



Characteristics and Working Conditions of Moonlighting Teachers: Evidence from the 2011-2012 Schools and Staffing Survey

Paul G. Fitchett, Tina L. Heafner, and Susan B. Harden
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Abstract:

Moonlighting, an employment practice where individuals work outside of their primary job, is popular within the public education sector. Using data from the National Center for Education Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey, this study examined both the characteristics and motivations of public school teachers across moonlighting categories. Findings indicate that teacher characteristics, workplace perceptions, and professional outlook varied across moonlighting type. The likelihood of moonlighting outside of the education sector increased among single, male teachers with high reported burnout and lower salaries. Results have implications for how school leaders and policymakers should view moonlighting inside and outside the education sector.

Keywords: Teacher moonlighting, teacher working conditions, teacher characteristics

APA-Style Citation:

Fitchett, P. G., Heafner, T. L., & Harden, S. B. (2016). Characteristics and working conditions of moonlighting teachers: Evidence from the 2011-2012 schools and staffing survey. *Current Issues in Education*, 19(1). Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/1672>

Accepted: March 17th, 2016

Moonlighting, an employment practice where individuals work outside of their full-time primary job, is a persistent reality for many public school teachers (Pearson, Carroll, & Hall, 1994; Santangelo & Lester, 1985; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Winters, 2010; Yeager, 1956). Yet, despite the persevering nature of moonlighting in the teaching profession, surprisingly little research has investigated the similarities and differences among public school teachers who hold secondary jobs (Ballou, 1995; Winters, 2010; Wisniewski & Kleine, 1984). For example, moonlighting work is not homogeneous; the location, duration, and types of moonlighting work can vary dramatically among public school teachers. Little is understood on how the differences in workplace conditions such as school-type and teachers' perceptions of autonomy, compensation, competency, and satisfaction are related to decisions to moonlight. In discussions about the professional lives of public school teachers, moonlighting has become both an acceptable and a non-controversial practice; a byproduct of a society that is antagonistic toward public workers and encouraging private employment markets (Giroux, 2005).

Research suggests that teacher moonlighting, if contained to the educational sector; helps invigorate teacher practice and might improve workplace performance (Parnham & Gordon, 2011; Raffel & Groff, 1990). However, moonlighting outside of education potentially pushes teachers into other careers and takes time away from work in the classroom (Winters, 2010; Wisniewski & Kline, 1984). In this study, we bring attention and currency to the issue by examining the relationship among teacher demographics and workplace perceptions across various moonlighting typologies. Understanding the potential motivations for moonlighting can aid school administrators and other education stakeholders in determining factors associated with taking on secondary employment and provide further evidence as to which teachers might be drawn to moonlighting inside and outside the education sector.

Literature Review

Demographic Characteristics of Moonlighting Teachers

Teacher working conditions research has long established moonlighting as an employment practice in which a significant number of public school teachers engage. Previous studies indicate that 15 to 35% of teachers hold second jobs (Ballou, 1995; Champion, 2010; Norris & Hecker, 1962; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Wisniewski & Kleine, 1984; Yeager, 1956). Public school moonlighting teachers are more likely to be young, white, single, college-educated males who teach at the secondary level (Ballou, 1995; Pearson et al., 1994; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Winters, 2010; Wisniewski & Kleine, 1984). These common characteristics are likely due to traditional employment opportunities that favor white, males coupled with constrained household responsibilities of domestic partnerships (Averett, 2001). Moreover, married/coupled teachers more often report dual incomes. Increased household income and other familial responsibilities pull (and push) teachers away from moonlighting (Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Smith & Cooper, 1967).

Moonlighting Motivations

The motivations behind teacher moonlighting vary across studies. Wisniewski and Kleine (1984) suggest three factors contributing to teachers' decision to moonlight: financial reasons, professional escape, and apprenticeship prior to quitting teaching. Among financial considerations, there has been substantial debate as to whether salary influences teachers' decision to moonlight. Research indicates that public school teachers believe that the work schedule for teaching provides the opportunity for moonlighting and, therefore, an opportunity to raise living standards (Ballou, 1995; Pearson et al., 1994; Raffel & Groff, 1990; Wisniewski & Kleine, 1984). A number of qualitative and small-scale studies have found that teachers are often pushed into moonlighting due to financial constraints (Hilty, 2008; Parnham & Gordon, 2011). Teachers, unable to live comfortably on shrinking wages, turn toward ancillary employment to provide additional spending money and improve the overall quality of their life. In a recent study using Schools and Staffing data (SASS) from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Champion (2010) found that teachers were less likely to moonlight as their salary rose. Specifically, a one percent increase in salary was associated with a 71% decrease in the moonlighting salary, inferring that providing small workplace incentives will offset the financial necessity or desire to moonlight. In their study of Texas public school climate, Maninger, Edgington, Johnson, Sullivan, and Rice (2011) noted that teachers reported less willingness to moonlight if salaries were increased. These findings run counter to more lucrative occupations. In high paying sectors like medicine, moonlighting can significantly increase overall income and therefore small increases in primary salaries do not offset the desire to moonlight (Dickey, Watson, & Zangelidis, 2011; Saxon, 2015).

Other studies suggest that salary is not associated with moonlighting. In an early analysis of teacher working conditions conducted by the NCES, Bobbitt (1988) reported no association between teacher moonlighting and salary. More complex statistical analyses have also indicated that pay is not significantly associated with a teacher's decision to moonlight (Ballou, 1995; Winters, 2010). However, it should be noted these studies did not differentiate across moonlighting type or separated out from summer teaching, potentially confounding results. To determine whether money was a prominent motivator and if other indicators contributed to decisions to moonlight, Raffel and Groff (1990) divided teacher moonlighters into two categories: willing and reluctant moonlighters. Willing moonlighters reported being more likely to moonlight regardless of a salary increase. Reluctant moonlighters were less likely to moonlight if their salary improved. Their analysis yielded substantial differences between these groups. Willing moonlighters were satisfied with their jobs, remained in teaching, viewed moonlighting as a form of professional development, and often took second jobs within education-related sectors. Reluctant moonlighters were less likely to moonlight within education, more prepared to leave the classroom, and less satisfied as teachers.

