on male and female gig workers, found that despite women having worked more total hours, their "hourly rates [were] 37% lower than men's: the overall average hourly rate for women is $28.20 compared to an average hourly rate of $45.07 for men" (408). Wage gaps are also salient outside of (food) delivery-based apps. Litman et al. (2020), after studying an online marketplace (Cloud Research) that allows for short-term on-demand menial labor, such as transcribing, found that the average hourly earnings of women were 10.5% lower than the men's and that women had a tendency to select tasks that paid less.

It is worth noting that, on the contrary, Cook et al. (2021) found a 7% gender wage gap in an analysis of rideshare drivers but argue that this "...gap can be entirely attributed to three factors: experience on the platform (learning-by-doing), preferences and constraints over where to work (driven largely by where drivers live and, to a lesser extent, safety), and preferences for driving speed" (1). However, I find that they fail to consider the fact that experience comes with time spent working and that the female makeup of the gig economy may have more duties that disallow them from working similar hours (Coltrane 2000; Milkman et al. 2020; Barzilay and Ben-David 2017).

Platform-based gender inequality can also manifest outside of wage gaps. For example, Galperin (2019) found that in an online freelance marketplace where gig-workers could perform temporary and low-value jobs on-demand, gender stereotyping played a role in determining the distribution of gigs. Specifically, "...the results corroborate that female candidates are less likely to be hired for male-typed jobs (e.g., software development) but more likely to be hired for female-typed jobs (e.g., writing and translation) than equally qualified male candidates (1). The wage gap, in addition to the gender stereotypes that female gig-workers face, makes it clear that "despite the absence of overt discrimination, labor segregation, and inflexible work arrangements, even after experience, education, and other human capital factors are controlled for," women have still face gender inequality in the gig economy. Next, I discuss how gender plays a role in identity construction.

Identity Construction

Extensive research has already shown that gender plays a large role in shaping (workplace) identity (Craner 2000; O'Brien 1992; Holmes 2006). Despite the prevalence of gig work, literature on the intersection between the gig economy, gender, and identity remains sparse. However, I find that using literature on gender and identity from other labor contexts helps explain my research. Alvesson (1998), in exploring gender relations and identities within an advertising agency, found that gender is constructed in an organizational context, and the feminine gendering of marketing work puts a strain on the gender identity of the males (Alvesson 1998). In a converse situation, van Veelen et al. (2019), in conducting a study of women in STEM industries, found that

> "The combination of working almost solely with male colleagues (being outnumbered) and working in the technical sector (where women are negatively stereotyped) predicted the

> highest levels of experienced gender identity threat, particularly among women who highly identified with their gender group. Gender identity threat, in turn, negatively predicted women's work engagement and career confidence. Men did not face double trouble: Their experience of gender identity threat was not related to working in a masculine STEM sector" (1).

Thus, in a typically male-dominated industry (driving) and the masculine framing of entrepreneurship, women in the gig economy may feel their gender identity is under strain. In this vein, in a study conducted by Atewologun and Singh (2010), they found that in the face of identity-challenging situations, women were less like to be agentic and would often frame their challenges to "protect/restore their identity" (1). I expect these findings to help explain the emotional labor that female gig workers performed in framing their work experiences in a positive and entrepreneurial light despite giving accounts that would indicate otherwise.

Entrepreneur(ial)-Framing

Emotional Labor

While it is evident that entrepreneurship involves emotional labor, research looking at the intersection of the two fields is relatively sparse (Burch et al. 2013). My research looks at whether and how gig-workers frame their work from an entrepreneurial lens, and it is within this framing, that emotional work occurs. Cardon et al. (2012) refer to entrepreneurial emotion as "...[the] affect, emotions, moods, and/or feelings—of individuals or a collective—that are antecedent to, concurrent with, and/or a consequence of, the entrepreneurial process, meaning the recognition/creation, evaluation, reformulation, and/or the exploitation of a possible opportunity" (1). Burch et al. (2013) further expanded on this definition by showing how the theory works in practice. They find that responding in a certain manner during

meetings with stakeholders or socially networking for venture capital all constitutes emotional labor.

As aforementioned, while I note the instances of entrepreneurial agency within the modern-day (gig) platform economy, research shows that entrepreneurship and gig work are often conflated (Eberhart et al. 2021). Since emotional labor and identity construction are involved in this process, I find that deep acting as a sociological concept is relevant. Specifically, "Brotheridge and Lee (2002) found that identification is positively related to deep acting…thus, the more one identifies with their job, the less surface acting they will be required to perform" (Baruch et al. 2013). I expect this to be applicable in my research which seeks to gain insight into the entrepreneurial framing of gig work.

Identity Construction

Factors outside of emotional labor play a role in the phenomenon of entrepreneurial framing within the gig economy, such as identity construction. In 2019, Petriglieri et al. (2019) found that

> …in the absence of…the holding environment [traditionally] provided by an organization…[gig workers] endeavored to create one for themselves through cultivating connections to routines, places, people, and a broader purpose…and [that] these personal holding environments helped them manage the broad range of emotions stirred up by their precarious working lives and focus on producing work that let them define, express, and develop their selves.(1)

Beyond this article, literature on the specific intersection between the gig economy and identity construction is relatively sparse. However, I find that research on identity from other contexts helps explain my research. First, Alvesson et al. (2008) found that identity formation can be linked to "…nearly everything: from…meaning-making to ethnicity, entrepreneurship and

emotions to politics…" (1). Then, Vignoles et al. (2006), in a study aimed to gain insight into what motivates identity construction, found that "participants were happiest about those identity elements that best-satisfied motives for self-esteem and efficacy" (1).

Given the precarity of gig work and the motives behind identity construction, I find that the entrepreneurial framing conducted by the gig workers is a coping mechanism, one that allows them to bypass the harsh realities of their working conditions in favor of the more positive connotations that come with being an entrepreneur (Tracy 2000).

As aforementioned, I find a lack of scholarship that looks at the intersection of emotional labor, identity, entrepreneurship, and gender within the gig economy. For example, while Milkman et al.'s (2020) research focus on women's experiences in the gig economy, their study is largely focused on one racial and income group that is not as diverse as my sample and fails to explore how entrepreneurship plays a role. While Marquis et al.'s (2018) research show that the type of emotional labor in the gig economy differs from that performed in the traditional economy, it fails to explore how gender or entrepreneurship plays a role in this context. To sum, while there is scholarship on the individual components that comprise my research question, my project seeks to bring the pieces together- to gain insight into the interplay of these factors.

Research Question

Considering the pre-existing literature and the gap, my question is as follows: *How do gendered differences manifest within the gig economy in terms of reasons for self-selecting into the gig economy*? I also ask, "*How do gendered differences intersect and manifest with*

entrepreneurial-framing within the gig-economy?" What role does emotional labor and identity construction play within these contexts?

