

Gender Differences In Multiple Jobholding: Moonlighting Among Teachers

Stephen C. Betts, (E-mail: betts@wpunj.edu) William Paterson University

Abstract

Moonlighting can be considered an alternative source of work-related outcomes for the individual. This is especially true for occupations which are known to have high rates of multiple jobholding, such as uniformed professions (police, firefighters), medical fields (nursing, physicians) and teachers and therefore warrants study by organization and occupation researchers. In this paper the findings of a recent multiple jobholding survey of 312 k-12 teachers are reported. Among the findings are differences in the patterns of moonlighting behavior between female and male teachers. These differences include the prevalence, pay and type of moonlighting activity.

Introduction

Organization studies often address jobs and job related topics with the underlying assumption that ‘the job’ is the employee’s only employment. Rarely do we find an explicit statement acknowledging the possibility of multiple-jobholding. Yet, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that 5.9% of workers in the US were multiple jobholders in May of 1999 (BLS, 1999) and there is considerable reason to believe that the actual rate is much higher (Baba & Jamal, 1992; Crawford, 1978; Jamal, 1986). Indeed, multiple-jobholding, or ‘moonlighting’, is a widespread phenomenon that has largely been overlooked in organization studies (Baba & Jamal, 1992; Jamal, 1986).

Moonlighting warrants attention by organization scholars because it provides workers with an alternative source of valuable work related outcomes such as income, training, and benefits (Factor, 1991; Henry & Rogers, 1986). It also potentially changes their perceptions, decisions, and behaviors, and may impact their performance, absenteeism and turnover at their primary jobs (Aebi, 1998; Davey & Brown, 1970; Habbe, 1957). With such potential effects, organization researchers are sure to benefit by considering the impact of moonlighting on the constructs and relationships they are studying.

Multiple Jobholding (Moonlighting)

Moonlighting is commonly understood as having a second job in addition to a primary job. In addition, it is assumed that the primary job is usually a full-time job. From the mid 1956 to 1966 the overall rate of moonlighting was relatively steady, ranging from 4.5% to 5.7% according to Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reports (Hamel, 1967; Perrella, 1970). From January, 1994, to January, 2004, the overall moonlighting rate has fluctuated from a low of 5.2% to a high of 6.6% with the most recent rate 5.2% (January, 2004).

The rates of moonlighting reported in empirical studies of moonlighting since the early 1960’s have consistently been much higher than government estimates (Baba & Jamal, 1992). The rates for mixed occupations/ blue-collar/ rank-and-file workers found in studies done in the 1960’s, range from 10.3% (Wilensky, 1963) to 14.2% (Mott, 1965). These rates are well above the official government estimates for the time of 4.5 - 5.7%. Studies in the 1980’s, show a much higher rate than the BLS reported among mixed occupations/ blue-collar/ rank-and-file workers of between 15.3% (Jamal & Crawford, 1981) and 20.9% (Dempster-McClain & Moen, 1989). The BLS estimates for the time went as high as 6.2% in 1989.

Although most of the moonlighting research published has used samples from the United States, moonlighting is an international phenomenon. Canada and Great Britain, two countries that are culturally and economically similar to the United States (Hofstede & Bond, 1983), show moonlighting statistics quite similar to those found in the US. In addition to Great Britain, the rest of Europe also experiences moonlighting. A recent Institute of German business study reported in the *Futurist* (1997) shows that moonlighting has been on the rise in Europe, doubling in 10 years. Sweden shows the highest rate at 8.3%, then Denmark 5.7%, Portugal 5.6% to Italy, which was the lowest at 1.3%. In short, moonlighting is a pervasive and international phenomenon.

The Impact of Multiple Jobholding

The popular and practitioner presses reveal general issues that concern employers regarding multiple jobholding. Many organizations have policies, either implicit or explicit, that restrict or encourage multiple jobholding activity (Davey & Brown, 1970). The widespread implementation of such policies indicates considerable concern on the part of organizations

The most common policies adopted by organizations regarding multiple jobholding are designed to eliminate conflicts of interest (Davey & Brown, 1970). Restrictions against working for a competitor, supplier or customer are implemented to minimize the possible disclosure of proprietary information or unfair preferences and favoritism towards certain firms or individuals (Davey & Brown, 1970; Miller, Balkin & Allen, 1993).

