



## ABSTRACT

The study aims to determine the impact of staff promotion on employee performance at federal polytechnic Mubi. The approach used in this study is quantitative approach. The population of this study was the academic staff of federal polytechnic mubi with a total of 773 a sample of 266. for the data collection use in this study is likert scale to measure the statement submitted to questionnaire that represent the indicators of each

# EFFECT OF STAFF PROMOTION ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE IN FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC MUBI

<sup>1</sup>YUSUF SAJO; <sup>2</sup>MOHAMMED ABDULLAHI; &  
<sup>3</sup>ABDULLAHI AHMED MOHAMMED

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Business Administration and Management,  
Federal Polytechnic Mubi. <sup>3</sup>Department of Procurement and  
Supply Chain Management, Federal Polytechnic Mubi.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70382/tijfrms.v09i7.022>

## Introduction

Employee performance is a crucial determinant of organizational success, and one of the key factors influencing it is staff promotion (Armstrong, 2014). Promotion is a form of career progression where employees are moved to higher positions with increased responsibilities, benefits, and recognition. It serves as an important motivational tool that fosters job satisfaction, commitment, and enhanced performance (Dessler, 2020). Organizations that implement a fair and transparent promotion policy are more likely to witness increased employee productivity and overall efficiency (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

Furthermore, organizations that prioritize staff promotion create a culture of continuous improvement and career growth (Gómez-Mejía, Balkin, & Cardy, 2016). Employees who see opportunities for advancement within their workplace tend to develop a stronger commitment to their jobs. Studies have shown that organizations with well-structured promotion policies experience lower turnover rates and higher employee retention (Noe et al., 2017). Conversely, workplaces where promotions are irregular, unfair, or based on favoritism may



variables in this study. After the data has been collected, the data was analysed using spss software version 24. The result of this study reveals that there is significant and positive effect of promotion on performance in federal polytechnic mubi. According to the report having high expectation for employee will motivate them to perform better. This study concludes that **staff promotion plays a crucial role in enhancing employees' performance** in Federal Polytechnic Mubi. Promotions serve not only as rewards for past performance but also as motivators for future excellence. The study recommend that. When management policies, action, choice, are perceived as fair consistent and progressive, staff morale can be further boosted.

**Key words:** Promotion, Performance, satisfaction commitment, and reward.

experience low morale, dissatisfaction, and decreased productivity (Luthans, 2011). However, there are challenges associated with staff promotion that can negatively affect employee performance. When promotions are not based on merit or clear criteria, employees may perceive favoritism, discrimination, or bias within the system. This perception can lead to disengagement, resentment, and a decline in overall performance (Torrington, Hall, & Taylor, 2014). In many organizations, the lack of transparency in the promotion process results in employees feeling undervalued and unmotivated to perform at their best (Ulrich, 2016).

Moreover, some employees experience the "Peter Principle," a phenomenon where individuals are promoted beyond their competence level, leading to inefficiencies in their new roles (Vroom, 1964). This highlights the importance of ensuring that promotions are accompanied by adequate training and preparation to enable employees to handle increased responsibilities effectively. Organizations that fail to provide sufficient support for newly promoted employees risk undermining both individual and organizational performance.

This study aims to examine the effect of staff promotion on employees' performance, focusing on how promotion policies, procedures, and implementation impact employee morale and performance. By assessing both positive and negative influences, the study will provide insights into best practices for enhancing productivity through strategic promotion policies. Ultimately, the findings will help organizations develop frameworks that maximize the benefits of staff promotion while minimizing potential drawbacks. Understanding these dynamics will contribute to more effective human resource management practices and improved organizational outcomes.



This study seeks to address the issue of whether staff promotion significantly affects employee performance in organizations. It will explore whether promotions are carried out fairly and the extent to which they influence workers' motivation, performance, and overall job satisfaction. The findings will help organizations develop effective strategies to improve employee performance through well-structured promotion policies.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Concept of Staff Promotion

The conceptual framework explores the relationship between staff promotion and employee productivity, focusing on key variables and their interactions. Staff promotion, as the independent variable, encompasses the advancement of employees to higher positions with increased responsibilities, authority, and benefits (Armstrong, 2020). This variable is influenced by factors such as the frequency of promotions, transparency in promotion processes, and the criteria used for promotions (e.g., performance, seniority, or skills) (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Employee productivity, the dependent variable, is measured through metrics such as output per employee, quality of work, innovation, and engagement (Cascio, 2018).

