To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Terry Acuff entitled "Moonlighting of Teachers in Grainger, Union, Claiborne, and Hamblen County School Systems." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Industrial Education.

Gerald K. Laborde, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Terry Duff

Date 8-13-85

MOONLIGHTING OF TEACHERS IN GRAINGER, UNION, CLAIBORNE AND HAMBLEN COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Terry Acuff

December 1985

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his gratitude to his wife and family for their assistance and patience during the time of this study.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Gerald LaBorde and Dr. Roger Haskell for their cooperation and assistance during this graduate study. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Bill Radcliff for his assistance during the preparation of this thesis.

Recognition is also given to Dwain Burke, Rebecca Pippin, Linda Roberts and Nancy Ritter.

ABSTRACT

The review of literature and the responses to the questionnaire revealed the following conclusions:

1. There was little apparent difference between the numbers of teachers moonlighting in the urban (Morristown City system) and the three rural counties surveyed. The major difference appeared in the comparison of female moonlighting teachers in the two groups. This could be attributed to the availability of moonlighting job opportunities in the rural areas for females.

2. Vocational teachers as a group appear to be involved in moonlighting somewhat more than the academic teachers. This could be attributed to their previously learned skills which would appear to make them more employable.

3. There did not appear to be a difference in the number of teachers moonlighting in the two systems surveyed. Sixty-five percent nonmoonlighting teachers indicated they would moonlight if the opportunity for employment was available.

4. Over one-half of the total sample surveyed indicated they felt that moonlighting was not detrimental to their teaching performance. The responses of the moonlighting teachers to this question were 19 of 55 moonlighting teachers (35%) felt moonlighting was not detrimental to their performance. Fifteen of 55 teachers (27%) felt moonlighting was slightly detrimental to their teaching. Twenty-one of 55 teachers felt moonlighting was detrimental to their teaching performance.

5. Most of the moonlighting teachers indicated a need for supplementary income as a reason for their moonlighting.

6. Morristown moonlighting teachers have a greater variety of sources of employment than the rural moonlighting teachers. Rural teachers appear to be limited to agricultural related jobs. The urban teachers appeared to have more opportunities in the sales,, construction and industrial jobs.

7. More male teachers are engaged in moonlighting than female teachers. There was some evidence in the literature to support the conclusion that in less populated areas the male is the principle "breadwinner" in the family.

8. Incidence of moonlighting among teachers appears to be rather high for a professional group.

9. The rural teachers predominant involvement in agricultural moonlighting activities might explain their expressed continuation in the moonlighting activities even if their teaching salaries were adequate. These teachers may own their farms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Problem	2
	The Purpose of the Study	2
	Objectives of the Study	3
	Definitions of Terms	4
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Organization of the Study	4
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
	The Review	6
	Summary	20
III.	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	21
	The Sample	21
	The Instrumentation	21
	The Procedure	22
	Methods of Data Analysis	22
IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	24
	Problem Review	24
	Results	24
	Summary	33
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
	Summary	35
	Conclusions	36
	Recommendations	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY		39
APPENDICES		42
A.	COVER LETTER	43
B.	STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE	44
VITA		47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Number of Teachers who Moonlight	26
2.	Comparison of Academic and Vocational Teachers that Moonlight	27
3.	Expressed Effect of Moonlighting on Teacher Performance by All Respondents	28
4.	Expressed Effect of Moonlighting on Teacher Performance by Moonlighting Teachers	28
5.	Reasons Teachers Moonlight	30
6.	Sources of Teacher Supplementary Income	31
7.	Comparison of Moonlighting by Male Teachers to Female Teachers	32
8.	Comparison of Male and Female Moonlighting Teachers by Systems	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many years a considerable number of teachers have worked at a second job in order to continue teaching as a full time job. A significant part of the income of many teachers is, in fact, derived from noncontractual sources. Over the years knowledgeable educators have hypothesized that low salaries account for a majority of the moonlighting by teachers (Gumm, 1968, p. 6).

School teaching has often been referred to as a part-time profession. The usual contract, when teachers are actually in the classroom, is for nine to ten months out of the year. This leisure time in the summer brought about the phrase "part-time profession." Because of the part-time aspect of school teaching and the low pay, a considerable portion of teacher's income is generated from sources outside the school system. "In the fall of 1981, 50.8% of the teachers nationwide earned income from outside the school system" (NEA Memo, 1982, p. 10).

This social phenomenon has caused the use of a relatively new word in educational literature, moonlighting. The term moonlighting is defined as "holding two or more jobs at the same time (Webster's Dictionary, 1983, p. 508). Multiple jobholders are employed persons who, during the survey week (1) held jobs as wage or salary workers with two or more employers, (2) were self-employed and also held a wage or salary job (Rosenfeld, 1979, p. 59). Moonlighting was defined

by Richard Wisniewski and Paul Kline as "any income earned beyond the basic salary covered in a teaching contract (Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, p. 553). This extra work seems necessary in order to meet the essential expenses incurred by the individual.

School administrators and boards of education have evidenced an interest in, and encouraged research for determining the reasons for, and extent of, moonlighting.

Problem

Moonlighting can be and usually is a strain on the teacher. It deprives the teachers time for planning and preparation for his/her classes. After a teacher devotes approximately forty-seven hours per week to teaching, there is less than sufficient time for a second job if health and personal activities are considered. Although moonlighting may be praised for providing an adequate standard of living, the only contribution to education is that teachers are able to remain in the education field longer with this extra income.

This study has produced information to show that teachers engage in secondary employment to supplement their teaching salaries. Knowledge of moonlighting practices help provide information on the incidence of moonlighting and the reason for it.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent and by what means the Union, Grainger, Claiborne County teachers, and

the Morristown City teachers supplemented their teaching income. A second part of the study was designed to compare the rural county school systems with the higher paid urban school system of Morristown to determine if the lower paid county teachers were more likely to be involved in moonlighting. A third part of the study was to determine if there were any differences between vocational and academic teachers in relation to numbers involved in moonlighting.

Objectives of the Study

Seven objectives were identified for the study:

1. To determine the extent of moonlighting in Grainger, Union, Claiborne and Morristown City school systems.

2. To determine if vocational teachers are more or less likely to be engaged in moonlighting than academic teachers.

3. To determine if teachers in lower paid counties are more apt to be moonlighting than teachers in higher paid counties.

