

An Examination of Promotion Satisfaction Among Employees in Revenue Generating Organisations

ADAMS ISSAHAKU

(Corresponding)

Tamale Technical University, Faculty of Business,
Department of Secretaryship and Management Studies.

Box 3ER, Tamale, Ghana, West Africa.

Email: issahaku@tatu.edu.gh

PATIENCE MOIMAAK NUNFAN

Ghana Revenue Authority, Box 2327, Tamale East TSC. Tamale. Ghana.

Email: amoimaak@gmail.com

Abstract

This research focused on promotion satisfaction among the employees of Revenue generating organisations in Ghana in the Tamale Metropolis. The study adopted a descriptive survey and involved the collection of data aligned to the research questions. The study sampled 47 respondents and adopted a non-probability sampling technique with respect to the unit of analysis using both quantitative and quantitative data collection methods. The study results revealed that employees are recognised and promoted when they always meet work deadlines and the objectives set, carry out error free task and respond to customers on time. Promotion in turn led to increased responsibility of employees, which resulted in increased workload or work volume. However, promotion does not cause employees to work outside normal working hours. Again, demographic factors such as age, educational level, performance and number of years on the job impacted promotion satisfaction except gender. The findings revealed that employees are promoted base on their recognition on the job but employees were not satisfied with issues like the working environment and relationship with colleagues. The study recommends that, Management should give recognition to effort of staff; enrich tasks, provide better and humane supervision and also ensure good work environment for their staff to enhance promotion satisfaction. Also, delays in employees' promotion should be avoided so that employees would work with diligence and utmost commitment.

Keywords: Employee Promotion, Performance, Job Satisfaction, Recognition, Motivation, Efficiency.

Introduction

Organisations are said to be efficient when they derive maximum output from the most available resources (Razak, Sarpan & Ramlan, 2018 and Sikula, 2000). Although an organisation engages and uses many different types of assets, human resource is viewed the most valuable asset of any organisation. Non-human resources become effective for an organisation only with the help of labour force (Baffour & Achemfuor, 2013). Globalisation of organisations practices thought us that, a competent workforce is believed to be a competitive edge for any firm. To be successful in the corporate world, organisations ought to have a highly motivated, loyal and satisfied workforce who undoubtedly should be committed to duty (Wekesa & Nyaroo, 2013). This is achieved through a thorough understanding and application of all the ingredients necessary for enhancing the satisfaction level of employees (Kreitner, 2004). Today business organisations face a threat of uncertainty and changes emanating from technological innovations. To overcome the fear of employees' turnover, organisations must work hard through superior human resources practices to retain

their valuable employees. One important factor for enhancing the job satisfaction of employees can be employee promotion (Wekesa & Nyaroo, 2013).

Employees are supposed to be satisfied with their work when they consider themselves to be a productive part of the organisation. Employees can derive such satisfaction when organisations realise and recognise their worth by promoting them to a position of greater authority and control (Rinny, Purba, & Handiman, 2020; Wekesa & Nyaroo, 2013). The more the number of motivated and satisfied employees in an organisation, better are the chances of the organisation in achieving its goal and attainment of the ultimate, profitability (Saari & Judge, 2004). A satisfied employee is more committed and can be retained in the organisation for a longer period, thus enhancing the productivity of the company (Bravendam, 2002). Researches have shown that a person who is a satisfied employee and stays motivated at the work place has higher probability of performing his other roles as a member of the society, which is interacting with other members of the society in various capacities.

For all employees worldwide, promotion is considered a very important element of the job (Baffour & Achemfuor, 2013). Promotion in the job is very important and it serves to increase the reputation of organisations. The success of the organisations depends on the satisfaction of its employees from promotion policies. This is why promotion and opportunities to the employees represent a very important strategy for the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the workers (Noor et al., 2015). Job promotion decisions are not only crucial for the career path of employees; they also increase job satisfaction (Kosteas 2011) and organisational performance (Delaney & Huselid 1996). Most firms have established promotion procedures and prefer internal promotions to higher positions to hiring from outside (Kwon & Milgrom 2014).

Movement within an organisation to a position in which responsibilities and presumably prestige is increased is ordinarily labelled as job promotion. Job promotion possibilities influence the behaviour of individuals in the organisation and stimulate individuals to greater abilities to move ahead (Parry & Kelliher 2009). Job promotion is used as a reward and an inducement to better work performance and other organisationally approved forms of behaviours. People will work harder if they feel this will lead to job promotion. They have little motivation if they feel that better and higher level jobs are reserved for outsiders (Pearce, 2011; Poulston, 2008).

The system of job promotion permits organisations to match its need for competent personnel with the employee's desire to apply the skills they have developed (Gomez, 2002). An effective system of job promotion can result to greater organisational efficiency and high level of employees' morale (Gomez, 2002). According to Armstrong (2006) the aim of job promotion procedure of a company should be to enable management to obtain the best talent available within the company to fill more senior posts and to provide employees with the opportunity to advance their careers within the company, in accordance with the opportunity available and their own abilities. Most people have a need for high evaluation of themselves and feel that what they do should be recognised by others concerned (Richard & Johnson 2001). Job promotion is an employee development strategy and also considered as a reward for good performance and a recognition of an employee capabilities (Samuel & Chipunza 2009). It carries a high value in employee retention as a clear succession plan keeps the employee motivated to keep up a good performance and long-term commitment with the company.

