

University Workers' Perception of Organizational Retirement Plans and Their Attitude to Work

Amininiye M. Manuel and Patrick N. Asuquo*

*Educational Foundations, Guidance and Counselling Department, Faculty of Education,
University of Calabar, Calabar*

**E-mail: patasu001@yahoo.com*

KEYWORDS Engagement. Perception. Attitude. Retirement Benefits. Retention

ABSTRACT The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of perception of the University organizational retirement plans on workers' attitude to work. The study which adopted survey design had a total of two hundred persons who participated as respondents. The result of data analysis revealed that workers had very low perception of their universities' organizational retirement plans. It also revealed that workers' attitude to work was largely unfavourable. There was, however, a significant influence of perception on attitude to work across all the categories of workers. Implications were discussed and recommendations made.

INTRODUCTION

Every organization is made up of people known as workers, and a university is not an exception. These workers are meant to be engaged by the organization through employment. They are supposed to be retained by the organization, and their welfare adequately taken care of. They are also supposed to leave the organization through retrenchment, retirement and dismissal.

Ideally, every organization is supposed to have condition of service for its workers which serves as a regular tool for their engagement, retention and lay-off. The condition of service also serves a guide in terms of the benefits accruable to the worker both while within or leaving the service. Experience has shown in recent times that university workers having retired from service spend over five years without receiving their retirement benefits. This implies that university management seems not to have credible plans for its workers on retirement. The awareness of this scenario by university workers tends to make them develop certain attitudes either negatively or positively towards work.

Either way, workers' attitudes have a lot of consequences for the well-being or otherwise of the organization. Allport (1974) perceived attitude as a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience exerting a direct or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situation with which it is related. Given the significance of workers attitudes in the organization it becomes necessary that well

meaning organizations should do things that promote positive workers attitudes.

Traditionally, the Nigerian Social Insurance Trust Fund (NSITF) was established by the Federal Republic of Nigeria for the purpose of providing pension scheme for the civil servant retirees. The NSITF was responsible for funding the scheme and to ensure that all the pensioners were adequately paid their retirement a benefits. In essence, the pension scheme was a benefit at their retirement for the services rendered (Efemini 2006). In this scheme, the worker on retirement was given a bulk of money based on his years of service and status on retirement. But it could be noted that even with this package the retirees were not given the needed benefits to enable them to cater for themselves and their families. Uzoeshi and Ubulom (2006) carried out a research about retirees benefits at Ideator Local Government Area in Imo State. In their findings, they discovered that the retirees in that local government area were owed their retirement benefits for over five years. It would appear as if the old scheme was not effective hence benefits could not get to their owners as at when due.

Recently, a new retirement package known as Pension Fund Administrators (PFA) has been introduced for civil servants and since Nigerian University Workers are part of the workforce, they are not exempted. This particular scheme is contributory in nature since both the employer and the employee contribute certain percentages to the fund. According to Nwabali (2006), the Pension Commission has licensed eleven Pension

Fund Administrators (PFAs) to administer the Contributory Pension Scheme for university workers. The Pension Reform Act 2004 established a compulsory contributory Pension Scheme for employees in both private and public sectors of the economy. The Act requires every employee to open a Retirement Savings Account (RSA) in which contributions by both employer and employee would be paid. The Nigerian Life and Pension Consultants Limited (NLPC 2005) stated that an employer with 5 or more employees must participate and each employee is expected to choose a Pension Fund Administrator to manage and administer the Retirement Savings Account.

The Pension Fund assets will be held by a licensed Pension Fund Custodian (PFC). The Act also established the National Pension Commission (PENCOM) to regulate supervise and ensure the effective administration of pension affairs in Nigeria (IBTC 2004). Under the Pension Fund Administrators scheme, members of staff are required to open Retirement Savings Account with any one of the Pension Fund Administrators (Nwabali 2006; NPLC 2005). Unfortunately, the new retirement plan seems to generate fears in the minds of university workers. This is so because, the current retirement plan is simply a contribution scheme aimed at “earn as you contribute” (Efimini 2006), in which all the workers are meant to contribute 7.5% of their monthly salaries and government to contribute 7.5%, making a total of 15% for the pension scheme.

Purposes of the Retirement Scheme

The purposes of this scheme are as follows:

1. To ensure that every person who has worked in either the public or private sector receives his retirement benefits as and when due.
2. To assist improvident individuals by ensuring that they save to cater for their livelihood during old age.
3. To establish a uniform set of rules and regulations for the administration and payment of retirement benefits in both the public and private sectors.
4. Stem the growth of outstanding pension liabilities.

The Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) protested strongly against this new retirement plan or pension scheme, considering its implications of unilateral violation of ASUU/

FGN (Federal Government of Nigeria) agreements that, professors can no longer retire with their full pay as provided by the law. It is contrary to the old one (the defined benefit scheme) instead “earn as you contribute”, in other words robbing the workers to pay him at the end of his services. What happens to all the years spent before commencement of the new pension scheme is not clearly defined yet. Research findings of experts, for example, Uzoeshi and Ubulom (2006) also reveal that the new scheme is worse than the old one following a mathematical model showing that a minimum of 20-year savings is what can afford a meaningful living out of it. There is no country known that this scheme has succeeded, not even the advanced countries practicing it. These apprehensions, fears and anxieties provide the background and justification for this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the University Workers’ Perception of the Organizational Retirement Plan and their Attitude to work. Specifically, this study attempted to achieve the following:

1. To examine the perception of the university retirement plan.
2. To find out the university workers perception about their university retirement plan influence their attitude towards work.
3. To establish the type of attitude, university workers develop towards work as a result of their university retirement plan.
4. To identify universities retirement plans which have been established for their workers.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the perception of the university workers towards the retirement plan of their universities?
2. To what extent does the university retirement plan for their staff influence their attitude to work?
3. What is the attitude of university workers towards work as a result of the university retirement plan?
4. What is the existing university Retirement plans for their employees?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were generated and tested at 5% level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference in the responses of University Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the perception towards the retirement plan of their university.
2. There is no significant relationship between the perception of University Staff about the retirement plan and their attitude to work.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

This study adopted both survey and correlational research designs. This is because the study elicited responses from the respondents to establish difference as well as relationship existing between the responses about the variables investigated.

The target population for this study was made up of academic and non-academic staff of University of Port Harcourt (UIPORT), and Rivers State University of Science and Technology (UNITECH), all located in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Stratified random procedure was adopted to select the sample of the universities' staff used as respondents for this study. The breakdown of the sample is presented in the table 1.

Table 1: Sample of academic and non-academic staff of University of Port Harcourt (UIPORT), and Rivers State University of Science and Technology (UNITECH)

S. No.	University	Academic staff	Non-academic staff	Total
1	UIPORT	50	50	100
2	UNITECH	50	50	100
	Total	100	100	200

The justification of using this sample size is based on the fact that the academic and non-academic staff used as respondents for this study, are prospective future retirees who are expected to benefit from the retirement plans of their universities. Hence, they are well-informed about the presently existing university retirement plans. The major instruments used in gathering data for this study are rating scales and checklists namely:

1. University Retirement Plan Checklist (URPC).
2. University Staff Attitude to Work Rating Scale (USAWRS).

3. Influence of Workers Attitude towards their Retirement Plan Rating Scale (IWARPRS).
4. Perception of University Workers towards the Retirement Plan of their University Inventory (PUWRPUI)

Each of the instruments consists of ten (10) items with options – Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). For the scoring of the instruments, SA = 4, A = 3, D = 2, SD = 1. Some of the statements of the instruments are positively cued while others are negatively cued.

The instruments were subjected to both face and content validity. The instruments were given to two experts in Measurement and Evaluation and two Professionals in Guidance and Counselling all of the University of Calabar to validate. For the Reliability of the instrument, Test retest method was employed after which Pearson's Product Moment Co-relation Coefficient statistics was used for the analysis, and therefore arrived at the reliability coefficient scores of 0.84, 0.76, and 0.78 for URPC, USAWRS, IWARPRS and PUWRPUI respectively.

The instruments were administered to the respondents, one after the other. The instruments were personally administered by this researcher to the respondents during which about how the instruments will be completed were read and interpreted to them. This researcher ensured that the instruments were completely retrieved from the respondents after completion.

In order to analyze the data collected for this study, simple percentage and mean scores were computed and used to answer the research questions. Also, to test the hypotheses at 0.05 alpha level, t-test statistics and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) were employed.

RESULTS

Research Question 1

What the perception of the academic and non-academic University's workers is with regards to the retirement plans of their university?

The table 2 depicts that an average university worker feels that his/her establishment does not have well-planned retirement package ($\bar{X} = 1.30$) and that the university retirement plans do not meet the required standard ($\bar{X} = 3.85$). The table also shows that the retirement plan does not favour

the university workers on retirement ($\bar{X} = 1.45$), that the university retirement plan is a contribution scheme ($\bar{X} = 3.99$) and that the current retirement plan favours government but displeases the retiring workers ($\bar{X} = 3.95$).

