Final Project Report

Analyzing the Impact of Work Environment and Recognition on Employees' Job Performance Using SPSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reliability analysis

1.1 Before

Table 01:

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	92	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 02:

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.600	19

Table 03:

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
WE1_BAN233002	62.0978	22.177	.355	.574
WE2_BAN233002	62.0000	23.121	.130	.596
WE3_BAN233002	61.5978	23.056	.036	.615
WE4_BAN233002	61.9783	21.626	.444	.563
WE5_BAN233002	62.6413	20.936	.411	.558
WE6_BAN233002	62.5652	21.369	.304	.572
WE7_BAN233002	62.4565	21.482	.381	.565
WE8_BAN233002	62.1848	21.361	.472	.558
Recog1_BAN233002	61.7609	24.052	-.078	.631
Recog2_BAN233002	62.1304	21.939	.086	.617
Recog3_BAN233002	63.5543	23.173	-.012	.631
Recog4_BAN233002	62.2717	22.640	.128	.598
Recog5_BAN233002	62.0652	22.985	.116	.598
Recog6_BAN233002	63.1522	21.713	.127	.606
JP1_BAN233002	62.0652	22.457	.291	.580
JP2_BAN233002	62.3587	21.134	.437	.558
JP3_BAN233002	62.2935	22.429	.232	.584
JP4_BAN233002	63.0543	21.612	.298	.574
JP5_BAN233002	63.2283	20.859	.467	.552

1.2 After

Table no 4

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	92	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table no 5

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.631	18

Table no 6

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
WE1_BAN233002	58.0000	22.066	.370	.606
WE2_BAN233002	57.9022	23.166	.112	.630
WE3_BAN233002	57.5000	23.286	.003	.653
WE4_BAN233002	57.8804	21.513	.458	.596
WE5_BAN233002	58.5435	20.822	.422	.592
WE6_BAN233002	58.4674	21.197	.323	.604
WE7_BAN233002	58.3587	21.397	.387	.599
WE8_BAN233002	58.0870	21.267	.482	.592
Recog2_BAN233002	58.0326	22.142	.062	.656
Recog4_BAN233002	58.1739	22.629	.123	.632
Recog5_BAN233002	57.9674	23.043	.098	.633
Recog6_BAN233002	59.0543	21.700	.123	.642
JP1_BAN233002	57.9674	22.384	.297	.613
JP2_BAN233002	58.2609	21.228	.411	.596
JP3_BAN233002	58.1957	22.225	.260	.615
JP4_BAN233002	58.9565	21.185	.358	.600
JP5_BAN233002	59.1304	20.774	.474	.587
Recog3_BAN233002	59.4565	22.537	.048	.653

Computing variables

1.3 Creating composite variables

1 . creating work environment composite variable by clicking on transform , then clicking on compute variable, write WE_BAN233002 in target variable , then write in numeric expression (WE1_BAN233002 +WE2_BAN233002 +WE3_BAN233002 + WE4_BAN233002 + WE5_BAN233002 + WE6_BAN233002 + WE7_BAN233002 + WE8_BAN233002) / 8

2. creating recognition composite variable by clicking on transform , then clicking on compute variable, write Recog_BAN233002 in target variable , then write in numeric expression (Recog1_BAN233002 + Recog2_BAN233002 + Recog3_BAN233002 + Recog4_BAN233002 + Recog5_BAN233002 + Recog6_BAN233002) / 6

3. creating job performance composite variable by clicking on transform , then clicking on compute variable, write JP_BAN233002 in target variable , then write in numeric expression (JP1_BAN233002 + JP2_BAN233002 + JP3_BAN233002 + JP4_BAN233002 + JP5_BAN233002) / 5 and then click ok

Demographic analysis

Table no 7

Smoking_BAN233002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Smoker	63	68.5	68.5	68.5
	Non-smoker	29	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Table no 8

gender_BAN233002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	50	54.3	54.3	54.3
	Female	42	45.7	45.7	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Table no 9

Education_BAN233002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Matric	4	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Graduation	36	39.1	39.1	43.5
	Master MS	36	39.1	39.1	82.6
	Phd	16	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Table no 10

Maritalstatus_BAN233002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	63	68.5	68.5	68.5
	Un-married	29	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Table no 11

age_BAN233002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21-30	63	68.5	68.5	68.5
	31-40	29	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Table no 12

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
WE_BAN233002	92	2.75	4.50	3.6685	.34937
Recog_BAN233002	92	2.00	4.17	3.3696	.40361
JP_BAN233002	92	2.00	4.40	3.2587	.43932
Valid N (listwise)	92				

