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Abstract. Online gig economy has been rapidly growing and shown a promising prospect in Indonesia, but little is known about familiarity and participation of Indonesians in this new business model. This study tries to fill that gap in literature by exploring familiarity and participation in four different types of online gig economy, i.e. transportation-based service (TS), professional service (PS), asset-sharing (AS), and handmade goods, household, and miscellaneous services (HGHM) among Indonesians based on an online survey of 385 participants. The primary data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics, multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) and logistic regression models to show that most Indonesians are TS gig users whereas PS is the most preferred category by Indonesian gig workers. This study found some differences in characteristics of gig users and gig workers in different categories of online gig economy. Most notably, it suggests the existence of sexual, generational, geographical, and socioeconomic gaps among Indonesians when it comes to their participation in different types of online gig economy. Despite the high participation rate in the online gig economy, the familiarity rate in both the concept and the term “online gig economy” is relatively low. The findings from this study can shed light and serve as a steppingstone for further research on the online gig economy as a new business model and dig deeper into its potential in Indonesia.

1. Introduction

Technological advancement over the time has constantly changed various aspects of human lives, including in economics and job sectors. Recently, many firms have changed their operations and started to look at freelance services as an alternative to their labor needs [1]. The Internet, acting as the bridge between individuals across the globe has also been used as a meeting point between employers and job seekers. Now, it also allows a new business model to grow by connecting freelancers as service providers and firms, organizations, or even other individuals looking for various types of freelance services as their users. This new business model is also known as the online gig economy, where the two parties are only bound in either a short-term contract of employment or on a gig or task basis.

The surge of Internet users in Indonesia, specifically that 10,12% increase in 2018 [2], has given a broad opportunity to many Indonesians to be part of that online gig economy, either as gig users or as gig workers. Most notably is in the case of the transportation-based service type of online gig economy that is driven by two major companies, an Indonesia-based Gojek and a Malaysia turned Singapore-based Grab. Both companies have been providing ride-hailing service with motorcycle or car options since 2010 [3] and 2014 in Indonesia [4]. The high popularity of food-based e-commerce at 27.85% [5], especially by small medium enterprises that have no official food delivery services have also contributed to the rising popularity of transportation-based online gig economy. Even more so during the COVID-
19 pandemic that shows a surge in online shopping activities by 320% [6] transportation-based online gig economy in the form of package couriers or delivery service. Apart from the transportation-based one, 20.83% e-commerce in Indonesia in 2019 provided various services ranging from professional services (PS) to asset sharing (AS) as per Indonesian Census Bureau [5]. Nonetheless, most platforms supporting asset-based or professional service online gig economy, such as Airbnb in the case of AS, or Fiverr and Upwork in the case of PS are either not Indonesian based companies, not operating in Indonesia officially, or not supporting Bahasa Indonesia as one of their official languages. Likewise, information about these types of online gig economy is rather limited. The facts above can serve as another barrier to entry for some Indonesians that can prevent them from joining the other types of online gig economy other than the TS category.

Therefore, this study aims to explore familiarity and participation of Indonesians in various types of online gig economy, including transportation-based, asset-sharing, professional service, and handmade goods as well as to investigate demographic factors associated with different types of online gig economy in Indonesia. Specifically, it will try to answer these research questions: a) what are the familiarity and participation rates of Indonesians in different types of online gig economy? and b) what are the differences in characteristics of Indonesian gig users and gig workers in different types of online gig economy? The findings from this study can shed light on the online gig economy that is shown to be a more preferable business model by the younger generations worldwide. It can also serve as a steppingstone for further research on the online gig economy as a new business model and dig deeper into its potential in Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

