

Teacher Turnover in Primary Schools: An Assessment of Promotion Factor

Umar Abdulkadir Umar*¹, Henry Eggon Ahmed², & Adamu Ndanusa²

¹Department of Public Administration
Ahmadu Bello Universty, Zaria

²Department of Economics
Nassarawa State University

*Correspondence Email: umarabdulkadirumar@gmail.com

Abstract

This study assessed the extent to which irregular promotion influence teachers' turnover in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs. The instruments used for the primary data were administration of questionnaires and interviews. 297 responses from the questionnaires were used; interviews were also conducted on 20 members of the LGEAs' management and SUBEB head quarter. The secondary sources of data used in this study include publications such as annual reports, journals, conference papers, gazettes, circulars, unpublished dissertations as well as internet data. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in presenting and analyzing the data for the study. The study found a significant relationship between promotion and teachers' turnover. The study recommends that a concerted effort should be made by the LGEAs to ensure regular promotion for its teachers to dissuade teachers' turnover.

Key Words: Promotion, Turnover, teachers and loyalty.

JEL Classification: M12

1. Introduction

Teachers' turnover has become a global challenge to educational development over the years. The movement of teachers outside teaching profession is turbulent issue irrespective of continents, countries, regions or communities but the menace is more pervasive to the teachers at primary schools level (Abdulkadir, 2018). One of the most critical functions that the management of an organization should perform is that of getting its employees motivated, stimulated and enticed to work positively towards the actualization and realization of predetermined goals and objectives upon which the organization is established (Dess & Shaw 2012; Armstrong 2011).

Mobley (1982) gave the meaning of employee turnover as the discontinuance of membership in an organization by the person who received monetary compensation from the organization. Bliss (2007) has defined turnover as the movement of

employees out of the organization. According to Ingersoll (2002) in the USA teacher scarcity is as a result of turnover, which is eminent in many States. In South Africa the mass exodus or movement of teachers being recruited are said to be leaving the profession for greener financial pastures in countries like Britain. It is unlikely that dispirited, under-motivated and dissatisfied teachers will be effective and committed instructors for a long period of time and the quality of teaching is hurt by the loss of these experienced teachers and raises the costs of recruiting and training new teachers as echoed by (Ongori, 2007). In Britain teacher turnover is reported as a national crisis. Issa and Adebola (2014) also reveal that the situation is worsening in Sweden, Germany and New Zealand as far as teacher turnover is concerned.

In the developing countries the problem is comparatively serious. Reports in countries such as South Africa, Zambia, New Guinea and Malawi indicated that the problem had almost reached a catastrophic stage (Xaba, 2003). The president of the Gambian Teachers' union reports a massive exit of teachers from the profession due to amongst other reasons, a lack of adequate salaries, allowances, housing and promotion (Xaba, 2003).

In Nigeria, labour turnover has been a common phenomenon in many organizations over the years, even so fundamental is the fact that labour turnover has badly affected one of the most important sector of the nation; the education sector most especially at primary school level,(Issa & Adebola 2014). According to the report by The Labour Force Survey conducted quarterly by the National Bureau of Statistics (2014) the number of personnel who left the establishment as a result of Resignation, Retirement, Retrenchment, Dismissal and Death by suitable manpower categories have reached about 20% across the nation in 2012. The reports show that education sector especially at primary level is worst hit by the trend. This of course is very alarming considering the importance attached to education in national development.

In Kano state, teacher turnover among the primary school teachers have assumed an alarming rate in the past years. According to report from the office of Planning, Research and Statistics of Kano State Universal Basic Education Board, (KNSUBEB) between 2011 to 2016, over 11254 primary school teachers across the forty four (44) Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) in Kano state have applied for transfer of service from SUBEB to other ministry agencies and parastatals in the state with tertiary institutions in the state having the highest proportion of applicants. It is against this background that this study is targeted at assessing factor of promotion and how it influence teacher turnover in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni Local Education Authorities of Kano state from 2011 to 2016.

Teachers' turnover is a serious issue militating against every school at all level be it public or private. For the effective teaching and learning in the schools, it is pertinent to retain its skilled labour force. Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) were established agencies under the Kano state Universal Education Board (KNSUBEB) and specifically shouldered with the

responsibility of ensuring better management and control of Primary education at local government level. The authorities were responsible for the appointment, compensation, training, promotion, discipline, transfer, as well as ensuring good condition of service to all teaching and non-teaching staff as enshrined in SUBEB Law of 2005.