During the evaluation of an employee performance for job promotion, an effective communication process should be established so as to know where the employee who might not be eligible for a job promotion is lacking and what can be done to achieve results (Prasad, 2001). Regular feedback regarding employee performance would provide the direction for the employee to improve his/her performance and gain a job promotion. This assures the employees that the firm is interested in their advancement (Gomez, 2002 and Sangaran & Jeetesh, 2015). Promoting employees should also be based on factors such as education, performance and expertise and should be justified so as to prevent employees from engaging in politics to exert pressure on managers for rewards and job promotions. Armstrong (2006) stated that justified job

promotions encourage employees to do their best knowing that good performance will be rewarded. In cases where employees feel that job promotions given in company are not justified and a dubious means such as chronicism or favouritism is used to promote employees, they are likely to look for jobs in other firms that promote their employees based on justified and genuine results. Employers should also give ear to employee concerns and ideas regarding job promotion to increase their commitment and loyalty (Gomez, 2002).

Hasibuan (2018) stated that promotion, usually a move to a higher position includes an increase in salary/other wages, although this is not always the case. According to Adi et. al. (2016) there are basics in job promotions, which include seniority, job performance, loyalty level, and honesty. Job promotions are mostly in the interest of employees because promotion does not only show the dynamics of the job but also other aspects that are given in line with the job description.

However, if the best job in the firm is often given to outsiders, then the employees will likely be less motivated towards working to achieve such jobs (Pearce, 2011) and this attitude affects the bottom-line. This current study therefore assesses promotion satisfaction among the employees in revenue generating sector.

Problem Statement

Promotions is deemed essential for both organisations and individual employees. For organisations, it engenders employees commitment and motivate them towards the company goals achievement. By rewarding workers through promotion which will eventually lead to financial and status gains, morale and commitment increases towards set targets. From individual employees' perspective, rising through the ranks leads to enhancement in morale, increased wellbeing, and job satisfaction (Timothy & Watanabe, 1994). Nevertheless, employee promotions can generate mixed feelings and blessing for many; while promotion provide an increase in occupational status, financial reward, job autonomy, privilege and edibility, they are often accompanied by job enlargement and job enrichment, extended working time, stress and reduced work-life balance (Dickinson & Villeval, 2012). Promotions are therefore, a win-lose situation. While workers may win through the status gain, financial and personal growth, they may impact their psychological wellbeing and work-life balance. In addition, job change or role transitions have the ability to change people (Jeanne, 1982). The characteristics of a person may change as a result of change in occupational status (Kosteas 2011). As people transition in their new role after promotion, it might involve psychological, cognitive and behavioural adjustments. Workers might need to embrace their new role in the social network, learn new tasks, get familiar with new routines as well as cope with potentially new physical settings and surroundings (Dickinson & Villeval, 2012) which mostly requires working late, less time to spend with family and the inconvenience of travelling, some of which may inject stress in the work life of the employee. As such, these transitions can have positive as well as negative consequences on a promoted worker's life. Prior studies have linked workplace promotions with health, mental wellbeing, job satisfactions among other adjustment issues for workers (Kosteas, 2011).

Base on previous research conducted, Simanjuntak (2015) found that promotion has a positive and significant influence on employee performance. According to Septiani (2015) promotion influences performance. Rahayu (2017) found that promotion of position has a positive and significant influence on performance. Malik et al. (2012) conducted a survey and reported that salary has a positive effect on or relation with job satisfaction; on the other hand, promotion has a poor relationship with job satisfaction. Job promotion decisions are not only crucial for the career path of employees, they also increase job satisfaction (Kosteas 2011) and organisational performance (Delaney & Huselid 1996). Most firms have established promotion procedures and prefer internal promotions to hiring from outside (Kwon & Milgrom 2014). Rinny, Purba and Handiman, (2020) argued that competitive relationships within organisations might suppress the information exchange and collaboration among employees. As a result, employees might even sabotage or punish their opponents (Chen, 2003). According to Johnson and Salmon (2016) low

ability workers are discouraged by arbitrary promotion decisions or promotions based on irrelevant skills. Job promotion procedure has salient consequences for the motivation of employees, specifically for low ability workers (Johnson & Salmon, 2016).

Dickinson and Villeval (2012) emphasise the importance of efficient job promotion rules. They reproduced the Peter Principle in the laboratory and compared the efficiency of a promotion standard with subjects self-selecting their task. They found that when the Peter Principle is not severe, promotion rules often dominate self-selection efficiency of task assignment (Dickinson & Villeval 2012). Most of previous studies focused on job satisfaction and turnover intention and generally, researchers used a single method of data collection (Saif, 2012; Hyder & Batool, 2013; Ghafoor, 2014; Rahman et al., 2015 and Farzeen et al., 2015). In order to cover and fill gaps, this study intends to use mixed approach to assess promotion satisfaction among the employees using Ghana Revenue Authority in the Tamale Metropolis.

