

MOONLIGHTING: A BITTER TRUTH

Miss Era*

ABSTRACT

Moonlighting is elaborated as the act of working at another workplace except primary job place without telling your employer or boss of the main job about the side job you are working in. Adding more, moonlighting can also be informally called as side job that a person does in addition to their primary job for supplement their income. This is the word which is being in vogue after the pandemic as in the Covid-19 there was no sector left which was not been affected by this great disease. When globally the whole offline work was shut down because of the government restriction then the entry of online work was made to continue our work life. The teaching sector was also the sector which had to be through this phase. Classes, assignments, class test, revisions and even finals were taken online through different online platforms. With the introduction of online work teachers pressure were released to a great extent as teachers now had a lot more time which they can utilise by doing different work as a result many tutors at the pandemic time along with their primary jobs started new jobs in different sectors which included jobs like cooking, sewing, photography, painting, interior designing, handicraft, etc. and some of them even opened their own coaching centres or started tutoring at home. It is also seen that the teachers not only got indulged in moonlighting after pandemic but it is also seen that approximately 75 percentage of this sector were already in secondary jobs before even the pandemic. From here we can conclude that excess time or leisure time is not the only cause of teachers getting into moonlighting but it can be due to numerous reasons such as wanting multiple source of income, change of career, passion, creativity, dissatisfaction with present salary, no security in present job and many more factors are there which too contribute to the moonlighting more deeply. The research paper is original and has collected only primary data from teachers. The analysis is done by using statistical software SPSS and Chi-Square test. This research paper will shadow light on more deep facts and causes of moonlighting. And will further suggest different ways or methods by which moonlighting can be slower down.

Keywords: Covid-19, Moonlighting, Pandemic, Side Job, Teachers.

Introduction

In recent years, proportion of educators working in extra jobs has been increased number fold day by day. This method has been commonly known as moonlighting, which says teachers get distracted from their primary jobs to secondary jobs. This further says that educators do this activity to enhance their salary and improve their living standards. In this sense, teachers split their job timing among teaching and some other forms of employment to generate extra income or to meet their monthly financial commitments. It is seen that the teachers who are employed in government schools in rural areas as seen more indulged in this activity as compared to the teachers who teach in urban areas in private schools.

Moonlighting reflects growing financial stress which has been arising from declining percentage of earning, as well as increased need for the flexibility to coordinate between primary job and other jobs to meet their family and the personal needs.

Kimmel and Conway (2000) explain that approximately 45 percentages of moonlighters highlights economic hardship as the reason for opting the second job. Adding more, moonlighting is a reflection of the choice of workers to pursue for extra income earning activities while maintaining the financial stability which is been offered to them by the primary job.

* Assistant Professor, Shaheed Bhagat Singh State University, Punjab, India.

If seeing moonlighting from the economic terminology, moonlighting raised from the two different reasons: first, many individuals opt for the multiple jobs because of the primary job that limits the individuals earnings capacity and, secondly, moonlighting is also raised because of the salary paid in the primary job may not be completely satisfying an individual and reflect the benefits or cost of the job where the individual is working.

According to Kimmel and Conway (2000), they said that while being in activity of moonlighting an employer forgets the value of leisure time whether the primary job provides a credential to adopt a higher paying secondary job or even the second job provide them with satisfaction which they were not able to receive from primary job. However, the cost and benefit received from the both jobs gets to be more complex and difficult in understanding than the monetary wages paid and hence they may forget value of leisure.

Availability of other alternatives induces moonlighting intentions into employees while providing a comparison of benchmarks by which the teachers can compare with a situation in present company. Since teachers have a very less monthly salary in hand, so because of which they get engaged in tutoring or teaching private tuition classes, they have also been seen engaged in petty businesses which also includes farming, makeup artist, small business, taxi driver, photography, weaving clothes, freelancer, and many more other small businesses comes in this category. Parham (2006) also found out that the teachers who opted for other source of income and business activities which are similar or may be not similar to profession of teaching have a lot impacted both the quality of instruction of teacher and their job performance that they provide. It is not unlikely that a situation like this in whole globe exists and had in one way or another also had affected the teacher's profession as well as the quality of education.