4. To determine to what extent, if any, moonlighting affects teacher's performance as perceived by the moonlighting teachers.

5. To identify the reasons for engaging in salary supplementing activities.

6. To identify the most common source from which teachers receive supplementary salaries.

7. To determine if male teachers are more or less likely to moonlight than female teachers.

Definitions of Terms

Terms used in this study were defined as follows:

Moonlighting. Holding two or more jobs at the same time.

Multiple jobholder. An individual who holds two or more jobs simultaneously.

Instrument. The written questionnaire designed to gather data for this study.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to vocational and an equal number of academic teachers.

2. The study was limited to a small geographical area of four counties in East Tennessee--and cannot reflect a state-wide trend.

3. The study was further limited to the extent that the teachers who responded to the questionnaire instrument gave complete and factual responses.

4. The study was limited to secondary teachers.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized as follows:

Chapter I presents the introduction and contains the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, definition of terms, limitations of the study and organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of related research.

Chapter III presents the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter IV contains an analysis of the data collected.

Chapter V contains the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter II presents a review of literature regarding the phenomenon known as moonlighting. In most states, the phenomenon of moonlighting by teachers has not been carefully investigated. Investigations which have been made have often failed to probe more deeply than the mere incidence of the phenomenon itself.

The Review

Research pertaining to teacher moonlighting and supplemental income has mostly been done by the National Education Association Research Division. In a survey of NEA members, beginning with the summer of 1980 and ending with the last school month of 1981, slightly more than half of all teachers (50.8%) reported sources of income other than teaching salaries (NEA Research Memo, 1980). The mean amount of additional income reported was $2,462. Smaller percentages of teachers in the Southeast, elementary teachers age 50 and over, and female teachers reported income from other sources.

A local level study was conducted in 1951 by the Beta Field Chapter of Phi Delta Kappan under the direction of Adolph Unrah in St. louis City and St. Louis County Schools. The purpose of the study was to determine how many men in the teaching profession, excluding administrators and supervisors, found it necessary to supplement their teaching incomes. In this study there were 700

teachers sampled with a 78% return. Ninety-two percent of the total number of respondents had supplementary incomes, and of those 59% held their additional jobs during the school year. "More than one-half of the respondents felt that holding an extra job was detrimental to their teaching effectiveness" (Parker, 1969, p. 17). Low salaries earned by teachers was the reason most often cited for moonlighting.

In most states, moonlighting by teachers has not been carefully investigated. One unmistakable fact was, however, that during the period 1966-1967, the average salary paid to Tennessee classroom teachers was $5,625. "This figure ranked fortieth among the fifty states" (NEA Memo, 1966, p. 31). Many knowledgeable educators have long felt that low salaries accounted for a majority of moonlighting by teachers. In a 1962 article, E. Turner wrote, "In most instances, the outside employment is obtained to supplement inadequate earnings from teaching" (Turner, 1962, p. 29).

Teachers appear to lead all other professions in holding second jobs. In a 1982 report by the National Education Association, moonlighting teachers earned an average of $2,462 in their supplemental jobs. Teachers who moonlight were most likely to be found working in industry. Industry is attracted to teachers because of the skills teachers have to offer, and teachers are attracted to industry because industrial jobs usually pay well. The second most attractive job for moonlighting teachers was in the area of agriculture. Agriculture interested teachers because of the flexible hours farming offered. According to the report school administrators did not agree on the

subject of secondary employment for teachers. Some superintendents felt that teachers should accept no outside employment, a larger number said that while some outside employment was ethical, some was not. One out of six superintendents cited in the report said, "Teaching was a full-time occupation" (Opinion Poll, 1955, p. 6). Not all superintendents felt that moonlighting was indicative of an attitude which was detrimental to the accomplishments of the objectives of one's primary teaching job. Benefit or harm from moonlighting may depend upon the individual teacher. An important consideration in determining whether or not moonlighting was harmful to teaching effectiveness was the number of hours devoted to outside work in relation to stamina and physical condition of the moonlighter. Some jobs may have actually been beneficial to teachers by increasing their knowledge, improving their skills, and varying their experiences. However, teachers were not always discriminating in seeking extra employment, because the major concern was not the job itself, but the additional income earned. It was revealed in a study by Anderson that,

> the majority of superintendents were opposed to classroom teachers moonlighting; however, when serving as classroom teachers, the majority of superintendents actually held a summer job of some type during the summer of 1963. (Anderson, W. D., 1966, p. 45)

"A survey made in Kanawha County, West Virginia, revealed that nearly two-thirds of the male secondary public school teachers worked at a second job some part of the year" (Turner, 1965, p. 21). This survey was done by the Kanawha County Education Association and involved 301 male secondary school teachers in the county, which

included Charleston. One hundred ninety-one of these men held seventy-three different kinds of second jobs. These jobs included serving as ambulance drivers, exterminators, janitors, service station attendants, bus drivers, parking meter repairmen, gardeners, store detectives, and many other occupations.

This survey, which covered the period from September 1962 through August 1963, sought to find out what percentage of teachers held second jobs and why they held second jobs. Those who worked second jobs earned an average of $1,745 at an hourly wage of $2.20. "Eighty-three percent of those surveyed said the main reason for holding a second job was to improve their standard of living. Sixty-five percent said they held a second job to provide the bare necessities" (Lambert, 1965, p. 21). The third most often cited reason for holding a second job was to finance the furthering of the respondent's education. Teachers who were supplementally employed during the summer felt their employment interfered with the advancement of their education. Ninety-one percent indicated they would have gone to summer school if they had not had to work.

The United States Bureau of the Census has conducted the most thorough research on moonlighting. The research consisted of several national surveys conducted since 1950, with considerable attention being devoted to the relationships between moonlighting and hours of work, job efficiency, economic status of families, and changing employment opportunities. "The survey conducted indicated that among teachers below the college level, the rates for multiple job

holdings for men and women were 23.5 and 2.5%" (Schiffman, 1961, p. 1069). Schiffman reported that, of all dual jobholding only 34% worked mostly at night, with the largest number, 42%, working during weekday working hours, and 24% working primarily on weekends at their second jobs. Sixty and nine-tenths percent of teachers worked at their second jobs at night, with 13.5% working primarily on weekends, and 25.6% employed mostly during weekday working hours. With these facts, it is understandable why school teaching has often been referred to as a part-time profession.

