



Original Article

Workplace Civility Behaviour-based Satisfaction among Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff(s)

Author (s): Arunima Kalita¹, Prof. Arup Barman*²

¹Research scholar, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India

²Head, Dept. Of Business Administration, Assam University, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India

Corresponding Author: *Prof. Arup Barman (Email: abgeet@gmail.com)

1. Abstract:

This study investigates job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff in universities, with a primary focus on their perceptions of civility behaviour. The objectives are twofold: first, to assess job satisfaction levels and explore their dependence on workplace behaviour, and second, to analyze potential differences in job satisfaction between teaching and non-teaching staff across various universities in Assam, India. Employing statistical methods such as the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the research finds that workplace behaviour significantly influences job satisfaction levels, rejecting the null hypothesis. Moreover, it identifies substantial differences in job satisfaction between teaching and non-teaching staff, supporting the alternative hypothesis. These findings underscore the importance of fostering positive civility behaviour within academic institutions and tailoring strategies to enhance job satisfaction based on the unique roles of teaching and non-teaching staff. The study's implications extend to promoting employee well-being and productivity in various organizational settings beyond academia.

Manuscript Information

Received Date: 20-07-2023
Accepted Date: 13-09-2023
Publication Date: 17-09-2023
Plagiarism Checked: Yes
Manuscript ID: IJCRM:2-5-4
Peer Review Process: Yes

How to Cite this Manuscript

Arunima Kalita, Prof. Arup Barman. **Workplace Civility Behaviour-based Satisfaction among Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff(s).** *International Journal of Contemporary Research in Multidisciplinary.* 2023; 2(5):10-19.

2. Keywords: Workplace Civility, Organizational success, Well-being, Job Satisfaction, Work Environment, Sense of Belonging.

3. Introduction:

In the intricate tapestry of academic institutions, the satisfaction and contentment of both teaching and non-teaching staff members are vital threads that contribute to the overall fabric of organizational success. Amidst the myriad factors that influence workplace satisfaction, civility behaviour emerges as a prominent determinant, impacting how individuals interact, communicate, and collaborate. Universities, as hubs of knowledge dissemination and growth, rely on the synergistic efforts of their diverse staff members. This chapter embarks on a journey to explore the intricate interplay between civility behaviour and job satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff across various universities. The significance of cultivating a

harmonious work environment cannot be understated. The demeanour with which colleagues and peers engage with each other influences not only their personal experiences but also the collective morale and effectiveness of the institution. Within the academic context, where learning and innovation thrive, understanding the nexus between civility behaviour and job satisfaction becomes paramount. By conducting a comprehensive ANOVA analysis encompassing a range of universities, this chapter aims to unravel potential variations in satisfaction levels attributed to the nuances of civility behaviour. By deciphering the intricate patterns of these relationships, this research contributes to the broader discourse on enhancing workplace dynamics, ultimately fostering an environment where both teaching and non-

teaching staff can flourish and contribute optimally to their academic communities.

4. Theoretical Framework:

In exploring the intricate connection between civility behaviour and job satisfaction among university staff, three prominent theoretical perspectives come into focus. Firstly, Social Exchange Theory underscores the role of reciprocity in social interactions, emphasizing that individuals engage in relationships to maximize benefits and minimize costs. Within this study's context, staff members perceive civility behaviour as a positive exchange, contributing to heightened job satisfaction. It elucidates how acts of respect and consideration from colleagues and supervisors foster a positive work environment, cultivating greater satisfaction among both teaching and non-teaching staff. Secondly, the Job Characteristics Model delves into the factors shaping job satisfaction and motivation, pinpointing five core job characteristics. Civility behaviour positively influences these attributes by facilitating collaboration, effective communication, and a supportive atmosphere, leading staff members to find more meaning in their work and, consequently, experience greater job satisfaction. Lastly, Social Identity Theory examines how individuals define themselves based on group affiliations, particularly within the university's diverse roles. Civility behaviour within these groups enhances social identity, engendering a sense of belonging, respect, and inclusivity, all of which contribute to increased job satisfaction as staff members' social identities are positively reinforced. These theoretical frameworks serve as invaluable lenses for researchers, offering deep insights into the mechanisms and factors underpinning the observed outcomes in the study.

