

## Job Promotion and Employee Performance among the Administration Police in Bungoma County, Kenya

Belyndah Shitakwa Ligare<sup>\*1</sup>, Dr. Kadian Wanyonyi Wanyama<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Victor Lusala Aliata<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master Student in the Department of Business Administration and Management of Kibabii University, Kenya

<sup>2</sup>PhD, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Business Administration and Management of Kibabii University, Kenya

<sup>3</sup>PhD, Lecturer in the Faculty of Business and Economics, Tom Mboya University College (A Constituent College of Maseno University) Kenya

### \*Corresponding author:

Belyndah Shitakwa Ligare

Received: 16.01.2020

Accepted: 28.01.2020

Published: 15.02.2020

**Abstract:** According to Kenya Police Service Annual Crime Reports (KPSACR) of 2016, the number of criminal offences is still on the increase with the 2013, 2014 and 2015 reports evidencing an offence number of 71832, 72,490 and 73,376 respectively. Based on this upward trend, it is still unclear if the trend is related to human resource practices such as job promotion as applied in the administration police which in turn have an effect on the performance of the administration police. In the service industry, especially the Kenya National Police Service, little research has been conducted on job promotion and employee performance especially in Bungoma County. The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of job promotion on the performance of administration police. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The target population was 1,318 administration police officers in Bungoma County from which a sample size of 384 respondents was used. Questionnaires were the main instruments used to collect primary data. Stratified random sampling, simple random sampling and systematic random sampling techniques were used. Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Reliability analysis gave an average Cronbach alpha value of 0.8034 which indicated that the instruments were reliable. Results of the study showed that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between job promotion and employee performance and that job promotion accounted for 71.3% ( $R^2 = 0.713$ ) variations in the employee performance. It was concluded that if job promotion was well executed in the administration police, the performance of the staff would be enhanced. The following were the recommendations of the study: organizations should adhere strictly to its promotion policy, ensure promotion process is fair and that employees are promoted based on merit. The findings of this study is expected to inform administration police management policy makers, the government and other stakeholders on relevance and implications of on job promotion in the administration police aimed at improving the performance of staff.

**Keywords:** Job Promotion, Employee Performance, Administration Police, Bungoma County.

## INTRODUCTION

Today employees are considered as an asset for the organization as it is not possible for survival without them. In order to ensure that the best employee be loyal to the firm Job satisfaction is necessary. Job satisfaction will enable individuals to be more innovative and hardworking. There are various factors that can lead to job satisfaction: environmental and work related such as pay, promotion, acknowledgement

or recognition, autonomy supervisor/manager support, and the work itself. The impact of these factors depends on the individual as to how much weight he gives to each factor and measures satisfaction level with each of these factors (Muhammad and Ahmed, 2017).

Promotion means climbing the corporate ladder or in other words when an individual moves from one designation to a higher one it is considered as promotion. For some people the key for job satisfaction

Quick Response Code



Journal homepage:

<http://crosscurrentpublisher.com/ccemms/>

**Copyright © 2020 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

is promotion. They feel that their status has improved which gives them power and satisfaction. Promoting employees to improve job satisfaction can be tricky unless there is justification that promotions will actually resolve issues pertaining to job satisfaction. The reason why employee wants promotion varies from person to person. Some want promotion because they are bored with their current job and feel like that their expertise are not utilize properly, some want to be promoted because they may not be having good relationship with their supervisor or simply they want to have a higher status job. All these factors lead to job satisfaction (Mayhew, nd). Pay and promotion is a part of extrinsic rewards and extrinsic rewards are monetary in nature.

