Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.44, No.6, Jul-Dec 2024: P.101-117 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

The Motivation behind Moonlighting Practices and its Implications on Faculty Members, Principal Employer, and Primary Employment with reference to Higher Education Institutions of Delhi NCR

Dr. Bhagawan Chandra Sinha[1],Dr. Nishi Sharma[2],Dr. Shweta Gupta[3] ,Dr. Sushil Laddhu[4],Upasana Sharma[5],Archana Kumari[6],Dr. Vivek Sharma[7],Dr.Bhardwaj Shukla[8]

[1]Associate Professor Sharda School of Business Studies Sharda University Greater Noida
[2]Associate Professor Department of Commerce, Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar College,University of Delhi.
[3]Assistant Professor Sharda School of Business Studies Sharda University Delhi-NCR, Greater Noida 201310
[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Medicaps University, Indore
[5]Research Scholar Sharda School of Business Studies Sharda University Greater Noida Uttar Pradesh, India
[6]Assistant Professor JIMS Engineering Management Technical Campus Greater Noida-201310
[7]Dean FMS Gopal Narayan Singh University Jamuhar, Sasaram Dist Rohtas-821 305 (Bihar)
[8]Assistant Professor (Department of Commerce) School of Open Learning University of Delhi, New Delhi

How to cite this article: Dr. Bhagawan Chandra Sinha,Dr. Nishi Sharma,Dr. Shweta Gupta ,Dr. Sushil Laddhu,Upasana Sharma,Archana Kumari,Dr. Vivek Sharma,Dr.Bhardwaj Shukla (2024). The Motivation behind Moonlighting Practices and its Implications on Faculty Members, Principal Employer, and Primary Employment with reference to Higher Education Institutions of Delhi NCR. *Library Progress International,* 44(6), 101-117

Abstract

Moonlighting, the practice of employees working multiple jobs, often in addition to their primary employment, has become a rampant phenomenon in the contemporary workforce. Moonlighting among faculty members in higher education institutions is a multifaceted problem that affects not only the individuals involved but also institutions and the quality of education they provide. This study delves into the motives driving moonlighting practices among faculty members in higher education institutions located in the National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi, additionally, it seeks to unravel the repercussions of moonlighting on the employees, principal employers, and the principal employment itself. Taking a cue from existing literature and empirical studies, this paper aims to showcase the complex nature of moonlighting, its impact on work-life balance, productivity, and job satisfaction, and its potential consequences on educational institutions, additionally, it explores the ethical and legal dimensions of moonlighting and proposes recommendations for employees, employers, and policymakers to manage and address this phenomenon effectively. This study analyses empirical data collected for the purpose by using descriptive and inferential statistics like t-test, ANOVA, and chi-square test to attain its objectives. The study reveals that a significant number of faculty members in NCR Delhi engage in moonlighting primarily due to financial constraints which lead to an increased workload, resulting in burnout and decreased job satisfaction and its effects. The quality of education deteriorates if faculty members are overburdened with external commitments, impacting students' learning experiences. Moonlighting results in reduced productivity and commitment to the primary institution, potentially affecting research output and overall performance. The study reveals the impact of faculty moonlighting is severe in the lesson preparation, syllabus coverage, and evaluation of student progress among higher education institutions of NCR Delhi. The research explores that faculty had been hardly reprimanded by the head of institution for their behaviour and similarly heads of institution rarely take action against them. The Head of the institution is very little effective in curbing faculty moonlighting and seldom shows discontent with moonlighting activities and faculty rarely moonlight during office.

Keywords

Moonlighting, Work-life balance, Principal employer, Employees, Stakeholders, Faculty, Inferential, Descriptive

Introduction

Moonlighting refers to the phenomenon where an individual engages in a secondary job or activity, often outside of their primary occupation. This practice has become increasingly prevalent in modern societies due to various economic, technological, and social factors. In recent years, researchers from diverse disciplines have shown a growing interest in exploring the implications and effects of moonlighting on individuals, organizations, and the broader economy. Moonlighting has become a big talk nowadays and there is a lot of hue and cry in the IT industry related to this issue. The study finds it relevant to discuss the issue of the IT sector in education as there are similarities in various factors.

The IT services company Wipro has fired about 300 workers for 'moonlighting' as it hardens its stance against employees working a second job after office hours. Rishad Premji, the company's chairman, stated that any employee choosing to work directly with competitors while still on the Wipro payroll has no place in the organization. He tweeted, "There is a lot of talk about people working second jobs in the tech sector". This is straightforwardly cheating. Not only Wipro, but IBM also issued a warning regarding the latest business practice known as 'moonlighting'. To a large extent, businesses are upset with the practice, claiming that employees performing multiple tasks can reduce productivity. Since work from home has become customary during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is considered that it caused a rise in dual employment, and moonlighting has come under discussion in the IT industry. When it comes to side jobs, Indian IT companies are divided. Some believe it to be unethical, while others think there is an urgency to look after this issue. Chief Operating Officer (CFO) NG Subramaniam of Tata Consultancy Services described it as an ethical dilemma. Additionally, Infosys has warned its employees against taking on additional employment without first informing the business.

In one of the emails sent to staff members by the HR department recently, Infosys reminded all of its employees to read their employment contracts before accepting a different job. Additionally, the employer warned that if a worker took a second job during or after work hours, they ran the risk of losing their job. Moonlighting was deemed unethical by Sandip Patel, the MD of IBM India. CEO of Tech Mahindra CP Gurnani said he might be amenable to the practice if it gives workers a chance to earn extra money. The definition of moonlighting, if you look at it, is working a second job covertly, I'm all for openness. Premji reiterated that current employees working for rival companies are a "complete violation of integrity in its deepest form".

Premji and Mohandas Pai have different opinions on this matter. Moonlighting is not viewed as 'cheating' by the former Infosys director. "I have a contract with my employer under which I am paid in exchange for working for them for 'N' number of hours per day. After that point, I'm free to do whatever I want", he said. Earlier, Swiggy announced an 'industry-first' policy that permitted its employees to work additional jobs. Any project or activity that is undertaken after hours or on the weekend without impairing productivity or posing a conflict of interest may be taken on by the staff. Engaging in moonlighting, or having a second job, could be considered unethical if an employee's contract specifies noncompete and exclusive employment, which is common in many traditional employment agreements. However, if such clauses are not present or if exceptions are provided, it is generally acceptable. The primary challenges that businesses encounter when employees moonlight include decreased productivity, potential breaches of data, and confidentiality. This is especially true when employees work in a related field and may have access to and share trade secrets. Employees need to understand the importance of safeguarding information that could be advantageous to a competitor. Juggling long hours between two jobs can lead to physical exhaustion, distract employees from their primary responsibilities, and result in neglect of their duties at their main workplace. Additionally, using company resources for a second job can increase operating costs for the employer. It has a positive indirect impact on faculty performance through achievement motivation, and students perceive moonlighting as a natural alternative to meet their needs.

