Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Employees of Select Indian Universities – A Study with Special Reference to Interpersonal Relations

Dr. M.A. Azeem[1], Dr. M.A. Quddus[2]

[1]*Associate Professor, Department of Management & Commerce Maulana Azad National Urdu University Gachibowli, Hyderabad – 500 032, Andhra Pradesh – INDIA*
[2]*Section Officer (Pro Vice-Chancellor's Office) Maulana Azad National Urdu University Gachibowli, Hyderabad – 500 032, Andhra Pradesh – INDIA*

Abstract: *In a University system the Teaching staff makes University excel in all its academic endeavours. The Non-Teaching staff renders their service to implement the plans needed for advancement of a University. The contribution of Non-Teaching staff is also very important in carrying out the activities of the University. The Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction form important aspects of efficient and effective management system. Hence, need is felt to undertake a research study on the work motivation and job satisfaction among the Non-Teaching staff working in Central and State Universities located in Hyderabad (INDIA). Interpersonal Relations is considered as a factor to study the work motivation and job satisfaction among the non-teaching staff. The objective of the study is to find the perception of Non-Teaching Employees regarding work motivation and job satisfaction with special reference to Interpersonal Relations. The study is based on both primary and secondary data. The main source of primary data is the non-teaching staff of the two Central and two State Universities situated in Hyderabad (INDIA) i.e. University of Hyderabad & Maulana Azad National Urdu University and Osmania University & Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University. The secondary data source includes the journals, books and university websites, etc.*
Key words: *Job Satisfaction, Non-Teaching staff, Universities, Work Motivation*

I. Introduction

India has been a major seat of learning for thousands of years. The present format of Higher education in India was started in 1857 with the inception of universities in the three residency towns. At present, India possesses a highly developed higher education system which offers facility of education and training in almost all aspects of human's creative and intellectual endeavors such as arts and humanities, natural, mathematical and social sciences, engineering, medicine, dentistry, agriculture, education, law, commerce and management, music and performing arts, national and foreign languages, culture, communications etc. Higher Education sector has witnessed a tremendous increase in its institutional capacity in the years since Independence. The number of Universities/University-level institutions has increased manifold from 27 in 1950 to 700 in 2013.

The quantum growth in the Higher Education sector is spear-headed by the Universities, which are the highest seat of learning. At present, the main constituents of University/University-level Institutions are – Central Universities, State Universities, Deemed-to-be Universities and University-level institutions. These are described as: **Central University:** A university established or incorporated by a Central Act. **State University:** A university established or incorporated by a Provincial Act or by a State Act. **Private University:** A university established through a State/Central Act by a sponsoring body viz. A Society registered under the Societies Registration Act 1860, or any other corresponding law for the time being in force in a State or a Public Trust or a Company registered under Section 25 of the Companies Act, 1956. **Deemed-to-be University:** An Institution Deemed to be University, commonly known as Deemed University, refers to a high-performing institution, which has been so declared by Central Government under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission (UGC) Act, 1956. **Institution of National Importance:** An Institution established by Act of Parliament and declared as Institution of National Importance. **Institution under State Legislature Act:** An Institution established or incorporated by a State Legislature Act.

The Universities comprise mainly of students, teaching and non-teaching staff. Teachers play a pivotal role in the teaching and learning process. They make a great difference on students' achievement, especially, nowadays, when the importance of education for knowledge and information societies has been acknowledged worldwide. The non-teaching staff form an integral part of the university system. They are valuable partners in working with teaching staff and the university authorities. It is imperative that the non-teaching staff is satisfied with their jobs and that they derive work motivation there-from. Hence, this study attempts to study the same.