Methods

Overview

I conducted a secondary data analysis of 39 transcribed interviews that were conducted by Diana Enríquez, a Ph.D. candidate at Princeton University. The interviews were conducted with the intention to gain insight into the experiences of driving-based gig workers in the United States from a human-computer interaction angle. Given that gig workers are a hard-to-reach demographic and the threat of retaliation they face for speaking of their experiences, I chose to conduct a secondary analysis of the data as it allows for the "investigat[ion] [of] research questions using large-scale data sets that are often inclusive of under-represented groups while saving time and resources" (Donnellan and Lewis 2013; Tripathy 2013; Ellard-Gray et al. 2015).

Following the sourcing of the data, I utilized an inductive coding scheme. I chose to utilize a ground-up coding process for two main reasons. First, the heuristic framework used to conduct the interviews was not the main focus of my research. Second, scholarship regarding gendered differences in gig work is relatively sparse. Given these limitations, an inductive coding scheme allows me to "analyze data in areas with limited knowledge…," and take "…transcripts from in-depth interviews or focus groups and structure it into themes and patterns for analysis" that allows for "…insights that are truly representative of your data and the human stories behind them." (one; Chandra and Shang 2019; Thomas 2003). Furthermore, given that the intention of my research is not to generalize but rather to shed insight into how

gender and entrepreneurship transpire within the gig economy. Thus, this qualitative methodology allows for findings that are not obtainable through quantitative methods of exploration.

Data Summary

The data I used to conduct my research was sourced from "*DataSpace at Princeton University*", a digital repository that stores cleansed and anonymized data collected by personnel at Princeton that has been made for public use. The data itself is comprised of 39 transcribed interviews with gig-workers that were conducted anytime between July-September 2019. All of the interviewees were those "…[that] [had] recently completed gigs for Uber(Eats), Lyft, and/or Amazon Flex," with a makeup of 21 Amazon Flex, 3 Lyft, 5 Uber, and 7 UberEats gig-workers (Enriquez 2021).

These companies were selected to be a driving-based platform app and have algorithm-based labor coordinators, allowing for insight into human-computer interaction (HCI) centered experiences. While garnering insight into HCI is not the purpose of my research, the format of the interview questions and the type of questions allows me to sufficiently answer my research questions regardless. Furthermore, Uber, Amazon, and Lyft are well-known giants and were part of the early conception of the modern-day platform economy (Enriquez 2021). Thus, garnering insights from workers of the three companies that represent standard examples of driving-based gig work will allow for insights applicable to a broad population.

The demographic range of the sample is broad, consisting of 15 males and 24 females from a wide spread of U.S states, including both urban, rural, and suburban locations. While participants were recruited heavily from low-income brackets through the Fresh EBT app, they

were also sourced from higher-income brackets through Facebook groups. While the sample itself is not wholly representative of the gig worker population, the range of the sample in location and income levels allows for varied insights of a population that encompasses a broad demographic. Furthermore, the varied spread of my sample only heights the applicability of my research.

Data Analysis

Following a preliminary analysis of the data, I utilized an inductive coding scheme to develop a set of codes which were further polished with multiple subsequent analyses of the interview (Charmaz 2001). In the initial stages of coding, I marked any mentions of collective bargaining or mentions of an individual or collective labor resistance on behalf of the gig-workers. My original intentions were to gain insight into labor resistance in the platform economy. However, during the analysis, I noticed the stark differences between male and female gig workers in how they experienced, perceived, and framed their work and viewed entrepreneurship.

Given the emergent pattern, I shifted away from my original framework and developed a codebook composed of theoretically derived codes to explore the gendered differences in labor experiences and entrepreneurship in the platform economy. I coded for (1) entry into gig work, (2) attitude towards gig work, (3) conflicting attitudes, and (4) entrepreneurial framing.

Coding Scheme

Entry Into Gig Work

This category consists of any reasons that indicate why interviewees self-selected into the platform economy. This can include reasons ranging from having extra time to having limited options. Thus, this coding scheme includes any mentions of limitations that have historically prevented persons from pursuing work in the U.S., such as any mentions of disabilities, pregnancy, schooling, or children (Vornholt et al. 2017). I chose this code as literature shows that some professions, such as nursing, can be dominated by a single gender (Veelen et al. 2019). Precarious labor and gender are inextricably tied in that; historically, women have dominated informal/precarious work settings. However, the gender makeup of gig workers in the U.S. today is nearly 50/50 (Anderson et al. 2021). This code allows for insight into whether there are any gender differences regarding entry into the gig work sector, which will facilitate comparisons between the labor experiences of male and female gig workers and the emotional labor that both genders perform.

Attitude Towards Gig Work

This code includes any sentiments expressed by the participants that indicate their attitudes towards the gig work that they perform. The insights generated by this code will show whether participants perform emotional labor in doing gig work since attitudes represent how participants frame their work (Hochschild 2013; Wharton 2009). Examples may include indirect comments such as “I don’t think I can see myself doing this for a long time” to more direct statements such as, “delivering for UberEats is awful.” This is a critical code as these insights (1) allow me to gauge how participants perceive their work as gig workers, (2) allow me to code for any mentions that conflict with participants’ attitudes, and (3) allow me to gauge whether their

attitudes towards gig work line up with whether they frame their role as entrepreneurial or not.

Conflicting Attitudes

This category includes any statements, comments, or sentiments that conflict with the participants' partiality towards the labor they perform as gig workers. An example may be a participant who indicates a positive framing of their role but, throughout the interview, will give negative examples that come with their work, such as the inability to secure gigs. This code is also key in showing how gig workers perform emotional labor as these contrasting sentiments will be compared to the participants framing of their work.

Entrepreneurial Framing

This code will include any answers to the question posed by the original data collector that asks how participants view their role within the gig work sector. Answers ranged from employee, freelancer, independent contractor, to entrepreneur. I grouped employees as their separate category and freelancers, independent contractors, and entrepreneurs as one separate category. The latter three are markedly different from being an employee, and the term “freelancer” and “independent contractor” are more related to entrepreneurship than they are to being a salaried employee (Bögenhold and Klinglmair 2016). I will also mark any sentiments traditionally associated with modern-day entrepreneurship, including but not limited to any mentions of scheduling flexibility, being one’s own boss, hustle culture, and view their role as a self- business rather than a gig.

Data Analysis cont.

After developing the coding scheme, I used ATLAS.ti to code the transcripts as it allows for thematic data analysis (Rivera 2012;). Following the coding, I conducted a gender-based analysis to see whether females and males differ in the rate at which they perform emotional labor and whether there is any gender-based differences in entrepreneurial-framing amongst the participants-allowing me to answer my research questions.

Findings

My findings give insight into the gendered differences between gig-workers in the platform economy. Specifically, I find many similarities and differences in the way that male and female gig workers experience, interpret, and convey their roles.

First, I find that the reasons for self-selecting into the gig-economy differ starkly amongst males and females. A common reason amongst the latter group involved the flexibility that allowed for them to care for their children. Out of the 15 interviewed, there was only one male participant that mentioned children as a factor in entering the gig-work sector. Second, I find that, as previous literature suggests, entrepreneurial framing is a familiar concept in the gig-economy as over half of those interviewed regarded their work as entrepreneurial or freelancing work. Third, despite scholarship pointing to entrepreneurship as a male-dominated concept, female gig-workers were more likely to self-identify as entrepreneurs or freelancers in comparison to male gig-workers. Following the ternary finding, I find that female gig-workers, despite being more likely to frame their work as positive and entrepreneurial, performed emotional labor more often than their male counterparts whose accounts and perception of their labor were less likely to conflict.