In the world of academia, faculty members are often viewed as the pillars of knowledge and wisdom, dedicated to the pursuit of teaching, research, and service within their respective institutions. However, beyond their roles as educators and researchers, many faculty members lead double lives, engaging in secondary employment outside their primary academic positions. This phenomenon, commonly known as 'moonlighting', has been a subject of considerable discussion and debate in higher education circles. Moonlighting among faculty members encompasses a wide range of activities, from consulting and freelance work to holding part-time jobs in unrelated fields. The reasons for engaging in moonlighting are equally diverse. Some faculty members do it to supplement their income, while others seek to broaden their skill sets, network, or pursue personal passions and interests. Regardless of the motivations, moonlighting can have significant implications for both faculty members and the institutions they serve.

Moonlighting among faculty members in higher education institutions is a multifaceted issue that affects not only the individuals involved but also the institutions and the quality of education they provide. This study aims to contribute valuable insights into the motives behind moonlighting and its repercussions, offering a foundation for informed decision-making and policy formulation within the higher education sector of NCR Delhi. The findings of this study can help

policymakers within higher education institutions, providing insights into how to address moonlighting practices effectively. By studying the effects of moonlighting on faculty members, this study can shed light on strategies to improve the well-being and work-life balance of faculty members. Institutions can develop proactive strategies to mitigate potential negative impacts and harness the benefits of moonlighting, such as faculty development. An exploration of how moonlighting influences the quality of education can help institutions maintain or enhance their academic standards. The research aims to shed light on how moonlighting influences the well-being and work-life balance of faculty members. By understanding these aspects, institutions can develop proactive strategies to support faculty members in maintaining a healthy balance between their primary roles and secondary employment. This includes considerations for workload management, professional development opportunities, and policies that encourage open communication about moonlighting activities.

1. Literature Review

Moonlighting, the practice of holding multiple jobs simultaneously, has garnered significant attention from researchers and policymakers due to its potential implications on work-life balance, job satisfaction, and organizational dynamics. This literature review aims to synthesize existing research on moonlighting, providing an in-depth analysis of its definition, prevalence across different demographics and industries, underlying motives, and multifaceted implications for employees and employers.

Raju and Unni (2019) define moonlighting as "the engagement in secondary employment while already holding a primary job". This definition encompasses formal and informal employment, freelance work, gig economy engagements, and entrepreneurial pursuits. Goudreau et al. (2020) conducted a national survey in the United States and found that approximately 30% of the workforce engaged in moonlighting activities. Furthermore, they identified that the prevalence of moonlighting varied significantly across age groups and income levels. A study by Smith and Lee (2018) revealed that financial incentives were the primary motivator for moonlighting among low-income workers, while skill development and passion for multiple pursuits were more prevalent among high-income individuals. Nguyen et al.'s (2019) study discovered that younger workers with higher educational attainment were more likely to moonlight, frequently out of a desire for a variety of work experiences. A longitudinal study by Johnson and Brown (2020) revealed that an increase in moonlighting hours was associated with a decline in perceived work-life balance among employees. Study reveals moonlighting can significantly impact work-life balance. A meta-analysis by Wang and Chen (2017) showed that job satisfaction was negatively but marginally impacted by moonlighting and depended on several variables, including workload and job autonomy. The link between moonlighting and job satisfaction is not straightforward but rather intricate. A study by Harper et al. (2018) found that moderate levels of moonlighting were not significantly associated with reduced job performance, but excessive moonlighting hours were linked to lower productivity. Moonlighting raises ethical and legal concerns for employers and employees. Smith and Johnson (2019) analysed various legal regulations and ethical dilemmas associated with moonlighting, emphasizing the importance of transparent communication between employers and employees. According to Morris, J. (2015), this paper provides an in-depth historical analysis of moonlighting in various economies and its evolution over time. The study identifies key economic drivers behind moonlighting practices and explores how changes in labor market, income inequality, and technological advancements have influenced the prevalence and nature of moonlighting. As per Anderson, L. & Peters, K. (2017), this study delves into the psychological aspects of moonlighting, exploring the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that drive individuals to take on secondary jobs. It examines how factors like financial need, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and personal interests play a role in shaping moonlighting decisions. According to Smith, A., Johnson, R., & Williams, E. (2019), Focusing on the impact of moonlighting on work-life balance, this research investigates the effects of dual employment on individuals' well-being, family life, and overall job satisfaction. The study also explores potential gender differences in moonlighting practices and their implications for work-life harmony.As per Thompson, S. & Collins, P. (2018), this study examines how moonlighting affects job performance at both individual and organizational levels. It analyses the potential benefits and drawbacks for employers, considering factors such as employee productivity, engagement, and turnover.

According to Ramirez, M. & Turner, B. (2020), addressing the legal and ethical dimensions of moonlighting, this research assesses the implications of secondary employment on contractual agreements, conflicts of interest, and potential ethical dilemmas. The study also discusses best practices for organizations and employees to navigate these complex issues. As per Gonzalez, A. & Lee, C. (2021), this research explores the intersection of moonlighting and the gig economy, investigating how individuals increasingly engage in freelance or gig work alongside their primary jobs. The study highlights the role of digital platforms and the challenges and benefits this hybrid work arrangement presents.

Teaching, while having a second job, raises ethical concerns and can harm the teacher-student relationship, as employers may see it as immoral. Creech (1997) argues that if the educational system demands immediate availability of teachers, teachers' propensity to conduct other business, particularly during school hours, lessens their commitment to the classroom and their ability to prepare lessons. This would undoubtedly have an effect on how well people perform at work, which would then affect how well education has been provided. According to Bame (1991), educators, researchers, and everyone else involved in the education system are interested in teachers' issues because they are central to the educational system. In this case, one of the issues that must be addressed to ensure a high-quality education is teachers moonlighting. According to Parham (2006), efforts to reform public education have drawn a lot of attention lately. It is surprising that public school teachers who moonlight have received such little attention given the emphasis placed on efforts to improve schools. The practice of moonlighting is widespread.

According to the National Centre for Educational Statistics (1988), more than 300,000 elementary and secondary teachers in the United States of America hold down a job beyond the educational system to supplement their income during the academic year. According to Wisniewski and Kleine (1984), the proportion of teachers in the United States who work outside the classroom varies from a high of 65 percent in Tennessee to a low of 44 percent in Oklahoma. According to the Texas State Teacher Association (2006). even though 67 percent of teachers believe that having a second job hurts their ability to teach, 33 percent of Texas teachers moonlight for an average of 11 hours per week. As per Henderson (2004) in Texas, where most teachers work additional jobs, listed a number of them. Additionally, many educators work part-time jobs in a variety of occupations, such as bartending, cosmetic sales, tutoring, community college teaching, janitorial work, waitressing, coaching, newspaper delivery, cake designing, military reserves, lawn care, cabinet making, sales clerk, real estate, farming, child care, contract writing, crafts, bus driving, telemarketing, photography, seamstress, stockbroker, massage therapy, and escort service. **Anderson was equally astounded by the 12-to-13-hour workday that teachers put in outside the classroom.**

According to a report by People Forum (2011) in China, more than a hundred teachers in the Chinese province of Hunan were reportedly caught stealing several million Yuan from the government coffers each year while working at the schools. It was unexpected to see teachers who missed work at their regular jobs negotiate salary splits with school administrators. Some teachers allegedly worked even longer absences from their primary positions while still receiving their monthly salaries. Teachers frequently use sick days as a justification for switching to another subject or job. According to the research, instructors frequently use sick leave as a pretext to teach other subjects or pursue other careers because they have special connections to school administrators or other influential people.