The main objective of this study was to assess promotion satisfaction among the employees of Ghana Revenue Authority in the Tamale Metropolis. The specific objectives this study sought to achieve among others were to: establish the influence of employee's recognition on employee's promotion in GRA in Tamale; examine the effect of promotion on employee's performance in GRA in Tamale; assess promotion satisfaction among the employees of GRA in Tamale; and identify factors affecting employee's promotion in GRA in Tamale.

Methodology

Survey research techniques was used because they required the description of events and giving explanatory of phenomena as they naturally transpired without intervention from the researcher (Russell, 2013). This required a research strategy that involves the structured collection of data from a sizeable population (Saunders, et al, 2007). Therefore, both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used. The qualitative approaches were used because it is highly structured, and allows for the cost efficient and less tedious data analysis (Saunders, et al, 2007). The qualitative data on the other hand allow researchers to collect responses from respondents and allows them to view on the questions and make concrete suggestions.

Population

According to Kothari (2012) a researcher has to have a specific population as his research population target upon which he uses to make all his inferences regarding validity of what he/she is researching on. A population is a comprehensive itemised list of all subjects from which a sample is taken (Saunders, et al, 2007). The target population for this study included staff of the various departments in the Tamale GRA office. The study used a total study population of fifty-three (53). The detail is shown in the Table 1 depicting the categories of the study population.

Table 1: Target Population of the Study

Staff category	Department	Number
Permanent	Compliance	6
	Tax Payers Service	10
	Enforcement	5
	Audit	17
	Administration	9
	Accounts	4
Temporal	Messenger	1
	Labour	1
Total		53

Source: Administration, Tamale GRA (2021)

Sample and Sampling Technique

In this study, non-probability sampling was used. The use of the non-probability sampling technique was to ensure that each category of the respondents was represented in the sample. Also, non-probability sampling is less strict and makes no claim for representativeness. Therefore, the purposive sampling technique was adopted for the procedure. Purposive sampling (also known as judgement, selective or subjective sampling) is a sampling technique in which researcher relies on his or her judgement when choosing members of population to participate in the study (Saunders et al., 2007). The sample size was derived using Nassiuma's (2000) formula.

$$n = \frac{NC^2}{C^2 + (N - 1)e^2}$$

Where:

n = sample size

N = population size

C = coefficient of variation which is 50%

e = error margin which is 0.05.

Substituting these values in the equation, estimated sample size (n) was:

$$n = \frac{53(0.5)^2}{0.5^2 + (53 - 1) 0.05^2}$$

$$n = 47$$

Out of a researchable population of 53, the sampling technique used indicated that the most appropriate sample size relevant for this study should be 47 respondents.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The study analysed the demographic characteristics of respondents who contributed in the research work. This information was very relevant for the understanding of the results emanating from the analysis of promotion satisfaction. In this study, the respondent's demographic included sex, age, educational background, length of service in the organisation and department of the respondents. In analysing the data, one questionnaire retrieved was not appropriately answered and was excluded from the analysis leaving a valid response of 46 questionnaire from the respondents.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Variables		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
Sex	Female	14	30.4	30.4	30.4
	Male	32	69.6	69.6	100.0
Age	20-29 years	3	6.5	6.5	6.5
	30-39 years	31	67.4	67.4	73.9
	40-49 years	10	21.7	21.7	95.7

Qualification	50 +	2	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Diploma	4	8.7	8.7	8.7
	First Degree	18	39.1	39.1	47.8
	Masters	21	45.7	45.7	93.5
	Others	3	6.5	6.5	100.0
Length of service	2-5 years	17	37.0	37.0	37.0
	6-10 years	19	41.3	41.3	78.3
	10 +	10	21.7	21.7	100.0
Department	Accounts	7	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Administrati on	7	15.2	15.2	30.4
	Audit	7	15.2	15.2	45.7
	Enforcement	6	13.0	13.0	58.7
	Labour	1	2.2	2.2	60.9
	Tax Payers Service	18	39.1	39.1	100.0
Total		46	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field survey, (2022)

From Table 2, out of the total respondents of 46, a majority of 69.6% were males whereas 30.4% were females. This means that majority of the respondents were males, even though the proportion of male respondents were in the lead, the female respondents was also encouraging and this shows that findings of the research did not suffer from gender bias since both gender were involved in the study.

Data on age distribution reveals that 6.5% of the respondents were between the ages of 20 and 29 years, 67.4% were between the ages of 30 and 39 years, 21.7% were between the ages of 40 and 49 years and only 4.3% of them were above 50 years. This data shows that most of the respondents were between the ages of 30-39 years. This is an indication that in terms of age, the respondents were well distributed and that the majority of worker are within the very active working class. Neek et al, (2018), Noor and Silitonga, (2018) and Pawirosumarto, Sarjana, and Muchtar, (2017) have observed that in many African context, age and sex could influence a person's decision-making position.