Literature Review

According to Kimmel and Conway (2000) states that approximately 40 percentage of moonlighters report opting of the second job due to the economic hardship. Moreover, moonlighting is the reflection of a worker's choice to pursue of other entrepreneurial activities while maintaining of the financial stability offered by the primary job. By March and Simons (1970) observation, one can identify all the areas where the chances of moonlighting is been more likely to took place. Moonlighting also reflects that growing financial stress which is arising from declining earnings, as well as an increased need for the flexibility to combine the primary job and other jobs to meet family needs and personal needs. Having an extra source of income is neither a new phenomenon nor an uncommon practice among any profession or we can say throughout the world especially teaching (Hakielimu, 2011). According to Reichel and Ramey (1987), a conceptual framework is a set of principles and ideas taken from different fields of enquiry and used to structure a subsequent study. It is a model that includes all key variables that helps to explain the relationships between the different concepts under investigation. Maslow (1943), as cited in Moorhead and Griffin (2004), states that human beings 'want' the things. They have desires that are to satisfy given set of needs. These needs are been properly arranged in a hierarchy of importance, with the most basic needs at the prior level of the hierarchy which is basic physiological needs followed by safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, self-actualization needs. Ofoegbu (2004) found that a teacher needs not only the regular payment of salary and allowance but also they need the right facilities for the effective classroom management and students and for school improvement. According to Anderson (2001) and Galabawa (1981), lack of these things therefore may lead to poor job performance which will further take the organisation to the step of poor productivity. If this is the case teachers' moonlighting also leads to the poor productivity in classroom as an individual teacher directs his performance to multi-activities, and in different organizations, because of which contributing little in each station will definitely results in poor performance in primary job.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to examine teachers moonlighting and its effects on teachers' job performance. The study aims to:

- Investigate that whether educators get paid accurately.
- To know the reason behind opting of secondary job.
- Whether the educators want to remain in teaching sector or not.

Research Methodology

The aim of paper is to know the impact of moonlighting on the teacher's performance and also on the grades of students. The data used in this paper is primary data. The questionnaire was made and got answered from 250 respondents that were in teaching sector amongst which 246 respondents data

was taken for further studies and rest 4 were not stated valid for the research. The statistical methods were used to calculate frequency, mean, median, standard deviation, percentage and others on the SPSS software including Chi square test and ANOVA test.

Finding and Research Analysis

The analysis is done of 246 educators about the moonlighting and the impact on the performance of teacher and students also class as a whole. Below given are explanations of the different factors contributing to the opting of secondary job over the primary job.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Sr. No.	Demographic Variables	Categories	No. of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1.1	Gender	Male	88	36.1
		Female	156	63.9
1.2	Age	Less than 25	28	11.5
		25-30	116	47.5
		30-35	72	29.5
		35-40	28	11.5
1.3	Highest Education	Bachelor	12	4.9
		Master	152	62.3
		PhD	80	32.8
1.4	Marital Status	Single	68	27.9
		Married	140	57.4
		Divorced	28	11.5
		Widowed	8	3.3
1.5	Years Passed in Teaching Profession	Less than 1 Year	51	20.9
		1-3 Years	84	34.4
		3-5 Years	44	18.0
		5-10 Years	24	9.8
		10-15 Years	28	11.5
		15-20 Years	8	3.3
		More than 20 Years	5	2.0

Source: Primary Survey Data

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents and it can be clearly seen that female respondents were more than the men as women were 156 and males were 88. Moving to the age groups mostly people working were seen of age 25-30 following by age group 30-35 and the same numbers of respondents were seen in the group of less than 25 and 35-40. The next section comes up of the highest education done by the respondents mostly teachers were doing their jobs after masters after that of PhD and least of bachelors. And if we see the section of marital status mostly teachers were married with the number of 140 after that single gained second and lastly by divorced and widowed. It is also seen that most teachers joined the respective workplace 3 years back only having the same serial of 3-5 years followed by 5-10 years, 10-15 years, 15-20 years and least were in the more than 20 years bar group.

Table 2: Monthly Salary (in Rupees)*Gender of Respondent

Monthly Salary (in rupee)		Highest Education of Respondent			Total
		Bachelors	Masters	PhD	
10,000-15,000	Count	8	12	4	24
	% of Total	3.3%	4.9%	1.6%	9.8%
15,000-25,000	Count	4	66	4	74
	% of Total	1.6%	27.0%	1.6%	30.3%
25,000-40,000	Count	0	50	20	70
	% of Total	0.0%	20.5%	8.2%	28.7%
40,000-60,000	Count	0	16	20	36
	% of Total	0.0%	6.6%	8.2%	14.8%
60,000-100,000	Count	0	8	8	16
	% of Total	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	6.6%
More Than 100,000	Count	0	0	24	24
	% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	9.8%
Total	Count	12	152	80	244
	% of Total	4.9%	62.3%	32.8%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey Data