Online gig economy can be defined as a business model where two parties (i.e., gig users and gig workers) agree to have a temporary or short-term arrangement to do one or more projects without any permanent and fixed employment relationship. In some cases, gig users and gig workers can meet on any social media platform, but in some other cases a dedicated third-party platform is also available. Oftentimes, this dedicated third party platform gives a better experience for both gig workers and gig users as they set some ground rules and establish a sense of security, trust, and safety net between gig workers and gig users who are likely to be strangers to each other. As per MasterCard’s classification, there are at least four different types of online gig economy [7]. First, asset sharing services (AS) that facilitates short-term peer-to-peer rentals of property with Airbnb as the most notable platform. Second, transportation-based services (TS) that includes ridesharing, carpooling, food delivery, or package couriers with some famous names like Uber, Lyft, Gojek, or Grab as the most notable platforms. Third, professional services (PS) that connects freelancers with a specialized skill set (e.g., graphic design, programming, copywriting) directly with their firms or individual clients, facilitated by some platforms like Fiverr or Upwork. And fourth, handmade goods, household, and miscellaneous services (HGHM) where freelancers can offer some homemade crafts or on-demand services for household-related tasks to anyone who are interested in buying their products or using their service on platforms like Etsy or Airtasker.

According to surveys [8], about 30 million Americans rely on the online gig economy activities for their living by 2019. It is reported that more females are working in the online gig economy sectors than they are in the traditional sectors despite there being more male gig workers than the female counterparts. Also, most of them are millennials with some college degree. The same case is true in the UK where more than half of the gig workers are between the range of 18 and 34 years of age, far more than the 10% aged at 55 years old or more [9]. The most popular online gig economy type in the UK is TS, with 42% gig workers identified as package couriers, 37% ride sharing drivers, and 21% food delivery service. The second most popular online gig economy type is the professional service (PS) on the freelance marketplace at 37% [9]. It is also confirmed by MasterCard that transaction-wise, TS online gig economy had the highest gross volume for that same year [7]. In terms of income, gig workers tend to treat gig work as a secondary source of income rather than their primary or even more so, their
only source of income. No more than 10% of gig workers in the UK made their gig work as their primary source of income [9].

TS online gig economy has also been thriving in Indonesia as it is driven by two major companies: Gojek and Grab. In 2019, there were 29.2 million active users of Gojek, which is an Indonesian company, in Indonesia [10]. Its competitor, Grab, Malaysia turned Singapore based company that operates mostly within the Southeast Asia region had 187 active users in 330 cities in 8 different countries across Asia [11]. The sheer number of Gojek and Grab users in Indonesia shows how familiar most Indonesians are and how high the participation rate of Indonesian is specific to the TS type of online gig economy. Unfortunately, apart from one study in 2019 profiling Indonesian PS gig workers that mostly fall within the creative and multimedia category with an average monthly salary of IDR 3.4 million [12], there is little to no research on the familiarity and participation rates of Indonesians in other types of online gig economy. This study will try to fill that gap by providing a firsthand analysis from the primary data collected specifically to answer the research questions about familiarity with and participation in different types of online gig economy in Indonesia.

3. Methodology

Data collection was conducted using online surveys on social media, specifically Twitter, Facebook, and WhatsApp in the first half of 2020. A total of 385 people completed the survey consisting of 40.26% males (n=155) and 59.74% females (n=230) aged between 15 and 60 years old. Participants also reported their educational attainment, their monthly income, place of origin, place of residence, and their familiarity with both the concept and the term “online gig economy”. Participants were then asked about their participation in any of the four online gig economy categories as per MasterCard’s classification as follows: Asset Sharing Services (AS), Transportation-Based Services (TS), Professional Services (PS), and Handmade Goods, Household, and Miscellaneous Services (HGHM). Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of participants in this study.

Data analysis was done with descriptive statistics and multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) in R 3.6.2 and RStudio 1.2.5 with the help of FactoMineR [13] and factoextra packages [14] as well as logistic regression models in STATA 15.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1 provides information about familiarity with and participation in four types of online gig economy among all participants. Unsurprisingly, TS had the highest participation rate of all categories at 93.8%, almost twice that of PS at 57.7% as the second highest while AS and HGHM shared quite similar participation rates at 47.3% and 46% respectively. Most participation in all categories are as gig users at 90% or higher except for PS that falls way behind at 73%. Interestingly, participation in PS as gig workers not only was the highest in all categories at 38.7% or almost twice that of HGHM at 20.9% at the second place, but also had the highest ratio between participation as gig workers and as gig users with slightly more than 1:2, far more than HGHM at roughly 2:9, AS at around 1:7, and TS at approximately 1:11. In other words, most Indonesians involved in the online gig economy participate as gig users in TS and as gig workers in PS category.