Organizations also adopt policies against controversial activities that can do damage to the reputation, create a legal liability or otherwise cause a loss for the organization. Some employers restrict employee involvement with advocacy groups involved in political or social causes because the employee's involvement might create an association between the cause and the primary employer. The primary employing organization is concerned that its reputation might be damaged (Miller, Balkin & Allen, 1993). Although explicit restrictions are unnecessary, employers are also concerned with employees engaging in illegal activities. In addition to damage to their reputation, they are concerned with legal liability due to an association with the employee, or face a loss if the employee is unable to work because of legal troubles (Davey & Brown, 1970; Miller, Balkin & Allen, 1993).

Organizations are also concerned with performance problems and inappropriate use of company resources associated with multiple jobholding. Performance problems dealing with the quality or quantity of an employee's work, and habitual absenteeism are believed to be among the best indicators to an employer that employees are moonlighting (Habbe, 1957). Employers are often concerned that employees are moonlighting on company time (Crawford, 1978) or while on sick leave (Habbe, 1957). They are also concerned with employees using materials, supplies (Crawford, 1978) and intellectual property.

Several occupations have unusually high rates of multiple jobholding. These occupations have dynamics and issues, which are not generalizable to other occupations. Teaching, medical residency, information systems and uniformed professionals are four such fields, which will briefly be recapped.

Teaching is the profession with the highest rate of moonlighting (BLS, 2001; Divocky 1978a). The common conclusion is that teachers hold multiple jobs in order to stay in a profession where they are underpaid (Divocky, 1978b; Guthrie, 1969; Turner, 1962; Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987). There is a greater acceptance of multiple jobholding among police officers and firefighters than other occupations because of a long history and tradition of moonlighting activity (Miller, Presley & Sniderman, 1973). A newer field where multiple jobholding is common is the information services area. In this area the primary moonlighting activities are entrepreneurial efforts to develop commercial products on the side and the primary concern of employers is the loss of intellectual property (Fafard, 1997; LaPlante, 1996; Whitford, 1998).

Medical residency is the occupational situation where moonlighting has generated the most controversy. Medical residents take on additional jobs because of the enormous financial burdens of medical school (Bazzoli & Culler, 1986; Buch & Swanson, 1986; Cohen, Conley & Henderson, 1987; Culler & Bazzoli, 1985). The financial concerns of the residents compete with residency program's concern that multiple jobholding compromises the

effectiveness of the health services and reduces the learning potential of the residency experience (Bazzoli & Culler, 1986; Buch & Swanson, 1986; Culler & Bazzoli, 1985; Moss, 1985).

Despite concern on the part of employers regarding the impact of multiple jobholding, there has been very little research regarding these issues conducted by organization researchers. A recent review cited (Betts, 2002) cited only 34 published empirical studies between 1963 to 1998. The research was primarily presented in economics or occupation specific journals, and many were descriptive in nature.

Academic Research into Moonlighting

There has been surprisingly little empirical research into moonlighting, given the prevalence of the activity. There are several theoretical frameworks that have been explored in multiple or single studies. These frameworks can be grouped into two general categories, economic/financial approaches and individual/dispositional approaches. The economic approaches assume that moonlighting activity is primarily a source of income. They concentrate on the trade off of free time for wages (Shisko & Rostker, 1976) or the choice between moonlighting and other income supplements under conditions of financial necessity (Allen, 1998; Culler & Bazzoli, 1985; Krishnan, 1990; Lakhani, 1995). The special case of financial necessity resulting from a high number of dependents is addressed in several studies (Dempster-McClain & Moen, 1989; Guthrie, 1965; Guthrie, 1969; Wilensky, 1963).

Financial/economic theories have generally found empirical support, but the support has not been universal. A number of studies had results inconsistent with the economic theories. For example, a number of studies found the primary wage rate to be positively related to the moonlighting rate (Lakhani & Fugita, 1993; Miller, 1972; Miller & Sniderman, 1974; Smith & Cooper, 1967). It might be that these moonlighters may have higher aspirations, be more ambitious and energetic. Their aspirations, ambition and energy result in earning more at their primary job, but they may still need additional income to reach their goals or otherwise value the moonlighting experience. If we consider these explanations, it becomes apparent that the economic theories are not enough. The economic approaches fail to account for dispositional differences between individuals. These differences between individuals were partially addressed during the same time period, but not in studies using financial/ economic explanations.