Financial incentives are not the sole motivation for moonlighting. Parham and Gordon (2011) reported that moonlighting could offer positive professional affirmations and boosts to self-esteem that are missing in primary teaching positions. Raffel and Groff (1990) found that physicians, working secondary jobs in free clinics, viewed moonlighting as a professional escape from their primary employment, allowing them to practice medicine without the bureaucratic morass associated with their primary job. Moreover, these secondary clinical positions served as ad hoc professional development, preparing doctors for various workplace situations. Similarly, schools may provide ancillary opportunities for teachers to connect with learners in less formalized and potentially rewarding ways. Like doctors who seek secondary clinic jobs, teachers turn to moonlighting as a potential professional fulfillment (or escape) from their primary job responsibilities. Working in extracurricular activities (i.e. coaching, sponsoring organizations, summer camps) provides additional teaching opportunities outside the constraints associated with traditional classroom teaching. Willing moonlighters are more likely tied to secondary employment in educational sectors, signifying that the additional work might serve as a form of professional renewal and development (Raffel & Groff, 1990).

Financial considerations and professional growth are not sufficient in explaining the multidimensional motivations for moonlighting. While willing moonlighters view secondary employment as opportunity for professional growth and exploration, others (i.e. reluctant moonlighters) use moonlighting as a potential path away from education altogether. The current occupational and policy climate toward teaching has been conducive toward this type of moonlighter. Teaching in the age of accountability has contributed to a ratcheting up of bureaucratic intensification that placed greater pressures on teachers (Apple, 2004; Costigan & Crocco, 2007; Hargreaves, 1994). Such perceptions of workplace environment are associated with increased risk for stress, burnout and lowered expectations for remaining in the classroom (McCarthy, Lambert, Fitchett, Lineback, & Reiser, 2015; McCarthy, Lambert, O'Donnell, & Melendres, 2009). In this high-stress context, teachers susceptible to burnout are more likely to distance themselves from their professional responsibilities and colleagues (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Elevated levels of teacher stress and burnout contribute to moonlighting, particularly secondary employment outside the education sector (Blase, 1982; Farber & Wechsler, 1991).

Ironically while the high-stress context of the classroom may encourage teacher moonlighting, studies indicate that second job-holders work longer hours, commute more, and sleep less compared to single job-holders (Marucci-Wellman, Lin, Willetts, Brennan, & Verma, 2014). Consequently, second job holders have higher work-family conflict and may be at greater risk for negative psychological and physical outcomes, like fatigue and injury, when compared to their single job holder counterparts (Boyd, Sliter, & Chatfield, 2015). For moonlighting teachers, the second job may compound the stress effects of the classroom.

Due to schedules, policies, and public perceptions of teachers, other employment opportunities are frequently open to educators who want to test the waters in other job sectors (Champion, 2010; Panos, Pouliakas, & Zangelidis, 2014; Winters, 2010). Additionally, employers interested in hiring individuals for part-time employment often target teachers—providing on-the-job training for disgruntled educators (Wieniewski & Kleine, 1984). Among some researchers, the extent of moonlighting is indicative of the de-professionalization of teaching (Hargreaves, 1994; Wieniewski & Kleine, 1984); whereby, the work of teachers is simply quantified by the number of hours they work a week and the amount of months employed within a year. This measured mindset fails to consider outside the classroom work of teachers including grading, instructional planning, professional development, and skill development. Thus, moonlighting is tacitly encouraged to keep teachers employed in a (semi-)profession that has been historically underfunded and politically undervalued (Betts, 2004; Ingersoll & Merritt, 2011). Under such conditions teachers are simultaneously pushed and pulled out of the education sector (Champion, 2010; Parnham & Gordon, 2010; Raffel & Groff, 1990).

Professional Effects of Moonlighting

The opportunity costs of remaining in teaching vis-à-vis the perceived professional freedom and rewards associated with leaving education are heavily skewed toward the latter (Boardman, Darling-Hammond, & Mullin, 1982; Guarino, Santibáñez, & Daley, 2006). Substantial research indicates that adverse school conditions and inhibited professional autonomy contribute to teacher attrition (Ingersoll, 2001, 2015; Johnson, 2006). In a longitudinal study of Boston-area teachers, Johnson (2004) found that teachers working in difficult working conditions were more likely to leave teaching in favor of the perceived professionalism associated with the private sector. In a study of North Carolina working conditions, Ladd (2011) indicated that working conditions were the most substantial predictors of teacher mobility—the decision of teachers to leave, move or stay in the classroom. As noted previously, research suggests that moonlighters (particularly those moonlighting outside of education) are less satisfied with their working conditions and more likely to leave teaching (Champion, 2010; Raffel & Groff, 1990). For those moonlighting outside of education, secondary employment may serve as both a temporary respite from the constraining environment of many schools, while also providing training for a potential career change.

The relationship between moonlighting and on-the-job performance is more tenuous. The professional effects of moonlighting on teachers differ across studies, suggesting varying degrees of influence job on performance. Robust empirical time studies (Ballou, 1995; Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Parham & Gordon, 2011; Winters, 2010) produced conflicting evidence of moonlighting effects on teacher performance. Moonlighters indicated that the practice did not harm their professional performance or their personal lives (Ballou, 1995; Smith & Cooper, 1967; Wieniewski & Kleine, 1984).

However, the time and energy placed into moonlighting can potentially have pernicious effects on work attentiveness of teachers. For example, moonlighters tend to spend less time on

school duties than non-moonlighters (Winters, 2010) and are less likely to take on leadership roles within schools (Parnham & Gordon, 2011). Champion (2010) noted that hours spent in moonlighting work inversely related to the amount of non-instructional time teachers reported, suggesting that moonlighters were likely to trade time from their primary job to fulfill secondary job requirements.