5. Aim and Objectives of the Study:

Here are two objectives for the study "Determining Satisfaction among Teaching and Non-teaching Staffs based on Civility Behaviour":

1. **Assess Satisfaction Levels:** Determine the levels of satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff across universities based on their perceptions of civility behaviour.
2. **Analyse Differences:** Investigate whether there are significant differences in satisfaction levels between teaching and non-teaching staff about their perceptions of civility behaviour.
3. **Elements of Job Satisfaction and Workplace Behaviour:** The elements of job satisfaction and workplace behaviour are classified in Table 1. Based on the contents or elements the questions are constructed to be incorporated into the measurement scale.

Table-1

Job Satisfaction	Workplace Behaviour
Work environment, Job security, Compensation, Autonomy, Work-life balance, Career development, Recognition, Colleague relationships, Management support, Task variety, Job, significance, Communication, Feedback, Organizational culture, Job performance	Civility, Professionalism, Communication, Respect, Collaboration, Teamwork, Conflict Resolution, Ethics, Attitude, Adaptability, Diversity and inclusion, Accountability, Leadership, Employee conduct, Organizational culture

Hypotheses:

For determining Satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff based on civility behaviour, the following hypotheses are formulated for each objective:

1. **For 1st objective**
 - **Null Hypothesis (H0):** Job satisfaction is not dependent on workplace behaviour.
 - **Alternative Hypothesis (Ha):** Job satisfaction is dependent on workplace behaviour.
2. **For 2nd objective**
 - **Null Hypothesis (H0):** There is no significant difference in job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff members across the various universities in Assam.
 - **Alternative Hypothesis (Ha):** There is a significant difference in job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff members across the various universities in Assam.

6. Literature Review:

In the realm of higher education, understanding the factors that influence staff satisfaction has garnered increasing attention. This literature review aims to delve into the roles of Determining Satisfaction among Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff based on Civility Behaviour.

Job satisfaction is a crucial aspect of employee well-being and organizational success, particularly within the education sector. Extensive research has explored the factors influencing job satisfaction among employees (Locke, 1976). However, a notable gap exists in understanding the role of civility behaviour in shaping job satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff in educational institutions.

Civility behaviour, characterized by respectful and considerate interactions, has gained prominence due to its positive impact on workplace dynamics (Porath & Pearson, 2009). Incivilities, even seemingly minor, can lead to negative outcomes, affecting job satisfaction and overall organizational climate. Despite the increasing recognition of the significance of civility behaviour, limited research focuses specifically on its influence on job satisfaction in the context of universities.

Hulpia et al. (2011) emphasized the link between job satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment

among teachers in the education sector. However, there remains a gap in the literature regarding the specific relationship between civility behaviour and job satisfaction among both teaching and non-teaching staff within universities. Understanding this relationship is essential as universities rely on collaboration, communication, and positive interactions among staff members to maintain a conducive learning and working environment.

Moreover, cross-university comparisons are crucial to understanding variations in job satisfaction levels and the impact of civility behaviour. Each university has a unique organizational culture and work environment, influencing how civility behaviour contributes to job satisfaction. Research that compares different universities can offer insights into contextual factors that contribute to differences in job satisfaction and the effectiveness of civility behaviour initiatives.

While existing literature often establishes correlations, there is a gap in research that delves into the causal relationship between civility behaviour and job satisfaction. Longitudinal studies that track changes over time can help establish whether improvements in civility behaviour lead to sustained increases in job satisfaction among staff members.

The literature reveals a significant gap in understanding the relationship between civility behaviour and job satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff in universities. By addressing this gap, this study aims to contribute valuable insights into the factors that influence job satisfaction and ultimately enhance the working environment in educational institutions.

7. Methodology:

The study employs a quantitative research methodology to examine the satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff across various universities based on their perceptions of civility behaviour. Descriptive statistics are utilized to summarize the data, including mean and standard deviation. Additionally, ANOVA analysis is conducted to ascertain statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels between the two groups, supported by high F-values and low p-values, providing meaningful insights into the relationship between civility behaviour and staff satisfaction.

7.1. Analysis and Findings:

I. Perception of Civility Behaviour:

The data (Annexure) presents the perception of civility behaviour in various universities and regions, showcasing mean scores, standard deviations, and response ranges. The Friedman Test, employed to assess differences across universities and regions, yielded statistically significant results for most combinations, suggesting variations in the perception of civility behaviour. The universities and regions exhibited diverse mean scores, indicating differing levels of perceived civility behaviour, with some institutions and areas scoring higher than others. These findings emphasize the importance of considering and addressing civility behaviour within academic environments, as it can significantly impact the perception of workplace culture and satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff across universities in Assam, India.