An extensive study of moonlighting in the state of Georgia was made by the Bureau of Educational Studies and Field Services, College of Education, University of Georgia and the Georgia State Department of Education. "During the period of the study, September 1, 1962 through August 31, 1963, 45.3% reported earnings other than their public school teaching" (Parker, 1960, p. 30). Of the male respondents, 57.9% also reported a second job. In contrast only 15.5% of the females reported holding a second job. The study showed that 26.9% of single teachers held a second job in comparison to only 25.3% of the married teachers. The most likely moonlighter was a young, white male living in a small town with a large family and a wife who did not work outside the home.

In a 1965 study, the National Education Association Department of Classroom Teachers found that "the professional teacher of today does not equate dedication with poverty, he feels no need to apologize for seeking higher salaries and improved fringe benefits" (Turner, 1962,

p. 33). The study concluded that moonlighting had a detrimental effect on teaching, but that it would continue until teacher received enough money to maintain an adequate standard of living.

Financially, teachers are living within the lower fringes of the middle class of America. "The typical man teaching in today's schools is both angry and impatient" (Turner, 1962, p. 34). Teachers have become tired of working nights, weekends, holidays, and sacrificing their families for their profession in order to make ends meet. Teachers and others have proclaimed the merits of salary supplementing activities on the part of teachers. Anderson had this to say:

> Teachers can gain a better understanding of the economic life of their community by holding a job outside the school. This experience provided an opportunity for them to work with people who have a variety of educational, social, and economic backgrounds. (Anderson, S. A., 1948, p. 71)

The argument that teachers were engaging in unfair competition when they sought part-time or summer employment does not appear to be justified. In fact, in most cases they were not taking work from the unemployed.

A study done in Oklahoma by Richard Wisniewski and Paul Kleine entitled Teacher Moonlighting: An Unstudied Phenomenon, respondents were placed into four categories according to the source of their extra income. One of the categories was: within the school system. Forty-four percent of the respondents said they earned supplementary income from duties beyond those required in their teaching contracts. The most likely source of this income would be from coaching, bus driving and teaching summer school. The second category was: outside the

school system. Working evenings and weekends at jobs outside the school is the most common form of moonlighting. A total of 31.4% of the respondents had held these type jobs during the last three years. The average income from these jobs was $2,075. During the same period of time 42% of the respondents had held jobs outside the school system during the summer months. The third category was: family income. This category was any additional income earned by the respondents through a family owned business such as farming and raising horses. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents had earned income from such sources. The fourth category was: income from other sources. This category included such activities as renting property, collecting royalties and earning interest from investments. The most frequent of these sources being income earned from dividends and interest (16.5%) and income from rental properties (12.5%).

Wisniewski and Kleine based their definition of moonlighting on two assumptions: "To leave anything out of the definition would ignore the importance of some kinds of monetary rewards for some individuals, and teaching school is a full-time occupation" (Kleine, Wisniewski, p. 553). The data from this study suggest that a moonlighting teacher is more likely to be moonlighting within the school system. Seventy-one percent of the respondents reported income from sources outside the school system with an average income of $3,917 per year. The respondents were asked why they were engaged in moonlighting. Thirty-seven percent needed the money to pay debts; 36% needed the money to improve their standard of living. Nearly 75% of

the respondents were engaged in moonlighting for monetary reasons. The respondents were also asked what affect moonlighting had on their teaching performance. Twenty-two percent of the respondents felt the supplemental job helps their performance, 20% thought it hindered their teaching and 58% felt it had no effect on their teaching performance.

A considerable portion of the literature relating to moonlighting is devoted to moralistic theorizing about whether one should or should not moonlight. Benjamin Wylie was quoted as saying: "Moonlighting is wrong. The whole purpose of the labor movement is to fight for shorter work hours so that workers can enjoy more leisure. The fellow who has two jobs is a hindrance" (Wylie, 1962, p. 61). There has been, according to the literature, a certain degree of impecuniosity associated with the attitude of the public toward teaching. Teachers today are not accepting this attitude and are demonstrating it through their militancy. Teachers are puzzled over why they should not be compared with other college graduates, where beginning salaries of men teachers run from 10 to 25% less than the beginning salaries of other male college graduates.

A study conducted in Jefferson County, Kentucky, among males only, during the school year 1964-65 brought responses from 506 men. Fifty-six percent held additional jobs during the school year at which they worked an average of 16 hours per week for an average income of $1,523. The study showed that the primary reason for holding a second job was financial and that the job was most likely to be of the professional or managerial type. The respondents of this study would

not likely encourage young students to enter the teaching profession. The respondents felt that additional job holding was detrimental to their teaching, family life and professional growth, but not as detrimental as inadequate income. "A majority felt that the boards of education should place no restrictions on additional jobholding, with reference to either hours worked or types of jobs held" (Burch, 1966, p. 96).

Whenever the income derived from teaching was inadequate to support the teacher and his family, the argument as to whether he should or should not hold a second job was purely academic. Howard Linn, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, summed it up when he said:

> The majority of moonlighters take on extra work because their regular salaries are inadequate to meet basic living expenses. School administrators will have to cope with moonlighting until such salaries are raised to a level that eliminates the need for seeking extra work. (Linn, 1962, p. 62)

School administrators from the earliest days in this country have been concerned about the part-time nature of teaching. With the summer months off and the relatively short hours of the school day, others construed this to be that teaching was only part-time during the months of school operation. Willard Elsbree was quoted as saying

> The public has always looked upon school teaching as a part-time job and, in considering the salaries to be awarded, it has attached undue weight to the proportion of the year in which teachers were not formally engaged in the classroom. Even today, when schools are commonly in session for ten full months, there is an inclination for school boards and lay citizens to view the teacher's task as a relatively easy one, consisting, as it does, of a five day week with generous vacations scattered throughout the

> year. The fact that teachers are heavily burdened with homework and their summers frequently spent in professional study is more often overlooked than recognized by those outside the profession itself. (Elsbree, 1959, p. 63)

A study of the moonlighting activities of Utah public school teachers was made in 1961-62 by Melvin Tucker. He found that almost two-thirds of the respondents had other income outside their teaching salary, and that 90.7% of the men and 32.1% of the women had moonlighted some during the year. Of the men moonlighting, 91.2% stated, "that they needed income in addition to their school salaries" (Tucker, 1965, p. 35).