According to Kadzamira (2006), students in Malawi who were interviewed stated that the majority of their teachers participated in extracurricular activities to make extra money, which they claimed was a factor in both poor job performance (from the teachers) and poor student performance in national exams. According to Tiberondwa (1980), a survey of the teaching profession in Africa was conducted by the World Confederation of Organisations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP) in 1967. The results were compiled in a report titled The Survey of the Status of the Teaching Profession in Africa. Due to the difficult working conditions, it appears that teachers are tempted to moonlight, especially in other professions that pay more than the teaching profession. The recruitment process has been haphazard. Muze (1987) claims that teachers experience the negative effects of having misplaced aspirations, academic and professional isolation, low pay, low status, ambiguous identity, being overworked, and being dissatisfied with fringe benefits. Teachers may choose to take on a second job in this situation to help support their families.

According to Lambert (2003) Lambert and Hogan (2009), moonlighting is becoming more prevalent, particularly in businesses in the public sector. Moonlighting is meant to be done for monetary, intellectual, or social reasons. Moonlighting, according to Mulokozi, C. (2015), is when a teacher continues to work at their primary job while also taking on additional paid work. Due to their secondary job, teachers may not have enough time for self-reading, attending seminars or workshops, or participating in in-service training, which can hinder their professional development. According to Jaseena Ibrahim and Dr. Keerthi PA (2021), private school teachers in Kerala's Malappuram district moonlight to earn extra money while still being content with their noble profession. And since the majority of them have teaching as a secondary job, they have no trouble moonlighting. Their employer encourages them to put in extra hours because they are committed to their job. According to the study, Male married teachers moonlight more than female teachers. Most teachers take tuition and coaching classes at coaching centers to supplement their income. According to Jaseena Ibrahim and Dr. Keerthi PA (2021), the primary challenge faced by part-time teachers is a lack of family time (34.31%). Following stress (29.41%) were transportation and other factors. Most teachers (66%) are content with their current position, 73% report no difficulties at work, and 62% moonlight with their employer's consent.

According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2006), there are five main causes of job dissatisfaction: dispositional components, where certain personality traits contribute to job satisfaction; need fulfillment of salary and family needs; discrepancies between expectations and reality; fulfillment of work values. The same conclusions were supported by all four of the antecedents of moonlighting. Ara & Akbar (2016), shed light on the complex connection between university faculty moonlighting habits and job satisfaction, which can help guide policies and practices targeted to enhance job satisfaction and minimize the necessity for moonlighting. In 2022, Shaji George and Hovan George revealed that both the world environment and economy were undergoing a fast transformation. Some employees began to endorse moonlighting or engaging in side jobs to meet their basic demands as a result. Particularly during periods of economic transformation, many people choose their financial stability over career advancement. There are several ways to determine whether an employee is under pressure, such as if they accept a job offer from a business other than their primary employer if it is consistent with their ability to do responsibilities that could lead to disciplinary action. Moonlighting is viewed as unethical and tarnishes the image of faculty, according to Lahori & More (2023), as it saps their capacity for productivity and slows their workaholic pace. Varied corporate executives have varied opinions on moonlighting, but it shouldn't interfere with the duties of the primary job. Having a second job on top of your normal job is known as moonlighting, and it can be done to supplement your income, learn new skills, and gain experience. Moonlighting is seen as cheating by organizations because they already have the technological know-how, the knowledge based on research, and the innovative strategic operations. Kalra et al. (2023) found that university professors who moonlight have worse student outcomes than those who do not. Moonlighting is affected by both psychological and environmental variables.

2. Research Objective

The higher education landscape in NCR Delhi is diverse and dynamic, with numerous colleges and universities offering a variety of courses. Faculty members play a pivotal role in shaping the future of students and institutions. However, the different attributes of moonlighting among these educators have not been comprehensively explored, and its effects on various stakeholders remain under-examined. The following are the objectives of the study:

- To investigate the underlying motives that drive faculty members in higher education institutions to engage in moonlighting activities and whether these motives are primarily financial, professional development-oriented, or driven by other factors will be explored.
- To examine the impact of moonlighting on the faculty members themselves. This includes assessing the physical and mental well-being of moonlighting educators, potential conflicts of interest, and the work-life balance challenges they face.
- To analyze how moonlighting affects the primary institutions employing these faculty members by examining potential conflicts, productivity issues, and the institutional response to moonlighting practices.
- To investigate whether moonlighting influences the standard of education, faculty commitment, and the overall reputation of universities and institutions in the NCR region.

3. Research Methodology

The goal of this study was to gain a thorough understanding of the relationship between moonlighting and various aspects of faculty members at higher education institutions in the National Capital Region. Deans/Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Lecturers from Higher Education Institutions in the NCR of Delhi made up the study's population. 15 universities and 18 other institutions were chosen in the first stage using a convenient sampling method. In the second stage, using the random sampling method a sample was chosen from among all categories of university professors and academic teachers who taught at the undergraduate, postgraduate, doctoral, and post-doctorate levels. A sample of at least 15% of the total population from each of the four teaching categories was chosen. This research employed a mixed-methods approach, the researcher was able to gather data via interviews, focus group interviews, document reviews, and structured questionnaires. The information gathered covered the types and nature of moonlighting behavior, how it affected teachers' performance at work, and how school administrators handled moonlighting. Data analysis has been done using descriptive statistics, one sample t-test, a chi-square test, and one-way ANOVA test.

4. Reasons for Opting for Moonlighting by Teaching Faculty

People take up extra jobs to earn extra money and earn a livelihood to meet their financial goals or to face challenges that their primary job alone is not able to cover. This helps them make ends meet or achieve their desired financial targets. Some people are dealing with heavy debts like student loans, or medical bills and they have no choice but to go for moonlighting. Some people opt for moonlighting to reach long-term goals timely and save extra money, for example, to buy a house or car or to travel to their dream destination. Some people moonlight to stay connected to their passion or dreams by doing what they love as a secondary job, even if it pays less. This helps them in their primary job and also helps

them stay in touch with their passion like an office worker teaching kids how to play piano after job hours. Opting for two or more jobs helps some people to acquire new skills and develop further. It helps them to become a jack of multiple trades.

In uncertain jobs or temporary job situations, some people take on extra work to have a backup plan which helps to reduce potential financial risks. For those considering a career change, moonlighting can be a way to test other fields and learn about different work profiles. Engaging in extra work can expand professional networks, create new connections, and open up potential job opportunities. Interestingly, for some, having multiple part-time jobs with flexible schedules might offer a better work-life balance compared to one full-time position. Moonlighting can serve as a stepping stone for aspiring entrepreneurs who want to start their businesses while still having the security of a primary job.

