
Effect of Socio-Economic Factors on Income Diversification: A Study of ASUU-IBB University, Lapai-Niger State

Sayed, Shuaib Ndagi¹, Jinjiri, Kabiru Ringim, PhD²

¹(Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State)

²(Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria)

Abstract: Socio-economic factors such as gender, age, marital status, service period, education and income may make academic lecturers to indulge in income diversification apart from their basic occupation of teaching/research supervision/community development to generate additional income. The objectives of this study therefore are to examine the effect of individuals' characteristic and income on income diversification among members of Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai-Branch. Data were collected using field research survey approach involving hand delivery of questionnaire. Simple random technique of probability sampling method was used to draw a sample size of 136 subjects from the population of 205 elements. The OLS regression results indicate that individuals' characteristic like marital status, dependency and service period have significant positive effect on income diversification while gender, educational qualification and rank have insignificant positive effect on income diversification. Also, income level has insignificant positive effect on income diversification. Other variables such as age and nature of appointment were unfit in the model.

Keywords: ASUU, Dependency ratio, Income Diversification, Service period, Socio-economic factors,

1. Introduction

Income diversification is receiving attention by individuals, households and entrepreneurs for improved livelihood in developing countries like Nigeria. Income diversification is alternative sources of income in addition to primary source of income. The primary source of income is the major source of income while secondary source are alternative sources of income to an individual. Income diversification is portfolio of income to an individual. It is a situation whereby an individual engages self in two or more activities to earn additional income. This income generation activities may be related to individual's main occupation. There are different types of income diversification activities namely, occupational income diversification and opportunity income diversification. Occupational income diversification is a situation whereby an individual has basic occupation and adopts a strategy in diversifying to related occupation (e.g. mix-farming, a motor mechanic trading on spare parts and lecturers engaging in visiting lecturing activity). Opportunity income diversification on the other hand is where an individual has major occupation and diversify to any activity that can earn him/her more income. This activity or job may not be related to primary occupation (a lecturer engaging self in farming and consultancy services or a farmer involving self in petty trading, matting and tailoring). Individuals engage self in alternative stream of income because of the survival strategy; planning for what do after retirement and risk of losing job through labour unrest, premature retirement. Ahmed (2012) opines that the motives of income diversification is push and pull factors. Push factors determine that the diversification occurs due to a need by individuals or households to reduce risk of diminishing return; employees' sickness, death or defiance; technological advancement and changes. Pull factor is a temptation for greater returns with minimum risk through improved strategy, machinery or specialization due to demand for products/services.

The origin of occupational diversification is traceable to the beginning of agriculture farming as a source of income. Many Individuals and household farmers relax at home when the raining seasons are over and they don't have anything to again in the farm land. Few of the agricultural farmers however do other occupations like fishing, hunting, crafting, artist work and trading as alternative sources of income. Over the years, as the responsibilities of individuals/households farmers that use to relax during the dry seasons continue to pile up, they also thought of other sources of income. This is because many services they were getting free of charge from relatives, friends and neighbours now have to be paid for. Family members need money for ceremonies/burials, payment of school fee, hospital bills, transportation fees and other unforeseen contingencies; aged parents need to be catered for and some members of the community rely on you for survival (Ahmed, 2012 and Amanze, Ezech & Okoronkwo, 2015). For this reason, the research