Educational qualification plays a vital role in every organisation thus, the education status of respondents was studied. The study requested the respondents to indicate their highest level of educational qualification. From the analysis, most of the respondents had obtained Master's degree certificate and constituted 45.7% and diploma certificate holders formed 8.7%. Respondents with first degree were 39.1% and those with other certificates were 6.5%. This means that majority of the respondents focused in this study had some level of educational background with most of them holding Master's degree certificate. According to GSS (2012), a person was considered literate if he or she could write a simple statement with understanding.

The study sought to know the number of years respondents have been working for the organisation and 37.0% of the respondents indicated that they have been in the organisation for 2-5 years, 41.3% indicate that 6-10 years and 21.7% of the respondents stated above 10 years. This implies that majority of the respondents have been with the organisation for considerable period which indicates that most of the respondents had vast knowledge and experience which could be relied upon by this study.

After knowing the length of service of the respondents, the respondents were finally asked under this section to indicate their department in the organisation. 15.2% of the respondents stated that they were with the Accounts, another 15.2% were with the Administration whiles 15.2% were with the Audit department. 13.0% were with the Enforcement department, 2.2% were with the Labour department while as high as 39.1% were with the Tax Payers Service department. This data shows that most (39.1%) of respondents were with the Tax Payers Service Department.

The Influence of Employee's Recognition on Employee Promotion

The section sought to establish the influence of employee's recognition on employee promotion. It is commonly expressed that hard work pays and if this statement has some level of substance, how is this hard work established and what form does the payment take? The result of the findings is shown in table 3.

Table 3: The Influence of Employee's Recognition on Employee Promotion

Recognisable employee behaviour	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The employee is recognised when he/she completes work within the stipulated time frame	46	1	5	2.39	1.145
When employee make best possible use of institutional resources	46	1	5	2.52	1.206
When employee always meet work deadlines	46	1	5	2.67	1.156
When employee work towards meeting the set objectives	46	1	5	2.96	1.154
When employees carry out error free task	46	1	5	2.96	1.134
When employee respond to customers on time when asked to do so	46	1	5	2.89	1.159
When employees are kind when attending to customers	46	1	5	2.52	1.005
When employees use amicable procedures to resolve conflict	46	1	5	2.96	.988
The institution gives employees a clear sense of what they should be aiming for.	46	1	5	2.26	1.104
Valid N (listwise)	46				

Source: Field survey, (2022)

From the Table 3, most of the respondents strongly agreed that the employee is recognised when he/she completes work within the stipulated timeframe with a mean score of 2.39 and a standard deviation of 1.145. Most of the respondents agreed that employees recognition leads to promotion. It was also highly agreed that when employee make best possible use of institutional resources, it leads to promotion which had a mean score of 2.52 and a standard deviation of 1.206. Most of the respondents agreed that when employee always meet work deadlines, it creates an opportunity for them to be promoted. This statement scored high with a mean score of 2.67 and a standard deviation of 1.156. Majority of respondents also agreed with a mean score of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 1.154 that when employee work towards meeting the set objectives, that becomes a good ground for them to be promoted. Most of the respondents agreed that promotion can be earned when employees carry out error free task with a mean score of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 1.134. In connection to this finding, workers might need to embrace their new

role in the social network, learn new tasks, get familiar with new routines as well as cope with potentially new physical settings and surroundings (Sitati, Were & Waititu, 2016 and Dickinson & Villeval, 2012).

Providing excellent customer service is a practice that all organisation strives for. Most of the respondents agreed that one can be promoted when customer service standards are met by an employee timeously and this scores a mean of 2.89 and a standard deviation of 1.159. Meanwhile, majority of the respondents were neutral regarding promotion prospects and employee kindness when attending to customers with a mean score of 2.52 and a standard deviation of 1.005. Again, most of the respondents agreed that when employees use amicable procedures to resolve conflict between themselves and co-workers or customers, this can lead to promotion with a mean score of 2.96 and a standard deviation of .988. In other words, some may exaggerate the competencies and the achievements of their peers or give a bleak account of colleagues due to unresolved differences and friction between employees (Bernardin & Wiatrowski, 2013).

Blau (1964) postulates that when employees are promoted, they feel honoured by the organisation so they repay the institute through their loyalty, commitment and involvement. This is why promotion and opportunities to the employees represent a very important strategy for the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the workers (Noor et al., 2015). Many researchers give their opinion that satisfaction is strongly correlated with promotion opportunities and there is a direct and positive association between promotional opportunities and satisfaction (Neck et al., 2018 and Ndede, 2014).

Lastly, most of the respondents agreed that when the institution gives employees a clear job description which is operationalised by employees, promotion might be given to the employee and this scored a mean of 2.26 and a standard deviation of 1.104. Correspondingly, Hasibuan (2016) states that work performance is work achieved by a person carrying out the tasks assigned to him based on skills, experience, sincerity, and time expended.

Effect of Promotion on Employee's Performance

This section sought to examine the effect of promotion on employee's performance. The result of the findings is shown on the table 4.