Another analysis with MCA by using participation in each category of online gig economy as the active variables and demographic information as the supplementary variables was conducted to see the closeness between variables in the dataset. Based on Figure 1, participation in TS is located at the barycenter of the chart, indicating most Indonesians as TS users, which is also confirmed by Table 1. Participations in the other three categories of PS, AS, and HGHM are closely located with people who are from or live in Java, including Jakarta and who work as freelancers. On the other edge of the spectrum are those who are both unfamiliar with the online gig economy and not participating in any type of online gig economy, not even TS. These people are indicated as those who are from and live outside Java.
Table 1. Familiarity with and participation in online gig economy among all participants (n=385)

| Variable       | Category                        | PS    | %     | AS    | %     | TS    | %     | HGHM  | %     |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                |                                 | *freq |       | *freq |       | *freq |       | *freq |       |
| Familiarity    | Familiar with both concept and term | 40    | 18.0  | 34    | 18.7  | 53    | 14.7  | 28    | 15.8  |
|                | Familiar only with the concept  | 151   | 68.0  | 119   | 65.4  | 233   | 64.5  | 115   | 65.0  |
|                | Unfamiliar                      | 31    | 14.0  | 29    | 15.9  | 75    | 20.8  | 34    | 19.2  |
| Participation† | As gig users                    | 162   | 73.0  | 168   | 92.3  | 349   | 96.7  | 160   | 90.4  |
|                | As gig workers                  | 86    | 38.7  | 25    | 13.7  | 34    | 9.4   | 37    | 20.9  |

Total participants  | 222  | 57.7 | 182  | 47.3 | 361  | 93.8 | 177  | 46.0 |

Note: † total do not add up to 100% since some gig workers also indicated some experience as gig users.

Figure 1. MCA of participation in four types of online gig economy

Considering the huge discrepancy between gig users and gig workers in all categories, it is necessary to split this information accordingly. Table 2 summarizes the demographic information about gig users, whereas Table 3 contains the same demographic information for gig workers. Based on the two tables, some differences in participation in the online gig economy across groups of people can be seen. For example, females have the highest participation rate as gig users in HGHM than in any other categories. Likewise, female participation rates as gig workers in HGHM and PS are much higher than in AS and TS that have more male participation instead. Still among the gig workers, those living in Java tend to have the highest participation rate in PS than in any other categories. There are more differences across groups of people and across different types of online gig economy that might warrant further analysis, especially a multivariate one.
Table 2. Participation in the online gig economy as gig users (n = 385)