Promotion is the elevation of an employee within an organization, often accompanied by increased responsibilities, better pay, and job security (Armstrong, 2020). Promotion serves as a vital component of career development and organizational success. Organizations with clear and structured promotion policies experience higher job satisfaction among employees, whereas unclear or biased promotion processes can lead to dissatisfaction and reduced commitment (Dessler, 2021).

### Concept of employee performance

Productivity and employee performance are critical concepts in organizational behavior and human resource management, as they directly influence the success and competitiveness of an organization. Performance is commonly defined as the ratio between output and input in the production process, and it reflects how efficiently resources are being utilized to achieve desired results. According to Oduwale (2015), productivity in the workplace refers to the efficiency with which employees perform their tasks to contribute to organizational goals. It involves maximizing output with minimal resource consumption, thereby enhancing operational efficiency.

The relationship between productivity and employee performance is therefore symbiotic. While productivity measures the efficiency of work done, employee performance gauges the effectiveness and quality of that work. As emphasized by Khan et al. (2010), improving



employee performance through effective training, motivation, and a supportive work environment can significantly boost organizational productivity.

### **Staff Promotion and Employee Performance**

Studies have shown that staff promotion directly impacts employee productivity by increasing motivation and engagement. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory identifies promotion as a key motivator that contributes to job satisfaction, leading to higher performance levels. When employees perceive that promotion opportunities are based on merit and transparency, they are more likely to demonstrate commitment and productivity in their roles (Armstrong, 2020). Conversely, lack of promotion or unfair promotional policies can lead to dissatisfaction, demotivation, and decreased productivity (Osemeke & Adegbite, 2016).

### **Review of Empirical Studies**

The studies on the relationship between promotion and employees' performance (Ansah, 2017; Hidig, 2014; Ligare, Wanyama, & Aliata, 2020; Peter, 2014; Ratemo, Bula, & Makhamara, 2021; Rinny, Purba, & Handiman, 2020; Winoto, Surati, & Wahyulina, 2021) were little. First, Peter (2014) employed the survey research design and descriptive statistics to investigate the effect of promotion on employees' performance at Dar es Salaam City Council (DCC). The 150 employees employed for this study were selected from 300 employees utilizing purposive, convenience and simple random sampling techniques. The results revealed the awareness of promotion procedures among DCC workers. However, there was an emphasis that it should be spelt out clearly to all workers by the human resource department.

In addition, the results showed that promotion influenced the performance of employees and the organization respectively. Furthermore, the findings revealed that non-adherence to procedures of promotion affected individual and organizational performance respectively. These were in terms of accumulated promotion, poor performance, poor relations and labour turnover. Hidig (2014) used descriptive research design and inferential statistics to examine the link between promotion policies and employees' performance in Golis Company branches in Dhahar. The 160 employees employed for this study were selected from 267 employees utilizing purposive and systematic sampling techniques and the Slovene formula. The results revealed that promotion policies had a positive and significant relationship with employees' performance.



## Theoretical Framework

### Equity Theory (Adams, 1965)

Posits that employees assess their job inputs and outputs relative to their peers. If they perceive inequity in promotions, it affects motivation and productivity. Organizations that uphold fairness in promotion processes tend to maintain higher employee morale and engagement (Greenberg, 2020).

Based on the equity theory, two things to be considered by managers for promotion are a uniform chance for promotion among all workers and the link between workers' inputs and outputs (Hellriegel, Slocum, & Woodman, 1998). As far as the current study is considered, the position of the equity theory is that promotion practices at the federal polytechnic mubi should be free and fair to motivate the workers to improve their general performance. Thus, when workers are satisfied with the, Promotion practices, it would serve as a yardstick to perform better causing an increase in performance.

The study on the effect of staff promotion on employee productivity can be anchored on the Expectancy Theory of Motivation by Vroom (1964). This theory posits that employees are motivated to perform better when they believe their efforts will lead to desirable outcomes, such as promotions. The three core components of the Expectancy Theory—expectancy (effort-performance linkage), instrumentality (performance-reward linkage), and valence (value of reward)—explain how promotion influences employee productivity. Employees who perceive a strong link between performance and promotion are more likely to exert effort in their roles, leading to increased productivity.