One of the early individual dispositional explanations for moonlighting behavior was the relative deprivation theory (Wilensky, 1963). Subjective deprivation was found to be “among the best predictors of moonlighting” (Wilensky, 1963). Other research failed to support the relative deprivation theory and chaotic work history ideas.

The idea of deprivation was re-examined about 15 years after Wilensky and Guthrie’s initial studies. A stream of research followed which paired the idea of ‘deprivation’ with ‘aspiration’ as competing hypotheses (Jamal, 1986; Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998; Jamal & Crawford, 1981). Deprivation was reframed as a negative view of the moonlighter. It was a more general concept than in the previous work. Under this theory, moonlighters are economically and socially deprived. The alternative, or the positive view of the moonlighter, was the aspiration hypothesis. Under this theory, moonlighters were special people, with higher aspirations and more energy. The aspiration theory has consistently found more support than the deprivation theory (Jamal, 1986; Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998; Jamal & Crawford, 1981; Mott, 1965).

Reasons Multiple Jobholding is Under-Researched

If the study of moonlighting activity has such potential value to researchers and practitioners, why has it not been extensively addressed? The available literature suggests several reasons. A traditional view of moonlighters is that moonlighters can be viewed as “socially withdrawn and economically deprived” (Baba & Jamal, 1992). If the ‘withdrawn and deprived’ view of moonlighting is accepted, there is no further reason to study the phenomenon. Although there was some early support for this view (Wilensky, 1963), more recent studies have found support for alternative portraits of the moonlighter (Jamal, 1986; Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998; Jamal & Crawford, 1981; Mott, 1965). This view was more prevalent in past generations and is generally not accepted (Baba & Jamal, 1992).

Another reason commonly cited for not studying moonlighting is that it is not seen as a pervasive enough phenomenon to warrant such attention (Baba & Jamal, 1992). One problem with this reasoning is that official government statistics grossly underestimate moonlighting rates (Baba & Jamal, 1992). Another reason for the lack of attention from organizational researchers is that moonlighting activity could be viewed as an occupation specific phenomenon such that findings couldn't be generalized across occupations. For example, the high rate of moonlighting among medical residents is attributed to the high debt associated with medical school and the low pay during residency (Bazzoli & Culler, 1986; Buch & Swanson, 1986; Culler & Bazzoli, 1985; Moss, 1985). The counter argument put forth here is that those occupations with high moonlighting rates do not have unique characteristics, but rather have high degrees of characteristics that generally affect moonlighting. Using the previous example, although debt is unusually high for medical residents, debt is not unique and is generally associated with moonlighting activity (Miller & Sniderman, 1974).

The most valid reason for the lack of a systematic study of moonlighting is the difficulty in obtaining data (Baba & Jamal, 1992). It is exceedingly difficult or impossible to a-priori identify those individuals in a population who moonlight. Another source of difficulty is the notion that some moonlighters may be hesitant to disclose their moonlighting activity (Taylor & Sekscenski, 1982, Perella, 1970). They may be secretive about their moonlighting because it is in violation of a policy of their primary employer, it goes unreported for tax purposes, or a host of other reasons (Perella, 1970; Taylor & Sekscenski, 1982). Additional difficulty lies in the methodology used to gather moonlighting data. Surveys are the primary means of data collection and response rates to surveys are typically low in the social sciences (Sudman, & Bradburn, 1982).

The combination of these three problems- difficulty in identifying moonlighters, hesitancy to disclose moonlighting status, and the low response rates of surveys in general - might make it necessary to start with an exceedingly large initial sample to deal with the risk of getting an insufficient response. Some researchers have tried to deal with these problems by: using a population with a comparatively high incidence rate of moonlighting; guaranteeing anonymity; distributing the questionnaires in the workplace; and aggressively following up and encouraging individuals to respond (Bell & Roach, 1990; Jamal, 1986; Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998; Pearson, Carroll & Hall, 1994; Raffel & Groff, 1990).

Research Question: Is The Gender Of Workers With A Full Time Primary Job Related To Their Multiple Jobholding Status?