Finally, while not the major focus of my research, my analyses yielded an emergent finding. Of those that brought it up unprompted, female participants were more likely to mention being a part of gig-work centered social networks, such as Facebook more often than men. Participants mentioned using these collective groups to keep up to date, share tips, and vent concerns regarding their work. While there are many labors, gender, and organizational-related themes present in my findings, I intend for them to be viewed from the paradigms of hegemonic theory, gender performativity, identity construction, and emotional labor.

Gendered Entry & Constraints

Given the lack of social safety nets, such as paid maternity leave, and workplace discrimination against pregnant women in the United States, it comes as no surprise that more than half (13/24) of the female gig-workers stated having dependent children as a factor in self-selecting into gig-work (Harknett and Hartnett 2011). Only one male participant mentioned children as a factor in entering the gig economy. Historically, women have been confined to the domestic sphere in the U.S, with set gender norms such as men as the breadwinner and women as homemakers and primary childcare givers (Coltrane 2000). And while the past 50 years have produced shifting- and more egalitarian-views of women in the workplace, women still struggle to navigate the work-family-conflict (WFC) amidst other gender-based labor disparities (Stamarski and Hing 2015). In the face of these gendered conflicts, the appeal of gig work to women who are pregnant or the primary caretaker of children, becomes clear.

Gig work such as delivering food, packages, or passengers on demand differs from traditional work models in their relatively low entry barriers as well as scheduling flexibility (Milkman et al. 2020). Platform companies such as Uber or Grubhub will often market these

traits to incentivize workers to apply, and it was apparent throughout the interviews with female gig workers that flexibility was a major motivating factor in entering the gig economy (Milkman et al. 2020. Take, for example, Sarah (A3), a single mother, nursing student, and a gig worker for GrubHub, Postmates, and Amazon Flex,

> *For me [,] I try to work when my kids are in school because their dad is incarcerated right now unfortunately. So I have [to] work around their schedule. That's what I am doing now. Most of the time my kids, they didn't mind on the weekends, they like to do Amazon Flex so I would let them ride with me and so they would find a package for me that I would have to deliver it made it a little easier for me. I just kind of work with their schedule.*

Sarah (A3) makes it clear that her work schedule is centered around that of her children as she juggles providing for a single-income household and having an incarcerated partner. For her, working 25-40hrs/week in the platform economy allows her to earn an income while being able to meet the needs of her children-a sentiment that was common amongst the other female interviewees. Similarly, Jamie (A12), an Amazon flex worker, a mother, and a nursing student reported that she brings her kids to work in order to juggle her schedule.

As aforementioned, male gig workers gave differing accounts on reasons for self-selecting and staying within the platform economy. For men, reasons for entry included doing gig-work until better opportunities came along, major-life changes such as a divorce, or, wanting to make supplemental income as a retiree. Paul (A4), is a delivery driver for Amazon Flex, has extensive experience with driving-based work, and is also a retiree.

> So, I applied and of course, they took me because I've got lots of years of driving experience. I was a cab driver. I was a truck driver. I was a county car driver. I've got lots of experience with…driv[ing]. *I'm up at the retirement years now, so this is just a supplemental type thing.*

Paul indicates that he pursued work with Amazon for the reason of supplementing income as a retiree. Given that gig-work is known for its flexibility in scheduling and the number of hours worked, short-term work presents an advantageous opportunity for those with the means and capability to pursue such work. Paul (A4) indicated no obligations or factors that influenced his self-selection into the platform economy beyond a supplemental source of income.

Similarly, Jason (A16), another gig-worker who delivers for Amazon Flex, is a full-time law student and is financing his own schooling.

> *Interviewer:* So to get into the questions, how did you find your work with Amazon?
>
> *Interviewee:* I actually just, I'm in law school basically. I just jumped on indeed and stuff and they were, it was one of the applications that they're applying for or you're accepting applications…. I just kind of was just blanket applying cause I needed to figure out, I need to at least bring some money in while I was in law school. Yeah. And it was just one of the options…

Jason speaks of "blanket applying" to short-term gig jobs for the purpose of finding an income to support himself through law school. Given the pressures of law school, juggling both work and schooling may bring hardships but, Jason found ways to make it work,

> So with their app, you basically, I'm not required to work in a certain amount of hours, so it just, you pull it up and if there's blocks available you do it. So it was basically, I liked it for the fact that I wasn't required to work. So during like finals and things, I don't have to actually work at all. Yeah. Cause I can pick it up on, usually most of the shifts are available in the evenings or weekends.

Praising the flexibility of gig work, Jason found that the informal scheduling and lack of a time commitment allowed him to cater around his schooling schedule. During finals week, he rarely worked, and if a pocket of time were to present itself, Jason was able to pick up shifts relatively easily as he was able to work in the evenings or on the weekends.

I was able to garner reasons for self-selecting into the gig work sector for nearly every interviewee. Answers ranged from scheduling flexibility around children to needing supplemental income for Christmas gifts. However, my analysis showed that while motives for doing gig-work varied, female gig-workers were more likely to bring up children as a reason for entering into gig-work whether it was needing supplemental income for children or the flexibility of gig work in order to take care of their children. The margin was large by a large, as out of the 39 interview transcripts that were analyzed, only 1 male reported children as a factor while more than half of the 24 women interviewed noted children as a reason.

Identifying as an Entrepreneur

There is well-documented research that looks at the intersection of entrepreneurship with the modern-day platform economy (Eberhart et al. 2021; Barrios et al. 2020). For some, the gig economy, may truly "enable entrepreneurial activity by offering work flexibility that allows the entrepreneur to redeploy resources strategically in order to pursue the nascent venture". (Burtch 2018) For others, such as the "success stories" in Ravenelle's (2019) ethnography, it allows for those with knowledge of skilled labor to capitalize on their skills in an entrepreneurial manner.

Companies themselves that are based on platform apps that rely on short-term gigs often frame the jobs in an entrepreneurial light (Ravenelle 2019). From emphasizing the ability to be one's "own boss" or marketing the scheduling flexibility that the gigs offer, companies seem well aware of the entrepreneurial framing within the gig economy. I found this to be true in my analyses, for both male and female gig workers. However, my analysis showed that

female interviewees were more likely to self-identify their gig-work as entrepreneurial in nature at a rate of 66% compared to 53% for men.