gap this study wants to fill in the field of academic discourse is to examine the influence of service period and dependents' responsibility on income diversification among members of Academic Staff Union of Universities, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai (ASUU-IBBUL) Branch. This study will be beneficial and significant to bank managements, policy makers and potential academic researchers as well as a contribution to knowledge.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Income diversification is becoming more widespread in Nigeria. Many civil servants like teachers/lecturers and other government workers are now found moving from one office to other selling different items during the work hours to generate additional income. Also, some civil servants are consultants, commercial motorcyclists, taxi drivers, tailors, shoe menders, farmers, traders, bricklayers, electricians, plumbers, carpenters, housing renting/land lords, estate developers/managers, hotel managers, part-time contractors, equipment leasors, car renters, car dealers etc. The reasons for all these income diversifications are to improve livelihood, reduce risk of diminishing return and losing job through labour unrest and premature retirement. However, the Fifth Schedule, Part I (1) of the Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) asserts that a public officer shall not put himself in a position where his personal interest conflicts with his duties and responsibilities during the work hours. There are three types of public officer namely, the civil servants, public servants and political office holders. Civil servants are type of public officers which lecturers in Nigeria universities belong. This is because they are individuals working as servants in government departments.

This study wants to view problems in Academic Staff Union of Universities, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai (ASUU-IBBUL) Branch. The problems are in respect of socio- economic factors and its effects on members' income diversification. Thus, this study is conducted by replicating the works of Idowu *et al.* (2011); Aloba (2012), Javed, Nadeem, Rafique and Kamran (2015), Combarry (2015) and Amanze *et al.* (2015) after slight modifications in their models. This is because their studies focused on farming occupation (agriculture, fishing and animal husbandry) and variables used have association with the occupations. But this study is on academic lecturers of IBB University.

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions are developed based on the statement of problems in the introduction:

- i. To what extent is individuals' characteristic affecting income diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL?
- ii. To what extent is income level influencing income diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The basic objective of the study is to examine the effect of socio-economic factors on income diversification among members of ASUU-IBBL. The specific objectives include:

- i. To investigate the effect of individuals' characteristic on income diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL.
- ii. To assess the effect of income level on **income** diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses derived from the objectives are stated in null form for testing as follows:

H₀₁: Individuals' characteristic has no significant effect on income diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL

H₀₂: Income level has no significant effect on ASUU-IBBL income diversification of members in ASUU-IBBL.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Concept and theory of Income Diversification

Income diversification is the process of switching from low-income occupation to related higher value occupation and non-related business activities. Income diversification is defined as a situation whereby an individual has two or more sources of income in order to improve his/her standard of living. It can also be defined as doing more than one job that is not related to primary occupation to enhance consumption pattern. Adebayo, Akogwu and Yisa (2012) define income diversification as a process whereby individuals or households adding new activities to existing one that generate income for improved livelihood. Ellis, 2000 in Aloba (2012) sees income diversification as expansion of the range of activities outside the main activity through pressures and opportunities. Sekumade and Osundare (2012) opine that livelihood diversification or income diversification is attempts by individuals and households to find new ways to raise income. Ahmed (2012) sees income diversification as capacity to operate a heterogeneous set of activities for the improvement of individuals' wellbeing. Javed *et al.* (2015) opine that income diversification is when individuals join multiple jobs to improve income and enhance consumption. In this study, the operational definition of income diversification is where an individual is doing two or more occupations that is not related to a primary occupation for improved livelihood.

This study underpinned Keynesians' absolute *income theory* that has association with income diversification theory. The Keynes' absolute income theory postulates that as a household's or individual's income increases at any given time, its consumptions and savings increases. Hence, there is need for an individual and household to diversify its income to guide against the risk of dwindling income (Nwankwo, Ewuim & Asoya 2013).

2.2 Measurement of Income Diversification

Income diversification can be measured using objective and subject measurement. Sekumade and Osundare (2012); Amanze *et al.* (2015); Javed *et al.* (2015) measured the income diversification index using a number of income sources employed divided by all the income sources (which may not be related to main occupation) available in the study area. Idowu *et al.* (2011) and Olugbire; Falusi, Adeoti and Oyekale (2012) gauged income diversification as sources of income to the households that is related and un-related to basic occupation. Demissie and Legesse (2013) and Combarry (2015) gauged income diversification as utility an individual derived from engaging in alternative activities. Ahmed (2012), Aloba (2012); Adebayo *et al.* (2012) measured income diversification as household income generation activities that are not related to the main occupation. In this study, income diversification can be measured using individual's income generating activities that are not related to a primary occupation.

