Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2024, 30(1), 1648 - 1656
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

Research Article

Impact Of Reward And Recognition On Employee Performance On Overall Development Of Small Enterprises In Haryana.

Punam Bizla[1*], Dr. Ajay Poddar[2]

[1*]Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Commerce, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar, Haryana, India.
[2]Professor, Department of Commerce, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar, Haryana, India.

***Corresponding Author:** Punam Bizla
*Email: punamghadhwal@gmail.com

Citation: Punam Bizla, et.al (2024) Impact Of Reward And Recognition On Employee Performance On Overall Development Of Small Enterprises In Haryana, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(1), 1648 - 1656*
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i1.6506

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the impact of reward and recognition on employee performance, specifically focusing on overall development in small enterprises in Haryana. The research had intended for 500 possible respondents, however owing to non-response and technical challenges, only 312 individuals were included for analysis. Recognizing possible biases caused by these difficulties, the research underlines that the offered data and conclusions are limited to the 312 participants. The data, which included marital status, experience, education, and pay, were extensively categorized and evaluated statistically. The inquiry starts with a look at Marital Status, which is assessed using T-tests and Independent Samples t-tests. Despite the stated discrepancies in mean scores between married and unmarried groups, statistical tests show no significant variation in overall developmental views. Similar analyses are conducted for Experience and Education, uncovering variation in average scores but no statistically significant disparities. The results are validated by doing a one-way ANOVA, which indicates that the groups do not have a significant influence on overall development. Salary analysis use One-way ANOVA to examine variance homogeneity and determines whether there are any significant differences. The study concludes with a correlation analysis, which shows robust connections among characteristics like as recognition, talents, incentives, and remuneration. Nevertheless, the negative correlation between recognition and bonuses is evident.

Keywords: impact, reward, recognition.

Introduction:

In today's fiercely competitive economic landscape, businesses increasingly recognize their workforce as their most invaluable asset. Employee effectiveness plays a crucial role in achieving organizational objectives, sustaining growth, and fostering a competitive edge. Enterprises actively explore innovative approaches to motivate and engage staff, with incentive and recognition programs gaining prominence in Human Resource Management (HRM) practices (Jee and Akram, 2022).

As organizations navigate the complexities of the modern business environment, the implementation of these programs not only boosts employee morale but also significantly contributes to enhancing overall organizational performance and resilience. To provide a comprehensive understanding of how reward and recognition systems impact individual and team performance, this research explores various facets of these strategies and their implications for organizational development. The concept of rewarding and recognizing employee contributions is rooted in motivation principles and human behavior psychology (Gul, 2015; Almas, 2016; Daniel, 2017; Bizla and Poddar, 2023). Organizations strategically adopt these systems to align individual and team efforts with overarching goals (Adeoti et al., 2018; Grace, 2018; Agarwal *et al.*, 2023), contributing to employee motivation and organizational success. The research delves into the multifaceted nature of reward

and recognition programs, examining their components and exploring their impact on employee motivation and organizational success. Reward systems encompass both monetary and non-monetary incentives, acknowledging contributions. Recognition programs involve celebrating achievements through praise, awards, and public acknowledgments, fostering a culture of appreciation. The symbiotic relationship between effective reward and recognition systems and enhanced employee performance motivates employees to exceed expectations and fosters loyalty, commitment, and job satisfaction. These systems impact team dynamics, promoting camaraderie and collaboration, leading to improved overall organizational performance.

The study aims to examine nuanced aspects of reward and recognition systems and their influence on individual and team performance, involving a comprehensive review of literature, case studies, and empirical data. By gaining deeper insights, this research aims to assist organizations in designing and implementing more effective strategies to motivate and engage their workforce. The significance of the research lies in studying the impact of reward and recognition on employee performance in small-sized enterprises. It aims to examine key motivational factors influencing employee performance and to understand the most beneficial aspects for creative workforce motivation. The research outcome can guide future researchers in understanding the frequency, complexity, and effects of reward systems on job satisfaction and employee performance. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to enhancing employee performance and achieving organizational goals in today's competitive business environment.