However, over the years, it appears that in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni local education authorities were affected by incidence of employee turnover from both teaching and non-teaching staff. Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni LGEAs (2016) Annual Report shows that from 2011 to 2015, over 453 staffers have resigned their appointment and took new employment where they have higher pay and regular promotion, while in Tarauni LGEA, the number has reached 607. In the same vein, over 741 and 857 employees applied for transfer of service in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni LGEAs respectively. There was only one promotion exercise from 2011 to 2016 in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni LGEAs, and a substantial number of staffers are in dire need to be promoted in these LGEAs. The SUBEB chairman recently revealed that no fewer than 40,000 thousand teachers were in need to be promoted as a result of skipping of some years without promotion (NUT Bulletin, 2016).

It is regrettable however, to point out that the most cited reason for this trend is associated with irregular promotion. Concerted effort were made by the LGEAs to prepare promotion brief annually but all their efforts remained futile, yet employee turnover keeps increasing in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni LGEAs of Kano State. It is in the light of the above that one fundamental question that this research work wants to ask is how has promotion influence employee turnover in Dawakin-Kudu and Tarauni LGEAs of Kano state? The main objective of this study is to assess why promotion influence teachers turnover in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs. Specifically, the study assessed the factor of promotion and how it relates with teachers turnover.

2. Literature Review

Durbin (2000) and Meyer (2001) also said that employee's turnover may be due to a particular cause but they can also be an indication of more fundamental organizational problems. According to Grobler (2006) and Nel (2008), the term is used to encompass all leavers, both voluntary and involuntary including those who resign, retire or are made redundant. This scenario may be described as overall or crude employee turnover because it covered voluntary and involuntary turnover while it fails to give the causes of turnover explicitly. Grobber (2006) view controllable staff turnover as resignations and dismissals, and define resignation as the ending of an employment contract by the employee. This definition depicts that there are turnover that are controllable and therefore unable to identify uncontrollable turnover such as death, retirement etc.

Employees' turnover is a much studied phenomenon (Shaw, 1998).But there is no standard reason why people leave organizations. Employee turnover is the rotation of

workers around the labour market; between firms, jobs and occupations; and between the states of employment and unemployment (Abassi&Hollman, 2000). Employee turnover can be interpreted as a leave or departure of intellectual capital from the employing organization (Johnson, 2000).

The term “turnover” is defined by Price (1977) as: the ratio of the number of organizational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organization during the period. This definition depicts that turnover is only measured by the percentage of staff who leave organization without considering the resourcefulness of those who are leaving, while in a real sense the term employee turnover is beyond quantitative measurement but qualitative measurement is more important. Frequently, managers perceived turnover as the entire process associated with filling a vacancy: Each time a position is vacated, either voluntarily or involuntarily, a new employee must be hired and trained. This replacement cycle is known as turnover (Woods, 1995). The definition is inadequate because it views turnover as recruitment process for replacing those that have left instead of looking it as how vacant existed.

Although, there is no standard framework for understanding the employees’ turnover process as whole, a wide range of factors have been found useful in interpreting employee turnover Kevin, Joan and Adrian (2004) It was found that employee goal setting (Medlin and Green 2009); career growth (Hamel and Breen, 2007), work environment (Cardoso and Monfardini, 2008; Hansen, 2008 and Burke and Hsieh, 2006), job satisfaction (Palazzo and Kleiner 2002; Garcia and Kleiner 2001; Hannay and Northam 2000 and Stein, K. 1996), training and development (Walsh and Taylor 2007; Shaw et al., 1998; Huselid, 1995) are the foremost decisive factors and very strong predictors of employee turnover. Employees’ turnover tends to be higher in environments where employees feel they are taken advantage of, where they feel undervalued or ignored, and where they feel helpless or unimportant. Clearly, if managers are impersonal, arbitrary and demanding, there is a greater risk of turnover (Hom & Griffeth, 2001).