| Variable | Category | PS freq | PS % | AS freq | AS % | TS freq | TS % | HGHM freq | HGHM % |
|----------|----------|---------|------|---------|------|---------|------|-----------|--------|
| Sex      | Male     | 64      | 39.5 | 63      | 37.5 | 137     | 39.3 | 53        | 33.1   |
|          | Female   | 98      | 60.5 | 105     | 62.5 | 212     | 60.7 | 107       | 66.9   |
| Age      | ≤19      | 7       | 4.3  | 7       | 4.2  | 21      | 6.0  | 8         | 5.0    |
|          | 20-29    | 107     | 66.0 | 109     | 64.9 | 209     | 59.9 | 99        | 61.9   |
|          | 30-39    | 35      | 21.6 | 38      | 22.6 | 86      | 24.6 | 38        | 23.8   |
|          | 40+      | 13      | 8.0  | 14      | 8.3  | 33      | 9.5  | 15        | 9.4    |
| Origin   | Jakarta  | 14      | 8.6  | 20      | 11.9 | 31      | 8.9  | 17        | 10.6   |
|          | Sulawesi | 17      | 10.5 | 13      | 7.7  | 31      | 9.7  | 14        | 8.8    |
|          | Sumatera | 13      | 8.0  | 14      | 8.3  | 34      | 9.7  | 12        | 7.5    |
|          | Jawa     | 61      | 37.7 | 73      | 43.5 | 136     | 39.0 | 62        | 38.8   |
|          | Kalimantan| 30     | 18.5 | 30      | 17.9 | 72      | 20.6 | 36        | 22.5   |
|          | Others   | 27      | 16.7 | 18      | 10.7 | 45      | 12.9 | 19        | 11.9   |
| Residence| Jakarta  | 26      | 16.0 | 27      | 16.1 | 43      | 12.3 | 21        | 13.1   |
|          | Sulawesi | 8       | 4.9  | 8       | 4.8  | 21      | 6.0  | 11        | 6.9    |
|          | Sumatera | 7       | 4.3  | 6       | 3.6  | 27      | 7.7  | 9         | 5.6    |
|          | Jawa     | 64      | 39.5 | 75      | 44.6 | 147     | 42.1 | 60        | 37.5   |
|          | Kalimantan| 37    | 22.8 | 34      | 20.2 | 79      | 22.6 | 42        | 26.3   |
|          | Others   | 20      | 12.3 | 18      | 10.7 | 32      | 9.2  | 17        | 10.6   |
| Occupation| Public Sector| 18 | 11.1 | 18 | 10.7 | 53 | 15.2 | 19 | 11.9 |
|          | Private Sector| 67 | 41.4 | 67 | 39.9 | 141 | 40.4 | 62 | 38.8 |
|          | Freelance | 28      | 17.3 | 35      | 20.8 | 56      | 16.0 | 31        | 19.4   |
|          | Unemployed| 49      | 30.2 | 48      | 28.6 | 99      | 28.4 | 48        | 30.0   |
| Monthly Income (IDR) | < 1 million | 41 | 25.3 | 43 | 25.6 | 74 | 21.2 | 45 | 28.1 |
|          | 1 -2.99 million | 45 | 27.8 | 43 | 25.6 | 89 | 25.5 | 40 | 25.0 |
|          | 3 - 4.99 million | 36 | 22.2 | 38 | 22.6 | 101 | 28.9 | 34 | 21.3 |
|          | 5 - 9.99 million | 30 | 18.5 | 33 | 19.6 | 66 | 18.9 | 29 | 18.1 |
|          | 10 - 19.99 million | 6 | 3.7 | 8 | 4.8 | 14 | 4.0 | 8 | 5.0 |
|          | > 20 million | 4 | 2.5 | 3 | 1.8 | 5 | 1.4 | 4 | 2.5 |
| Education | Middle School | 2 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|          | High School | 67 | 41.4 | 74 | 44.0 | 121 | 34.7 | 70 | 43.8 |
|          | Vocational School | 10 | 6.2 | 10 | 6.0 | 38 | 10.9 | 8 | 5.0 |
|          | Bachelor’s Degree | 63 | 38.9 | 64 | 38.1 | 147 | 42.1 | 61 | 38.1 |
|          | Master’s Degree | 18 | 11.1 | 19 | 11.3 | 35 | 10.0 | 20 | 12.5 |
|          | Doctoral Degree | 2 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.6 | 4 | 1.1 | 1 | 0.6 |
| All gig users |                  | 162 | 42.1 | 168 | 43.6 | 349 | 90.6 | 160 | 41.6 |

To confirm whether the differences in characteristics of gig users and gig workers in all four types of online gig economy were statistically significant, logistic regression models were used by developing two models, one for gig users and another for gig workers in all four categories. All four models for the gig users turned out to be statistically significant whereas three out of four models for the gig workers
turned out to be not statistically significant, indicating no significant differences across different groups of people who are involved in the online gig economy as gig workers apart from the PS category. The results of logistic regression analysis are summarized in Table 4.