According to Lazear, Edward (2000), promotion is defined as elevating employee at a job of higher significance and compensation level or in other words it is basically shifting employee in an upward hierarchy that will increase their level of responsibility. Promotions are considered as significant aspect of one's career life. The perception of justice by the employees is the leading factor in determining the relationship between job satisfaction and promotion (Malik, Qaiser & Munir, 2012). Kosteas & Vasilios (2010) states that expectation related to promotion can also play a vital role. Those Employees who realize that they are not going to get a promotion this time will reduce their work effort, unless they believe that they are still in the hunt for future promotion. On the other hand, employees who consider that a promotion is likely to happen in the next two years report higher level of job satisfaction. In brief promotion is an effective tool for firm to produce a positive behavior from their employees and also to maintain a greater level of job satisfaction by making workers believe that a promotion is possible. Robbins (2001) states that promotions construct the chance for individual growth, increased levels of accountability and also increases social standing. According to Shields and Ward (2001) employees show dissatisfaction and greater intension to leave the organization, when they are not given opportunity to be promoted.

Promotion is evidence of recognition of employee performance. Someone who promoted will be considered to have a good performance on the job. Promotions are very important for the company, because the promotion means the stability of the company and employee morale will be more assured. Promotion can affect employee satisfaction; Kosteas (2007) said hopes to be promoted to have a strong role. Employees who are aware that they will never be promoted will degrade its performance, until they think there will be opportunities to be promoted in the future. Bohlander (2004) puts it forward that promotions involve change of the assignment to that of a higher level in the organization. The new job normally provides an increase in pay and status and demands more skills and carries more responsibility. Promotions

enable an organization to utilize the skills and abilities of its personnel more effectively thus, good performance realized. The three principle criteria for determining promotions are merit, seniority, and potential.

### **Statement of the Problem**

According to Kenya Police Service Annual Crime Reports (KPSACR) of 2016, the number of criminal offences is still on the increase with the 2013, 2014 and 2015 reports evidencing an offence number of 71832, 72,490 and 73,376 respectively. Based on this upward trend, it is still unclear if the trend is related to human resource practices such as performance appraisal, career development and promotions as applied in the administration police which in turn have an effect on the performance of the administration police. In the service industry, especially the Kenya national police service, little research has been conducted to show these relationships. In Kenya, the recent past has experienced dramatic increase in the number of crime rates despite the national police service witnessing an additional 10,000 new recruits every year. It's not documented whether human resource practices such as performance appraisal, career development and promotions have been applied in this sector and its effect. Performance appraisal has encompassed setting targets and achieving them such as reduction in crime rates, participate in further trainings and promoting officers whenever due. Similarly, previous study findings on the relationship between human practices and employee performance remain inconclusive. The study therefore strove to establish the influence of human resource practices on performance of the administration police in Bungoma County, Kenya.

### **Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

This study was based on two factor theory also known as Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The key proponent of the theory was Herzberg (1959). The theory postulates that there are certain factors at the work place which cause job satisfaction while another set of factors cause dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1959) asserts that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction act independent of each other. The two factors are; motivators (intrinsic) which results in positive satisfaction arising from intrinsic conditions of the job itself and Hygiene factors (extrinsic) that do not give positive satisfaction although dissatisfaction results from their absence. Motivators may include: challenging work, recognition, achievement, promotion, professional growth among others. Hygiene factors may include: company policy, supervision, relationship with the boss and colleagues, work conditions, salary, security among others. The theory assumes that at high levels, motivators' results in satisfaction while at low levels, hygiene result in dissatisfaction (Murinova, Sinovsky and Horak, 2010). The theory argued that meeting the lower needs which are hygiene factors does

not necessarily lead to satisfaction but meeting higher level intrinsic or motivation factors results in job satisfaction (Yusoff, Kian & Idris, 2013).

The theories' strength comes from recognition that motivation comes from within the person and not as from external factors. The theory has provided a practical application by managers on employee satisfaction and commitment (Baah & Amoako, 2011). One of the weaknesses of the theory is that it assumes that employees have common intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Wan & Tan (2013) observed that employees have differences in their intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors hence the need for employers to modulate their operations and procedures to satisfy employees.

Applying the two factor theory to enhance police commitment, the police service commission should strike a balance between motivation factors and hygiene factors. There should be adequate compensation which should take the form of basic pay, medical cover for police and family, attractive retirement package, fringe benefits among others. The promotion procedures should be achievable for police. Police should not stagnate in certain job groups for long. Lastly, police discipline through a well outlined code of conduct (Yusoff, Kian & Idris, 2013).