The basic idea of multiple jobholding has been around for centuries. However, as a social phenomenon, it would be reasonable to assume the specific role of moonlighting in society changes over time. Empirical research over the past four decades has shown changes over time in the demographics and frequency of moonlighting activity (Amirault, 1997; Stinson, 1986; Stinson, 1990). Given these changes it becomes necessary to establish the current relationship between moonlighting and key constructs that have been explored in the past. The questions in this section address the relationships between multiple jobholding and several key demographic factors for which the previous empirical findings are in question.

The main idea driving a proposed relationship between gender and moonlighting is that men have traditionally been viewed as the primary wage earners.. As the primary wage earners they are expected to do what is necessary (i.e. moonlight) in order to support their families. A great many studies have supported for view by finding that men were more likely to moonlight than women (Buch & Swanson, 1986; Guthrie, 1965, 1969; Miller, 1972; Miller & Sniderman, 1974; Pearson, Carroll & Hall, 1994; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987).

The research findings were strong and consistent for several decades, but there is reason to believe that the relationship between gender and moonlighting has changed in recent years. The government (BLS) statistics have indicated a steady shift in the rate of moonlighting among women throughout the 1980's (Stinson, 1986, 1990), and 1990's such that the moonlighting rate among women surpassed the rate among men (Amirault, 1997). The BLS statistics indicate that the findings of the research studies may no longer hold true.

Methods and Analysis

An anonymous mail survey was conducted during spring 2001. The population that the sample is drawn from is elementary, middle and high schoolteachers in the state of New Jersey. There are several advantages to using teachers for a sample population. Teachers have a high survey response rate (Betts, 2002), have a high rate of multiple jobholding (Betts, 2002), and have often been the focus of moonlighting studies (Bell & Roach, 1990; Guthrie, 1965, 1969; Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998; Miller & Sniderman, 1974; Pearson, Carrol & Hall, 1994; Raffel & Groff, 1990; Santangelo & Lester, 1985; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987). The survey was distributed to 20 schools across the state. Approximately 1400 survey packets were distributed and 312 were returned for a return rate of approximately 22.3%. The schools were selected to include public and private schools of different sizes, purposes (occupational vs. traditional), and socio-economic groupings.

Survey packages (an envelop with the survey, a business reply envelope and a business reply postcard) were either placed in teachers' mailboxes or distributed by the school administrator in a staff meeting. Participation by the teacher required only completing the survey, placing it in the attached business reply envelope and placing it in the mail. In order to insure anonymity, there was nothing on the survey or envelope that could be used to identify either the individual or school. Approximately two weeks after the initial distribution of the survey, follow-up letters were delivered to the schools. The letter thanked those who participated, emphasized the importance of the research and encouraged participation by those who had not yet responded. Precautions have been taken to ensure the integrity of the data and the confidentiality of responses on every step, including secure storage of the filled questionnaires and files with the data.

The research question involved dichotomous variables (multiple jobholding, gender). The appropriate measure of the relationship between two true categorical variables is the Φ coefficient (Glass & Hopkins, 1996, Ch. 7). The Φ coefficient was used for exploring the relationship between gender and multiple jobholding. ANOVA is used to explore the relationship between gender and several additional variables.

Table 1 - Prevalence of Moonlighting

Moonlighting Category	Prevalence in Sample
Job Outside of School System	34.0%
Supplemental Contract	47.7%
Summer Employment	53.2%
all three	14.7%
at least one	76.0%

Results

Prevalence of Multiple Jobholding. The rates of various categories of moonlighting can be found in Table 1. The rate holding a 'Job Outside of School System' during the school year was 34% which correspond to the rate of 35% reported by both Jamal, Baba and Riviere (1998) and Pearson, Carroll & Hall (1994).

Although there was no common definition of moonlighting across studies, one study of teachers in Tennessee closely paralleled the three categories of multiple jobholding used in this study (Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987). In that study, 33.2% held jobs outside the school system during the school year. They also reported 28.6% held a supplemental contract during the school year, compared to 47.7% in this study, and 35.1% had summer employment, compared to 53.2% respectively in this study (Wisniewski & Hilty 1987). The 'outside job' findings are similar, but the supplemental contract and summer employment are higher in this study. This discrepancy at might be partly due to Wisniewsky and Hilty including a fourth category, 22.6% of the respondents reported income from 'self or family owned businesses'.

The multiple jobholding rates reported from our sample of teachers were well above the reported rate across all occupations by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2001) for the same period. This is consistent with previous research, which concluded that teaching was the occupation with the highest rate of multiple jobholding (BLS, 1999; Divocky, 1978a).

Table 2 - Gender versus Moonlighting Status

		Male	Female	Total	Φ coefficient	
		count	count			
Did you have a job outside the school	no	44	159	203	value	4.358
	%	53.7	70.4	65.9	df	1
	yes	38	67	105	Sig.	.037
	%	46.3	29.6	34.1		
	Total	82	226	308		
Did you have a supplementa I contract?	no	39	117	156	value	.60
	%	48.8	52.5	51.5	df	1
	yes	41	106	147	Sig.	.330
	%	51.3	47.5	48.5		
	Total	80	223	303		
Did you have summer employment	no	25	123	148	value	13.26
	%	30.9	54.4	48.2	df	1
	yes	56	103	159	Sig.	..000
	%	69.1	45.6	51.8		
	Total	81	226	307		

Relationships between gender and multiple jobholding The relationship between gender and multiple jobholding has changed over the last 45 years from the rate among men being three times that of women (Hamel, 1967; Perrella, 1970) to being about even by 1989 (Stinson, 1990) and even to slightly higher for women through the late 1990’s (Amirault, 1997; BLS, 1999). The findings of this study (Table 2) and others (Pearson, Carroll & Hall, 1994; Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987) suggest that this trend has not occurred among teachers.

Further analyses of the data suggest that the explanation might lie in gender differences in multiple jobholding and financial need. Outside employment pay and summer job pay were higher (p<.05) for male teachers than for female teachers (Table 3), which might provide a greater incentive for men to take these jobs. Male teachers also had lower (p<.05) spouse’s pay than female teachers (Table 3). This might indicate greater financial need and the increased likelihood of taking on additional employment to supplement income. These two factors together, higher potential moonlighting pay and greater financial need together might explain the gender differences in moonlighting rates. A number of other gender differences were found and are reported in Table 3.

Table 3 - ANOVA – Means and Standard Deviations of Gender by Moonlighting Pay, Selected Variables

	N	Mean	SD	Sig.
# of hours at summer employment				
male	55	31.8	17.8	0.004
female	101	24.4	13.2	
Total	156	27.0	15.3	
summer job pay (\$/week)				
male	53	\$543.06	\$438.74	0.012
female	89	\$389.44	\$279.80	
Total	142	\$446.78	\$354.13	
# of hours per week at supplemental contract				
male	41	12.0	9.9	0.047
female	103	8.7	8.6	
Total	144	9.6	9.1	
supplemental contract pay (\$/week)				
male	35	\$371.66	\$915.15	0.107
female	84	\$179.55	\$378.84	
Total	119	\$236.05	\$591.60	
# of hours at outside employment				
male	39	18.8	16.4	0.000
female	61	8.1	9.0	
Total	100	12.2	13.4	
outside employment pay (\$/week)				
male	35	\$355.57	\$417.26	0.007
female	59	\$182.78	\$190.20	
Total	94	\$247.12	\$305.40	
# of dependents				
male	78	1.45	1.41	0.025
female	217	1.09	1.14	
Total	295	1.18	1.22	
# hours per week spouse works				
male	55	40.5	12.3	0.000
female	126	47.6	11.0	
Total	181	45.5	11.8	
\$ per week spouse earns				
male	49	\$896.88	\$560.47	0.000
female	100	\$1,559.19	\$960.89	
Total	149	\$1,341.38	\$903.87	
Affective Occupational Commitment				
male	82	5.97	0.90	0.002
female	225	6.29	0.72	
Total	307	6.20	0.78	

Limitations

The limitations of this study come primarily from the nature of the sample population. The sample is made up of teachers. Teaching as an occupation and teachers as a group have unusual characteristics (Divocky, 1978a). Unusual characteristics are a limitation because they bring into question the generalizability of the results (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). Among the unusual occupational characteristics are its gender balance, work schedule and pay (Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987).

Teaching is historically a female dominated profession (Miller & Sniderman, 1974). This study supports this notion with 75% of the respondents being female. This study has revealed gender differences in several

important areas such as moonlighting rate and pay. Such gender differences bring into doubt the generalizability of the findings to a more balanced population (Smith & Cooper, 1967).