In a study conducted by George Harris Gumm during the school year 1966-67, 57% of Tennessee's male school teachers were supplementing their teaching salaries. Six hundred and sixty-seven male teachers were included in the study. The most often cited moonlighting employment was farming, followed by: sales, ordinary labor, preaching, adult education, teaching, athletic officiating, choir director, recreation, and general office. During the summer months, the percentage of moonlighting teachers increased to 64%. It was apparent from the study that economic necessity forced teachers to seek extra employment of almost any type. Gumm stated, "The little old lady who thrived on dedication is a stereotype no longer applicable to the American educational scene" (Gumm, 1968, p. 7). Four hundred and sixty-seven (70%) of the respondents stated that a sufficient increase in the teaching salaries would cause them to refrain from seeking extra employment. Four hundred and twenty-one of the respondents (63.1%) stated they would consider leaving the profession

due to the financial considerations. Respondents of the study also stated they would not encourage high school students to pursue a teaching career. Gumm said, "There are few who believe that teachers should be forced to 'moonlight' in order to make ends meet. And, in most cases, teachers cannot be blamed for the practice. They are the victims of a financially inadequate profession" (Gumm, 1968, p. 71).

A study conducted by the office of Current Employment Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics found that one in every twenty workers held more than one job during 1979. During May 1979, about 4.7 million persons held more than one job. Among the major occupational groups, farmers and farm managers reported the highest rates of moonlighting. Professional workers with teachers leading the list was the second most likely occupation to be moonlighting. Teaching is a targeted profession. Teachers are constantly targeted by firms that need extra workers by sending direct advertising.

Moonlighting often starts out as an extra job to help cope with a rush of bills but then turns out to be a permanent part of everyday living. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that approximately one-third of nearly 5 million Americans who have more than one job need the extra income to cover basic living expenses. Part-time workers are usually moonlighters and make up more than one-half the people staffing department stores and retail establishments. Moonlighters, man the phones for telephone research firms and are the main staff of companies that sell cosmetics, household products and other items door to door.

Some moonlighters' earnings are merely pocket money to ease the everyday crunch of groceries, gas, and etc. Others moonlight to achieve long-term goals rather than to earn pocket money. Many work two or three part-time jobs for money to invest in their main job or business.

With as large a number of teachers and other occupations moonlighting, job dissatisfaction may or may not be the reason for moonlighting. One factor which may lead to job dissatisfaction is inadequate pay, a primary reason for "moonlighting."

In a survey by the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, "good pay was ranked fifth in order of importance, preceded by interesting work, enough help and equipment to get the job done, enough information to get the job done, and enough authority to get the job done, in that order" (Work in America, 1971, p. 13).

The physiological needs--food, shelter, clothing--of human beings, of course, are related to satisfaction and indirectly to job satisfaction if moonlighting is an absolute necessity to maintain the standard of living and environment required to feel important and maintain self-esteem.

Robert Kahn suggests that the question of satisfaction related closely to self-esteem.

> For most workers it is a choice between no work connection (usually with severe attendant economic penalties and a conspicuous lack of meaningful alternative activities) and a work connection which is burdened with negative qualities (routine, compulsory scheduling, dependency, etc.). In these circumstances, the individual has no difficulty with choice; he chooses work, pronounces himself satisfied, and tells us more only if questions become more searching.

> Then we learn that he can order jobs clearly in terms of their status or desirability, wants his son to be employed differently from himself, and, if given a choice, would seek a different occupation. (Kahn, 1972, p. 15)

Some relationship between job satisfaction is shown in a survey report by Richard Wisniewski and Paul Kleine in Teacher Moonlighting: An Unstudied Phenomenon. In response to why respondents engaged in "moonlighting" it was found that 5.5% were pursuing a secondary work interest, 4.7% were looking for diversion from teaching, and 5.1% were preparing to leave teaching. Thirty-eight percent said they were dissatisfied with their present income from teaching.

In an attempt to determine whether salary is a sole determinant of job satisfaction, a recent study by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman produced some interesting findings. In this study it was found that the determinants of job satisfaction were qualitatively different from the determinants of job dissatisfaction. Three factors that stood out strongly as major factors in producing high job attitudes were the work itself, responsibility, and advancement, or better job, better pay. But the role these three factors have in producing poor job attitudes was extremely small by contrast. Recognition, achievement, interesting work, responsibility, and advancement all relate to positive job attitudes but their absence will much less frequently lead to dissatisfaction. It was also stated that: "It would seem that as an effector of job attitudes salary has more potency as a job dissatisfier than as a job satisfier" (Ewen, 1964, p. 82). These findings are in direct opposition to the traditional idea that a given factor in the work situation can cause both satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Salary

itself was found to be a dissatisfier but in many cases it represents achievement and recognition, which are satisfiers.

The Herzberg study involved a narrow range of jobs and only one measure of job attitudes. It is possible that some or all of the Herzberg results were due to the one method of measurement that was used. This method was called critical incidents technique. Participants of the study told times when they were very happy or unhappy in their job and to describe the cause of their feelings. This technique; however, is the only method used and; therefore, bias due to this method cannot be discounted. There is no basis for assuming that the variables described in the critical incidents caused overall job satisfaction. Smith and Kendall (1963) have shown that an employee may dislike some aspects of his job yet still think it is acceptable overall. It must be concluded then that the nature of satisfiers and dissatisfiers is yet far from clear and may be different in different jobs. However, one sole variable does not produce job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Many variables are involved. Salary is but one.