The moonlighting typology further complicates the relationship between moonlighting and the effects on teacher performance. Betts (2006) suggested that the key to understanding the motivations and effects of moonlighting is the type of secondary job. Some teachers' moonlighting activities (i.e. tutoring, consultancy) are compatible and perhaps complementary to classroom work; while, in other situations moonlighting detracts from teachers' work. Moonlighting outside of education offers professional outlets and income unrelated to their primary job; thus, possibly compounding teacher stress and fatigue.

Cumulatively, the research indicates that teachers moonlighting within the educational sector often perceive secondary employment as source of professional revitalization, which may improve productivity. Teachers moonlighting outside of education, however, trends toward occupational burnout lower salaries, less commitment to their primary jobs, and an increased likelihood of leaving field. While the aforementioned studies examined the complex motivations and characteristics of teachers who moonlight, little research has parsed out the differences in moonlighting types. In this study, we examined both the characteristics and perceived working conditions of public school teachers across moonlighting categories with particular emphasis on comparing teachers who moonlight inside and outside of education. Examining the unique relationships among moonlighting typologies and work place perceptions helps to inform policies that might leverage moonlighting for the purpose of improving teacher working conditions.

Method

Our research was guided by the following questions:

1. What are the demographics of moonlighting teachers? How do these demographics differ across moonlighting categories?
2. What are the workplace conditions of moonlighting teachers? How do these conditions differ across moonlighting categories?
3. To what extent do moonlighting teachers' professional outlook differ from non-moonlighters? How do these differences compare across moonlighting categories?
4. To what extent are teacher characteristics, workplace conditions, and professional outlook associated with the likelihood that a teacher moonlights?

Data

For this study, we used the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey data (SASS) from 2011-2012. Administered every four years, SASS is the most comprehensive survey of teachers' characteristics, attitudes, and workplace conditions in the United States. We selected for full-time, public school teachers (n=22,990).¹ Because SASS uses a complex inverse probability sampling frame, sampling and replicate weights were included in the analysis to provide accurate national estimates and standard errors for comparison across subgroups. SASS items reported information on additional income from state supplements, merit pay, and extracurricular activities such as coaching. While these additional items include information on supplemental work, they do not capture the traditional definition of moonlighting as paid employment outside the control of the primary employer. Moreover, teachers' primary employment responsibilities are often tied to their extracurricular responsibilities, such as

coaching or serving as band director. We operationalized teacher moonlighting from SASS item, “During the current school year, do you, or will you, earn additional compensation from working in any job outside this school system?” Responses included no, teaching or tutoring, non-teaching but related to the teaching field, or other (non-teaching/education related). The nature of this question allowed us to separate moonlighting as work from school or school district-related work (i.e. coaching, department chair, mentoring, and curriculum specialist). It also distinguished during-the-school-year employment from summer work. From the chosen SASS item, we classified moonlighting into four typologies:

- Non-moonlighters: teachers who do not moonlight.
- Teaching/tutoring moonlighters: teachers who moonlight in traditional teaching capacities.
- Education-related moonlighters: consultants, test-development, textbook sales, district-wide curriculum leaders, non-teacher.
- Outside of education moonlighters: moonlighting outside of the education sector.

Analysis of moonlighter demographics included SASS items: Gender, Marital Status, Early Career Status, and School-level. To examine workplace conditions, we averaged Likert-type items from the SASS teacher climate and attitudes inventory. These averages were then calculated into four scales with the standardized scores of 500 and a standard deviation of 100 for ease of interpretation. The scales include: School Influence ($\alpha = .817$), Classroom Control ($\alpha = .786$), Job Satisfaction ($\alpha = .813$), and Burnout ($\alpha = .763$).² To examine the financial motivations of moonlighting, we included school-related salary. Professional outlook included two variables created from SASS items: Professional Retrospection, (would teach; would not teach), and Professional Intentions (stay in teaching; leave teaching).³ Lastly, we standardized all scale scores and reported salary to ease the interpretation of the multinomial logistic regression model described in the subsequent section.

Analysis

We examined descriptive statistics for each of the aforementioned characteristics and professional outlook variables across teachers’ reported moonlighting behavior. We conducted ANOVA to analyze mean differences across each of the five reported dimensions of workplace conditions by moonlighting behavior. We used multinomial logistic regression to examine the change in odds of teacher moonlighting across each of the moonlighting typologies associated with teacher characteristics, attitudes, and professional commitment. Per NCES recommendations, Balanced Repeated Replication method was employed in order to calculate means and standard errors that allow for nationally representative generalizability.

Results

Demographics of Moonlighting Teachers

According to SASS generalizable findings, approximately 19% of US public school teachers moonlight (see Table 1). Teaching/tutoring moonlighters comprise approximately 5% of the total teachers and 26.3% of all moonlighters. The odds of moonlighting as a teacher are 1:19. Education-related moonlighters make up the smallest group, 4% of the teachers and 21.2% of all moonlighters. The odds of moonlighting in education (but not teaching) are 1:24. Outside of education, moonlighters represent approximately 10% of the total teaching workforce and 53% of the moonlighting population; making the odds of moonlighting outside of education 1:9. Approximately, one-quarter of the male teaching force reports engaging in moonlighting. Among moonlighting subgroups, over half of the male moonlighters work outside of education. These findings confirm previous research, suggesting males tend to moonlight more frequently than

women (Bobbitt, 1988; Champion, 2010). Conversely, moonlighting women are more likely to engage in job-related secondary employment. A greater proportion of females reported moonlighting as teachers or tutors (31.5 %). Non-coupled teachers reported a greater frequency of moonlighting compared to married/partnered teachers, again supporting previous findings that moonlighters tended to be single (Dickey et al., 2011; Smith & Cooper, 1967). Early career (first-five years) did not report moonlighting in substantially greater percentages as compared to more experienced teachers. However, when early career teachers do moonlight, a greater proportion found secondary work outside of education. Over half of early career teachers (56%) moonlight in non-educational jobs. In contrast, more experienced teachers engaged in a higher percentage of teaching/tutoring moonlighting opportunities. High school teachers indicated secondary employment in greater percentages than other grade bands. Yet among moonlighters, high school teachers reported instances of moonlighting outside of education less frequently. Teachers in elementary or combined grade bands were more likely to indicate non-education related secondary employment.