### Table 3. Participation in the online gig economy as gig workers (n = 182)

| Variable       | Category     | PS freq | PS % | AS freq | AS % | TS freq | TS % | HGHM freq | HGHM % |
|----------------|--------------|---------|------|---------|------|---------|------|-----------|--------|
| Sex            | Male         | 34      | 39.5 | 14      | 56.0 | 20      | 58.8 | 13        | 35.1   |
|                | Female       | 52      | 60.5 | 11      | 44.0 | 14      | 41.2 | 24        | 64.9   |
| Age            | ≤19          | 8       | 9.3  | 3       | 12.0 | 2       | 5.9  | 5         | 13.5   |
|                | 20-29        | 56      | 65.1 | 10      | 40.0 | 21      | 61.8 | 18        | 48.6   |
|                | 30-39        | 17      | 19.8 | 7       | 28.0 | 7       | 20.6 | 11        | 29.7   |
|                | 40+          | 5       | 5.8  | 5       | 20.0 | 4       | 11.8 | 3         | 8.1    |
| Origin         | Jakarta      | 10      | 11.6 | 0       | 0.0  | 3       | 8.8  | 0         | 0.0    |
|                | Sulawesi     | 4       | 4.7  | 2       | 8.0  | 3       | 8.8  | 2         | 5.4    |
|                | Sumatera     | 6       | 7.0  | 3       | 12.0 | 5       | 14.7 | 4         | 10.8   |
|                | Jawa         | 45      | 52.3 | 12      | 48.0 | 14      | 41.2 | 18        | 48.6   |
|                | Kalimantan   | 10      | 11.6 | 5       | 20.0 | 6       | 17.6 | 10        | 27.0   |
|                | Others       | 11      | 12.8 | 3       | 12.0 | 3       | 8.8  | 3         | 8.1    |
| Residence      | Jakarta      | 7       | 8.1  | 0       | 0.0  | 2       | 5.9  | 2         | 5.4    |
|                | Sulawesi     | 2       | 2.3  | 2       | 8.0  | 2       | 5.9  | 1         | 2.7    |
|                | Sumatera     | 6       | 7.0  | 2       | 8.0  | 3       | 8.8  | 3         | 8.1    |
|                | Jawa         | 50      | 58.1 | 11      | 44.0 | 18      | 52.9 | 16        | 43.2   |
|                | Kalimantan   | 13      | 15.1 | 8       | 32.0 | 8       | 23.5 | 12        | 32.4   |
|                | Others       | 8       | 9.3  | 2       | 8.0  | 1       | 2.9  | 3         | 8.1    |
| Occupation     | Public Sector| 5       | 5.8  | 5       | 20.0 | 3       | 8.8  | 4         | 10.8   |
|                | Private Sector| 33      | 38.4 | 11      | 44.0 | 16      | 47.1 | 14        | 37.8   |
|                | Freelance    | 34      | 39.5 | 4       | 16.0 | 8       | 23.5 | 11        | 29.7   |
|                | Unemployed   | 14      | 16.3 | 5       | 20.0 | 7       | 20.6 | 8         | 21.6   |
| Monthly Income (IDR) | < 1 million | 16      | 18.6 | 6       | 24.0 | 8       | 23.5 | 9         | 24.3   |
|                | 1 - 2.99 million | 21      | 24.4 | 3       | 12.0 | 12      | 35.3 | 11        | 29.7   |
|                | 3 - 4.99 million | 23      | 26.7 | 6       | 24.0 | 5       | 14.7 | 7         | 18.9   |
|                | 5 - 9.99 million | 22      | 25.6 | 8       | 32.0 | 7       | 20.6 | 10        | 27.0   |
|                | 10 - 19.99 million | 3        | 3.5  | 1       | 4.0  | 2       | 5.9  | 0         | 0.0    |
|                | > 20 million | 1       | 1.2  | 1       | 4.0  | 0       | 0.0  | 0         | 0.0    |
| Education      | Middle School| 2       | 2.3  | 1       | 4.0  | 2       | 5.9  | 1         | 2.7    |
|                | High School  | 27      | 31.4 | 6       | 24.0 | 12      | 35.3 | 13        | 35.1   |
|                | Vocational School | 8       | 9.3  | 1       | 4.0  | 4       | 11.8 | 3         | 8.1    |
|                | Bachelor’s Degree | 42      | 48.8 | 10      | 40.0 | 13      | 38.2 | 16        | 43.2   |
|                | Master’s Degree | 7       | 8.1  | 7       | 28.0 | 3       | 8.8  | 4         | 10.8   |
|                | Doctoral Degree | 0       | 0.0  | 0       | 0.0  | 0       | 0.0  | 0         | 0.0    |