II. Definitions

"Work motivation is a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior and to determine its behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration." Pinder (1998)

"Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job; an affective reaction to one's job; and an attitude towards one's job". Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviours. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

III. Review of Literature

Pinder (1998) described work motivation as the set of internal and external forces that initiate work-related behavior, and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration. Pinder (1998) contended that an essential feature of this definition is that work motivation is an invisible, internal and hypothetical construct, and that researchers, therefore, have to rely on established theories to guide them in the measurement of observable manifestations of work motivation. Du Toit (1990) added that three groups of variables influence work motivation, namely individual characteristics, such as people's own interests, values and needs, work characteristics, such as task variety and responsibility, and organizational characteristics, such as its policies, procedures and customs. Van Niekerk (1987) saw work motivation as the creation of work circumstances that influence workers to perform a certain activity or task of their own free will, in order to reach the goals of the organization, and simultaneously satisfy their own needs. Farace, Monge and Russell (1977) define communication as the exchange of symbols that are commonly shared by the individuals involved, and which evoke quite similar symbol-referent relationships in each individual. Organizational communication goes a bit further. Organizational communication is "both similar to and distinct from other types of communication" (Shockley-Zalabak, 1999, p. 28). It is more than the daily interactions of individuals within organizations, it is the process through which organizations create and shape events (Shockley-Zalabak, 1999). According to Huse and Bowditch (1973), an organization is effective and efficient when it has the ability to be integrated and to consider three different perspectives simultaneously: structural design, flow and human factors.

IV. Need of the Study

Higher education is an "enterprise of human beings" (Liebmann, 1986) where technology and service delivery are primarily driven by human resources (Jensen, 2006). Thus, an innovative organizational climate that maximizes the potential of its members may be a viable option for an enhanced work environment where employees feel empowered to experiment with new ideas (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978) and, ultimately, may become important to the long-term survival of colleges and universities in today's increasingly competitive environment (Jensen, 2006; Scott & Bruce, 1994).

Non-academic professional employees are key components in today's higher education. They are responsible for the day-to-day operations of a university (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Non-academic professional employees in colleges and universities are staffs who are employed for the primary purpose of providing academic support, student services, and institutional support. These assignments require post-secondary credentials or a substantial record of comparable background (Knapp et al., 2009). Scholars have argued that non-academic professional employees are important to all academic departments and colleges and universities could not function without the assistance of these support staff members who oversee the day-to-day operations (Knight & Trowler, 2001). As such, in brief it can be described that:

In a University system the Teaching staff makes University excel in all its academic endeavours. The Non-Teaching staff renders their service to implement the plans needed for advancement of a University. The contribution of Non-Teaching staff is also very important in carrying out the activities of the University. The Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction form important aspects of efficient and effective management system. Hence, need is felt to undertake a research study on the work motivation and job satisfaction among the Non-Teaching staff working in Central and State Universities located in Hyderabad (INDIA). Interpersonal Relations is considered as a factor to study the work motivation and job satisfaction among the non-teaching staff. For the purpose, two Central and two State universities (Central Universities: Maulana Azad National Urdu University and University of Hyderabad – State Universities: Osmania University and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University) have been selected for study. Each university has carved a niche in the academic and research domains. The contributions of these universities have been widely acknowledged by the government and all sections of society.

Objective of the Study
* To find the perception of Non-Teaching Employees regarding work motivation and job satisfaction with special reference to Interpersonal Relations.

Hypothesis
* Ho1: There is no significant difference among the Group 'A B & C' Non-Teaching staff of the Universities in study with respect to the level of work motivation and job satisfaction.

V. Scope & Limitation of the Study

The study is meant to find the factors of work motivation and job satisfaction in the non-teaching staff of the Universities in study (Maulana Azad National Urdu University, University of Hyderabad, Osmania University and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University). The present study confine to Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction with special reference to Interpersonal Relations. The authenticity and accuracy of the data depend upon the responses given by the respondents. The inferences cannot be generalised.