Allen (2000) pointed out that employees turnover can be expensive, although the actual costs are difficult to estimate. To get indication, organizations can start adding up the most obvious expenses: those of advertising, recruitment and supervisory time. In simpler terms, promotion refers to upward movement in present job leading to greater responsibilities, higher status and better salary. Promotion may be temporary or permanent depending upon the organizational requirement. According to Clothier and Spriegel (2007) “promotion is the transfer of an employee to a job which pays more money or one that carries some preferred status.” In this definition promotion attached with monetary value while in real sense promotion is beyond monetary value rather career progression.

In the corporate sector employee promotions doesn't make much difference as that of in government sector. In the government, the word promotion is the ultimate desire for

an employee for the service rendered by him in the organization and this is the only way for an employee career development in the government sector. Promotion is the ultimate motivating factor for any employee because moves employee forward in hierarchy of concern organization added with additional responsibility, higher respect, honour, with increase in grade pay and allowances.

Heathfield (2016) defined promotion in the following: A promotion is the advancement of an employee's rank, salary, duties, and/or designation within an organization. Promotions can also carry increases in benefits, privileges, and prestige, although in some cases the promotion changes designation only. A promotion is the advancement of an employee's rank, salary, duties and/or designation within an organization. Promotions are often a result of good employee performance and/or loyalty (usually via seniority). The opposite of a promotion is a demotion (Heathfield, 2016). This above definition of promotion is comprehensive because it encompasses career progression and increase of salary but absence of promotion does not mean demotion rather status quo. The advancement of an employee from one job position to another job position that has a higher salary range, a higher level job title, and, often, more and higher level job responsibilities in an organization, is called a promotion Chand (2016).

Sometimes a promotion results in an employee taking on responsibility for managing or overseeing the work of other employees. Decision-making authority tends to rise with a promotion as well. Promotion means elevation to a higher job accompanied by increased pay and privileges. It is an upward advancement of an employee in an organization, which commands better pay, better status, higher opportunities, higher responsibilities and better working environment (Chand, 2016). Promotion provides motivation and job satisfaction to all personnel. Quite often, industrial unrest, frustration and negative feeling among the employees are on account of matters concerned with promotion. A sound promotion policy is essential in all types of organizations. It is purely a managerial decision in which trade unions have no role to play. "A promotion is the transfer of an employee to a job which pays more money or one that carries some preferred status (Scott and Clothier, 2007).

"Promotion is the advancement of an employee to a better job-better in terms of greater responsibilities, more prestige or status, greater skill and especially, increased rate of pay or salary (Pigors and Myers, 1981)" "A promotion involves a change from one job to another that is better in terms of status and responsibilities (Flippo, 1961). Promotion implies upgrading of an employee to a higher post involving increase in rank and responsibilities. Generally increase in pay also accompanies promotion but it is not an essential ingredient. A 'dry promotion' can also be given which would mean that the person being promoted does not get any monetary benefit.

George (2013) pointed out that career progress creates stress on employee's understandings of the worth of his or her career prospects. Obstacles in career development can appear at any time during an employee's employment period which

serves as stressor for them. These stressors can include an array of problems like being stuck at a position, without any hopes of progress or threats of downsizing (Smith and Cooper, 1994). Career growth is much more important than salary in Europe or America but it is counted equivalent to salary in Asian context. “Moving Up or Moving Out” counts career growth as basic for turnover (Geoege, 2013). High employee turnover could also be due to no potential opportunity for advancements or promotions. Employees prefer other companies which may provide them with higher posts and increased compensation packages (Cascio and Bodedreau, 1987).

Different types of promotions are discussed below as submitted by Yorder, et al (1958); (a) Up or Out Promotion: In this case, an employee either earns a promotion or seeks employment elsewhere. Out promotion usually leads to termination of employee and joining some other organization in a better position. (b) Dry Promotion: In this type, promotion is given in lieu of increase in salary. For example, when a university professor is made Head of the Department, there is no increase in salary. (c) Paper promotion: Paper promotion happens on seniority of employee in government sector having different departments. Paper promotion is an employee promotion given to the employee belonging to the parent department, but indeed working in another department on transfer, on request of employee or due to exigency of work. Paper promoted employee draws salary pertaining to job in another Department, but not according to promotion’s job in the parent Department.