Table 2 describes the salaries of the respondents according to the highest education of them that whether the respondents are getting the salaries according to the education they have received this is seen in the table as we can see that the Bachelors get highest 25,000 paid whereas the minimum they get paid is 10,000. Also in another group that is the teachers who have done Masters mostly group of them get paid in the group of 15-25,000 and after that 25-40,000 is common amongst them followed by 14 educators get salary between 45-60,000 also there are only 8 teachers who gets salary between the bar of 80-1,00,000. As seen the educators who have been pursuing PhD or have completed the same gets the salary more than 1, 00,000 also 25,000-60,000 were common amongst 40 people followed by bar of 80,000-1, 00,000. And least in the group of 10,000-25,000 there were 8 educators seen.

Table 3: Retaining of Teachers in Teaching Sector*Gender of Respondent

			Highest Education of Respondent			
			Bachelors	Masters	PhD	Total
Do you want to remain in the teaching field	Yes	Count	9	62	53	124
		% of Total	3.7%	25.4%	21.7%	50.8%
	No	Count	3	28	8	39
		% of Total	1.2%	11.5%	3.3%	16.0%
	May Be	Count	0	62	19	81
		% of Total	0.0%	25.4%	7.8%	33.2%
Total		Count	12	152	80	244
		% of Total	4.9%	62.3%	32.8%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey Data

Table 3 describes that whether the teacher's wants to continue their jobs in the teaching sector or not the surest about the decision of remaining in the same sector were the teachers who have passed their masters followed by PhD and least sure were of Bachelors. Also, the educators who had master's degree were ready to quit the teaching job followed by PhD and Bachelors. The educators who were not sure that if they want to remain in the teaching sector or want to pursue something else the count was seen zero of bachelor's degree holder educators and most were of masters followed by PhD educators.

Table 3: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.879 ^a	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	23.793	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.855	1	.091
N of Valid Cases	244		

Source: Primary Survey Data

Table 3 represents the Pearson Chi-square value or the test static being calculated is 19.879 at 2 degrees of freedom, the asymptotic significance value or P-value is 0.022 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference between retain in sector and their highest qualification" is accepted.

Conclusion

At last it can be concluded that the salaries of the employees and will they retain in teaching sector or not are highly interconnected as the teachers if they don't get the salary that they want then they highly are in the view to leave the job and do the secondary job which is considered to be the process of moonlighting and by which it is also seen that they can start doing some extra work for the financial freedom, status or for skill up gradation. So it is highly advisable that the teachers should get salary which they deserve as according to their highest qualification and then they will never ever think to leave the teaching sector and will try best to excel the most in the sector of teaching.

References

1. Anderson, P. (2001). Job Satisfaction, retrieved on 19th September 2011 from www.cnn.com/2000/career/10/23
2. Bame, K. B. (1991). Teacher Motivation and Retention in Ghana, Accra: Ghana University Press.
3. Bell, B. (1999). Doing your Research Project: A Guide for First Time Researcher in Education and Social science. United Kingdom: Open University Press, McGraw- Hill House.