### **Job Promotion and Employee Performance**

Employee tends to be satisfied with their place in the organization when they perceive that there are fair chances for promotion (De Souza, 2002). The possibility of advancement often serves as a major incentive for superior managerial performance and promotions are the most significant way to recognize superior performance. Therefore, it is extremely important that promotions be fair, based on merit and untainted by favouritism (James *et al.*, 2000). In some instances, even fair and appropriate promotions can create a number of problems for instance, members of an organization who are bypassed feel resentful, which may affect their morale and productivity. In Uganda's context there is always a problem of failure to retain staff especially higher cadres. This is evident in the Uganda Police Forces. Barungi (2005) contends that this problem has its roots in conditions of service and job satisfaction.

According to the study by Saharuddin and Sulaiman (2016) on the effect of promotion and compensation toward working productivity through job satisfaction and working motivation of employees in the Department of Water and Mineral Resources Energy North Aceh District promotion implementation, has several challenges and obstacles. This issue is confirmed through interviews with staff at the department saying that the implementation of a promotion for civil servants (PNS) is still hampered by the limitation of existing resources. Interview results show that some employees are promoted to a position that is inappropriate to their competence. On

the other hand, the fact shows that employees' development and capacity building within the department get less attention. The problem on the employees' development scheme affects the quality of their work. This shows the neglect aspects of efficient and certainly also not effective. Realizing this, the employee needs will be developed or nurtured on an on-going basis so that they can consistently contribute in accordance with the professional level expected as well as more reliable behavior. If this continues then it is likely to reduce the level of morale as a result of dissatisfaction of employees in work.

Researches by Zainuddin, Junaidah & Nazmi (2010) and Danish, & Usman (2010) found a positive significant relationship between opportunities for promotion and job satisfaction. Wan, Sulaiman & Omar (2012) argue that employees that perceived promotion decisions as fair are more likely to be committed to the organization, experience career satisfaction, perform better and subsequently have a lower intention to leave the organization. Today, many lecturers will consider leaving the institutions where they work, if they do not have equal promotion opportunities as offered by other organizations, particularly young lecturers who are looking for more work experiences from various institutions before deciding to remain with a particular institution. The study by Khalid & Irshad & Mahmood (2011) indicated that academicians in private universities were more satisfied with their promotional opportunities, pay and supervision than the academicians of public university.

## **METHODS**

The research design adopted was descriptive survey. The study was carried out in Bungoma County. The target population was 1318 administration police officers in Bungoma County. A sample size of 384 Administrative Police Officers was used. Stratified simple random sampling used to categorise Administrative Police Officers based on the sub-counties they came from. Simple random sampling and systematic random sampling techniques were used to obtain respondents from each department. The sample size was selected using Slovin's formula, written as:  $n = \frac{N}{1 + E^2 N}$  where  $n$  = sample size (384);  $N$  = total population of members (1,318);  $E$  = Tolerance level of confidence or probability level of  $\alpha=0.05$ . Primary data (quantitative data) was collected by use of questionnaires. The study ensured that content, face and construct validity were achieved. Reliability test was carried out and the results yielded a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.8034, implying that the research instrument was reliable. Analysis involved the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics used mainly measures of central tendencies like means and standard deviations; while inferential statistics employed linear regression analysis. Inferential statistics were used to test research hypotheses at p-value of 5% (0.05) at confidence interval of 95%.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The objective of the study was to determine the influence of job promotion on performance of employees among the Administration Police in Bungoma County. The respondents were required to

state their level of agreement with six (6) statements relating to downsizing and performance of employees, where, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= not sure, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree. The Relevant results are as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics of Job Promotion