VI. Research Methodology

Sources of Data:

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. **Primary Source:** Non-Teaching staff of the Central and State Universities in study. **Secondary Source:** Annual Reports, Act & Statutes of Universities in study, Profiles, Websites of the Universities in study, Journals, Books and other published material available. Primary Data has been collected from the Non-Teaching staff of the Universities in Study by administering a structured questionnaire. The Questionnaire consisted of two parts:

Part – A : Demographic Profile of respondents
Part – B : Questions related to Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction

Five Point Likert Rating Scale has been used where the number represents as: (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Uncertain (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree
Reliability of the Questionnaire is done using Cronbach's Alpha method and is found to be 0.762

Sample Design
Sampling Method: Stratified Random sampling technique has been adopted to select samples from the Universities in Study. **Population:** Non-Teaching staff of the cadres – Group 'A' (Deputy Registrars and Assistant Registrars) Group 'B' (Section Officers/Superintendents and Assistants/Senior Assistants) Group 'C' (Upper Division Clerks/Office Assistants and Lower Division Clerks/Junior Assistants).

Sample Size

Group	Universities, Population and Sample size								Grand Total	
	MANUU		UoH		OU		Dr. BRAOU			
	Population	Sample size	Population	Sample size	Population	Sample size	Population	Sample size	Population	Sample size
A	14	05	19	05	30	10	19	05	82	25
B	41	10	47	12	283	76	46	12	417	110
C	90	22	124	31	201	51	124	31	539	135
Total	145	37	190	48	514	137	189	48	1038	270

* Staff strength as on September, 2013.

Sample Size: A sample size equivalent to 25% of the total staff strength of Universities in study is selected for study which comes to 260. However, it has been rounded off to 270 for convenience of analysis.

Data Analysis Method

The responses obtained from the respondents through questionnaire has been analysed by using statistical techniques viz., Descriptive Statistics like mean, standard deviation and z-test. SPSS software has been used for analysis.

VII. Demographic Profile

The data is collected from the Non-Teaching staff of two Central and two State Universities in study. The table drawn hereunder reveals the demographic profiles (viz., gender, age and length of service) of the respondents.

Table – 1

Universities		MANUU			UoH			OU			Dr. BRAOU			Total
Groups		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
Gender	Male	05 (50%)	06 (27%)	17 (32%)	05 (50%)	12 (55%)	29 (55%)	10 (67%)	70 (80%)	45 (55%)	5 (33%)	12 (13%)	26 (32%)	242
	Female	-	04 (18%)	05 (9%)	-	-	02 (4%)	-	06 (7%)	6 (7%)	-	-	5 (6%)	28
Age (in years)	18-39	-	01 (5%)	14 (26%)			02 (4%)	-	-	06 (7%)	-	-	02 (3%)	25
	31-40	02 (20%)	05 (22%)	07 (13%)	-	-	11 (21%)	-	31 (35%)	41 (50%)	-	-	23 (28%)	120
	41-50	03 (30%)	03 (14%)	01 (2%)	02 (20%)	06 (27%)	13 (24%)	-	-	04 (5%)	01 (6%)	04 (5%)	06 (7%)	43
	51-60	-	01 (5%)	-	03 (30%)	06 (27%)	05 (10%)	10 (67%)	45 (51%)	-	04 (27%)	08 (9%)	-	82
Length of service (in years)	1-5	-	01 (5%)	11 (21%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
	6-15	02 (20%)	07 (32%)	11 (21%)	01 (10%)	-	12 (23%)	-	-	40 (49%)	-	-	20 (25%)	93
	16-25	02 (20%)	02 (9%)	-	01 (10%)	06 (27%)	14 (26%)	-	41 (47%)	11 (13%)	01 (7%)	7 (8%)	11 (13%)	96
	26-35	01 (10%)	-	-	01 (10%)	06 (27%)	05 (9%)	10 (67%)	35 (40%)	-	04 (26%)	5 (5%)	-	67
	36 & above	-	-	-	02 (20%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	02

From the above table it is revealed that majority of the respondents are male and are in the age group of 31-40 years and 51-60 years. Majority of the respondents have put in 6-15 and 16-25 years of service.

