



THE INFLUENCE OF STAFF PROMOTION ON EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTION IN FOOD AND BEVERAGE INDUSTRY IN NIGERIA



B.A. Chukwu

Department of Business Administration, Igbinedion University,
Okada, Edo State, Nigeria.

Email: benedictchukwu103@yahoo.com



ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 16 September 2019

Revised: 18 October 2019

Accepted: 30 October 2019

Published: 13 November 2019

Keywords

Staff promotion
Turnover intention
Employee retention
Regular promotion
Transparent promotion
Employee.

This research examined the influence of staff promotion on employee turnover intention in food and beverage industry in Nigeria. Labor turnover brings destruction to food and beverage industry in Nigeria in the form of direct and indirect costs and profitability. Retention of employee is not easy and is a complex issue and there is no single recipe for retaining employees in a company. Management of food and beverage industry can reduce turnover by considering different preventive measures such as regular and transparent promotion and promotion as at when due. Employees will opt out of the organization if denied promotion. Therefore the objective of the research was to examine the influence of staff promotion on employee turnover intention. This research adopted a survey research instrument through the administration of questionnaires to three hundred and fifty-five (355) staff of the sampled firms. The data for the research was analyzed using descriptive statistics and chi-square. The empirical results from the chi-square analysis showed that promotion as at when due, regular promotion, transparent promotion and when employees are satisfied with promotion has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5 percent level of significance. Based on the findings of the research, it is recommended that employees should be promoted regularly and as at when due.

Contribution/ Originality: This study contributes to the existing literature by examining the influence of staff promotion on employee turnover intention in food and beverage industry in Nigeria.

1. INTRODUCTION

The term promotion means advancement, moving ahead, securing greater recognition and status in his area of specialization (Adeboye & Adegroye, 2012; Mogaji, 1998). Promotion is a reassignment of the individual to a job of higher rank and authority, and greater responsibilities. Dale (1969), Parker, Nouri, and Hayes (2011) argued that employees will opt out when their hope

to climb managerial ladder through hard work and display of intelligence is frustrated. Promotion does not always associate with pay raise. However, often time a person may be given what is widely described as dry promotion, which is an advance in prestige, authority, responsibility, etc., without any accompanying increase in compensation (Mogaji, 1998). Employees will leave to other organization if there is no opportunity for promotion in their organization (Chukwu, 2017; Jackson, 1981). The same thing will be applicable where promotion is not regular.

Promotion increases employees' moral and provides motivation for better performance. Prospects of promotion give employees a hope and faith in their career in the work place and stimulate them to move ahead for better work performance and other organizational approved forms of behavior (Chukwu, 2017; Kim, 2012).

A sound and systematic promotion policy is a source of intrinsic benefits and job satisfaction to employees. Employees get job satisfaction and develop loyalty with the organization when there is sound and systematic promotion policy. They get opportunities for development and seek to learn and develop with a view to securing promotion. Employees' moral is heightened as a result of sound promotion policy and the heightened moral is conducive to both self development and organizational development (Kim, 2012; Mogaji, 1998; Mottaz, 1986). Employees will intend to leave organization where there is lack of systematic promotion policy in view of the benefits mentioned above.

The promotion policy must clearly state the lines of promotion describing requirements of education, experience, ability and other qualifications for each job. It should state the management's intention of filling up vacancies in senior or junior positions through promotion. There should be scientific plans for rating of employee with the help of job evaluation and job rating techniques to enhance fairness in executing promotion (Mogaji, 1998). Appraised of employee is very necessary in effecting promotion because it not only shows the performance level of the employee but also shows the potentials of the employee for future job roles which helps management in determining his suitability for promotion (Eze, 2010). Employees will not intend to leave where they believe that they were fairly treated in their appraisal and where they deem the appraisal to be fair and just.

2. PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

Staff turnover is associated with high level of cost of training and hiring replacement (Gustafson, 2002; Roshidi, 2014). Staff turnover brings destruction to the organization as a result of these costs. There are also costs emanating from loss of intellectual capital, loss production and management time (Gustafson, 2002). In addition to monetary measurability costs, high staff turnover might affect the organizations reputation negatively and might impact its competitive advantage.

Loss employee as a result of staff turnover can cause additional work stress and lower moral and motivation of employees that stay (Solomon, Hashim, Mehdi, & Ajagbe, 2012). Staff turnover can disrupt organizational strategic planning to achieve objectives when a critical employee is lost (Capelli, 2008; Oluwafemi, 2010). It can also reduce customers' service, loyalty and cause psychological effects on employees (Oluwafemi, 2010).

