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This study was undertaken to determine the relationship between pay satisfaction, job burnout and intention to stay. The determinants of both pay satisfaction and job burnout were looked at as previous validated in other related studies. The interrelationship between the variables was analysed using regression and Anova analytical tools. The findings revealed that pay satisfaction and job burnout are strong indicator of the intention to stay by lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State, though, job burnout has inverse relationship. We, therefore, recommend that management of the institutions should as a matter of urgency pay adequate and prompt attention to pay satisfaction and job burnout by looking at their determinants and as well, improve the lecturers’ interpersonal training and, stress and stress related activities management.
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INTRODUCTION

"Management of human resources is concerned with obtaining the best staff for an organisation and having got them, looking after them so that they will stay and give of their best to their jobs" Cummings (1978)

Employee performance is enhanced by pay satisfaction as it creates the necessary impetus to the partial fulfilment of the main reason for engaging in a paid job which is the employee’s ability to fulfil certain financial needs and/or obligations. Satisfaction, therefore, could be described as “a fulfilment of a need or desire; the pleasure obtained by such fulfilment; the source of such gratification; a reparation for an injury or loss; a vindication for a wrong suffered” (en Dictionary). However, for the purpose of this study, it would be better to go with the first description that satisfaction is a fulfilment of a need or desire. Pay in this context could be described as those things (financial and nonfinancial) given in return for work; that is, salary or wage. It is salary if it is calculated annually and paid on monthly basis while it is wage if it is paid on daily or hourly basis. On the other way round, salaries are fixed amount of money paid to worker, usually measured on a monthly or annual basis, not hourly, as it is in wages. This implies a degree of professionalism and/or autonomy.

Pay satisfaction, therefore, is the fulfilment of a need or desire and in this case the reason for going into contractual agreement with employer by any employee. The ‘take-home pay’ assist individual employee to accomplish or fulfil certain individual/personal need or desire. Muo (2007:197) as quoted in Sule, Amuni, Obasan and Banjo (2015) while talking about wages and salaries said that “the only living thing among the elements of production are the human beings, who have entered into contractual relationship with the organisation to offer their human endowments in exchange for some forms of reward”. The forms of reward could either be wages or salaries. This study is concerned with the satisfaction with the pay paid by the employers of lecturers in tertiary institutions within Rivers State. It must be noted that employment here is based on pay (salary) and not a gratuitous employment/services. “Pay satisfaction is, therefore, of primary concern to both employers and employees. For employees, pay is of obvious importance in terms of satisfying their economic needs. It is important that they are satisfied with their overall pay as this may impact their attitudes and behaviours” (Singh and Loncer, 2010).

Heneman and Judge (2000:85) as quoted in Singh and
Loncer (2010) concluded that “research has unequivocally shown that pay dissatisfaction can have important and undesirable impacts on numerous employee outcomes/output”. It must be noted that, it is a common belief nowadays that “human existence dated back to the days of first man and woman on this planet earth – Adam and Eve, were punished for eating the assumed forbidden fruit and the punishment for doing that was a pronouncement from their assumed creator that they shall eat from their sweat” (Sule, et al., 2015). Perhaps, eating from one’s sweat makes it mandatory for every living soul to seek employment which denotes that the reason for seeking employment is to earn a living – pay. But the issue here is not how and why do academic staffs in tertiary institutions in Rivers State earn a living but whether they are satisfied with their pay and if they are satisfied or not, why the issue of burn out and perhaps, the intention to quit the job.

**Problem Statement**

Going back into our early Economic principles, we have labour as one of the basic principles as such the production process cannot achieve optimally its set desires. Therefore, in Sule (2012), it was opined that “no organisation can survive in isolation. Organisations need to relate with people, bodies and organisations in order to survive”. He went further to stress that “the organisations continuous existence depends largely on their resources (including labour or human) to break-even at worst. Thus, it is very significant that the workforce is a stakeholder in every organisations”.