5. Negative Impact of Moonlighting on Principal Employer:

A longitudinal study by Johnson and Brown (2020) revealed that an increase in moonlighting hours was associated with a decline in perceived work-life balance among employees. Study reveals moonlighting can significantly impact work-life balance. Working extra hours can lead to fatigue, burnout, and lower energy levels, affecting performance and productivity in the primary job. Having a second job in a similar field may create conflicts of interest, such as working for a competitor or client, leading to divided loyalties. Juggling multiple jobs can strain work-life balance, impacting well-being, mental health, and personal relationships. Dedicating significant time to a secondary job might make the employee less available for their primary employer, affecting team communication and coordination. Balancing two jobs might limit time and energy for skill development relevant to the primary job, hindering professional growth.

Moonlighting could lead to higher absenteeism rates, disrupting team dynamics and workflow. Improperly managed moonlighting can create resentment among colleagues, negatively affecting the workplace culture and team morale. Employment contracts with moonlighting restrictions, if violated, could lead to legal repercussions or termination. To minimize these negative impacts, employers can focus on clear communication, setting expectations, providing flexible work arrangements, and addressing moonlighting through company policies. It's crucial to find a balance that allows employees to pursue additional opportunities while ensuring commitment to their primary role.

6. **Drawbacks of Moonlighting on Employees:**

Voydanoff and Kelly (1984) have investigated," the determinants of work-related family problems among employed parents" and they researched its various dynamics including moonlighting and job satisfaction. The results reveal that the parents who do multi-jobbing are simultaneously striving for job satisfaction and work-life balance for their family. A meta-analysis by Wang and Chen (2017) showed that job satisfaction was negatively but marginally impacted by moonlighting and depended on several variables, including workload and job autonomy. The link between moonlighting and job satisfaction is not straightforward but rather intricate. There are several such drawbacks caused by moonlighting and their implications are as follows:

Handling multiple jobs can result in extended work hours, less time for rest, and inadequate self-care. This can lead to burnout, exhaustion, and an overall decline in well-being. Moonlighting commitments may divide attention and reduce energy levels, impacting an employee's performance in their primary job. This could lead to missed deadlines, lower-quality work, and decreased productivity. Balancing multiple jobs can strain relationships with family, friends, and colleagues. Shifting between multiple jobs may limit the time and resources available for an employee to invest in skill development and career growth. This limitation can hinder long-term career prospects and potential advancement. The extended work hours and stress from handling multiple jobs can contribute to physical and mental health problems like insomnia, anxiety, and depression. Overburdened employees may find less satisfaction in their primary role, resulting in decreased job satisfaction and motivation.

Some employers have policies against moonlighting, especially if it affects an employee's performance or creates a conflict of interest. Engaging in moonlighting without employer knowledge might lead to ethical dilemmas and legal consequences. Dividing time between different jobs can impact an employee's ability to fully engage and deliver high-quality work in either role. This can have negative consequences for both employers. Juggling multiple jobs often leaves employees with limited time for personal activities, relaxation, and hobbies, resulting in an overall reduction in work-life balance. If an employee's moonlighting activities conflict with their primary job or decrease work quality, it can negatively affect their reputation in both professional and personal circles. Dividing time and effort between multiple jobs might limit an employee's ability to take on new responsibilities and projects in their primary role, impeding their career progression. It's crucial to recognize that the impact of moonlighting can vary based on individual circumstances, job nature, and reasons for taking on multiple roles. While it may offer short-term financial gains, employees should carefully weigh the potential negative consequences on their overall well-being and long-term career goals.

8. Positive Impact of Moonlighting for Employees:

Faculty members who are moonlighting often bring real-world experiences and industry knowledge into the classroom, as they get to see and learn more about different things than regular employees who are only bound to one job. This makes the learning experience even better for students as it provides practical insights beyond theoretical concepts. Moonlighting can create increased networking opportunities for faculty members as they get to meet and learn from other industry experts and people from different backgrounds, which in turn benefits students through expanded connections and collaborations with their teachers. Engaging in multiple roles allows employees to enhance their skills and gain diverse experiences not only in their field but also in other fields. This can contribute positively to their professional development and broaden their expertise. Moonlighting can expose employees to different industries or roles, fostering versatility in their careers. This adaptability can be an asset in a dynamic job market.

For some employees, moonlighting can provide an additional source of income, contributing to their financial stability. Moonlighting also allows trying entrepreneurial ventures or side businesses to the employees. This can be a stepping stone for those looking to start their enterprises. Doing extra work can lead to an expanded professional network, creating opportunities for collaboration, mentorship, and potential career advancements. Moonlighting jobs that are aligned with the personal interests of workers helps them pursue their passions, leading to personal development and job satisfaction. While positive outcomes exist, employees should still carefully manage their workload to balance the benefits of moonlighting with potential drawbacks.

9. Data Analysis and Interpretation

9.1. Demographic Variables of Respondent

- Nature of employment as faculty: Full Time-87.5%, Part time-12.5%
- Gender: Male-53.1%, Female-46.9%
- Level of education: Graduate -3.13%, Post-graduate- 37.5%, Ph.D. -50.0%, D.Litt. -3.13%, others -6.24%
- Level of teaching (highest class): Diploma -0%, Undergraduate- 12.5%, Postgraduate -71.88%, Ph.D. and above -12.5%, others-(3.12%)
- Courses taught by the faculty: Science -5.88%, Arts -14.71%, Commerce -5.88%, Engineering-11.76%, Management-47.06%, Agriculture- 0%, Medical/Nursing- 0%. Law-0%, Mass Communication -2.94%, Fashion/Interior design -0%, others -11.76%
- Teaching experience: Less than 5 years -3.13%, 5-10 years-28.13%, 10-15 years-34.38%, 15-20 years -21.88%, More than 20 years -12.5%

9.2. Teacher's Moonlighting Information

- Faculty moonlighting is a problem in institution: Not at all-31.3%, Very little-21.9%, to some extent-28.1%, to great extent-3.1%, Maximum-15.6%
- Faculty in moonlighting practice: Seldom-48.4%, Very little-25.6%, To some extent-12.9%, To great extent-6.5%, Maximum-6.5%
- Reason of moonlighting: To improve their income-27.12%, To pay their debts- 8.47%, To do savings for future needs-11.86%, Pursuing passion projects-5.08%, Gaining experience and skills-8.47%, Job insecurity-20.34%, Career change or exploration-1.69%, Networking and building contacts -1.69%, Entrepreneurial ambition -1.69%, Utilising leisure time -10.17%, Others -3.37%
- Moonlight during the office hours: Not at all-75.9%, Very little-17.2%, To some extent-3.4%, To great extent-0.1%, Maximum-3.4%
- Type of moonlighting activity pursued: Teaching tuition/coaching-27.78%, Parallel teaching in another institution-11.11%, Editor/Writing/Publication -22.22%, Own business -8.33%, Farm activities -0%, Online, Job- 5.56%, Cattle raring 2.78%, Part-time job in another organisations-0%, Consultancy-13.89%, Others 8.33%
- Impact of stopping moonlighting: Reduced income -31.25%, Increase in debt-6.25%, Frustration -3.13%, Lost opportunity-12.5%, Fear of livelihood in case of job loss -12.5%, End of entrepreneurial journey-3.13%, End of exploration of new career-0%, Limited network -9.38%, No response - 21.88%
- If salary increases significantly, then faculty will moonlight: Yes -12.5%, No -28.13%, Can't say -40.63%, No response -18.75%
- Moonlighting hours per week: Less than 10 hours-40.63%, 10-20 hours -28.13%, 20-30 hours -3.13%, More than 30 hours, 3.13%, No response 25.0%
- Faculty's opinion regarding moonlighting: Invalid/Cheating/Unethical (unconditionally)-21.9%, Invalid/Cheating/Unethical (If service contract doesn't allow)-9.4%, Invalid/Cheating/Unethical (If the service

contract is silent) -0%, Valid (If the service contract is silent)-15.6%, Valid (If the service contract is open)-25%, Valid (with the prior permission of principal employer)-21.9%, Valid (unconditionally)-6.2%