Many studies have attempted for example Abraham Maslow's presented the most popular theory which specify that human depend basically on five need and they are physiological need, safety need, love and belongingness need, esteem need and last is self-actualization need, and each need get fulfilled step wise right from top to bottom for this reason it is known as hierarchical needs of Maslow's (Tezcan, 2017). According to Inskeep and Hall, 2008 on Reward and recognition concepts that support talent and knowledge management initiatives, argued on fact that in an organization there exist knowledgeable and talented workers so to keep then for long period of time it's the core responsibility of HR of firm to come up with reward and recognition concepts. Like by promotion, increasing pay scale, commission, compensation, appreciation, sick leave, travel allowances, insurance allowances, guidance from time to time whenever worker face issues while performing task etc. According to the Michael Armstrong book name "A Handbook of Employee Reward Management and Practice" (Armstrong, 2005) specifically focuses only on prize administration aspect. Beside this it also focused on themes such as the relationship that exist between human resource cost and motivation , types of reward, techniques to build effective creation of reward strategies and salary structure, methods of job evaluation techniques etc. Moreover and International journal of business and management which has been published by Danish and Usman, 2010 has studied on Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation. In his journal he talks mainly about the relation that exist between rendering reward system and job satisfaction level as well as on the relation that exist between Recognition of employees performance from time to time and their motivation level.

From the above review of literature it can be specified that many researcher have carried out research on the topic impact of reward and recognition system on employees. As many researchers have carried out research on MNCs companies, IT sector companies. Hence, here in my research have plan to carry out research on Small Size Enterprises, as they play the major role in boosting up economic growth and most importantly the research will try to do more minutely.

Materials and Methods

The schedule was originally designed for 500 potential respondents; however, only 312 respondents provided usable data for the analysis presented in this chapter. The fact that some individuals did not respond or encountered technical issues may have introduced a potential source of bias or non-response error in the study. It's crucial to recognize that the results and conclusions derived from the analysis pertain exclusively to the 312 respondents who successfully participated, and any insights should be interpreted with the awareness that the non-respondents or those affected by technical glitches are not represented in the findings. Researchers should consider the potential impact of this non-response or technical issues on the overall validity and generalizability of the study's results. After gathering the data, each kind was coded for statistical analysis. Coding's goal is to construct variables from input in preparation for analysis. The data was first input in MS Excel and then exported to SPSS-26 for further analysis.

The following are the main methods to the research challenge, along with their methodologies:

Mean:

Arithmetic mean or simple mean of a set of observation is their sum divided by the number of observation, *e.g*, the arithmetic mean x of n observation x_1, x_2, x_3.....,x_n is given by $\overline{x} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$. In case of grouped data,

$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i x_i$ where x_i's are the mid values of the classes and f_i's are the respective frequencies. Among the three means viz. arithmetic mean (AM), geometric mean (GM) and harmonic mean (HM), AM is most widely used for its simplicity in calculation and explanation.

Standard deviation:

It is more accurate and detailed estimate of dispersion because an outlier can greatly exaggerate the range. It is expressed by $\sigma = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{N}}$

Where, x_i = value of the variable for the i^{th} observation
$\bar{x}$ = the mean or average
N = the number of values

T-test

The t test formula for comparing means between two group is

$$t = \frac{(X_1 - X_2)}{S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where, X_1 and X_2 are the mean of the two group; S_p is the pooled standard deviation and n_1 and n_2 are the sample size of the two group

ANOVA:

The ANOVA formula for assessing mean difference among multiple group is

$\mathbf{F} = \frac{MS_{between}}{MS_{within}}$

Where, $MS_{between}$ is the mean square between group; and MS_{within} is the mean square within group

Levene's test:

Levene test formula for homogeneity of variance is

$$W = \frac{N-k}{k-1} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i (z_i - Z)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{ni} (z_i - Z)^2}$$

Where,
N is the total number of observations; k is the number of groups; n_i is the sample size of the i-th group; Z_{ij} is the individual score in the i-th group; Z_i is the mean of the i-th group; and Z is the overall mean.