2.3 Review of Related Empirical Studies on Income Diversification

Factors determining income diversification are many. Israr, Khan, Jan and Ahmad (2014) examined livelihood diversification as a strategy for 323 rural households' income enhancement in Shangla district of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The result of descriptive statistic shows that overall non-farm income contribution was 69.40% in relation to farm income which is the main occupation. Thus, it was concluded that income diversification had increased the household income. The study recommends improvement in both farm and non-farm sources of income for sustainable livelihood and this can be done by investing more in the productive capitals of the rural households. But the findings cannot be generalized even in Pakistan because a district was studied. Ghimire, Huang and Rudra (2014) studied factors affecting nonfarm income diversification among rural farm households in Central Nepal. The result reveals that household characteristics such as age, gender and education of the household head, and family size play a significant role in non-farm work decisions. The households with larger farm size are less likely to participate in non-farm work than their counterpart. Additionally, for those in the rural areas, distance to road and market, hinders the opportunities for non-farm work. Finally, regional differences also exist in participating nonfarm activities among farm households. This study suggests that government policy should pay more attention to education, gender and infrastructures such as road and markets, to reduce the entry barriers and facilitate easier access to non-farm activities. However, the study was carried out in Nepal and findings cannot be generalized. Javed *et al.* (2015) investigated determinants of Income diversification on samples of 76546 rural households of Pakistan. The data for the study was obtained from Social and Living Standards Measurement (PSLM) of Pakistan from 2010-2011. The regression

results show that age, household size and education are positive determinants while gender, income and marital status are negative determinants of income diversification. The study encourages income diversification among rural household to reduce poverty, but the result cannot be generalized to other nations.

In Africa, Alobo (2012) studied determinants of income diversification among 1770 rural households in Senegal and Kenya between 2007 and 2010. The regression results reveal that completing secondary or university education, access to farm capital and access to transport, access to markets for farm products, access to mutual or unpaid labour, access to migration opportunities and farm characteristics such as the farm size and irrigated farm area are the significant factors determining the level of income diversification. The study contributes significantly to knowledge but the results can only be generalized in *Senegal and Kenya*. Demissie and Legesse (2013) study determinants of income diversification among 120 rural households in Fedis district, Eastern Hararghe Zone, Ethiopia. The regression result indicates that human capital related variables (gender and age of household head, number of economically active family members, education level of household head and presence of children attending school), livelihood assets (livestock holding, size of cultivated land), livelihood diversifying strategy (crop-based diversification through number of crops grown and harvested) and infrastructure related variable (proximity to market) influence non/off-farm employment activities known as income diversification. Nevertheless, the paper focuses on rural household activities. Senadza (2014) investigated non-farm income diversification in rural Ghana. Regression results show that the gender composition of households, age, education, and access to credit, electricity and markets are important determinants of multiple non-farm activities and non-farm income. The findings call for strategies that can help rural households maximize the benefits from income diversification. The scope is limited to Ghana. Combarry (2015) studied determining factors as strategies for diversifying sources of income among 540 rural households in Burkina Faso. The regression results reveal that age of household, household size, dependency ratio, acreage, membership of a producer group, amount of credit, agricultural potentials of the area, morbidity (probability of falling ill), distance from main road, access to radio, total income and technical assistance are significant factors determining income diversification. The findings cannot however be generalized because of the limited scope.