Teaching schedules typically end earlier than traditional work schedules and teachers have summers off. This truncated work schedule might facilitate multiple jobholding activity and influence the decision to hold another job (Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987). Similarly the typical low pay and traditionally high rates of moonlighting among teachers might influence multiple jobholding decisions (Divocky, 1978a; Wisniewski & Hilty, 1987).

The attitudes of teachers might also threaten the generalizability of the study. In this study, the respondents showed high job involvement, high affective organizational commitment and affective occupational commitment, which is consistent with prior studies of teachers (Jamal, Baba & Riviere, 1998). These attitudes might affect the decision to moonlight, therefore the results of this study might not be generalizable to populations where attitudes are more moderate and with greater variation.

In addition to the characteristics of the sample, the study is subject to the limitations common in survey methods. Among these are memory, honesty, attention and same source errors (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991; Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

References

1. Aebi, M. E. (1998). Forget About Moonlighting- If You Can. *Medical Economics*, 75 (7), 235-239.
2. Allen, W. D. (1998). The moonlighting decision of unmarried men and women: Family and labor market influences. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 26(2), 190-205.
3. Amirault, T. (1997). Characteristics of multiple jobholders, 1995. *Monthly Labor Review*, 120(3), 9-15.
4. Baba, V. V., & Jamal, M. (1992). How much do we really know about moonlighters? *Public Personnel Management*, 21(1), 65-73.
5. Bazzoli, G. J., & Culler, S. D. (1986). Factors affecting residents' decisions to moonlight. *Journal of Medical Education*, 61(10), 797-802.
6. Bell, D., & Roach, P. B. (1990). Moonlighting: The economic reality of teaching. *Education*, 110(3), 397-400.
7. Betts, S.C. (2002) An exploration of multiple jobholding (moonlighting): A multi-level perspective. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 7(3), pp. 72-90
8. Buch, D., & Swanson, S. M. (1986). Moonlighting by psychiatric residents. *Journal of Psychiatric Education*, 10(4), 247-254.
9. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2001) The Employment Situation: November 2001. News Release. *United States Department of Labor*.
10. Bureau of Labor Statistics (1999) The Employment Situation: May 1999. News Release. *United States Department of Labor*.
11. Cohen, R. L., Conley, R. R., & Henderson, P. B. (1987). Moonlighting: A realistic approach. In R. L. Cohen & M. K. Dulcan (Eds.), *Basic handbook of training in child and adolescent psychiatry* (Vol. xviii, pp. 308-320). Springfield, IL, USA:: Charles C Thomas, Publisher.
12. Crawford, R. L. (1978). Moonlighting: New look at an old practice. *Supervisory Management*, 23(8), 2-9.
13. Culler, S. D., & Bazzoli, G. J. (1985). The Moonlighting Decisions of Resident Physicians. *Journal of Health Economics*, 4(3), 283-292.
14. Davey, P. J., & Brown, J. K. (1970). The corporate reaction to "moonlighting". *The Conference Board Record*, 7(6), 31-35.
15. Dempster-McClain, D., & Moen, P. (1989). Moonlighting Husbands: A Life-Cycle Perspective. *Work & Occupations*, 16(1), 43-64.
16. Divocky, D. (1978a). Moonlighting: Occupational habit or benefit? *Learning*, November, 40-45.
17. Divocky, D. (1978b). Moonlighters in Profile. *Learning*, November, 42-43.
18. Factor, R. M. (1991). Moonlighting: What residents do in their free time is their decision. *Hospital & Community Psychiatry*, 42(7), 739-742.
19. Fafard, L. (1997). Who owns your creativity? *Computerworld*, 31(34), 92-94.