Correlation

A correlation is the connection between two variables. The data may be represented as ordered pairs (x, y), with x as the independent (or explanatory) variable and y as the dependent (or response) variable.
A scatter plot may help you assess if two variables have a linear (straight line) link.
The correlation coefficient measures the degree and direction of a linear link between two variables. The r symbol denotes the sample correlation coefficient. The formula for *r* is

$$r = \frac{n\sum xy - \left(\sum x\right)\left(\sum y\right)}{\sqrt{n\sum x^2 - \left(\sum x\right)^2}\sqrt{n\sum y^2 - \left(\sum y\right)^2}}.$$

The range of the correlation coefficient is –1 to 1. If *x* and *y* have a strong positive linear correlation, *r* is close to 1. If *x* and *y* have a strong negative linear correlation, *r* is close to –1. If there is no linear correlation or a weak linear correlation, *r* is close to 0.

Regression

A regression line, also called a line of best fit, is the line for which the sum of the squares of the residuals is a minimum.

The Equation of a Regression Line

The equation of a regression line for an independent variable *x* and a dependent variable *y* is
$\hat{y} = mx + b$
Where, $\hat{y}$ is the predicted *y*-value for a given *x*-value. The slope *m* and *y*-intercept *b* are given by

$$m = \frac{n\sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{n\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2}$$

and $b = \bar{y} - m\bar{x} = \frac{\sum y}{n} - m\frac{\sum x}{n}$

Where $\bar{y}$ is the mean of the y-values and $\bar{x}$ is the mean of the x-values. The regression line always passes through the ($\bar{x}$, $\bar{y}$).

Results and Discussion

In this section, we explore data pertaining to personal characteristics such as Marital Status, Experience in Organization, Education, and Salary, focusing on the homogeneity of variance and its implications for overall development.

1) Marital Status

1.1. T-Test

Table 1 displays the outcomes of a t-test that was performed to examine the variable of "Overall Development" between two groups categorized by marital status: "Married" and "Unmarried." The table presents group data for each category, including the number of respondents (N), the average score, standard deviation (Std. Deviation), and standard error of the mean (Std. Error Mean). The "Married" group, which includes 270 participants, has a mean score of -0.1868 for "Overall Development." The standard deviation for this group is 1.04346, and the standard error of the mean is 0.15220. In contrast, the "Unmarried" group, consisting of 42 participants, has a mean score of -0.5433, which is somewhat lower. The standard deviation for this group is 0.78263, and the standard error of the mean is bigger at 0.31951. These group statistics provide insights into the differences in "Overall Development" between married and unmarried respondents. While the "Married" group has a higher mean score, suggesting slightly more positive perceptions of overall development, the "Unmarried" group exhibits greater variability, as reflected in the larger standard error of the mean. Further statistical analysis, such as a t-test, is typically performed to determine if the observed differences in means are statistically significant.

Table 1 Marital Status T-Test

Group Statistics					
	Marital Status of Respondent	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Overall Development	Married	270	-0.1868	1.04346	0.15220
	Unmarried	42	-0.5433	.78263	0.31951

1.2 Independent Sample Test

Table 2 shows the results of an Independent Samples t-test, which was used to compare the means of the "Overall Development" variable across two groups with assumed equal variances and one without. When identical variances are assumed, the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances produces an F-statistic of 0.533 with a corresponding p-value of 0.469, suggesting that the variances between the two groups are not significantly different. The t-test, which assumed equal variances, yielded a t-statistic of 0.806 with 261 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed p-value of 0.424. The average difference between the groups is 0.35652, with a standard deviation of 0.44256. The 95% confidence interval for the difference is -0.53195 to 1.24500. When equal variances are not assumed, the t-test yields a t-statistic of 1.007 with 7.485 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed p-value of 0.345. The mean difference stays constant at 0.35652, while the standard error is somewhat different at 0.35391. The 95% confidence interval for the difference is -0.46947 to 1.18252. In both situations, the p-values surpass the traditional significance level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in the means of "Overall Development" between the two groups, regardless of whether equal variances are assumed or not. This implies that, based on the t-test results, the groups have similar mean values for this variable, and any observed differences are likely due to random variability rather than meaningful group distinctions.