Furthermore, the table also provides that the university retirement makes no arrangement to pay gratuity on retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.37$), that the current retirement plan does not cater for any ill worker beyond 45 days on admission ($\bar{X} = 3.63$) and that the retirement plan is limited to only 4 children and wards for the married couples ($\bar{X} = 3.47$). Table 2 further expresses that the retirement plan does not provide any opportunity to the contributor ($\bar{X} = 3.56$) as well as that the university retirement plan make provision for refund of money when one is not satisfied with the services of the health providers ($\bar{X} = 3.74$). Table 2 shows that the Grand Mean (GX) on the perception of the University workers towards the retirement plans of their university is 3.578, which is greater than the average point of 2.5. This indicates that there is a negative perception of the university workers towards the retirement plan of their university.

Research Question 2

To what extent does the university retirement plan for their staff influence their attitude to work?

The table above highlights that university workers do not go to work regularly ($\bar{X} = 1.75$), that the university workers do not leave their office before the closing time ($\bar{X} = 2.03$) and that the workers no longer work till closing time because they have other businesses to augment their low monthly salary ($\bar{X} = 3.26$). Table 3 also shows that university workers sometimes go to work late since the working environment is not encouraging any more ($\bar{X} = 3.43$) and that most of their official hours are spent on sick off for fear of their financial position on retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.01$).

Table 3 in another development, expresses that the university workers spend part of their official hours in pursuing their academic in order to retire at a good grade ($\bar{X} = 3.37$), that the workers engage in buying and selling at work just to make enough savings ($\bar{X} = 3.04$) and that the workers no longer take their work serious since much will not be benefited from it on retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.70$). Furthermore, table 3 exposes that the university workers do not put in more effort in their work since they know they are also contributing to

their retirement benefit ($\bar{X} = 1.62$) and that the university workers have decided that the work can perish since it cannot benefit them on retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.58$). Table 3 therefore shows that the Grand Mean (GX) on the extent to which the University retirement plan has influenced the attitude of their staff to work is 2.821, which is greater than the average point of 2.5. This shows that the extent to which the University retirement plan has influenced the attitude of their staff to work is very low.

Research Question 3

What is the perception of University workers with regards to University retirement plan?

The table 3 shows that the university workers feel that because their university authority places less importance on settlement of retirees, being regular at work is not necessary ($\bar{X} = 3.46$), that the university management is not serious about payment of gratuity so the university workers feel they can only work when they like to do so ($\bar{X} = 3.17$) and that university workers engage in other businesses to support themselves ($\bar{X} = 3.39$). The table also depicts that university workers have learnt to budget their monthly income ($\bar{X} = 3.17$) and that they no longer buy on credit anymore ($\bar{X} = 2.56$). Furthermore, table 4 highlights that the university workers have now learnt to save monthly because they feel their establishment have no retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 2.75$), that the workers engage in monthly contributions ($\bar{X} = 3.46$) and that they indulge in some buying and selling to make ends meet ($\bar{X} = 2.87$). Table 4 also shows that the university workers have decided to pursue their academics in order to retire at a higher grade ($\bar{X} = 2.81$) and that they have decided to put up buildings before their due retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.29$). Table 4 shows that the Grand Mean (GX) on the attitude of University workers towards work as a result of their University's retirement plan is 3.093, which is greater than the average point of 2.5. This shows that there is a negative attitude of University workers towards work as a result of their universities' retirement plan.

Research Question 4

What are the existing University retirement plans for their employees?

The table 4 expresses that the university

Table 2: Percentage and mean computation of university workers' perception towards the retirement plan of the university (N = 200)

S. No.	Statement	Response				Total response	Mean score	Remarks
		SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)			
1.	My establishment has well-planned retirement package	-	-	12046.15	14053.85	260	1.30	Negative Perception
2.	My university retirement plans do not meet the required standard	68088.31	9011.69	-	-	770	3.85	Positive Perception
3.	The retirement plan favours the university workers on retirement	-	-	18062.07	11037.93	290	1.45	Negative Perception
4.	The University Retirement Plan is a contribution scheme	79299.25	60.75	-	-	798	3.99	Positive Perception
5.	The current retirement plan favours government but displeases the retirees	76096.20	303.80	-	-	790	3.95	Positive Perception
6.	My University Retirement Plan makes no arrangement to pay gratuity on retirement	40059.35	24035.61	284.15	60.89	674	3.37	Positive Perception
7.	The current retirement plan do not cater for any ill worker beyond 45 days on admission	60082.76	9012.41	304.14	50.69	725	3.63	Positive Perception
8.	The retirement plan is limited to only 4 children and wards for the married couples	48069.16	18025.94	284.03	60.86	694	3.47	Positive Perception
9.	The retirement plan does not provide any opportunity to the contributor	56078.65	12016.85	243.37	81.12	712	3.56	Positive Perception
10.	The university retirement plan does not make provision for refund of money when one is not satisfied with the services of the health providers	68090.91	456.02	162.14	70.94	748	3.74	Positive Perception

Table 3: Percentage and mean computation of university staff attitudes to work (N = 200)

S. No.	Statement	Response				Total response	Mean score	Remarks
		SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)			
1.	I come to work regularly	6016.9	7521.1	12033.8	10028.2	355	1.75	Negative Perception
2.	I leave my office before the closing time	10024.7	4511.1	20049.4	6014.8	405	2.03	Negative Perception
3.	I no longer work till closing time because I have other businesses to augment my low monthly salary	40061.3	18027.6	649.8	81.2	652	3.26	Positive Perception
4.	I sometimes come to work late since the working environment is not encouraging any more	44064.2	21030.7	304.4	50.7	685	3.43	Positive Perception
5.	Most of my office hours is spent	33655.8	18029.9	6010.0	264.3	602	3.01	Positive Perception
6.	I spent part of my official hours in pursuing my academic in order to retire at a good grade	24043.0	17431.2	12422.2	203.6	558	2.79	Positive Perception
7.	I engage in buying and selling at work just to make enough savings	36059.2	15024.7	641.05	345.6	608	3.04	Positive Perception
8.	I no longer take my work serious since much will not be benefited from it on retirement	64086.5	608.1	405.4	-	740	3.70	Positive Perception
9.	I put in more effort in my work since I know I am also contributing to my retirement benefit	4012.4	4814.9	11234.7	12338.1	323	1.62	Negative Perception
10.	I have decided that the work can perish since it cannot benefit me on retirement	52072.7	17424.3	182.5	30.4	715	3.58	Positive Perception

workers do not feel happy with the University's retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 1.26$), that the university workers are satisfied with their retirement package ($\bar{X} = 1.40$) and that university workers feel being robbed to pay them back on retirement ($\bar{X} = 3.72$). The table also highlights that workers in the university feel unsecured with the retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 3.85$) and that they feel denied of their social rights by this university retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 3.88$).

Table 5 further shows that the university workers feel threatened by these organizations brought in to share their contributions with them ($\bar{X} = 3.75$), that they are not sure if this current plan will not fail as the former scheme ($\bar{X} = 3.58$) and that they are not very comfortable with these Pension Fund Administrators set up to manage their funds ($\bar{X} = 1.20$). The table also shows that university workers fear the outcome of their retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 3.72$) as well as that they are not relaxed about their retirement plan ($\bar{X} = 1.34$).

Table 5 summarily expresses that the Grand Mean (GX) on the effect on the existing University retirement plans for their employees is 2.770, which is greater than the average point of 2.5. This indicates that there is a negative effect on the existing University retirement plans for their employees.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the responses of university academic and non-academic on their perception with regards to their university retirement plans.

The means and standard deviations of the responses of university academic and non-academic staff of their perception towards the retirement plan of their university are presented in the table above with $N = 200$, $df = 198$ and $P = 0.05$, the calculated t-ratio between the responses concerning their perception towards the retirement plan of their university was 0.5781 and the critical value of t-ratio was ± 0.1980 (Table 6). At this juncture therefore, the calculated t-ratio is not statistically significant at $\pm = 0.05$ level of significance since it is less than the given critical value of t-ratio. The hypothesis (H_{O1}) is thus accepted and the conclusion is that there is no significant difference between the responses of university academic and non-academic staff about their perception towards their universities' retirement plan. This implies that no difference

exists in the responses of university academic and non-academic staff on their perception towards their universities' retirement plan.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant relationship between the perception of university retirement plan by staff and their attitude to work.

The means and standard deviations of the responses of university academic and non-academic staff on the relationship existing between their perception about their retirement plan and their attitude towards their work in their university are presented in table 7. With $N = 200$, $df = 198$ and $P = 0.05$, the calculated r in their perception about their retirement plan and their attitude towards their work in their university was 0.6001 and the critical value of r was ± 0.1946 . At this juncture therefore, the calculated r is statistically significant at $\pm = 0.05$ level of significance since it is greater than the given critical value of r. The hypothesis (H_{O2}) is thus not accepted (that is, rejected) and the conclusion is that there is significant relationship existing between the responses of university academic and non-academic staff about their perception of their universities' retirement plan and their attitude towards work in their universities. This implies that relationship exists in the responses of university academic and non-academic staff about their perception of their universities' retirement plan and their attitude towards work.

DISCUSSION

It is obvious that the average university worker perceives that their establishments do not have well-planned retirement package and that their retirement plans do not meet the required standards in terms of their expectations. Undoubtedly, this finding agrees with findings of the study by Uzoeshi and Ubulom (2006) who reported that the current retirement scheme was worse than the old scheme. The retirement plan of their universities do not favour their workers as they retire and that the university retirement plan is merely a contribution scheme, which favours the employer but displeases the retiring workers. The university retirement plan makes no arrangement to accommodate the payment of gratuity on retirement, it does not cater for any ill workers beyond 45 days on admission and only

Table 4: Percentage and mean computation of university workers perception towards the university retirement plan (N = 200)

S. No.	Statement	Response				Total response	Mean score	Remarks
		SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)			
1.	Because our university places less importance on settlement of retirees, I feel being regular at work is not necessary	47668.8	18626.9	223.2	81.2	692	3.46	Positive Perception
2.	Management of our university is not serious about payment of gratuity so I can only work when I like to do so	28845.5	29746.9	386.0	101.6	633	3.17	Positive Perception
3.	I engage in other business to support myself	42062.0	23134.1	162.4	101.5	677	3.39	Positive Perception
4.	I have learnt to budget my monthly income	35255.6	23437.0	223.5	253.9	633	3.17	Positive Perception
5.	I no longer buy on credit anymore	16031.3	19538.2	12223.9	346.7	511	2.56	Positive Perception
6.	I now learn to save monthly because my establishment has no retirement plan	17231.3	21038.2	14225.8	264.7	550	2.75	Positive Perception
7.	I also engage in monthly contributions	52075.1	12618.2	365.2	101.4	692	3.46	Positive Perception
8.	I indulge in some buying and selling to make ends meet	32456.4	14425.1	7012.2	366.3	574	2.87	Positive Perception
9.	I decided to pursue my academics in order to retire at a higher grade	24844.2	16529.4	13023.2	183.2	561	2.81	Positive Perception
10.	I have decided to put up a building before my due retirement	32048.6	30045.6	365.5	20.3	658	3.29	Positive Perception

Table 5: Percentage and mean computation of the existing university retirement plans for their employees (N = 200)

S. No.	Statement	Response				Total response	Mean score	Remarks
		SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)			
1.	University workers feel happy with the university's Retirement Plan	41.6	2710.8	6023.9	16063.7	251	1.26	Negative Perception
2.	University workers are not satisfied with their retirement package	207.2	279.7	9233.0	14050.2	279	1.40	Negative Perception
3.	University workers feel being robbed to pay them back on retirement	61682.8	10814.5	202.7	-	744	3.72	Positive Perception
4.	Workers in the university feel unsecured with the retirement plan	68088.4	8711.3	20.3	-	769	3.85	Positive Perception
5.	University workers feel denied of their social rights by this university retirement plan	70891.2	668.5	20.3	-	776	3.88	Positive Perception
6.	University workers feel threatened by these organizations brought in to share their contributions with them	64085.3	9012.0	202.7	-	750	3.75	Positive Perception
7.	The university workers are not sure if this current plan will not fail as the former scheme	56879.3	10514.7	405.6	30.4	716	3.58	Positive Perception
8.	The workers are very comfortable with these pension fund administrators set up to manage their funds	-	62.5	7230.0	16267.5	240	1.20	Negative Perception
9.	University workers fear the outcome of their retirement plan	63284.9	8411.3	283.8	-	744	3.72	Positive Perception
10.	University workers are relaxed about their retirement plan	-	217.8	10840.3	13951.7	268	1.34	Negative Perception

Table 6: Difference in the responses of university academic and non-academic on the perception towards the retirement plan and their university

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Dev.</i>	<i>t-ratio Cal</i>	<i>t-ratio Crit</i>
University Academic Staff (X_1)	2.4157	0.9280	0.5781+	± 0.1980
Non-academic Staff (Y)	2.3577	1.2167		
N = 200	df = 198		P > 0.05	+ = Not Significant

Table 7: Relationship between the perceptions of university staff about the retirement plan and their attitude to work

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Dev.</i>	<i>t-ratio Cal</i>	<i>t-ratio Crit</i>
Perception of University Staff about the Retirement Plan (X_1)	2.3562	0.5960	0.6001*	± 0.1946
University Staff 's Attitude to Work (Y)	2.3577	1.2167		
N = 200	df = 198		P < 0.05	* = Significant

limited to only 4 children and wards for the married couples. The university's retirement plan does not provide any opportunity to the contributors as well as making provision for refund of money when one is not satisfied with the services of the health providers. The finding also concludes that there is a negative perception of the university workers towards the retirement plan of their universities. This explains why the ASUU, the academic workers' union has consistently opposed the current scheme.

The study also reveals that university workers do not go to work regularly, they leave their offices before the closing time and no longer work till closing time because they have other businesses to augment their low monthly salaries after 7.5% has been deducted. University workers sometimes go to work late since the working environment is not encouraging any more and most of their official hours are spent on sick off for fear of their financial positions on retirement. Instead of university workers spending part of their official hours in pursuing their academics in order to retire at a good occupational level, they engage in buying and selling at work just to make enough savings; they no longer take their work serious since much will not be benefited from it on retirement. The university workers do not put in more effort in their work since they know they are also contributing to their retirement benefit and they feel that their work can perish since it cannot benefit them on retirement. The extent to which the University retirement plan has influenced the attitude of their staff to work is very low. University workers feel that because their university authority places less importance on settlement of retirees, being regular at work is not necessary.

The university management is not serious about payment of gratuity so the university workers feel they can only work when they like to do so and that university workers engage in other businesses to support themselves. University workers have learnt to budget their monthly incomes and that they no longer buy on credit anymore. University workers have now learnt to save monthly because they feel their establishment have no retirement plan, they engage in monthly contributions and they indulge in some buying and selling to make ends meet. University workers have decided to pursue their academics in order to retire at a higher grade and they have decided to put up buildings before their due retirement. There is a negative attitude of University workers towards work as a result of their universities' retirement plan. University workers do not feel happy with their Universities' retirement plan; they are not satisfied with their retirement package and they feel being robbed to pay them back on retirement. Workers in the university feel insecure with the retirement plan and they feel denied of their social rights by this university retirement plan. University workers feel threatened by these organizations brought in to share their contributions with them, they are not sure if this current plan will not fail as the former scheme and they are not very comfortable with these Pension Fund Administrators set up to manage their funds. University workers fear the outcome of their retirement plans and they are not relaxed about their universities' retirement plan. There is a negative effect on the existing University retirement plan for their employees. No difference exists in the responses of university academic and non-academic staff on their perception towards their

universities' retirement plan but relationship exists in the responses of university academic and non-academic staff about their perception of their universities' retirement plan and their attitude to work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made:

1. University workers should adequately be provided with their gratuities on retirement.
2. The monthly pay of university retired workers should be made to remain the same and if possible be reviewed upward.
3. The current university retirement plan for their workers should be revised.
4. Counsellors should be in the forefront of educating workers on both organizational and individual plans of retirement and their strategic implementation.

REFERENCES

- Allport GM 1974. *In Marketing: A Behavioural Analysis*. London: McGill UK Limited
- Efimini AO 2006. New Pensions and Health Scheme. *An Internal Memo to ASUU Staff*. ASUU University of Port Harcourt Branch.
- IBTC 2004. *Your Pension is Your Future*. Lagos: IBTC Pension Managers Limited.
- NLPC 2005. *Freedom to Choose: Exercise Your Right Now*. Lagos: The Nigerian Life and Pension Consultants Limited.
- Nwabali RI 2006. Opening Retirement Savings Accounts with Licensed Pension Fund Administrators for the Implementation of the Contributory Pension Scheme. *An Internal Memo to Staff*. University of Port Harcourt.
- The Pension Reform Act 2004. In Choose a PAL for life. Lagos: Pension Alliance Limited.
- Uzoeshi C, Ubulom WJ 2006. Sources of Depression among civil servant retirees in Ideato-North Local Government Area of Imo State: Implications for counselling. *Journal of Technical and Science Education*, 15(1-2): 1-18.