Table 1
Teacher Demographic Characteristics across Moonlighting Category

| | | | <u>Two-group comparison</u> | | <u>Three-group comparison of moonlighters⁴</u> | | |
|---|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------|
| | | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Tutor, teach</u> | <u>Non-teach, Ed.</u> | <u>Outside Ed</u> |
| | | | <i>n</i> =4,660 | <i>n</i> =18,330 | <i>n</i> = 1,180 | <i>n</i> =980 | <i>n</i> =2,450 |
| <u>Total</u> | Weighted % | | 18.7 | 81.3 | 26.3 | 21.2 | 52.5 |
| <u>Gender</u> | Male | Weighted % | 24.8 | 75.2 | 19.7 | 22.7 | 57.6 |
| | Female | Weighted % | 15.6 | 84.4 | 31.5 | 20.0 | 48.4 |
| <u>Married/Partner</u> | Yes | Weighted % | 17.6 | 82.4 | 25.5 | 22.1 | 52.4 |
| | No | Weighted % | 21.5 | 78.5 | 27.9 | 19.3 | 52.8 |
| <u>Within First Five Years Teaching</u> | Yes | Weighted % | 17.4 | 82.6 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 56.2 |
| | No | Weighted % | 19.0 | 81.0 | 27.2 | 21.1 | 51.7 |
| <u>School Level</u> | Elementary School | Weighted % | 12.3 | 87.7 | 24.9 | 15.7 | 59.4 |
| | Middle School | Weighted % | 17.5 | 82.5 | 26.1 | 19.0 | 54.8 |
| | High School | Weighted % | 21.3 | 78.7 | 27.2 | 23.4 | 49.5 |
| | Combined | Weighted % | 16.8 | 83.2 | 21.1 | 18.9 | 60.0 |

Working Conditions of Moonlighting Teachers

Analysis of working conditions across moonlighting types suggested variability in professional perceptions and attitudes (see Table 2). Similar to Champion (2010), salary was associated with moonlighting. Moonlighters in teaching/tutoring reported higher school-salaries than non-moonlighters. However, teachers moonlighting outside of education reported the least amount of school-based salary. This subgroup indicated approximately \$1600 less (on average) school-based salary compared to non-moonlighters and over \$3500-\$3900 less (on average) than education-related moonlighters. Teachers moonlighting in non-teaching, education-related positions conveyed a higher average school influence and a higher average classroom control compared to non-moonlighters. Non-moonlighting teachers reported the lowest level of classroom control among the typologies. Moonlighters in teaching/tutoring and outside of education indicated significantly less average job satisfaction compared to non-moonlighters. Non-moonlighting teachers noted the highest level of job satisfaction, affirming non-salary motives for secondary employment (Ballou, 1995; Parnham & Gordon, 2011; Winters, 2010). Professional burnout was most prevalent among non-education moonlighters. These findings provide evidence of moonlighting as a potential escape from workplace stress and burnout (Blase, 1982; Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Maslach et al., 2001).

Table 2
Analysis of Mean Workplace Conditions across Moonlighting Category

| Variables | | Not | Tutor, Teach | Non-teach, | Outside Ed. | Contrasts | F | Effect Size |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------|-------------|
| | | Moonlighting (N) | Group (A) | Ed. Group (B) | Group (C) | | | |
| | | <i>n</i> =18,330 | <i>n</i> = 1,180 | <i>n</i> =980 | <i>n</i> =2,450 | | | |
| School-related Salary (\$) | Weighted mean (SE) | 55601.75 (333.93) | 57541.12 (920.99) | 57955.59 (1395.34) | 53988.10 (667.90) | N > C*; N < A* | 6.04*** | 0.003 |
| School Influence | Weighted mean (SE) | 500.50 (1.32) | 489.64 (4.85) | 513.44 (5.95) | 495.64 (4.10) | N > A*; N < B* | 4.09** | 0.003 |
| Classroom Control | Weighted mean (SE) | 498.69 (1.34) | 503.99 (4.87) | 520.35 (5.41) | 500.65 (4.125) | N < B*** | 5.24** | 0.002 |
| Job Satisfaction | Weighted mean (SE) | 501.90 (1.66) | 488.05 (5.36) | 501.50 (5.24) | 489.30 (4.15) | N > A,C** | 5.34** | 0.002 |
| Teacher Burnout | Weighted mean (SE) | 497.09 (1.59) | 506.72 (7.40) | 504.17 (5.78) | 519.07 (4.17) | N < C*** | 9.25*** | 0.004 |

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Professional Outlook of Moonlighting Teachers

Examination of professional outlook variables indicated that non-education moonlighters reported displeasure with their teaching career choice and intention to leave the field more frequently than other categories of moonlighting (see Table 3). Among the subgroups, non-moonlighters reported in greater frequency compared to the moonlighting subgroups that they

would more likely choose to teach retrospectively. Non-moonlighters also noted an intention to stay in teaching more frequently than moonlighters. These reported discrepancies are most profound when examining the moonlight outside of education subgroup. Over 40% of teachers moonlighting outside of education would not teach if given the opportunity again. Almost a third of these teachers (32%) indicated intentions to leave teaching. Thus, when moonlighting is reported in non-education related jobs, it is associated with professional regret and attrition.