Promotion is given on the basis of seniority or merit or a combination of both. Let us discuss each one as a basis of promotion. Seniority as a basis: It implies relative length of service in the same organization. The advantages of this are: relatively easy to measure, simple to understand and operate, reduces labour turnover and provides sense of satisfaction to senior employees. It has also certain disadvantages: beyond a certain age a person may not learn, performance and potential of an employee is not recognized, it kills ambition and zeal to improve performance. Merit as a basis: Merit implies the knowledge, skills and performance record of an employee. The advantages are: motivates competent employees to work hard, helps to maintain efficiency by recognizing talent and performance. It also suffers from certain disadvantages like: difficulty in judging merit, merit indicates past achievement, may not denote future potential and old employees feel insecure (Scot and Clothier, 2007). Seniority-cum-Merit as basis: As both seniority and merit as basis suffer from certain limitations, therefore, a sound promotion policy should be based on a combination of both seniority and merit. A proper balance between the two can be maintained by different ways: minimum length of service may be prescribed, relative weight age may be assigned to seniority and merit and employees with a minimum performance record and qualifications are treated eligible for promotion, seniority is used to choose from the eligible candidates.

2.2 Empirical Perspectives of the Related Studies

Ampomah and Cudjo (2015) conducted study on the Effects of Employee turnover on organizations with reference to the Electricity Company of Ghana (ECG). The research design used in this study was the quantitative approach, through the use of structured questionnaires in collecting data. The study found out that lack of promotion was the primary cause of employee turnover in ECG. Mbah and Ikemefuna (2012) concentrated on job satisfaction and employee turnover intentions. The study used both primary and secondary data with variables such as employee initiatives, autonomy, individual competence, self-approach, etc. reduce employee turnover. They found Less supervision, clarity of roles, and functions and so on reduce rate of turnover intention. Pay package alone cannot enhance employee satisfaction.

Khan and Aleem (2014) in their work “impact of job satisfaction on employee turnover: An empirical study of autonomous medical institutions of Pakistan”. They used both primary and secondary sources of data, and findings suggested that the variable like pay, promotion, working conditions and nature of work are prominent for the job satisfaction level and employees. It is suggested that management should take into account of the factors such as pay, promotion, work in conditions and nature of work in order to minimize the turnover level of the employees. This study analysed impact of job satisfaction on employee turnover in the medical institutions in Pakistan, which also provided gap for our study since their study centred on medical institutions, our research centred on educational institutions specifically primary schools in Dawakin- kudu and Tarauni LGAs. Kosi, Sulemana, Bonteng and Mensah (2015) The study investigated the influence of motivation and job satisfaction on teachers’ intention to quit teaching in public senior high schools in Tamale Metropolis, Ghana. Data were collected using self-reported questionnaires. The results revealed that job satisfaction made the most significant but negative contribution to intention to quit. Motivation made the least but significant contribution to intention to quit. It is recommended that training and development programmes as well as offering of more extrinsic motivation variables by all stakeholders in the education sector is required to retain more teachers in public schools.

Shukla and Sinha (2013) conducted study on Turnover in banking sector: Empirical evidence. This research looked at extent of influence of various factors on employee turnover in urban and semi urban banks. The research was aimed at achieving the following objectives: identify the key factors of employee turnover; determine the extent to which the identified factors are influencing employees’ turnover. The study found out the following factors have significantly influenced employee turnover in banking sector: Work Environment, Job Stress, Compensation (Salary), Employee relationship with management, Career Growth. Issa and Adebola (2014) Conducted research on the implication of employee turnover in Nigerian Higher Education. The question of the relationship between turnover and productivity is the focus of the research and ask the question “is the productivity slowdown due to a high turnover rate of workers? Is high turnover rate an indicator of poor performance?” It was found

that an institution with low turnover rate may still experience low productivity. It was discovered that low turnover is not an indication of high performance and productivity. The research also revealed that turnover intention can also slow productivity and turnover is high in academic staff compared to non-academic staff. It is therefore recommended that an exit interview should be conducted for any staff leaving the service of the institution with a view to determining the immediate and remote causes of leaving the service.

