International Journal of Academic Research
ISSN: 2348-7666 Vol.2, Issue-3(5), July-September, 2015
Impact Factor: 1.855

Impact of Moonlighting on Individual Performance with Reference to Selected Educational Institutions in Bhimavaram Town, Andhra Pradesh, India

Dr. K.Pavan Assistant Professor, Vishnu Institute of Technology, Bhimavaram, West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh, India
M.RamyaKrishna, Assistant Professor, Vishnu Institute of Technology, West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

The present paper focuses on the impact of moonlighting in the selected educational institutions in Bhimavaram town. It basically focuses on finding the effect of moonlighting on the performance levels of lecturers. It also focuses on how a lecturer will face problems in building his or her career. Study was conducted on lecturers working in various colleges both intermediate and engineering colleges in Bhimavaram with the help of structured questionnaire. In this paper an attempt was been made to identify how age and gender will have impact on the performance factors like work stress, interpersonal relationships, administration relationships, effectiveness in delivery and professional development.

Keywords: Moonlighting, Lectures, Performance factors, Age, Gender, Work stress

Introduction

Moonlighting refers to an individual working in multiple organizations. This is one of the most important problems for any organization as well as for an individual in long run. This may be due to several factors like low salary, poor financial status, dependents, increasing requirements etc. The concept of moonlighting may look good initially but in later cases it may cause lot of problems for both the individual and organization. It may impact the health of an individual by increasing stress and thereby his / her relations with family and other members surrounding him will get impacted. It may also have an impact on loyalty of the individual towards the organization. By moonlighting an individual may not be able to get the benefits like a normal employee in an organization. It may also impact the delivery quality of the lecturer and thereby reduces the effectives of teaching in classes. It will also create a negative image on the individual and thereby it may influence his personal as well as professional life. These points created interest and made us to conduct the study in Bhimavaram area.

Objectives of the study:

- To study how age will impact on the performance factors of an individual.
- To study how gender will have impact on the performance factors of an individual.

Research Methodology:

Area of study: The study was conducted in Bhimavaram town, West Godavari district, Andhra Pradesh.

Sample Size: The sample was selected randomly and analyzed basing on the basis of responses of the 100 respondents.

Research Instrument and Method:

A structured questionnaire was developed to collect the data from the lecturers of both intermediate and

engineering colleges in Bhimavaram. Convenience sampling was been used for the purpose of collecting the data.

Hypothesis:

H_{01}: There exists an association between age and performance factors.

H_{02}: There exists an association between gender and performance factors.

Review of Literature:

One study on teachers who moonlight was conducted in Arkansas by Bell and Roach (1990). The study revealed that 38 percent of Arkansas' teachers moonlight, and that this percentage would be much greater if additional jobs were available. Fifty-one percent of those not moonlighting indicated a need or desire to work at a second job if job were available. Seventy percent of Arkansas teachers either are currently moonlighting or wish to moonlight. Of all Arkansas teachers moonlighting, 88 percent worked because of economic necessity.

A study by Prince (2003) reported that higher salaries effectively attracted more educators to schools with greater needs such as low performing, inner-city schools.

Some experts argue that educator salary deficits can cause significant shortages in highly qualified teachers. Along with this ongoing discussion regarding teacher shortages, some policymakers and teacher advocates have recommended raising teacher salaries. This is consistent with the current empirical research on the various influences tying teacher salaries to student achievement. Teacher quality does appear to have a larger impact on student success than any other school factor (Goldhaber, 2002a; Hanushek et al., 2002).

Current teacher salaries may need to be adjusted to retain quality teachers in the teacher labor force (Kappa Delta Pi, 2005). These efforts may lead to the enhancement of student success and teacher performance, and limit the number of teachers who moonlight to supplement their salaries. This study will explore the relationship between teacher salaries and moonlighting, both in terms of the extent to which teacher salaries are a reason for moonlighting, and the extent to which increased income is perceived as a benefit of moonlighting

In a study by Mertler (2002), teacher job satisfaction was examined through a teacher survey and interview. Research questions focused on the nature and extent of job satisfaction, goals and responsibilities, the importance of subject areas, teachers' relationships with colleagues and administrators, and their perceived balance of professional and personal lives outside of school.

Current research suggests that if a teacher experiences the classroom as a happy, safe, and healthy place with resources and opportunities for maximum learning, then he/she tends to stay involved more in the overall efforts toward the improvement of the entire school (Ofoegbu, 2004).

Strategies for improving teachers' salaries have been utilized for many years, yet little progress has been made (Buckley, Schneider, & Shang, 2005). Improving teacher salaries may or may not influence teachers' decisions to moonlight. This study will explore the relationship between a teacher's salary and the decision to moonlight, as well as how much a teacher's salary would need to increase before the teacher would choose to cease moonlighting.

Analysis and Interpretation:

Table 1: Demographic profile of the respondents:

Demographic Factor	Category by Years and gender	Frequency	Percent
Age	25-35 years	16	16.0
	36-45	38	38.0
	46-60	32	32.0
	>60	14	14.0
Gender	Male	64	64.0
	Female	36	36.0

From the table it is clear that majority of the respondents are in the age group of 36-45 years and 64% of respondents are male and 36% are women. In order to test the relationship between the variables, correlation was calculated and the analysis of the same was presented below.