Descriptive Statistics Questions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Organization strictly sticks to promotion policy	372	1.00	5.00	4.0323	1.01950
Promotion process is fair	372	1.00	5.00	4.1909	1.07087
I am satisfied with promotion process in the organization	372	1.00	5.00	4.1263	1.04490
Employees are promoted based on merit	372	1.00	5.00	4.0833	0.98836
Officers involved in promotion of staff are fair and honest in carrying out the exercise.	372	1.00	5.00	3.8763	1.12352
My organization provides opportunities for career advancement.	372	1.00	5.00	4.0376	0.96498
Promotion of employees is based on performance	372	1.000	5.000	4.12903	1.053561
There are opportunities for promotion in my organisation	372	1.00	5.00	3.7688	1.34397
Promotion of employees is based on employees' experience and knowledge.	372	1.00	5.00	3.7876	1.30541
Promotion of employees is carried out regularly	372	1.00	5.00	3.3844	1.55061
Valid N (list wise)	372				

Source: Field data, 2019

I am satisfied with promotion process in the organization had a mean of 4.1263 with standard deviation of 1.04490; employees are promoted based on merit had a mean of 4.0833 with standard deviation of 0.98836; my organization provides opportunities for career advancement had a mean of 4.0376 with standard deviation of 0.96498; organization strictly sticks to promotion policy had the mean of 4.0323 with standard deviation of 1.01950; officers involved in promotion of staff are fair and honest in carrying out the exercise had a mean of 3.8763 with standard deviation of 1.12352; promotion of employees is based on employees' experience and knowledge had a mean of 3.7876 with standard deviation of 1.30541; there are opportunities for promotion in my organisation had a mean of 3.7688 with standard deviation of 1.34397 and promotion of employees is carried out regularly had a mean of 3.3844 with standard deviation of 1.55061. From these results, the majority of the respondents were in agreement on

the questions asked on job promotion. Out of the ten (10) questions on job promotion, six (6) questions had means of 4.0 and above while three (3) questions had means of less than 4.0.

Inferential statistics results of job promotion and employee performance are as shown in the Table 2 where the variables of job promotion were regressed with the mean of employee performance. The following was the second null hypothesis:  $H_02$ : There is no significant association between job promotion and employee performance of staff in the Administrative Police in Bungoma County. Results illustrated that there was a statistically significant ( $p$ -value  $< 0.05$ ) positive relationship between job promotion and employee performance where regression coefficient,  $B=0.356$ , correlation coefficient,  $\beta=0.335$ , ANOVA,  $F=37.373$  and  $t$ -test value,  $t=5.040$ .

**Table 2:** Job Promotion and Employee Performance

Model Summary								
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Sig. F Change
				R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	
0.856	0.713 <sup>a</sup>	0.509	0.495	0.80910	0.509	10	361	0.000
		ANOVA	df	Mean Square	F			Sig.
Regression		244.663	10	24.466	37.373			0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual		236.326	361	0.655				
Total		480.989	371					

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance  
b. Predictors: (Constant): Job Promotion

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		Beta			
1	(Constant)	1.369	0.279			4.906	0.000
	Job Promotion	0.356	0.071	0.335		5.040	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance  
b. Independent Variable: Job Promotion; Significance level  $\leq 0.05$

Source: Field data, 2019

**The test model is as follows:**  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$

Whereby Y = employee performance,  $X_2$  = job promotion,  $\beta_0$  = constant,  $\beta_2$  is coefficients of determination and  $\varepsilon$  is the standard error. Replacing in the equation above, the model becomes:  $Y = 1.369 + 0.356X_1 + \varepsilon$ .

The results therefore clearly indicate that there existed a statistically significant positive relationship between job promotion and employee performance. Job promotion accounted for 71.3% ( $R^2 = 0.713$ ) variations in the employee performance. From the results in Table 2, the null hypothesis was rejected since a positive, linear and significant (p-value is less than 0.05) was established between job promotion and employee performance.

These findings are in congruent with other studies which revealed job promotion had positive influence on employee performance. Zainuddin, Junaidah & Nazmi (2010); Danish, & Usman (2010) and Ssesanga & Garrett (2005) found a positive significant relationship between opportunities for promotion and job satisfaction. Wan, Sulaiman & Omar (2012) argue that employees that perceived promotion decisions as fair are more likely to be committed to the organization, experience career satisfaction, perform better and subsequently have a lower intention to leave the organization. Many lecturers would consider leaving the institutions where they work, if they did not have equal promotion opportunities as offered by other organizations, particularly the young lecturers. The study by Khalid & Irshad & Mahmood (2011) indicated that academicians in private universities were more satisfied with their promotional opportunities, pay and supervision than the academicians of public university.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Job promotion accounted for 71.3% ( $R^2 = 0.713$ ) variations in the employee performance which was higher than that of career development. This implies that promotion was able to encourage employees to work harder and these needs to be enhanced to improve employee morale. Furthermore, promotion as a fringe benefit to employees is an important factor for an organization to continuously improve their productivity and it should provide capacity building and development to the employees. Career stagnation (no promotion) will lead to laziness and discontent, moreover, dissatisfied of employees would lead to decreased work productivity. Organizations should adhere strictly to its promotion policy, ensure promotion process is fair and employees are promoted based on merit.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdulhadi, B. N. A. (2009). Relationship between HR Practices and Perceived Employees' Performance of Bankers in NWFP, Pakistan (an Empirical Evidence). *European Journal Social Sciences* –18(2).
2. Ackah, D. (2014). The impact of motivation on employee performance in the Manufacturing industry in Ghana. *Global Journal of Management Studies and Researches*, 1(5), 291-310.
3. Adelabu, M. A. (2003). "Motivation and Communication Strategies and their Application in Primary School Supervision", in (Ajayi A. and Olayisade A. (eds.) Education Quality Assurance: Ekiti State SPEB Initiative, Ibadan, Gabesther Educational Publishing coy
4. Ajang, P.E. (2007). 'Assessing the Role of Work Motivation on Employee Performance', student thesis, Umea University, Sweden 2007, [Online] available at <http://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?searchId=1&pid=diva2:140549>.
5. Akmal, U. (2015). The Effect of Motivation and Career Development against Employee's
6. Ann, P., & Bartel, A. P. (2000). 'Human resource management and performance in the service sector: The case of bank branches', NBER working paper 7467.
7. Armstrong, M. (1999). Human Resource Management. (7th ed). London: Kogan Page
8. Armstrong, M. (2001), *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, Kogan Page, London.
9. Aycan, Z., Al-Hamadi, A.B., Davis, A., & Budhwar, P. (2007). *Cultural Orientations and Preference for HRM Policies and practices*
10. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17 (1): 99-120.
11. Brown, M., Hyatt, D., & Benson, J. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience. *Personnel Review*, 39(3), 375-396
12. Burkart, H., & Leslie, H. (2006). A Worldwide Culture Shift toward Transparency, flow of Information, Proactive Disclosure, and Strengthened Accountability for all Government Institutions. *Management Information Systems*.
13. Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In Dunnette MD, Hough LM (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed., pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