Table 4: Effect of Promotion on Employee's Performance

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Promotion leads to increase in responsibility of employees	46	1	5	2.26	1.104
Increase in responsibilities results to increase in workload or work volume	46	1	5	2.54	1.149
Promotion cause employees to work outside normal working hours	46	1	5	2.46	1.026
Promotion enhances employee competency and skills	45	1	4	2.93	.939
Promotion boosts employees' confidence to perform a particular task	46	1	5	3.22	1.134
Employees acquire new skills through job promotion	43	1	5	3.12	1.051
Promotion among staff results to shift in management position	46	1	5	2.48	1.027
Change of positions leads to the requirement of new skills	46	1	4	2.30	.866
Valid N (listwise)	43				

Source: Field survey, (2022)

From Table 4, most of the respondents agreed that promotion leads to increase in responsibility of employees with a mean score of 2.26 and a standard deviation of 1.104. This is in line with the findings of Ndede (2014) which indicates that job promotion practices focus on improving staff skills, assigning new responsibilities and transfers.

Most of the respondents were neutral that increase in responsibilities results to increase in workload or work volume with a mean score of 2.54 and a standard deviation of 1.149. Dissimilar to this finding, promotion is the advancement in ranks within the organisation which is accompanied by increase in responsibilities (Kwon & Milgrom 2014). Job promotion is an elevation of the employees to a higher or better jobs position compared to previously greater responsibilities, create room for more achievements, access to better facilities, enjoyment of higher status, exhibition of higher proficiency on job demands, and additional wages or salaries and other benefits (Neck et al., 2018).

Most of the respondents were also neutral that promotion cause employees to work outside normal working hours with a mean score of 2.46 and a standard deviation of 1.026. However, promotions can be a mixed blessing for many, while they provide an increase in occupational status, financial reward, job autonomy, privileges and edibility, they can often also be accompanied by added responsibility, longer working hours, stress and reduced work-life balance (Dickinson & Villeval, 2012).

Most of the respondents disagreed that promotion enhance employee competency and knowledge with the necessary tax laws which registered a mean score of 2.93 and a standard deviation of .939. Conflicting to this finding, the system of job promotion permits organisations to match its need for competent personnel with the employee's desire to apply the skills they have developed (Gomez, 2002). Indeed, promotion could enhance employee competency and knowledge if it accompanied by training. This support the established finding in the 'Peter's Principle' that employees are mostly promoted from their level of competence to their level of incompetence.

Most of the respondents disagreed that promotion boost employees' confidence to perform a particular task with a mean score of 3.22 and a standard deviation of 1.134. On the contrary, using valued skills and abilities provides workers with a sense of self pride, competence and self-confidence (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

Further, most of the respondents agreed that employees acquire new skills through job promotion with a mean score of 3.12 and a standard deviation of 1.051. The system of job promotion permits organisations to match its need for competent personnel with the employee's desire to apply the skills they have developed (Gomez, 2002). Ndede (2014) indicates that job promotion practices focus on improving staff skills, assigning new responsibilities and transfers.

Majority of the respondents agreed that promotion among staff results to shift in management position with a mean score of 2.48 and a standard deviation of 1.027.

Lastly, most of the respondents agreed that change of positions leads to the requirement of new skills with a mean score of 2.30 and a standard deviation of .866. In connection to this finding, according to Fahmi (2016), promotion increases an employee from his previous position to a higher position. Hasibuan (2018) stated that promotion is usually a move to a higher position includes an increase in salary/other wages, although this is not always the case. Rahayu (2017) found that promotion of position has a positive and significant influence on performance.

Promotion Satisfaction among Employees

This section sought to assess the promotion satisfaction among employees. The results of the findings is shown on the table 5.

Table 5: Promotion Satisfaction among Employees

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction with ranks attached to promotions	46	1	5	2.20	1.185
Satisfied with the remuneration	46	1	5	2.91	1.396
Satisfaction with other rewards attached to promotion	46	1	5	2.59	1.203
Satisfied with the working environment	46	1	5	2.57	1.186
Satisfied with the relationship I have with my colleagues	46	1	5	3.20	1.003
Satisfied with the support I receive from my co-workers	45	1	4	2.58	.941
Satisfied with the level of supervision	44	1	5	2.09	1.235
Valid N (listwise)	43				

Source: Field survey, (2022)

From Table 5, most of the respondents agreed that there is satisfaction associated with ranks attached to promotions with a mean score of 2.20 and a standard deviation of 1.185. The movement of an employee upward in the hierarchy of the organisation, typically that leads to enhancement of responsibility and rank and an improved compensation package is a promotion (Hassan, 2019).

Most of the respondents agreed that they were satisfied with the remuneration they get from promotion with a mean score of 2.91 and a standard deviation of 1.396, Similar to this finding, Noor and Silitonga, (2018) and Pawirosumarto, Sarjana and Muchtar, (2017) examined the effect of job promotion practices on retention of staff employed in hoteling industry in Kenya and the study found out that for employee retention to have a good impact there must be remuneration and allowance practices in place. Peter (2014) findings indicated that promotion has effects to employee and company performance as it motivates, encourages good performance, improve relations as well as higher remunerations

Most of the respondents were neutral on satisfaction with other rewards attached to promotion with a mean score of 2.59 and a standard deviation of 1.203. Contrary to this finding, Johari and Ali (2012) did a study on how reward programmes influenced employee promotion and satisfaction in Tanzania and the results revealed a positive association of promotion and work satisfaction as well as motivation. Armstrong (2006) stated that justified job promotions encourage employees to do their best knowing that good performance will be rewarded.