George Gumm said,

> A professional teacher should not feel compelled to worry continuously or have to become unduly concerned about his financial status. Rather, he should feel free to devote his evening hours to reading, planning and preparation of materials, professional improvement and relaxation. There are few who question the value of education in a democratic society. Our nation and our state cannot afford to provide any less than the best. It is time for boards of education to give serious consideration to the relevant and adequate employment of all professional in education at adequate salaries on a twelve month basis. Anything less will continue to insure fragmented rather than total commitment to education. (Gumm, 1968, p. 7)

Summary

From research referred to above, it was apparent that a high percentage of public school teachers are engaged in supplementing their teaching salaries. The most often cited reason for supplementary employment was lack of sufficient income to provide the desired standard of living. The second reason most often given for moonlighting was economic necessity.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Chapter III explains the methods and procedures used in the study. Included in the explanation is a description of the research population, the sample, the instrumentation, the procedures used for analysis of the data.

The Sample

The sample was drawn from high school teachers in four different school systems in East Tennessee. The school systems included Grainger, Union, Claiborne, and Morristown City Schools. All 59 vocational instructors from the four systems were included in the study. An equal number of academic instructors were also included in the study. Fifty-six percent of the respondents were in the 30-39 years of age group. Eighty-three percent of the respondents were married.

The Instrumentation

After an analysis of related studies and literature, a questionnaire was developed consisting of thirty (30) items of a factual and attitudinal nature. Questions were developed in the questionnaire to provide information as to the extent and reasons for moonlighting. The questionnaire was coded to distinguish between city and county school systems.

A cover letter explaining the nature of the study and soliciting the participation of the teachers was prepared to accompany each questionnaire.

The Procedure

This research was completed with the use of a thirty (30) item questionnaire. To further refine the questionnaire (Appendix B), the instrument was pilot tested by five middle school teachers at Lincoln Heights Middle School in Morristown, Tennessee, and five vocational teachers at Jefferson County High School in Dandridge, Tennessee. Suggestions made by the people in the pilot test were used to improve the final draft of the instrument. A cover letter (Appendix A) explaining the nature of the study and soliciting the participation of the sample was prepared.

The questionnaire was hand delivered to the vocational directors or the principals of the participating schools to be handed out to the teachers. After completion of the questionnaire the teachers gave the questionnaire back to the administration.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire was tabulated so that subjective material could be reviewed and studied for relevance. Comparisons were made between the number of male and female teachers who moonlight. Comparisons were made between the number of vocational and academic teachers who were employed in a second job. The number of

county and rural system teachers who moonlight was also compared. Comparisons were made to determine to what extent, if any, moonlighting affects teacher's performance in the classroom. Comparisons were made to identify reasons for engaging in moonlighting. Comparisons were made to identify the most common source for teacher's supplementary salaries. Comparisons were made to determine the extent of moonlighting.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Problem Review

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of teacher moonlighting and their reasons for moonlighting. A second objective was to determine which teachers are more likely to moonlight and if they feel it is detrimental or beneficial to their teaching performance.

Results

One hundred and eighteen questionnaires were hand delivered to the principals and vocational directors of the participating schools to be distributed to the teachers involved in this study. Of the 118 questionnaires delivered, one half were placed in the rural county schools of Grainger, Union and Claiborne. The other half of the questionnaires were distributed to teachers in the Morristown City school system. In Morristown, 30 of the questionnaires were delivered to male teachers and 29 were delivered to female teachers. In the rural county schools, 31 of the questionnaires were delivered to male teachers and 28 were delivered to female teachers.

Ninety questionnaires were returned for a 76.27% return rate. In the Morristown system 59 questionnaires were delivered, there were 42 responses (71%). Of these 42 responses 22 out of 30 were males (73%) and 20 out of 29 were females (68%). In the rural counties there were 48 returned questionnaires (81%) of the 59 questionnaires delivered.

Of these 48 responses 25 out of 31 were males (80%) and 23 out of 28 were females (82%).

Fifty of the respondents (55.5%) had at least a B.S. or a B.A. degree. Another 25% or a total of 22 respondents had a M.S. degree. The remainder had less than a baccalaureate degree. The 90 respondents in this study were predominantly married individuals. Only 6 or (7%) of the respondents were not married. Two (4%) of the 55 moonlighting teachers were not married.

All of the married teacher respondents had one or more children. A total of 165 dependents were listed for all respondents. The 55 moonlighting teachers indicated a total of 116 child dependents or an average of 2.1 children per moonlighting respondents. The nonmoonlighting teacher had a total of 49 dependent children for an average of 1.4 per respondent.

Twenty-six of the married respondents (31%) indicated their spouses were not employed. Seventeen (65%) of the 26 nonemployed spouse responses were from the teachers employed in the rural areas.

Thirty-five percent or a total of 32 respondents had from 6-12 years of teaching experience. Thirty-four percent or a total of 31 had from 13-20 years of teaching experience. A majority (51%) of the responding teachers indicated their teaching salaries were between $14,00 and $17,999 per year.

A combined total of 37 male teachers (78.7%) of a total of 47 male teachers responding are involved in moonlighting. A combined total of 18 female teachers 41.8% of a total of 43 female teachers responding are involved in moonlighting. Of the 90 respondents surveyed, a total of

55 male and female teachers (61%) indicated they were engaged in moonlighting. There was no evidence to show that teachers in lower paid counties were more likely to be involved in moonlighting. The opposite was found to be true with the higher paid teachers of the Morristown City schools more likely to be moonlighting. The extent of moonlighting in the school systems is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Number of Teachers who Moonlight[a]

	Morristown[b]			Rural counties[c]		
	N_2	N	%	N_2	N	%
Male	22	18	82	25	19	76
Female	20	12	60	23	6	26
Total		30	71		25	52

[a]Moonlighting teachers (N = 55); all respondents (N_1 = 90).

[b]Moonlighting teachers (N = 30); all respondents (N_1 = 42).

[c]Moonlighting teachers (N = 25); all respondents (N_1 = 48).

*The moonlighting teachers indicated continued work through the summer. None of the nonmoonlighting teachers indicated their involvement in summer employment.

Vocational teachers in Morristown and the rural counties were more likely to be engaged in moonlighting than their academic counterparts. This could be attributed to the fact that vocational teachers have more employable skills to offer employers. Of the 55 moonlighting

respondents the comparison of academic to vocational was 25 academic teachers moonlighting (45%) and 30 vocational teachers moonlighting (55%) (Table 2).