In Nigeria, Idowu *et al.* (2011) examined determinants of income diversification amongst 411 rural farm households in Southwest (Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo) of Nigeria. The regression results indicate that age, gender, education, experience in other non-farm activities, household dependency ratio, household size, per capita landholding, distance to urban centre and investment asset base of the households and availability of electricity/water supply are significant determinants of income shares or income diversification. Nevertheless, the findings can only be generalized in Southwest of Nigeria. Adebayo *et al.* (2012) examined determinants of income diversification among 222 farming households in Ikara, Giwa and Makarfi of Kaduna State. The results indicate that educational level, farm size, membership of cooperatives and non-farm income are significant variables that increase income diversification strategies of farm households while farm size decreases the income diversification of households. However, the study only picked a local government from three agricultural zones in state. Ahmed (2012) examined income diversification determinants among 110 farming households in Konduga, Borno State, Nigeria. The result show that age, educational level of household head and ownership of assets influence income diversification while household size, access to loan and marital status did not. Most households were involved in income diversification activities such as petty trading, matting and tailoring. To enhance income diversification, it is important to improve rural infrastructure in terms of provision of electricity and improving access to markets. However, the study was conducted in Konduga, Borno State.

Furthermore, Sekumade and Osundare (2012) investigated determinants of livelihood diversification among 120 farm households in Ekiti State, Nigeria. The regression results show that education and income levels were the significant determinants of the livelihood diversification (households doing more than two jobs for more income). Other insignificant determinants are sex, age, family size, marital status, primary occupation, access to credit and distance. The research paper recommends that government should intensify more efforts in enhancing human capital development for better standard of living of rural

households. The findings can only be generalized in Ekiti state and not entire Nigeria. Olugbire *et al.* (2012) examined determinants of non-farm income diversification among 13033 rural households in Nigeria. Data are obtained from Nigeria Living Standards Surveys (NLSS) of households between September 2003 and August 2004 in the 36 states of the Federation including the Federal Capital Territory. One hundred and twenty enumeration areas were studied in each of the states while sixty were covered in Abuja. The regression results show that education, gender, land size and household size are key determinants of participation in non-farm wage-employment activities, while value of assets, access to credit, social capital, household size and land size are the key determinants of non-farm self-employment activities.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design, Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique

This study used field survey research design by administering a questionnaire instrument in sourcing for primary data. The survey research involves gathering of data from selected sample drawn from the entire population to meet the research objectives. The population of study is 205 lecturers of ASUU-IBBUL (Yusuf, 2014). This population excludes lecturers who did not register with ASUU-IBBUL chapter. Out of the 205 elements of the population, 136 members were sampled using Yaro Yamene's formula for determining sample size as shown in the work of Kelechi (2008) in Ogbadu (2009).

$$\text{Therefore, } n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n is the sample size,
N is the population,
1 is constant and
e is level of significance (i.e. 0.05).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus, } n &= \frac{205}{1 + 205(0.05)^2} \longrightarrow n = \frac{205}{1 + 205(0.0025)} = \frac{205}{1 + 0.5125} \\ n &= \frac{205}{1.5125} = 135.54 \end{aligned}$$

or 136

The study used simple random sampling technique of probability sampling to select 136 subjects of the sample. In this sampling technique every element in the population has a known and equal chance of being selected as a subject (Cavan *et al.*, 2001). However, out of 136 questionnaires distributed and administered to respondents only 131 questionnaires were completed and returned to the researcher. Hence, data of 131 completed and returned questionnaires are used in this study.

3.2 Method of Data Collection

The data was collected by self administration of questionnaire with the help of research assistant approach. The unit of analysis for this study is individual members of ASUU-IBBUL. They consist of both male and female respondents. The questionnaire is close-ended type of questions that consist of dual choice questions which allow respondents to make quick decision. The close-ended questions are easy to interpret and code (Cavan *et al.*, 2001 & Araoye, 2004).

3.3 Instrument and Measurement Variables

The questionnaire designed for this study consists of two (2) main sections. Section A involves demographic questions about gender, age, marital status, dependency, educational qualification, period of contribution, nature of appointment, rank. But section B is questions in respect to measurement of independent and dependent variables of the study. The dependent variables are income diversification of

members of ASUU-IBBUL. On the other hand, the independent variables are individuals' characteristic and income level that includes gender, age, marital status, dependency, and educational qualification, and service period, nature of appointment, rank and annual income level. Data extracted from these variables are coded using binary coding system of 0 and 1. Binary coding system in most cases provides a good model that is fit for study and produces a robust regression result. **Alobo (2012)**, Javed *et al.* (2015) and Combarry (2015) used binary coding system.