Table 2: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Sr. No	Name of the Institution/University	Variables	N=df	Statistic	Sig
1	Assam University	Job Satisfaction	52	0.17	.001c
		Workplace Behaviour	52	0.113	.095c
2	Bodoland University	Job Satisfaction	48	0.171	.001c
		Workplace Behaviour	48	0.075	.200c,d
3	Dibrugarh University	Job Satisfaction	50	0.143	.012c
		Workplace Behaviour	50	0.177	.000c
4	Gauhati University	Job Satisfaction	50	0.126	.047c
		Workplace Behaviour	50	0.08	.200c,d
5	Kumar Bhaskar Varma University	Job Satisfaction	30	0.125	.200c,d
		Workplace Behaviour	30	0.151	.080c
6	Tezpur University	Job Satisfaction	48	0.144	.014c
		Workplace Behaviour	48	0.185	.000c
7	Kaziranga University	Job Satisfaction	55	0.153	.003c
		Workplace Behaviour	55	0.167	.001c
8	Assam Downtown University	Job Satisfaction	50	0.12	.071c
		Workplace Behaviour	50	0.185	.000c
9	Cotton College State University	Job Satisfaction	45	0.149	.014c
		Workplace Behaviour	45	0.179	.001c
10	Royal Global University	Job Satisfaction	48	0.173	.001c

		Workplace Behaviour	48	0.082	.200c,d
11	Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam	Job Satisfaction	65	0.141	.003c
		Workplace Behaviour	65	0.155	.000c
12	Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University	Job Satisfaction	50	0.127	.044c
		Workplace Behaviour	50	0.195	.000c
13	Assam Agriculture University	Job Satisfaction	49	0.151	.007c
		Workplace Behaviour	49	0.199	.000c
14	Bhattadev University, Bajali	Job Satisfaction	48	0.118	.092c
		Workplace Behaviour	48	0.2	.000c

a. Level of Job Satisfaction:

The results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (Table 2) for job satisfaction and workplace behaviour across various universities in Assam provide insights into the relationship between these variables, as per the stated objective and hypothesis.

Looking at the results:

- For the variable "Job Satisfaction," several universities, including Assam University, Bodoland University, and Dibrugarh University, exhibit significant deviations from a normal distribution ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that job satisfaction may be influenced by workplace behaviour in these institutions.
- For the variable "Workplace Behaviour," Dibrugarh University, Tezpur University, Kaziranga University, Assam Town University, Cotton College State University, Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University, Assam Agriculture University, Bhattadev University show significant deviations from normality ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that workplace behaviour may have an impact on job satisfaction in these universities.

In summary, the results suggest that there is evidence to support the alternative hypothesis (H_a) that job satisfaction is dependent on workplace behaviour in several universities in Assam. This implies that workplace behaviour could play a role in influencing the satisfaction levels of teaching and non-teaching staff in these institutions. Further analysis and exploration of these relationships may be warranted to better understand the dynamics at play.

Table 3: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7030.678 ^a	990	.000
Likelihood Ratio	2724.279	990	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.412	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	688		
a. 1043 cells (99.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.			

b. Test Chi-Square:

The Chi-Square test results (Table 3) revealed highly significant differences in job satisfaction levels between teaching and non-teaching staff based on their perceptions of civility behaviour. With a Pearson Chi-Square statistic of 7030.678 and a p-value of < 0.001 , as well as a Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square statistic of 2724.279 with a p-value of < 0.001 , both tests overwhelmingly rejected the null hypothesis, confirming a strong association between staff type and satisfaction levels. The Linear-by-Linear Association test further emphasized this relationship with a Chi-Square statistic of 17.412 and a p-value of < 0.001 . These findings, derived from a dataset with 688 valid cases, provide robust statistical support for the objective of investigating satisfaction differences among teaching and non-teaching staff in the context of civility behaviour perceptions. In summary, the results underscore the pivotal role of workplace behaviour in shaping job satisfaction among university staff.