Table 2

Comparison of Academic and Vocational Teachers that Moonlight

	Academic moonlighting teachers %	Vocational moonlighting teachers %
N	25-45	30-55

Teachers in the Morristown system were more inclined to believe moonlighting was detrimental to teaching performance with (28.5%) indicating this on the questionnaire. Only 10% of the rural county teachers felt that moonlighting was detrimental to teaching performance. Table 3 shows the expressed effect of moonlighting on teaching performance. This data represents the expressed feelings of all respondents (90) to the effect of moonlighting on teacher performance.

The 55 moonlighting teachers were almost equally divided on their response to the effect of moonlighting on their teaching performance. Thirty (55%) of the moonlighting teacher thought their outside employment was slightly detrimental or detrimental to their teaching performance. The urban teachers expressed a greater negative effect of moonlighting on their performance than the rural teachers (Table 4).

Table 3

Expressed Effect of Moonlighting on Teacher Performance by All Respondents

	Morristown (N = 42)		Rural counties (N = 48)	
	N	%	N	%
Not detrimental	18	42	34	71
Slightly detrimental	12	28.5	9	19
Detrimental	12	28.5	5	10
Extremely detrimental	0	0	0	0
Total	42	100	48	100

Table 4

Expressed Effect of Moonlighting on Teacher Performance by Moonlighting Teachers

	All moonlighting teachers (N = 55)		Morristown (N = 30)		Rural counties (N = 25)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not detrimental	25	45	12	40	13	52
Slightly detrimental	18	33	10	33	8	32
Detrimental	12	22	8	27	4	16
Extremely detrimental	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	55	100	30	100	25	100

Economic necessity was listed as the main reason for 92% of teachers in the rural county systems to engage in moonlighting. In the urban systems, 90% listed economic necessity as the reason for moonlighting. In both urban and rural systems combined, 91% listed economic necessity as the major factor in forcing them to moonlight to supplement their teaching salaries.

In the rural systems other reasons listed for moonlighting were: hobby--8%; training for another job--4%; improving their skills--4%; other--4%.

In the urban system, reasons stated for moonlighting were: hobby--23%; training for another job--17%; improving their skills--7%; other--.03%.

In the systems surveyed with 91% of teachers listing economic necessity as the reason for moonlighting it appears that their salary from teaching is not sufficient to meet their living expense as shown by Table 5.

Twenty-three (65%) of the 35 nonmoonlighting teachers indicated their desire to moonlight if there was an opportunity for them to find employment.

The 55 moonlighting teachers were almost evenly divided on their response to the statement, "would you discontinue moonlighting if your teaching salary was raised to meet your economic need." Forty-four (80%) of the moonlighting teachers indicated they would not discontinue working if their teaching salary was raised. Of this group of 46 respondents, 9 or (20%) were from the urban school systems.

Table 5

Reasons Teachers Moonlight (N = 55)

	Morristown (N = 30)		Rural counties (N = 25)	
	N	%	N	%
Economic necessity	27	90	23	92
Hobby	7	23	2	8
Training for another job	5	17	1	4
Improving their skills	2	7	1	4
Other	1	.03	1	4
Total*	42	137.03	48	112

*More than one response given by individual respondents. Total is greater than 100%.

The urban respondents indicated their moonlighting jobs were primarily easier than their teaching jobs. Eighteen (72%) of the rural moonlighting respondents indicated their outside employment was more difficult than their teaching jobs.

Twenty-four (44%) of the moonlighting teachers thought their outside employment made them more appreciative of teaching.

The most common source from which teachers receive supplementary salaries is different between the Morristown system as compared to the rural county systems. Teachers in the rural county systems listed farming as the number one moonlighting activity. In contrast, teachers in the Morristown City system listed farming and construction last as a moonlighting activity. It appears there are a greater variety of job opportunities in the Morristown City system other than farming, which would help explain the greater diversity in jobs listed. Sales,

industry, and clerical jobs were all listed before farming as a means for supplementing Morristown teachers' salaries as shown in Table 6. Some other moonlighting jobs that were listed: truck driver, mechanic, bus driver, teaching night school, computer consultant, Tennessee National Guard and insurance salesman.

Table 6

Sources of Teacher Supplementary Income

	Morristown (N = 30)		Rural counties (N = 25)	
	N	%	N	%
Farming or agriculture	5	17	17	68
Construction	5	17	6	24
Sales	9	30	1	4
Industry	7	23	1	4
Clerical	6	20	0	0
Other	10	33	8	32
Total*	42	140	48	132

*More than one response given by individual respondent. Total is greater than 100%.

Male teachers were more likely to be moonlighting than their female counterparts. Of the total 55 moonlighting respondents, there were 37 males (68%) compared to 18 females (32%) (see Table 7).

In comparing male and female moonlighting teachers of Morristown and the rural counties the ratio of male teachers moonlighting compared to female teachers moonlighting is much closer in the Morristown City

Table 7

Comparison of Moonlighting by Male Teachers to Female Teachers (N = 55)

	N	%
Male	37	68
Female	18	32
Total	55	100

system. In the Morristown City system, 18 of 30 respondents (60%) were males moonlighting and 12 of 30 respondents (40%) were females.

The rural systems had 19 of 25 male respondents moonlighting (76%) and only 6 of 25 female respondents (24%) moonlighting (see Table 8).

Table 8

Comparison of Male and Female Moonlighting Teachers by Systems (N = 55)

	Morristown (N = 30)		Rural counties (N = 25)	
	N	%	N	%
Male	18	60	19	76
Female	12	40	6	24
Total	30	100	25	100

Twenty-nine (53%) of the moonlighting teachers indicated some degree of benefit to their teaching from their outside employment. Only 9 (30%) of the 30 urban moonlighting teachers expressed no benefit from their outside employment. Seventeen (68%) of the 25 rural moonlighting respondents indicated no benefit from their outside employment.

Summary

Moonlighting is a serious problem today as it was in the past which was reviewed in Chapter II. Sixty-one percent of teachers that responded to the questionnaire are engaged in some type of moonlighting. The number one reason for moonlighting, in both the rural county systems and the Morristown system was economic necessity. With the teachers in Morristown receiving a higher salary they were still more likely to be moonlighting than teachers in the rural counties due to the larger job market.

Morristown teachers with more of the teachers involved in moonlighting were likely to feel that moonlighting was detrimental to their teaching performance with 28.5% or 12 of them indicating this on the questionnaire.

