

High-Tech and Public Sectors Employees' Perception of Factors Influencing Promotion.

Moshe Sharabi, Ph.D.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Yezreel Valley College, Emek Yezreel
Israel.

Ofer Arian, Ph.D.

Department of Politics
Yezreel Valley College, Emek Yezreel
Israel

Javier Simonovich, Ph.D.

Department of Human Services
Yezreel Valley College, Emek Yezreel
Israel

Abstract

Promotions are a sensitive, emotionally loaded subject and the use of non-rational decisions regarding promotions can cause wide negative outcomes to organizations. This study, for the first time, compare between perceptions of employees from the high-tech (n=131) and the public (n=166) sectors, regarding to a varied promotional factors. The findings indicated significant differences in most of the factors relating to promotion (except for professional experience and luck). While the high-tech employees ranked success in projects/ missions at work as the most important factor influencing promotion, followed by education and multi-disciplinary knowledge, the public sector employees ranked organizational politics as the most important factor, followed by tenure and pressure on the supervisor. Regression analysis and ANOVA were conducted to investigate the affect of the participant's demographic variables on the promotion factors. The implications of the findings in terms of human resource management are discussed in the paper.

Keywords: High-tech sector; Public sector promotions; human resource management; Israel

Introduction

Many scholars perceive promotion as one of the most important components of employer-employee relations (e.g. Bore, 1997; Fenwick and Bierema, 2008; James, 2000; Sharabi, 2008). As far as a worker is concerned, a promotion is not only an expression of gratitude and reward for effort, but also a chance for self-fulfillment and career advancement, satisfying an individual's need for achievement and success. However, for an organization, a promotion is both an expression of gratitude and a motivational tool. There is no doubt that promotions bring the additional benefit of "binding" the worker to the organization and preventing "brain drain". Promotion (or 'Organizational career development) is a positive necessity for an organization and is one of the most important tools in HRM (Human Resource Management) (Bore, 1997) It was found that a lack of promotion opportunities, flawed promotion processes or a perception of unfairness in the promotion decisions, are related to a low level of performance, a low level of loyalty and commitment (Bonnie-Bei and Carolyn, 2005; McKay, 2004; Williams and O'Reilly, 1998) and high turnover and absenteeism (Chun-Hsien, Mu-Lan and Nai-Hwa, 2006; Eby, Allen and Brinley, 2005; Fairris, 2004; Saporta and Farjoun, 2003).

Furthermore, it negatively affects employees' wellbeing and performance (Baptiste, 2008). Actually, individuals who are more involved and socially integrated, those who perform better at work, and who are more committed to the organization, will have greater chances of being offered promotions, and vice versa (Williams and O'Reilly, 1998). The problem is that many workers claim that promotion is based on who you know and not what you know; that the impression one makes and playing the promotion "game" can lead you to the top management. (Singh, Kumra and Vinnicombe, 2002) Thus, they feel that anyone wishing to advance in the employment world is required to invest great efforts into establishing interpersonal relationships with the right people rather than investing their efforts in improving their work performance for the benefit of the organization (Deondra, 2006).

The assumption is that organizations operating in a competitive environment will strive to maximize human potential to survive the business competition; therefore, promotion according to whom you know is more prominent in public organizations where there is little or no competition (Vigoda and Drory, 2006; Vigoda and Kapun, 2005). The replacement costs of the public sector and especially high-tech employees are high not only due to the HR functional aspects (e.g. recruiting, selecting, interviewing, staffing, training and development) but mainly due to the intellectual capital aspect; i.e. departure of workers who are familiar with processes, work methods, marketing systems, technological developments, classified information concerning the business and patents, etc. (Sharabi, 2008). According to this, maintaining and promoting good employees is the main mission of the public and private sectors HRM. While there are many studies about the influence of politics and performance on the promotions in the private and the public sector and few studies that compare the perceptions of employees in the private and the public sector regarding to politics and performance, there are no comparative studies between the public and the high-tech sector regarding promotional factors. This study wants to fill this gap and to compare between high-tech and public sector employees perceptions, not only regarding to politics and performance factors, but also regarding to other promotional factors.

The Effect of Demographic Variables on Worker Promotion in Organizations

Many studies have focused on the effect of demographic variables, such as ethnicity, gender and tenure on promotion opportunities (e.g. James, 2000; Taniguchi, 2006; Woodhams and Lupton, 2006). One aspect reported in various studies is that educational similarities (i.e. level of education, educational institution attended, and type of certification) are also factors considered by supervisors when making a decision regarding the promotion of employees (Bonnie Bei and Carolyn, 2005). This notion is not unfamiliar to the Israeli organizational culture, for instance, where upper level managers who were formerly senior military commanders, ensure the addition of newly-retired high ranking military commanders to their organizations (Tzafrir et al., 2007). Although this is not a case of educational similarities, the similar background creates empathy and may be a factor which should be taken into consideration when making promotion related decisions (Bonnie Bei and Carolyn, 2005; Tzafrir et al., 2007).

Another interesting finding reported in the literature is the correlation between personal similarities between employers and employees and promotion opportunities. The way, in which these similarities may be expressed between workers at the same level, or between a worker and a supervisor, is through sharing the same perspective, responding in similar ways, interpersonal trust, and personal commitment. The greater the number or degree of similarities, the more "bonus points" (social capital) are credited to the worker. Thus, a particular worker becomes a natural candidate for promotion (James, 2000). This is typical of organizational politics and emphasizes the importance of personal connections in achieving promotions. Organizational political games are one of the tactics workers use to pursue personal interests, including pay and promotions (Vigoda and Drory, 2006; Deondra, 2006). Similarly, Singh, *et al.* (2002) and Deondra (2006) assume that workers, by not using political tactics or "impression games" are limiting themselves from achieving personal goals such as promotion. In order to survive and advance in an organization, workers must use political tools such as being familiar with the organizational culture, identifying the sources of power, nurturing relations with superiors, cooperating with colleagues and other figures of power, building a positive, well-liked image, etc. (Vigoda and Drory, 2006; Vigoda and Kapun, 2005)

When examining promotion by gender in Israel, it is evident that although women were 48.4 percent of the workforce in 2002, most of them were employed in traditional feminine occupations characterized by low wages, such as teaching, secretarial work, sales, etc. (Pasternak and Zaritzky, 2003; Tzafrir et al., 2007). Data from the Statistical Abstracts of Israel - 2002 (2002) shows that although the percentage of women managers has doubled over the past 20 years, the percentage of male CEOs is almost 4 times higher than female CEOs. As for managers in the high-tech industry, there has been some progress. While in 1978, only 9 percent of managerial positions were filled by women, by 2000, 22 percent of all managers were women, even though women comprise only 34 percent of the high-tech workforce (Wertzberger, 2001).

Based on the above literature review and the findings, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 1: *the public sector employees will attribute higher impotence to the influence of gender on promotions, then the high-tech employees.*

Hypothesis 2: *the women in the public sector will attribute higher impotence to the influence of gender on promotions then men, while in the high-tech sector there will be no differences between men and women regarding the influence of gender on promotions.*

The private/high-tech and public sectors

In his classical study, Murray's (1975) compared between the private and the public organizations characteristics. The differences focus on five main points:

- 1 *Criteria for the goal realization:* In a private organization there are purely economic considerations, while in a public organization there are blurred considerations meant to ultimately achieve consensus among the various population components.
- 2 *The degree of activity and values level:* In a private organization there are simple activities and a limited emphasis on values, while in a public organization there are complex and value-based activities that serve the interests of different and sometimes opposing groups. Frequently, such activities result in extensive extra-organizational and intra-organizational politics.
- 3 *Law:* Private organizations may act within any framework that is not against the law, while public organizations have to obey the law exclusively.
- 4 *Exposure and auditing:* A private organization is less exposed to auditing because of alternatives available to the client, while a public organization can be subjected to a long list of auditors and supervising bodies.
- 5 *Dependence upon the system:* A private organization is free from politicization, while a public organization is often impacted by, and must always be cognizant of, politics.

The inherent politics in the public sector and the inherent profit rational goals in the private sector can explain the main differences between the two sectors' function and performance. We cannot deny that the main factor for the differences is the level of external pressure. According to Pfeffer, (1992) the higher the external pressure (competition) on the organization, the lesser the internal organizational politics and the higher the inter-organizational politics will be. When examining at a continuum based on environment stability degree and an organization's chances of survival, the private organizations (especially the high-tech companies) are at one end of the spectrum and the public monopolies, operating in a secure stable environment, are at the other end (based on the continuum of organic-mechanistic organizations by Barnes and Stalker) (Jackson and Schuler, 2000). Clearly, the latter types of organizations, are more internally focused, less exposed to a turbulent environment, and usually do not face a high level of uncertainty (Harpaz and Meshoulam, 2004); therefore they are more prone to considerations based on personal relations, organizational politics, tenure and gender when granting promotion, and less prone to rational business considerations (Jackson and Schuler, 2000).

Although recently many of the world's nations have introduced a significant level of competition into the public sector as well (many public bodies and mechanisms have to justify their mere existence by the comparison between their performances and those of their competitors in the private sector in the fields of employment, health, education, and even security), this competition is still not similar to what is happening in the private sector (Vigoda and Kapun, 2005).

Vigoda and Kapun (2005) have found significant differences between the private and the public sector employees in all 9 items reflecting politics perception. The public sectors employees show lower agreement with the statements "promotions in this department generally go to top performers", "since I have worked in this department, I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically" and "rewards come only to those who work hard in this organization" than the private sector employees. They also show higher agreement with the statement "favoritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here" than the private sector employees. Therefore, this explanation strengthens the expectation that we will find more internal politics at play in the public sector than in the private one. Harpaz & Meshoulam (2004) indicates that in contrast to the traditional organizations (including the public sector), the high-tech industries are based primarily on the development of new knowledge and the production and management of new technologies. These organizations are associated with innovation and high value-added production and are characterized by a relatively high percentage of highly-educated technical professionals and a relatively high investment in R&D.

Based on the differences between the public and the high-tech sectors, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 3: *politics and pressure on the supervisor as promotional factors will gain higher importance among the public sector employees while success in projects/ missions will gain higher importance among the high-tech employees.*

Hypothesis 4: *Professional experience and multi-disciplinary knowledge as promotional factors, will gain higher importance among the high-tech employees while tenure in the organization and age will gain higher importance among the public sector employees*

The public and high-tech sectors in Israel

Israel was established in 1948 as a welfare state with economy and society managed by a high degree of centralistic system that favors the public sector at the expense of the private sector (Vigoda, 2007). Since the 1970s, the Israeli economy has shifted from a centralized socialistic economy, with employment virtually guaranteed for almost all, to a capitalist market economy characterized by an uncertainty of employment (Sharabi and Harpaz, 2002). The 1980s privatization of state-controlled organizations, led to the decrease of the sacred institution of 'work tenure'. It also led to an increase in the unemployment rate and employment uncertainty in the labor force (Sharabi and Harpaz, 2007). The public sector (especially the governmental units) reacted slowly to the change and became more efficient. The employees still have tenure status and their unions are very militant in preserving the employee's historical condition. In addition to that, the public sector still suffers from high political involvement that limits the rational, effective and efficient decisions and policy (Vigoda and Kapun, 2005).

The trend of global high-tech growth has made a major impact on the Israeli economy and society. The first high tech organizations were founded at the end of the 1960s, but only at the beginning of the 1980s was there prosperity of Israeli high tech organizations occurring simultaneously with the opening of subsidiaries by large multinational corporations (Blumen and Hareli, 2006; Tzafrir et al., 2007). The development of the high-tech industry has particularly influenced managerial philosophy, attitudes, and behavior in the workplace (Harpaz and Meshoulam, 2004). HRM faced the new challenges of managing a multi-cultural, multi-value workforce. The HRM and management practices applied by the private sector (especially the high tech), such as flexible work agreements, 'high performance work systems' and organizational career systems, permeated into the public sector (Tzafrir et al., 2007).

The significance of the high-tech sector in the Israeli economy goes far beyond its sheer size or the number of its employees. For example, in 1999, more than 52 percent of all investments in industry, 41 percent of all exports, and over 23 percent of all industrial revenues (the highest of all the segments in industry) came from the high-tech sector (Harpaz and Meshoulam, 2004). Today, there are many multinational corporations that have invested in Israeli technology and opened subsidiaries in Israel (e.g. Motorola, Cisco, Intel, IBM, Google, Microsoft, and Philips) (Invest in Israel, 2008). This research was conducted on one of the corporation's subsidiaries in Israel and on one of the governmental units, with the purpose of comparing the employee's perception of factors influencing promotion.

Method

The Samples

Our public sector sample was based on 166 employees who returned the questionnaires that were distributed (42 percent of the questionnaires were returned). They were from public governmental agencies in several geographical locations (the center and the north of Israel). 141 of them were workers and 25 managers. 55.4 percent men and 44.6 percent women, 16.9 percent had secondary school education; 46.4 percent had some college or vocational-technical education; and 36.7 percent had first or higher academic degree. The mean age was 44.2 years. The high-tech sector sample includes 131 employees in an international high-tech corporation's subsidiary located in Israel. The questionnaires were distributed and collected by the author at the work place (89.1 percent of the questionnaires were returned). The sample included 95 workers and 36 managers in the R&D area. 85.5 percent men and 14.5 percent women, 58 percent had first degree, 36.7 percent had second degree and 5.3 percent had third degree. The mean age was 31.5 years.

The questionnaire

A questionnaire containing several demographical questions (age, sex, educational level, etc.) and a series of factors related to promotion was handed out to the employees in the two sectors. They were asked to rate the degree to which they agree to the next statement, ranging from 1 "very little" to 7 "very much".

Statement: Promotions in your organization are based on:

1. Education
2. Tenure in the organization

3. Professional experience
4. Success in projects/ missions
5. Politics - social relations with the "right" people
6. Multi-disciplinary professional knowledge
7. Constant pressure by worker on the supervisor (including presenting letters of recognition, certificates of excellence, etc).
8. Age
9. Gender
10. Luck (or "being the right person at the right time")

The Findings

The findings in table 1 reveal significant differences between high-tech and public sectors employees' perception of factor influencing promotion. A significant multivariate difference was found for the centrality of areas of life ($F_{(9,291)} = 37.92, p < .001$).

Table 1: means, rankings^a and standard deviations of the factors influencing promotions in public and high-tech sectors

Promotion factors	public sector		high-tech sector		<i>t value</i>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Education	(6) 4.13	2.15	(2) 4.82	1.65	-3.07*
Tenure in the organization	(2) 5.01	2.34	(8) 3.04	1.59	8.43**
Professional experience	(5) 4.40	2.72	(5) 4.11	1.53	1.13
Success in projects/ missions	(4) 4.64	2.16	(1) 6.35	1.38	-8.09**
Politics	(1) 5.42	2.24	(4) 4.14	1.85	5.29**
Multi-disciplinary knowledge	(8) 3.69	2.17	(3) 4.63	1.45	-4.36**
Pressure on the supervisor	(3) 4.84	2.63	(6) 4.02	2.10	2.93*
Age	(7) 3.88	2.37	(9) 2.28	1.34	7.16**
Gender	(9) 3.52	2.43	(10) 1.92	.91	7.59**
Luck	(10) 3.44	2.42	(7) 3.90	1.97	-1.77

a. Rankings are in parenthesis

* $P < .01$; ** $P < .001$

A comparison between the high-tech and public sectors employees shows significant differences in most of the factors relating to promotion (except for professional experience, and luck). The strongest and most significant differences between the two sectors were in success in projects/ missions and tenure. The rankings indicates that the public sector employees believe that organizational politics is the most important factor influencing promotion, followed by tenure and pressure on the supervisor. Success in projects/ missions, experience and education (ranked 4-6 respectively) are all considered to have similar medium influence on promotions. The variables of multi-disciplinary knowledge, age, gender and luck received the lowest scores.

The high-tech employees believe that success in projects/ missions at work is the most important factor influencing promotion, followed by education, and multi-disciplinary knowledge. Organizational politics, experience, pressure on the supervisor and luck (ranked 4-7 respectively) are all considered to have similar medium influence on promotions. The variables of gender, age and tenure received the lowest scores among high-tech employees. The finding confirmed our first and third hypotheses that the public sector employees will bestow higher importance to the influence of gender, politics and pressure on the supervisor, while the high-tech employees will bestow higher importance to the success in projects/ missions on organizational promotions. The fourth hypothesis was partially confirmed since tenure in the organization and age gains higher importance among the public sector employees while multi-disciplinary knowledge gains higher importance among the high-tech employees, however there were no differences regarding the influence of professional experience on the promotions.

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the affect of the participant's demographic variables (status: worker- manager, age and gender) on the factors of promotion. Overall, employees status (worker- manager) have the highest prediction regarding the promotional factors, especially regarding pressure on the supervisor ($\beta = -.28, p < .001$) and politics ($\beta = -.36, p < .001$) factors.

Based on the regression analysis the second hypothesis was partially confirmed, since the women in the public sector bestow higher importance to the influence of gender on promotions than men ($\beta = .29, P < .001$) but also the high-tech sectors' women bestow higher importance to the influence of gender than men ($\beta = .12, P < .05$). Moreover, age and gender (except of the influence of gender on promotions) have low effect on the promotion factors and they can hardly explain the perception differences. The correlation coefficients of the two sectors are presented in table 2. We can see that education, success in projects/ missions, experience and multi-disciplinary knowledge are negatively correlated to politics and pressure on the supervisor among the two sectors.

Table 2: correlations of the factors influencing promotions public (upper diagonal) and high-tech sectors

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Education	-	.07	.17	.25	-.21	.13	-.33	.19	-.12	-.35	.36	-.22	-.03
2. Tenure in the organization	-.06	-	.23	.00	.39	-.14	.42	.76	-.01	.23	-.12	.18	-.02
3. Professional experience	.27	.47	-	.25	-.23	.15	.11	.52	.13	-.31	.09	.31	-.10
4. Success in projects/ missions	.37	-.07	.21	-	-.56	.21	-.60	-.18	-.05	-.24	.38	.12	-.23
5. Politics	-.51	.22	-.18	-.46	-	-.29	.71	.34	.36	.31	-.70	.38	.41
6. Multi-disciplinary knowledge	.23	-.31	.19	.32	-.41	-	-.12	-.06	-.06	-.20	.29	.25	.12
7. Pressure on the supervisor	-.44	.25	-.26	-.52	.60	-.36	-	.22	.47	.44	-.62	.41	.44
8. Age	-.04	.52	.43	-.01	.03	-.12	.07	-	.16	-.12	-.11	-.15	-.23
9. Gender	-.30	.16	.01	-.09	.28	.03	.23	.27	-	.19	-.33	.23	.46
10. Luck	-.33	.19	-.22	-.19	.37	-.32	.43	-.00	.05	-	-.15	.19	-.02
11. Employees status ^a	.30	-.37	-.05	.46	-.54	.22	-.53	-.12	-.32	-.34	-	.42	-.50
12. Employees age	-.10	.12	.18	.02	.33	.26	.41	-.22	.14	.07	.36	-	-.04
13. Employees gender ^b	-.09	.08	-.20	-.11	.22	-.08	.31	-.17	.30	.27	-.32	.15	-

Correlations higher than .17 are significant at $P < .05$.

a. 1-Worker, 2-Manager

b. 1-Male, 2-Female

Since there were a much higher proportion of educated individuals in the high-tech sample (compared to the public sample) there was the possibility that the answers were influenced by that. To examine that, general linear model procedure (ANOVA between and within education and sector) was conducted. The findings reveal that almost all the differences have no relation to education except the factor of success in projects/ missions; the more educated people are, they higher is their agreement that success in projects/ missions, is an important promotional factor.

Discussion

As described before, there were substantial differences between the ranking of high-tech and public employees regarding the promotions factors. Some of our findings were to be expected in the high-tech company examined. The most important factor influencing promotion is success in projects/ missions and that complies with one of the stated goals of the organization, namely "results orientation". Its organizational goals are achieved mainly through the success ratio of workers in various projects. While the high-tech employees ranked success in projects/ missions at work as the most important factor influencing promotion, the public sector employees ranked organizational politics as the most important. These beliefs: politics vs. performance exemplifies a major difference between the public and private sectors as a whole (Vigoda and Kapun, 2005). The great and significant gaps between high-tech and public sectors' employees in the scores given to politics and pressure on the supervisor can be explained by the organizational culture and the environment they exist in. The key to high-tech organizational survival is to stay on the "cutting edge" of technological advances by operating in technology-driven markets. Therefore, they are more exposed to the external environment, which is characterized by complex and global markets; in actual fact, the business environment directs them to competition and achievement. Additional characteristics of high-tech industries include a high growth rate (Harpaz and Meshoulam, 2004; Kunda, 2006), hence there are rapid promotions (Kunda, 2006). Our findings strengthen his prediction that the level of organizational politics is negatively correlated to the level of external pressure. The high-tech highly skilled workforce must be able to adapt to the demands of an ever-changing and uncertain industry; hence, promoting the suitable workers for achieving the organizational business goals, have to be based mainly on success in projects/ missions and also on professional experience, multi-disciplinary professional knowledge and education (Kunda, 2006).