Table – 2 Responses of Group 'A' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	Central	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0	1 (10%)	0	10 (100%)
		State	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	Central	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to	Central	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	10 (67%)	5 (33%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)

	be open when discussing work problems and concerns							
4	Working relationships in my section / department is good	**Central**	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	**Central**	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	**Central**	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0	1 (10%)	0	10 (100%)
		State	8 (53%)	6 (40%)	1 (7%)	0	0	15 (100%)
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	**Central**	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	8 (53%)	7 (47%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)

From the table above, it is revealed that 100% respondents have agreed that they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties and also that working relationships in their section / department is good. Further, 90% of the respondents agreed that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities. Similarly, 90% of the respondents have agreed that they are consulted and their opinions seem to count and also they get encouragement for creativity and innovation. Further, 100% respondents agree that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities and also they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties. Further, 93% of the respondents have agreed that they get encouragement for creativity and innovation.

Table – 3
Descriptive Statistics of Group 'A' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Mean	Standard deviation	Total Respondents
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	**Central**	4.20	.91	10
		State	4.86	.35	15
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	**Central**	4.60	.51	10
		State	4.86	.35	15
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns	**Central**	4.40	.51	10
		State	4.66	.48	15
4	Working relationships in my section / department is good	**Central**	4.60	.51	10
		State	4.60	.50	15
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	**Central**	4.30	.67	10
		State	4.60	.50	15
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	**Central**	4.40	.96	10
		State	4.46	.63	15
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	**Central**	4.30	.48	10
		State	4.53	.51	15

Descriptive statistics of the respondents of Central Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I get encouragement for creativity and innovation (SD = .96) and I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .91). Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .51), the relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns (SD = .51) and Working relationships in my section / department is good (SD = .51). Descriptive statistics of the respondents of State Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I get encouragement for creativity and innovation (SD = .63) and Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university (SD = .51).

Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .35) and I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .35).

Table – 4 Responses of Group 'B' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					
			Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Uncertain**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Total**
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	**Central**	9 (41%)	11 (50%)	2 (9%)	0	0	22 (100%)
		State	34 (39%)	54 (61%)	0	0	0	88 (100%)
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	**Central**	16 (73%)	6 (27%)	0	0	0	22 (100%)
		State	69 (78%)	19 (22%)	0	0	0	88 (100%)
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns	**Central**	6 (27%)	15 (68%)	0	0	1 (5%)	22 (100%)
		State	37 (42%)	51 (58%)	0	0	0	88 (100%)
4	Working relationships in my section / department is good	**Central**	9 (41%)	12 (54%)	0	0	1 (5%)	22 (100%)
		State	54 (61%)	34 (39%)	0	0	0	88 (100%)
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	**Central**	7 (32%)	12 (55%)	3 (13%)	1 (.50%)	0	22 (100%)
		State	28 (32%)	56 (64%)	4 (4%)	0	0	88 (100%)
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	**Central**	8 (36%)	10 (46%)	3 (14%)	1 (4%)	0	22 (100%)
		State	25 (28%)	41 (47%)	20 (23%)	2 (2%)	0	88 (100%)
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	**Central**	6 (27%)	11 (50%)	3 (14%)	2 (9%)	0	22 (100%)
		State	33 (37%)	41 (47%)	14 (16%)	0	0	88 (100%)

From the table above it is revealed that 100% respondents of the Central Universities agree that they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties. Further, 95% of the respondents have agreed that the relationship with their bosses enable them to be open when discussing work problems and concerns. Similarly, 95% have responded that the working relationship in their sections / departments is good. Further, 100% respondents of the State Universities agree that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities and also they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties. Further, 100% have responded that the relationship with their bosses enable them to be open when discussing work problems and concerns and working relationships in their section / department is good. Further, 96% of the respondents have agreed that they are consulted and their opinions seem to count.