3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire Instrument

In this study, face and content validity assessments by expert in this area of academic discipline were done, and ordinal rating scale was used to ensure proper adaptation of the questionnaire before a full-scale study. In order to measure the reliability of the questionnaire instrument, Cronbach's alpha reliability statistical test was conducted. The Cronbach alpha coefficient result tests for all the eight (8) variables or items are 0.568 which is acceptable. This is because Cronbach alpha values for scales less than ten items (i.e. short scales) is 5.0 and above. But, Cronbach alpha values for scales of ten items and above (i.e. long scales) is 7.0 and above (Pallant, 2001).

3.5 Method of Data Analysis

The coded data is analyzed using a mixture nominal/ordinal scale. Nominal scale split data into mutually exclusive (male and female or man or woman). Regression statistic will help in transforming primary data to secondary form that are inputted in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)-version 16. This is because this study uses logic linear regression due to dichotomous in dependent variable. The regression outcomes in form of Pearson correlation coefficient and regression results are analyzed and the hypotheses tested. Correlation tests the degree of association ($-1 \leq r \leq 1$) while regression tests the relationship/effect of independents variables on the dependent variable. The hypotheses of this study were tested at 1%, 5% and 10% significance level. The researcher therefore, rejects the null hypothesis if the result is at 1% (0.000 – 0.005), 5% (0.006 – 0.010) and 10% (0.011 – 0.099) significance level, otherwise the researcher accepts the null hypothesis because no sufficient reasons for rejection.

3.6 Model Specification

In this logic linear regression model, the dependent variable is income diversification while independent variables are individuals' characteristic and income level affecting income diversification. This model adapts the analytical framework of Idowu *et al.* (2011); **Alobo (2012)**, Javed *et al.* (2015), Combarry (2015) and Amanze *et al.* (2015) as shown below:

$$Y = \alpha + B_1GDR + B_2MrSt + B_3Dep + B_4EduQual + B_5SerPer + B_6Rank + B_7IncomePm + e$$

Where:

Y	=	Income Diversification
α	=	Constant or Intercept
$B_1, \dots, B_7$	=	Régression Coefficients
GDR	=	Gender (male/famale)
MrSt	=	Marital Status (single/married)
Dep	=	Dependency (children/wards)
EduQual	=	Educational Qualification
SerPer	=	Period of Service with ASUU-IBBUL
Rank	=	Rank
IncomePm	=	Income per month or Salary per month
e	=	Error term.

3.7 Techniques for Coding the Variables

The data collected through the questionnaires administered to respondents who are members of ASUU-IBBUL are coded using the techniques in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Description of Variables used in the Analysis

S/N	Variables	Definition
1	GDR	Gender [Female = 0, Male = 1]
2	MrSt	Marital Status [Single = 0, Married = 1]
3	Dep	If a lecturer do not have any person depending on him [No = 0; Other =1].
4	EduQual	Educational qualification. [? HND/B.Sc. Degree = 0 ; ? HND/B.Sc. Degree = 1]
5	SerPer	Period of services with ASUU-IBBUL [? 5 years = 0; ? 5 years = 1]
6	Rank	Lecturers' current position or rank in IBBUL [Graduate Assistant/Assistant lecturer/Lecturer II/Lecturer I = 0; Senior lecturer/Associate Professor/Professor = 1]
7	IncomePm	Income per month or Salary per month of lecturers [? N 300, 000= 0; ? ₦ 300, 000 = 1].
8	Y = Income Diversification	If a lecturer do not involve self in others jobs apart from teaching/research supervision/community development [No = 0; otherwise Yes = 1]

