LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

MARKET CULTURE, COMPETITIVE PRESSURE, AND EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTION IN SELECTED MULTINATIONAL OIL SERVICE COMPANIES IN NIGERIA: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION AND REWARD SYSTEMS

IFENOWO, Bamidele Olufemi
Department of Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria.
Corresponding Author: bamideleifenowo@gmail.com

Abstract
Getting employees to stay in multinational oil service companies in Nigeria is becoming harder every year, especially as the industry becomes more demanding and competitive. This study looked at how market culture and competitive pressure affect turnover intention among employees of four multinational oil service companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria, and whether job satisfaction and reward systems help explain this relationship. The study was anchored on Job Demands-Resources Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and the Competing Values Framework. A descriptive survey research design was used to collect data from 315 employees out of a total population of 1,660, selected through proportionate stratified random sampling. Four sets of validated and adapted scales were used to measure the study variables through structured questionnaires. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, simple regression, and Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4) for parallel dual mediation with 5,000 bootstrap resamples. The results showed that market culture (β = .448, p < .001) and competitive pressure (β = .521, p < .001) both significantly and positively predicted turnover intention. Job satisfaction significantly mediated the relationship between market culture and turnover intention (B = .165, 95% CI [.091, .247]) and also between competitive pressure and turnover intention (B = .198, 95% CI [.124, .281]). Similarly, reward systems significantly mediated both relationships — market culture (B = .113, 95% CI [.043, .189]) and competitive pressure (B = .134, 95% CI [.067, .208]). All mediations were partial. The study concludes that oil service companies must take employee job satisfaction and reward systems seriously as practical tools for managing the damaging effects that market culture and competitive pressure have on staff retention.

Keywords: *Competitive pressure; employee turnover intention; job satisfaction; market culture; multinational oil service companies; Nigeria; Port Harcourt; reward systems*

1. Introduction

The oil service sector in Nigeria is one of the most competitive and demanding industries in the country. Companies like Halliburton, SLB, Baker Hughes, and Weatherford operate in an environment where client contracts are won on technical competence, cost efficiency, and speed of delivery. This kind of

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

business environment creates two organisational conditions that this study is particularly interested in. The first is market culture — the kind of organisational culture where performance, competition, and results take centre stage (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). The second is competitive pressure — the constant push that employees feel to outperform each other, meet aggressive targets, and deliver results under tight deadlines (Karatepe & Vatansever, 2021). Together, these two forces shape the daily work experience of most employees in these companies, and not always in positive ways. Turnover intention — a worker's deliberate plan to leave their current employer — has been rising steadily in the Nigerian oil service industry (Tett & Meyer, 2023). This is a serious concern because oil service companies depend heavily on the technical knowledge and operational experience of their workforce. When a skilled petroleum engineer or field technician decides to leave, the company loses not just a productive employee but years of accumulated expertise that is very expensive and time-consuming to replace (Omotayo, Owolabi, & Elegbede, 2023). Understanding why employees in this sector develop intentions to leave is, therefore, an important business and management question.

This study focuses on two specific mechanisms through which market culture and competitive pressure may lead to turnover intention. The first is job satisfaction, which refers to how positively an employee feels about their work overall (Locke, 1976). Research consistently shows that when employees are not satisfied with their jobs, they are much more likely to start thinking about leaving (Balogun, Afolabi, & Adetunji, 2022). In high-pressure environments where market culture and competitive demands dominate, job satisfaction can suffer badly because employees often feel they are giving more than they are getting back from their jobs.

The second mechanism is reward systems — how employees perceive the fairness and adequacy of the pay, bonuses, recognition, and other benefits they receive for their work (Mensah, 2019). Reward systems are especially important in a market-culture environment because workers in such environments expect that high performance will be properly rewarded. When it is not, or when rewards are seen as unfair or insufficient given the level of effort and pressure involved, employees begin to question whether staying is worth it (Akinwale & George, 2020). The study, therefore, asks: Do job satisfaction and reward systems explain, at least in part, how market culture and competitive pressure lead employees in oil service companies to think about leaving? These questions are grounded in Job Demands-Resources Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and the Competing Values Framework, and they address an important gap in the literature on workforce retention in Nigeria's oil service sector.