Table – 5 Descriptive statistics of Group 'B' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Mean	Standard deviation	Total Respondents
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	**Central**	4.31	.64	22
		State	4.38	.48	88
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	**Central**	4.72	.45	22
		State	4.78	.41	88
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns	**Central**	4.13	.83	22
		State	4.42	.49	88
4	Working relationships in my section /	**Central**	4.27	.88	22

	department is good	State	4.61	.48	88
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	Central	4.18	.66	22
		State	4.27	.54	88
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	Central	4.13	.83	22
		State	4.01	.78	88
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	Central	3.95	.89	22
		State	4.21	.70	88

Descriptive statistics of the respondents of Central Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university (SD = .89) and Working relationships in my section / department is good (SD = .88). Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .45) and I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .64). Descriptive statistics of the respondents of State Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I get encouragement for creativity and innovation (SD = .78) and Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university (SD = .70). Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .41), I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .48) and Working relationships in my section / department is good (SD = .48).

Table – 6 Responses of Group 'C' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	Central	24 (45%)	29 (55%)	0	0	0	53 (100%)
		State	31 (38%)	51 (62%)	0	0	0	82 (100%)
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	Central	43 (81%)	9 (17%)	1 (2%)	0	0	53 (100%)
		State	49 (60%)	33 (40%)	0	0	0	82 (100%)
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns	Central	21 (40%)	31 (58%)	1 (2%)	0	0	53 (100%)
		State	17 (21%)	58 (70%)	7 (9%)	0	0	82 (100%)
4	Working relationships in my section / department is good	Central	23 (43%)	29 (55%)	1 (2%)	0	0	53 (100%)
		State	23 (28%)	52 (63%)	7 (9%)	0	0	82 (100%)
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	Central	14 (26%)	38 (72%)	0	0	1 (2%)	53 (100%)
		State	12 (15%)	55 (67%)	15 (18%)	0	0	82 (100%)
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	Central	21 (40%)	31 (58%)	0	0	1 (2%)	53 (100%)
		State	17 (21%)	56 (68%)	9 (11%)	0	0	82 (100%)
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	Central	13 (25%)	34 (64%)	6 (11%)	0	0	53 (100%)
		State	12 (15%)	55 (67%)	15 (18%)	0	0	82 (100%)

From the table above it is revealed that 100% of the respondents of Central Universities agree that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities. Further, 98% have responded that they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties, working relationship in their sections / departments is good and that they get encouragement for creativity and innovation. Further, 100% respondents of State Universities agree that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities and also that they

help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties. Further, 91% of the respondents have agreed that the relationship with their bosses enable them to be open when discussing work problems and concerns and that working relationships in their sections / departments is good.

Table – 7 Descriptive statistics of Group 'C' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Mean	Standard deviation	Total Respondents
1	I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university	Central	4.45	.50	53
		State	4.37	.48	82
2	I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties	Central	4.79	.45	53
		State	4.59	.49	82
3	The relationship with my boss enables me to be open when discussing work problems and concerns	Central	4.37	.52	53
		State	4.12	.53	82
4	Working relationships in my section / department is good	Central	4.41	.53	53
		State	4.19	.57	82
5	I am consulted and my opinions seem to count	Central	4.20	.63	53
		State	3.96	.57	82
6	I get encouragement for creativity and innovation	Central	4.33	.67	53
		State	4.09	.55	82
7	Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university	Central	4.13	.58	53
		State	3.96	.57	82

Descriptive statistics of the respondents of Central Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I get encouragement for creativity and innovation (SD = .67) and I am consulted and my opinions seem to count (SD = .63). Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .45) and I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .50). Descriptive statistics of the respondents of State Universities revealed that there is deviation in the responses of the statements relating to Interpersonal Relations. High deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I am consulted and my opinions seem to count (SD = .57), Interpersonal relationships are excellent in my university (SD = .57) and Working relationships in my section / department is good (SD = .57). Low deviation is seen in the responses pertaining to the statements – I enjoy talking to others about what is great about my university (SD = .48) and I help my colleagues if they have problems with their duties (SD = .49).

Group Statistics and Hypotheses Testing:
To examine the significance of the perception of Group 'A, B & C' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities z-test was conducted with the following hypotheses and the results are depicted in table No. 8

H$_o$: There is no significant difference in the perception of Group 'A, B & C' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities with regard to 'Interpersonal Relations'.