The public sector workers, from their experience in the sector milieu, feel that promotion can be achieved mainly via politics (having the right "connections", lobbying, "advertising/promoting" themselves in one way or another) and by applying pressure, directly or indirectly, on their managers to promote them (Deondra, 2006; Singh *et al.* 2002; Vigoda and Drory, 2006). Public sector employees, who do not apply these tactics, jeopardize their chances of promotion, while being in a competitive environment, high-tech employees try to maximize their chances of promotion by being successful in projects/ missions. These findings indicate that there is a lack of transparency in the processes of evaluating and promoting workers in public organizations, since using clear criteria for promotion and applying them should have prevented this discrepancy (concerning politics and pressure on the supervisor as promotional factors) between high-tech and public sector employees.

The low ranking given in the high-tech to tenure in promotion decisions opposite to the public sector (ranked 8 vs. 2 respectively), reflects the belief that tenure in the organization does not guarantee successful performance in an organization that operates in a competitive market. On the other hand, it is possible that tenure and age received the lowest scores in the high-tech company since most of the workers were younger than the public sector workers. The findings of this survey reveal that public sector employees perceive organizational politics as much more important than success in projects/ missions in influencing promotion decisions. They also regard constant pressure on the supervisor as an important factor (which also characterizes partially organizational politics). Organizational politics based on personal relations, cooperation, interests, etc. create a preference for promoting workers similar to managers in their personal traits, gender, ethnicity, academic institution, place of residence, membership in various organizations and so forth. Using these characteristics in the promotion process does not support diversity management and legal norms, or the corporate social responsibility. HRM professionals have to assimilate equal opportunity policy on the promotion decisions, and support the advancement of discriminated groups (See suggestions by Woodhams and Lupton, 2006).

It is likely that employees act according to how they are measured, appreciated and rewarded. Therefore, the public sector employees, instead of succeeding in projects/ missions, will prefer to devote their time and energy to organizational politics, as well as putting pressure on superiors, rather than acquiring more knowledge, education, and experience. Hence, employees focus on activities that they perceive are crucial to their personal success, but which do not necessarily contribute to the organization's success, thus reducing organizational effectiveness. In international high-tech companies, supporting an organizational culture of innovation, diversity management and maximizing the personal potential, is essential to coping with environment demands. Furthermore, the growth of the high-tech industry is more dependent on the successful HR management in terms of enhancing motivation, loyalty, and commitment and workers wellbeing (Harpaz and Meshoulam, 2004; Baptiste, 2008).

Promoting the most suitable candidates, regardless of subjective variables, is one of the main bases for reaching the above advantages. Promotions are a sensitive, emotionally loaded subject. Extensive use of non-rational considerations and a lack of transparency regarding promotions create anger, frustration and low job satisfaction (Baptiste, 2008) as well as a decrease in work performance, involvement and commitment and higher rates of absenteeism (Bonnie-Bei and Carolyn, 2005; Fairris, 2004; McKay, 2004). Such a promotion process leads to turnover not only among the low level workers (Chun-Hsien, Mu-Lan and Nai-Hwa, 2006; Fairris, 2004) but also among the middle and top managers (Eby, Allen and Brinley, 2005; Saporta and Farjoun, 2003).

Public and private sectors HR and CD specialists' mission is to insure that the career paths planning will comply with the organization strategy and needs and to set objective requirements for each promotion. Hence, to assure that those employees who contribute the most to the organization success will be promoted, by developing and using relevant criteria for promotions. In addition, more and more HR managers today, consider the promotion processes as main issue in corporate social responsibility (Fenwick and Bierema, 2008). Global competition together with the privatization process of the public sector in western countries, requires increasing efficiency of organizations, and obligates management to focus on improving the way in which promotions are determined. A survey such as this one, performed periodically in organizations, may help HRM professionals to identify patterns or changes in employees' perceptions regarding the factors influencing promotions. Learning and development intervention can generate awareness among managers about non-relevant factors affecting their promotion decisions. With such intervention, managers will, hopefully, be able to focus on objective criteria regarding promotions to the mutual benefit of the company and the workers.