### All gig workers

|               | freq | %   |
|----------------|------|-----|
| PS             | 86   | 22.3|
| AS             | 25   | 6.5 |
| TS             | 34   | 8.8 |
| HGHM           | 37   | 9.6 |
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Table 4. Logistic regression estimates of participation in online gig economy per category

| Variable  | TS User | PS User | PS Worker | AS User | HGHM User |
|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Sex       |         |         |           |         |           |
| Female    | 2.206*  | 1.010   | 1.219     | 1.276   | 1.662*    |
|           | (.844)  | (.224)  | (.334)    | (.285)  | (.374)    |
| Age       |         |         |           |         |           |
| Teenagers | .6133   | .349*   | 3.465*    | .315*   | .442†     |
|           | (.386)  | (.170)  | (1.864)   | (.155)  | (.209)    |
| Location  |         |         |           |         |           |
| In Jakarta| 3.167   | 2.537** | .350*     | 2.125*  | 1.774     |
|           | (3.375) | (.916)  | (.775)    | (.640)  |           |
| Not in Java| 1.637  | .835    | .561*     | 1.222   | .604*     |
|           | (.639)  | (.196)  | (.162)    | (.287)  | (.144)    |
| Occupation|         |         |           |         |           |
| Freelancer| .454†   | 1.119   | 8.835***  | 1.713†  | 1.646     |
|           | (.211)  | (.351)  | (3.348)   | (.536)  | (.518)    |
| Private Sector | .780 | 1.303 | 2.106* | 1.219 | 1.313 |
|           | (.368)  | (.338)  | (.738)    | (.319)  | (.345)    |
| Education |         |         |           |         |           |
| College Degree | .868 | .553* | .951 | .441** | .455** |
|           | (.366)  | (.141)  | (.307)    | (.115)  | (.118)    |
| Monthly Income |         |         |           |         |           |
| Less than IDR 3 million | .213** | 1.291 | .501* | .899 | .988 |
|           | (.103)  | (.325)  | (.159)    | (.228)  | (.250)    |
| Constant  | 17.788*** | .854 | .118* | .872 | .908 |
|           | (10.551) | (.286) | (.052) | (.295) | (.308)    |
| Model χ²  | 24.92** | 17.78* | 55.18*** | 26.35*** | 21.36** |
| Pseudo R² (McFadden) | 0.104 | 0.034 | 0.135 | 0.050 | 0.041 |
| df        | 8       | 8       | 8       | 8       | 8         |
| Observation | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 |

Note: Numbers reported are odds ratios with standard errors between parentheses. Signif. codes: ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘†’ 0.1

As shown in Table 4, females are more likely to be gig users than males in TS and HGHM categories, whereas no significant difference between males and females in any other online gig economy categories, either as gig workers or gig users. One plausible explanation is that females are less comfortable driving on the roads their own, and thus relying more on TS as their main source of transportation. As for HGHM, it might have something to do with the patriarchal culture in Indonesia meaning many married females who are housewives, and thus be in charge of their household and domestic affairs. In terms of age, one interesting but not really surprising finding is that teenagers are much more likely to be a PS gig-worker than the older people. It further confirms that the online gig economy, or specifically PS in the case of Indonesia, is loved and more preferred means of living by the younger generations. While it is true that younger people tend to have more exposure on the Internet, including how to use it to earn money than the older people, it might also have something to do with difficulties in getting a more conventional job for these younger people. On the other hand, older generations are more likely to be a gig user in AS and HGHM categories, which is understandable since teenagers are less likely to need some accommodation either for work or leisure activities, just like they
are less likely to need help with household chores than older people who are either a house owner or a house renter.

The findings also suggest some geographical gap between people living in Java, including Jakarta, and others who live in any other part of the country as it is shown that Jakartans are more likely to be a gig user in PS and AS whereas those living outside Java are less likely to be a gig user in HGHM or a gig worker in PS. This phenomenon can be attributed to either digital divide between Java and outside Java, especially in terms of access and infrastructure needed as the main driver or gig-economy. It can also be attributed to an urban lifestyle of Jakartans that makes them more likely to be a gig user on a more regular basis than people living in other parts of Java island. Interestingly, most PS workers tend to live in Java but outside of Jakarta. It could be the case that the urban lifestyle doesn’t really fit these people, so they are opting for a more suburban lifestyle as long as the infrastructure is adequate. Regarding their occupations, as expected most PS workers identified themselves as freelancers with some other indicating that they have another job in the private sector. In terms of educational attainment, it is interesting to note that those without college degrees are more likely to be a gig user in PS, AS, and HGHM categories. Most probably, these people are college students in their early twenties. Finally, those with a low-income background who earn less than IDR 3 million (roughly USD 200) per month are less likely to be TS users and PS workers. It further confirms that TS users are more likely to be from the middle class and that PS workers can earn a decent amount of money to be considered as a primary source of income for some.