Table – 8 Group Statistics and Hypothesis Testing of Group 'A, B & C' Non-Teaching staff regarding 'Interpersonal Relations'

Factor	Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	z-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
Interpersonal Relations - Group A CUs and SUs	CUs	70	4.40	.66	2.917	173	.004	S
	SUs	105	4.65	.49				
Interpersonal Relations - Group B CUs and SUs	CUs	154	4.24	.77	2.376	768	.018	NS
	SUs	616	4.38	.61				
Interpersonal Relations - Group C CUs and SUs	CUs	371	4.38	.59	5.123	943	.000	S
	SUs	574	4.18	.58				

The result of the Hypotheses Testing reveals that there is significant difference in the perception of Group 'A, & C' Non-Teaching staff and that there is no significant difference in the Group 'B' Non-Teaching Staff of the Central and State Universities with regard to 'Interpersonal Relations'

VIII. Conclusion
From this study it is revealed that all the Group 'A, B & C' Non-Teaching staff members have agreed that they help their colleagues if they have problems with their duties. Majority of the Group 'A & B' staff

members have agreed that they enjoy talking to others about what is great about their universities. Most of the Group 'C' staff members have agreed that the relationship with their bosses enable them to be open when discussing work problems and concerns and also that working relationships in their section / department is good. The result of the Hypotheses Testing reveals that there is significant difference in the perception of Group 'A, & C' Non-Teaching staff of the Central and State Universities with regard to 'Interpersonal Relations. However, there is no significant difference in the perception of Group 'B' non-teaching staff members. The overall response of the staff members have been very positive with regard to the kind of Interpersonal Relations they have in their respective universities. Maintenance of such Interpersonal Relations may be helpful for the staff in discharging their duties more efficiently and effectively.

References

[1]. Du Toit, M.A. (1990). Motivering (Motivation). In J. Kroon (Ed.), Algemene bestuur (General management) (2nd ed.) (pp.83 – 92). Pretoria : HAUM.
   Farace, R., Monge, P., & Russell, H. (1977). Communicating and organizing. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley
[2]. Huse, E. & Bowditch, J. (1973). Behavior in organizations. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley
[3]. Jensen, J. A. (2006). Support for innovation in schools: Effects of trust, empowerment, and work environment variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.
[4]. Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., Ginder, S. A., & National Center for Education, S. (2009). Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2008, and salaries of fulltime instructional staff, 2008-09. First look. Washington, DC.: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
[5]. Knight, P., & Trowler, P. (2001). Departmental leadership in higher education. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press/SRHE.
[6]. Liebmann, J. D. (1986, June). Non-academic employees in higher education: A historical overview. Paper presented at the 1986 Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Orlando, FL.
[7]. Pinder, C. C. (1998). Work motivation in organizational behavior. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[8]. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. The Academy of Management Journal, 37(3), 580-607.
[9]. Shockley-Zalabak (1999). Fundamentals of organizational communication: knowledge, sensitivity, skills, values, 4th Ed. New York: Longman
[10]. Siegel, S. M., & Kaemmerer, W. F. (1978). Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(5), 553-562.
[11]. Smerek, R., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. Research in Higher Education, 48(2), 229-250.
[12]. Van Niekerk, W.P. (1987). Eietydse bestuur (Contemporary management). Durban: Butterworth.
[13]. Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. Human Resource Management Review, 12, 173-194
[14]. www.academic.csuohio.edu
[15]. www.arp.sagepub.com
[16]. www.braou.ac.in
[17]. www.education.nic.in
[18]. www.eprints.hec.gov.pk
[19]. www.etd.uum.edu.my
[20]. www.etd.uwc.ac.za
[21]. www.manuu.ac.in
[22]. www.osmania.ac.in
[23]. www.ugc.ac.in
[24]. www.uohyd.ac.in
[25]. www.usca.edu/essay
[26]. www.wikipedia.org