Assuming the workforce is a stakeholder in every organisation and they are not in the organisation for gratuitous service coupled with the fact that primary and basic mission of the entrepreneur is profit; but then, based on the principle of equity, justice and fair play the employees must be adequately rewarded in form of wage/salary. Perhaps, this is why Sule et al (2015) emphasised that “for there to be a valid employment contract between employer and employee, Section 7 of the Nigeria Labour Code Act of 1946 must be complied with accordingly”.

If the employees are then paid by the employers accordingly in accordance with Section 7 of the Nigeria Labour Code Act of 1946, why should the employees, in this case, the lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State refused to stand on the words of Cumming (1978) of staying to give of their best to their job, after being looked after? Could it be pay dissatisfaction which, for instance, can “decrease commitment to the job, increase in stealing, unprofessional attitudes and catalyse turnover” (Greenberg, 1990; Miceli and Mulvey, 2000; Currall et al, 2005)? Or on the other hand, could there be no job satisfaction? The fact still remains that once dissatisfaction of any kind set in, boredom set in which results in burnout and in most cases, the intention to quit.

It must be noted, therefore, that organisation spend huge money on their employees for wages/salaries and other emoluments including cost of training and development. Essien (2002) argued that “wages, salaries and related costs (pension, etc.) make up about 65 percent of the total costs of running a business” and Singh and Loncer (2010) said “employers spend as much as 70 – 80% of their budget in wages, salaries and benefits in the service sector and that the issue have implications for the survival of the organisation if they do not get decent returns on their investments”.

Here, we intend to show how employees pay dissatisfaction can cause burn out and the consequential effect on the intention to stay among lecturers in tertiary institution in Rivers State.

**Aim and Objectives of the Study**

Basically, the primary aim of this research is to add to the body of knowledge as much as possible but not much has been done in the effect of pay satisfaction, burn out and intention to stay relating it precisely to the lecturers in tertiary institutions, generally and specifically, those within the Rivers State where the cost of living is on the high side. This will enable their employers to reconsider their position of the remunerations of the lecturers if they expect them to stay to give their best to the job.

Again, in most developing nations it is rather unfortunate that we adopt motivational theories within our organisations forgetting that the research that led to such theories came into being using different environment from ours. For instance, the motivational research that concluded that money or pay increase does not motivate was conducted using senior managers like Accountants and other professionals in a developed country where government provide all essential amenities unlike the developing nations where “everybody is a municipal government on his/her own with the provision of essential amenities” Muo (2013). Sincerely, the result of the investigation at the two different countries must be different because in one country, individuals provide the essential amenities and in the other country, government provide the essential amenities, therefore, one will require more pay than the other. Also, the determinants of the pay satisfaction must be different. This study will throw more light on this area.

Furthermore, the study will expose how pay satisfaction can on its own be a motivational factor based on the argument of Johnnie (2002) that “although motivational theories developed around Western norms may not be too relevant in developing societies due to the fact that organisations in developing countries have not been able to offer attractive conditions like paying employees fair and reasonable remunerations that would have led to higher performance”.

This study is going to, specifically, expose if pay satisfaction will be a remedy to burn out or perhaps, it
does not stop burn out and possibly other factors that may lead to burn out of lecturers in the tertiary institutions within Rivers State. Again, the study will see if it is pay dissatisfaction that normally cause burn out and intention to quit or there are other factors apart from burn out that lead to intention to quit among the lecturers in the tertiary institutions in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The research questions must always be tailored toward the aim and objectives of the study such that if they are answered, it will easily expose if truly employee pay satisfaction, burn out can lead to intention to quit or stay among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State. The questions are as follows:

1. What is the relationship between pay satisfaction and intention to stay of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State?
2. What is the relationship between job burnout and intention to stay of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intention to Stay and Pay Satisfaction

According to Olayinka (2011) workers/employees are “experienced and capable workforce, talented employees in key areas, motivated and energetic employees, cutting edge knowledge and intellectual capital, astute entrepreneurship and managerial know how, or the collective learning embedded in the organisation and built up time”. Before a lecturer in tertiary institution can be a talented employee, so much investment must have been made in terms of forgoing of leisure time for reading, self-development, paper publications as well as attending conferences all over the world and accumulation of useful academic materials and many other programmes and/or sojourn. All these pain of ‘publish or perish’ were made in actual sense or reasoning of expecting a ‘pay back’ which is earning reasonably and equitably. But what happen in case satisfaction is not derived from the pay of such employee?

Weiler’s (1985) as quoted in Omonijo, Oludayo, Eche and Uche, (2015) view “salary consideration as a strong determinant of job satisfaction and voluntary turnover. Again, a situation, according to Omonijo et al (2015), whereby workers’ salaries and remuneration cannot sustain their families could be a fertile ground for voluntary turnover.

In addition to salaries, previous studies also emphasise the importance of fringe benefits in determining voluntary turnover” (Osibanjo, Adeniji, Falola and Heirsmac, 2014). “Fringe benefits are services provided by an employer to employees as compensation for their performances” (Bizfilings, 2014). These benefits add to workers’ salaries at the end of the month. Past studies show that workers tend to stay in organisations where fringe benefits are higher than low ones. More often than not, “most employers of labour used to deny their workers some of these fringe benefits and it makes workers vulnerable to voluntary turnover” (Omonijo et al., 2015).

One facet of employee satisfaction which is crucial for ones well-being and sufficient to influence one's behaviour is satisfaction toward compensation/pay. Compensation, Milkovich and Newman (2005), “should be equally distributed because it is considered as a tangible symbol of working exchange and relationship between employer and employee”. Lawler (1971); Locke (1969) opined that “if the employees do think that there is a discrepancy between how much pay they should receive and how much pay they do receive, then, the pay satisfaction will erupt in most of them naturally”.

However, intention to stay is defined as “employee willingness to continue to stay to give his/her best to the organisation on long term basis. This might easily be referred to in other quarter as turnover intention which simply indicates when individual thinks, plan and wish to leave the job” (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino, 1979). “Theoretical and empirical studies on turnover reveal that intention to quit is one of the strongest determinants and an immediate predecessor of turnover” (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1975; Griffeth, Horn and Gaertuor, 2000; Lee and Mowday, 1987; O’Reilly and Caldwell, 1981; Porter and Steers, 1973).

“Intention is conceptualized as statements about the particular behaviour and exhibit stronger effect on turnover than other employees’ attitudes such as commitment with the organisation and job satisfaction. Again, intention to quit is a manifestation of actual turnover” (Mohd Makhbul, Mohd Radzuan and Mohamad Hasun, 2011). Ajzen (1991) indicated that “intention to quit acts as a predictor to the action of real turnover because of the theory of planned behaviour. According to the theory, behavioural intention is a good predictor of an actual intention”.

Lawler (1971) had “buttressed the arguments and studies improving this concept about pay satisfaction until a concept of its dimensions emerged and he argued that one thing which is considered in evaluating pay is pay level”. Dyer and Theriault (1976) later examined “the model of pay satisfaction by Lawler and found another predictor of pay satisfaction as pay system administration”.

Heneman and Schwab (1985); Scarpello, Huber and Vandenberg, (1988) identified “four dimensions of pay satisfaction as Pay level which refers to individual’s current direct compensation (wage or salary), as fixed by the organisation. Pay Raise is the individual’s changes in pay level as being set by organisation and based on job classification or other criteria. Structure/administration
refers to the hierarchical structure created among pay rates for different jobs in an organisation including the way pay is distributed to employees, which according to them in most organisation is administered and allocated by immediate supervisor. Lastly, benefits is indirect pay to the individual in the form of payment for time not work, such as vacations, insurance, pensions, income maintenance, and miscellaneous services which are set by organisation and very based on job classification of employees”.

Motowidlo (1983) as quoted in A’yuninnica (2015) explored “the relationship between amount of pay, pay satisfaction, and expectation with pay with withdrawal cognition, and actual quitting. Pay satisfaction was more potent determinant of withdrawal cognition than general satisfaction”. Currall, et al (2005) examined “the linkage between pay satisfaction and performance outcomes at the organisational level. Most of the studies predicts the dimensionality of pay satisfaction showing support to the way pay satisfaction leads to intention to quit”.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between pay satisfaction and intention to stay.

**Intention to Stay and Burnout**

“Burnout was said to have appeared in the literature in the 1970s, developed by Freudenberger in the early 1970s and was originally defined as a state of fatigue or frustration that resulted from professional relationships that failed expectations of reward” (Freudenberger, 1974). Daley explained this emerging field of study as:

“Inability to handle continued stress on the job that results in demoralization, frustration, and reduced efficiency has come to be termed ‘burnout’” (Daley, 1979, p. 375).

“The impetus for Daley’s observation was an article published in the previous year by Maslach (1978) to explain the phenomenon that occurs among professionals who have continuous and direct contact with patients, welfare clients or prisoners. These professionals operate in an often emotionally charged environment, constantly dealing with other people’s problems. Maslach explained that over time, the stress of interpersonal contact can result in emotional exhaustion where workers experience a gradual loss of sympathy and respect for their charges. This may lead to a cynical perception of clients, and burnout is associated with low morale and high job turnover. Maslach advocated for professional training in interpersonal skills and management of stress to prevent the occurrence of burnout among workers”.

It must be noted that Maslach (1978) phenomenon is quite similar to our target population – lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State as students can be liken to their patients, they get involved in community service as against welfare clients or prisoners in Maslach’s study. This tends to suggest that they are almost on the same terrain as regards burnout effects.

“It is assumed that emotional exhaustion (i.e. feelings of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one’s emotional resources) and intention to leave the organisation are likely to develop when individual workers perceive a lack of reciprocity in their employment relationship (social exchange), and when they receive information from their colleagues consistent with their perception (social comparison). Emotional exhaustion, generally, considered to be the key dimension of the burnout syndrome” (Shirom, 1989).

Maslach, Jackson and Leither (1996) on their own defined the concept of burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and reduced personal accomplishment that occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity” (p. 4). This definition includes three concepts:

a) “emotional exhaustion refer to as the sense of being tired and exhausted emotionally due to one’s employment;

b) depersonalisation is defined as the employee’s frosty and feeling less response to his/her recipients of care, service, treatment or supervision;

c) personal accomplishment is characterized as feeling of competitiveness and successful achievement in his/her work”.

“The intensity of burnout will be higher if the magnitude of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation will be higher while personal accomplishment will be lower. Lack of necessary resources, responsibility with no or less authority, lack of recognition for one’s achievement are consider as the indications of job burnout” (Emener Jr., 1979). In contrast, Daley (1979) as quoted by Aslam (n.d.) argued that “symptoms of burnout are emotional detachment from one’s job, taking clients as cases instead of humans and less involvement in clients’ issues”. To this author, these three dimensions are very synonymous to the earlier three dimensions by Maslach, Jackson and Leither (1996).

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between job burnout and intention to stay.

**Research Hypothesis**

Research hypothesis according to Kothari and Garg (2014) is said to be “a predictive statement that relates an independent variable to a dependent variable”. Research hypothesis could also be describes as a tentative answer to the research questions. Therefore, the tentative answers to this study arise as we review the literature and they are:
**Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>FCE(T) No in Group</th>
<th>FCE(T) No in Resp.</th>
<th>KSWP No in Group</th>
<th>KSWP No in Resp.</th>
<th>IAUE No in Group</th>
<th>IAUE No in Resp.</th>
<th>RSU No in Group</th>
<th>RSU No in Resp.</th>
<th>TOTAL No in Group</th>
<th>TOTAL No in Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. P</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. L.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L II</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. L.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey data, 2017

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between pay satisfaction and intention to stay.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between job burnout and intention to stay.

**METHODOLOGY**

The Research Design

The research design for this study was the Ex-post facto design in which the researcher “examined the effects of a naturally occurring treatment following the occurrence of the event” (Ajila, 1996). The study was a systematic empirical enquiry that the researcher could not have influence and/or control over the lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State’s intention to stay or quit. It, therefore, indicate that the manifestations must have occurred as such it could not be manipulated by the observer.

Sources of Data

This study made up of both primary and secondary data. The primary data was obtained through a structured and pre-tested questionnaire adopted from similar work administered on respondents in another sector and in the Asian countries. The secondary data came from journals articles, books and related research works.

Population and Sample

Population of this study were lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State – University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt; Rivers State University, Port Harcourt; Port Harcourt Polytechnic, Port Harcourt; Ken Saro Wiwa Polytechnic, Bori; Federal College of Education (Tech.), Omoku; Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Iwofe and Rivers State College of Education, Orowokwo. They were stratified and random sampling techniques used in their selection. For purpose of this study, two universities, one polytechnic and one College of Education were selected randomly. All the tertiary institutions were first stratified into universities, polytechnic and college of education. The two universities selected were Rivers State University (RSU) and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE); from polytechnic, Ken Saro-Wiwa Polytechnic, Bori (KSWP) was selected and for College of Education, it was Federal College of Education (Tech.), Omoku (FCE[T]) that was selected.

Selection of Respondents

The same stratified and random sampling technique was adopted in picking the respondents to the questionnaire. The sample was stratified into Professors (Prof), Associate Professors (Ass. P), Senior Lecturers (S. L.), Lecturer I (L. I), Lecturer II (L. II), Assistant Lecturers (A. L.) and Graduate Assistant (G. A.). It must be noted that the cadre/designation might not actually be called the same name in the three tertiary institutions but they are very similar and the same upon comparism and evaluation of the pedigree of people on the cadre. Here, we only make use of the most common and easy nomenclature of the profession for stratification. Simple random sampling technique was adopted in selecting the respondents from each stratum. In order to make the selecting from each stratum proportional, at least ten percent of the lecturers in each stratum were randomly selected making it possible for every strata to be represented in the population of the study to form the sample size.

The Sample Size

Table 1 indicate the extraction of the sample size of 93 copies distributed in FCE(T) Omoku, 56 copies in KSWP, Bori, 70 copies in IAUE, Iwofe and 196 copies of questionnaires distributed in RSU, Diobu. Taro Yamane Rule was adopted for knowing the sample frame and from this work there is about 2,268 target population and with 95% Level of Confidence, our ê will be 0.05 which makes the sample [n] to be 340. In order to be able to have at least 340 copies of questionnaire back after
retrieving, 415 copies of the questionnaire were distributed. After administering the questionnaire 365 copies were retrieved.

**Research Instrument**

Self-administered questionnaire was the main instrument used for gathering primary data. It was divided into four parts, the personal information, pay satisfaction test and burnout test and the intention to stay test. The questionnaire had never been used previously together this way but had been used separately, that is, the pay satisfaction measures was used separately by Heneman and Schwab (1985); Scarpello et al (1988) and confirmed in A’yuninnisa (2015); the burnout measures was used separately by Maslach, Jackson and Leither (1996) and confirmed in Aslam (n.d.); and Thanacoody, Bartram and Casimir (2009), the aspect of intention to stay was measured by Kumar and Govindarajo (2013). The different aspects of the questionnaire had been subjected to validity test using the Alpha Coefficient. With 4 points Likert Scale, the responses of the respondents was graded with 4 for Strongly Agreed, 3 for Agree, 2 for Disagree and 1 for Strongly Disagree.

**Hypotheses Testing**

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between pay satisfaction and intention to stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.93427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Pay Satisfaction  
b. Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>297.735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>297.735</td>
<td>341.101</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>146.641</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>341.101</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444.376</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Pay Satisfaction  
b. Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>5% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>16.492</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between job burnout and intention to stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.8934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant): Job Burnout  
b. Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay
ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>155.485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155.485</td>
<td>234.210</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residua</td>
<td>038.452</td>
<td>089</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>328.289</td>
<td>091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>5% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>-.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Burnout</td>
<td>6403</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.856</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Intention To Stay

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

From the analysis, the dependent variable, intention to stay tested against the predictor, pay satisfaction showed that the variables are related. The \( R = 0.819 \) indicates that pay satisfaction is highly and positively related to intention to stay. Moreover, the \( R^2 = 0.670 \) indicates that 67% of pay satisfaction is actually explained by their intention to stay or to leave derived from their pay level, pay raise, the pay structure/administration and benefits. This may however contain some error term, thus the adjusted \( R^2 = 0.668 \) show that in fact only 68% of their intention to stay is attributable to pay satisfaction by the lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State. The model is found significant at 99% confidence level.

The test of hypothesis two as reflected in the model summary shows that intention to stay is significantly related inversely to job burnout. The coefficient of regression of \( R = -.659 \) indicate that there is a negative relationship between the variables but the negative relationship is strong. This means that if the lecturers should be able to get reed of job burnout they will be more mentally and physically stable, other things being equal, staying on the job will increase. The proportion of the explained dependent variable caused by the independent is measured by the \( R^2 = 0.5620 \) which indicates that 56% of intention to stay is explained by job burnout inversely.

Therefore, we conclude from this analysis that intention to stay can be improved by strategically manipulating the job burnout in a way that it stimulates the lecturers’ intention to stay on their current job.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result of the finding was consistent with the conclusions of the findings of similar earlier studies like that of Weiler’s (1985) as quoted in Omonijo et al (2015) where it was viewed that salary consideration as a strong determinant of job satisfaction and voluntary turnover. Omonijo et al (2015) was also in support of the finding when they opined that “whereby workers’ salaries and remuneration cannot sustain their families could be a fertile ground for voluntary turnover”.

Again, the result of the second findings that burnout is significantly related to intention to stay inversely, was in consistent with the conclusions of the findings of similar earlier studies like that of Maslach (1978) that burnout may lead to a cynical perception of clients, and burnout is associated with low morale and high job turnover. Maslach, therefore, advocated for professional training in interpersonal skills and management of stress to prevent the occurrence of burnout among workers and in this case, the lecturers in tertiary institutions in Rivers State, in order to in increase their intention to stay.

Finally, the findings had stylishly established that pay dissatisfaction can be one of the sources of job burnout and consequently, the intention to leave the organisation. In the same vein, once the pay is satisfactory, the tendency of having job burnout might be seriously reduced as well as any negative thought and/or feelings concerning intention to stay.

CONCLUSION

The result exposed a high level of retrieval of questionnaire administered and much participation by all the strata of lecturers in the selected institutions within Rivers State.

The outcome of the study revealed that to a very large extent pay satisfaction and job burnout are significantly related to intention to stay or leave jobs within tertiary
Institutions in Rivers State. It is, therefore, pertinent that management of tertiary institutions in Rivers State should reconsider the level of pay satisfaction by looking critically at the pay level, pay raise, structure/administration of pay as well as the benefits accrued to lecturers. They must as well help reduce job burnout by encouraging professional training in interpersonal training and management of stress as well as stress related activities.

RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendations will help the management of the tertiary institutions in Rivers State to improve on intention to stay by the lecturers:

1. Pay level of the lecturers should be commensurate with their certificates and experience.
2. The pay raise should be effected as at when due and it should be related to the current inflationary trend.
3. The pay structure and administration should be competitive within the industry.
4. The benefits should include the financial and non-financial benefits.
5. The management of these tertiary institutions should help the lecturers reduce emotional exhaustion and depersonalization as well as help boost the lecturers' personal accomplishment via professional training in interpersonal training and stress related activities management.

REFERENCE