2.1. Objective of the Study

This study attempts to examine the influence of staff promotion on employees turnover intention. The specific objective of the research is to:

- i. Ascertain whether employees will intend to leave when promoted as at when due.
- ii. Determine whether employees will intend to leave when promotion is regular.
- iii. Examine whether employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.
- iv. Examine whether employees will intend to leave when satisfied with promotion.

2.2. Research Questions

The following research questions were utilized for the study:

- i. Will employees intend to leave when promoted as at when due?
- ii. Will employees intend to leave when promotion is regular?

- iii. Will employees intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent?
- iv. Will employees intend to leave when satisfied with promotion?

2.3. Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide this study:

Hypothesis 1

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when promotion is as at when due

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.

Hypothesis 2

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when promotion is regular

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when promotion is regular.

Hypothesis 3

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent

Hypothesis 4

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when satisfied with promotion

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when satisfied with promotion.

2.4. Significance of the Study

This research would be of great benefit to the following stakeholders

- i. Employees: The research would be of great benefit to employees to strongly appraise those motivational factors that would enhance employee intention to stay. This would also enable employee to know how they can find better opportunities to reduce turnover intention.
- ii. Managers: This research would help managers of food and beverage industry in finding possible measures/strategies to reduce employee turnover intention. It would be of great interest and valuable to practicing managers especially human resources managers and help them to reduce turnover intention and create savings in hiring and training replacements.
- iii. Researchers and Academics: This research would be of great benefit to researcher in Business Administration and management related field as it would provide empirical evidence for further studies on the area of employee turnover.

2.5. Scope of the Study

The study examined the influence of staff promotion on employees turnover intention in food and beverage industry in Nigeria. The scope of this study would delimit to staff of Brewery Company in Nigeria. The study adopts a survey research design through the administration of structured questionnaire raised on a five point likert scale on the sample respondents for the study.

2.6. Limitations of the Research

In carrying this research, the researcher was faced with the following limitations:

- i. Low response rate: The usage of research instrument is usually constrained with poor response and this ultimately affects the sample size. Also the reluctant of respondents to answer the questionnaire in the process of data collection, due to fear of victimization by those in authority was another limitation of the research.
- ii. Low sample size: The sample size of the research was constrained due to the inability of the respondents to voluntarily participate in the survey.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Turnover Intention

Turnover intention refers to one step before leaving which is planning to leave while actual turnover is the employee departure from the organization (Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, & Bliese, 2011). Chen et al. (2011) stated that the best predictor of whether an employee will leave the organization is based on turnover intention of employee.

Turnover intention is the intention of employees to quit their job role and organization (Price, 2001). It is acknowledged as the best predictor of actual turnover (Adeboye & Adegrooye, 2012; Price, 2001). Actual turn is expected to increase as the intention to turnover increases (Adeboye & Adegrooye, 2012).

The measurement of turnover intention determines the likeliness of staff leaving the organization (Price, 2001). This helps to determine how one can find opportunities to reduce the overall turnover. Turnover intention is one of the determinants of turnover behaviour i.e. leaving behavior (Price, 2001). Therefore when employees intend to leave it will lead to high loss of employees. Loss of employees can cause psychological distress, reduced productivity, quality service, increased recruitment cost (Oluwafemi, 2010; Powell & York, 1992). It can also lead to work overload, mistrust, disruption in workflow and further turnover (Chukwu, 2017).

3.2. Staff Promotion and Turnover Intention

Staff promotion is a reassignment of individual to a job of higher rank and authority and greater responsibilities (Adeboye & Adegrooye, 2012). It is an advancement in ones chosen career and involves securing greater recognition and status in his area of specialization (Adeboye & Adegrooye, 2012; Mogaji, 1998). Korsakiene, Stankeviciene, Simielyte, and Talacikiene (2014) argued that promotion is a determinant of turnover intention and that lack of advancement opportunity is an influencing factor.

Employees will opt out of the organization when their chance of climbing management ladder is blink (Dale, 1969; Parker et al., 2011). Employees will leave for a greener pasture if there is no chance of promotion in their organization (Chukwu, 2017; Jackson, 1981). Employees will also intend to leave when promotion is not regular.

