



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROMOTION AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN COUNTY GOVERNMENTS IN KENYA; A CASE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF KAKAMEGA

Musambi, C. W., & Juma, D.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROMOTION AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN COUNTY GOVERNMENTS IN KENYA; A CASE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF KAKAMEGA

Musambi, C. W.,^{1*} & Juma, D.²

^{1*} Master Scholar, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology [JKUAT], Kenya

² Ph.D, Director, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology [JKUAT], Kenya

Accepted: January 17, 2020

ABSTRACT

*This study sought to establish the influence of promotion on employee job satisfaction in the Revenue Department of the County Government of Kakamega. The study was guided by; Goal setting Theory and Equity theory. Promotion was operationalized as independent variable while dependent variable was employee satisfaction at the Revenue Department of the County Government of Kakamega. The study targeted 381 employees that included the County head of revenue, regional revenue officers, Strategic members, sub county revenue officers, and 358 revenue collectors. Stratified sampling method was used. Data was collected by use of a questionnaire whose items were adapted from the relevant previous studies. Percentages were used to initially analyze the data and the results presented in tables. Inferential statistics were obtained by carrying out correlations analysis; bivariate, and multiple linear regression analyses, to test for the degree of association (correlations) between variables in relation to the relationship between Promotion Practices and Employee Job Satisfaction. Results in the study indicated that; Promotion has a positive and significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction ($r=0.569^{**}$, $p< 0.01$). The results revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between Promotion and Employee Job Satisfaction in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. It was clear therefore that, Promotion practices should always be considered as a key component and outcome of strategic human resource management for enhanced employee Job satisfaction and performance. Organizations should consider promotion as an important Reward Management Practice if they are to retain their employees and ensure they are satisfied at the place of work. The study recommended a longitudinal research for an in-depth examination of other promotion Practices and Employee Job Satisfaction.*

Key Words: Promotion, Job Satisfaction

CITATION: Musambi, C. W., & Juma, D. (2020). Relationship between promotion and employee job satisfaction in county governments in Kenya; A case of county government of Kakamega. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 7(1), 458 – 468.

INTRODUCTION

Globally organizations are using different tools to deal with stiff competition in the market. Rewards being one of them fulfills employees' need for challenge, responsibility, decision making, variety, social recognition and career such as, benefits, recognition may be more motivating in the short term, in the long run, nonfinancial like Incentive, Promotion, Fringe benefits and recognition trigger a high level of interest in creative approaches to remuneration (Danish & Usman, 2010).

In Africa a total reward system ensures employee satisfaction, appropriate and recognizing exceptional performance or hard work, motivating employees to work productively, encouraging loyalty and fostering a positive culture in the workplace. Employers often choose a combination of financial and non-financial rewards and incentives. This is known as the “total reward” approach. Organizations nowadays appreciate the need to use reward practices as a tool for gaining competitive advantage in the market environment (Franklin, 2003). Armstrong (2014), Pointed out that there are many achievements a company can attain by using rewards to boost employee satisfaction such as attraction and retention of new and old employees in an organization hence minimizing on recruitment costs training costs of new employees and high employee satisfaction that leads to high productivity. Low turnover, minimal absenteeism, minimum industrial unrests such as strikes and boycotts.

(Murlis, 2012) defines reward management as strategies, policies and processes that are mandatory to ensure that employees influence in an organization is recognized either by monetary or non-monetary means. This in essence implies that basically, there are two types of rewards; financial rewards, which translate as pay or compensation and other benefits the organization gives to its employees and no-

financial rewards, whose main focus is on motivation and enhancing employee job engagement.

Organizations are today engaging competitively into productivity, and for that matter, reward management is now instrumental in encouraging employees towards commitment, as it increases their job satisfaction. With this strategy, firms can bring on board and maintain their employees and in essence increase productivity (Dalvi, 2013). A study by Datta (2012), notes that a majority of organizations consider employees as their core factor in generating organizational value and competitive advantage.

Following the promulgation of the constitution on 27th August 2010, the National Government devolved some functions. The devolved system of government has been implemented since March 2013. Various principles of devolved Government that includes democratic ideals and the separation of powers. County governments are facilitated with reliable sources of revenue to enable them govern and deliver services effectively. One of the objectives of devolution is to encourage social and economic growth and the providing of immediate and easily accessible services throughout Kenya. To achieve this, counties are required to decentralize further to the smallest feasible units. These units are sub-counties, wards and villages. However, in many counties the decentralization process has not been fully operationalized due to inadequate resources, capacity infrastructure and system of delegation from county government to the decentralized units. There lacks a mechanism to harmonize the processes of national and county government representatives within the devolved units.

There is no policy and enabling legislation to direct County Governments on the taxes they can levy beyond those outlined in the Constitution as per Article 209 (c). County taxes and business licensing requirements and procedures are not harmonized to ensure consistency and certainty in undertaking

commerce, taking into account the national, regional and international protocols mandating partner states to eliminate any new tariff and non-tariff barriers which negatively affects trade and commerce. Therefore, counties can maximize their revenue collection potentials based on this.

Statement of the Problem

Job satisfaction is an important element in a work situation and has been associated with improved performance as well as increased commitment to the organization (James & Hannah, 2013). Gratified employees will impact the productivity of the organization and as a result this translates to the achievement of organizational goals (Hussin, 2011).

Sang, Kiragu, and Wangechi (2018) reiterate that employee job satisfaction is one of the cornerstones of manpower development in organisations. County governments have been bedeviled with strikes as employees demand for better to an extent, reward system. Frequent strikes in public service significantly affects productivity (Wangechi, Kiragu & Sang 2018). County Public Service Boards have not been keen on the causes of the frequent strikes by the county employees and as a result, dissatisfaction. Otemba (2014) found out that 46 per cent of professionals were dissatisfied with their jobs, out of this lots between 45 and 47 per cent in public and private sector respectively consider the reward system as one of the major factors causing job dissatisfaction. The study notes that non-monetary factors, working conditions, job security and career growth opportunities also affected their job satisfaction by county governments. A study by Mutai (2014) noted that county governments are confused as regards how to handle job satisfaction. Sikoro, Namusonge, Makhokha and Nyagechi (2016) in their study in Trans-Nzoia County corroborate these findings. Rewards and compensation have been cited as major factors affecting job satisfaction of employees in many institutions (Chebet, 2015; Mwangi *et al.*, 2017;

Anyango, 2011; Njoroge & Kwasira, 2015; Ombimba, 2014)

Invariably, many studies conducted in county governments in Kenya note that remuneration, compensation and benefits are the main factors affecting job satisfaction (Nanzushi, 2015; Obwoyere, 2016). Most studies conducted with regard to job satisfaction have focused on commitment (Obwoyere 2016) Recognition (Kuria 2011) security and grievance handling (Simatwa 2011) and work environment (Sikoro, Namusonge, Makhokha & Nyagechi, 2016), Leadership Style, (Orute, Mutua, Musiega & Masinde, 2015) Worklife Balance (Kisilu, 2015). On this premise, this study sought to bridge the gap in knowledge by probing the relationship between promotion practices and employee job satisfaction among county government employees.

Research Objective

The main objective of the study was to establish the Relationship between Promotion Practices and Employee Satisfaction in the Revenue department of Kakamega County.

Research Hypothesis

H₀₁: Promotion practices has no significant influence employee job satisfaction

LITERATURE REVIEW

A theory can be defined as a reasoned statement or group of statements supported by evidence, meant to elucidate phenomena. Theories are used to explain all that which is integrated in the framework. According to (Kombo, 2006) definition, a theoretical framework is a compilation of interrelated ideas based on theories. This study focused on establishing the relationship that exists between reward management practices and employee satisfaction by use of two theories; the Goal Setting Theory and Equity theory.

Goal Setting theory

Goal-setting theory (Locke, 1977) states that goal setting is essentially linked to task performance. The theory posits that specific, challenging goals together with appropriate feedback results to higher and better task performance. Most Governments use goal setting to check individual employee performance, departmental performance this is also a tool to determine which employees qualify for promotions, incentives, financial benefits and recognition therefore there is need to peg rewards to specific targets or goals.

Goal setting theory prompts the willingness for an employee to work harder hence feeling fully utilized and satisfied. Specific and clear goals lead to greater output and better performance. Definite, quantifiable and clear goals which have timelines avoids misunderstanding. The theory suggests that goals should be realistic as well as challenging. When attained, these goals give an individual a sense of pride and triumph, as a result, they push him further to the attainment of subsequent goals. Essentially, the more challenging the goal is, the greater the reward is expected and in essence the greater the passion in achieving the same. Employees should be involved in the goals setting process to avoid resistance and make it more acceptable and satisfying to the employees.