Farming was the number one moonlighting activity for teachers in the rural county systems. Jobs in sales was the number one listed moonlighting activity among Morristown teachers. Male teachers in both Morristown and the rural counties were much more likely to be moonlighting than female teachers.

Question 17 on the questionnaire (Appendix B) showed that 65% of the teachers, presently not moonlighting, would if the opportunity arose.

With 61% of teachers moonlighting and 65% of nonmoonlighting teachers showing an interest in moonlighting if the opportunity arose this may indicate that teaching salaries are not sufficient to meet the living expenses of today's teacher. Slightly more than half of the moonlighting teachers thought this outside employment was of some benefit to their teaching.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Teacher moonlighting is a virtually unstudied phenomenon with only a few studies having been done across the country. With education being in the national spotlight and our state being involved in the career ladder program, the teachers of today are being put under a magnifying glass to determine if they are performing their jobs in a professional and skillful manner. Is moonlighting really detrimental to the teacher's performance in the classroom? This study would indicate that moonlighting probably is a slight detriment to the teacher's performance.

This study originated because the researcher of this subject is involved in moonlighting. One reason was to find out if other teachers had to hold down two jobs in order to support their family. The data that was collected shows this is indeed the case.

It was an unexpected fact to find that moonlighting was as prevalent among teachers who were employed in the better paying system, even though the source of their supplementary income was different.

The review of literature confirms the same results that were found in this study. Slightly more than half of all teachers (50.8%) nationwide are involved in moonlighting. A study done in the St. Louis County schools found that 92% of teachers had supplementary

incomes. The literature showed that teachers lead all other professions in holding second jobs. Statistics find that industry is the leading area that attracts teachers, with agriculture being the second area where moonlighting is done. As was found in this study, the main reason teachers are moonlighting is to better their standard of living or from economic necessity.

Conclusions

The review of literature and the responses to the questionnaire revealed the following conclusions:

1. There was little apparent difference between the numbers of teachers moonlighting in the urban (Morristown City system) and the three rural counties surveyed. The major difference appeared in the comparison of female moonlighting teachers in the two groups. This could be attributed to the availability of moonlighting job opportunities in the rural areas for females.

2. Vocational teachers as a group appear to be involved in moonlighting somewhat more than the academic teachers. This could be attributed to their previously learned skills which would appear to make them more employable.

3. There did not appear to be a difference in the number of teachers moonlighting in the two systems surveyed. Sixty-five percent nonmoonlighting teachers indicated they would moonlight if the opportunity for employment was available.

4. Over one-half of the total sample surveyed indicated they felt that moonlighting was not detrimental to their teaching performance.

The responses of the moonlighting teachers to this question were 19 of 55 moonlighting teachers (35%) felt moonlighting was not detrimental to their performance. Fifteen of 55 teachers (27%) felt moonlighting was slightly detrimental to their teaching. Twenty-one of 55 teachers felt moonlighting was detrimental to their teaching performance.

5. Most of the moonlighting teachers indicated a need for supplementary income as a reason for their moonlighting.

6. Morristown moonlighting teachers have a greater variety of sources of employment than the rural moonlighting teachers. Rural teachers appear to be limited to agricultural related jobs. The urban teachers appeared to have more opportunities in the sales,, construction and industrial jobs.

7. More male teachers are engaged in moonlighting than female teachers. There was some evidence in the literature to support the conclusion that in less populated areas the male is the principle "breadwinner" in the family.

8. Incidence of moonlighting among teachers appears to be rather high for a professional group.

9. The rural teachers predominant involvement in agricultural moonlighting activities might explain their expressed continuation in the moonlighting activities even if their teaching salaries were adequate. These teachers may own their farms.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were drawn:

1. Additional research should be conducted on moonlighting on a statewide level. Larger sample sizes will help to validate findings.

2. A public information campaign should be started to acquaint the public with the problems related to the low teaching salaries.

3. Teaching salaries should be raised to the point where teaching is a profession where a person can support himself and his family on the teaching salary alone.

4. School boards might review this study to consider the impact of moonlighting on their teachers performance.

5. Administrators, parents and students should be surveyed to ascertain their perception of the effect of moonlighting on teaching.

6. A future study should be conducted to look at the relationship between married moonlighting teachers and the employment status of their spouses.

7. The questionnaire used in this study could be expanded to ask specific job titles for moonlighting teachers. Job titles would permit the researcher to more carefully examine the relatedness of their moonlighting job and their teaching area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A look at the nation's 5 million moonlighters. (1980, December 8). U.S. News and World Report, p. 60.

Anderson, S. A. (1948). A study of the professional personnel of Wisconsin secondary schools with special reference to extra-contractual income. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Anderson, W. D., Jr. (1966). Supplemental income survey Oklahoma classroom teachers and counselors K-12. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Burch, K. L. (1966). An investigation of the status of the male secondary school teacher in Jefferson County, Kentucky, in relation to additional jobs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, pp. 188-196.

Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association. (1965, March). Conditions of work for quality teaching. Journal of the National Education Association, LIV, 33.

Ewen, R. B. (1964). Some determinants of job satisfaction, a study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 161-163.

Gumm, G. H. (1968, November). Moonlight or greener pastures. Tennessee Teacher, XXVI, 6-7.

Kahn, R. L. (1972). The meaning of work: Interpretation and proposals for measurement. The Human Meaning of Social Change, p. 15.

Kendall, L. M., Smith, P. C., Holin, C. L., & Locke, E. A. (1963). Cornell studies of job satisfaction: IV. The relative validity of the job descriptive index and other methods of measurement of job satisfaction. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Kleine, P., & Wisniewski, R. (1984, April). Teacher moonlighting: An unstudied phenomenon. Phi Delta Kappan, XXI, 553-555.

Lambert, B. J. (1965, December). Moonlighting in Kanawha County. Journal of NEA, p. 21.

Linn, H. (1962, March). Moonlighting and maintenance. Education Executives Overview, III, p. 61.

Opinion Poll: Ethics involved in out-of-school jobs for teachers. (1955, April). Nation's Schools, LV, 6.

Parker, C. (1969). Salary supplementing activities of male public school teachers in Missouri. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Rosenfeld, C. (1979). Multiple jobholding holds steady in 1978. Monthly Labor Review, p. 59.