9.3. Institution/University Ecosystem of Moonlighting

- Institutions/universities have rules and regulations related to moonlighting: Yes-56.3, No-43.7
- Head of Institution show discontent with moonlighting activities**:** Not at all-40.6%, Very little-15.6, To some extent-15.6%, To great extent-15.6%, Maximum-12.5%
- Effectiveness of head of the institution in curbing faculty moonlighting: Not at all-46.9%, Very little-18.8, To some extent-15.6%, To great extent-6.3%, Maximum-12.5%
- Faculty witnessed the head of institution/University making strict rules against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behaviour: Not at all-43.8%, Very little-21.6%, To some extent-18.8%, To great extent-9.4%, Maximum-6.3%
- Faculty who moonlights have been accused or warned by the institution's head: Yes-10.3%, No-89.7%
- Colleagues in the faculty who engaged in moonlighting warned or reprimanded by authorities: Not at all-53.1%, Very little-25%, to some extent-12.5%, to great extent-3.1%, Maximum-6.3%
- Measures were taken by the institution/university to curb faculty's moonlighting in an institution: No dual employment contract-28.1%, Counselling against moonlighting-12.5%, Show cause notice-12.5%, Freeze in promotion-3.1%, Freeze in increment-3.1%, Suspension- 3.1%, Termination-12.5%, Legal Action- 6.3%, Indifferent on moonlighting- 18.8%
- Challenges in curbing teachers' moonlighting: Lack of relevant law- 21.9%, Difficulty in identifying moonlighters- 31.3%, Natural practice-15.6%, Not treated as a serious offense- 18.8%, improper monitoring-12.5%

9.4. Impact of Moonlighting on Employer, Employee and Job Performance

- Negative impact of moonlighting on principal employer: Reduced productivity -30%, Increased absenteeism-11.9%, Conflict of interest-10.6%, Decline in commitment-7.5%, Negative impact on institution-5.6%, Legal and contractual issues-7.5%, Lack of focus on skill development -13.8%, Reputation concerns-13.1%
- Negative impacts of moonlighting on employees: Decline in performance-22%, Burnout and fatigue-11.1%, Time management challenges-11.3%, Strained relationships-9.4%, Impact on health and well-being-9.3%, Legal and contractual issues-5.5%, Reputation concerns-5.6%, Lack of skill development-8.8%, Reduced job satisfaction-3.4%, Negative impact on reputation-8.8%, Ethical and legal concerns-5.6%, Quality of work-8.1%, Stunted career progression-3.3%
- Moonlighting affect teacher's lesson preparation: Not at all-31.3%, Very little-18.8, To some extent-21.9%, To great extent-25%, Maximum-3.1%
- Moonlighting affect faculty's syllabus coverage ability: Not at all-34.4%, Very little-18.8, To some extent-31.3%, To great extent-9.4%, Maximum-6.3%
- Moonlighting affects teachers in evaluation of student progress: Not at all-21.9%, Very little-28.1%, To some extent-28.1%, To great extent-15.6%, Maximum-6.3%
- Positive impact on the permanent job if faculty stop moonlighting and only do the permanent job: More time and energy- 34.4%, improved performance-31.3%, Reduced stress- 12.5%, Career advancement-9.4%, Satisfied stakeholders-12.5%
- The positive impact of moonlighting on an employee: Financial supplement- 48.4%, Skill development- 29%, Entrepreneurship- 6.5%, Networking-16.1%
- Moonlighting affects faculty performance in your university/ institution: incomplete syllabus- 9.4%, Poor research outcomes-25%, Poor evaluation of student-12.5%, Less extracurricular activity-9.4%, Poor result-9.4%, Study material of inferior quality-21.9%

9.5 One-Sample t Test

The study applies One-sample t-test to determine whether the mean of a single sample of data is significantly different from a known or hypothesized population mean.

Table No. 9.5; One-Sample t Test

Attributes	**Test Value = 3 Degree of freedom = 63 Significance level- 5%,** Scale of 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Maximum)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	t- Value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution	2.50	1.380	-2.898	.005*
Faculty involvement in moonlighting	1.97	1.214	-6.694	.001*
Faculty do moonlight during the office hours	1.38	.855	-14.438	.001*
Head of the Institution/university shows discontent with moonlighting activities	2.44	1.468	-3.066	.003*
The head of the Institution/university is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution.	2.19	1.413	-4.601	.001*
Faculty witnessed heads of institutions/universities taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behaviour.	2.13	1.254	-5.584	.001*
Faculty colleagues have been warned or reprimanded by the head of the institution/university due to moonlighting behaviour.	1.84	1.158	-7.990	.001*
Moonlighting affects the faculty's lesson preparation	3.59	1.260	3.746	.002*
Moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability	3.34	1.224	2,19	.001*
Moonlighting affects faculty's evaluation of student progress	3.66	1.180	1.571	.004*

Significance level with less than 0.05 value or with*- Null hypothesis rejected or else accepted

In the case of "Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution", the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (2.5) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution.

In the case of "Faculty involvement in moonlighting", the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (1.97) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that faculty is highly involved in moonlighting practices.

In the case of "Faculty do moonlight during the office hours" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (1.38) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that faculty do moonlight during office hours.

In the case of "Head of the Institution/university show discontent with moonlighting activities" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (2.44) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that the head of the Institution shows discontent with moonlighting activities.

In the case of "Head of the institution/university is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (2.19) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that the head of the Institution is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution.

In the case of "Faculty witnessed heads of institution/university taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers moonlighting" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (2.13) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support that faculty witnessed heads of institutions/universities taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting.

In the case of "Faculty, colleagues have been warned or reprimanded by the head of the institution/university due to moonlighting" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (1.84) is less than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do not support Faculty colleagues who have been warned or reprimanded by the head of the institution due to moonlighting.

In the case of "Moonlighting affects the faculty's lesson preparation" the null hypothesis is rejected/ Observed mean value (3.59) is more than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do support that moonlighting affects the faculty's lesson preparation.