Table 3

Teacher Professional Outlook Characteristics across Moonlighting Category

| | | | <u>Moonlighting Category</u> | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | <u>No</u> <u>Moonlighting</u> | <u>Tutor,</u> <u>teach</u> | <u>Non-teach,</u> <u>Ed.</u> | <u>Outside</u> <u>Ed</u> |
| | | | <i>n</i> =18,330 | <i>n</i> = 1,180 | <i>n</i> =980 | <i>n</i> =2,450 |
| <u>Professional</u> <u>Retrospection</u> | Would teach | Weighted % | 66.9 | 65.2 | 64.7 | 58 |
| | Would not teach | Weighted % | 33.1 | 34.8 | 35.3 | 42 |
| <u>Professional Intention</u> | Intend to stay teaching | Weighted % | 74.2 | 72.1 | 71.8 | 68.1 |
| | Intent to leave teaching | Weighted % | 25.8 | 27.9 | 28.2 | 31.9 |

Relationship among Working Conditions, Teacher Characteristics, and Professional Outlook on Teachers' Likelihood to Moonlight

As a final step, we examined the association among teacher characteristics, working conditions, and professional outlook on the change in odds associated with moonlighting outside of education. Previous research suggests that teachers reported working conditions, including teachers' control over the classroom and school influence, are associated with job satisfaction (Liu & Ramsey, 2008; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Bi-serial correlations conducted *a priori* to the multinomial logistic regression indicated substantial correlation between job satisfaction and the other working condition predictors. Because of multicollinearity concerns, job satisfaction was not included in the model. In this analysis, goodness-of-fit tests revealed a significant relationship among the independent and dependent variables [$\chi^2(3060)=6.903, p <.001$].

Multinomial logistic regression results indicate substantial variability among working conditions, teacher characteristics, and professional outlook associated with the odds of moonlighting across each of the categories (see Table 4). Holding other variables constant, males were more likely to moonlight outside of teaching. Males were associated with a 2.23 times increase in the odds of moonlighting outside of teaching compared to not moonlighting. Conversely, married/coupled teachers were associated with a decrease in the likelihood to moonlight across each of the categories. Findings were most pronounced and statistically significant when comparing non-moonlighters to moonlighters in teaching and non-education

moonlighters. Teachers with spouses or partners were associated with a 28% decrease in the odds of moonlighting outside of education and a 33% decrease in the odds of moonlighting in teaching. Elementary teachers were associated with a decrease in the odds of moonlighting in teaching capacity. Interestingly, salary was only associated with the odds of moonlighting outside of teaching. Results indicate each standard deviation increase in salary correlated with a 13% times decrease in the odds of moonlighting outside of education.

Among perceived working conditions, teachers' reported influence over school-level decisions was associated with a decrease in the odds of moonlighting in teaching. Curiously, teachers' reported control over their classroom was significantly associated with an increase in the odds of moonlighting at each of the three categories. Each standard deviation increase in teachers' perceptions of classroom control was associated with a 26% increase in the odds of a teacher moonlighting in education. Teachers' reported attitudes symptomatic to occupational burnout were associated with increases in the odds of moonlighting in non-teaching categories. Each standard deviation increase in reported burnout was associated with a 19% times increase in the odds of moonlighting outside of education altogether. When controlling for demographics and working conditions, indicators of professional outlook were not significantly associated with change in odds of moonlighting across each of the categories

Table 4
Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses across Moonlighting Classification

| Parameter | <u>Moonlight in Teaching</u> | | | <u>Moonlight in Education</u> | | | <u>Moonlight Outside of Education</u> | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| | b | SE | Exp(b) | b | SE | Exp(b) | b | SE | Exp(b) |
| Constant | -2.46*** | 0.125 | 0.085 | 3.135*** | 0.154 | 0.043 | 2.252*** | 0.108 | 0.105 |
| Male | 0.092 | 0.129 | 1.096 | 0.641*** | 0.122 | 1.898 | 0.804*** | 0.1 | 2.234 |
| Married/Partner | -0.395** | 0.147 | 0.674 | -0.202 | 0.15 | 0.817 | -0.328** | 0.097 | 0.720 |
| Within first five years | -0.289 | 0.174 | 0.749 | 0.023 | 0.182 | 1.023 | -0.164 | 0.109 | 0.849 |
| Elementary School Teacher | -0.528* | 0.229 | 0.590 | -0.591 | 0.441 | 0.554 | -0.191 | 0.195 | 0.826 |
| School-related earnings (Z) | 0.074 | 0.054 | 1.077 | 0.107 | 0.08 | 1.113 | -0.137** | 0.048 | 0.872 |
| Teacher burnout (Z) | 0.099 | 0.125 | 1.104 | 0.165* | 0.07 | 1.179 | 0.175*** | 0.048 | 1.191 |
| School Influence (Z) | -0.134* | 0.06 | 0.875 | 0.07 | 0.065 | 1.073 | -0.037 | 0.047 | 0.964 |
| Classroom control (Z) | 0.119* | 0.057 | 1.126 | 0.23** | 0.07 | 1.259 | 0.098* | 0.046 | 1.103 |
| Would not be a teacher | -0.073 | 0.168 | 0.930 | -0.015 | 0.144 | 0.985 | 0.125 | 0.098 | 1.133 |
| Intend to leave teaching | 0.066 | 0.189 | 1.068 | 0.116 | 0.134 | 1.123 | 0.132 | 0.089 | 1.141 |

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. (Z) denotes standardized scale.

Implications

Findings from this study suggest variability in teachers' characteristics, attitudes, and perceptions across moonlighting category. Understanding who moonlights and the perceived working conditions of those who take on secondary jobs has the potential to inform how teachers work and serve to better understand factors that contribute to teacher retention and attrition. The following sections detail how the aforementioned results shed light on who moonlights, provide more detail on the working conditions of moonlighters, consider the career trajectory and

occupational commitment of moonlighters, and suggest the potential for within-school moonlighting as an option to improve teachers' professional fulfillment.

Understanding Who Moonlights

Among teachers' characteristics, results indicate substantial differences between moonlighters and non-moonlighters particularly among gender and marriage/coupling status. The propensity for singles and males to moonlight has, to our knowledge, never been fully examined. Further research could shed light into the motivations for higher frequency of moonlighting men. In addition, early career teachers (less than five years experience) are most likely to moonlight outside of education. This finding is troubling in that the first years of teaching are particularly formative and help educators establish their identity in the classroom (Hargreaves, 2005; Johnson, 2004; Katz, 1972). Outside of education sector work has the potential to distract teachers and take away from their professional growth.