Employees' moral is boosted by promotion which provides motivation for better performance. Prospect of promotion give employees hope and faith in their chosen career and stimulate them to perform better. Employees' moral is heightened when there is sound and systematic promotion policy backed with fair and just appraisal system (Kim, 2012; Mogaji, 1998; Mottaz, 1986). Employees will opt out of the organization when promotion policy is not sound and systematic. Promotion policy will enumerate and guide all the procedures laid down for fair and just promotion. Employees should be appraised based on scientific plans for rating with the help of job evaluation and rating technique. This will go a long way in ensuring fairness in executing promotion. Eze (2010) posited that appraisal of employees is very necessary in effecting promotion because it shows both the performance level of employees and their potentials for future job role.

There must be strong link between performance and promotion to ensure perception of justice and satisfaction of employees (Kaplan & Feris, 2001; Parker et al., 2011). They also argued that fairness is a critical point concerning promotion otherwise employees will intend to leave. Work design and promotion is the main reason why employees intend to leave the organization (Cafaro, 2001).

Korea Institute of Local Finance in their study argued that promotion has negative relationship with turnover intention. Perceived promotional chances was found to be positively related with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and negatively related to turnover intention (Munasinghe, 2006; Price, 2001).

Kim (2012) emphasized the importance of staff promotion in his management theory and posited that it enhances organizational performance. Perceived promotion opportunities outside the organization and lack of promotion opportunities inside the organization will increase employee intention to leave the organization (Stahl, Chua, Caligiuri, Cerdin, & Taniguchi, 2009). Lack of promotional chances in areas such as learning and promotion often compel employees to seek employment elsewhere. They opined that employees will intend to leave when promotion is not transparent and is not based on performance appraisal criteria.

Usman and Jangraiz (2015) conducted a study on the factors affecting turnover intention among 150 employees of Private Sector Universities of Peshawar in Peshawar. The objective of the study was to examine the inter relationship among promotion opportunities, job satisfaction and turnover intention. The findings of the study showed that promotion opportunities, competitive salaries make the system transparent and justified.

Wimalasiri and Jaytilake (2016) conducted a study on the factors affecting turnover intention among staff of machine operators in apparel industry in Sri Lanka. The objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between career development and promotion opportunities, compensation and benefits, employee performance management system, employee relation, job security and turnover intention among staff of machine apparel industry. The findings showed that career development and promotion opportunities, compensation and benefits, job security, work family life balance significantly impacted on turnover intention, while perceived supervisor supports and employee performance management were not significantly influenced by turnover intention. The research recommended that employees should be given enough time to meet their family requirement, enhance career development opportunities and the immediate supervisor need to keep strong relationship with their subordinates.

Nazim (2005) carried out a study on factors affecting employee's turnover among lecturers of private sector college NWFP in Pakistan. The objective of the study was to examine the influence of staff promotion on employee turnover intention. The research findings showed that lecturers of private sectors were satisfied with promotion and moderately satisfied with operating condition, Co-worker nature of work and communication. In another research carried out by Ali (2017) on the influence of job satisfaction on turnover intention. He came up with the same pattern of results reported by Nazim (2005) when he studied the factors affecting employee turnover intention and also found that pay, promotion, fringe benefit and contingent rewards had highest correlation with turnover intention.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

4.1. Theory of Turnover Intention

4.1.1. Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory asserts that various social exchange relationships exists between members of an organization (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). Social exchange theory is an exchange process that takes place between two parties that is mutually contingent and mutually rewarding (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). This theory was used by many studies to explain the relationship between a diversity of organizational aspects and employee behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). High level of social exchange builds a sense of attachment and commitment towards the organization (Gould-Williams, 2007). Employees that have high positive perception of exchange relation are less likely to leave the organization or their employer (Gould-Williams, 2007). The social exchange theory is of the opinion that organizations and managers can provide organizational support to achieve desirable attitude and behaviours from employees (Gould-Williams, 2007; Julian & Daves, 2005).

Employees stay at their job when they are satisfied with their salary, career growth, training and development and performance appraisal in their organization (Abubakar, Chanhan, & Kura, 2014). Eisenberger, Shlnigihamber, Vanderbergher, Suchurski, and Roades (2002) argues that the greater employee satisfaction with organization support, the more likely they will feel a responsibility to reward their organization.