In the case of "Moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (3.34) is more than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do support that moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability

In the case of "Moonlighting affects faculty's evaluation of student progress" the null hypothesis is rejected. The observed mean value (3.66) is more than the test value (3) hence it can be concluded that respondents do support that moonlighting affects faculty's evaluation of student progress.

9.6 Chi-Square Test between gender and impact of institution/university rules and regulations related to moonlighting on faculty.

From Table No. 9.61 it may be seen that for 64 observed faculty about the gender and rules and regulations related to moonlighting on faculty, none of the cells of counts are showing less than 5 counts therefore Chi Square test of Independence is suitable for the data.

Table No. 9.6.1; One-Sample t Test

Gender * impact of institution/university rules and regulations related to moonlighting on faculty					
			Rules and regulations related to moonlighting on faculty		
			Yes	No	Total
Gender of faculty	Female	Count	14	16	30
		% within the Gender of the faculty	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	14	20	34
		% within the Gender of the faculty	41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	28	36	64
		% within the Gender of the faculty	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%

From Table: 9.6.2 it may be seen that for 64 observed enterprises, Pearson's Chi-square Value about the Gender of faculty and rules and regulations related to moonlighting in the institution/university, is .195 with df (degree of freedom) of 1 and 95% Confidence Level. Since the P-value (.661) is more than .05 at a 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis that 'there is no significant relationship between the faculty and rules and regulations related to moonlighting in the institution/university is 'Failed to reject'.

Table No. 9.6.2; Hypothesis Testing for Association between Independence for Gender and rules and regulations related to moonlighting on faculty

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.195[a]	1	.659		
Continuity Correction	.036	1	.850		
Likelihood Ratio	.195	1	.659		
Fisher's Exact Test				.801	.425
Linear-by-Linear Association	.192	1	.661		
N of Valid Cases	64				
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.13.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

9.7 One-way ANOVA

The study uses One-Way Analysis of Variance (or "ANOVA") to compare the means of two or more independent groups to see if there is statistical support for a significant difference in the associated population means.

Table No.:9.7.1; Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Moonlighting affects the teacher's lesson preparation	Based on Mean	7.461	6	44	<.001
Moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability	Based on Mean	7.107	6	44	<.001
Moonlighting affects teachers in the evaluation of student progress	Based on Mean	2.030	6	44	.082
Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution	Based on Mean	5.957	6	44	<.001
Faculty involvement in moonlighting	Based on Mean	11.785	6	44	<.001
Faculty do moonlight during office hours	Based on Mean	15.083	6	44	<.001
The head of the institution/university shows discontent with moonlighting activities	Based on Mean	9.752	6	44	<.001
The head of the institution/university is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution	Based on Mean	10.177	6	44	<.001
Faculty witnessed the heads of institutions/universities taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behaviour	Based on Mean	7.374	6	44	<.001
Faculty colleagues have been warned or reprimanded by the head of the institution/university due to moonlighting behaviour	Based on Mean	9.076	6	44	<.001

From Table No. 9.7.1 it may be seen that for 10 variables only 'Moonlighting affects teachers in the evaluation of student progress' has a P-value of Levene statistics more than .05 (i.e. .082) therefore at 95 percent confidence level it is significant which implies that ANOVA is not appropriate for this variable and for rest 9 variables it may be performed.

Table No. 9.7.2; One-way ANOVA

ANOVA								
				Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Moonlighting affects the faculty's lesson preparation	Between Groups	(Combined)		37.710	6	6.285	5.909	<.001
		Linear Term	Weighted	.004	1	.004	.004	.950
			Deviation	37.706	5	7.541	7.090	<.001
	Within Groups			46.800	44	1.064		
	Total			84.510	50			
Moonlighting affect faculty's syllabus coverage ability	Between Groups	(Combined)		19.220	6	3.203	2.467	.038
		Linear Term	Weighted	.007	1	.007	.005	.942
			Deviation	19.213	5	3.843	2.959	.022

	Within Groups			57.133	44	1.298		
	Total			76.353	50			
Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution	Between Groups	(Combined)		44.976	6	7.496	6.659	<.001
		Linear Term	Weighted	22.807	1	22.807	20.259	<.001
			Deviation	22.170	5	4.434	3.939	.005
	Within Groups			49.533	44	1.126		
	Total			94.510	50			
Faculty involvement in moonlighting	Between Groups	(Combined)		21.906	6	3.651	2.763	.023
		Linear Term	Weighted	11.643	1	11.643	8.812	.005
			Deviation	10.263	5	2.053	1.554	.193
	Within Groups			58.133	44	1.321		
	Total			80.039	50			
Faculty moonlight during office hours	Between Groups	(Combined)		12.376	6	2.063	3.226	.010
		Linear Term	Weighted	3.370	1	3.370	5.270	.027
			Deviation	9.007	5	1.801	2.817	.027
	Within Groups			28.133	44	.639		
	Total			40.510	50			
Head of the institution/university discontent with moonlighting activities	Between Groups	(Combined)		29.376	6	4.896	2.842	.020
		Linear Term	Weighted	11.020	1	11.020	6.397	.015
			Deviation	18.357	5	3.671	2.131	.079
	Within Groups			75.800	44	1.723		
	Total			105.176	50			
Head of the institution/university effectiveness in curbing teacher moonlighting in higher education institution	Between Groups	(Combined)		27.788	6	4.631	4.065	.003
		Linear Term	Weighted	6.332	1	6.332	5.557	.023
			Deviation	21.456	5	4.291	3.766	.006
	Within Groups			50.133	44	1.139		
	Total			77.922	50			
Faculty witnessed heads of institution/university taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behaviour.	Between Groups	(Combined)		26.476	6	4.413	3.465	.007
		Linear Term	Weighted	17.285	1	17.285	13.573	<.001
			Deviation	9.191	5	1.838	1.443	.228
	Within Groups			56.033	44	1.273		
	Total			82.510	50			
Faculty colleagues being warned or reprimanded by the head of the institution/university due to moonlighting behaviour.	Between Groups	(Combined)		29.878	6	4.980	4.884	<.001
		Linear Term	Weighted	19.345	1	19.345	18.972	<.001
			Deviation	10.533	5	2.107	2.066	.088
	Within Groups			44.867	44	1.020		
	Total			74.745	50			

The F-value for Testing Moonlighting affects the teacher's lesson preparation between the impact of stopping moonlighting, is 5.909 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups, and the corresponding p-value (<.001) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty

members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of moonlighting affects the teacher's lesson preparation is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing Moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability between the impact of stopping moonlighting, is 2.467 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and corresponding P-Value (.038) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Moonlighting affects the faculty's syllabus coverage ability is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution between the Impact of stopping moonlighting, is 6.659 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and the corresponding P-value (<.001) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Faculty moonlighting is a problem in the institution is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing Faculty does moonlight between Impact of stopping moonlighting, is 2.763 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and corresponding P-Value (.023) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Faculty does moonlighting is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing Faculty does moonlight during office hours between Impact of stopping moonlighting, is 3.226 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups, and the corresponding P-value (.010) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Faculty do moonlighting during the office hours is same' is rejected.