Perceived Workplace Conditions of Moonlighters

In addition, findings suggested significant differences across moonlighting type when considering various working conditions. Outside education moonlighters were associated with lower pay, less job satisfaction, and a greater risk for teacher burnout compared to other moonlighters and non-moonlighting subgroups. Moonlighting teachers, across typologies, were less likely to remain in teaching or retrospectively consider teaching if given the chance. In particular, those moonlighting outside of education reported less commitment to remain in teaching or consider teaching a good decision. These findings are perhaps indicative of the different motivations for outside education moonlighting and highlight potential risks associated with this form of supplemental work. Furthermore, motives for moonlighting also provide evidence of workplace differences that drive teachers to seek secondary employment. Findings parallel previous research, which has suggested that out of the field moonlighters are often pulled away from teaching (Betts, 2006).

When considering a more multinomial logistic regression model, findings are more complex. Results indicate that gender/family dynamics influence teachers' decisions to moonlight outside of education. Considering that moonlighting takes away from leisure time with family (Ballou, 1995), families and domestic couples might be less likely to moonlight in non-education fields. Males, interestingly, were more likely to moonlight than females, similar to previous studies (Ballou, 1995; Winters, 2010). Respondents making less money in their teaching job were more likely to moonlight outside of education. This finding suggests that lower paid teachers sought outside moonlighting opportunities in order to increase their standard of living (Betts, 2004, 2006). Interestingly, teachers who reported greater classroom control were associated with an increase in moonlighting across each of the typologies. Increased odds were most pronounced among teachers who reported moonlighting in teaching and in education. Previous research has found that teachers' who report higher levels of classroom control were associated with a greater sense of professional empowerment (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Perhaps, teachers' reported control over the classroom indicates a level of acclimation to the teaching profession that induces teachers to pursue additional career possibilities. Increased reported teacher burnout was associated with a significantly greater likelihood in moonlighting outside of traditional teaching categories. As noted in prior studies (cf. Parnham & Gordon, 2011), teachers occasionally moonlight for additional professional fulfillment. However, high teacher burnout coupled with outside work distractions may take away from the teacher productivity and can have negative consequences on job performance (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). Salary differences were also linked to moonlighting typology. Teachers who

moonlight outside of education reported significantly lower in-school salaries compared to their non-moonlighting peers. Providing more within-profession moonlighting opportunities will perhaps not only keep teachers occupationally content, but also alleviate financial burdens. While money alone cannot resolve issues of teacher moonlighting, salary advancement opportunities within educational settings could invigorate workplace environments and reduce outside of education moonlighting. A tangential return on the investment would be advancement in job-related knowledge and skills necessary related to teaching and learning.

Moonlighters Professional Outlook

The relationship between moonlighting and teachers' professional outlook is less clear. Descriptive analysis indicates that teachers who moonlight across each of the three categories are more likely to consider leaving teaching and regret their decision to teach in greater numbers than non-moonlighters. The least likely to considering staying in the profession and the most regretful are teachers finding secondary work outside of education. Moonlighting outside of the education sector might serve as a professional barometer as to teacher job satisfaction and commitment to the profession. Yet, little is understood as to whether moonlighting is a response to poor working conditions or a contributing factor of poor working conditions. As educational leaders develop strategies to improve school climate, it is important that the frequency and extent of moonlighting is considered. Moreover, additional research is needed to explore to what extent are teachers pushed out of the classroom by working conditions or pulled toward private sector jobs that offer higher salaries and a better workplace climate.

Leveraging the Potential for Within-School Moonlighting

As one potential solution to curtail outside of education moonlighting, education leaders should consider policies that encourage more in-school supplemental employment. Findings illustrate that teachers who moonlight in education, non-teaching positions reported more classroom control and school influence, suggesting that those teachers who were moonlighting within the education sector (but outside the traditional parameters of a classroom teacher) perhaps have secondary occupations that offer greater overall responsibilities compared to their counterparts. Teachers who feel valued and remain vested in the interest of the school are more likely to remain in teaching and potentially improve the overall school climate. Creating opportunities for professional leadership that includes financial compensation may incentivize teachers to take on additional roles and responsibilities while potentially diminishing the risk for occupational stress. Unfortunately, teaching remains one of the only careers that provides little opportunities for professional advancement, unless leaving the field altogether for positions in administration. With scant openings for promotion, many educators seek additional career challenges and leave the classroom; potentially depleting the workforce of quality teachers.

Similar to Raffel and Groff's (1990) category of the "willing moonlighter," school leaders should embrace a moonlighting culture or an expansion of duties that complements rather than conflicts with teachers on-the-job responsibilities. Across the nation, local school agencies have initiated various policies aimed at differentiating leadership opportunities for teachers. Teacher-in-residence initiatives offer opportunities for classroom practitioners to work in teacher preparation programs. These programs connect classroom experts with the academic knowledge and skills of schools and colleges of education, potentially reinvigorating the professional outlook of classroom teachers and recognizing the practical knowledge that teachers bring toward teacher preparation (Kagan, Dennis, Igou, Moore, & Sparks, 1993; Zeichner, 2010). Additional efforts to expand the leadership and professional opportunities for teachers include hybrid teacher leaders and instructional coaches. These positions allocate greater professional

authority to classroom practitioners who supervise, mentor, and plan with faculty peers (Margolis, 2012). Ostensibly, these programs offer high performing teachers a different pathway toward leadership and greater professional fulfillment while keeping them in the classroom. Attempts at fostering hybrid-teaching leaders have been somewhat successful at improving the quality of professional development and increasing teacher job satisfaction (Margolis, 2012; Muijs & Harris, 2006; Taylor, Goeke, Klein, Onore, & Geist, 2011).