Table 4: ANOVA

Name of the Institution/ University	Type of Employee	Mean Square	F	Sig
Assam University	Teacher	59.636	182.234	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	12.414	30.515	0.000
Bodoland University	Teacher	34.824	105.308	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	16.63	68.003	0.000
Dibrugarh University	Teacher	47.016	137.055	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	24.675	69.406	0.000
Gauhati University	Teacher	51.238	179.527	0.000

	Non-teaching staff	14.783	47.191	0.000
Kumar Bhaskar Varma University	Teacher	28.649	93.968	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	12.944	32.549	0.000
Tezpur University	Teacher	45.072	133.172	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	23.865	63.627	0.000
Kaziranga University	Teacher	50.172	143.427	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	24.106	72.504	0.000
Assam Downtown University	Teacher	51.697	160.057	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	25.739	71.971	0.000
Cotton College State University	Teacher	43.816	127.879	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	17.841	44.581	0.000
Royal Global University	Teacher	39.313	101.281	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	16.061	62.331	0.000
Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam	Teacher	65.16	184.819	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	28.466	81.541	0.000
Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University	Teacher	49.928	155.648	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	27.4	77.961	0.000
Assam Agriculture University	Teacher	56.762	221.596	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	29.19	104.621	0.000
Bhattadev University, Bajali	Teacher	56.772	237.034	0.000
	Non-teaching staff	29.19	104.621	0.000

Grand Mean = 3.82

7.2. Mean differences:

Significant differences in mean among the non-teaching and teaching employees:

The results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff in various universities in Assam provide valuable insights into the differences in satisfaction levels based on the type of employee. These findings are aligned with the stated objective and hypothesis.

The ANOVA results show that the p-values associated with the F-statistics for both teacher and non-teaching staff in all the universities are extremely small ($p = 0.000$), which is significantly less than the typical significance level of 0.05. This indicates strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_a). Therefore, there is a significant difference in job satisfaction levels between teaching and non-teaching staff across the various universities in Assam.

In summary, the ANOVA results confirm that the type of employee (teaching or non-teaching) has a substantial impact on job satisfaction levels, suggesting that civility behaviour may influence job satisfaction differently for these two groups. This information is valuable for understanding the dynamics of job satisfaction in the context of Assam's universities and may inform policies and practices aimed at improving employee satisfaction.

8. Discussion:

The results from the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test indicate that in most universities, job satisfaction

levels deviate significantly from a normal distribution. This implies that workplace behaviour plays a pivotal role in shaping job satisfaction perceptions among both teaching and non-teaching staff. The p-values often lower than the significance level of 0.05; and provide strong evidence to support the alternative hypothesis (H_a). This underscores the importance of promoting positive civility behaviour within academic institutions to enhance overall job satisfaction.

The ANOVA results provided compelling evidence to support the alternative hypothesis (H_a). The analysis revealed significant differences in job satisfaction between teaching and non-teaching staff, indicating that civility behaviour had varying effects on these two employee groups. This finding highlights the need for tailored strategies to improve job satisfaction based on the distinct roles and responsibilities of teaching and non-teaching staff within academic institutions.

9. Conclusion:

In conclusion, the presented data underscores the crucial link between civility behaviour and job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff in the universities of Assam. The rejection of the null hypotheses for both objectives emphasizes the importance of workplace behaviour in shaping job satisfaction. Moreover, the recognition of significant differences in job satisfaction between these two employee groups suggests that universities should adopt targeted approaches to enhance job satisfaction.

To create a more conducive work environment and foster greater job satisfaction, institutions should prioritize efforts to promote positive civility behaviour. These findings provide actionable insights that can inform policy and practice within universities in Assam and beyond. By addressing the specific needs and perceptions of both teaching and non-teaching staff, academic institutions can contribute to higher morale, productivity, and overall well-being among their employees, ultimately benefiting the educational community as a whole.

10. Future Scope:

The findings from this study, which emphasize the significant influence of civility behaviour on job satisfaction levels among teaching and non-teaching staff in universities, open up promising avenues for future research and practical applications. Further investigations could delve into the specific behaviours and interventions that lead to enhanced job satisfaction, allowing institutions to develop targeted strategies for creating more supportive work environments. Additionally, exploring the long-term effects of improved job satisfaction on employee retention, performance, and overall institutional success could offer valuable insights for academia and other industries. Ultimately, the study's implications extend beyond universities, offering valuable lessons for organizations seeking to enhance employee well-being and productivity through a focus on workplace behaviour and civility.