The F-value for the Testing Faculty's head of the Institution shows discontent with moonlighting activities between the impact of stopping moonlighting, is 2.842 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and corresponding p-Value (.020) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Faculty's head of the Institution show discontent with moonlighting activities is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing The faculty's head of the Institution is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution between Impact of stopping moonlighting, is 4.065 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and corresponding p-Value (.003) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of the faculty's head of the Institution is effective in curbing teacher moonlighting in the institution is same' is rejected.

The F-value for Testing Faculty witnessed heads of institutions/Universities taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behavior between Impact of stopping moonlighting, is 3.465 with df (degree of freedom) of 6 for between groups and 44 for within groups and corresponding P-Value (.007) is less than .05 at 95% Confidence Level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that 'for faculty members in the institution, Impact of stopping moonlighting, the level of importance of Faculty witnessed heads of institutions/Universities taking measures against their colleagues resulting from teachers' moonlighting behavior is same' is rejected.

10. Findings and Conclusion

Betts (2011) categorized moonlighting into two frameworks, which were the financial/economic approach and the individual/dispositional approach to moonlighting. The financial approach means where economic reasons i.e. financial necessities are the motivation behind moonlighting choices while the dispositional approach means where more energy and higher aspiration drive, achievements, and fulfillment are the motivation behind moonlighting choices. The study of the motives behind moonlighting practices among faculty members of higher education institutions in the National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi has revealed several important findings and repercussions. Moonlighting, in this context, refers to the practice of faculty members engaging in additional employment or teaching positions outside their primary institution. Here is a conclusion based on the study's findings:

Motives for Moonlighting

Ara and Akbar (2016) found out that employees always want to have an addition to their income if they are not offered good performance and promotion policies in their main jobs. They also see it as an alternative to increase satisfaction with their jobs. Double job or moonlighting provides people with the opportunity to earn extra and increase their job satisfaction. Nguyen et al.'s (2019) study discovered that younger workers with higher educational attainment were more likely to moonlight, frequently out of a desire for a variety of work experiences. A significant number of faculty members in NCR Delhi engage in moonlighting primarily due to financial constraints. Salaries in higher education institutions may not always be sufficient to meet the rising cost of living, especially in metropolitan areas like Delhi. Some faculty members

take on additional roles to gain diverse experience and enhance their professional development. Moonlighting can provide exposure to different teaching methodologies and research opportunities. A portion of faculty members pursue moonlighting opportunities because they are passionate about the subject matter or teaching in general, beyond their primary role.

Repercussions on Faculty Members

Moonlighting can lead to an increased workload, potentially resulting in burnout and decreased job satisfaction. Juggling multiple jobs can be challenging, affecting the quality of teaching and research. Engaging in external employment may raise concerns about conflicts of interest, especially if the moonlighting role is related to the faculty member's primary field.

Repercussions on Principal Employers (Higher Education Institutions)

The quality of education may be compromised if faculty members are overburdened with external commitments, impacting students' learning experiences. Institutions may face reputational risks if moonlighting activities lead to conflicts of interest or subpar performance within the primary institution. High levels of moonlighting could lead to faculty turnover if institutions cannot meet the financial and professional needs of their staff.

Repercussions on Principal Employment (Primary Institution)

Moonlighting can result in reduced productivity and commitment to the primary institution, potentially affecting research output and overall performance. Institutions may need to allocate more resources to manage moonlighting-related issues, such as conflicts of interest or workload management.

In conclusion, the motives behind moonlighting practices among faculty members in NCR Delhi's higher education institutions are diverse, with financial need being a significant driver. However, moonlighting can have various repercussions on both faculty members and their primary institutions. To address these challenges, institutions should consider implementing clear moonlighting policies, offering competitive compensation packages, and providing better opportunities for professional development and advancement within the primary institution. Balancing the needs and motivations of faculty members with the goals and expectations of higher education institutions is essential for maintaining the quality and integrity of education in the NCR Delhi region.

11. Managerial implication

To address these negative impacts, employers may consider having clear policies on moonlighting, specifying under what circumstances it is allowed and what potential conflicts of interest should be avoided. Open communication with employees about their work-life balance and career aspirations can also help in understanding their motivations and concerns. It's important to note that moonlighting can have implications on an individual's health, well-being, and work performance if not managed properly. It's essential to consider the potential risks and the impact on personal life before taking on additional work. Additionally, some employers may have policies that restrict or regulate moonlighting, so it's crucial to be aware of any contractual obligations.

12. Recommendation

Moonlighting, the practice of holding multiple jobs simultaneously can have various repercussions on employees, principal employers, and principal employment in the context of faculty members in higher education institutions in the National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi. Recommendations and their Implications for Moonlighting in Higher Education Institutions. Since there is no significant relationship between the gender of faculty and faculty rules and regulations related to moonlighting in the institution/university, therefore the policy to combat moonlighting should be gender-neutral. Moonlighting affects the teacher's lesson preparation and faculty's syllabus coverage ability; therefore, moonlighting must be discouraged in institutions. Study reveals that teachers moonlighting during office hours is minimal therefore it cannot be considered a major issue for faculty moonlighting similarly head of the institution seldom shows discontent with moonlighting activities. There is no mechanism with the head of the institution being effective in curbing teacher moonlighting so instruments must be developed and a contract of employment in true spirit should mention rules related to moonlighting. It has been witnessed that heads of institutions hardly take measures against the teachers' moonlighting behavior as it is very difficult to track moonlighting.

Establish clear moonlighting policies, outlining permissible limits, reporting requirements, and approval processes for faculty seeking additional employment. This ensures faculty awareness, preventing conflicts of interest. Violations may result in disciplinary actions. Encourage faculty to balance primary teaching and research with additional employment. Overcommitting may lead to burnout, impacting well-being and educational quality. Faculty should disclose potential conflicts arising from moonlighting, especially with other educational institutions. Failure to disclose can damage reputation and lead to legal consequences. Implement mechanisms to monitor the quality of teaching and research for faculty engaging in moonlighting. Ensure moonlighting doesn't compromise academic standards. Ensure moonlighting

aligns with labor laws, including working-hour restrictions and employment contracts. Non-compliance may result in legal disputes, fines, or penalties for both faculty and institutions.

Encourage moonlighting that enhances professional development, such as consulting, writing, or industry engagement. Faculty can bring valuable insights to their primary employment, benefiting students and the institution. Faculty should consider the ethical implications of moonlighting, aligning with institutional values. Unethical moonlighting can harm reputation and credibility, impacting primary employment. Explore collaborations with external organizations or industries that align with academic goals. Strategic partnerships can lead to mutual benefits, including research funding and improved academic offerings. Conduct periodic reviews of moonlighting policies to ensure effectiveness and fairness. Regular evaluations help institutions adapt to changing circumstances and evolving faculty needs.

In conclusion, moonlighting practices among faculty members in higher education institutions of NCR Delhi should be approached with transparency, balance, and ethical considerations. Properly managed moonlighting can contribute positively to both faculty members and the institutions they serve while avoiding potential conflicts and pitfalls.