5. METHODOLOGY

Survey research method was used in this research work. It entails collection of data or information from specific population or sample through questionnaire instrument. Survey research method is used because the goal was to sample the opinions of the people on issues concerning the research. The population of this research comprised staff of Brewery Companies in Nigerian and was 3195. A sample of 355 was selected from this research using (Yamane, 1964) formular. A stratified random sampling technique was used to distribute sample to Brewery Companies in Nigerian using stratum allocation technique of Kumar (1976). This sampling technique is considered most appropriate because it gives everybody in the population equal chance of being selected.

Questionnaire was the measuring instrument. The questionnaire was made up of five point likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree with the statement) to 5 (strongly agree with the statement). The questionnaire adapted staff promotion scale proposed by Weng, McElroy,

Morrow, and Liu (2010) and turnover intention scale proposed by Michaels and Spector (1982) and self development of items. Demographic data was part of the questionnaire. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire was measured using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.807. The value of 0.807 was above 0.7 which is within the acceptable limit in social science. This means that the data collected were valid and reliable for analysis.

A total of 355 questionnaire were distributed to staff of Nigerian Breweries Plc and 313 responses were collected which has 88.1% response rate. Tables and percentages were used to present and analyze the data while Chi-square was used to test the hypotheses.

5.1. Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

5.1.1. Pilot Test

A pilot test was carried out on 50 respondents before questionnaire distribution to collect their comments, ensure simplicity and understanding of questionnaire, which helped in developing the questionnaire more efficiently. A favorable comment was obtained from the 50 respondents and the result of the pilot test ensured that the survey was understandable by the 50 respondents.

The reliability analysis was carried out on when promotion is as at when due, when promotion is regular, when promotion is transparent and when employee is satisfied with promotion.

Table 1 show the result of the reliability analysis of the questionnaire. And the results showed that the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire ranged from 0.754 to 0.890. The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was 0.807. This means that the data collected were valid and reliable enough to be used for analysis. Walonick (1993) stated that values above 0.7 are considered acceptable and the values above 0.8 are preferable or good.

Table-1. Results of reliability analysis.

Variable	Items	Cronbach's alpha
Promotion as at when due	4	0.792
Promotion is regular	4	0.789
Promotion is transparent	4	0.812
Promotion is satisfied	4	0.754
Turnover intention	4	0.89

6. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A total of three hundred and fifty five (355) questionnaires were given out to respondents and three hundred and thirteen (313) were duly returned and usable, and subsequently analyzed. Therefore the response rate was 88.17%.

Table 2 shows the age distribution of sampled respondents of whom, 69(22%) of them were age 30 years below, 126 (40.3%) of them were aged 30 – 39 years, 80 (25.6%) of them were aged 40 – 49 years and 38 (12.1%) of them were aged 50 years and above. This shows that the majority of the respondents were aged 30 – 39 years. On the issue of sex of sampled respondents, 208 (66.5%) were males and 105 (33.5%) were female. This implies that majority of the respondents were males. On the educational level of the respondents who returned valid copies of distributed questionnaires of whom 86 (27.5%) of them attended secondary school, 128 (40.9%) of them attended post secondary school and 99 (31.6%) of them attended polytechnic/university. This means that majority of the sampled respondents attended post-secondary school. Based on department, 36(11.5%) of the respondents were in accounting department, 76 (24.3%) of the respondents were in marketing department, 46(14.7%) of the respondent were in administration department, 100 (31.9%) of the respondents were in production department and 55 (17.6%) of the respondents were in maintenance department. This means that majority of the respondents were in the production department. On the issue of marital status of the sampled respondents, 109 (34.9%) of them were single and 203 (65.1%) of them married. This shows that the majority of the respondents were married. On the year of service, 82 (27.8%) had worked for the period of 5 years and below, 128 (43.4%) had worked for the period of 5 – 10 years, 69 (23.4%), had worked for the period of 10 – 15 years and 16 (5.4%) had worked for the period of 16 years and above. This shows that majority of the respondents had worked for the period of 5 – 10 years. On the number of times change job, 191

(61.4%) of the respondents had changed job less than twice, 81 (26.1%) of the respondents had change job for 3 – 4 times and 39 (12.5%) of the respondents had changed job for 5 times above. This means that the majority of the respondents had changed job less than 2 times.

Table-2. Demography of respondents.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age:		
Below 30 years	69	22.0
30 – 39 years	126	40.3
40 – 49 years	80	25.6
50 years and above	38	12.1
Total	313	100.0
Sex:		
Male	208	66.5
Female	105	33.5
Total	318	100.0
Educational level:		
Secondary	86	27.5
Post-secondary	128	40.9
Polytechnic / university	99	31.6
Total	313	100.0
Department:		
Accounting	36	11.5
Marketing	76	24.3
Administration	46	14.7
Production	100	31.9
Maintenance	55	17.6
Total	313	100.0
Marital status		
Single	109	34.9
Married	203	65.1
Total	313	100.0
Years of service		
Below 5 years	82	27.8
5 – 10 years	128	43.4
10 – 15 years	69	23.4
16 year and above	16	5.4
Total	313	100.0
Number of times change job		
2 times and below	191	61.4
3 – 4 times	81	26.1
5 times and above	39	12.5
Total	313	100.0

Source: Field survey 2019.

6.1. Test of Hypotheses

Chi-square formular was used as a statistical instrument for testing the hypotheses. Chi-square formular:

$$X^2 = \frac{\sum of - ef}{ef}$$

Where of = observed frequency.
 ef = expected frequency.

Σ = summation

X^2 distribution is worked out by the value of its Degree of Freedom (df). Contingency table was also used to work out the expected frequencies.

Decision Rule: Reject the null (H_0) hypothesis and accept the research / alternate (H_1) hypothesis if the calculated (X^2) value is greater than the table value.

$$\text{Expected Frequency (ef)} = \frac{\text{RollTotal} \times \text{ColumnTotal}}{\text{GrandTotal}}$$

6.2. Hypothesis 1

H_1 : Employees will intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.

H_0 : Employee will not intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in 3 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table-3. Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	88	28.1
Disagreed	180	57.5
Undecided	45	14.4
Total	313	100

Source: Field survey, 2019.

Table 3 shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when promotion is as at when due. 88 respondents representing 28.1% agreed that employees will intend to leave when promotion is as at when due, 180 respondents representing 57.5 percent disagreed while 45 respondents representing 14.4% were undecided on the issue.

Table-4. Contingency.

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	58 (58.5)	30 (29.5)	88
Disagreed	124 (119.6)	56 (60.4)	180
Undecided	26 (29.9)	19 (15.1)	45
Total	208	105	313

In Table 4 58 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed, while 58.5 is the expected frequency. 30 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed, while 29.5 is the expected frequency.

124 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed, while 119.6 is the expected frequency. 56 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 60.4 is the expected frequency.

26 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondent that were undecided while 29.9 is the expected frequency. 19 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 15.1 is the expected frequency.

Expected Frequency Calculation:

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{RollTotal} \times \text{ColumnTotal}}{\text{GrandTotal}}$$

- Roll 1 Cell 1 $208 \times 88 \div 313 = 58.5$
- Roll 1 Cell 2 $105 \times 88 \div 313 = 29.5$
- Roll 2 Cell 1 $208 \times 180 \div 313 = 119.6$
- Roll 2 Cell 2 $105 \times 180 \div 313 = 60.4$
- Roll 3 Cell 1 $208 \times 45 \div 313 = 39.9$
- Roll 3 Cell 2 $105 \times 45 \div 313 = 15.1$

Table-5. Chi-square.

of	ef	of-ef	(of-ef) ²	$\frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$
58	58.5	-0.5	0.25	0.004
30	29.5	0.5	0.25	0.008
124	119.6	4.4	19.36	0.162
56	60.4	4.4	19.36	0.321
26	29.9	3.9	15.21	0.509
19	15.1	3.9	15.21	1.007
313				2.011

The meaning and explanations of the notations in Table 5 is shown below:

of = Observed frequency.

ef = expected frequency.

X² = chi-square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

X² value calculated = 2.011

To find degree of freedom.

df = (R-1) (C-1)

(3-1) (2-1)

3 x 1

df = 3

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho if the x² calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (2.011) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.

6.3. Hypothesis 2

H1: Employees will intend to leave when promotion is regular.

H0: Employee will not intend to leave when promotion is regular.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in Table 6 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table-6. Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when promotion is regular.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	84	26.8
Disagreed	181	57.8
Undecided	48	15.4
Total	313	100

Source: Field survey, 2019.

Table 6 shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employee will intend to leave when promotion is regular. 84 respondents, representing 26.8 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when promotion is regular. 181 respondents representing 57.8 percent disagreed while 48 respondents representing 15.4 percent were undecided on the issue.

Table-7. Contingency.

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	60 (55.8)	24 (28.2)	84
Disagreed	120 (120.3)	61 (60.7)	181
Undecided	28 (31.9)	20 (16.9)	48
Total	208	105	313

In Table 7 60 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed, while 55.8 is the expected frequency. 24 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed, while 28.2 is the expected frequency.