Source: Survey Research, 2014.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Results

The section presents and analyses the regression results of the model. It also tests the null hypothesis (Ho) relating to the variables of the study (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2: Summary of Regression Results

Model	Coefficients β	Standard Error	T	Significance Level
Constant (α)	-0.014	0.041	-0.328	0.743
GDR	-0.015	0.033	-0.441	0.660
MrSt	-0.068*	0.035	-1.955	0.053
Dependency	0.218***	0.039	5.517	0.000
Educational Qualification	0.064	0.082	0.785	0.434
Service period	0.795***	0.037	21.40	0.000
Rank	-0.015	0.032	8	0.639
Income per month	0.004	0.081	-0.470	0.961
R	0.950		0.049	
R ²	0.902			
Adjusted R ²	0.896			
F Statistics	161.199***			
Significance of F (P -alpha value = 0.000)	?	?	?	0.000
Durbin Watson	2.028			

Source: Author Computation using SPSS, 2015

Dependent variable: Income Diversification

*Significance Level: One percent (***), Five percent (**), Ten percent (*)*

Table 1.2 shows the values of estimated linear regression coefficients of dependency, educational qualification, service period and income per month in ASUU-IBBUL with constant β value of -0.060. Service period has the highest significant positive coefficient β value of 0.7904 with standard error of 0.037, t - value of 21.306 and significance level of 0.000 (1%). Thus, service period will significantly influence income diversification. Also, dependency has significant positive coefficient β value of 0.198

with standard error of 0.036, t - value of 5.456 and significance level of 0.000 (1%). Thus, dependency has significant positive influence on income diversification. This result is the same with the findings of Idowu *et al.* (2011), Combary (2015) and Amanze *et al.* (2015) that found dependency ratio significantly determine income diversification. Hence, dependency will significantly influence income diversification.

But, educational qualification has insignificant positive coefficient β value of 0.079 with standard error of 0.326, t - value of 0.326 and significance level of 0.745. Therefore, educational qualification of members has significant positive influence on income diversification. This result is different from the findings of Senadza (2014), Ghimire *et al.* (2014) Combary (2015) that identified significant effect of education on income diversification. So, the education qualification of members will insignificantly influence income diversification. Income also has insignificant positive coefficient β value of 0.079 with standard error of 0.326, t - value of 0.326 and significance level of 0.745. Hence, educational qualification of members has significant negative influence on income diversification. This result is different from the findings of Sekumade and Osundare (2012), Israr *et al.* (2014), Javed *et al.* (2015) that discovered significant effect of education on income diversification. So, the education qualification of members will insignificantly influence income diversification.

In diagnose test of the model, the values of R, R^2 and adjusted R^2 are 0.948, 0.898 and 0.895 respectively. The R^2 value is the coefficient of correlation that explains the relationship between the dependent and independent variables which is a strong positive relationship. In addition, the R^2 value tells us that 89.8 percent of the variation in the dependent variable (income diversification) is explained by the independent variables of the model. On the other hand, the adjusted R^2 statistic corrects the R^2 value to provide a better estimate of the true population. If you have a small sample you may wish to consider reporting adjusted R^2 is better than normal R^2 value (Pallant, 2001). The F statistic value (P-alpha) is 278.505 which is significant at 1% (0.000). There is statistical significant contribution as indicated by the Sig. F change value (0.000). This reveals that the model is fit for this study going by F statistic rule of fitness. The model provides a good fitness for study if the significance of F statistic value is less than 0.005 ($p < 0.005$) contributing to the prediction of the dependent variable (Pallant, 2001). The Durbin Watson (DW) value is 2.081 which is an evidence of relative serial correlation. If the value of DW is less than one (1) as rough rule of thumb, there may be cause for alarm. This means there are dual standards of measuring the model fitness. Looking at the model fitness, the model is fit for this study.

From the results of findings, service period and dependency have influence on income diversification which are both significant at 1%. Educational qualification and income of members have insignificant influence on income diversification. Other variables such as gender, age, marital status, nature of appointment and rank were unfit in the model. Thus, the researcher rejects the null hypotheses (H_{01} and H_{02}) for reason that the hypotheses are significant in the study.

4.2 Discussions of Findings

The regression results of the model shows that service period and dependency have significant influence on income diversification. The researcher therefore, rejects the null hypothesis. This is because the results are different from the null hypotheses (H_{01} and H_{02}) stating that service period and dependency have no significant influence on income diversification. This means service period and dependency will significantly influence income diversification. However, educational qualification and income of members have insignificant influence on income diversification. Other variables such as gender, age, marital status, nature of appointment and rank were unfit in the model. Therefore, these results are unique and contribute to knowledge by revealing that service period and dependency have significant correlation with income diversification as well as influencing income diversification in ASUU-IBBUL branch, Niger state.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Income diversification is a situation whereby individuals, households and lecturers do two or more occupations as alternative sources of income to improve their livelihood. In Nigeria, income diversification is inevitable because of rising responsibilities and challenges almost on daily basis. Family members need money for ceremonies/burials, payment of school fees, hospital bills and other unforeseen contingencies; aged parents need to be catered for and some members of community rely on you for

survival. Thus, income diversification reduces the risk of dwindling income. Despite the advantage of income diversification, governments (at all levels) have to implement policies on occupational diversification by civil servants as sometimes it conflicts with their duties and responsibilities during work hours. This is because some civil servants like lecturers are seen selling handouts, textbooks, clothing materials and others doing unrelated activities during work hours with intention to generate additional income.

Factors discovered and significantly caused income diversifications among university lecturers are service period and dependency responsibilities. This result is in harmony with the findings of Idowu *et al.* (2011), Combarry (2015) and Amanze *et al.* (2015) that found dependency ratio significantly determine income diversification. In a nut-shell, diversification reduces risk, so don't put all your eggs in one basket. The study therefore recommends that since dependency responsibility is one of the significant factors determining income diversification, government should encourage payment of salary promptly to avoid lecturers thinking of other sources of living apart from teaching/research supervision/community development in ASUU-IBB University, Lapai-Niger state, Nigeria.

5.1 Suggestions for Further Studies

The focuses of previous studies on income diversification were mostly farming occupation (agriculture, fishing and animal husbandry). This study on income diversification focused on Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU). Further studies should widen the scope of this study with more variables. Also, future studies should focus on Academic Staff Union of Polytechnics, Academic Staff Union of Colleges of Education, and Nigeria Union of Teachers etc.

References

- Adebayo, CO, Akogwu, GO & Yisa, ES 2012: Determinants of income diversification among farm households in Kaduna State: Application of tobit regression Model. *Journal of Production, Agriculture and Technology (PAT)*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 1-10, December, 2012. A publication of Nasarawa State University, Keffi.
- Ahmed, FF 2012: Income diversification determinants among farming households in Konduga, Borno state, Nigeria. *Academic Research International*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 555- 561, March, 2012.
- Alobo, S 2012: "Determinants of rural household income diversification in Senegal and Kenya". Part of unpublished Ph.D work from Lund University (Sweden).
- Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999.
- Demissie, A and Legesse, B 2013: Determinants of income diversification among rural households: The case of small holder farmers in Fedis district, Eastern hararghe zone, Ethiopia. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, Vol.5, No. 3: pp. 120-128, March 2013.
- Ebi, B, Okon, EN & Ubi, P 2013: Social capital and economic growth opportunities: A case study of rural households in Obudu, Cross River state, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Economics*, Vol.13, No. 2, pp. 13-16.
- Ghimire, R, Huang, WC & Rudra, BS 2014: Factors affecting nonfarm income diversification among rural farm households in Central Nepal. *International Journal of Agricultural Management and Development* 2014: Vol.4, No. 2, pp. 123-132.
- Israr, M, Khan, H, Jan, N & Ahmad, N 2014: Livelihood diversification: A strategy for rural income enhancement. *Journal of Finance and Economics*, Vol.2, No. 5, pp 194-198.
- Javed, S, Nadeem, AM, Rafique, MZ & Kamran, MA 2015: Determinants of income diversification among rural households of Pakistan, *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 6, No. 14, pp. 45- 49
- Ogbadu, EE 2009: Profitability through effective management of material. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, Vol.1, N0.4, pp. 099–1055.
- Olugbire, OO, Falusi, AO, Adeoti, AI & Oyekale, AS 2012: Determinants of non-farm income diversification among rural households in Nigeria. *Journal of American Science*, Vol.8, No. 1, pp.77- 82.
- Pallant, J 2001: *SPSS Survival Manual. A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using Statistical Package for Social Science*. First edition, Open University Press McGraw-Hill Education McGraw-Hill House Shoppen hangers Road Maidenhead Berkshire
- Senadza, B 2014: Non-farm income diversification in rural Ghana: Patterns and determinants. *African Development Review*, Vol.24, No. 3, pp. 233-244, September, 2012.