Schiffman, J. (1979). Multiple jobholders in December 1960. Monthly Labor Review, p. 7.

Survey of NEA members. (1966). NEA Research Memo, p. 24.

Survey of NEA members. (1982). NEA Research Memo, p. 31.

Tucker, M. L. (1965). A study of the salary supplementing activities of Utah public school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pp. 32-112.

Turner, E. (1962, April). Moonlighting over the chalkboards. Journal of the NEA, LI, 29.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear Fellow Teacher:

Your voluntary completion and return of this anonymous questionnaire constitutes your informed consent to participate in this project.

Teaching is a full-time responsibility, and yet many have been forced to seek extra employment in order to meet the rising cost of living. This questionnaire is designed to gather information in regard to teacher "moonlighting." This study was developed to determine the extent and reasons for moonlighting.

The cooperation of teachers is needed to complete this study. If you would like to participate, would you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Do not place your name on this questionnaire or any other information that would identify you.

Sincerely,

Terry Acuff

APPENDIX B

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

Put a check in the appropriate box.

1. Your age: 20-29 [ ] 50-59 [ ]
   30-39 [ ] over 60 [ ]
   40-49 [ ]

2. Sex: Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. Marital status: Single [ ] Married [ ] Other [ ]

4. Number of dependent children: A. 0 [ ] E. 4 [ ]
   B. 1 [ ] F. 5 or more [ ]
   C. 2 [ ]
   D. 3 [ ]

5. Is your spouse presently employed: Yes [ ] No [ ]

   5A. If yes, full or part time: Full [ ] Part [ ]

6. What is the highest degree you have earned:

   A. High school graduate [ ] E. B.S. [ ]
   B. Post secondary F. MsS. [ ]
   vocational school [ ] G. Other [ ]
   C. Technical school [ ]
   D. 2 years college [ ] _____
   please specify

7. What type teaching certificate do you have:
   Professional [ ]
   Trade shop certificate [ ]

8. How many years teaching experience do you have:

   A. 0-5 [ ] D. 21-27 [ ]
   B. 6-12 [ ] E. over 27 [ ]
   C. 13-20 [ ]

9. Are you a vocational or academic teacher: Vocational [ ]
   Academic [ ]

10. Approximately how many hours outside of school hours do you spend in preparation for your classes per week:

    A. 0-1 [ ] C. 4-5 [ ]
    B. 2-3 [ ] D. more than 5 [ ]

11. What is your present income from teaching:

A. $10,000-11,999 [ ]
B. $12,000-13,999 [ ]
C. $14,000-15,999 [ ]
D. $16,000-17,999 [ ]
E. Over $18,000 [ ]

12. Do you plan to continue teaching: yes [ ] no [ ]

13. Do you have a job other than teaching during the school year:

yes [ ] no [ ]

13A. How many hours per week do you devote to this activity during the school year:

A. 0-10 [ ]
B. 11-20 [ ]
C. 21-30 [ ]
D. 31-40 [ ]
E. over 40 [ ]

14. Do you have a job during the summer: yes [ ] no [ ]

15. How many hours per week do you devote to your moonlighting job during the summer months:

A. 0-10 [ ]
B. 11-20 [ ]
C. 21-30 [ ]
D. 31-40 [ ]
E. over 40 [ ]

16. What is the main reason you are involved in moonlighting:

Check one

A. Economic necessity [ ]
B. Improving your skills [ ]
C. Hobby [ ]
D. Training for another job [ ]
E. Other. Explain briefly [ ]

_____
_____

17. If you are not presently moonlighting would you if the opportunity arose:

yes [ ] no [ ]

18. What type of moonlighting are you involved in:

A. Farming or agriculture related [ ]
B. Industrial worker [ ]
C. Construction worker [ ]
D. Sales and marketing [ ]
E. Clerical [ ]
F. Other. Explain briefly [ ]

_____
_____

18 A. Are you self-employed: yes [ ] no [ ]

19. How many years have you been involved in moonlighting either during the school year or summer months:

A. 0-4 [ ]
B. 5-9 [ ]
C. 10-14 [ ]
D. 15-19 [ ]
E. over 20 [ ]

20. What is the approximate income you receive from your supplemental job per year:

A. $500-1,499 [ ]
B. $1500-2,499 [ ]
C. $2500-3,499 [ ]
D. over $3500 [ ]

21. Would you continue moonlighting if teaching salaries were raised to the equivalent income of both jobs:
yes [ ] no [ ]

(22) Would you discontinue moonlighting during your contractual work if teaching salaries were raised to meet your economic needs:
yes [ ] no [ ]

23. Do you feel that your part-time job is harder or easier than teaching:
harder [ ] easier [ ]

24. Do you find your moonlighting more or less interesting than teaching:

more interesting [ ]
less interesting [ ]

25. In your opinion does this part-time employment make you more appreciative of teaching:
yes [ ] no [ ]

26. Does this part-time employment make you dissatisfied with teaching:
yes [ ] no [ ]

27. Do you feel moonlighting makes teaching less of a profession:
yes [ ] no [ ]

28. Do you feel this activity is detrimental to your teaching:

A. Not detrimental [ ]
B. Slightly detrimental [ ]
C. Detrimental [ ]
D. Extremely detrimental [ ]

29. Do you feel this activity is of benefit to your teaching:

A. Of no benefit
B. Slightly beneficial
C. Very beneficial [ ]
D. Extremely beneficial [ ]

30. Do you feel the Board of Education should regulate the part-time employment of teachers:
yes [ ] no [ ]

VITA

Terry Randall Acuff was born in Knoxville, Tennessee, on March 11, 1956. He attended elementary school in Grainger County and was graduated from Rutledge High School in May 1974.

In 1976 he received his Associate of Science degree from Walters State Community College. In 1979 he graduated with honors from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, with a Bachelor of Science degree in industrial education. In 1982 he began his graduate studies in industrial education at The University of Tennessee.

In the fall of 1979, he was employed by the Grainger County Board of Education as a teacher at Rutledge High School. He is presently still in the same position and also the head football coach at the high school.

He is married to the former Gage Harrell. They have two children, Andy, age 5, and Katy, age 3.