Again, most of the respondents were neutral on satisfaction with the working environment as a result of promotion with a mean score of 2.57 and a standard deviation of 1.186. However, Robbins (2001) advocates that working conditions influence job promotion, as employees are concerned with comfortable physical work environment. Promotion is a means that can encourage employees to be better or more enthusiastic about doing a job in an organisational environment (Rahayu, 2017).

Most of the respondents were neutral that they were satisfied with the relationship they have with their colleagues after promotion with a mean score of 3.20 and a standard deviation of 1.003. Nevertheless, in other finding of Bernardin and Wiatrowski (2013) some may exaggerate the competencies and the achievements of their peers or give a bleak account of colleagues due to unresolved differences and friction between employees.

Most of the respondents agreed that they were satisfied with the support they receive from their co-workers after been promoted with a mean score of 2.58 and a standard deviation of .941. According to Adams' (1963) equity theory clarifies that fair treatment motivates employees, maintaining that sense of fairness amongst the co-workers guarantees a reciprocity from them to the organisation.

Most of the respondents strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the level of supervision from their supervisors with a mean score of 2.09 and a standard deviation of 1.235. Similar to this finding, supervision plays a pivotal role in relation to job motivation in terms of the ability of the supervisor to provide emotional and technical support and guidance with work related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003).

Factors Affecting Employee's Promotion

The researchers sought to identify the factors affecting employee's promotion. Broadly, there are three main factors that affects employee's promotion from a lower job position to a higher and better job position. These are personal, organisational and societal factors. Personal factors include but not limited to age, sex, educational level, year of experience and performance level. Some organisational factors influencing promotion include recognition system in the organisation, performance appraisal system, promotion policy and procedures, working condition and workgroup, supervision and work task. Some societal factors affecting promotion may include partisan political affiliation, influence of opinion leaders, interest of chiefs and traditional leaders within the organisation jurisdiction and professional cabals formed with entrench interest with particular interest in the organisation. For this study, the focus is on the personal factors affecting promotion within the organisation. The results of the findings is shown on the Table 6.

Table 6: Personal Factors Affecting Employee's Promotion

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	44	1	5	3.07	1.404
Gender	43	1	5	3.35	1.307
Educational level	44	1	5	2.89	1.061
Number of years on the job	44	1	5	2.34	1.311
Performance on the job	44	1	5	2.66	1.200
Valid N (listwise)	43				

Source: Field survey, (2022)

From Table 6, most of the respondents agreed that age was a factor affecting employee's promotion with a mean score of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 1.404. In connection to this finding, mixed evidence exists regarding the relationship between age and promotion satisfaction (Robbins & Odenaal, 2003). Greenberg and Baron (2008) delineate that, older employees are generally happier with their jobs than younger employees, while people who are more experienced in their jobs are more highly satisfied than those who are less experienced.

Most of the respondents disagreed that gender was a factor affecting employee's promotion with a mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 1.307. However, in relation to this result, Murray and Atkinson (1981) investigated gender differences as determinants of promotion satisfaction. The reflection of the study revealed that females attach more importance to social factors, while their male counterparts place greater value on pay, advancement and other extrinsic aspects. In support, Tang and Talpade (1999) maintained that there is a significant difference between males and females in terms of job dimensions impacting on promotion satisfaction.

Most of the respondents agreed that educational level was a factor affecting employee's promotion with a mean score of 2.89 and a standard deviation of 1.061. According to KhMetle (2003) promotion satisfaction decreases in relation to an increase in the level of education as the expectations of employees are often not met by employers.

Most of the respondents agreed that number of years on the job was a factor affecting employee's promotion with a mean score of 2.34 and a standard deviation of 1.311. Similarly, studies investigating promotion satisfaction indicate that personal determinants such as age, gender, educational level, and number of years on the job have impact on promotion satisfaction (Neck et al., 2018).

Lastly, most of the respondents agreed that performance on the job was a factor affecting employee's promotion with a mean score of 2.62 and a standard deviation of 1.268. In connection to this finding, Ekabu, Nyagah and Kalai, (2018) noted that a lot of employees continue to remain in one category notwithstanding the outlined processes and procedures for promotion which include academic qualification, duration of service and performance on the job.

Regression Analysis on Factors Affecting Employee's Promotion

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.564 ^a	.318	.226	1.003

a. Predictors: (Constant), Performance on the job, Gender, Number of years on the job, Educational level, Age

Table 8: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	17.398	5	3.480	3.456	.012 ^b
	Residual	37.253	37	1.007		
	Total	54.651	42			

a. Dependent Variable: Promotion Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Performance on the job, Gender, Number of years on the job, Educational level, Age