This study came at fore when most of the researchers of employee turnover focused the attention of their study in the private sectors. The phenomenon of employee turnover is more pervasive in the public sector where all the indicators of the employee turnover are more apprehensible and have more serious challenges in carrying out public services. The study adopted Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) model profounded by Siegrist (1986) According to Siegrist (1996) the core prediction of the ERI model is that employees who are persistently exposed to high effort (costs) and low rewards (gains) conditions at work will suffer from detrimental psychosocial effects characterized by low reciprocity possibly leading to emotional strain and stress-related physiological reactions. The ERI Model is based on the proposition that benefits that an employee derives from work are dependent upon a communal relationship between effort exerted and rewards gained at work (Van Vegchel, *et al* 2005). Thus there is a correlation between the effort exerted by an employee and the reward they expect to gain from the work engagement. “The model of effort-reward imbalance (ERI) claims that failed reciprocity in terms of high efforts spent and low rewards received in turn is likely to elicit recurrent negative emotions and sustained stress responses in exposed people” (Siegrist 2012). An imbalance in the form of high effort and low reward will ultimately result in stress.

Siegrist’s model suggests that there are two different kinds of effort. The physical extrinsic effort an employee puts into their work due to physical demands and the more internal intrinsic effort that is termed over-commitment. Kinman and Jones (2008) postulate that effort reward imbalance occurs more frequently in employees who are overcommitted to their work. Those employees who care much about their work are more likely to experience ERI than those employees showing very little or no commitment towards their job. About 10 and 40 per cent of the labour force experience some amount of effort-reward imbalance (Siegrist, 2001). This is a very significant portion of the workforce thus if unchecked ERI can have very significant detrimental effects on the employees and the organizations that they work for. Siegrist (1996) postulates that rewards are distributed to employees as money esteem and job security. Money includes financial and non-financial benefits an employee may be awarded as part of their salary. Esteem involves the respect and support awarded the employee at their workplace and security encompasses job security and career opportunities like promotion. Rewards are perceived to be a key work stressor in the ERI model (JuarezGarcia, 2015).

The teacher effort in this study is loyalty, hard work, ability, skills, adaptability, trust in superior among others. While the reward is promotion, the imbalance is absence or irregular promotion. The reward imbalance is what lead to teacher turnover. The relevant of the model to this study can be more comprehend in the diagram below.

Efforts	Reward	Imbalance	Consequence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loyalty • Teacher Turnover 		Promotion	Absence or irregular
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard work • Skills • Ability • etc. 		promotion	

Source: Researcher's application of ERI Model By Siegrist, (2017)

3. Methodology

The study employs a survey research design, the population of the study comprised Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs as well as KNSUBEB head quarter with total 3700 population. Krecie and Morgan (1970) sample size table was used in determining the sample size of the respondents where Dawakin-kudu LGEA has 1510 population size and 141 as sample size, Tarauni LGEA has 1912 population size and 179 as sample size, SUBEB head quarter has 278 population size and 26 as sample size (Krecie and Morgan 1970). Multi-stage sampling was used in this study. The sources are both primary and secondary data the primary data include questionnaire and interview while secondary sources include text books, journals, internet etc. The study used both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics in describing and analysing the data. Linear regression was used as a tool for analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

The rate of return of the questionnaires by each category of respondents under study was presented in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Rate of Return of Questionnaires

Questionnaires	Number	Percent
Administered	346	100%
Retrieved	318	91.9%
Unreturned	28	8.1%
Valid	297	85.5%
Invalid	21	6.1%
Total	346	100%

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2017

4.2 Data presentation on Hypothesis

Analysis of the data collected for hypothesis two which states that, "There is no significant relationship between promotion and employee turnover in Dawakin- kudu and Tarauni LGEAs of Kano state. The data collected were presented and analyzed as follows:

Table 4.2: Promotion is regular and when due

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagreed	80	26.9	26.9	26.9
Disagreed	120	40.4	40.4	67.3
Valid Undecided	9	3.0	3.0	70.4
Agreed	53	17.8	17.8	88.2
Strongly Agreed	35	11.8	11.8	100.0
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2017

The table 4.2 presents the opinions that 'Promotion is regular and when due. 80(26.9%) strongly disagreed, 120(40.4%) disagreed, 9(3.0) they are uncertain, 53(17.8%) agreed, while 35(11.8%) of the total respondents strongly agreed. Findings revealed that 200(67.3) constituting majority of the respondents disagreed that promotion is regular and when due. In Complementing the responses from the questionnaires, the interviews conducted to Management of the LGEAs and SUBEB

head quarter shows that majority of the responses admitted that promotion is not regular and when due.