Limitations

Self-reported data and social desirability are concerns when using survey data. Nevertheless, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey data (SASS) is accepted as the most comprehensive survey of teachers' characteristics, attitudes, and workplace conditions in the United States. Given that the survey is taken anonymously and numerous controls are put into place in order to safeguard the identity of participants, we are confident that biases associated with survey responses were kept at a minimum. Additionally, in using secondary data, our study is limited in the interpretation of how and why teachers' decide to moonlight. While our analysis allows us to describe the characteristics of moonlighters demographically and in relation to their perceived working conditions, the data are unable to provide appropriate descriptions of what specific secondary employment teachers are pursuing or offer specific reasons for their decisions to moonlight. Future research is need both qualitatively and in large-scale to more accurately explore moonlighting inside and outside the education sector.

Conclusion

This study addresses two central themes: who and in what conditions teachers moonlight. The demographic characteristics associated with this highest probability of moonlighting are: teaching in high schools and being an experienced, male, single teacher. Among moonlighters, most teachers find secondary employment outside of education. The rationale behind teacher moonlighting is linked to workplace satisfaction, emotional drains of teaching (i.e. burnout), opportunities for professional autonomy, and salary supplements. Moonlighting teachers express a more negative professional outlook and are more likely to indicate a desire to leave the profession. These sentiments increase when moonlighting moves from job-related to non-education employment opportunities. Teachers moonlighting outside of education are more likely to earn lower salaries and report higher levels of teacher burnout. These findings raise questions about the school contexts in which teachers work. Further research is needed to examine the link between teacher moonlighting and educational quality.

In conclusion, we recommend that to stem the tide of moonlighting outside of education, school leaders and administrators consider ways to improve the professional atmosphere in their schools, offering opportunities for professional advancement within the field of education that include both monetary incentives and professional reinvigoration. Improving teacher professionalism, including opportunities for intellectual development, autonomy, and financial rewards, has the potential to offset teacher moonlighting decisions, or at the very least, leverage moonlighting's potential to improve the teaching and learning climate

Notes

¹All sample sizes were rounded to the nearest 10 per NCES disclosure regulations.

²School influence items included teachers' reported influence: setting standards for students at the school, establishing curriculum, determining content of in-service professional development programs, evaluating teachers, hiring new full-time teachers, setting discipline policy, and deciding how the school budget will be spent. Classroom control items included teachers' reported control over: selecting textbooks and other materials, selecting content, topics, and skills taught, selecting teaching techniques, evaluating and grading students, disciplining students, and determining the amount of homework to be assigned. Job satisfaction items included teachers' reported: overall

satisfaction, belief that the teachers at the school are satisfied, and belief that the school is well run. Burn-out items include teachers' report: that stress and disappointments at school are not worth it, they would leave for a higher job as soon as possible, they do not have the enthusiasm to teach, and they think about staying home because they are too tired to teach.

³ The item for professional retrospection was: "If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?" For ease of interpretation, responses were collapsed into two categories: would become a teacher and probably become a teacher to would teacher and chances are even for and against, probably would not, and certainly would not to would not teacher. The item for professional intention was how long do you plan to remain in teaching. For ease of interpretation, responses were collapsed into two categories: as long as I am able/until eligible for retirement/until retirement for another job/until social security benefits as intend to stay teaching and all other categories as intend to leave teaching.

⁴50 cases were removed from the between moonlighting group analysis due to missing data.

References

- Apple, M. W. (2004). Controlling the work of teachers. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (3rd ed.) (pp. 183-198). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Averett, S. L. (2001). Moonlighting: Multiple motives and gender differences. *Applied Economics*, 33(11), 1391-1410. doi:10.1080/00036840010007957
- Ballou, D. (1995). Causes and consequences of teacher moonlighting. *Education Economics*, 3(1), 3-18. doi: 10.1080/0964529950000032
- Betts, S. C. (2004). Gender differences in multiple job holding: Moonlighting among teachers. *Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 2(8), 25-34. doi:10.19030/jber.v2i8.2908
- Betts, S. C. (2006). The decision to moonlight or quit: Incorporating multiple jobholding into a model of turnover. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 10(1), 63-78.
- Blase, J. J. (1982). A social-psychological grounded theory of stress and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 93-113. doi:10.1177/001316x82018004008
- Boardman, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., & Mullin, S. P. (1982). A framework for the analysis of teachers' demand and supply. *Economics of Education Review*, 2(2), 127-155. doi:10.1016/0272-7757(82)90038-3
- Bobbitt, S. A. (1988). *Moonlighting among public school teachers: Survey report* (No. CS-89-119). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Boyd, E. M., Sliter, M. T., & Chatfield, S. (2015). Double trouble: Work-family conflict and well-being for second job holders. *Community, Work & Family*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/13668803.2015.1074545
- Champion, S. (2010). *Increased accountability, teachers' effort, and moonlighting* (Working paper). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Graduate School of Business.
- Crocco, M. S., & Costigan, A. T. (2007). The narrowing of curriculum and pedagogy in the age of accountability. Urban educators speak out. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 512-535. doi:10.1177/0042085907304964
- Dickey, H., Watson, V., & Zangelidis, A. (2011). Is it all about money? An examination of the motives behind moonlighting. *Applied Economics*, 43(26), 3767-3774. doi:10.0180/00036841003724403
- Farber, B. A., & Wechsler, L. D. (1991). *Crisis in education: Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Giroux, H. A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32(1), 1-19. doi:10.1353/lit.2005.0006