5. Conclusion

This study shows that participation rates in different types of online gig economy among Indonesians are quite high, especially in TS category, which is the most popular type of online gig economy where most Indonesians are participating, mostly as gig users. Apart from PS that has the lowest participation rate at 73%, all other types of online gig economy have participation rates at above 90%. However, familiarity rates are a different story. Apparently, most Indonesians are still not familiar with the term “online gig economy” despite being familiar with the concept itself. Interestingly, despite its status as the most popular type of online gig economy, TS has the lowest familiarity rate among all other types of online gig economy among its participants. It turns out that some Indonesians have been participating in TS, mostly as users, without realizing that it is a form of online gig economy.

This study also found some significant differences in characteristics of Indonesian gig users in all four categories and gig workers in PS category. HGHM users tend to be middle aged or older females without college degree living in Java, while TS and PS users tend to be females from middle class economy or higher, PS users tend to be young adults living in Jakarta. As for the PS gig workers, they are likely to be younger people living in suburban Java who use their gig work as either their main source of living or as a side for their main job in the private sector and they tend to earn more than IDR 5 millions per month.

The findings from this study, despite all of the limitations, especially in terms of geographical distribution of sample, can help fill the gap in the literature about familiarity and participation in different types of online gig economy among Indonesians by providing a first-hand analysis from the primary data collected. This study also confirms that the online gig economy is more popular among the younger generations and that it has tremendous potential to be a new business model that can be a primary source of income for many. Further research can build upon this either by focusing on a specific type of online gig economy to dig deeper into its potential, or by investigating factors determining the accessibility and acceptability of various types of online gig economy among different groups of people across the country.

References

[1] Signes A T 2017 The ‘Online gig economy’: Employee, Self-employed or the Need for a Special Employment Regulation? (New York: SAGEPUB) pp 1–3

[2] TIM APJII 2019 Buletin APJII 2019 vol 40 Retrieved from
[3] Gojek 2020 *Gojek: About Us* Retrieved from https://www.gojek.com/about/

[4] e27 2014 *GrabTaxi launches beta trial in Jakarta* Retrieved from https://e27.co/grabtaxi-launches-beta-trial-in-jakarta-20140606/

[5] Sub Direktorat Statistik Komunikasi dan Teknologi Informasi 2019 *Statistik E-Commerce 2019* ed T Sujono *et al* (Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia) pp 10–5

[6] Sub Direktorat Pengembangan Model Statistik 2020 *Tinjauan Big Data Terhadap Dampak COVID-19* (Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia) pp 23–4

[7] Mastercard and Kaiser Associates 2019 *The Global Online Gig Economy: Capitalizing on a ~$500B Opportunity* Retrieved from https://newsroom.mastercard.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Gig-Economy-White-Paper-May-2019.pdf

[8] MetLife 2019 *The Online Gig Economy: Opportunities, Challenges, and Employer Strategies* (New York: MetLife Services and Solution)

[9] Lepanjuuri K, Wishart R and Comick P 2018 *The Characteristics of Those in the Online Gig Economy* Retrieved from https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv%3A79237#

[10] Iwamoto K 2019 *Gojek aims to grow non-Indonesia users to 50% of operations* Retrieved from https://asia.nikkei.com/Business/Startups/Gojek-aims-to-grow-non-Indonesia-users-to-50-of-operations

[11] CNBC 2020 *CNBC Disruptor 50* Retrieved from https://www.cnbc.com/2020/06/16/grab-disruptor-50.html

[12] Faisal A L F, Sucayho Y G, Ruldeviyani Y and Gandhi A 2019 Discovering Indonesian digital workers in online gig economy platforms *2019 Int. Conf. on Information and Communications Technol.*

[13] Sebastien L, Josse J and Husson F 2008 FactoMiner: a package for multivariate analysis *J. of Statistical Software* vol 25 no 1 p 1–18

[14] Kassambara A and Mundt F 2020 *Factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of Multivariate Data Analyses* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package= factoextra