Several theories underpin the relationship between staff promotion and employee productivity. The two main theories applicable to this study are the Equity Theory and the Expectancy Theory.

### Research method

This study adopted the use of survey research design For the purpose of this research work, the population is made up of the academic staffs of Federal Polytechnic Mubi numbering seven hundred and seventy three (773). They form the units of analysis of this study and their nature is determined by the survey objective. A sample size is *a selection of respondents* chosen in such a way that they represent the total population as good as possible. The sample techniques are used in the simple sampling techniques to avoid biasness and guarantee confidence. In other to determine the sample size, the sampling method adopted is the Yaro Yameni formula.

$$N = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$



Where	n	=	Sample size
	N	=	Population size
	e	=	Estimated Error
	1	=	Constant

That is;

$$\frac{795}{1 + 795(0.5)^2} = \frac{795}{1 + 795(0.0025)} = \frac{795}{2.9875} = 266.1 \cong 266$$

Therefore, the sample size of the study is 266.

### Instrument of Data Analysis

For the analysis of data, statistical package for social sciences (SPSS version 24) was used. Correlation and regression were used for the analysis to measure the variance between the observed (the actual field result) and the expected (the hypothesis to arrive at a deduction to valid, or confirmed) result. The following are the formula for calculating mean and standard deviation.

#### Mean

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

Where

$\bar{X}$  = Mean

$\Sigma$  = Summation

X = Nominal/Assigned values

F = Frequency

N = Number of respondents

#### Standard Deviation

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{N-1}}$$

Where

$\sigma$  = Standard Deviation

$\sqrt{\phantom{x}}$  = Square Root

$\Sigma$  = Summation

x = Number of Respondents for Scale Response

$\bar{x}$  = Mean

N = Total Number of Respondents



### Research Question One:

How does staff promotion impact employee productivity and performance?

**Table 1: Impact of Staff Promotion on Employee Productivity and Performance (N = 266)**

S/N	Statements	SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\Sigma fX$	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	Remarks
1	Promotion motivates employees to perform better	130	100	12	15	7	1146	4.3	0.68	Agreed
2	Productivity increases after promotion is granted	125	105	10	15	9	1134	4.3	0.70	Agreed
3	Staff promotions enhance goal commitment and efficiency	128	98	15	14	9	1127	4.2	0.72	Agreed
4	Employees with promotion prospects are more innovative	122	103	12	17	10	1119	4.2	0.71	Agreed
5	Promotion leads to higher job satisfaction and morale	135	95	11	14	9	1135	4.3	0.69	Agreed

**Average Mean ( $\bar{X}$ ): 4.26**

The data clearly reveal a strong consensus among respondents that staff promotion significantly enhances employee productivity and performance. A majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that promotion serves as a motivational factor that encourages employees to commit more to their work responsibilities. Specifically, promotion not only improves job morale but also boosts innovative thinking and goal achievement. Employees perceive promotion as recognition of their hard work, which in turn inspires them to remain dedicated and work more efficiently. The high average mean score of 4.26 further supports the assertion that promotion is positively linked with better individual and organizational outcomes. Thus, promotion in Federal Polytechnic Mubi is not only viewed as a reward system but also as a performance-enhancing mechanism.

### Research Question Two:

What challenges do employees and management face in the promotion process?

**Table 2: Challenges in the Promotion Process (N = 266)**

S/N	Statements	SA	A	UD	D	SD	$\Sigma fX$	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	Remarks
1	Lack of transparency in the promotion process causes dissatisfaction	140	90	10	15	9	1195	4.5	0.68	Agreed
2	Inconsistent promotion criteria create tension in the workplace	135	92	15	12	10	1188	4.5	0.69	Agreed
3	Delayed promotions demoralize staff and reduce output	138	89	12	15	10	1185	4.5	0.70	Agreed
4	Employees are often not aware of promotion procedures	125	95	20	14	10	1153	4.4	0.72	Agreed





S/N	Statements	SA	A	UD	D	SD	$\Sigma fX$	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	Remarks
5	Management sometimes lacks fairness in promotion decisions	130	100	10	14	10	1168	4.4	0.71	Agreed