Table no 13

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
gender_BAN233002 * Smoking_BAN233002	92	100.0%	0	0.0%	92	100.0%
gender_BAN233002 * Education_BAN233002	92	100.0%	0	0.0%	92	100.0%
gender_BAN233002 * Maritalstatus_BAN233002	92	100.0%	0	0.0%	92	100.0%
gender_BAN233002 * age_BAN233002	92	100.0%	0	0.0%	92	100.0%

Table no 14

gender_BAN233002 * Smoking_BAN233002 Crosstabulation

Count

		Smoking_BAN233002		
		Smoker	Non-smoker	Total
gender_BAN233002	Male	36	14	50
	Female	27	15	42
Total		63	29	92

Table no 15

gender_BAN233002 * Education_BAN233002 Crosstabulation

Count

		Education_BAN233002				
		Matric	Graduation	Master MS	Phd	Total
gender_BAN233002	Male	1	25	15	9	50
	Female	3	11	21	7	42
Total		4	36	36	16	92

Table no 16

gender_BAN233002 * Maritalstatus_BAN233002 Crosstabulation

Count

		Maritalstatus_BAN233002		
		Married	Un-married	Total
gender_BAN233002	Male	36	14	50
	Female	27	15	42
Total		63	29	92

Table no 17

gender_BAN233002 * age_BAN233002 Crosstabulation

Count

		age_BAN233002		
		21-30	31-40	Total
gender_BAN233002	Male	31	19	50
	Female	32	10	42
Total		63	29	92

Table no 18

Correlations

		WE_BAN233002	Recog_BAN233002	JP_BAN233002
WE_BAN233002	Pearson Correlation	1	.094	.338***
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.372	<.001
	N	92	92	92
Recog_BAN233002	Pearson Correlation	.094	1	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.372		.874
	N	92	92	92
JP_BAN233002	Pearson Correlation	.338***	.017	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.874	
	N	92	92	92

***. Correlation at 0.001(2-tailed)

Pearson Correlations

Highly Positive: *(None)*

Positive: *(WE_BAN233002 <---> Recog_BAN233002), (WE_BAN233002 <---> JP_BAN233002), (Recog_BAN233002 <---> JP_BAN233002)*

No Linear Correlation: *(None)*

Negative: *(None)*

Highly Negative: *(None)*

Note: Curated Help is calculated based on actual cell values, not the formatted values.

Regression analysis

Table no 19

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Recog_BAN233002, WE_BAN233002[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: JP_BAN233002

b. All requested variables entered.

Table no 20

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.006	2	1.003	5.737	.005[b]
	Residual	15.557	89	.175		
	Total	17.563	91			

a. Dependent Variable: JP_BAN233002

b. Predictors: (Constant), Recog_BAN233002, WE_BAN233002

Table no 21

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.338[a]	.114	.094	.41809	.114	5.737	2	89	.005

a. Predictors: (Constant), Recog_BAN233002, WE_BAN233002

Table no 22

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.750	.564		3.101	.003
	WE_BAN233002	.426	.126	.339	3.383	.001
	Recog_BAN233002	-.016	.109	-.015	-.151	.880

a. Dependent Variable: JP_BAN233002

Table 01: Case Processing Summary (Before Reliability)

This table shows that data from 92 respondents were included in the analysis. No cases were excluded, indicating complete and usable data for reliability analysis.

Table 02: Reliability Statistics (Before)

The Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.600 for 19 items, which indicates acceptable but relatively low internal consistency. This suggested that some items needed improvement or removal.

Table 03: Item-Total Statistics (Before)

This table shows the contribution of each item to overall reliability. Some items have low or negative corrected item-total correlations, indicating weak consistency. Removing these items helped improve reliability.

Table 04: Case Processing Summary (After Reliability)

All 92 cases were retained after removing weak items. No missing data were found, confirming that the dataset remained complete.

Table 05: Reliability Statistics (After)

After removing weak items, Cronbach's Alpha increased to 0.631 for 18 items. This improvement indicates better internal consistency of the measurement scales.

Table 06: Item-Total Statistics (After)

This table confirms improved item reliability. Most items show acceptable corrected item-total correlations, indicating that retained items contribute positively to the overall scale reliability.

Creation of Composite Variables

Composite variables for work environment, recognition, and job performance were created by averaging their respective items. This allowed meaningful analysis using combined scores.

Table 07: Smoking

The table shows that 68.5% of respondents are smokers, while 31.5% are non-smokers. This indicates that the majority of respondents fall into the smoker category.

Table 08: Gender

The sample consists of 54.3% males and 45.7% females, showing a relatively balanced gender distribution.