- Guarino, C. M., Santibáñez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 173-208. doi:10.3102/00346543076002173
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (2005). Educational change takes ages: Life, career, and generational factors in teachers' emotional responses to educational change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(8), 967-983. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.007
- Hilty, E. B. (2008). *Teacher moonlighting in North Carolina: Implications for the profession*. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Association for Research, New Bern, NC.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499-534. doi: 10.3102/00028312038003499
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2015). *What impact have accountability policies and practices had on the satisfaction and retention of teachers?* Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Merrill, E. (2011). The status of teaching as a profession. In J. H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds.), *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (4th ed.) (pp. 185-198). Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press/SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, S. M. (2004). *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, S. M. (2006). *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and effectiveness*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Kagan, D. M., Dennis, M. B., Igou, M., Moore, P., & Sparks, K. (1993). The experience of being a teacher in residence. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 426-443. doi: 10.3102/00028312030002426
- Katz, L. G. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 73*(1), 50-54. doi:10.1086/460731
- Ladd, H. F. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of their working conditions: How predictive of planned and actual teacher movement? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*(2), 235-261. doi: 10.3102/0162373711398128
- Liu, X. S., & Ramsey, J. (2008). Teachers' job satisfaction: Analyses of the Teacher Follow-Up Survey in the United States 2000-2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(5), 1173-1184. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.010
- Maninger, R. M., Edgington, W., Johnson, D., Sullivan, S. S., & Rice, M. (2011). Moonlighting and teacher status: What are the implications for professional practice? *The Texas Forum of Teacher Education, 1*, 63-76.
- Margolis, J. (2012). Hybrid teacher leaders and the new professional development ecology. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(2), 219-315. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2012.657874
- Marucci-Wellman, H. R., Lin, T., Willetts, J. L., Brennan, M. J., & Verma, S. K. (2014). Differences in time use and activity patterns when adding a second job: Implications for health and safety in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(8), 1488-1500. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2014.301921

- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.397
- McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., Fitchett, P. G., Lineback, S., & Reiser, J. (2015). Identification of elementary teachers' risk for stress and vocational concerns using the national Schools and Staffing Survey. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(43). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1792>
- McCarthy, C., Lambert, R., O'Donnell, M., & Melendres, L. T. (2009). The relation of elementary teachers' experience, stress, and coping resources to burnout symptoms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109(3), 282-300. doi:10.1086/592308
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 961-972. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.010
- Norris, W., & Hecker, S. E. (1962). Are Michigan educators moonlighters? *Michigan Journal of Education*, 39, 559-561.
- Panos, G. A., Pouliakas, K., & Zangelidis, A. (2014). Multiple job holding, skill diversification, and mobility. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 53(2), 223-272. doi:10.1111/irel.12055
- Parham, J. N., & Gordon, S. P. (2011). Moonlighting: A harsh reality for many teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(5), 47-51. doi:10.1177/003172171109200511
- Pearson, L. C., Carroll, D., & Hall, B. W. (1994). Analysis of demographic, perceptual, and work-related factors in teacher moonlighting. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 87(5), 304-308. doi:10.1080/00220671.1994.9941258
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 37-53.
- Raffel, J. A., & Groff, L. R. (1990). Shedding light on the dark side of teacher moonlighting. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(4), 403-414. doi:10.3102/01623737012004403
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36. doi:10.3102/0002831212463813
- Santangelo, S., & Lester, D. (1985). Correlates of job satisfaction of public school teachers: Moonlighting, locus of control, and stress. *Psychological Reports*, 56(1), 130. doi:10.2466/pr0.1985.56.1.130
- Saxon, J. T. (2015). Moonlighting: Pros and cons for fellows. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 65(2), 214-216. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2014.11.020
- Smith, D. M., & Cooper, B. (1967). A study of moonlighting by public school teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 4(1), 51-58. doi:10.3102/00028312004001051
- Taylor, M., Goetze, J., Klein, E., Onore, C., & Geist, K. (2011). Changing leadership: Teachers lead the way for schools that learn. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 920-929. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.003
- Winters, J. V. (2010). Teacher moonlighting: Evidence from the US Current Population Survey. *Applied Economics Letters*, 17(11), 1111-1114. doi:10.1080/00036840902817524
- Wisniewski, R., & Kleine, P. (1984). Teacher moonlighting: An unstudied phenomenon. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 65(8), 553-555.
- Yeager, W. A. (1956). Teaching is still a part-time profession. *The Nation's Schools*, 57, 61-62.

Fitchett, Heafner, & Harden: Characteristics and Working Conditions of Moonlighting Teachers: Evidence from the 2011-2012 Schools and Staffing Survey

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99. doi:10.1177/0022487109347671.

Author Notes

Paul G. Fitchett
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 29223
704-687-0997
Paul.Fitchett@uncc.edu

Paul G. Fitchett is associate professor of education in the Department of Middle, Secondary, and K12 education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His research focuses on the intersections between education policy, teacher working conditions, and school-related outcomes.

Tina L. Heafner
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 29223

Tina L. Heafner is professor in the Department of Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her research interests include social studies marginalization and policy, teacher autonomy and praxis, online and technology mediated learning, and social studies literacy

Susan B. Harden
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 29223

Susan Harden is an assistant professor in the Department of Middle, Secondary, and K12 Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Her research interests focus on civic engagement in schools and the professional lives of teachers.



Current Issues in Education

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College • Arizona State University
PO Box 37100, Phoenix, AZ 85069, USA

Volume 19, Issue 1

May 2, 2016

ISSN 1099-839X

Authors hold the copyright to articles published in *Current Issues in Education*. Requests to reprint *CIE* articles in other journals should be addressed to the author. Reprints should credit *CIE* as the original publisher and include the URL of the *CIE* publication. Permission is hereby granted to copy any article, provided *CIE* is credited and copies are not sold.



Editorial Team

Executive Editor

Constantin Schreiber

Assistant Executive Editors

Anna Montana Cirell

Niels Piepgrass

Authentications Editor

Tray J. Geiger

Layout Editor

Constantin Schreiber

Copy Editor

Lucinda Watson

**Earl Aguilera
Evelyn Concepcion Baca
James Cunningham
Darlene Michelle Gonzales
Colin Kavanagh**

Section Editors

**Laura Beth Kelly
Tomé Martínez
Priyanka Parekh
Bethany Richmond**

**Lydia Ross
Olivia Stewart
Joseph Sweet
Lori Talarico**

Faculty Advisors

**Dr. Gustavo E. Fischman
Dr. Jeanne M. Powers**