120 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed, while 120.3 is the expected frequency. 61 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 60.7 is the expected frequency.

28 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 31.9 is the expected frequency. 20 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 16.9 is the expected frequency.

Expected Frequency Calculation:

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{RollTotal} \times \text{ColumnTotal}}{\text{GrandTotal}}$$

- Roll 1 Cell 1 208 x 84 ÷ 313 = 55.8
- Roll 1 Cell 2 105 x 84 ÷ 313 = 28.2
- Roll 2 Cell 1 208 x 181 ÷ 313 = 120.3
- Roll 2 Cell 2 105 x 181 ÷ 313 = 60.7
- Roll 3 Cell 1 208 x 48 ÷ 313 = 31.9
- Roll 3 Cell 2 105 x 48 ÷ 313 = 16.1

Table-8. Chi-square

of	ef	of-ef	(of-ef) ²	$\frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$
60	55.8	4.2	17.64	0.3161
24	28.2	-4.2	17.64	0.6255
120	120.3	-0.3	0.09	0.0007
61	60.7	0.3	0.09	0.0049
28	31.9	3.9	15.21	0.4765
20	16.1	3.9	15.21	0.9447
315				2.368

The meaning and explanations of notations in 8 is shown below:

of = Observed frequency.

ef = expected frequency.

X² = chi-square.

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

X² value calculated = 2.368

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

Level of significance = 5% = 0.05

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if the χ^2 calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (2.368) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when promotion is regular.

6.4. Hypothesis 3

H1: Employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.

H0: Employee will not intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in 9 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table-9. Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	89	28.4
Disagreed	184	58.8
Undecided	40	12.8
Total	313	100

Source: Field survey 2019.

Table 9 shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent. 89 respondents representing 28.4 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent. 184 respondents representing 58.8 percent disagreed while 40 respondents representing 12.5 percent were undecided on the issue.

Table-10. Contingency.

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	61 (59.1)	28 (29.8)	89
Disagreed	122 (122.3)	62 (61.7)	184
Undecided	25 (26.6)	15 (13.4)	40
Total	208	105	313

In Table 10 61 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 59.1 is the expected frequency. 28 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 29.8 is the expected frequency.

122 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 122.3 is the expected frequency. 62 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 61.7 is the expected frequency.

25 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 26.6 is the expected frequency. 15 is the observed frequency of the female respondents that were undecided while 13.4 is the expected frequency.

Expected Frequency Calculation:

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{RowTotal} \times \text{ColumnTotal}}{\text{GrandTotal}}$$

Roll 1 Cell 1 $208 \times 89 \div 313 = 59.1$

Roll 1 Cell 2 $105 \times 89 \div 313 = 29.8$

Roll 2 Cell 1 $208 \times 184 \div 313 = 122.3$

Roll 2 Cell 2 $105 \times 184 \div 313 = 61.7$

Roll 3 Cell 1 $208 \times 40 \div 313 = 26.6$

Roll 3 Cell 2 105 x 40 ÷ 313 = 13.4

Table-11. Chi-square.

of	Ef	Of-ef	(of-ef) ²	$\frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$
61	59.1	1.9	3.61	0.0611
28	29.8	-1.8	3.24	0.1087
122	122.3	-0.3	0.09	0.0007
62	61.7	0.3	0.09	0.0015
25	26.6	-1.6	2.56	0.0962
15	13.4	1.6	2.56	0.1910
313				0.4592

The meaning and explanation of the notations in Table 11 is shown below:

of = Observed frequency.

ef = expected frequency.

X² = chi-square.

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

X² value calculated = 0.459

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$(3-1)(2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

Level of significance = 5% = 0.05

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject H₀ if the x² calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (0.459) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.

6.5. Hypothesis 4

H_i: Employees will intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion.

H₀: Employee will not intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in Table 12 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table-12. Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	76	24.3
Disagreed	196	62.6
Undecided	41	13.1
Total	313	100

Source: Field survey 2019.

Table 12 shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion. 76 respondents representing 24.3 percent agreed that employee will intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion, 196 respondents representing 62.6 percent disagreed while 41 respondents representing 13.1 percent were undecided on the issue.

Table-13. Contingency.

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	56 (50.5)	20 (25.5)	76
Disagreed	129 (130.2)	67 (65.7)	196
Undecided	23 (27.2)	18 (13.7)	41
Total	208	105	313

In Table 13 56 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 50.5 is the expected frequency. 20 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 25.5 is the expected frequency.

129 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 130.2 is the expected frequency. 67 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 65.7 is the expected frequency.

23 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 27.2 is the expected frequency. 18 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 13.7 is the expected frequency.

Expected Frequency Calculation:

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{RollTotal} \times \text{ColumnTotal}}{\text{GrandTotal}}$$

Roll 1 Cell 1 $208 \times 76 \div 313 = 50.5$

Roll 1 Cell 2 $105 \times 76 \div 313 = 25.5$

Roll 2 Cell 1 $208 \times 196 \div 313 = 130.2$

Roll 2 Cell 2 $105 \times 196 \div 313 = 65.7$

Roll 3 Cell 1 $208 \times 41 \div 313 = 27.2$

Roll 3 Cell 2 $105 \times 41 \div 313 = 13.7$

Table-14. Chi-square.

of	Ef	of-ef	(of-ef) ²	$\frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$
56	50.5	5.5	30.25	0.599
20	25.5	-5.5	30.25	1.186
129	130.2	-1.2	1.44	0.011
67	65.7	1.3	1.69	0.026
23	27.2	-4.2	17.64	0.648
18	13.7	4.3	18.49	1.349
313				3.819

The meaning and explanations of notations in Table 14 is shown below:

of = Observed frequency.

ef = expected frequency.

X² = chi-square.

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

X^2 value calculated = 3.819

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1) (C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

Level of significance = 5% = 0.05

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if the x^2 calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (3.819) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when they are satisfied with promotion.

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The result showed that the entire four null hypotheses were accepted while the alternate hypotheses were rejected. Four findings were revealed from the results which showed that:

- i. Employees will not intend to leave when promotion is as at when due.
- ii. Employees will not intend to leave when promotion is regular.
- iii. Employees will not intend to leave when promotion criteria is transparent.
- iv. Employees will not intend to leave when satisfied with promotion.

Chi-square statistical analysis showed that staff promotion has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5% level of significance. Employee will not turnover when all issues concerning staff promotion is given proper attention and resolved.

8. CONCLUSION

The objective of this research is to examine the influence of staff promotion on employee turnover intention in food and beverage industry in Nigeria. To execute this research goal, four objectives were raised from four research questions drawn, and four hypotheses were also formulated and tested. Based on the results from the test of the four hypotheses, it is concluded that staff promotion has significant influence on employee turnover intention. And employees will not turnover when all issues concerning staff promotion is given proper attention and resolved.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the research findings:

- i. Employees should be promoted as at when due to avoid incidence of turnover intention.
- ii. Promotion of staff should be on regular basis to avoid incidence of turnover intention.
- iii. Promotion exercise must be transparent and should be done through appraisal system.
- iv. Promotions must be based on performance and organizations must ensure that employees are satisfied with promotion.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, R., Chanhan, A., & Kura, K. (2014). Relationship between perceived organizational politics, organizational trust, human resource management practice and turnover intention among Nigerian nurses. *Management Science Letters*, 4(9), 2031 – 2048. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2014.8.018>.

- Adeboye, T., & Adegoroye, A. (2012). Employees' perception of career progression and turnover intention among bank workers in Ife Central Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. *Research Journal in Organisational Psychology and Educational Studies*, 1(6), 353-360.
- Ali, N. (2017). Factors affecting overall job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 2(2), 11-15.
- Cafaro, D. (2001). When the honeymoon ends: Thinking in long-term solutions. *Workspan*, 44(2), 42-46.
- Capelli, P. (2008). *Talent on demand: Talent age of uncertainty*. Boston, Boston, USA: Harvard Business Press.
- Chen, G., Ployhart, R. E., Thomas, H. C., Anderson, N., & Bliese, P. D. (2011). The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 159-181. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.59215089>.
- Chukwu, B. A. (2017). *Determinants of employee turnover intention in food and beverage industry*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Igbinedion University Nigeria.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchel, S. (2005). Social exchange theory, An inter-disciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 814 - 900. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602-S>.
- Dale, S. B. (1969). *The management of people at work*. New York, USA: Macmillan Publisher Company.
- Eisenberger, R., Shlnigihamber, F., Vanderbergher, C., Suchurski, I. L., & Roades, L. (2002). Perceived organizational support contribution to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565 - 573. Available at: <https://doi.org/10-1037/00219010873.565>.
- Eze, F. O. (2010). *Human resource management: Strategy, theory and application*. Enugu: Chamets Publishing Company, Enugu, Nigeria.
- Gould-Williams, J. (2007). HR practice, organizational climate and employees outcomes evaluating social exchange relationship in local government. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(9), 1627 - 1647. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701570700>.
- Gustafson, C. M. (2002). Staff turnover retention. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospital Management*, 14(3), 100 - 110.
- Jackson, M. (1981). Explaining turnover: Evidence of UK establishment. *Labour*, 17(3), 291 - 412.
- Julian, G.-W., & Daves, F. (2005). Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practices on employee outcomes: An analysis of public sector workers. *Public Management Review*, 7(1), 1 - 24. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903420-00339392>.
- Kaplan, D. M., & Feris, S. R. (2001). Fairness perception of employees promotion systems: A two-research investigation of antecedents and mediators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 1204 - 1222. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02670.x>.
- Kim, S. (2012). The impact of human resource management on state government IT employee turnover intentions. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(2), 257-279. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102601204100204>.
- Korsakiene, R., Stankeviciene, A., Simielyte, A., & Talackiene, M. (2014). Factor driving turnover and retention of information technology professionals. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 16, 1 - 11. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2015.984492>.
- Kumar, S. (1976). *A manual of sampling technique*. London: Heimemann.
- Michaels, C. E., & Spector, P. E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(1), 53-59.
- Mogaji, A. A. (1998). *Personnel selection and placement*. Paper presented at the Personnel Psychology Series vol I Lecture Note on Human Resource Management at Enugu State University of Science and Technology Business School, Enugu Nigeria.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1986). An analysis of the relationship between education and organizational commitment in a variety of organization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 7(4), 214-228.
- Munasinghe, L. (2006). Expectations matter: Job prospects and turnover dynamics. *Labour Economics*, 13(5), 589-609.
- Nazim, A. (2005). Factors affecting overall job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 2(1), 239-609.
- Oluwafemi, O. J. (2010). *Contextual dispositional factors, turnover intention and perceived. Job alternative as predictor of organization citizenship behaviours of employees of Nigerian's oil industry*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Parker, R. J., Nouri, H., & Hayes, A. F. (2011). Distributive justice, promotion instrumentality, and turnover intentions in public accounting firms. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 23(2), 169-186. Available at: [102308/bria-50020](https://doi.org/10.2308/bria-50020).
- Powell, M. J., & York, R. O. (1992). Turnover in county public welfare agencies. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences*, 16(2), 111-127.

- Price, J. L. (2001). Reflection of the determinant of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Manpower*, 22(17), 600 – 624. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/eum000000000>.
- Roshidi, H. (2014). Factors influencing turnover intention among technical employees in information technology organization: A case of xyz (m) SDN. BHD. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 3(9), 120-137.
- Solomon, O., Hashim, N. H., Mehdi, Z. B., & Ajagbe, A. M. (2012). Employee motivation and organizational performance in multinational companies: A study of Cadbury Nigeria Plc. *IRACST-International Journal of Research in Management & Technology (IJRMT)*, 2(3), 303-312.
- Stahl, G. K., Chua, C. H., Caligiuri, P., Cerdin, J. L., & Taniguchi, M. (2009). Predictors of turnover intentions in learning-driven and demand-driven international assignments: The role of repatriation concerns, satisfaction with company support, and perceived career advancement opportunities. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 48(1), 89-109.
- Usman, S., & Jangraiz, K. (2015). An analysis of the factor affecting turnover intention. Evidence from private sector universities in Peshawar MPRA Muni Personal Rep Ec Achive. Retrieved from <http://inpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/67396> posted October 2015 17.23 UTC.
- Walonick, D. S. (1993). The research process. Retrieved from www.statprocess.com [Accessed 24 Sept 2010].
- Weng, Q., McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Liu, R. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 391-400.
- Wimalasiri, H. S., & Jaytilake, L. V. K. (2016). *Factors that affect employees' turnover intention. Special reference to machine operates in apparel industry in Sri-Lanka*. Paper presented at the Paper Presented at the Fourth Students International Conference on Business in Sri-Lanka SICB/16/4RM/02.
- Yamane, T. (1964). *Statistics: An introductory analysis*. New York: Harper and Roy Publishers.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), Journal of Asian Business Strategy shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.