Ren (A6), is a male deliverer for Amazon Flex who also works for LaserShip (another gig), found the job to be a great opportunity for those with an entrepreneurial edge,

> Oh, it's awesome. Like I said, I've never been more happier. I have a job now that I could pretty much set my own pace. Not only that, but I mean if I feel like I want to make, I feel like I don't want to work that day, then I'm not, and I'll just [inaudible 00:16:15].
>
> Of course. Of course. I think that this is a great opportunity for young entrepreneurs or even like people who don't know what they want to do. Like if you want some extra cash, I think a universal job for a lot of different people. People of different ages, people of different work ethic, work background and the like. It's a great opportunity for anything and everybody. That's what I see

Ren makes it clear that short-term contract work is entrepreneurial in nature and finds great pride in his work which allows him to work at his own pace. Ren also finds that anyone can find success in this type of venture so long as they apply themselves

> …it's not like you're stuck in one place and you just go into a dead-end job you can basically make what you want to make by actually applying yourself…

This was also a common sentiment amongst female gig-workers. For example, Kim (A15), an Amazon Flex worker, a mother of a teenage son, likened her work to being her own boss

> Interviewee: I am totally my own boss. That's what I tell people. I said, "You don't work for Amazon. You're your boss. You want to work, work. If you don't want to work, don't work." You make what it is. I have a crate that is just flex stuff. I had my rain coat. I have extra batteries for my flashlight. I have all that stuff. If I'm going somewhere, I've tossed that in my car in case I pick up something while I'm out. If I decide I want [name], that's just me. I'm my own boss. Amazon does not control me

Amazon Flex does not require workers to prepare for their gig by having flashlights or other items to ease work, as everything that is technically needed is supplied by the company. However, Kim speaks of taking it upon herself to make the most out of her work by buying

items that are helpful in performing her job. Like Ren, she finds her work to be entrepreneurial in nature, likening herself to being her own boss and noting that gig work is what one makes of it and that success is largely determined by one's own effort. However, while Ren and Kim's sentiments reflected the majority of those interviewed, there were those that seemed aware of the flaws of gig work.

For example, Sarah (A3) who is mentioned above, found no semblance of entrepreneurship within her work,

> No, I felt like an employee but I just didn't feel like I got the employee benefits. I never felt like an independent contractor. [inaudible 00:17:22] If I would have thought about it that way, but it didn't feel like it. I felt like I was working for Uber and Amazon. Not as a private contractor. I wasn't making the money, that if I were a private contractor should be benefiting, but I wasn't.

Sarah makes it clear that she never identified her work as entrepreneurial in any way, but rather, she felt like she was working for Uber and Amazon but without any of the benefits that come with being a salaried employee such as paid time off or sick pay. This sentiment was mirrored by Joshua (A4) who found that his job delivering for Amazon Flex was more akin to being an employee. Then there were those who found elements of both entrepreneurship and employed work within their roles, such as Lily (UE2), a mother of a minor child and a delivery driver for Uber Eats.

> Interviewer: "Yeah. Would you describe yourself as being self-employed or managing a business or being a freelancer?
>
> Lily: I would say a little bit of both.
>
> Interviewer: What parts of it feel like you are kind of running your own business? [inaudible 00:15:48] I make my own hours, I make my own time, I go when I want to.
>
> Interviewer: And what parts of it feel like being an employee or being like a freelancer?

> Lily: There is the pay, I don't have control of the pay. [inaudible 00:16:06] controls the pay, and my raise or anything like that. I feel like [inaudible 00:16:11] so long, I should be you know, I don't know, I guess with [inaudible 00:16:18] I can't say okay, I can't decide I should get paid more than them. I don't know how to go about [inaudible 00:16:22] be paid. I don't know how [inaudible 00:16:24]. How did they [inaudible 00:16:27]? How did they calculate that? They give a breakdown but I just feel like they have to get [inaudible 00:16:40] Yeah. So it feels like there is still some mystery between you and the company. Right.
>
> Interviewer: Do you feel like you have a boss or do you feel like you work for yourself? I feel like I do have a boss, because I can do what I want, but I can't.
>
> Because I feel like if I do something, like I still have rules, I can't do anything I want. Yeah. Just do deliveries. Taking of orders. Can't make any stops you have to go straight to work. If you delay the order. If they see that you have stopped they actually call to say is everything okay. Its like are you watching me?"

Lily (UE2) makes it clear that there were aspects of her job that made her feel as being her own boss, a trait that is deeply embedded in entrepreneurial framing, but is also aware of the limitations that come with her role such as the taking orders, not being able to take liberties, and the lack of control and transparency over how much she makes per gig. The numerous traits that Lily lists that are more akin to describing an employed position largely juxtapositions her self-identification of her work as entrepreneurial.

Emotional Labor & Identity Construction

A finding I came across during my analyses of the interviews is of juxta-positioning accounts. A majority of the interviewees self-identified their work as more entrepreneurial in nature than that of an employed position. Participants then went on to emphasize traits that are typical of those with an entrepreneurial agency such as being one's own boss and working at one's own pace. Yet, many would give accounts of dismal working conditions that would be avoidable with someone that truly had control of the work that they performed. Whether or

not participants were aware of their conflicting accounts, I find that many of the gig workers were performing emotional labor in identifying and framing their work in a manner that is positive-one that indicates power and dignity (entrepreneurial) despite giving negative accounts of their work. Amongst those that self-identified as an entrepreneur and/or framed their work in a positive light, female gig-workers were more likely than men to perform this sort of emotional labor.

For example, Lily (UE2), who found her work to have elements of being both an employee and an entrepreneur and largely spoke of her job in a positive manner, mentioned having to compete with others in order to schedule shifts,

> "[You choose shifts 24-hours in advance] ...but sometimes, for instance, if somebody['s] schedule comes up from 1 to 5 tomorrow and something happened [for them to] jump out of it. it'll give you an opportunity to take the miles up it's first come first serve so if you see [it] you better go and schedule it for now because [if] you go back now it's not going to be there"

While this may offer flexibility for those with the time that are simply looking to supplement their income-it can also lead to job insecurity. Competing for shifts, as participant UE2 noted above, can make it harder for workers to budget or have a sense of financial security without knowing how many shifts they will be able to obtain or how much they will make per shift with fluctuating rates. Another example comes from Jenny (A19), an Amazon Flex worker and a mother, who identified her in a positive manner and indicated that she gains a large sense of dignity from the role,

> Jenny: We choose to work when we want and they don't say that we have to do it from this time to this time. So we're running our own business and that's why I was saying earlier, I like those apps where I can see how much money I'm going to make and already in my head, I know how long it's going to take me. I always try to make sure that I average over 20 an hour. That's how I run things. Now, I watch people like on the DoorDash chat groups and stuff like that on there, and they're taking those $2 offers

> and it's taking them 30 minutes and they're making no money, they're losing money. And like every business owner, because you've got to run this like a business. So every business owner, you've got to look at what's profitable for you and what's profitable for me is running the multiple platforms and figuring it all out. And knowing where I'm going to make my money. But yeah, I don't really work for less than 20 an hour

Yet, indicated that she self-selected into the role for its flexibility due to being pregnant and also spoke of having to switch between platform company apps in order to find enough work.

> Jenny: So therefore, with that it's just easier because I need to be flexible, like right now, this is why this is perfect, because then I can just work little blocks here and there and my belly is pretty big now and I can pick and choose. I'm not stuck at a certain job. And that's why it works great.
>
> Jenny: Right? I mean, but you know it's great about Amazon, whatever. But the way they assign the work is ridiculous because I'm spending over eight hours a day to work for three. Because you can't go to another app. You have to literally sit here religiously and hit refresh over, and over, and over again. Like I've been doing the whole time we were on our call, which I've been doing since eight o'clock this morning.