4. Bennel, P. & Akyeampong, K. (2007). *Teacher Motivation in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia*. London: Department for International Development.
5. Benner, A. D. (2000). *The Cost of Teacher Turnover*. Austin: Texas Center for Educational Research. Retrieved on October 30, 2011 from <http://80-vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/hww/>.
6. Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Person Education, Inc.
7. Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (1998). *Research in Education*. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
8. Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
9. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
10. Creech, W. (1997). *Quality Teachers for quality learning: A review of Teacher education*. Wellington: Crown Copyright.
11. Crowe, P. H. (1978). *How to Teach School and Make a Living at the Same Time*. Mission, KS: Sheed Andrews and Mc Meel.
12. Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
13. Galabawa, J. C. J. (1981). *Determination of Employment in Tanzania: An economic Analysis of Some Aspects of Wage Employment Trends*, Unpublished MA(Ed) Dissertation, The Hague, Institute of Social Studies.
14. Gregory, S. (2012). *Moonlighting: Are you doing it the Right way?* The Citizen Tuesday, 03 April 2012.
15. Gupta, C. B. (1991). *The Process of Management*. New Delhi: V.K. Publishing House.
16. Hanushek, E. A. (2005). *Teachers, Schools and Academic Achievement*. *Econometrical*, 73, 417-458.
17. Henderson, D. (2004). *Moonlight Jobs Listed by Teachers*. Retrieved 6th November, 2011 from http://unx1.shsu.edu/~pin_www/T@S/2000/MoonlightJobs.html.
18. Herzberg, F. (1968). *Work and the Nature of Man*. London: Staples Press.
19. Ishumi, A. G. M. (1982). *Brain Drain as a Dimension of Labour Migration Case: Eastern and Southern Africa*, Oslo: U-Landseminaret.
20. Kimmel, J., & Conway S. K. (2001). "Who Moonlights and Why? Evidence from the SIPP". *Industrial Relations*, 40(1), 89-120. Retrieved 10th August 2011 from: <http://research.upjohn.org/jrn/articles/64/>
21. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods & techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited.
22. Leedy, P. D., & Omrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical Research Planning and Design*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.
23. Lemmer, E. M., & Badenhorst, D. C. (1997). *Introduction to Education for South African Teachers*. Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd
24. Leu, E. (2004). *Developing a Positive Environment for Teacher Quality: Working Paper under EQUPTS Study of School Based Teacher in Service Programme and Clustering of Schools*.
25. Levin, H. M. (1985). *Solving the Shortage of Mathematics and Science Teachers*. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 7, 371-382.
26. Locke, E. A. (1976). *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297- 1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
27. March, J. G. & Simon, H. L. (1970), *Motivation Constraints: The Decision to Participants*, In V. H. Vroom, and E. L. Deci, *Management and Motivation*. Ringwood: Penguin.
28. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Need-Hierarch Theory of motivation*. In R. M. Baron, G. Graziano & C. Stangor (1991). *Social Psychology*, Fortworth, Holt & Rinhartand Winston Inc.

29. National Center for Education Statistics-Elementary and Secondary Education Statistics Division. (1988). Survey report: Moonlighting among Public School Teachers. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education-CS 89- 119.
30. Nayak, A. K., & Rao, V. K. (2006). Classroom Teaching: Methods and Practices. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
31. Ofoegbu, F. I. (2004). Teacher Motivation: A factor for Classroom Experience and School Improvement in Nigeria. *College Student Journal*, 38(1) 1- 4. Retrieved August 5, 2011 from <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles.com/p/articles/mi>
32. Organ, D. W., & Bateman, T. S. (1991). *Organization Behaviour*, Homewood, Richard D. Irwin Inc
33. Orlich, D. C (1968). Information System for Teacher Turnover in Public Schools, US: US Office of Education. Retrieved September 10, 2011 from <http://www.world>
34. Orodho, A. J., & Kombo, D. K (2002). *Research Methods*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University, IOL.
35. Parham, B. S. (2006). Moonlighting: A reality for Many Public Secondary School Teachers. USA, Texas state University San Marcos: Retrieved on 5th August 2011 from <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/eapstad/2/>
36. Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation Research Methods*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
37. People Forum (2011). Moonlighting Teachers Cause Scandal in Hunan: Retrieved on 28th September 2011 from <http://www.peopleforum.cn/redirect.php?tid>.
38. Raffel, J. A., & Groff, L. R (1990). Shedding Light on the Dark Side of Teachers Moonlighting. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12 (4), 403- 414.
39. Reichel, M., & Ramey, M. A. (Eds.). (1987). *Conceptual frameworks for bibliographic education: Theory to Practice*. Littleton Colorado: Libraries Unlimited Inc.
40. Robbins, S. P. (1989). *Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice- Hall.
41. Saracho, N., & Spodek, B. (2007). Early Childhood Teacher's Preparation and the Quality of Program Outcomes. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, 177 (1), 71-91.
42. Smith, J. (1995) Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis. In J. Smith, R. Hare, & L. Van Langenhove, (eds) *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*, pp 9-27. Retrieved on October 15, 2011 from <http://www.arasite.org/nsnarrv2.html>
43. Stephens, C. E. (2001). Report to the Governor on Teacher Retention and Turnover.
44. TAHOSA, (2012). Tanzania Annual General Meeting, Tanzania: Arusha
45. Texas State Teacher Association, (2006). Almost Half of Texas Teachers Could Leave the Profession. Retrieved on 28th August, 2011 from <http://www.tsta.org/>.
46. UNESCO, (2009). *UNESCO and Education*. Paris: Jouve Print Services.
47. Wisniewski, R., & Kleine, P. (1984). Teacher Moonlighting: An unstudied Phenomenon. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 70, 553-555.