References

- Baptiste, R. N. (2008). Tightening the link between employee wellbeing at work and performance: A new dimension for HRM, *Management Decision*, 46(4), 284-309.
- Blumen, O. & Hareli, S. (2006). How children feel about their fathers' work in the hi-tech sector *International Journal of Work Organization and Emotion*, 1(4), 317 – 335.
- Bonnie Bei, Y. & Carolyn, P. E. (2005). Human resource management practices and affective organizational commitment: A comparison of Chinese employees in a state-owned enterprise and a joint venture, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 43(3), 332–360.
- Bore, M. (1997). Promotion as a tool for organizational planning, *Human Resources*, 112, 12-13.
- Chun-Hsien, L., Mu-Lan, H. & Nai-Hwa, L. (2006). The impacts of benefit plans on employee turnover: a firm-level analysis approach on Taiwanese manufacturing industry, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(11), 1951–1975.
- Deondra S. C. (2006). Human-resource professionals' perceptions of organizational politics as a function of experience, organizational size, and perceived independence, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146, 717-732.
- Eby, T. L., Allen, D. T. & Brinley, A. (2005). A Cross-Level Investigation of the Relationship Between Career Management Practices and Career-Related Attitudes, *Group and Organization Management*, 30(6), 565-597.
- Fairris, D. (2004). Internal Labor Markets & Worker Quits, *Industrial Relations*, 43(3), 573–94.
- Fenwick, T. & Bierema, L. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: issues for human resource development professionals, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 12(1), 24-35.
- Harpaz, I. & Meshoulam, I. (2004). Differences in the meaning of work in Israel: Workers in high-tech vs. traditional work industries, *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 15(2), 163-182.
- Invest in Israel* (2008). Jerusalem: Ministry of Industry Trade and Labor, Foreign Trade Administration, Investments promotion center.
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (2000). *Managing Human Resource*, N.Y.: South-Western College Publication.
- James, E.H. (2000). Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital, *Organization Science*, 11(5), 493 - 508.
- Kunda, G. (2006). *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia, PA.: Temple University Press.
- McKay, C. S. (2004). Securing Commitment in an Insecure World: Workers in Multinational High-Tech Subsidiaries, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 25(3), 375–410.
- Murray, M.A. (1975). Comparing public and private management – An exploratory essay. *Public Administration Review*, 35, 364-371.
- Pasternak, S. & Zaritzky, M. (2003). International women's day 2003, Jerusalem: *The Central Bureau of Statistics-Israel*.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Saporta, I. & Farjoun, M. (2003). The relationship between actual promotion and turnover among professional and managerial-administrative occupational groups, *Work and Occupations*, 30(3), 255-280.
- Sharabi, M. (2008). Promotion According to Who or What You Know: Managers' and Workers' Perception of Factors Influencing Promotion, *Human Resource Development International*, 11(5), 545-554.
- Sharabi, M. & Harpaz, I. (2007). Changes in Work Centrality and Other Life Areas in Israel: A Longitudinal Study, *Journal of Human Values*, 13(2), 95-106.
- Singh, V., Kumra, S. & Vinnicombe, S. (2002). Gender and impression management: Playing the promotion game, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37(1), 77-89.
- Statistical Abstracts of Israel - 2002* (2002). (Jerusalem: Central Bureau of Statistics).
- Taniguchi, M. (2006) Succeeding where others fail to try; A case study of diversity management in the Japanese retail sector, *Career Development International*, 11(3), 216-229.
- Tzafirir, S. S., Baruch, Y. & Meshoulam, I. (2007). HRM in Israel – New challenges, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(1), 114 – 131.
- Vigoda, E., (2007). Public administration – the next generation: Managerial transformations and challenges towards the formation of a modern public sector, *The Public Space*, 1, 57-88 (Hebrew).
- Vigoda, E. & Drory, A. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Organizational Politics*, Northampton, MA.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vigoda, E. & Kapun, D. (2005). Perceptions of politics and performance in public and private organizations: A test of one model across two sectors. *Policy & Politics*, 33(2), 251-276.
- Wertzberger, R. (2001). *Women in the Israeli economy – Those who influence, participate and are harmed (presented to the committee for advancing the women's status)*, The Knesset- centre of research and information, Jerusalem.
- Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly, C.A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research, in B.M. Staw (Ed.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*. (pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Woodhams, C. & Lupton, B. (2006). Gender-based equal opportunities policy and practice in small firms: the impact of HR professionals, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 74-97.