Table 4.3: Promotion of employees in this organization motivate workers in this organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagreed	23	7.7	7.7	7.7
Disagreed	47	15.8	15.8	23.6
Undecided	6	2.0	2.0	25.6
Agreed	126	42.4	42.4	68.0
Strongly Agreed	95	32.0	32.0	100.0
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2017

The table 4.3 which presents the views that 'Promotion of employees in this organization motivates workers and can reduce employees' turnover'. 23(7.7%) strongly disagreed, 47(15.8%) disagreed, 6(2.0%) undecided, 126(42.4) agreed, while 95(32.0%) of the total respondents strongly agreed. The study found out that majority of the responses which constituted 221(74.4%) agreed that promotion of employees motivates workers and reduces turnover. However, the respondents' interview goes along the line with questionnaires views where majority of the respondents from LGEAs and SUBEB management agreed that promotion of employees motivates workers. Therefore, the interviewees and the questionnaires responses indicates that promotion of employees motivates workers and reduces employees' turnover in the LGEAs

Table 4.4: The more employees are promoted, the more loyal they become to the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagreed	36	12.1	12.1	12.1
Disagreed	43	14.5	14.5	26.6
Undecided	26	8.8	8.8	35.4
Agreed	116	39.1	39.1	74.4
Strongly Agreed	76	25.6	25.6	100.0
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2017

The above table 4.4: indicates that the views of the respondents which clearly stated that ‘the more employees are promoted, the more loyal they become to the organization’. 36(12.1%) strongly disagreed, 43(14.5) disagreed, 26(8.8%) undecided, while 116(39.1%) agreed, 76(25.6) strongly agreed that the more employees are promoted, the more loyal they become to the organization. Findings revealed that the majority of the questionnaires respondents which constituted 192(64%.7) agreed that the more employees are promoted the more loyal they become to the organization. However, the responses from the interviews affirmed the views collected from the questionnaires where the majority of the interviewees agreed that ‘the more employees are promoted the more loyal they become to the organization. Therefore, both the opinions of questionnaires and interviews affirmed that the more employees are promoted the more likely to be loyal to the organization.

Table 4.5: The current promotion system will retain employee with the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagreed	63	21.2	21.2	21.2
Disagreed	180	60.6	60.6	81.8
Undecided	11	3.7	3.7	85.5
Valid Agreed	41	13.8	13.8	99.3
Strongly Agreed	2	.7	.7	100.0
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2017

The table 4.5 above shows the responses that the current promotion system will retain employees with the organization. 63(21.2%) strongly disagreed, 180(60.6%) disagreed, 11(3.7%) undecided, 41(13.8%) agreed, 2(.7%) strongly agreed. Findings revealed that 243(81.8%) which constituted majority of the respondents disagreed that the current promotion system will retain employees in the organization. Complementing the above findings from the questionnaires, the interviews conducted on LGEAs and SUBEB Management shows that, majority of the respondents are in line with questionnaires findings which shows that the current promotion system will not augur well in ensuring retention in the LGEAs. Therefore, from the result of the above findings the current promotion system will not reduce employee turnover in the LGEAs.

4.2.1 Test of Hypothesis

The null hypothesis tested states that: “There is no significant relationship between Promotion and employee turnover. The independent variable is ‘Promotion’ while the dependent variable is ‘Teacher Turnover’. The study wants to see the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. For the purpose of performing

regression analysis operation on the computer for the hypothesis, responses on the above tables produced the output presented on tables below:

Table 4.9 Regression Result

Dependent Variable: Teacher Turnover	Coefficients
<i>(Constant)</i>	-3.745*** (0.143)
<i>Promotion (IV)</i>	29.330*** (0.034)
<i>F-Stat</i>	860.265***
<i>R²</i>	0.863

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses, P values: significance *10%; **5%; ***1%

Tables 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 presented simple regression analysis with Promotion as predictor (IV) and teacher turnover as criterion (DV). The result shows that a significant regression model was found (**F = 860,265, p < .05**). The P < 0.05 indicating that promotion has significant relationship with teacher turnover with 95% confidence level, thus, alternate hypothesis is therefore accepted while null hypothesis is rejected.

4.2.2 Decision Rule

We accept the null hypothesis where the probability value (Sig.) of a particular independent variable is greater than 0.05 and we reject the null hypothesis if the probability value (Sig.) is lower than 0.05.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The study revealed that there is significant relationship between promotion and teacher turnover, Promotion was not regular and when due throughout the years under review, this constituted serious enigma in the LGEAs service. Most of the workers that sought for transfer of service or resigned their jobs to take another job elsewhere cited lack of promotion as one of the reasons for their exit. It is noted that from 2011 to 2016 there was only one promotion exercise in 2013 in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs and the entire teaching and non-teaching staff of SUBEB, Kano.

In Dawakin-kudu LGEA, 1428 teaching and non-teaching staff were not promoted from 2014 to 2016 who are due for promotion but they were not promoted, the same problem in Tarauni LGEA were 1842 staff were not promoted from 2014 to 2016. It was revealed by the SUBEB chairman that no fewer than 40,000 teachers that need to be promoted (NUT Bulletin, 2016). This has happened as a result of accumulated promotion of the previous years.

In complementing this assertion the data collected as depicted in table 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents disagreed that there were regular promotion. While table

4.3 shows that majority of the responses agreed that promotion motivates workers to ensure their retention. Furthermore, the interviews responses disclosed that there were no regular promotion in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs which significantly discourages loyalty and commitment to service. This finding is in tandem with that of Ampomah and Cudjor (2015) in their work the effect of employee turnover on organization in the Electricity Company of Ghana which revealed that lack of promotion was the primary cause of employee turnover.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study assessed promotion on teacher turnover in primary schools of Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs in Kano state. The study came on board when there are issues militating against promotion of teachers in primary schools of Kano state. The data was presented and analysed as well as hypothesis was tested. The study concluded that the level of teacher turnover in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs of Kano state in the period under study is alarming. The study was conducted when majority of the teachers are bitterly complaints about irregular promotion in the entire state.

Deliberate and Concerted effort should be made to ensure promotion is regular and as when due. Regular promotion will reduce teachers' turnover and ensure employees' loyalty (Retention) in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs and Kano State at large.

References

- Abdulkadir, U. U. (2018) *Assessment of the effect of Motivation on Employee Turnover in Dawakin-kudu and Tarauni LGEAs of Kano State*: Unpublished Dissertation Department of Public Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Allen, D. (2000) Managing employee turnover: Myths to dispel and strategies for effective management. *Journal of Management*. 6 (2)
- Ampomah, P. & Cudjoh S. K. (2015) The Effect of Employee Turnover on Organisation (A case study of Electricity Company of Ghana, Cape Coast); *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies*; 2(1); 21, -24.
- Amstrong, M.,(2011) *Handbook of human resource management practices*. 12th Edn., New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Bliss, W.G. (2007). Cost of employee turnover. Seneca, SC: Bliss & Associates, Inc. Available at http://www.blissassociates.com/html/articles/cost_of_turnover15.html.
- Cascio, W. & Bodedreau, J. (1987) *Financial Impact of Human Resources Initiatives (2nd edition)*: Upper Saddle River, N. J. Person Education, Inc.
- Chand, S. (2016). *Training, Meaning, Definition and Types of Training*. Retrieved on Febuary, 7, 2017 from www.yourarticlelibrary.com/human-resources
- Clothier, R.C.and Scott, W. D.(2007) *Personnel Management Principles*: New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Dawakin-kudu LGEA (2016) *Annual Report*; Unpublished Report Submitted to SUBEB, Kano.
- Dess, G. J. & Shaw S.M. (2001) Voluntary Turnover, Social Capital and Organisational Performance. *Academic Management Review*. 26(3).
- Durbin, H., (2000) *Applying psychology: Individual and organizational*. London, England: Prentice Hall.
- Flippo, E. (1990) *Personnel Management*: New York: McGraw-Hill.
- George, M. (2013) *An Analysis of Factors Influencing Turnover of Teachers in Public High Schools in Limuru Districts, Kenya*: Unpublished Project Report Presented to School of Business, Kenyatta University.
- Ghana National Association of Teachers (2010). *Teacher Attrition in Ghana: Results of a Questionnaire Survey 2009*.
- Ghanaian Times. (2014). The education ministry must not allow this bomb to explode.pp 4, No. 17,197.
- Global trend (2015) available at www.mercer.com/newsroom,
- Grobler, P.A. & Warnick S., Carrel N.F., Elbert, &Hartfierd, R.D. (2006). *Human Resource Management in South Africa*. (2nd ed). UK London, Cornwall Institute of Management.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2016) Tips to Reduce Turnover. Availble: Wikipedia 2016.
- Hom P. W. & Griffeth R. W., (1995). *Employee Turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.
- Ingersoll, R. M. & Smith, T.M. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Seattle, WA, Center for study of teaching and policy.
- Issa, A. & Adebola, D.E. (2014). Implications of Employee Turnover In Nigerian Higher Education. *Journal of Research and Development*. 1 (10).
- Johnson, S. (2000) Job To Job Turnover To Non –Employment Movement: *Journal of Personnel Review*. 31(6).
- Kevin M.M, Joan L.C, & Adrian J.W., (2004). Organizational change and employee turnover *Personnel Review*. 33(2)
- Khan, H. A. & Aleem, M. (2010). Impact of Job Satisfaction On Employee Turnover; An Empirical Study Of Autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan: *Journal of International Studies*. 7 (1)
- Kinman, G. & Jones, F. (2008). Effort-reward imbalance, over-commitment and work-life conflict: testing an expanded model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(3): 236-251.
- Kosi, I. Sulemana, I. Boteng, J. S. & Mensah, R. (2015) Teacher Motivation and Job Satisfaction on intention To Quit; An Empirical Study in Public Cycle Schools in Tamale Metropolis, Ghana; *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*. 5(5).
- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970), *Determining Sample Size for a Finite Population*. Retrieved from www.kenpro.org/sample-size-determining on 30th July, 2015.

- Mbah, S.E. & Ikemefuna, C.O. (2012) Job Satisfaction And Employees' Turnover Intentions In Total Nigeria P.L.C., In Lagos State; *International Journal Of Humanities And Social Sciences*. 19(1).
- Mobley, W. H. (1982). *Employee Turnover. Reading In*: Addison- Wesley Press.
- Meyer, J.P. (2001). *Organizational commitment: Personnel psychology and HRM*. London, England: Wiley.
- National Union of Teachers Kano (2016) Primary School's Teachers in Critical Need of Promotion; *NUT official Bulletin, September – December, 2016*
- Nel, P.S., Werner, A., Haasbroek, G.D., Poisat, P., Sono, T. & Schultz, H.B. (2008). *Human Resource Management*. (8thed).Oxford University Press, Cape Town.
- National Bureau of Statistics (2014) *Statistical Report on Women and Men in Nigeria* Retrieved at www.google.com/search pdf
- Ogonri, H. (2011) Review of Employee Turnover; *African Journal of Business Managemen*; Vol.4 No. 19 Available Online; [Http://www.academicjournal.org/ajbm](http://www.academicjournal.org/ajbm)
- Pigors, P.J.W. & Myers, C. A. (1981) *Personnel Administration: A Point of View and Method*: New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Price J. L. (1977). *The Study of Turnover*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Shaw, D. Jason, D. (1999). Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: The Moderating Role of Positive Effect. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139 (2)
- Society for Human Resource Manangement (2012) *Job Satisfaction and Engagement*: Retrieved from; <https://www.shrm.org/Resources>
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high effort-low reward conditions at work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1; 27-43.
- Siegrist, J. (2001). *A theory of occupational stress*. In Dunham, J. (Ed.). *Stress in the Workplace: Past, Present and Future*. Whurr Publishers, London.
- Siegrist, J. (2012). Effort-reward imbalance at work - theory, measurement and evidence, Department of Medical Sociology. University Du'sseldorf, Germany.
- State Universal Basic Education Board, Kano (2013) Annual Report: Raab Printing Press and Ventures Nigeria Ltd, Kano.
- Tarauni LGEA (2016) *Annual Report*; Unpublished Report Submitted to SUBEB, Kano
- Woods, R. H. (1995). *Managing Hospitality Human Resources*. 2nd. Ed., Lansing, MI: American Hotel and Motel Association.
- Van Vegchel, N., De Jonge, J., Bosma, H. & Schaufeli, W. (2005). Reviewing the effort reward imbalance model: Drawing up the balance of 45 empirical studies. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60(5)
- Xaba, M. (2003). Managing teacher turnover, *South African Journal of Education*; 23(4)
- Yorder, D., Heneman, G. H., Turnbull, J. G. & Stone, H. (1958) *Hand Book on Personal Management and Labour Relations*: New York: MacGraw-Hill.