Despite the insecurity in being able to secure gigs and self-selecting into the gig-work sector for the reason being that would allow her to accommodate her pregnancy-all indicators of, Jenny (A19) identified her role as that of an entrepreneurial one. While exhibiting emotional labor in this regard was more common amongst female gig-workers than males, the latter sex also performed emotional labor. For example, Brian (U2), an Uber driver and a disabled veteran, self-identified his role as entrepreneurial,

> I think of it as a small business because I keep my mileage, I keep my...fluids, the gas the oil, everything that I spend on the car, you know, since we both drive. It can go to...possibly deduction. You know, this is the first year we're doing it. So we've been doing it similar in every way.

Only to account for this experience after,

> I didn't trust the person. I left and that was pretty bad to mark from Uber. As well there because I need something in the neighborhood and I might have judged, albeit with a neighborhood and types people and stuff, but I didn't feel afraid. I was just told I

> shouldn't have took the ride by them and whenever they rate five stars, four stars, three stars. Whenever you get a lot of, whenever I'm sitting at 4.5 stars, but I get a two thrown in there or a one that will drop it down to four. But then they climb back up to 4.5, takes weeks and stuff. That's it, yeah. Yeah. There was almost a punishment in your grade from this? Big punishment.
>
> There is many, a lot of people doing this. That's why they do both apps. I'm in [city], [state], I'll tell you. [city], [state] is ... I stay here because I'm close [large] VA hospital. They have all the casinos and everything around here and at, shoot, at any one ... on a Friday, Saturday night and stuff, they'll have ... 100 people with Uber and Lyft signed on so it's sometimes a rat race around here.

In his first statement, Brian (U2) speaks of canceling a ride from a passenger in a neighborhood in which Brian (U2) felt unsafe but had to take a 'grade hit' after. This is in reference to ratings that all Uber drivers have. It is out of a scale of 5 and Uber drivers, and the ratings are largely determined by the passengers who give a rate after the ride. However, rejecting rides can also negatively affect the rating. If the driver falls below a certain rating, they will be disqualified from working as a driver for Uber. The second statement also speaks of similar complaints amongst other drivers: having to compete with other drivers for gigs and being penalized for canceling a ride in a situation that Brian (U2) felt unsafe in.

Gendered Differences in Identity Construction

However, while a small portion of male gig workers did perform emotional labor in identifying and framing their labor as entrepreneurial, more often than not, men did not give conflicting accounts of their labor. Elaborating, there were higher rates of male gig workers who gave positive accounts of their work and identified as an entrepreneur than female gig workers doing so. For example, Loren (A1), has been working with Amazon Flex for several years, has no children, is on disability and takes a cab to get to his work at the warehouse. Larry

(A1) made it clear throughout the interview that he did not view the job in a positive light, stating reasons ranging from the job being “racist” to being a cold place.

> Interviewer: What are your hours like every week?
> Interviewee: My hours sucks. Sometimes I get 15, sometimes I get ten, sometimes I get 20 [for the whole week]. Yeah. Depending on if somebody calls out, or if ... Because I'm basically on call because I'm part time. So, the people that's full time is the supervisors. Then the people that's been there longer. I only been there for five." "Because it's no ... The hours suck, there's no money. And then I'm battling staying with friends and different things of that. So, it's not really a good fit for me, and I'm tired of it."

Larry (A1) speaks of wildly varying and unpredictable hours. Given Larry’s (A1) situation in being on disability and being homeless, the inability to predict how many hours he can work only worsens the severity of the precarity. This sentiment was not lost on Larry (A1) as they spoke of looking to quit his position with Amazon Flex soon during the interview. Then, there is Justin (UE3), an uber eats driver and deliverer who found enjoyment in his gig work, giving positive accounts. He also seemed aware of the nature of gig work, stating that there were ups and downs, just like with any other job.

> They[‘re] sweet. You know how when like nobody standing over you [inaudible 00:10:40] make your own schedule, you decide when you clock in and clock out. Yeah. [crosstalk 00:10:46] There's still rules, but you make your own rules too.

Justin (UE3) differed from many of those performing emotional labor in that, while he found enjoyment in his job and understood the liberties that came with it, he recognized that his role as a gig worker was not an entrepreneur’s fantasy. And while Lily’s (UE2) account of her view of gig work implied an understanding of having limitations, Lily (UE2) was more adamant of her identity as being her own boss while Justin (UE3) did not mention any similar notion of identifying as a boss or an entrepreneur.

Both of Larry's (A1) and Justin's (UE3) framing of their roles show that whether they view their job in a positive or negative light, they are candid about the realities that comes with being a gig worker. Neither Larry (A1) nor Justin (UE3) performed emotional labor in trying to identify as an entrepreneur in the face of conflicting work accounts. This differs from the accounts given by the female gig workers such as Lily (UE2), Sarah (A3), and Jamie (A12) who gave starkly contrasting of identifying as their own boss or as an entrepreneur despite having to take their children along with them when delivering packages of giving accounts of being able to feel secure in their hours worked.

There is a myriad of factors that can contribute to explaining the juxtaposition of female gig workers self-identifying as an entrepreneur and framing their role in a positive light all the while giving negative accounts that speak of job insecurity amidst other dismal working conditions. However, the concepts of emotional labor and identity construction helps to explain my findings.

Discussion

Entrepreneurial Framing and Identity Construction

While relatively scarce, prior research has shown that entrepreneurial framing within the modern-day gig economy is not always truly entrepreneurial in nature, rather, it is more indicative of the neoliberalisation of labor (Barratt et al. 2020; Zwick 2018). There are many reasons that can help explain the rise of entrepreneurial framing within the platform economy, but I call attention to hustle culture such as the rise of hustle culture (Ravenelle 2019; Thieme 2013). Cotton (2020), describes "hustling" below,

> "In lay terms, economic opportunity in the future of work looks like hustling. Hustling traditionally refers to income-generating activities that occur in the informal economy.

> It has also become synonymous with a type of job-adjacent work that looks like it is embedded in the formal economy but is governed by different state protections, which makes the work risky and those doing it vulnerable."

Hustle culture is ripe within the gig economy and explains why many of those that identified as entrepreneurs held the sentiment that one could succeed simply if they applied themselves and took advantage of the opportunities. Rather than taking into consideration the social factors and the neoliberal trend in labor that led to the rise of the informal economy and insecure working conditions, they assume the burden themselves.

The hustle culture also helps to explain the emotional labor that workers perform in framing their work in a positive light or identifying as an entrepreneur despite indications that this may not be true. If the society within which they work values the ideals that come with neoliberal labor models, then it comes as no surprise that gig workers internalize this message. I call again on Hochschild's (1983) theory of emotional labor to explain the sociological phenomenon that is occurring. There are two types of emotional management that a laborer can perform. Surface acting refers to "...faking the required emotions: that is, when people engage in surface acting, they do not actually try to feel the emotions they wish to portray" (Lu 2019). Then, there is deep acting, which can be defined as the following,

> "Deep acting separates itself from surface acting in that it involves an attempt to actually experience the desired emotion (Grandey 2003). Hochschild (1979,1983) identified two ways of accomplishing deep acting. First, the person can actively attempt to evoke the required emotions. Or second, the worker can use imagination and/or previous memories to invoke similar emotions (such as excitement or happiness) to comply with the situational display rules. The key difference between surface acting and deep acting is an attempt to feel the emotion."