Table 2 correlation

	Work stress	Effectiveness in delivery	Professional development	Interpersonal relationships	Administration relationships
Gender	-.100	-.003	-.133	**.026**	-.101
Age	**.188**	-.151	.000	**.094**	**.139**

From the above tables it is clear that the correlation coefficient values lies between -1 and 1. If the correlation value is negative it indicates that there is negative correlation between the variables i.e., if one value increases the other value decreases. Positive correlation indicates that both the values move in the same direction i.e., there exists a positive relation between the two variables which will have impact on the study. Out of the values the correlation coefficients with positive values are taken to find the impact of these variables with age and gender. From the correlation analysis we have identified that there exist a positive correlation between gender and interpersonal relationships, age and work stress, age and interpersonal relationships and age and administration relationships. Further analysis was done to identify the association between these selected variables and chi-square test was conducted to study the strength of association and the same was presented below:

Gender * Interpersonal Relationships

Crosstab

			Interpersonal relationships					Total
			Very high	High	Average	Poor	Very poor	
Gender	Male	Count	7	16	13	20	12	68
		% within gender	10.3%	23.5%	19.1%	29.4%	17.6%	100.0%
	Female	Count	5	6	6	5	10	32
		% within gender	15.6%	18.8%	18.8%	15.6%	31.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	12	22	19	25	22	100
		% within gender	12.0%	22.0%	19.0%	25.0%	22.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.227[a]	4	.376
Likelihood Ratio	4.256	4	.372
Linear-by-Linear Association	.069	1	.793
N of Valid Cases	100		

A. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.84.

Since the calculated value of chi square i.e. 0.376 is more than 0.05 we can accept the null hypothesis (H_{01}).

Age * Work Stress Crosstab

			WORK STRESS					
			Very high	High	Average	Poor	Very poor	Total
age	25-35	Count	9	2	0	2	4	17
		% within age	52.9%	11.8%	.0%	11.8%	23.5%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	11	5	10	5	4	35
		% within age	31.4%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	11.4%	100.0%
	46-60	Count	4	4	3	6	6	23
		% within age	17.4%	17.4%	13.0%	26.1%	26.1%	100.0%
	>60	Count	3	7	5	5	5	25
		% within age	12.0%	28.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	18	18	18	19	100
		% within age	27.0%	18.0%	18.0%	18.0%	19.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.380[a]	12	.105
Likelihood Ratio	20.792	12	.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.515	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 13 cells (65.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06.

Since the calculated value of chi square is more than 0.05 therefore we can accept the null hypothesis (H_{02}).

Age * Interpersonal Relationships

Crosstab

			INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS					
			Very high	High	Average	Poor	Very poor	Total
age	25-35	Count	2	3	3	5	4	17
		% within age	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	29.4%	23.5%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	5	11	7	6	6	35
		% within age	14.3%	31.4%	20.0%	17.1%	17.1%	100.0%
	46-60	Count	3	3	5	7	5	23
		% within age	13.0%	13.0%	21.7%	30.4%	21.7%	100.0%
	>60	Count	2	5	4	7	7	25
		% within age	8.0%	20.0%	16.0%	28.0%	28.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	12	22	19	25	22	100
		% within age	12.0%	22.0%	19.0%	25.0%	22.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.358[a]	12	.945
Likelihood Ratio	5.463	12	.941
Linear-by-Linear Association	.883	1	.347
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 10 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.04.

Since the calculated value of chi square is more than 0.05 therefore we can accept the null hypothesis (H_{02}).

Age * Relationship with Administrators

Crosstab

			RELATIONSHIP WITH ADMINISTRATORS					
			Very high	High	Average	Poor	Very poor	Total
age	25-35	Count	5	4	1	4	3	17
		% within age	29.4%	23.5%	5.9%	23.5%	17.6%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	6	12	6	3	8	35
		% within age	17.1%	34.3%	17.1%	8.6%	22.9%	100.0%
	46-60	Count	4	3	8	5	3	23
		% within age	17.4%	13.0%	34.8%	21.7%	13.0%	100.0%
	>60	Count	3	6	4	4	8	25
		% within age	12.0%	24.0%	16.0%	16.0%	32.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	18	25	19	16	22	100
		% within age	18.0%	25.0%	19.0%	16.0%	22.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.449[a]	12	.337
Likelihood Ratio	13.593	12	.327
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.917	1	.166
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 11 cells (55.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.72.

Since the calculated value of chi square is more than 0.05 therefore we can accept the null hypothesis (H_{02}).

Conclusion:

From the correlation and chi-square analysis we can conclude that there is a positive relationship between age, work stress, ad ministration relationship, effectiveness in delivery and professional development and there is also a positive relationship between gender and

interpersonal relationship. Thus, we can say that with increase in age the stress levels, relationships and performance of a moonlighting employee will be impacted.

References:

1. Bell, D., & Roach, P. B. (1990). *Moonlighting: the economic reality of teaching? Education, (110)*, 397-400. Retrieved September 9, 2005, from http://80-vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/hww/results/.
2. Prince, C. (2003). *Higher pay in hard-to-staff schools: The case for financial incentives*. American Association of School Administrators, 2002.Retrieved November 4, 2004 from http://aasa.org/issues_and_insights
3. Goldhaber, D. (2002a). The mystery of good teachers. *Education Next 2*(1), 50-55 http://educationnext.org/
4. Kappa Delta Pi, (2005). No teacher left behind. *Kappa Delta Pi*. Retrieved January 17, 2006 from http://www.kdp.org/.
5. Mertler, C. A. (2002). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle school and high school teachers. *American Secondary Education 31*(1).Retrieved January 17, 2006 from http://80vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/hww/results/.
6. Ofoegbu. F. I. (2004). Teacher motivation: A factor for classroom experience and school improvement in Nigeria. *College Student Journal*, *38*(1) 1- 4. Retrieved September 5, 2005 from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_1_38/ai_n6073200
7. Buckley, J., Schneider, M., & Shang, Y. (2005). Fix it and they might stay:School facility quality and teacher retention in Washington, D.C.
8. *Teachers College Record 107*(5). Retrieved September 9, 2005, from http://80-vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/hww/results/.