20. Futurist (1997). More Europeans Are Moonlighting. *The Futurist*, 31(3), 14.
21. Guthrie, H. W. (1965). Who Moonlights and Why. *Illinois Business Review*, 22, 6-8.
22. Guthrie, H. W. (1969). Teachers in the moonlight. *Monthly Labor Review*, 92(2), 28-31.
23. Habbe, S. (1957). Moonlighting and its controls. *Management Record*, 19(7), 234-237.
24. Hamel, H. R. (1967). Moonlighting - An Economic Phenomenon. *Monthly Labor Review*, 90(10), 17-22.
25. Henry, M. L., & Rogers, L. (1987). *How To Be A Working Actor*. New York, NY: M. Evans & Company.
26. Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 5-21.
27. Jamal, M., & Crawford, R. L. (1981). Moonlighters: A product of deprivation or aspiration? *Relations Industrielles*, 36, 325-335.
28. Jamal, M. (1986). Moonlighting: Personal, Social, and Organizational Consequences. *Human Relations*, 39(11), 977-990.
29. Jamal, M., Baba, V. V., & Riviere, R. (1998). Job stress and well-being of moonlighters: The perspective of deprivation or aspiration revisited. *Stress Medicine*, 14(3), 195-202.
30. Krishnan, P. (1990). The Economics of Moonlighting: A Double Self-Selection Model. *Review of Economics & Statistics*, 72(2), 361-367.
31. Lakhani, H., & Fugita, S. S. (1993). Reserve/Guard retention: Moonlighting or patriotism? *Military Psychology*, 5(2), 113-125.
32. Lakhani, H. (1995). Reenlistment Intentions of Citizen Soldiers in the U.S. Army. *Armed Forces & Society*, 22(1), 117-130.
33. LaPlante, A. (1996, Dec. 2 1996). More than one master (IS employees are moonlighting). *Computerworld*, 30, 88.
34. Miller, G. W. (1972). The extent, characteristics and effects of multiple jobholding in south central Kansas. *Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal*, 9(1), 19-25.
35. Miller, G. W., Presley, R. W., & Sniderman, M. S. (1973). Multijobholding by Firemen and Policemen Compared. *Public Personnel Management*, 2(4), 283-289.
36. Miller, G. W., & Sniderman, M. S. (1974). Multijobholding of Wichita Public School Teachers. *Public Personnel Management*, 3(5), 392-402.
37. Miller, J. L., Balkin, D. B., & Allen, R. (1993). Employer restrictions on employees' legal off-duty conduct (smoking, dating, sexual behavior, and life-style activities). *Labor Law Journal*, 44, 208-19.
38. Moss, A., J. (1985). Moonlighting house officers - Reply. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 312(13), 863-864.
39. Mott, P. E. (1965). Hours of Work and Moonlighting. In C. E. Dankert, F. C. Mann, & H. R. Northrup (Eds.), *Hours of Work* (pp. 76-94). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
40. Pearson, L. C., Carroll, D., & Hall, B. W. (1994). Analysis of demographic, perceptual, and work-related factors in teacher moonlighting. *Journal of Educational Research*, 87(5), 304-308.
41. Perrella, V. C. (1970). Moonlighters: their motivations and characteristics. *Monthly Labor Review*, 93(8), 57-64.
42. Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R. L. (1991), *Essentials of Behavioral Research: Methods and Data Analysis* (2nd edition), New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, Ch. 3
43. Santangelo, S., & Lester, D. (1985). Correlates of job satisfaction of public school teachers: Moonlighting, locus of control, and stress. *Psychological Reports*, 56(1), 130.
44. Shishko, R., & Rostker, B. (1976). The Economics of Multiple Job Holding. *American Economic Review*, 66(3), 298-308.
45. Stinson, J. F., Jr. (1986). Moonlighting by Women Jumped to Record Highs. *Monthly Labor Review*, 109(11), 22-25.
46. Stinson, J. F., Jr. (1990). Multiple Jobholding up Sharply in the 1980's. *Monthly Labor Review*, 113(7), 3-10.
47. Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. (1982). *Asking Questions A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design*, San-Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass p.17-19
48. Taylor, D. E., & Sekscenski, E. S. (1982). Workers on long schedules, single and multiple jobholders. *Monthly Labor Review*, 105(5), 47-53.
49. Turner, E. (1962). Moonlight over the chalkboard. *NEA Journal*, 51(April), 29-30.

50. Whitford, D. (1998, Apr. 27 1998). Confessions of an online moonlighter (office workers with E-mail and Web connections at their fingertips). *Fortune*, 137, 443-444.
51. Wilensky, H. L. (1963). The Moonlighter: A Product of Relative Deprivation. *Industrial Relations*, 3, 105-124.
52. Wisniewski, R., & Hilty, E. B. (1987). Moonlighting: An educational tradition that we can do without. *Tennessee Teacher*, 55(3), 8-11, 30.

Notes