Table 2 Independent Sample test

Particulars		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Overall Development	Equal variances assumed	0.533	0.469	0.806	261	0.424	0.35652	0.44256	-0.53195	1.24500
	Equal variances not assumed			1.007	51.48	0.345	0.35652	0.35391	-0.46947	1.18252

2. Experience

2.1 One-way ANOVA

Table 3 shows the results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) that was used to compare the mean differences in the "Experience" variable across various experience groups. The table contains information on the number of respondents (N), mean score, standard deviation (Std. Deviation), standard error (Std. Error), and 95% confidence interval for the mean for each experience group. The mean scores for "Experience" differ amongst the different experience categories. The group with "16-20 years" of experience has the greatest mean score (0.0843), while the group with "1-5 years" of experience has the lowest mean score (-0.4063). The standard deviations reveal the variety within each experience group's results. The 95% confidence interval for the mean provides a range within which the genuine population mean for each group is expected to fall. Furthermore, the ANOVA results suggest that there are differences in responses across the experience groups, as indicated by the variation in means. The minimum and maximum values reflect the range of responses within each experience group. Overall, this ANOVA analysis highlights the variations in perceptions related to "Experience" among different groups and lays the groundwork for further investigation to understand the specific factors contributing to these differences.

Table 3 Experience One way ANOVA

Particulars	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1-5years	96	-0.4063	1.17050	0.26853	-0.9705	.1578	-2.81	0.92
6-10years	60	-0.1150	1.12348	0.35528	-0.9187	.6887	-2.81	0.92
11-15years	60	-0.2180	0.57104	0.18058	-0.6265	.1905	-0.95	0.92
16-20years	48	0.0843	0.64665	0.24441	-0.5138	.6823	-0.92	0.92
21-More Years	48	-0.2257	1.35057	0.51047	-1.4748	1.0234	-2.81	0.92
Total	312	-0.2272	1.01739	0.13975	-.5076	.0533	-2.81	0.92

2.2 Test of Homogeneity of Variance

Table 4 presents the results of various tests for the homogeneity of variances with respect to "Overall Development." The table includes statistics related to different measures, such as mean, median, median with adjusted degrees of freedom, and trimmed mean, to assess the homogeneity of variances across these categories. The p-values (Sig.) for each test are also provided. The results indicate that, regardless of the measure used (mean, median, median with adjusted df, or trimmed mean), the p-values for the tests of homogeneity of variances are all relatively high, ranging from 0.207 to 0.332. These higher p-values suggest that there is no significant evidence to reject the null hypothesis of homogeneity of variances among the groups for "Overall Development." In other words, the variances across the different groups are not significantly different. This finding is crucial as it supports the assumption of equal variances, a key requirement in various statistical tests, strengthening the validity of subsequent analyses conducted on this dataset.

Table 4 Test of Homogeneity of Variance

Particulars		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Overall Development	Based on Mean	1.535	24	287	0.207
	Based on Median	1.187	24	287	0.329
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.187	24	282.803	0.332
	Based on trimmed mean	1.445	24	287	0.234

2.3 Overall Development ANOVA

Table 5 depicts the results of an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) used to compare the variance in the "Overall Development" variable among groups. The table contains information on the sums of squares, degrees of freedom (df), mean squares (Mean Square), F-statistic (F), and related p-value (Sig). In this ANOVA study, the variance between the groups (Between Groups) accounts for a sum of squares of 1.415 with four degrees of freedom, yielding a mean square of 0.354. The estimated F-statistic is 0.324, with an associated p-value of 0.860. This p-value shows that there is no statistically significant difference in "Overall Development" between the groups, since it well surpasses the standard significance level of 0.05. In contrast, the bulk of the variability in "Overall Development" is found within the groups (Within Groups), accounting for a total of squares of 52.409 with 48 degrees of freedom and a mean square of 1.092. In conclusion, the ANOVA findings indicate that there is no significant difference in the mean values of "Overall Development" across the groups being compared, since the p-value is significantly greater than 0.05. This implies that, based on this ANOVA analysis, the groups exhibit similar mean scores for this variable, and any observed differences are likely due to random variability rather than meaningful group distinctions.