Sekumade, AB and Osundare, FO 2012: Determinants and effect of livelihood diversification on farm households in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development* Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 104- 110

Yusuf, IG 2014: The financial secretary, Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai.

Appendix Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error	Std. Error
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Income Diversification	131	1.00	.00	1.00	.3588	.48148	.596	.212	-1.671	.420
Dependency	131	1.00	.00	1.00	.5191	.50155	-.077	.212	-2.025	.420
Education Qualification	131	1.00	.00	1.00	.3664	.48367	.561	.212	-1.712	.420
Service Period	131	1.00	.00	1.00	.3740	.48573	.527	.212	-1.750	.420
Income per month	131	1.00	.00	1.00	.3664	.48367	.561	.212	-1.712	.420
Valid N (listwise)	131									

Correlation Matrix

		Income Diversification	Dependency	Education Qualification	Service Period	Income per month
Income Diversification	Pearson Correlation	1	.720**	.026	.935**	.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.771	.000	.771
	N	131	131	131	131	131
Dependency	Pearson Correlation	.720**	1	-.124	.649**	-.124
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.158	.000	.158
	N	131	131	131	131	131
Education Qualification	Pearson Correlation	.026	-.124	1	.001	.934**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.771	.158		.986	.000
	N	131	131	131	131	131
Service Period	Pearson Correlation	.935**	.649**	.001	1	.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.986		.986
	N	131	131	131	131	131
Income per month	Pearson Correlation	.026	-.124	.934**	.001	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.771	.158	.000	.986	
	N	131	131	131	131	131

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Author Computation using SPSS, 2015

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.	Regression	27.075	4	6.769	278.505	.000 ^a
	Residual	3.062	126	.024		
	Total	30.137	130			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Income per month, Personal Service, Dependency, Education Qualification

b. Dependent Variable: Income Diversification

Model Summary ^b										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		
1	.948 ^a	.898	.895	.15590	.898	278.505	4	126	.000	2.081

a. Predictors: (Constant), Income per month, Personal Service, Dependency, Education Qualification

b. Dependent Variable: Income Diversification

Coefficients ^a									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		95% Confidence Interval for B			Collinearity Statistics
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance VIF
1	(Constant)	-.060	.023		-2.578	.011			1 (Constant)
	Dependency	.198	.036	.207	5.456	.000	.562	1.779	Dependency
	Education Qualificatio	.026	.079	.026	.326	.745	.127	7.869	Education Qualification
	Personal Service	.794	.037	.801	21.306	.000	.571	1.750	Personal Service
	Income per month	.026	.079	.026	.326	.745	.127	7.869	Income per month

a. Dependent Variable: Income Diversification

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.686	5

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.700	4