14. Carrington, W., DeBuse, J., & Lee, H. (2008). *The Theory of Governance & Accountability*. The University of Iowa Center for International Finance and Development
15. Carter, S., & Shelton, M. (2009). *The Performance Equation - What makes truly great, sustainable performance?* Apter Development LLP. [Online] Available from:
16. Castillo, J. J. (2009). Stratified Sampling Method. Retrieved 29 May. 2012 from Experiment Resources: <http://www.experiment-resources.com/stratified-sampling.html>
17. Ceci SJ. (1991). How much does schooling influence general intelligence and its cognitive components? A reassessment of the evidence. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 703-722.
18. Charity, B. C. (2015). Effect of Training and Career Development on Employee Performance: A Case of KCB Branches in The North Rift Region, Kenya. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Science*, 4 (5): 38-49.
19. Chen, T. Y., Chang, P. L., & Yeh, C. W. (2003). Square of Correspondence between Careers Needs and Career Development Programs for R & D Personnel. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 14(2):189-211.
20. China, S. S., & Oteng'i, B. B. S. (2007). *Guidelines on Writing Research Proposals and Theses*. Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.
21. Cohen, A., & Gattiker, U. E. (1994). Rewards and organizational commitment across structural characteristics: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 9(2), 137-157.
22. Conlon, T. J. (2003). Development of an operational definition of career development for the 21st century workplace. *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development*, USA, 489-493.
23. Coovert, M. D. (1995). *Technological changes in office jobs: What we know and what we can expect*. In A. Howard (Ed.). *The changing nature of work*. (pp. 175-208). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
24. Creed, P., dan Hood, M. (2009). *Career Development, Planning and Management from the Organisational Perspective*. Griffith University. Australia.
25. Cronbach, L. J. (1946). "Responses sets and test validating," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 6, pp. 475 - 494.
26. Danish, R.Q., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of Reward and Recognition on Job Satisfaction and Motivation: An Empirical Study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business And Management*, 5(2), 159-167.
27. Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802-835.
28. Dewhurst, J., Grawhich, & Barber, L. K., (2010). *Are you Focusing both Employees and Organizational Outcomes*. Organizational Health Initiative at Saint Louis University (ohi.slu@edu), 1-5.
29. Dialoke, I., & Nkechi, P. A. J. (2017). Effects of Career Growth on Employee Performance: A Study of Non-academic Staff of Michael Okpara University of Agriculture mudike Abia State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Entrepreneurial Development Studies*, 1(1): 2579-0544.
30. Directorate of Personnel Management.(DPM, 2002b).Guidelines on Introducing Performance Improvement Programmes in the Public Service.Nairobi: Government Printer
31. Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. (1950). *Personality and psychotherapy: An analysis in terms of learning, thinking, and culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
32. Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Motivation*. Routledge.
33. Drucker, P., (2004), Edwards, P. and Wright, M. (2001). "High involvement work systems and performance outcomes".
34. Dyer, L., & Reeves, T. (1995). Human resource strategies and firm performance: What do we know and where do we need to go? *International Journal of Human Resource management*, 6, 656-670.
35. Education Policy of Gambia. (2004-2015). *The Importance of ICTs In Government Schools*. Government of Gambia.
36. Falola, H. O., Osibanjo, A. O., & Ojo, S. I. (2014). Effectiveness of Training and Development on Employees' performance and Organisation Competitiveness in the Nigerian Banking Industry, *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov.Series V: Economic Sciences*, 2014.
37. Gardner, T., & Wright, P. (2003). The HR-firm performance relationship: is it only in the mind of the beholder? *Center for Advanced HR Studies Working paper*, Ithaca, NY.
38. Gay, L. R. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and evaluation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
39. Gilley, J. W., & Maycunich, A. (2000) *Organisational Learning, Performance and Change. An Introduction to Strategic Human Resource Development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Perseus Publishing.
40. Greenberg, J., & Baron, A.R (2003) "Behaviour in Organisations", Prentice Hall, (8), pp. 188-215.
41. Guest, D. E. (1997). 'Human Resource Management and Performance: A Review and Research Agenda', *International Journal of Human Resource Management* (8), pp.263-276.
42. Guest, D. E., Michie, J., Sheehan, M., and Metochi, M. (2000), 'Effective People Management: Initial Findings of the Future of Work Survey', *Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development*, London.

43. Guthrie, J. (2001). High-involvement work practices, turnover and productivity: evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 180-192.
44. Gutteridge, T., Leibowitz, Z. B., and Shore, J. E. (1993). *Organizational career development: Benchmarks for building a world-class workforce*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
45. Hall, D.T. (1996). *The career is dead: Long live the career*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
46. Hamidun, H.B. (2009). *The Influence of Training on Employee's Work Commitment and Performance*, Mara University of Technology – Malaya.
47. Harrison, R. (2000) *Employee Development*. (2nd ed) London, Institute of Personnel and Development.
48. Haslinda, A. (2009). *Evolving Terms of Human Resource Management and Development*. J. Int. Soc. Res., 2(9): 22-34.
49. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Herzberg, F (1966). *Work and nature of man*, Cleveland: World Pres.
50. Hunter, J.E., & Hunter, R.F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 72–98.
51. Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P.L. (2004). Aging, adult development, and workmotivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 440–458.
52. Katou, A. A., & Budhwar, P. S. (2007). *The effect of human resource management policies on organisational performance in Greek manufacturing firms*. Thunderbird International Business Review, 49, 1-35.
53. Kaufman, H.G. (1990). *Assessing adolescent and adult intelligence*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
54. Khalid, S., Irshad, M. Z., & Mahmood, B. (2011). Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: A Comparative Analysis between Public and Private Sector Universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126-136.
55. Khan, A. H., Nawaz, M. M, Aleem, M., & Hamed, W. (2011). Impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: An empirical study of autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (7), pp. 2697-2705.
56. Lazear, E. P. (2000). Performance Pay and Productivity. *American Economic Review* 90:1346 – 61.
57. Luthans, F., Luthans, B. C., & Luthans, K. W. (2015). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach*. IAP.
58. Maguire, M., Morgan, R., & Reiner, R. (2007). *The Oxford handbook of Criminology*, Oxford University Press, Social Sciences.
59. Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 18(1), 99-121. doi:10.1080/13602380903424167
60. Malik, E. M., Qaiser, R., & Munir, Y. (2012). The impact of pay and promotion on job satisfaction: Evidence from higher education Institute of Pakistan. *American Journal of Economics* June 2012, Special Issue: 6-9.
61. Mayhew, R. (nd). How to Improve Job Satisfaction With Promotions (online). <http://www.chorn.com>
62. McCloy, R.A., Campbell, J.P., & Cudeck, R. (1994). A confirmatory test of a model of performance determinants. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 493–505.
63. Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2014). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. Routledge.
64. Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (1999). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. African Centre for Technology Studies.
65. Muhammad, Z. A., & Nawaz, A. (2017). Impact of Pay Promotion and Recognition on Job Satisfaction (A Study on Banking Sector Employees Karachi). *GMJACS*, 7(2).
66. Nayaab, H. H., Hamid M., Naseer, F., & Iqbal, M. (2011). The Impact of Performance Management system on Employee: The moderating role of Balance Scorecard usage.
67. Nelson, Bob (1994), *1001 Ways to Reward Employees* New York: Workman Publishing Company, Inc.
68. Ogula, P. A. (2005). *Research Methods*. Nairobi: CUEA Publications.
69. Owusu, T. (2012). Effects of motivation on employee performance: A case study of Ghana Commercial Bank.
70. Patrick, H. A., & Kumar, A. (2011). Career Management, Employee Development and Performance in Indian Information Technology Organizations. *Business Management Dynamics*, 1 (5), 24-31.
71. Performance and Job Satisfaction of the Governor Office South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 5 (9): 628-638.
72. Pfeffer J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people*: Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
73. Purcell, & P. Wright (2007) *the Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
74. Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior* (9th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
75. Wan, H., Sulaiman, M., & Omar, A. (2012). Procedural justice in promotion decision of managerial staff in
76. Wood, S. (2000), 'Human resource management and performance', *International journal of management reviews*, 1, 367-413.

77. World Bank. (2000). *Can Africa Claim the 21st Century*, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
78. World Bank. (2000). *Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance: A World Bank Strategy*, World Bank, Washington, D. C.
79. Wright, P. M., & Snell, S. A. (1991), "Towards an integrative view of strategic human resource management", *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 203-25.
80. Yadapadithaya, P. S., & Stewart, J. (2003) Corporate training and development policies and practices: A cross-national study of India and Britain. *International Journal of Training and Development*. Oxford. 7 (2), 108-123.
81. Yildirim, O., Acar, A. C., Bull, S., & Sevinc, L. (2008). Relationships between Teachers' Perceived Leadership Style, Students' Learning Style, and Academic Achievement: A Study on High School Students. *Educational Psychology Journal*.
82. Youndt, M. A., Snell, S. A., Dean. J. W. Jr., & Lepak, D. P. (1996). Human resource management, manufacturing strategy, and firm performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 836-866.
83. Zohural, I. M. D., & Sununta, S. S. (2010). Resource Management Practices & Firm Performance Improvement in Dhaka Export Processing Zone, *Research and Practice in HumanResourceManagement*18 (1), 60-77.