Table 9: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.487	.606		2.455	.019
	Age	-.001	.200	-.001	-.006	.995
	Gender	-.283	.203	-.325	-1.399	.170
	Educational level	.407	.200	.380	2.038	.049
	Number of years on the job	.091	.139	.106	.653	.518
	Performance on the job	.130	.149	.138	.874	.388
	Total	0.344	0.891	0.216	2.16	2.12

a. Dependent Variable: Promotion Satisfaction

Discussion of Findings

Outcomes from Table 7 to 9 illustrate that association between dependent variable and independent variable was linear, positive, significant ($p \leq 0.05$) and highly correlated ($\beta = 0.344$, $\text{beta} = 0.891$, $R = 0.564$, $F = 3.456$ and $t = 2.16$). $R^2 = 0.318$ implied that 56.4% of the variance in dependent variable was accounted for by the independent variable. Similarly, a unit change in dependent variable would result to change in independent variable by 0.344 in the same direction. The regression equation to estimate the degree of promotion satisfaction is stated as: $ES = 1.487 + 0.344EP$Eq.1

Therefore, independent variables had positive linear association ($p \leq 0.05$) with promotion satisfaction. The findings were supported by Nel (2004) who indicated that personal determinants such as age, gender, educational level, and number of years on the job have impact on promotion satisfaction.

Conclusion

The study showed a number of insights that are especially relevant for promotion satisfaction. From the study, it can be concluded that several factors contribute to the promotion satisfaction and these includes age, gender, education among others. In line with the correlation and linear regression analysis, all these factors one way or the other has an impact on the employee promotion. Consequently, these factors were found to have had a positive and significant influence on promotion. Also, the Equity Theory suggests that employees seek to maintain a balance between what they put into the job, and what they get from their job (inputs and outcomes). This study supports the theory and concludes that employees are promoted base on their recognition on the job. It is further concluded that the employees were not satisfy with the issues like the working environment and relationship with colleagues. Therefore, there is the need for management to address these issues for resourceful promotion satisfaction.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions that have been described, some recommendations were made as follows:

Management should give recognition to effort of staff; enrich tasks employees perform, provide better and humane supervision and also ensure good work environment for their staff to enhance promotion satisfaction. Management and immediate supervisors should ensure that there is good working environment and relationship among colleagues through collaboration.

The organisation should develop a good reward system as it can influence employees to do their work effectively and be satisfied with their work, induce employees to perform well by providing rewards, train employees to adopt new technology and or develop their career and avoid the delays of some employees' promotion despite the fact that they are qualified and due for promotion.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422.
- Adi, I. Gede P., Wayan B., & dan-Wayan C. (2016). "Pengaruh Promosi Jabatan dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai". *e-Journal Bisma Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*. Vol.4.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. (10thed.). Kogan Page: London and Philadelphia.
- awarding institution librarians of Lahore: a comparative study", *Pakistan Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 14 No. 16, pp. 16-25.

- Baffour, K. P. Q. & Achemfuor, A. A. (2013), "The effects of lack of career path on job satisfaction among South African teachers", *Anthropologist*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 25-32.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Wiatrowski, M. (2013). Performance appraisal. *Psychology and Policing*, 257.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bravendam Research Incorporated (2002). *Effective management through measurement: Special report*. <http://www.employeesatisfactions.com/>
- Chen, K. P. (2003). Sabotage in promotion tournaments. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 19(1):119-140.
- Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 39(4):949-969.
- Dickinson, D. L., & Villeval, M. C. (2012). Job allocation rules and sorting efficiency. Experimental outcomes in a Peter principle environment. *Southern Economic Journal* 78(3):842-859.
- Ekabu, P., K., Nyagah, G. & Kalai, J., M. (2018). Influence of Promotional Prospects on Turnover Intentions of Public Secondary School Teachers in Meru County. *European Scientific Journal* 14(25). DOI: 10.19044/esj.2018.v14n25p17
- Farzeen, M., Ahmad, A. & Anwar, N. (2015), "Relationship among job satisfaction, attitude towards work and organizational commitment", *Journal of Management Information System*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 84-96.
- Ghafoor, M. (2014), "Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction evidence from Pakistani universities", thesis, University of Dundee.
- Gomez, M. (2002). Management. New York: MC Graw Hill.
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations* (Ninth Edition). Upper Saddle River: New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hasibuan, M., S. P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. PT Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Hassan, A., & Baker, R. (2018). The Effect of Training On Job Satisfaction: A Review Paper. The International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities 2018, August.
- Hyder, M. & Batool, S. H. (2013), "Job satisfaction among public and private university/degree
- Jeanne M. B. (1982). Job transfer and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67, 4 450.
- Johnson, D., & Salmon, T. C. (2016). Sabotage vs. discouragement: which dominates post promotion tournament behaviour? *Southern Economic Journal* 82(3):673-696.
- KhMetle, M. (2003), "The Impact of Education on Attitudes of Female Government Employees", [Electronic version], *The Journal of Management Development* 22.
- Kosteas, V. D. (2011). Job satisfaction and promotions. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 50(1): 174-194.
- Kothari, C. R. (2012). Research methodology: Methods and techniques. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited Publishers.
- Kreitner, E. (2004). Management. 9th Ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Kwon, I., Meyersson, M. & Eva M., (2014). The significance of firm and occupation specific human capital for hiring and promotions, *Labour Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 31(C), pages 162-173.
- Malik, E. M., Danish, Q. R. & Munir, Y. (2012), "The impact of pay and promotion on job satisfaction: evidence from higher education institutions of Pakistan", *American Journal of Economics, Special Issue*, pp. 6-9, doi: 10.5923/j.economics.20120001.02.
- Murray, M. & Atkinson, T. (1981), "Gender differences in correlates of job satisfaction", *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 13, pp. 44-52.
- Ndede, H. O. (2014). Effects of Reward Management on Employee Performance in Hotels in North Coast, Kenya. Retrieved from <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke>
- Neck, C. P., Houghton, J. D., & Murray, E. L. (2018). *Organizational Behavior: A Skill-Building Approach*. SAGE Publications.
- Noor, R. R. & Silitonga, E. S. (2018). Effect on job promotion and competence to organizational performance through organizational commitments Pt. Harapan Mulia Berkah Tangerang regency. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 3(6), 164-169.