11. References:

1. Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Keer, H. V. The relations between school staff's dispositional resistance to change, job satisfaction, and job-related stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.2011; 27(5).968-977.
2. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Rand McNally.1976; 1297-1349. [[Google Scholar](#)]
3. Pearson C. The cost of bad behaviour: How incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it. *Human Resource Management International Digest*. 2010; 18(6). [[Google Scholar](#)]
4. Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Keer, H. V. The relations between school staff's dispositional resistance to change, job satisfaction, and job-related stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.2011; 27(5), 968-977.
5. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes. *Rand McNally*.c1969. [[Google Scholar](#)]
6. O'Driscoll, M., & Randall, D. M. Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards, and employee job involvement and organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology*, 1999; 48(2), 197-209.[[Google Scholar](#)] [[Academia](#)]
7. Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2002; 45(2), 331-351.[[Google Scholar](#)]
8. Robinson, S. L., & O'Reilly, J. A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39(2), 555-572. [[Google Scholar](#)]
9. Li, A. N., & Cropanzano, R. Do East Asians respond more favourably to negative feedback than do North Americans? A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2009; 40(3), 387-404.[[Google Scholar](#)] [[Wiley Online Library](#)]
10. Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*. 1999; 24(3), 452-471.[[Google Scholar](#)]
11. Koeske, G. F., & Koeske, R. D. Factors related to the subjective well-being of university professors. *Research in Higher Education*. 1993; 34(5), 607-625.
12. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*.2009; 23(1), 24-44.[[Google Scholar](#)]
13. Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*. 2000; 29(2), 123-137.[[Research Gate](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
14. Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., & Sivanathan, N. Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2007; 92(1), 228-238.[[APA Psynet](#)]
15. Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 1988; 9(4), 297-308.[[Wiley Online Library](#)]
16. Blau, G. J. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58(4), 277-288. [[Wiley Online Library](#)]
17. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 2001; 86(2), 278-321.[[Google Scholar](#)]
18. Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 2005; 58(2), 281-342.[[Google Scholar](#)]
19. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. Relationship of core self-evaluation traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2001; 86(1), 80-92.[[Google Scholar](#)]
20. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1990; 1(2), 107-142.[[Google Scholar](#)]

21. Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190. [[Google Scholar](#)]

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Annexure:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Name of the Institution/ University		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Assam University	SEARCH	52	66.1154	6.56388	52.00	77.00
	WB	52	64.6538	9.44309	50.00	86.00
Bodoland University	SERC	48	64.5417	6.36466	48.00	78.00
	WB	48	61.0833	7.02831	52.00	86.00
Dibrugarh University	SERC	50	66.8600	6.10791	56.00	76.00
	WB	50	64.9200	10.00171	50.00	86.00
Gauhati University	SERC	50	64.1800	8.27016	40.00	77.00
	WB	50	66.4000	9.10035	51.00	86.00
Kumar Bhaskar Varma University	SERC	30	66.9667	6.32174	56.00	77.00
	WB	30	65.7333	9.73062	50.00	84.00
Tezpur University	SERC	48	66.7500	6.12459	56.00	76.00
	WB	48	64.8542	9.66897	50.00	86.00
Kaziranga University	SERC	55	65.8545	6.26400	56.00	76.00
	WB	55	63.9091	9.43255	50.00	86.00
Assam Downtown University	SERC	50	67.7400	5.85125	56.00	77.00
	WB	50	65.3600	9.89900	50.00	86.00
Cotton College State University	SERC	45	66.2889	6.17039	56.00	76.00
	WB	45	64.4222	10.09610	50.00	86.00
Royal Global University	SERC	48	61.8125	8.56926	40.00	77.00
	WB	48	64.5833	9.05029	51.00	85.00
Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam	SERC	65	66.9385	6.10296	56.00	77.00
	WB	65	64.8769	9.78760	50.00	86.00
Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University	SERC	50	67.6400	5.63792	56.00	76.00
	WB	50	64.8800	9.75546	50.00	86.00
Assam Agriculture University	SERC	49	68.7143	3.65148	63.00	76.00
	WB	49	63.6327	8.14119	51.00	77.00
Bhattadev University, Bajali	SERC	48	68.9792	3.56991	63.00	76.00
	WB	48	63.8542	8.33090	51.00	77.00

Table 2: Test Statistics

Assam University	N	52
	Chi-Square	6.480
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.011
Bodoland University	N	48
	Chi-Square	10.083
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.001
Dibrugarh University	N	50
	Chi-Square	10.083
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.001
Gauhati University	N	50
	Chi-Square	.191
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.662
Kumar Bhaskar Varma University	N	30
	Chi-Square	1.690
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.194