This helps explain the emotional labor that the gig-workers who had conflicting accounts are performing. The institution in which they labor, the platform economy, is one built on

neoliberal work values. In desiring to see themselves as entrepreneurs, which is a concept that implies more dignity and power than an employee, the gig-workers actively frame their work as positive and entrepreneurial in nature. By doing so, they are responding to the organizational rules of the institution (the society) which values traits associated with "hustle culture" (Balkeran 2020; Ravenelle 2021).

Emotional labor and identity construction also go hand-in-hand. As aforementioned, my findings show that gig-workers perform emotional labor to frame their labor in a positive light and self-identify as being their own bosses or entrepreneurs despite giving contradictory work accounts. I have posited several factors that could contribute to this phenomenon such as the emergence of hustle culture or the rise in neoliberal labor values. I find that regardless of what the reasons may be, that identifying as an entrepreneur despite dismal working conditions indicates the usage of entrepreneurial-framing as a coping mechanism to deal with the reality of precarious gig-work.

Gendered Differences in Entrepreneurial Framing

My findings showed that there were gendered differences amongst the gig-workers interviewed in how they self-selected into the gig economy, self-identified as an entrepreneur/employee, and how viewed their role (positive/negative). For the finding of women identifying children/pregnancy as a factor in self-selecting into the gig economy more often than men, it was one that was expected. Given that childcare is a gendered role that often falls on women and the appeal that the flexibility of gig work can have for those with

childcare responsibilities, my findings are in line with current research (Milkman et al. 2020; Coltrane 2000).

However, taking into context the literature on entrepreneurship, I did not expect to find female gig-workers to have a higher rate of self-identification of their role as entrepreneurial. Scholarship has shown that entrepreneurship is often framed as a masculine activity, largely due to the historical and cultural factors that have prevented women from accessing the same opportunities as men (Cardella 2020; Bullough 2022). While male gig workers did indeed see their role as entrepreneurial, women had an edge when it came to self-identifying as entrepreneurs over the men by 13%. While this gap is by no means large, this finding goes largely against the pre-existing scholarship and current statistics in the U.S and opens possibilities for future research as to whether this phenomenon is specific to the gig economy or if it represents shifting societal values overall that research has yet to capitalize on.

While there could be a myriad of factors that can help explain this phenomenon, I find that emotional labor and identity construction is useful in framing this finding. Studies show that women are more likely to perform emotional labor than men, this is evident in looking at the gendered expectations of women alone such as child-rearing or housework (Hartley 2018; Newcomb 2021). Since many of the women that self-identified as an entrepreneur indicated children as a factor in self-selecting into the gig economy, it is entirely possible that performing this form of emotional labor is a way to claim dignity and power in an institution that requires them to bear the burden of gendered responsibilities. The phenomenon of men self-identifying as entrepreneurs can also be viewed in the same vein. Framing the role in an entrepreneurial manner and focusing on the positives of the role can be a way for those in the role to claim

dignity and power in a neoliberal labor economy working against them (coping mechanism). This is in line with previous research conducted by Atewologun and Singh (2010), both of whom found that when gender identities were being challenged in any shape or form, women were more likely to "…reframe[e] challenging episodes to protect/restore their identity" (1). This helps explain why female gig workers who bear the burden of gendered responsibilities (childcare) view their labor as entrepreneurial.

While whether the modern-day gig economy is of a truly entrepreneurial nature is one that is still being debated within the academic community, much of the scholarship points to the platform economy as being conflated with entrepreneurship (Eberhart et al. 2021; Rosenblat et al. 2019). Then, in light of this scholarship, the findings of emotional labor playing a factor in the entrepreneurial framing of gig work are further supported.

There are many implications for my research. First, in an economy where the rate of gig work, both precarious and secure has exploded over the past decade, my findings shed light on the continued existence of the platform economy. Second, it shows how platform companies, which often act as monolithic corporations that spend millions on lobbying for regulations in their favor, weaponize on the values of "hustle culture" to incentivize workers to tolerate dismal working conditions and attract a steady supply of workers. Third, it shows exactly what demographics are self-selecting into the gig-work sector and where future research should be directed in exploring more about how gender continues to matter in novel labor situations such as the gig economy. Fourth, it sheds light on how traditionally masculine phenomenon, such as entrepreneurship, are changing in the face of shifting labor values. Finally, my research shows

that further research and advocacy is needed on preventing the exploitation of gig workers and to explore how the effects of predatory practices differ by gender.

Works Cited

Alkhatib Ali, Michael S. Bernstein, and Margaret Levi. 2017. “Examining Crowd Work and Gig Work Through The Historical Lens of Piecework.” Pp. 4599–4616 in Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Denver Colorado USA: ACM.

Alvesson M, Lee Ashcraft K, Thomas R. 2008. Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of Identity Scholarship in Organization Studies. Organization. 15(1):5–28

Alvesson M. 1998. Gender relations and identity at work: A case study of masculinities and Femininities in an advertising agency. Human Relations. 51(8):969–1005

Anderson, Monica, Colleen Mcclain, Michelle Faverio, and Risa Gelles-Watnick. 2021. “The State of Gig Work in 2021.” Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech. Retrieved March 18, 2022 (https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/12/08/the-state-of-gig-work-in-2021/).

Atewologun ’D, Singh V. 2010. Challenging ethnic and gender identities. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal. 29(4):332–47

Balkeran, Arianna. 2020. “Hustle Culture and the Implications for Our Workforce.” CORPORATE COMMUNICATION 54.

Barrios, John Manuel and Hochberg, Yael V. and Yi, Hanyi. 2020. “Launching with a Parachute: The Gig Economy and Entrepreneurial Entry.” University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for Economics Working Paper No. 2020-21.

Barratt Tom, Goods Caleb, and Veen Alex. 2020. “‘I’m My Own Boss…’: Active Intermediation and ‘Entrepreneurial’ Worker Agency in the Australian Gig-Economy.” Retrieved March 18, 2022. (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0308518X20914346).

Barzilay Arianne Renan and Ben-David Anat. 2017. “Platform Inequality: Gender in the Gig-Economy.” Retrieved March 18, 2022.

Bögenhold, Dieter, and Andrea Klinglmair. 2016. “Independent Work, Modern Organizations and Entrepreneurial Labor: Diversity and Hybridity of Freelancers and Self-Employment.” Journal of Management & Organization 22(6):843–58. doi: 10.1017/jmo.2016.29.

Brotheridge, Céleste M., and Alicia A. Grandey. 2002. “Emotional Labor and Burnout: Comparing Two Perspectives of ‘People Work.’” Journal of Vocational Behavior 60(1):17–39. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1815.

Baughn, C. Christopher, et al. “The Normative Context for Women’s Participation in Entrepreneruship: A Multicountry Study.” Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, vol. 30, no. 5, Sept. 2006, pp. 687–708, doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00142.x.