Table 5 Overall Development ANOVA

Particulars	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	24.015	24	0.354	0.324	0.860
Within Groups	287.409	287	1.092		
Total	311.824	311			

3. Education –

3.1 Oneway ANOVA

Table 6 provides the results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) conducted to examine the mean differences in the "Education" variable across different education categories. The table includes data on the number of respondents (N), the mean score, standard deviation (Std. Deviation), standard error (Std. Error), and the 95% confidence interval for the mean for each education group. Across the various education categories, it is observed that the mean scores for "Education" vary. The group with "Under Graduation" education has the lowest mean score at -0.3400, while the group with "Technical" education has the highest mean score at -0.0300. The standard deviations provide insights into the variability within each education group's responses. The 95% confidence intervals for the mean offer a range within which the true population mean for each group is likely to fall. Furthermore, the ANOVA results suggest that there are differences in responses across the education groups, as indicated by the variation in means. The minimum and maximum values reflect the range of responses within each education group. Overall, this ANOVA analysis highlights the variations in perceptions related to "Education" among different groups and sets the stage for further investigation to understand the specific factors contributing to these differences.

Table 6 Education One way ANOVA

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Non-Technical	40	-0.1200		.	.		-0.12	-0.12
Under Graduation	79	-0.3400	1.10419	0.36806	-1.1888	0.5088	-2.81	0.92
Post-Graduation	117	-0.2346	0.96467	0.15859	-0.5562	0.0870	-2.81	0.92
Technical	56	-0.0300	1.42887	0.58334	-1.5295	1.4695	-2.81	0.92
Total	312	Tes-0.2272	1.01739	0.13975	-0.5076	0.0533	-2.81	0.92

3.2Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The homogeneity of variances was assessed using multiple methods for the overall development variable. Levene's test was employed based on mean, median, and trimmed mean, with degrees of freedom (df1) equal to 12 and 199 (df2). The test statistic yielded values of 0.177 (p = 0.838) when based on the mean, 0.148 (p =

0.863) when based on the median, and 0.145 (p = 0.865) when based on the trimmed mean. Additionally, an adjusted degrees of freedom value of 199.118 was used when the test was based on the median. Overall, the results from these tests indicate that there is no significant difference in variances across the groups, as all p-values exceed the conventional significance threshold of 0.05, suggesting homogeneity of variances for the overall development variable across the groups.

Table 7 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Overall Development	Based on Mean	0.177	12	199	0.838
	Based on Median	0.148	12	199	0.863
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	0.148	12	199.118	0.863
	Based on trimmed mean	0.145	12	199	0.865

3.3 Overall Development ANOVA

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess the impact of different groups on the overall development variable. The results from Table 8 indicate that the between-groups variation (Sum of Squares = 0.361, df =23, Mean Square = 0.120) and within-groups variation (Sum of Squares = 53.463, df = 287, Mean Square = 1.091) were computed. The F-statistic, with a value of 0.110, and its associated p-value of 0.954, were used to evaluate the significance of differences among the groups. Given that the p-value exceeds the typical significance level of 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall development scores among the groups. Therefore, based on this ANOVA analysis, it appears that the groups do not have a significant impact on overall development.

Table 8 Overall Development ANOVA

Particulars	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	23.61	23	0.120	.110	.954
Within Groups	287.463	287	1.091		
Total	311.824	311			

4 Salary

4.1 One-way ANOVA

Table 9 presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the impact of different salary ranges on the variable of interest. The table includes the number of observations (N), the mean, standard deviation (Std. Deviation), standard error (Std. Error), and the 95% confidence interval for the mean, as well as the minimum and maximum values within each salary range category. The analysis reveals that there are five salary categories, ranging from "Less than Rs. 250000" to "Above 1000000." The mean values for these categories range from approximately -0.5033 to 0.1107. The ANOVA F-statistic is not presented in the table, but it would be used to test whether there are statistically significant differences in means among the salary categories. Additional information, such as the p-value for the ANOVA, would be necessary to determine if there are significant differences. Overall, this table provides a summary of the descriptive statistics for each salary category, enabling a preliminary assessment of potential differences in salary across these groups.