- Noor, Z., Khan, U. A. & Naseem, I. (2015), "Impact of job promotion and job advancement in universities of KPK province of Pakistan", *Science International (Lahore)*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 1499-1505
- Parry, E. & Kelliher, C. (2009). Voluntary sector responses to increased resourcing challenges. *Employee Relations*, 31(1), 9-24.
- Pawirosumarto, S., Sarjana, P. K. & Muchtar, M. (2017). Factors affecting employee performance of PT. Kiyokuni Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59(4), 602-614.
- Pearce, J. (2011). *Strategic Management Formulation Implementation and Control*. 11th Ed Buxton: McGraw Hill.
- Peter, C. G. (2014). Impact of promotion to employees performance At Dar es salaam city council. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11192/1180>
- Poulston, J. (2008). Hospitality workplace problems and poor training: A close relationship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 412-427
- Rahayu, S. (2017). "Pengaruh Promosi Jabatan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Garuda Metalindo". *Jurnal KREATIF: Pemasaran, Sumberdaya Manusia dan Keuangan*. Vol.5. No.1. ISSN 2339 – 0689. Hal 59-75.
- Rahman, W., Rahman, H. & Ali, F. (2015), "Interrelationship of employee development organizational commitment job satisfaction and their impact on turnover intention", *City University Research Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 301-314.
- Razak, A., Sarpan, S & Ramlan, R. (2018). Influence of Promotion and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. *Journal of Accounting, Business and Finance Research*. ISSN: 2521-3830. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 18-27., DOI: 10.20448/2002.31.18.27
- Richard, O. C. & Johnson, N. B. (2001). 'Strategic human resource management effectiveness and firm performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2), 299- 310.
- Rinny, P., Purba, C. B. & Handiman, U. T., (2020). The Influence of Compensation, Job Promotion, And Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance Of Mercubuana University. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management (IJBMM)* Volume 5 Issue 2, P.P. 39-48 ISSN: 2456-4559 www.ijbmm.com
- Robbins, S. P. Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2003), "Organisational Behaviour", (9th ed.). Cape Town: Prentice-Hall International.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior*: Pearson education limited.
- Russell, R. B. (2013). *Social research method: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Saari, M. L., & Judge, A. T. (2004). Employee attitude and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395-407
- Saari, M. L., & Judge, A. T. (2004). Employee attitude and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395-407.
- Saif, K. (2012), "Job satisfaction of academicians in higher education institutions of KPK Pakistan", thesis, Quataba University.
- Samuel, M. O. & Chipunza, C. (2009). Employee retention and turnover: using motivational variables as a panacea. *African Journal of Business and Management*, 3(8), 23-29.
- Sangaran G, & Jeetesh, K. (2015). The Effects of job satisfaction towards employee turnover in the hotel industry: A Case Study of Hotels in Kuala Lumpur City Center. *Journal Tourism Hospitality*, 4, 142.
- Sattar, A. & Nawaz, A. (2011), "Investigating the demographic impacts on the job satisfaction of district officers in the province of KPK, Pakistan", *International Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 68-75.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). Chapter 4: Understanding research philosophy and approaches to theory development. In *Research Methods for Business Students* (Issue January).
- Septiani, V. M. (2015). "Pengaruh Pelatihan, Pengalaman Kerja, dan Promosi Jabatan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Sulawesi Utara". *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis, dan Akuntansi*. Vol.3. No.3. ISSN 2303-111. Hal 992-1002.

- Shahzad, K., Bashir, S., & Ramay, M. I. (2008). Impact of HR Practices on Perceived Performance of University Teachers in Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4(2), 302-315.
- Sikula, A. E. (2000). Personnel administration and human resources management. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Simanjuntak, W. Y. (2015). "Pengaruh Promosi Jabatan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Riau Media Grafika/Tribun Pekanbaru". *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*. Vol.2. No.2. Hal 1-12.
- Sitati, N., Were, S. & Waititu, G. A. (2016). Effects of job promotion on employee retention in hotels in Kenya. *The strategic journal of change and business management*, 3(51), 956-972.
- Timothy A. J. & Watanab, S. (1994). Individual differences in the nature of the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology* 67, 2 (1994), 101–107.
- Wekesa, J. N. & Nyaroo, S. (2013). Effect of Compensation on Performance of Public Secondary School Teachers in Eldoret Municipality Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(6), 23-29.