2. Literature Review

Market Culture

Market culture, as described in the Competing Values Framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Cameron & Quinn, 1999), is a type of organisational culture that is built around results, competition, and goal achievement. Organisations with strong market culture put a high value on productivity and hold their employees accountable for meeting specific targets. In commercial settings like oil service companies, this culture fits naturally because the business model depends on winning contracts, beating

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

competitors, and delivering value faster and cheaper than anyone else (Ngozi & Chukwuemeka, 2022). However, when this culture is very strong and is not balanced with attention to employee needs and well-being, it tends to create a difficult and draining work environment. Studies conducted in Nigerian and African organisational contexts have found that market culture significantly increases work stress, reduces employee motivation, and predicts higher turnover intention (Olaniyi & Salami, 2023; Adebayo & Okonkwo, 2024).

Competitive Pressure

Competitive pressure in the workplace refers to the degree to which employees feel pushed to outperform colleagues, hit demanding performance benchmarks, and continually prove their value in a results-driven environment (Karatepe & Vatansever, 2021). In multinational oil service companies in Nigeria, this pressure is felt at every level. Technical staff compete for project assignments, managers compete for contract renewals, and the organisation as a whole competes for market share in an industry where large oil companies regularly switch service providers based on performance and pricing (PETAN, 2026). For individual employees, this translates into a workplace where the feeling of being evaluated and compared never really goes away. Research has shown that sustained competitive pressure reduces job satisfaction, increases burnout, and contributes significantly to turnover intention, especially when employees feel that the pressure is not matched by appropriate rewards or recognition (Mensah, 2019; Ampofo, 2020).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is broadly defined as the positive emotional state that results from evaluating one's job experience (Locke, 1976). It captures how much an employee actually enjoys and values their work, their relationships at work, and the conditions under which they work. Research across many industries and countries has consistently found that job satisfaction is one of the strongest predictors of turnover intention — when employees are satisfied with their jobs, they are far less likely to think about leaving, and when they are not, the desire to find something better grows quickly (Tett & Meyer, 2023; Balogun et al., 2022). In the oil service industry, job satisfaction is shaped by many things, including the quality of supervision, the interest level of the work itself, pay, and working conditions. However, in environments where market culture and competitive pressure are very high, many of these satisfaction drivers are negatively affected. Employees may find the work interesting but feel frustrated by the relentless pressure, the lack of recognition, or the sense that they can never do enough (Nwosu & Iheriohanma, 2022).

Reward Systems

Reward systems refer to the overall package of financial and non-financial incentives that an organisation uses to compensate and recognise its employees for their contributions (Mensah, 2019). This includes base salary, performance bonuses, promotions, recognition programmes, and other benefits. From a Social Exchange Theory perspective (Blau, 1964), employees engage in an implicit exchange with their employer — they give time, effort, and expertise, and they expect to receive

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

appropriate rewards in return. When employees feel that their rewards are fair and that the company values their contributions, they are more likely to stay. When they feel underpaid, unrecognised, or that the reward system does not adequately reflect the level of effort and pressure they endure, they are much more likely to start thinking about other options (Akinwale & George, 2020). In market-culture environments where the expectation of performance is very high, any perception that the reward system fails to match this expectation can have a quick and significant negative effect on retention.

The Relationships between Market Culture, Competitive Pressure, Job Satisfaction, Reward Systems, and Turnover Intention

The argument that this study makes is that market culture and competitive pressure do not just directly push employees toward turnover intention. They also work indirectly by reducing job satisfaction and making employees feel that reward systems are inadequate, and it is these experiences that then translate into the decision to leave. Job Demands-Resources Theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; 2017) explains this well. Market culture and competitive pressure are job demands — they consume the energy and psychological resources of employees. Job satisfaction and reward systems, when they are present and healthy, serve as job resources that can offset the depletion caused by these demands. But when market culture and competitive pressure are very high, and job satisfaction and reward systems are weak, the depletion becomes too much to handle, and employees start thinking about leaving.

This mediation logic has been tested in related contexts (Ampofo, 2020; Mensah, 2019; Balogun et al., 2022), but its specific application to multinational oil service companies in Nigeria, where both market culture and competitive pressure are especially intense, has not been adequately studied. That is the gap this research fills.

Theoretical Framework

Three theories support this study. The first is the Competing Values Framework (CVF), developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) and expanded by Cameron and Quinn (1999). This framework gives the study its conceptual definition and measurement of market culture. Market culture sits in the external-focus and control quadrant of the CVF, making it the cultural type most associated with competition, results, and performance accountability. The second theory is Job Demands-Resources Theory (JD-R), introduced by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) and further updated by Bakker and Demerouti (2017). This theory says that every work environment can be described in terms of demands (things that cost effort and energy) and resources (things that help workers cope and achieve their goals). Market culture and competitive pressure are job demands in this framework, while job satisfaction and reward systems represent job resources. When demands are high and resources are low, employees experience strain and withdrawal, which leads to turnover intention.