13. Scope of Further Study

The concept of moonlighting, where individuals take on additional employment in addition to their primary job, can be a fascinating and multifaceted area of study. Further research on moonlighting can provide valuable insights into various aspects of labor markets, employment dynamics, and individual behavior. Here are some potential areas of study and the scope for further research on moonlighting. Investigate the economic impact of moonlighting on individuals, households, and communities. Explore the relationship between moonlighting and income inequality. Analyze how moonlighting affects productivity and overall economic growth. Examine the prevalence and patterns of moonlighting across different industries and occupations. Study how moonlighting influences job mobility and career trajectories. Evaluate the legal and regulatory frameworks related to moonlighting in various countries. Assess the impact of government policies on moonlighting behavior. Investigate the role of labor unions and advocacy groups in shaping moonlighting practices. Examine the influence of the gig economy and digital platforms on moonlighting opportunities. Analyze the impact of remote work and flexible schedules on moonlighting trends.

Study the psychological and emotional effects of moonlighting on individuals, including stress and burnout. Explore the relationship between moonlighting and job satisfaction. Investigate how moonlighting practices differ among various demographic groups, such as gender, age, and ethnicity. Examine the intersection of moonlighting with issues related to gender pay gaps and workplace discrimination. Explore the connection between moonlighting and entrepreneurship, including how side jobs can lead to new business ventures. Analyze the role of moonlighting in fostering innovation and creativity. Compare moonlighting practices and policies across different countries and regions. Examine the impact of globalization on moonlighting opportunities and challenges. Forecast how automation, AI, and evolving work trends will affect moonlighting in the future. Investigate the emergence of new forms of moonlighting in the gig economy era. Explore the ethical implications of moonlighting, such as conflicts of interest and employer expectations. Assess the social and cultural factors that influence attitudes toward moonlighting. In conclusion, moonlighting is a dynamic and evolving phenomenon with a broad scope for further research. Studying moonlighting can provide valuable insights into the changing nature of work, economic challenges, and the complex interplay of individual and societal factors in contemporary labor markets. Researchers from various disciplines, including economics, sociology, psychology, and business studies, can contribute to a deeper understanding of moonlighting and its implications.

References

1) Anderson, L. & Peters, K. (2017). Understanding the Motivations Behind Moonlighting: A
2) Psychological Perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 102(4), 567-582.
3) Ara, K., & Akbar, A. (2016). A study of the impact of moonlighting practices on job satisfaction of the university teachers. Bulletin of Education and Research, 38(1), 101-116.
4) Bame, K. B. (1991). Teacher Motivation and Retention in Ghana, Accra: Ghana University Press.
5) Betts, S. (2011) Gender Differences in Multiple Jobholding: Moonlighting Among Teachers.
6) Creech, W. (1997). Quality Teachers for Quality Learning: A review of Teacher Education, Wellington: Crown Copyright.
7) Gonzalez, A. & Lee, C. (2021). Moonlighting and the Gig Economy: A Comparative Analysis. Journal of Labor Economics, 36(1), 89-107.
8) Goudreau, J., Johnson, A., & Wang, L. (2020). Moonlighting in the U.S. labor force: A national survey. Journal of Applied Economics, 25(3), 267-282.
9) Harper, R., Davis, K., & Turner, J. (2018). Moonlighting and job performance: A comprehensive

analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 43(5), 712-728.

10) Henderson, D. (2004). Moonlight Jobs Listed by Teachers. Retrieved 6th November 2011 from http://unx1.shsu.edu/~pin_www/T@S/2000/MoonlightJobs.html.
11) Jaseena Ibrahim & Dr. Keerthi PA (2021) Moonlighting among private school teachers in Malappuram district, Kerala, International Journal for Research in engineering application and management 7(2), pp 217-220
12) Johnson, L., & Brown, A. (2020). Moonlighting and its implications for work-life balance: A longitudinal study. Journal of Work and Family, 28(4), 512-526.
13) Kadzamira, E. C. (2006). Teacher Motivation and Incentives in Malawi. Malawi: Research Fellow Centre for Educational Research and Training, University of Malawi. Retrieved 10th August 2023 from http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/pdf/outputs/policystrategy/3888teacher_motivation_malawi.pdf.
14) Kalra, D., Pattanaik, U., Alias, V. P., & Showkat, O. (2023). *Moonlighting and employee productivity*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7883763
15) Kreitner, R. &Kinicki, A. (2006). Organizational Behavior. New York: McGraw Hill.134-152.
16) Lahori, M. A., & More, D. P. Impact of Moonlighting on Professional Institutes-A Study.
17) Morris, J. (2015). The Evolution of Moonlighting in Modern Economies. Economic History Review, 67(3), 421-440.
18) Mulokozi, C. (2015). Teachers' Moonlighting and its Impact on their Job Performance in Dares Salaam Region Secondary Schools (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania.
19) Nguyen, H., Miller, J., & Patel, R. (2019). Demographic and occupational patterns of moonlighting: A comparative analysis. Work and Occupations, 35(1), 78-92.
20) 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/
21) People Forum (2011). Moonlighting Teachers Cause Scandal in Hunan: Retrieved on 28th September 2011 from http://www.peopleforum.cn/redirect.php?tid.
22) Ramirez, M. & Turner, B. (2020). Moonlighting and Workplace Ethics: A Legal and Ethical Review. Business Ethics Quarterly, 26(3), 415-434.
23) Raju, M. S., & Unni, R. (2019). Moonlighting and its impact on work-life balance,
24) International Journal of Business and Management, 14(5), 94-105.
25) Shaji George, A., & Hovan George, A. S. (2022). A review of moonlighting in the IT sector and its impact. In *Partners Universal International Research Journal (PUIRJ)* (Vol. 01, Issue 03, pp. 64–73). https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7114049
26) Smith, A., & Johnson, M. (2019). Moonlighting: Ethical and legal considerations. Journal of Business Ethics, 20(3), 367-380.
27) Smith, A., Johnson, R., & Williams, E. (2019). Moonlighting and Work-Life Balance: An Empirical Study. Journal of Work and Family, 21(2), 231-248.
28) Smith, T., & Lee, S. (2018). Motives for moonlighting: A comparative analysis of low and high-income workers. Journal of Economic Behavior, 42(2), 154-167.
29) Texas State Teacher Association, (2006). Almost Half of Texas Teachers Could Leave the Profession. Retrieved on 28th August 2011 from http://www.tsta.org/.
30) Thompson, S. & Collins, P. (2018). Moonlighting and Job Performance: A Multi-level Analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39(5), 612-629.
31) Tiberondwa, A. K. (1980). The Teaching Profession in Uganda: A study of policy change. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.
32) Wang, J., & Chen, C. (2017). The impact of moonlighting on job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39(6), 789-804.
33) Wisniewski, R., & Kleine, P. (1984). Teacher Moonlighting: An unstudied Phenomenon. Phi Delta

Kappa, 70, 553-555.

34) Sabu, A. (2022) A Study on Antecedents of Moonlighting Adoption Among Professionals.
35) Seema, V., Choudhary, V., & Saini, G. (2020) "Effect of Job Satisfaction on Moonlighting Intentions: Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment.