

jobs at school in some professional activity, but other evidence suggests that the most likely explanation is their comparatively low earnings of teachers.⁴ The dual jobholding rate for other male professional and technical workers is high, but less than half that of teachers.

A very high proportion of men employed in protective services (policemen, firemen, and guards) had an extra job in May 1966—1 out of every 6. Their flexible work schedules make moonlighting possible and their relatively low earnings often make it necessary. Other service workers (including barbers, cosmetologists, janitors, attendants, and other workers) also had higher than average moonlighting rates. Men who were managers, officials and proprietors—an occupation group which typically works long hours and whose earnings are generally above average—were least likely to be multiple jobholders. Nonfarm laborers and retail sales workers were also unlikely to be multiple jobholders. Moonlighting rates were generally higher for white than Negro men, particularly among blue-collar and service workers.

ABLE 4.—OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS WITH 2 JOBS OR MORE, AND RATE OF MULTIPLE JOB-HOLDING, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX, MAY 1966

Occupation group	Persons with 2 jobs or more—			
	Percent distribution		Multiple jobholding rate ¹	
	Primary job	Secondary job	Men	Women
All occupations.....	100.0	100.0	6.4	2.2
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	17.8	15.1	8.9	3.5
Medical and other health workers.....	1.8	1.6	8.3	2.1
Teachers, except college.....	5.2	1.8	19.7	3.8
Other professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	10.8	11.6	7.4	4.1
Farmers and farm managers.....	5.5	16.1	9.5	2.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	7.8	10.6	4.2	2.1
Clerical and kindred workers.....	10.4	7.4	6.5	2.1
Salesworkers.....	5.2	8.2	5.4	1.7
Retail trade.....	2.1	4.9	4.4	1.3
Other salesworkers.....	3.1	3.3	6.1	3.8
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	15.8	9.8	6.0	4.7
Operatives and kindred workers.....	17.0	11.4	6.0	.9
Private household workers.....	.7	2.2	(?)	1.1
Service workers, except private household.....	11.7	11.4	9.6	2.7
Protective service workers.....	3.8	1.3	16.8	(?)
Waiters, cooks, and bartenders.....	2.3	3.7	6.4	3.3
Other service workers.....	5.7	6.3	7.5	2.4
Farm laborers and foremen.....	3.2	3.0	6.7	6.2
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	4.9	4.7	4.8	3.1

¹ Persons with 2 jobs or more as percent of all employed persons in occupation of primary job.

² Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

A large proportion of the moonlighters (42 percent) earned their supplementary income as professional and technical workers or managers, or by operating their own farm or nonfarm businesses. Much smaller proportions of the moonlighters were craftsmen or operatives on their second than on their first job. One of the principal differences in the types of jobs held by white compared with Negro moonlighters is that a much larger proportion of Negroes work in lower paying service occupations, including private household service, while a much smaller proportion of Negro moonlighters hold white-collar jobs on either their main or their extra jobs.

The majority of second jobs were in occupations different from the moonlighter's main line of work, but usually within the same major occupation group as their first job. Half the professional and technical workers had a second job in the same occupation group, and half the farm laborers were farm workers on their second job. About one-third of the clerical and the service workers, and one-fourth of the managers and the craftsmen, had second jobs in the same broad occupation groups. On the other hand, the manual skills of farmers and blue-collar workers made a common moonlighting combination. Half the self-employed

⁴ Harold W. Guthrie suggests that the teaching profession is an economically deprived one and men teachers, particularly those who are married with a nonworking wife, must moonlight to maintain a standard of living commensurate with their professional status. See "Who Moonlights and Why?" *Illinois Business Review*, March 1965, p. 8.