The third theory is Social Exchange Theory (SET), originally proposed by Blau (1964) and widely applied in more recent organisational research (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels, & Hall, 2017). SET says that employment relationships are based on an exchange of obligations. Employees give effort and commitment, and in return, they expect support, recognition, and adequate reward. When market

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

culture and competitive pressure keep raising the demands on employees without a corresponding increase in rewards and satisfaction, the balance of exchange is disrupted, and employees begin to look for employers who will treat them more fairly.

3. Methodology

A descriptive survey research design was used in this study. Data were gathered from employees at a single point in time without manipulating any variable (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The study used a quantitative approach because the variables were measured numerically and the hypotheses were tested using statistical tools (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2023). The study targeted all employees of four multinational oil service companies operating in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. As reported by PETAN (2026), the total estimated population was 1,660 employees across the four companies, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Population Distribution

S/N	Company	Estimated Population
1	Halliburton Nigeria	650
2	SLB Nigeria	550
3	Baker Hughes Nigeria	280
4	Weatherford Nigeria	180
	Total	**1,660**

Source: PETAN (2026)

The Yamane (1967) formula was used at a 5% margin of error: A sample of 323 was therefore drawn. The sampling frame for this study was drawn from the official employee records and company profile databases of the four selected multinational oil service companies operating in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, the estimated staff strength of each company was obtained from the 2026 edition of the Petroleum Technology Association of Nigeria (PETAN) directory, which provides periodic updates on the workforce composition of oil and gas service companies operating in Nigeria. To cross-validate these figures, additional employee strength data were sourced from the respective companies' LinkedIn organisation pages and RocketReach company profiles, which are widely used professional databases that independently report workforce size for registered organisations. Where slight variations existed between sources, the PETAN (2026) figure was treated as the primary reference because it is an industry-recognised official source. This process produced an aggregated sampling frame of 1,660 employees spread across Halliburton Nigeria (650), SLB Nigeria (550), Baker Hughes Nigeria (280), and Weatherford Nigeria (180)

Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to allocate the sample across the four companies in proportion to their sizes. Within each company, simple random sampling was used to identify individual participants. The sample distribution is shown in Table 2.

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Table 2: Proportionate Sample Allocation

S/N	Company	Population	Proportion	Sample
1	Halliburton Nigeria	650	.3916	127
2	SLB Nigeria	550	.3313	107
3	Baker Hughes Nigeria	280	.1687	54
4	Weatherford Nigeria	180	.1084	35
	Total	**1,660**	**1.000**	**323**

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Section A gathered respondents' demographic information. Section B measured the five study variables using adapted and validated scales.

Market Culture was measured with eight items adapted from Cameron and Quinn's (1999) Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), capturing the results-orientation, competitiveness, and performance-accountability dimensions of market culture. Cronbach's alpha for the pilot test was .83. Competitive Pressure was measured using six items adapted from Karatepe and Vatansever (2021) and Mensah (2019), assessing the degree to which employees felt pressured to constantly outperform and meet aggressive targets. Cronbach's alpha was .81.

Job Satisfaction was measured with five items adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form, as validated in recent African organisational studies (Balogun et al., 2022; Ampofo, 2020). Cronbach's alpha was .87. Reward Systems was measured using six items adapted from Mensah (2019) and Akinwale and George (2020), covering perceived fairness and adequacy of pay, bonuses, and recognition programmes. Cronbach's alpha was .85. Turnover Intention was measured with five items adapted from Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) and validated in recent Nigerian workforce studies (Olaniyi & Salami, 2023). Cronbach's alpha was .82. All items were answered on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). All alpha values exceeded the .70 threshold set by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Content validity was confirmed through a review by three academic experts in human resource management and organisational behaviour. Their suggestions were used to improve item clarity and coverage before the final questionnaire was produced.

Out of the 323 questionnaires distributed, 315 were returned and found usable, giving a response rate of 97.5%. Data were analysed using SPSS version 27.0. Descriptive statistics were used to summarise the variables, and Pearson correlation was used to examine the bivariate relationships among them. Simple linear regression was used to test the direct effects of market culture and competitive pressure on turnover intention. For the mediation hypotheses, Hayes' (2022) PROCESS Macro (Model 4) was used with 5,000 bootstrap resamples at a 95% confidence interval, run separately for each independent variable with both mediators tested in parallel. All predictors were mean-centred before analysis, following Aiken and West (1991).

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

4. Findings and Discussions

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 3: Demographic Profile (N = 315)

Variable	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	248	78.7
	Female	67	21.3
Age	25–35 years	96	30.5
	36–45 years	139	44.1
	46–55 years	61	19.4
	56 and above	19	6.0
Job Role	Field Engineer/Technician	121	38.4
	Senior Engineer/Supervisor	92	29.2
	Manager/Team Lead	59	18.7
	Support/Admin Staff	43	13.7
Years of Experience	1–5 years	67	21.3
	6–10 years	111	35.2
	11–15 years	76	24.1
	16–20 years	42	13.3
	Above 20 years	19	6.0
Company	Halliburton	124	39.4
	SLB	106	33.7
	Baker Hughes	52	16.5
	Weatherford	33	10.5

Source: Field Survey (2026)

The workforce was mostly male (78.7%), consistent with the technical and field-heavy nature of oil service operations. The 36–45 age bracket was the most represented (44.1%), and 35.2% of respondents had between 6 and 10 years of work experience. Field engineers and technicians made up the largest occupational group (38.4%).

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics (N = 315)

Variable	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
Market Culture (MC)	8	3.71	0.738	−0.301	0.187	.83
Competitive Pressure (CP)	6	3.84	0.712	−0.263	0.142	.81
Job Satisfaction (JS)	5	2.76	0.843	0.418	0.231	.87
Reward Systems (RS)	6	2.91	0.816	0.382	0.219	.85
Turnover Intention (TI)	5	3.74	0.851	−0.437	0.204	.82

Source: Field Survey (2026)

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Market culture returned a high mean score (M = 3.71, SD = 0.738), confirming that employees in these companies strongly perceive their workplaces as results-driven and competitive. Competitive pressure was even higher (M = 3.84, SD = 0.712), suggesting that employees feel a very strong personal pressure to constantly perform and stay ahead of their peers. Both job satisfaction (M = 2.76) and reward systems (M = 2.91) fell below the scale midpoint of 3.0, which is a worrying finding. It means that, on average, employees are not particularly satisfied with their jobs and do not feel that their reward packages adequately reflect what they put in. Turnover intention was high (M = 3.74), showing that many employees are actively considering leaving. All skewness and kurtosis values were within acceptable bounds of ±1.0 and ±2.0, respectively (Hair et al., 2019).

Correlation Analysis

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Matrix (N = 315)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Market Culture	3.71	0.738	1.000				
2. Competitive Pressure	3.84	0.712	.512**	1.000			
3. Job Satisfaction	2.76	0.843	−.434**	−.501**	1.000		
4. Reward Systems	2.91	0.816	−.398**	−.456**	.487**	1.000	
5. Turnover Intention	3.74	0.851	.448**	.521**	−.563**	−.487**	1.000

***p* < .01 (two-tailed)**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

The pattern of correlations supports the study's conceptual model. Market culture and competitive pressure are significantly and positively related to each other (r = .512), showing that in these oil service companies, a results-oriented culture naturally generates a high degree of competitive pressure among employees. Both market culture (r = −.434) and competitive pressure (r = −.501) are negatively related to job satisfaction, confirming that these two pressures reduce how satisfied employees feel with their work. Similarly, both are negatively related to reward systems (r = −.398 and r = −.456, respectively), suggesting that the heavier the pressure, the more employees feel that their rewards do not measure up. Job satisfaction (r = −.563) and reward systems (r = −.487) are both negatively related to turnover intention, meaning that when employees are more satisfied and feel better rewarded, they are less likely to think about leaving. All correlations stay below .80, ruling out multicollinearity concerns (Hair et al., 2019).

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis One: Effect of Market Culture on Turnover Intention

H_{o1}: Market culture does not significantly predict turnover intention among employees in selected multinational oil service companies in Nigeria.

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Table 6a: Model Summary — Market Culture → Turnover Intention

R	R^2	Adj. R^2	Std. Error	F	df1	df2	Sig.
.448	.201	.198	0.762	79.087	1	313	.000

Table 6b: Regression Coefficients

	B	SE	β	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.491	0.257		5.803	.000
Market Culture	0.517	0.058	.448	8.893	.000

Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention. Source: Field Survey (2026)

The model is significant, $F(1, 313) = 79.087$, $p < .001$, with market culture explaining 20.1% of the variance in turnover intention. The coefficient confirms a significant positive effect ($\beta = .448$, $t = 8.893$, $p < .001$). The null hypothesis is rejected. The stronger employees perceive their organisation's market culture to be, the more they think about leaving.

Hypothesis Two: Effect of Competitive Pressure on Turnover Intention

H_{02}: Competitive pressure does not significantly predict turnover intention among employees in selected multinational oil service companies in Nigeria.

Table 7a: Model Summary — Competitive Pressure → Turnover Intention

R	**R^2**	**Adj. R^2**	**Std. Error**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig.**
.521	.271	.269	0.727	116.382	1	313	.000

Table 7b: Regression Coefficients

	B	**SE**	**β**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	1.168	0.247		4.729	.000
Competitive Pressure	0.623	0.058	.521	10.787	.000

Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention. Source: Field Survey (2026)

Competitive pressure also has a strong and significant effect on turnover intention ($\beta = .521$, $t = 10.787$, $p < .001$), explaining 27.1% of the variance. Notably, competitive pressure has an even stronger direct effect on turnover intention than market culture alone, which reflects how personally felt the pressure to perform is among oil service employees. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypotheses Three and Four: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Reward Systems in the Market Culture → Turnover Intention Relationship

H_{03}: Job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between market culture and turnover intention.

H_{04}: Reward systems do not significantly mediate the relationship between market culture and turnover intention.

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

These two hypotheses were tested simultaneously using PROCESS Macro (Model 4) for parallel dual mediation, with market culture as the predictor and both job satisfaction and reward systems as parallel mediators.

Table 8a: Path Coefficients — Market Culture Mediation Model

Path	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI
Path a1: MC → JS	−0.497	0.059	−.434	−8.424	.000	[−0.613, −0.381]
Path a2: MC → RS	−0.441	0.057	−.398	−7.737	.000	[−0.553, −0.329]
Path b1: JS → TI (controlling MC, RS)	−0.332	0.054	−.328	−6.148	.000	[−0.438, −0.226]
Path b2: RS → TI (controlling MC, JS)	−0.256	0.056	−.245	−4.571	.000	[−0.366, −0.146]
Path c (Total): MC → TI	0.517	0.058	.448	8.914	.000	[0.403, 0.631]
Path c' (Direct): MC → TI	0.239	0.061	.207	3.918	.000	[0.119, 0.359]

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 8b: Indirect Effects through Job Satisfaction and Reward Systems (Market Culture Model)

Mediation Path	B	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI	Decision
MC → JS → TI	0.165	0.040	0.091	0.247	Significant
MC → RS → TI	0.113	0.037	0.043	0.189	Significant
Total Indirect Effect	**0.278**				
Direct Effect (c')	**0.239**				
Total Effect (c)	**0.517**				

Based on 5,000 bootstrap resamples. Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 8c: Model Summary — Market Culture Mediation

Model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	F	df	p
MC → JS	.434	.188	.186	72.39	1, 313	.000
MC → RS	.398	.158	.156	58.82	1, 313	.000
MC → TI (Total)	.448	.201	.198	79.09	1, 313	.000
MC + JS + RS → TI	.631	.398	.393	68.87	3, 311	.000

Source: Field Survey (2026)

For Hypothesis Three, the indirect effect of market culture on turnover intention through job satisfaction was B = .165 (95% CI [.091, .247]). Because this confidence interval does not include zero, the mediation is statistically significant. Market culture significantly reduces job satisfaction (Path a1: B = −0.497, $p < .001$), and lower job satisfaction significantly increases turnover intention (Path b1: B = −0.332, $p < .001$). This means market culture indirectly increases turnover intention by making employees less satisfied with their jobs. The null hypothesis is rejected.

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

For Hypothesis Four, the indirect effect through reward systems was also significant (B = .113, 95% CI [.043, .189]). Market culture significantly reduces how employees view their reward systems (Path a2: B = −0.441, p < .001), and perceptions of inadequate rewards significantly increase turnover intention (Path b2: B = −0.256, p < .001). The null hypothesis is rejected. Since the direct effect of market culture on turnover intention remained significant after controlling for both mediators (c' = 0.239, β = .207, p < .001), the mediation is partial for both job satisfaction and reward systems. Together, both mediators account for 53.8% of the total effect (0.278/0.517).

Hypotheses Five and Six: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Reward Systems in the Competitive Pressure → Turnover Intention Relationship

H_{05}: Job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between competitive pressure and turnover intention.

H_{06}: Reward systems do not significantly mediate the relationship between competitive pressure and turnover intention.

The same PROCESS Macro (Model 4) parallel mediation framework was applied, this time with competitive pressure as the predictor.

Table 9a: Path Coefficients — Competitive Pressure Mediation Model

Path	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI
Path a1: CP → JS	−0.595	0.057	−.501	−10.438	.000	[−0.707, −0.483]
Path a2: CP → RS	−0.524	0.056	−.456	−9.357	.000	[−0.634, −0.414]
Path b1: JS → TI (controlling CP, RS)	−0.332	0.052	−.328	−6.385	.000	[−0.434, −0.230]
Path b2: RS → TI (controlling CP, JS)	−0.256	0.054	−.245	−4.741	.000	[−0.362, −0.150]
Path c (Total): CP → TI	0.623	0.056	.521	11.125	.000	[0.513, 0.733]
Path c' (Direct): CP → TI	0.291	0.060	.243	4.850	.000	[0.173, 0.409]

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 9b: Indirect Effects through Job Satisfaction and Reward Systems (Competitive Pressure Model)

Mediation Path	B	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI	Decision
CP → JS → TI	0.198	0.040	0.124	0.281	Significant
CP → RS → TI	0.134	0.036	0.067	0.208	Significant
Total Indirect Effect	**0.332**				
Direct Effect (c')	**0.291**				
Total Effect (c)	**0.623**				

Based on 5,000 bootstrap resamples. Source: Field Survey (2026)

LASUJMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Table 9c: Model Summary — Competitive Pressure Mediation

Model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	F	df	p
CP → JS	.501	.251	.249	104.97	1, 313	.000
CP → RS	.456	.208	.205	82.15	1, 313	.000
CP → TI (Total)	.521	.271	.269	116.38	1, 313	.000
CP + JS + RS → TI	.680	.463	.458	89.52	3, 311	.000

Source: Field Survey (2026)

For Hypothesis Five, the indirect effect of competitive pressure on turnover intention through job satisfaction was B = .198 (95% CI [.124, .281]), and since zero is not within this interval, the mediation is confirmed. Competitive pressure strongly reduces job satisfaction (Path a1: B = −0.595, p < .001), and this reduced satisfaction then increases turnover intention. The null hypothesis is rejected.

For Hypothesis Six, the indirect effect through reward systems was also significant (B = .134, 95% CI [.067, .208]). The strong competitive pressure in these companies significantly reduces employees' perceptions of their reward systems (Path a2: B = −0.524, p < .001), and this dissatisfaction with rewards in turn predicts higher turnover intention. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Again, since the direct effect of competitive pressure on turnover intention remained significant after controlling for both mediators (c' = 0.291, β = .243, p < .001), the mediation is partial. Both mediators together account for 53.3% of the total competitive pressure effect on turnover intention (0.332/0.623).

Summary of Mediation Findings

Table 10: Comparative Summary of All Indirect Effects

Indirect Path	B	95% CI	Type of Mediation
MC → JS → TI	.165	[.091, .247]	Partial
MC → RS → TI	.113	[.043, .189]	Partial
CP → JS → TI	.198	[.124, .281]	Partial
CP → RS → TI	.134	[.067, .208]	Partial

Source: Field Survey (2026)

The summary table shows that all four mediation paths are significant and consistent in direction. Job satisfaction is the stronger mediator in both cases, explaining more of the total effect than reward systems, though both make independent and statistically meaningful contributions.

Discussion

The results of this study offer a clear and practically useful account of what drives turnover intention in multinational oil service companies in Nigeria and how it works. The finding that market culture significantly and positively predicts turnover intention (β = .448, p < .001) is consistent with what earlier research has found in similar settings (Olaniyi & Salami, 2023; Adebayo & Okonkwo, 2024). In oil service companies, the market cultural emphasis on performance, results, and competition naturally creates a high-demand work environment. Employees are expected to deliver constantly, and when this expectation is not matched by adequate support, recognition, or personal fulfilment, the

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

desire to find a less taxing employer grows. The finding that competitive pressure is an even stronger predictor of turnover intention ($\beta = .521$, $p < .001$) than market culture is itself an important finding. It suggests that what pushes employees toward the exit most directly is not just the general culture of results-orientation but the personal, day-to-day experience of being compared, evaluated, and pressured to outperform. This distinction matters practically because it means that even a company with a strong market culture can manage turnover intention better if it moderates the degree to which employees personally experience that culture as competitive pressure.

The mediation through job satisfaction in both models adds important depth to these findings. In the market culture model, market culture reduces job satisfaction (Path a1: $\beta = -.434$, $p < .001$), and this reduced satisfaction then predicts higher turnover intention (Path b1: $\beta = -.328$, $p < .001$). The same pattern holds for competitive pressure, where the negative effect on job satisfaction is even stronger (Path a1: $\beta = -.501$, $p < .001$). This is consistent with what JD-R Theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; 2017) predicts: high job demands deplete the psychological resources that are necessary for job satisfaction. When employees are chronically under pressure to perform in a results-driven culture, the aspects of work that normally generate satisfaction — a sense of achievement, positive relationships, professional growth, and manageable challenges — become harder to access. Over time, this erodes satisfaction to the point where employees start seriously questioning whether staying is the right choice. The mediation through reward systems tells a related but slightly different story. In an environment where both market culture and competitive pressure are very high, employees naturally expect that their efforts and performance will be adequately rewarded. Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano et al., 2017) explains why: the implicit employment contract says that high performance deserves high reward. But when employees in these oil service companies look at their actual pay, bonuses, and recognition, and feel that it does not match the level of effort and pressure they endure, the exchange balance breaks down. The relatively low mean score for reward systems ($M = 2.91$) recorded in this study is a strong signal that many employees in these companies feel this imbalance. And as the mediation results show, this dissatisfaction with rewards is a significant step on the path toward deciding to leave.

The fact that both mediations are partial is also meaningful. It tells us that market culture and competitive pressure do not only drive turnover intention through job satisfaction and reward systems — they also have direct effects that are not explained by either mediator. This suggests there are other important variables at play, such as work-life balance, psychological safety, supervisor support, or organisational commitment, that future studies should explore within this framework. Comparing the two mediation models, competitive pressure consistently explains more variance in turnover intention than market culture alone, and its indirect effects through both job satisfaction and reward systems are also larger. This pattern suggests that competitive pressure — the lived, personal experience of being in constant competition — is a more proximal and intense driver of turnover intention than market culture, which is a more abstract organisational characteristic. For management, this means that

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

addressing the personal experience of competitive pressure in day-to-day operations may be a more impactful intervention than trying to change the broader cultural orientation of the organisation.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study found that both market culture and competitive pressure significantly increase turnover intention among employees in multinational oil service companies in Nigeria, and that both of these effects operate partly through reduced job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with reward systems. Job satisfaction was the stronger mediator in both cases, reinforcing its importance as a central variable in understanding why employees decide to leave. Reward systems also played a meaningful mediating role, reminding management that employees who feel undercompensated relative to what they endure will eventually start looking elsewhere. Together, these findings point to a clear message for the management of oil service companies in Nigeria: it is not enough to build a high-performing culture and expect employees to fall in line. If that culture does not translate into a satisfying and fairly rewarded work experience, the company will keep losing the very people it needs most.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made for the management of oil service companies and for relevant industry stakeholders. First, the management of Halliburton, SLB, Baker Hughes, Weatherford, and similar companies should take a hard look at whether the competitive pressure their employees experience is healthy and proportionate or whether it has crossed into territory that is genuinely damaging to wellbeing and retention. Regular employee surveys that specifically measure perceptions of competitive pressure can help management identify early warning signs and adjust their practices before the problem escalates into large-scale turnover. Second, given that job satisfaction came out as the strongest mediator in both models, companies should invest directly and deliberately in the drivers of job satisfaction. This means improving the quality of supervision, giving employees more meaningful work, reducing unnecessary bureaucracy, and creating regular opportunities for employees to receive positive feedback and recognition for their contributions. Small, consistent actions that make employees feel valued can significantly lift overall job satisfaction, especially in a high-pressure environment. Third, the reward systems in these companies need urgent attention. The fact that the mean score for perceived reward adequacy was below the scale midpoint ($M = 2.91$) tells us that many employees feel underpaid or under-recognised relative to what they contribute. Companies should conduct structured pay reviews, ensure that bonus and incentive schemes are transparent and seen as fair, and explore non-financial recognition options such as public acknowledgement, career advancement opportunities, and flexible working arrangements. When employees can see a direct connection between their performance and their rewards, the exchange imbalance that drives turnover intention is significantly reduced. Fourth, the competitive pressure that employees feel should be managed more carefully at the team and departmental levels. While some degree of healthy competition is natural and motivating, the kind of chronic, high-stakes competitive pressure described by respondents in this study can be destructive. Team managers and supervisors should be trained to balance performance expectations with psychological safety — creating environments where employees feel challenged but not threatened.

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Fifth, PETAN and the NCDMB should incorporate human capital retention indicators into their reporting requirements for multinational oil service companies operating in Nigeria. Making turnover rates, employee satisfaction scores, and reward benchmarking part of regular industry reporting would create greater accountability and encourage companies to treat workforce retention as a strategic priority rather than an afterthought.

This study has several limitations that should be kept in mind. The cross-sectional survey design means that data were collected at a single point in time, which makes it impossible to establish a definitive causal order between the variables. Although the theoretical framework and the direction of the regression paths are logically grounded, a longitudinal study tracking the same employees over multiple time points would provide stronger evidence for causal claims.

The study also relied entirely on self-report questionnaires, which may introduce common method bias. Future research could reduce this bias by using multiple data sources, such as combining employee-reported job satisfaction with supervisor-reported performance data or company-recorded turnover rates. The study was limited to four multinational oil service companies in Port Harcourt. While these are among the most significant players in the Nigerian oil service industry, there are many smaller indigenous companies with very different cultures and working conditions that were not captured here. A comparison between multinational and indigenous oil service companies could produce very valuable insights. Finally, since both mediations were partial, future research should investigate additional mediating variables — such as organisational commitment, psychological contract fulfilment, burnout, or perceived supervisor support — that may explain the remaining direct effects of market culture and competitive pressure on turnover intention. A serial mediation model, where market culture leads to competitive pressure, which then affects satisfaction and rewards and ultimately turnover intention, would also be a worthwhile extension of this study.

References

Adebayo, S. O., & Okonkwo, E. C. (2024). Organisational culture dynamics and academic staff retention in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Educational Management and Administration, 12*(1), 45–63.

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.

Akinwale, O. E., & George, O. J. (2020). Work environment and job satisfaction: Implications on workers' productivity in selected public institutions in Nigeria. *Management Science Letters, 10*(8), 1851–1860.

Ampofo, E. T. (2020). Mediation effects of job satisfaction and organisational commitment on the relationship between organisational climate and employee intention to quit. *Management Research Review, 43*(9), 1070–1090.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285.

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Balogun, A. G., Afolabi, O. A., & Adetunji, O. M. (2022). Organisational culture and turnover intention: The moderating roles of psychological capital among Nigerian workers. *Current Psychology*, *41*(5), 3014–3025.

Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organisational research. *Human Relations, 61*(8), 1139–1160.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organisational culture: Based on the competing values framework.* Addison-Wesley.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals, 11*(1), 479–516.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

Karatepe, O. M., & Vatansever, M. (2021). The effects of role overload on burnout and turnover intentions among hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 92*, 102707.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organisational psychology* (pp. 1297–1343). Rand McNally.

Mensah, J. K. (2019). Talent retention and turnover intention among employees: The mediating role of organisational commitment. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies, 10*(2), 195–210.

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(4), 408–414.

Ngozi, A., & Chukwuemeka, E. O. (2022). Competing values framework and organisational performance in Nigerian public institutions. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *12*(4), 55–74.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Nwosu, H. C., & Iheriohanma, E. B. J. (2022). Conservation of resources, job demands, and turnover intention in Nigerian higher education. *Sociological Spectrum, 42*(3), 201–218.

Olaniyi, A. S., & Salami, S. O. (2023). Organisational commitment, culture and turnover intention among university academic staff in Nigeria. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(2), 14–29.

Omotayo, F. O., Owolabi, T. O., & Elegbede, T. (2023). Role stressors and job outcomes among polytechnic lecturers in Southwestern Nigeria. *Management and Labour Studies, 48*(1), 67–84.

PETAN. (2026). *Directory of petroleum technology companies operating in Nigeria*. Petroleum Technology Association of Nigeria.

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 2 - 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21015780

Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organisational analysis. *Management Science*, *29*(3), 363–377.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research methods for business students* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (2023). Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *76*(1), 43–90.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row