Bucher, Eliane, Christian Fieseler, Christoph Lutz, and Gemma Newlands. 2020. “Shaping Emotional Labor Practices in the Sharing Economy*.” Pp. 55–82 in Theorizing the Sharing Economy: Variety and Trajectories of New Forms of Organizing. Vol. 66, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, edited by I. Maurer, J. Mair, and A. Oberg. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Bullough, Amanda, Ulrike Guelich, Tatiana S. Manolova, and Leon Schjoedt. 2022. “Women’s Entrepreneurship and Culture: Gender Role Expectations and Identities, Societal Culture, and the Entrepreneurial Environment.” Small Business Economics 58(2):985–96. doi: 10.1007/s11187-020-00429-6.

Bullough, Amanda, Maija Renko, and Dina Abdelzaher. 2017. “Women’s Business Ownership: Operating Within the Context of Institutional and In-Group Collectivism.” Journal of Management 43(7):2037–64. doi: 10.1177/0149206314561302.

Burch, Gerald F., John H. Batchelor, and Ronald H. Humphrey. 2013. “Emotional Labor for Entrepreneurs: A Natural and Necessary Extension.” Entrepreneurship Research Journal 3(3):331–66. doi: 10.1515/erj-2012-0022.

Butler, Nick, and Dimitrinka Stoyanova Russell. 2018. “No Funny Business: Precarious Work and Emotional Labour in Stand-up Comedy.” Human Relations 71(12):1666–86. doi: 10.1177/0018726718758880.

Cardella, Giuseppina Maria, Brizeida Raquel Hernández-Sánchez, and José Carlos Sánchez-García. 2020. “Women Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review to Outline the Boundaries of Scientific Literature.” Frontiers in Psychology 11:1557. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01557.

Cardon, Melissa S., Maw–Der Foo, Dean Shepherd, and Johan Wiklund. 2012. “Exploring the Heart: Entrepreneurial Emotion Is a Hot Topic.” Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 36(1):1–10. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00501.x.

Cardon, Melissa S., Joakim Wincent, Jagdip Singh, and Mateja Drnovsek. 2005. “Entrepreneurial Passion: The Nature of Emotions in Entrepreneurship.” Academy of Management Proceedings 2005(1):G1–6. doi: 10.5465/ambpp.2005.18778641.

Caza, Brianna B., Erin M. Reid, Susan J. Ashford, and Steve Granger. 2021. “Working on My Own: Measuring the Challenges of Gig Work.” Human Relations 00187267211030098. doi: 10.1177/00187267211030098.

Cerulo KA. 1997. Identity construction: New issues, New Directions. Annual Review of Sociology. 23(1):385–409

Chandler, D., & Munday, R. (2011). A dictionary of media and communication: OUP Oxford.

Coltrane, Scott. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." Journal of Marriage and Family 62(4):1208–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01208.x.

Cook, Cody, Rebecca Diamond, Jonathan V. Hall, John A. List, and Paul Oyer. 2021. "The Gender Earnings Gap in the Gig Economy: Evidence from over a Million Rideshare Drivers." The Review of Economic Studies 88(5):2210–38. doi: 10.1093/restud/rdaa081.

Cooley IH. 1902. Human Nature and the Social Order. Charles Scribner's Sons

Cramer P. 2000. Development of identity: Gender makes a Difference. Journal of Research in Personality. 34(1):42–72

De Stefano, Valerio. 2015a. "The Rise of the 'Just-in-Time Workforce': On-Demand Work, Crowd Work and Labour Protection in the 'Gig-Economy.'" SSRN Electronic Journal. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2682602.

Donnellan, M. Brent, and Richard E. Lucas. 2013. "Secondary Data Analysis." Pp. 665–67 in The Oxford handbook of quantitative methods: Statistical analysis, Vol. 2, Oxford library of psychology. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Eberhart, Robert, Stephen R. Barley, and Andrew J. Nelson. 2021. Freedom Is Just Another Word for Nothing Left to Lose: Entrepreneurialism and the Changing Nature of Employment Relations.SSRN Scholarly Paper. ID 3904624. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.

Ellard-Gray Amy, Jeffrey Nicole K., Choubak Melisa, and Crann Sara E. 2015 "Finding the Hidden Participant: Solutions for Recruiting Hidden, Hard-to-Reach, and Vulnerable Populations." Retrieved March 18, 2022 (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1609406915621420).

Enriquez, Diana. 2021. "Delivery Gig Worker Interviews on Automation at Work."

Frenken, Koen, and Juliet Schor. 2017. "Putting the Sharing Economy into Perspective." Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions 23:3–10

Galperin, Hernan. 2021. "'This Gig Is Not for Women': Gender Stereotyping in Online Hiring." Social Science Computer Review 39(6):1089–1107.

Gandini, Alessandro. 2019. “Labour Process Theory and the Gig Economy.” Human Relations 72(6):1039–56. doi: 10.1177/0018726718790002.

Gartner William B. 1988. “‘Who Is an Entrepreneur?’ Is the Wrong Question.” Retrieved March 18, 2022

Giazitzoglu Andreas and Down Simon. 2017. “Performing Entrepreneurial Masculinity: An Ethnographic Account.” Retrieved March 18, 2022i (https://journals.sagepub.com /doi/abs/10.1177/0266242615599244).

Hochschild, Arlie Russel. 2012. The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling. Updated ed. Berkeley, Calif. London: University of California Press.

Holmes J. 2006. Gendered Talk at Work: Constructing Gender Identity through Workplace Discourse. Malden (Massachusetts): Blackwell

Huws, U, Spencer , N & Joyce , S. 2016. “Crowd Work in Europe: Preliminary results from a survey in the UK, Sweden, Germany, Austria and the Netherlands.” Foundation for European Progressive Studies.

Ilie, Camelia, Abel Monfort, Gaston Fornes, and Guillermo Cardoza. 2021. “Promoting Female Entrepreneurship: The Impact of Gender Gap Beliefs and Perceptions.” SAGE Open 11(2):21582440211018468. doi: 10.1177/21582440211018468.

Jennings, Jennifer E., and Candida G. Brush. 2013. “Research on Women Entrepreneurs: Challenges to (and from) the Broader Entrepreneurship Literature?” The Academy of Management Annals 7(1):663–715. doi: 10.1080/19416520.2013.782190.

Kerr, Sari Pekkala, William R. Kerr, and Tina Xu. 2017. “Personality Traits of Entrepreneurs: A Review of Recent Literature.” 52.

Koutsimpogiorgos, Nikos, Jaap van Slageren, Andrea M. Herrmann, and Koen Frenken. 2020. “Conceptualizing the Gig Economy and Its Regulatory Problems.” Policy & Internet 12(4):525–45. doi: 10.1002/poi3.237.

Kuhn, Kristine M. 2016. “The Rise of the ‘Gig Economy’ and Implications for Understanding Work and Workers.” Industrial and Organizational Psychology 9(1):157–62. 10.1017/iop.2015.129.