Table 09: Education

Most respondents have graduation or master's level education (78.2%), while fewer respondents fall into matric and PhD categories. This reflects a well-educated sample.

Table 10: Marital Status

A majority of respondents (68.5%) are married, while 31.5% are unmarried.

Table 11: Age

Most respondents (68.5%) fall in the 21–30 age group, while 31.5% are aged between 31–40, indicating a relatively young workforce.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics

The mean values indicate that respondents perceive the work environment positively, while recognition and job performance are at moderate levels. Standard deviations show reasonable variability in responses.

Table 13: Case Processing Summary (Crosstabs)

All cross-tabulation analyses include 92 valid cases with no missing values, confirming complete demographic data.

Table 14: Gender × Smoking

This table shows that smoking is more common among males than females, although both genders include smokers and non-smokers.

Table 15: Gender × Education

Male respondents are more represented in graduation and PhD levels, while females are more concentrated at the master's level.

Table 16: Gender × Marital Status

Both males and females show a higher number of married respondents compared to unmarried respondents.

Table 17: Gender × Age

Most respondents from both genders belong to the 21–30 age group, with fewer respondents in the 31–40 category.

Table 18: Correlation Analysis

Work environment shows a significant positive correlation with job performance, while recognition has a weak and insignificant relationship with job performance.

Table 19: Variables Entered/Removed

Work environment and recognition were entered as independent variables to predict job performance. No variables were removed.

Table 20: ANOVA

The regression model is statistically significant ($p = .005$), indicating that the predictors collectively have a significant impact on job performance.

Table 21: Model Summary

The model explains 11.4% of the variance in job performance. This indicates a moderate explanatory power of the independent variables.

Table 22: Coefficients

Work environment has a significant positive impact on job performance, while recognition does not significantly influence job performance.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is developed to examine the relationship between **work environment**, **recognition**, and **job performance**. Based on existing literature and the objectives of the study, **work environment** and **recognition** are treated as **independent variables**, while **job performance** is considered the **dependent variable**.

Independent Variables

1. **Work Environment**
   The work environment refers to the physical, psychological, and social conditions in which employees perform their duties. A supportive and healthy work environment is expected to enhance employees' motivation, efficiency, and overall performance.
2. **Recognition**
   Recognition refers to the acknowledgment, appreciation, and rewards given to employees for their efforts and achievements. Recognition is considered an important motivational factor that can influence employees' attitudes and behaviors at work.

Dependent Variable

- **Job Performance**
  Job performance represents the level at which employees effectively perform their assigned tasks and responsibilities. Higher job performance contributes to organizational success and productivity.

Explanation of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework proposes that both **work environment** and **recognition** have a direct impact on **job performance**. A positive work environment is expected to improve employee focus, satisfaction, and productivity, leading to better job performance. Similarly, recognition is assumed to motivate employees by making them feel valued, which may enhance their performance.

In this study, the framework is empirically tested using correlation and regression analysis through SPSS. The results indicate that **work environment has a significant positive effect on job performance**, while **recognition does not show a significant impact**. This suggests that although recognition is important, a supportive and healthy work environment plays a more critical role in improving employee performance.

Conclusion:

The purpose of this research was to examine the impact of **work environment** and **recognition** on **job performance** using SPSS statistical analysis. Data were collected from **92 respondents**, and appropriate reliability, descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses were performed to achieve the research objectives.

Reliability analysis showed that the measurement scales used in this study had **acceptable internal consistency**, with Cronbach's Alpha improving after the removal of weak items. This confirms that the constructs of work environment, recognition, and job performance were measured reliably and were suitable for further analysis.

Descriptive statistics indicated that respondents generally perceived their **work environment positively**, while perceptions of **recognition** and **job performance** were at a moderate level. The demographic analysis showed a diverse sample in terms of gender, education, age, and marital status, providing a reasonable basis for general analysis.

Correlation analysis revealed a **significant positive relationship between work environment and job performance**, indicating that employees perform better when they experience a supportive and healthy work environment. However, the relationship between recognition and job performance was found to be **weak and insignificant**.

Regression analysis further supported these findings. The overall model was **statistically significant**, confirming that the independent variables jointly influence job performance. Among the predictors, **work environment emerged as a significant positive predictor**, while **recognition did not show a significant impact** on job performance.

In conclusion, the study highlights that a **positive work environment plays a more critical role in enhancing job performance than recognition alone**. Organizations should therefore focus on improving workplace conditions, employee support, and organizational culture to achieve better performance outcomes. Future research is recommended to include additional factors such as motivation, leadership style, job satisfaction, and compensation to better explain job performance.