The theory posits that self-efficiency is the individual's belief and faith in himself that he has the potential of executing the task. The higher the level of self-efficiency, the greater will be the efforts put in by the individual when they face thought-provoking, stimulating as well as challenging tasks. While, the lower the level of self-efficiency, the less will be the efforts put in by the individual or he might even quit while meeting challenges, the objective of employee satisfaction is to make the employee stay for a longer time in the organization. Goal setting as a theory addresses the concept of target setting and

specifically the issue of recognition of individuals and teams in the aspect of setting and achieving targets.

Equity theory

Adams'(1963) Equity theory clarifies why pay and conditions alone do not guarantee employee satisfaction. It goes further to demonstrate why, giving one employee a pay-rise or promotion may have a demotivating effect on the rest. People tend to feel satisfied when they have a sense of fair treatment; whenever they feel any unfairness, they tend to be dissatisfied and demotivated as well. Employees want to always maintain equity between what they bring to the job as inputs and outcomes they receive from the organization viz-a-viz what they receive in return from the organization. The central idea in the equity theory is that, employees value fair treatment. Fair treatment motivates employees, maintaining that sense of fairness amongst the co-workers guarantees a reciprocity from them to the organization. The structure of equity in the workplace is based on the ratio of inputs to outcomes. Inputs are the contributions made by the employee for the organization.

According to (Meyer, 1997), Equity theory concerns the perception of (cognitive process) how employees are being treated. It's the assessment process workers use to evaluate fairness, justice of organizational outcomes and adjustments process used to maintain perception of Fairness i.e. during reward process the scales and measures must be clearly understood by all employees. And employees should participate in the structuring of the reward systems. It focuses on distributive justice. This theory is concern with fairness of procedures used to make decisions to rewards or that prompts certain outcome. It deals with how levels of performance are evaluated and how disputes are handled. This theory will help in establishing relationship between the relational rewards from the County government and employee performance. This theory will help in

determining various aspects of relational rewards towards satisfaction. The theory will help discuss the importance of equality and fairness to all revenue collectors, and introduce accountability so that any reward action by the employer is basically accounted for, and explained to all other employees. The theory operationalizes the independent variable as well as the concept of employee satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

The research design adopted in this study was descriptive. Descriptive studies may help the researcher to understand the characteristics of a group in a given situation, think systematically about aspects in a particular case, offer ideas for further probe and research and finally help make certain simple decisions (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). The study targeted employees working in the revenue department at the County Government of Kakamega. The department was supervised by the County Head of Revenue, and had three regions headed by regional revenue officers these were Northern which had Likuyani, Malava and Lugari, Southern which had Matungu, Butere, Khwisero, Mumias both East and West, Central which had Lurambi, Ikolomani, Shinyalu Navakholo and Kakamega. Each sub county had a Sub County Revenue Officer, who reported to the Regional Revenue Officers.

The department had a total of 358 revenue officers but targeted 150 staff, 9 Sub county revenue officers and 10 strategic team members including human resource, ICT officer, compliance officers and accountants, who were policy makers for the department chaired by the head of revenue. The reason for this was that rewards are different at every level and that the level of satisfaction may be different at each stage.

The study used stratified random sampling design. Stratified sampling method divides the population

into sub population called strata that have the same characteristics. The population was divided into strata basing on the work categories of the employees. The categories used in this study were; Management, Supervisors, clerks and lower cadre staff. For a sample frame to be valid, it has to contain holistic representation of the entire population. It is also known as the working population because these units will eventually give units involved in the analysis (Zikmund & Babin, 2010).

This study collected information regarding data using self-administered questionnaires from the top management, supervisors and the lower cadre staff. The major purpose was to obtain a high response rate to ensure that the analysis and findings was statistically significant (Walsh, 2010).

Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics tabulated in percentages, and frequencies to describe the categories formed from the data. The data was be tabulated to permit interpretation. Multiple regression and correlation analysis were used to portray the sets of categories formed from the data and establish the relationship between relational rewards and employee satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Promotion

The study determined the extent to which Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega practiced Promotion among their diverse workforce. The predictor variable of Promotion was operationalized using the indicators of competence and Fairness (Salah, 2016) All the measures of Promotion under the two themes used a five-point Likert scale from 1=strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree. The results obtained were presented in the table 1:

Table 1: Promotion

Promotion	SA	A	N	D	SD
Competence					
Promotion in our department is done according to one's experience	16.3	69.4	8.2	3.4	2.7
Experience in other sectors is considered when one is considered for promotion	8.8	65.3	22.4	3.4	0.0
One's level of education is considered for eligibility for promotion	17.0	53.7	22.4	6.8	0.0
Fairness					
One's competence demonstrated in various assignments is used in promotion evaluation	11.6	63.3	21.8	3.4	0.0
The performance history of the individual is considered when being promoted	7.5	59.9	23.8	8.2	0.7
One's gender is also considered for promotion	4.1	17.7	18.4	46.3	13.6
Promotions are done fairly in our department	17.7	56.5	12.2	9.5	4.1

Key; SD=Strongly agree, A= Agree, N= Neither agree nor disagree, A= Agree; SA= Strongly agree

Competence

The findings in table 1 revealed that a majority of respondents (85.7 per cent) cumulatively agreed that promotions in the department were based on experience. However, 8.2 per cent of respondents could neither disagree nor agree that indeed the promotion in the department were based on experience. The findings also revealed that a cumulative majority of 74.1 per cent of respondents (8.8=strongly agreed 65.3=agreed) experienced in other sectors was a basis for promotion. Nonetheless, only 3.4 per cent of them indicated that this statement was not true about promotion in the department. 22.4 per cent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Equally, 70.7 per cent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that The Revenue Department based some of the promotions on Education level of the employees. This was against a paltry 6.8 per cent of respondents who felt otherwise but a significant 22.4 per cent of respondents could neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

Cumulatively, 74.8 per cent of respondents felt that some of the promotions in the department were as a

result of a demonstrated history of competence in other assignment related to the tasks in the department (11.6=strongly agree, 63.3=agree). 7.5 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed and 59.9 per cent agree that the performance history of the employee was also a factor for promotion. This was against 8.9 per cent of respondents who felt that that was not a factor at all. 23.8 per cent could neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

Fairness in Promotion

In addition, the findings in table 1 revealed that the department accorded every employee equal chance for promotion. In terms of gender, the findings revealed that 4.1 per cent of employees strongly agreed, 17.7 per cent agreed that gender was a consideration for promotion. This was cumulatively about only 21.8 per cent of the respondents that believe that an employee's gender was an important consideration for promotion. This was against a cumulative 59.9 percent (13.6= strongly Disagree, 46.3= Disagreed) that gender was an important consideration. However, 18.4 per cent of the respondents could neither agree nor disagree to the statement that promotions were done fairly in the

department, the study findings revealed that 17.7 per cent strongly agreed, 56.5 per cent agreed. This was to a cumulative of 74.1 per cent. 13.6 per cent however disagreed that the promotions in the department was done fairly. 12.2 per cent could neither agree nor disagree.

It was therefore concluded that Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega has a strong Promotion program for its employees. The program considers education, competence, experience and performance in other roles as important for promotion of employees. They further revealed that, gender was not an important consideration in the promotion procedure. Similarly, the findings revealed that the promotion procedure in the Revenue

Department was fair and thus trusted by the employees.

Employee Job Satisfaction

The study determined the extent to which employees at Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega were satisfied with their organizations and how such commitment was influenced by promotion practices. The predicted variable of Employee Job Satisfaction was operationalized by the indicators of working environment, compensation satisfaction, support from coworkers and level of supervision in the department. Similarly, all measures of employee satisfaction used a five-point Likert scale as from 1=strongly disagree (SD) to 5=strongly agree (SA). The results obtained were as shown in table 2:

Table 2: Employee Job Satisfaction

Employee Job Satisfaction	SA per cent	A per cent	N per cent	D per cent	SD per cent
I am satisfied with the remuneration	25.9	66.0	2.0	2.7	3.4
I am satisfied with the working environment	15.6	65.3	13.6	2.0	3.4
I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my colleagues.	10.9	42.2	41.5	3.4	2.0
I am satisfied with the support I receive from my co-workers.	9.5	36.1	44.9	4.1	5.4
I feel good about working in this department	15.6	56.5	17.0	8.8	2.0
My job makes me happy	13.6	53.1	21.8	7.5	4.1
I am satisfied with the level of supervision in my department	15.0	51.0	18.4	9.5	6.1

Compensation satisfaction

The findings presented in table 2 revealed that a majority (66.0 per cent) of respondents simply agreed that they were satisfied with the remuneration they received from Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega while 25.9 per cent of them strongly agreed with the same statement. However, this was against 3.4 per cent who strongly disagreed with the statement and 2.7 per cent who

simply disagreed. A further 2.0 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed with the same statement.

Satisfaction in the working Environment

Table 2 presented the findings that showed that a majority of respondents at 15.6 per cent (agreed) and 65.3 per cent (strongly agreed) of respondents were happy and satisfied with the working environment in the department of Revenue in the County Government of Kakamega. This was against 3.4 per

cent (strongly disagreed) and 2.0 per cent (disagreed) who were not really satisfied with the working environment. This was against 13.6 per cent of respondents who were unsure whether they were satisfied or not with the working environment in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. Also, 10.9 per cent (strongly agreed) and 42.2 per cent (agreed) of respondents revealed that they were satisfied by the relationship they had with their colleagues in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. This was against 2.0 per cent (strongly disagree) and 3.4 per cent (disagree) who did not feel the same way. Similarly, table 2 indicated that 9.5 per cent (strongly agreed) and 36.1 per cent (agreed) that they were satisfied with the level of relationship they received from their co-workers in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. However, 4.1 per cent (disagreed) and 5.4 per cent (strongly disagreed) that they were not satisfied with the level of support they received from their co-workers. 72.1 per cent felt good working for the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. This meant that a majority of the respondents were happy in the department as compared to 10.8 per cent who seemed uncomfortable with the same.

In addition, the findings in table 2 revealed that a majority, 66.7 per cent (13.6 strongly agreed, 53.1, agreed) of respondents revealed that they were proud of their job in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. This was against 4.1 per cent (strongly disagreed) of respondents who did not feel the same way and 21.8 per cent who were not sure. These findings could also mean that these employees were satisfied with their current department and therefore did not feel like taking up other jobs elsewhere.

Supervisor Support

On supervisor support, results in table 2 revealed that most respondents, 66.0 per cent (agreed) and 15.0 per cent (strongly agreed) felt that they were satisfied

with the level of supervision in the department. This was against 6.1 per cent (strongly disagreed) and 9.5 per cent (disagreed) who felt unsatisfied with the level of supervision in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega.

From the findings of table 2 it was clear that majority of respondents were willing to stay in the current department. They were satisfied with the work they were doing and were committed to Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega. The findings however, indicated clearly that the level of support from workers was quite wanting and there was need for something to be done about it. This was a clear indication that a lot of teamwork and teambuilding activities were needed for the employees in the department.

Inferential Analysis

The results of correlation analysis revealed that Promotion has a positive and significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction ($r=0.569^{**}$, $p<0.01$). These results were found to be in support of the findings from previous researches in the same area. For instance, Malik, Danish and Munir (2012) who explored the role of Promotion on Employee Job Satisfaction in Pakistan Higher Education, results from their study revealed that; there was a significant and positive influence of Promotion programs on Employee Job Satisfaction. Mustapha and Zakaria (2013) study on The Effect of Promotion Opportunity in Influencing Job Satisfaction among Academics in Higher Public Institutions in Malaysia. The result indicated that there was a positive significant relationship between promotion opportunity and job satisfaction. Their results obtained $r = 0.590$, $p = 0.000$ and according to Guildford Rule of Thumb, when $r = 0.590$, $p = 0.000$, it showed moderate strong correlation between promotion opportunity and job satisfaction. The results therefore emphasized a significant correlation between promotion opportunity and job satisfaction. The finding of this study aligned with the result from Zainuddin, Awang

et al. (2010) which revealed that promotion opportunity had a positive significant relationship with job satisfaction among lecturers. This is also consistent with Khan, Nawaz, Aleem and Hamed (2011) which indicated that promotion significantly affects the level of job satisfaction among autonomous medical institutions of Pakistan. The results were also in tandem with the finding of Naveed, Usman and Bushra (2011) who investigated Promotion: A Predictor of Job Satisfaction, A Study of Glass Industry of Lahore (Pakistan). The study revealed that Promotion programs had a huge impact on employee job satisfaction. Professionals who were in organizations that had Promotion programs tended to stay longer and that the Promotion programs tended to increase their intent to stay with their employers, in one or more ways: by enhancing their

affective commitment to their employers; by generating a felt obligation to stay in reciprocation for the development investment; and by elevating their belief that career opportunities laid ahead of them.

Regression Analysis

The hypothesis predicted that Promotion has a significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction. Therefore, the amount of variation of the independent variable (Promotion) on the dependent variable (Employee Job Satisfaction) was found by regressing the two variables. In comparison, the results from the correlation matrix (table 3) showed that Promotion had a positive and significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction ($r=0.569^{**}$, $p<0.01$).