Tezpur University	N	48
	Chi-Square	9.383
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.002
Kaziranga University	N	55
	Chi-Square	12.519
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.000
Assam Downtown University	N	50
	Chi-Square	10.083
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.001
Cotton College State University	N	45
	Chi-Square	9.800
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.002
Royal Global University	N	48
	Chi-Square	.087
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.768
Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam	N	65
	Chi-Square	11.571
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.001
Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University	N	50
	Chi-Square	12.000
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.001
Assam Agriculture University	N	49
	Chi-Square	15.364
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.000
Bhattadev University, Bajali	N	48
	Chi-Square	15.364
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Friedman Test		

Table 3: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Name of the Institution/ University		WB	SERC	
Assam University	N	52	52	
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.6538	66.1154
		Std. Deviation	9.44309	6.56388
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.170	.113
		Positive	.170	.093
		Negative	-.078	-.113
	Test Statistic	.170	.113	
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.001 ^c	.095 ^c	
Bodoland University	N	48	48	
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	61.0833	64.5417
		Std. Deviation	7.02831	6.36466
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.171	.075
		Positive	.171	.055
		Negative	-.115	-.075
	Test Statistic	.171	.075	
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.001 ^c	.200 ^{c,d}	
Dibrugarh University	N	50	50	
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.9200	66.8600
		Std. Deviation	10.00171	6.10791
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.143	.177
		Positive	.143	.147
		Negative	-.081	-.177
	Test Statistic	.143	.177	
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012 ^c	.000 ^c	
Gauhati University	N	50	50	
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	66.4000	64.1800
		Std. Deviation	9.10035	8.27016
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.126	.080
		Positive	.126	.073
		Negative	-.072	-.080
	Test Statistic	.126	.080	

	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.047 ^c	.200 ^{c,d}
Kumar Bhaskar Varma University	N		30	30
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	65.7333	66.9667
		Std. Deviation	9.73062	6.32174
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.125	.151
		Positive	.122	.151
		Negative	-.125	-.130
	Test Statistic		.125	.151
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 ^{c,d}	.080 ^c	
Tezpur University	N		48	48
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.8542	66.7500
		Std. Deviation	9.66897	6.12459
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.144	.185
		Positive	.144	.156
		Negative	-.071	-.185
	Test Statistic		.144	.185
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.014 ^c	.000 ^c	
Kaziranga University	N		55	55
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	63.9091	65.8545
		Std. Deviation	9.43255	6.26400
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.153	.167
		Positive	.153	.167
		Negative	-.070	-.125
	Test Statistic		.153	.167
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.003 ^c	.001 ^c	
Assam Downtown University	N		50	50
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	65.3600	67.7400
		Std. Deviation	9.89900	5.85125
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.120	.185
		Positive	.120	.097
		Negative	-.068	-.185
	Test Statistic		.120	.185
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.071 ^c	.000 ^c	
Cotton College State University	N		45	45
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.4222	66.2889
		Std. Deviation	10.09610	6.17039
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.149	.179
		Positive	.149	.179
		Negative	-.086	-.165
	Test Statistic		.149	.179
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.014 ^c	.001 ^c	
Royal Global University	N		48	48
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.5833	61.8125
		Std. Deviation	9.05029	8.56926
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.173	.082
		Positive	.173	.055
		Negative	-.082	-.082
	Test Statistic		.173	.082
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.001 ^c	.200 ^{c,d}	
Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam	N		65	65
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.8769	66.9385
		Std. Deviation	9.78760	6.10296
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.141	.155
		Positive	.141	.129
		Negative	-.064	-.155
	Test Statistic		.141	.155
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.003 ^c	.000 ^c	
Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University	N		50	50
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	64.8800	67.6400
		Std. Deviation	9.75546	5.63792
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.127	.195
		Positive	.127	.101
		Negative	-.076	-.195
	Test Statistic		.127	.195
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.044 ^c	.000 ^c	
Assam Agriculture University	N		49	49
	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	63.6327	68.7143
		Std. Deviation	8.14119	3.65148
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.151	.199
		Positive	.151	.199
		Negative	-.119	-.143
	Test Statistic		.151	.199
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.007 ^c	.000 ^c	
Bhattadev University, Bajali	N		48	48

	Normal Parameters ^b	Mean	63.8542	68.9792
		Std. Deviation	8.33090	3.56991
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.118	.200
		Positive	.118	.200
		Negative	-.115	-.148
	Test Statistic		.118	.200
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.092 ^c	.000 ^c	
a. Test distribution is Normal.				
b. Calculated from data.				
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.				
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.				