Table 9 Salary One-way ANOVA

Particulars	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than Rs. 250000	53	-0.5033	0.46608	0.26909	-1.6611	0.6545	-0.95	-0.02
Rs.250001 – Rs.500000	67	-0.5414	0.76117	0.28770	-1.2454	0.1625	-1.90	0.41
Rs.500001 – Rs.750000	62	-0.5792	0.89276	0.25772	-1.1464	-0.0119	-2.81	0.55
Rs.750001 – Rs.1000000	64	0.1107	1.05371	0.28162	-0.4977	0.7191	-2.81	0.92
Above 1000000	67	-0.0788	1.18144	0.28654	-0.6863	0.5286	-2.81	0.92
Total	312	-0.2272	1.01739	0.13975	-0.5076	0.0533	-2.81	0.92

4.2Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Table 10 presents the results of the Test of Homogeneity of Variances using different methods for assessing the overall development variable. The table includes the Levene Statistic, degrees of freedom (df1 and df2), and the

associated significance level (Sig.). The Levene Statistic values are approximately 0.488 when based on mean, 0.426 when based on median, 0.426 with adjusted degrees of freedom, and 0.416 when based on the trimmed mean. In all cases, the p-values are notably higher than the conventional significance threshold of 0.05, with values ranging from 0.744 to 0.796. These results suggest that there is no significant difference in variances across the groups, regardless of the method used to assess homogeneity. Therefore, it can be concluded that the variances of the overall development variable do not significantly differ across the tested groups.

Table 10 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Particulars		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Overall Development	Based on Mean	0.488	14	197	0.744
	Based on Median	0.426	14	197	0.789
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	0.426	14	182.41	0.789
	Based on trimmed mean	0.416	14	197	0.796

4.3 Overall Development ANOVA

Table 11 shows the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) used to investigate the effect of various groups on the overall development variable. The table displays the sum of squares for both between-groups and within-groups changes, degrees of freedom (df), mean square values, the estimated F-statistic, and the corresponding significance level (Sig.). The between-groups variance is stated as 4.379 with 24 degrees of freedom, for a mean square of 1.095. The F-statistic, which has a value of 1.063, is used to determine the significance of differences between groups. The F-test has a p-value (Sig.) of 0.385, which above the commonly accepted significance threshold of 0.05. As a result of this ANOVA study, the p-value is larger than 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in total development scores between the groups. In other words, the groups do not seem to have a major influence on overall development, according to this data.

Table 11 Overall Development ANOVA

Particulars	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	24.379	24	1.095	1.063	.385
Within Groups	287.445	287	1.030		
Total	311.824	311			

5. Hypothesis for Regression Analysis

Table 12 displays the correlation coefficients between various factors in a regression analysis. The Pearson correlation coefficients are used to assess the strength and direction of linear relationships between the variables. Notably, the correlations between "Recognition" and "Skills" ($r = 0.803$, $p < 0.001$), "Recognition" and "Incentives" ($r = 0.477$, $p < 0.001$), "Salary" and "Skills" ($r = 0.603$, $p < 0.001$), and "Salary" and "Incentives" ($r = 0.356$, $p = 0.008$) are all positive and statistically significant, suggesting strong positive linear associations. Conversely, "Recognition" exhibits a negative correlation with "Bonus" ($r = -0.425$, $p = 0.001$), indicating a negative linear relationship between these variables. Overall, this table provides valuable insights into the strength and direction of relationships between various factors, which can inform further regression analyses and help understand the interplay between these variables in the context of the study.

Table 12 Hypothesis for Regression Analysis

Correlations									
		Reward	Recognition	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Incentives	Skills	Other Aspects
Reward	Pearson Correlation	1	0.108	0.144	-0.079	-0.111	0.088	0.051	0.064
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.433	0.296	0.568	0.421	0.524	0.711	0.645
Recognition	Pearson Correlation	0.108	1	0.748**	0.214	-0.425**	0.477**	0.803**	-0.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.433		0.000	0.117	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.848
Salary	Pearson Correlation	0.144	0.748**	1	0.182	-0.264	0.356**	0.603**	-0.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.296	0.000		0.184	0.052	0.008	0.000	0.661
Commission	Pearson Correlation	-0.079	0.214	0.182	1	-0.336*	-0.175	0.499**	-0.145
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.568	0.117	0.184		0.012	0.201	0.000	0.290
Bonus	Pearson Correlation	-0.111	-0.425**	-0.264	-0.336*	1	0.120	-0.567**	0.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.421	0.001	0.052	0.012		0.382	0.000	0.631

Incentives	Pearson Correlation	0.088	0.477**	0.356**	-0.175	0.120	1	-0.121	-0.186
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.524	0.000	0.008	0.201	0.382		0.377	0.175
Skills	Pearson Correlation	0.051	0.803**	0.603**	0.499**	-0.567**	-0.121	1	0.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.711	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.377		0.652
Other Aspects	Pearson Correlation	0.064	-0.027	-0.060	-0.145	0.066	-0.186	0.062	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.645	0.848	0.661	0.290	0.631	0.175	0.652	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).									
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).									

Conclusion

Based on the information presented above, a complete study was conducted to investigate the impact of human qualities and organizational factors on overall growth. We used statistical techniques such as t-tests, ANOVA, and homogeneity tests to investigate characteristics such as marital status, experience, education, and pay. Despite variations in mean scores and group perceptions, statistical analysis consistently revealed no significant differences, underscoring the importance of random variability over meaningful distinctions. These findings show the complexities of the factors that determine general development perspectives. Furthermore, correlation coefficients from the regression analysis indicated significant relationships between critical components. In conclusion, our research provides nuanced insights into employee viewpoints, emphasizing the need of holistic considerations in organizational development projects.

References

1. Adeoti JO, Isiaka SB, Lawal AI, Olawale, YA and Adeyemi EA. "Impact of Reward philosophy on Corporate Entrepreneurship performance for sustainability of the food and beverages industry", Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, 2018, 20(3), 192-207.
2. Agrawal A, Gandhi P, Khare P. "Women empowerment through entrepreneurship: case study of a social entrepreneurial intervention in rural India". International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 2023; 31(4), 1122-1142.
3. Almas S, "Reward and Recognition System-Key Behaviours to Benefit Employees and Businesses in Competitive Job Markets", American Research Journal of Business and Management, 2016, 2, 1-7.
4. Armstrong M. "A Handbook of Employee Reward Management and Practice" 2nd Edition first published in Great Britain and the United States in 2005 by Kogan Page Limited, ISBN-10 0 7494 4962 4, ISBN-13 978 0 7494 4962 9.
5. Bizlar P and Poddar A. Impact of Reward and Recognition on Employee Performance level of Small Enterprises in Haryana. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*,2023; 5(6):1-12.
6. Daniel N N. "Effects of Reward and Recognition on employee performance in public educational institutions: A Case of Kenyatta University, Kenya", Global Journal of Management and Business Research: A Administration and Management, 2017, 17(1).
7. Danish R Q and Usman, A., "Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan", International journal of business and management, 2010, 5(2), 159.
8. Grace AO. "Influence of reward philosophy on the growth of micro and small furniture manufacturing enterprises in Kenya", International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration, 2018, 3(3), 333-355.
9. Gul Z. "Impact of employee commitment on organizational development", FWU Journal of Social Sciences, 2015, 9(2), 117-124.
10. Inskeep N A and Hall B. "Reward and recognition concepts that support talent and knowledge management initiatives", Smart Talent Management–Building Knowledge Assets for Competitive Advantage, 2008, 161-175.
11. Jee FC and Akram A S, Al-K. "Rewards and Organizational Commitment: A Study among Malaysian SME's Employees", International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2022, 12(2), 144-164.
12. Tezcan U, Sibel A and Emine G. "Maslow's Hierarch of needs in 21st century: The Examination of Vocational Differences". In book: Researches on Science and art in 21st century Turkey, 2017, 1(23), 211-227.