Table 3: Promotion on Employee Job Satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
						R Square Change	F Change	Sig. Change	F
1	.569 ^a	.324	.319		.55772	.324	69.407	.000	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Promotion

The results in table 3 also showed the measure of variation of the predicted variable (Employee Job Satisfaction) as explained by the predictor variable (Promotion). The regression analysis output yielded a coefficient R-value of 0.569 and R^2 of 0.324 which implied that 32.0 per cent of the corresponding variance in Employee Job Satisfaction can be predicted by Promotion. The rest of the percentage could be explained by other variables not included in this model. The F test statistic gave a value of $F=69.407$, $P<0.001$, which was also sufficient to support the goodness of fit of the model in explaining the variance in the dependent variable (Employee Job Satisfaction). This finding validated the fact that Promotion is a useful predictor of Employee Job Satisfaction. This meant that employees who

experience higher levels of Promotion will also have higher levels of Employee Job Satisfaction. These findings also corroborated the findings of Darte-Baah (2010). According to Darte-Baah (2010) promotion is positively and significantly correlated to Employee job satisfaction. This was consistent with the findings obtained from Gana and Bababe (2011). In addition, the adjusted R square (.319) also attempts to give a more honest value that tends to estimate the R square for the entire population at 31.9 per cent. Further, the rest could be explained by other variables included in the multiple regression models. The coefficient of the fitted model using the “unstandardized coefficients” was given in the table 4;

Table 4: Regression coefficients of Promotion

Coefficients ^a		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.900	.339		2.650	.000
	Promotion	.776	.093	.569	8.331	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction

The results obtained in table 4 revealed that the unstandardized regression coefficients β value of the computed (composite index) scores of Promotion was 0.776, with a t-value of 8.331 at a significance level of $p < 0.01$. This implied that for every 1 per cent increase in Promotion, there was a predicted increase in the percentage of Employee Job Satisfaction of zero. Having achieved the objective, the study rejected the null hypothesis that: H_{01} : *Promotion has no significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega*

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In line with the objective which sought to determine whether Promotion Practices has a relationship with Employee Job Satisfaction in the Revenue Department in the County Government of Kakamega, the predictor variable (Promotion practices) was assessed by the indicators of a Promotion plan, competence, Education and experience and fairness. The findings from both the correlation and linear regression analysis indicated that at 99 per cent confidence level, the influence of Promotion practices on Employee Job Satisfaction was positive and significant. The predictive power as calculated by R-squared indicated that Promotion practices could explain 32.4 per cent of variance in Employee Job Satisfaction. From the descriptive analysis, the

results indicated that a clear Promotion plan, competence-based training and fairness had a significant influence on employees' job satisfaction in the Revenue Department. Consequently, enhancing Promotion was found to have had a positive and significant influence on Employee Job Satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis in line with this view was rejected. The objective was attained with the results indicating a statistically significant influence of the predictor variable (Promotion) on the dependent variable (Employee Job Satisfaction).

To boost Employee Job Satisfaction, it was recommended that organizations should provide their employees with appropriate support in the performance of their tasks. Similarly, it was also recommended that all employees be allowed flexi-time, and that they should be given greater autonomy in the performance of their work.

Areas for Future Research

As the study established an obvious and existing gap in literature on promotion in studies carried out on Reward Management in Africa and Kenya particularly, future studies on promotion and Employee Job Satisfaction should highlight more on these variables. The studies should look at how these specific variables influence Employee Job Satisfaction without the other constructs explored in the current study.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M. &. (2014b). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (13 ed.). Kogan Page publishers.

- Danish, R. a. (2010). *Impact of reward provide insight understanding that how organizations can and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation.*
- 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.
- Datta, P. (2012). *An Applied Organizational Rewards Distribution System* (Vol. 3).
- Franklin, L. (2003). *An introduction to workplace counseling: A Practitioners Guide*. Houndmills.
- Khan, S. A., Rajasekar, J., & Al-Asfour, A. (2015). Organizational Career Development Practices: Learning from an Omani Company. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(9).
- Meyer. (1997). Organisational commitment', In C. I. Cooper & I.T. Robertson(Eds.). *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 1997, 12, 175-228.
- Murlis, A. (2012). Armstrong's Handbook of HumanResource Management Practice. New York, NY: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Sekaran, U. &. (2013). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (6th ed.). Wiley, United Kingdom:: Chichester .
- Wangechi, B., Kiragu, D., Sang, A. (2018). Role of Reward Systems on Job Satisfaction of Employees in the County Government of Nyeri, Kenya, *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 8 (1): 196-204.