Litman, Leib, Jonathan Robinson, Zohn Rosen, Cheskie Rosenzweig, Joshua Waxman, and Lisa M. Bates. 2020. “The Persistence of Pay Inequality: The Gender Pay Gap in an Anonymous Online Labor Market.” PLOS ONE 15(2):e0229383. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0229383.

Low, Murray B., and Eric Abrahamson. 1997. “Movements, Bandwagons, and Clones: Industry Evolution and the Entrepreneurial Process.” Journal of Business Venturing 12(6):435–57.

Lu, Yongbiao, Wenfeng Wu, Gaoxing Mei, Shouying Zhao, Haibo Zhou, Daling Li, and Deng Pan. 2019. “Surface Acting or Deep Acting, Who Need More Effortful? A Study on Emotional Labor Using Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy.” Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 13.

Marquis, Elizabeth B., Sangmi Kim, Rasha Alahmad, Casey S. Pierce, and Lionel P. Robert Jr. 2018. “Impacts of Perceived Behavior Control and Emotional Labor on Gig Workers.” Pp. 241–44 in Companion of the 2018 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, CSCW ’18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.

Milkman, Ruth, Luke Elliott-Negri, Kathleen Griesbach, and Adam Reich. 2021. “Gender, Class, and the Gig Economy: The Case of Platform-Based Food Delivery.” Critical Sociology 47(3):357–72. doi: 10.1177/0896920520949631.

Miller, Katherine I., Jennifer Considine, and Johny Garner. 2007. “‘Let Me Tell You About My Job’: Exploring the Terrain of Emotion in the Workplace.” Management Communication Quarterly 20(3):231–60. doi: 10.1177/0893318906293589

Muntean, Susan Clark, and Banu Ozkazanc-Pan. 2015. “A Gender Integrative Conceptualization of Entrepreneurship.” New England Journal of Entrepreneurship 18(1):27–40. doi: 10.1108/NEJE- 18-01-2015-B002.

Newcomb, Michelle. 2021. “The Emotional Labour of Academia in the Time of a Pandemic: A Feminist Reflection.” Qualitative Social Work 20(1–2):639–44. doi: 10.1177/1473325020981089.

O’Brien M. 1992. Gender identity and sex roles. Handbook of Social Development. 325–45

Peck, Jamie, Rutherford Tod D., Jessop Bob. 1996: Workplace: The Social Regulation of Labor Markets. New York: The Guilford Press. Retrieved March 18, 2022 (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132507088120).

Petriglieri Gianpiero, Ashford Susan J., and Wrzesniewski. 2019. “Agony and Ecstasy in the Gig Economy: Cultivating Holding Environments for Precarious and Personalized Work Identities. Retrieved March 18, 2022 (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177 /0001839218759646).

Ravenelle, Alexandrea J., Ken Cai Kowalski, and Erica Janko. 2021. “The Side Hustle Safety Net: Precarious Workers and Gig Work during COVID-19.” Sociological Perspectives 64(5):898–919. doi: 10.1177/07311214211005489.

Reynolds Paul D. 1992. “Sociology and Entrepreneurship: Concepts and Contributions.” Retrieved March 18, 2022l (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/104225879201600205).

Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. “Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms.”American Sociological Review 77(6):999–1022. doi: 10.1177/0003122412463213.

Rosenblat, Alex. 2018. Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Schor, Juliet B., William Attwood-Charles, Mehmet Cansoy, Isak Ladegaard, and Robert Wengronowitz. 2020. “Dependence and Precarity in the Platform Economy.” Theory and Society 49(5):833–61. doi: 10.1007/s11186-020-09408-y.

Stanford, Jim. 2017. “The Resurgence of Gig Work: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives.” The Economic and Labour Relations Review 28(3):382–401. doi: 10.1177/1035304617724303.

Strawser, Joyce A., Diana M. Hechavarría, and Katia Passerini. 2021. “Gender and Entrepreneurship: Research Frameworks, Barriers and Opportunities for Women Entrepreneurship Worldwide.” Journal of Small Business Management 59(sup1):S1–15. doi: 10.1080/00472778.2021.1965615.

Thornton, Patricia H. 1999. “The Sociology of Entrepreneurship.” Annual Review of Sociology 25(1):19–46. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.19.

Thieme, Tatiana A. 2013. “The ‘Hustle’ amongst Youth Entrepreneurs in Mathare's Informal Waste Economy.” Journal of Eastern African Studies 7(3):389–412.

Tracy SJ. 2000. Becoming a character for Commerce. Management Communication Quarterly. 14(1):90–128

Tripathy, Jaya Prasad. 2013. “Secondary Data Analysis: Ethical Issues and Challenges.” Iranian Journal of Public Health 42(12):1478–79.

Vallas, Steven, and Juliet B. Schor. 2020. “What Do Platforms Do? Understanding the Gig Economy.”Annual Review of Sociology 46(1):273–94. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054857.

van Veelen, Ruth, Belle Derks, and Maaike Dorine Endedijk. 2019. “Double Trouble: How Being Outnumbered and Negatively Stereotyped Threatens Career Outcomes of Women in STEM.” Frontiers in Psychology 10:150. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00150.

Vignoles VL, Regalia C, Manzi C, Golledge J, Scabini E. 2006. Beyond self-esteem: Influence of multiple motives on identity construction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 90(2):308–33

Vornholt, Katharina, Patrizia Villotti, Beate Muschalla, Jana Bauer, Adrienne Colella, Fred Zijlstra, Gemma Van Ruitenbeek, Sjir Uitdewilligen, and Marc Corbière. 2018. “Disability and Employment – Overview and Highlights.” European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology 27(1):40–55. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2017.1387536.

Wang, Wei, Qiaozhuan Liang, Raj V. Mahto, Wei Deng, and Stephen X. Zhang. 2020. “Entrepreneurial Entry: The Role of Social Media.” Technological Forecasting and Social Change 161:120337. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120337.

Ward, Alexander, Brizeida R. Hernández-Sánchez, and Jose C. Sánchez-García. 2019. “Entrepreneurial Potential and Gender Effects: The Role of Personality Traits in University Students’ Entrepreneurial Intentions.” Frontiers in Psychology 10:2700. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02700.

Watson, Gwendolyn Paige, Lauren D. Kistler, Baylor A. Graham, and Robert R. Sinclair. 2021. “Looking at the Gig Picture: Defining Gig Work and Explaining Profile Differences in Gig Workers’ Job Demands and Resources.” Group & Organization Management 46(2):327–61. doi: 10.1177/1059601121996548.

Webster, Natasha A., and Qian Zhang. 2020. “Careers Delivered from the Kitchen? Immigrant Women Small-Scale Entrepreneurs Working in the Growing Nordic Platform Economy.” NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research 28(2):113–25. doi: 10.1080/08038740.2020.1714725.

Welter, Friederike, and David Smallbone. 2011. “Institutional Perspectives on Entrepreneurial Behavior in Challenging Environments.” Journal of Small Business Management 49(1):107–25. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00317.x.

Wharton, Amy S. 2009. “The Sociology of Emotional Labor.” Annual Review of Sociology 35(1):147–65. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115944.

Zwick, Austin. 2018. “Welcome to the Gig Economy: Neoliberal Industrial Relations and the Case of Uber.” GeoJour