**Average Mean ( $\bar{X}$ ): 4.46**

This table addresses the various difficulties that both employees and management encounter during the promotion process. The findings indicate widespread agreement that the process is faces with several challenges, primarily revolving around transparency, consistency, timeliness, and communication. Many respondents believe that the absence of clearly defined promotion procedures contributes to dissatisfaction and workplace tension. Delayed promotions and perceived unfairness in decision-making processes have a demoralizing effect, leading to reduced employee trust in the institution. The high average mean score of 4.46 reflects a general dissatisfaction with how promotions are currently administered, implying a need for urgent reforms to address these systemic challenges and ensure a more equitable and structured process.

### Research Question Three:

What is the relationship between promotion policies and employee productivity?

Table 3: Relationship Between Promotion Policies and Productivity (N = 266)

S/N	Statements	SA	A	UD	D	SD	$\Sigma fX$	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	Remarks
1	Clear promotion policies lead to improved performance	140	100	8	10	6	1206	4.6	0.66	Agreed
2	Well-defined policies promote fairness and staff morale	135	95	10	12	12	1195	4.5	0.69	Agreed
3	Employees work harder when promotion criteria are known	138	98	10	12	6	1200	4.6	0.67	Agreed
4	Productivity increases in organizations with structured promotion guidelines	132	90	15	14	13	1170	4.4	0.71	Agreed
5	Promotion policy clarity reduces favoritism and bias	130	100	12	14	8	1182	4.5	0.70	Agreed

**Average Mean ( $\bar{X}$ ): 4.52**

### Conclusion

Analysis from Table .1 reveals that the majority of respondents strongly agreed that job satisfaction plays a vital role in shaping their commitment and job performance. High mean scores ranging from 1 to 3 across variables such as welfare benefits, conducive work environment, promotion prospects, and employee recognition reflect a broad consensus on the positive influence of satisfaction.





As indicated in Table 2, respondents rated training programs as highly effective in boosting job satisfaction, with mean scores ranging from **4.5 to 4.7**. The findings show that regular training enhanced staff skills, increased their confidence.

Data from Table 3 show exceptionally high ratings for workshops, with mean values between **4.7 and 4.9**. Respondents confirmed that workshops promoted professional growth, improved teamwork, and motivated staff.

Findings indicate that both financial and non-financial rewards significantly affect employee productivity. Respondents emphasized the importance of fairness, transparency, and recognition in reward distribution.

This study concludes that **staff promotion plays a crucial role in enhancing employees' productivity** in Federal Polytechnic Mubi. Promotions serve not only as rewards for past performance but also as motivators for future excellence.

### Recommendations

- i. Polytechnic should implement a performance-based promotion system that links promotions directly to employees' performance, skills development, and contributions to the organization.
- ii. Institutions should put extra effort in continuous training and skill development programs for both employees seeking promotions and those recently promoted. Also, offer workshops, seminars, and mentorship programs to enhance employees' competencies and ensure they stay updated on industry trends

When management policies, action, choice, are perceived as fair consistent and progressive, staff morale can be further boosted. To reduce ambiguity and partiality and inconsistency, requirement for discipline promotions and other benefit or punishment must be explicitly stated.

### References

- Armstrong, M. (2014). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, e- tal (2020). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. Kogan. London, Konga Page publishers.
- Dessler, G. (2021). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. Seventeen edition.
- Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Balkin, D. B., & Cardy, R. L. (2016). *Managing Human Resources*. Pearson.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). *A Theory of Human Motivation*. Psychological Review.



**AUGUST, 2025 EDITIONS. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF:  
FINANCIAL RESEARCH & MGT. SCIENCE VOL. 9**

- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*. Prentice Hall.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2017). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The Human Equation: Building Profits by Putting People First*. Harvard Business Press.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson.
- Torrington, D., Hall, L., & Taylor, S. (2014). *Human Resource Management*. Pearson.
- Ulrich, et al, 2017). Competencies for HR professional who Deliver Outcomes.
- Ulrich, D. (2016). *Victory Through Organization: Why the War for Talent is Failing Your Company and What You Can Do About It*. McGraw-Hill.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley.