

Olayemi J. ABIODUN-OYEBANJI¹

Olabamiji, A.E STEPHEN²

**Administrative, Social and Structural Factors as Predictors of Access to Public
University Education in Nigeria**

Received: 26 May 2025 / Accepted: 10 July 2025 / Published: 16 July 2025

© 2025 Olayemi J. Abiodun-Oyebanji

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15973832>

Abstract

Access to education is a human right phenomenon which is greatly encouraged by local, regional and international human rights declarations and other similar allied documents in the world. Despite this development, the manner in which access to education is fostered and provided varies from one country to another worldwide. In Nigeria, access to education, especially university education is hindered by numerous factors, some of which are legally created to boost it, but turn out to become issues due the ways they are implemented. Therefore, this study investigated the extent at which administrative, social and structural factors potentially influence access to university education in Nigeria. Therefore, to achieve the objectives of the study, one hundred and fifty (150) undergraduate students were selected as samples from University of Ibadan. Stratified sampling technique cum random sampling method was used for the selection of respondents for the study. A self-structured questionnaire titled ‘Administrative, Social and Structural Factors as Predictors of Access to University Education Questionnaire (ASSFPAUEQ)’ was used for collection of data. The coefficients cronbach alpha method of reliability was calculated and the instrument was found to be 0.752, 0.772 and 0.679 for administrative, social and structural factors respectively. Data collected was analysed through Pearson Product Moment correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis. The study discovered that all the independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of access to University education, and it was recommended that a complete review of the administrative, social and structural factors should be conducted in order make them more productive to increase access to university education in the country.

Keywords: *Access, Administrative Factors, Social Factors and Structural Factors*

¹ Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Email: cnalimba@mau.edu.ng

² Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Introduction

The issue of access to education is long recognised by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other similar allied documents promulgated locally and internationally, that everyone has the right to quality education. These documents evidently guaranteed the inalienable right of every individual to receive education as long as such a person is willing and ready for it. Therefore, guarantying access to education is promoting the right, opportunity or means of making education available within the reach of every citizen of a nation (Enaohwo, 2009). Access to education is the opportunity to facilitate entry as well as enrolment of learners to a given level of education. It also encompasses the retention of learners in the appropriate level of education to completion. The significance of education perhaps provoked nations across the globe to accept it as a tool for unlocking the unlimited opportunities at all levels of societal strata. Thus, education is the instrument for human capital development for advancement and transformation of societies. According to Alimba (2020), education ensures that the innate potentials of people are positively transformed to enhance their abilities and capabilities to make meaningful contributions to their personal improvement and the growth of their societies. Therefore, the achievement of laudable educational objectives demand that the issue of access should be given priority attention in the way it is planned, organised and implemented in a country. There are numerous factors influencing how education should be planned and delivered to enhance quality and promote access in societies. For instance, in Nigeria, achieving quality and access have been hindered by many factors, especially with regards to university education. Fabunmi (2003) posited that politics, economy, culture, technology and religion influence access at all levels of education in Nigeria. However, the ways and manner these factors play out vary from one country to another. Therefore, depending on how they are manifesting in a system, the devastating effects of the interplay of these factors will prevent people from gaining entrance into tertiary institutions, thereby thwarting access at that level of education in an unimaginable way in the country. It is important to note at this point that the increasing demand for university education without sufficient supply of spaces to absorb all the candidates that applied has implicated access to university education in a great measure. Also, the parameters employed as the measuring indexes coupled with the poor socio-economic conditions of parents, have made many candidates seeking admission to be denied of the opportunity.

In Nigeria, these measuring indexes in the forms of administrative factors, social factors as well as structural elements have severely hindered the attainment of access to education, due

to the they are implemented and the economic status with regards to the per capita income of consumers in the country. This development, therefore, runs contrarily to the provisions of Universal Declaration of Human Rights with respect to access to education. This is because many of the potential qualified university candidates are often prevented from gaining admission based on the existing parameters provided to promote equity and justice in the system. There are 170 universities in Nigeria, the federal and state governments own 43 and 48 respectively, while 79 universities are privately owned (Statista, 2021). Despite this, so many potential candidates that applied for admission will not be offered, especially in federal and state institutions because of availability of limited spaces with increasing demand for admission. Thus, many of the candidates that will be denied admission will have to rewrite the Unified Tertiary Matriculation Examination (UTME) in order to start seeking admission afresh. The denial, in most cases, are attributed to the existing criteria such quota system and carry capacity put in place universities to guide the conduct of admission exercise. The socioeconomic conditions of parents equally play a vital role in decision making process for the admission of children. Also, the social factors such as funding and school facilities often shape the selection process. This is because these factors contribute in large measures either to promoting access or causing it to shrink. However, this depends on the degree at which they are provided and their implementation patterns in a society. For instance, an average Nigerian is finding it difficult to cope with the subsidised tuition fees and other necessary fees payable in public universities; therefore, the decision to attend private universities is not an option because the fees are very high in the country. Therefore, those candidates that will rewrite the UTME, do so for the sake of seeking university education at a minimum cost bearing level in public institutions in the country. Table 1 showed the state of admission offered to candidates in relations to the number that applied in Nigeria.

Table 1: Number of Registered and Admitted Students in Nigeria (2015-2019)

Year	Number of Registered students	Number of students not admitted	Number of students admitted	Percentage of students not admitted
2015	1,475,600	952,744	522,856	65%
2016	1,592,462	1,031,537	560,925	65%
2017	1,722,269	1,155,628	566,641	67%

2018	1,653,127	1,069,877	583,250	65%
2019	1,886,509	1,273,952	612,557	68%

Source: Stears Business (2021)

From the Table, it is clear that the border line of the percentage of the number of students not offered admission from 2015 to 2019 ranges from 65% to 68%. Going by these indicators, the numbers of those candidates not admitted are far more than half of the candidates that applied for admission. This analysis critically reflects the need to examine the predicting factors to access to university education in Nigeria.

Statement and Conceptualisation of Hypotheses

The problem of access to university education around the world and particularly in Nigeria, is a serious one that contributes immensely to robbing societies of their capacities to produce highly skilled manpower that will make tangible contributions to the growth and development of their economies. In Nigeria, the issue has become a pathetic one in this contemporary time. This perhaps motivated Ojo (2008) to raise a fundamental question that why has higher education not served the cause of Nigeria's development. Ojo (2008) linked the answer to the worrisome issue of access, and indicated that Nigeria has not yet produced a critical mass of persons with the requisite generic skills needed to create the necessary paradigm shift that will bring about development of the country. Why this line of thought is factual, however, there are administrative, socioeconomic and structural factors inhibiting the capacity of tertiary institutions to accommodate more candidates by the way of offering them admission opportunity. The issues of quota system, catchment areas, carry capacity and the idea of educationally backward states were created to provide favourable atmosphere that will promote equity and equality in the educational system in order to enhance access. However, these factors have turned out to be terrible barriers to access to higher education in Nigeria. Abdu and Joshua (2019) observed that regardless of the fact that quota system created opportunities for disadvantaged states and provided special considerations for candidates from educationally disadvantaged states, the policy encouraged discrimination and undermined merit in university admission. Omeje, Egwa and Adikwu (2016) were of the opinion that quota system has inequitable effect on students' admission processes; bastardises admissions process, contributes to the production of low-quality graduates among others. The point is that the issues of quota system, carrying capacity, infrastructural facilities, funding and socioeconomic conditions of parents and their connections with access to education, especially university education, is not peculiar to Nigerian education system. These elements equally exist in

different forms in educational systems around the world. Fundamentally, quota system is not primarily unique to only the education system, it can also be used as a parameter in other areas of life endeavours such as politics. It was pointed out many parliamentary democracies that have implemented quotas of women to stand for election, include Germany, France, Belgium, Bolivia, Rwanda and Palestine. Such quotas have produced greater female representation in parliaments and changes in public policy and legislation that have an impact upon women's well-being (Encyclopedia, 2018).

This statement is insightful in the sense that it shows that quota system is being used in many countries and in other areas of life endeavours. Therefore, its outcome is a function of how it is implemented in a place. In Jordan, Woldegiorgis (2015) revealed that most Jordanian citizens see the Quota Law as a great assistance to the political representation and improvement of women in politics, while in Brazil, the state of Rio de Janeiro instituted preferential admissions policies for black and mixed-race students in 2011, this provision has already led to more than 200 lawsuits (Salmi and Bassett, 2012). India has by far the most elaborate system in the world, with quotas absorbing half of all the seats in some of its public universities (Salmi and Bassett, 2012). Thus, quota system and other administrative parameters such as carrying capacity, may not be completely bad, but the ingenuity of the implementers to judiciously employ these elements as expected to accomplish set goals is the major problem. In Nigeria, in tackling educational imbalance, the adoption of quota system, carrying capacity catchment areas amongst others have acted as a catalyst for promoting the achievement of this goal. However, due to how these elements are being implemented in educational systems, they resulted in the reproduction of mediocrity and inequalities in some places. For instance, Nwogu (2015) asserted that due to the existence and operations of these parameters all that the educational system is doing at present is to deepen already extremely high level of social inequality in Nigeria. Also, it was advanced that while originally intended to address differences in socio-economic and educational development among its 36 states, the Nigerian quota system is today accused by some people as promoting educational mediocrity and even curtailing development (Opara, 2017). These observations are obvious reflections of the fact that administrative factors were originally designed to promote equality, equity and egalitarianism in Nigerian educational system, but have along the line become a very big menace to the advancement of the system. The social and structural factors have always been there, however, in the recent times, they have been widened due to the dynamics of the forces politics, social and economic policies of government in the country. This development has

resulted in adverse consequences on the nature of decision making of government concerning the educational attainments of citizens, as well as parents on their wards. Therefore, given this development, it becomes essential to raise the following hypotheses, which are tested at 0.05 level of significance to empirically determine the potency and dynamics of these variables in connection with access to university education in Nigeria. The hypotheses are:

H0₁ administrative factors (quota system and carrying capacity) have no significant relationship with access to university education.

H0₂ social factors (educational funding and infrastructural facilities) will not significantly have relationship with access to university education

H0₃ structural factors (socio-economic status and economic condition) will not have significant relationship with access to university education.

H0₄ there will be no joint contribution among administrative factors (quota system and carrying capacity) social factors (educational funding and school infrastructural facilities) and structural factors (socio-economic status and economic conditions) on access to University education.

Scope of the Study

This study focuses on interrogating the relationship of administrative factors (i.e quota system and carrying capacity); social factors (i.e educational funding and school infrastructural facilities) and structural factors (i.e socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents) with access to university education. In doing this, the undergraduate students of University of Ibadan were used as samples for the study.

Review of Related Literature

The thematic issues germane to the study were reviewed to reflect on their relevance and to increase their understanding. Therefore, quota system is a policy that limits resource distribution and allocation on a specific proportion among its beneficiaries. According to Encyclopedia (2018), quota traditionally emerged from pragmatic discussions regarding the implementation of legislation or constitutional mandates to pursue equality among citizens. A clear fact about quota is that it has the force of the law, and therefore, should be observed in areas attributed to it. Abdu and Joshua (2019) asserted that quota system in education simply refers to allocating certain percentage of parameter or resources to different groups, mostly

which could be based on race or ethnicity as a selection method for admission into government own institutions. Thus, the criteria set up to govern the operations of quota are mostly gear towards the “pursue of equality among citizens”. Quota, therefore, is put in place to promote equity and guarantee equality in the distribution of educational resources in a plural society. It has to do with an attempt to provide a level playing ground for all categories of citizens, with particular emphasis on 'disadvantaged groups' rather than injured individuals (Lee, 1999). In Nigeria, the federal government guidelines for admission into government owned universities are based on the quota system, which is: 45% merit, 35% catchment/locality, and 20% educationally less-developed states, especially in the Northern states.

Despite the fact that this admission policy is meant to provide equitable access to federal and state institutions based on academic merit, residential zones, and discretion, the competition for admission for limited spaces has led to unintended practices such as cheating in prequalifying examinations, bribery for admission, manipulation of examination scores, and denial of admission. More importantly, some of the most competent students who have great potentials are often denied admission because of geographical constraints, discretion, or over-emphasis on science majors as opposed to arts in Nigeria. Quota system is highly disadvantageous in the sense that student from Northern states, that even scored less mark in matriculation examinations will be given admission at the expense of students from Southern states with higher marks. The implications of this development are that universities will be losing bright and more qualified students just because of quota system, and this will produce huge impact on the efficiency of the university system (Akpan and Undie, 2007), and the nature of outputs that will be turned out into the society. Carrying capacity is the maximum number of candidates that a particular institution can admit based on the available resources in a given academic session. Abdulkareem and Muraina (2014) posited that carrying capacity means that students are admitted based on the facilities available. They further indicated that these facilities include adequate lecture rooms, well stocked libraries, good staff/student ratio, accommodation, etc. The capacity of universities to admit candidates students is a function of the available institutional resources in a given academic session. The essence of this policy is to enhance quality and efficiency of the system. However, this policy has become an impediment to access to university education as universities are careful not to exceed this capacity by high margins in order not to incur sanctions from the Nigerian Universities Commission (Abdulkareem and Muraina, 2014). Therefore, no institution can admit above its carrying capacity, no matter the number of candidates that applied for admission. Also, there is the problem of absorption capacity, where the increasing number of students seeking

admission into universities far outpaces the rate of capacity expansion in Nigerian public universities.

Many students, based on this development, are discouraged from furthering their education, because it will be extremely difficult for them to secure admission, due to this challenge. The point is that carrying capacity limits access and may encourage increased anti-social behaviours practices among the youths that were denied admission. Equally, social factors such as funding and infrastructural facilities limit access to education. Shackman (2017) was of the opinion that social factors are any variable which arises from culture, environment, community, family, organization, society, government, the state, the media, technology, religion, ideology, discourse, language, communication, and which influences the individual to think and act in a certain way when taking decision regarding any choice of career, education or life matter.

These factors play dominant roles in the ways events are viewed, conducted and delivered. The nature of decision households will make at a particular time on access is going to be affected by these factors. Consequently, the expansion of educational system to accommodate more candidates is a function of the provision of these social elements such funding and school facilities in the country. Thus, enhanced funding will accomplish the expansion phenomenon of education. In the year 1999, a budget of 11.2% allocated to education was reduced to 5.9% in 2002 and 1.83% in 2003 (Aluede, Idogho and Imonikhe, 2012). Subsequently, the budget was increased and later continuously started declining from 10.7% in 2015, 7.9% in 2016, 7.4% in 2017, 7.04% in 2018, 7.05% in 2019, 6.7% in 2020 and 5.6% in 2021 (Premium Times, 2021). These figures are far below the 26% minimum standard recommended by UNESCO for emerging countries as the bench mark for educational development. The chronic under-funding of education, especially at the university level is one of the incidents that have intensified the manifestations of strike actions by lecturers, and protests by students in the recent times. The point is that funding will ultimately prevent the expansion of the educational system, which will dysfunctionally affect access to education. The insufficiency of infrastructure and equipment coupled with poor library and laboratory facilities have become a major threat to access to university education in Nigeria. According to Okebukola (2013), 15-30% of the infrastructure and equipment in Nigerian higher institutions especially in public establishments are outdated. Generally, the environment of classrooms, hostel facilities, libraries and the laboratories in public universities are obsolete and cannot adequately support teaching and learning process. In addition, the structural factors such as socioeconomic status and economic conditions of parents and potential candidates also

have bearing on access to education. Individual's or family's economic and social positions in relations to income, education and occupation as well as their present economic status contribute significantly to their educational attainments. According to World Bank Report (2022), in Nigeria, as many as 4 in 10 Nigerians live below the national poverty line. The high level of poverty in Nigeria has implications on the fact that many will find it difficult to afford to pay for their children's educational fees. Thus, it is evident that an average parent cannot afford to send their children to private universities, as alternative means of accessing tertiary education in the country. The incident of labour market failure (i.e low absorptive capacity of the economy) and unemployment tend to hinder access to education. Ajayi and Adeniji (2009) described unemployment as the basic cause of the failure in the educational system in Nigeria. In essence, the peculiarities of the administrative, social and structural factors to predict access to university education needs to be empirically tested and situated. Therefore, it becomes paramount to determine the extent at which these factors operate to underscore access to university education in Nigeria.

Methodology

The study is practically a descriptive research survey by design, and this design is adopted to critically examine individuals, groups, institutions, methods and materials in order to describe, compare, contrast, classify, analyse and interpret the entities and the events that constitute the various fields of enquiry (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). Therefore, the design was used to determine the potentialities of the administrative, social and structural factors to significantly predict access to university education. The study adopted a stratified sampling technique, which allowed the researchers to uniquely divide the population of the students into strata based on certain characteristics possessed by each group such as identifying the entrance pattern of students, whether through matriculation examination or direct entry, income capability of students etc. Subsequently, a random sampling method was used to select the undergraduate students used as sample for the study. Thus, a total of one hundred and fifty (150) undergraduate students were chosen from University of Ibadan, Nigeria. A structured questionnaire titled "Administrative, Social and Structural Factors as Predictors of Access to University Education (ASSFPAUEQ)", designed by the researchers was employed for data collection. Face and content validity were used to determine the validity of the instrument. This was conducted by using three scholars in the field of educational management to assess the questionnaire in order to determine its validity. The observations of the scholars were used as inputs in the final development of the questionnaire. A pilot test was conducted on

undergraduate students of Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH) to determine the reliability of the instrument. The estimated cronbach's alpha coefficients (α) of internal consistency of 0.752, 0.772 and 0.679 for administrative, social and structural factors were established. Thus, the pilot test indicated that the instrument is reliable to be used for the study. Data collected was analysed with Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis.

Results and Discussion

The tables and consequent explanations that follow represent results and its interpretations.

Hypothesis 1

Administrative factors with regards to quota system and carrying capacity do not have any significant relationship with access to university education.

Table 1a: Quota system and Access to University Education

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
Quota System	150	16.3667	2.45063	0.254	0.002	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 1a presented the results of the relationship between quota system and access to university education. The null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there was a significant relationship between quota system and access to university education ($r=0.254$; $p<0.05$.) This implies that quota system will considerably influence access to university education.

Table 1b: Carrying Capacity and Access to University Education

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
Carrying Capacity	150	15.8200	2.48504	0.155	0.000	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 1b revealed the results of the relationship between carrying capacity and access to university education. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, showing that there was significant relationship between carrying capacity and access to university education ($r=0.155$; $p<0.05$). This is an indication that carrying capacity can substantially affect access to university education.

Hypothesis 2

Social factors in the forms of educational funding and infrastructural facilities do not have any significant relationship with access to university education.

Table 2a: Funding and Access to University Education.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
Funding	150	16.0933	2.23561	0.182	0.026	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 2a indicated the results of the relationship between funding and access to university education. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there was a positive relationship between educational funding and access to university education ($r=0.182$; $p<0.05$). This is a reflection of the fact that funding is significantly related to access to university education.

Table 2b: School Infrastructural Facilities and Access to University Education

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
School Infrastructural Facilities	150	14.9067	3.47058	0.140	0.037	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 2b presented the results of the relationship between school infrastructural facilities and access to university education. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, signifying that there was a significant relationship between school infrastructural facilities and access to university education ($r=0.140$; $p<0.05$). This means that school infrastructural facilities will considerably predict access to university education.

Hypothesis 3

Structural factors such as socio-economic status and economic condition of parents do not have any significant relationship with access to university education.

Table 3a: Socio-Economic Status and Access to university Education

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
Socio-Economic Status	150	15.1133	2.52912	0.209	0.010	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 3a indicated the results of the relationship between socio-economic status of parents and access to university education. The result showed that the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there was positive relationship between socio-economic status of parents and access to university education ($r=0.209$; $p<0.05$). This means that socio-economic status of parents have the potential to significantly influence access to university education.

Table 3b: Economic Conditions and Access to university Education

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev	r	Sig.	P	Remark
Economic Conditions	150	16.0800	2.65593	0.124	0.012	< 0.05	Significant
Access to University Education	150	17.6200	2.18497				

Table 3b signified the results of the relationship between economic conditions of parents and access to university education. The result revealed that the null hypothesis was rejected, showing that there is a significant relationship between economic conditions of parents and access to university education. ($r=0.124$; $p<0.05$). This implies that the economic condition of parents relates significantly with access to university education.

Hypothesis 4: Administrative factors, social factors, and structural factors do not make any relative contributions to access to university education.

Table 4: Joint Contribution of Independent Variables on Access to University Education

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	10.005	1.861		5.375	.000
Quota system	.190	.074	.213	2.552	.012
Carrying capacity	.032	.079	.036	.400	.031
Funding	.051	.090	.053	.570	.050
Infrastructural facilities	.040	.060	.064	.672	.037
Socio-economic Status	.139	.071	.160	1.940	.043
Economic Condition	.030	.080	.037	.382	.028

a. Dependent Variable: Access to university education

Table 4 presented a Multiple Regression Analysis of the relative contributions of the variables to access to university education. The result clearly showed that all the factors (i.e independent variables) were found to be significant with access to university education. Also, it is explicit from the table that quota system made the highest contribution to access to university education at $\beta = 0.213$, $t(150)$, $p<0.05$; followed by socio-economic status of parents at $\beta = 0.160$, $t(150)$, $p<0.05$; and school infrastructural facilities at $\beta = 0.064$, $t(150)$, $p<0.05$. The next to school infrastructural facilities was educational funding at $\beta = 0.053$, $t(150)$, $p<0.05$; which is followed by economic conditions of parents at $\beta = 0.036$, $t(150)$, $p<0.05$ and lastly, carrying capacity at

$\beta = 0.036$, $t(150)$, $p < 0.05$. It can be observed that all the independent variables contributed significantly to access to university education. This is a revelation that administrative factors, social factors and structural factors were positive predictors of access to university education.

Hypothesis 5: *Administrative factors, social factors, and structural factors do not make any joint contributions to access to university education.*

Table 5: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	82.809	6	13.802	3.140	.006 ^b
	Residual	628.531	143	4.395		
	Total	711.340	149			
Model Summary						
Model		1				
R		.341 ^a				
R Square		.116				
Adjusted R Square		.079				
Std. Error of the Estimate		2.09650				

Table 5 showed the Regression Analysis of the joint contributions of administrative, social and structural factors to access to university education. The result revealed that the joint contributions of the factors (i.e independent variables) to access to university education were found to be significant at ($F(6, 143) = 3.140$; $R = 0.341$; $R^2 = 0.116$; $\text{Adj.}R^2 = 0.079$; $p < 0.05$). The result $R^2 = 0.116$ was an indication that the independent variables, which are: quota system, carrying capacity, educational funding, school infrastructural facilities, socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents accounted for 11.6% of the total variance. This means that all the factors have the potential to collectively influence access to university education. Thus, there is significant joint contributions of administrative, social and structural factors to access to university education in Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

The study found out that administrative, social and structural factors can significantly influence access to university education. Tables 1 to 3 measured the individual relationships of the independent variables with the dependent variable. Therefore, it was discovered that quota system, carrying capacity, educational funding, school infrastructural facilities, socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents respectively significantly predicted access to university education. Thus, the independent variables have positive linear connection with the dependent variable. Therefore, any adjustment on any of the independent variables will significantly affect the dependent variable. Table 4 expressed the relative contributions of administrative, social and structural factors on access to university education, and it was discovered that all the independent variables reliably predicted access to university education. Table 5 signified the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the variables considered in the study. The independent variables accounted for 11.6% of the total variance observed in relations to the dependent variable (i.e access to university education); leaving the remaining 88.4% to other factors that are not considered in the study. Also, it was uncovered that the combination of all the independent variables reliably predicted access to university education.

Thus, it is posited that administrative, social and structural factors were significantly related to access to university education. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Omeje, Egwa and Adikwu (2016) and Thorat (2006). According to Omeje, Egwa and Adikwu (2016), the quota system and the catchment areas are federal government policies formulated to bridge the gap between the educationally developed states and the educationally less developed states, and the impact of the quota system and catchment area policies on students' admission was to a high extent. This idea showed that quota system and catchment area policies greatly impacted on the admission of students into tertiary institutions in the country. Thus, these factors have the potential to influence access to university education. Thorat (2006) was of the opinion that the quota system policy in India has increased the enrollment rate of Scheduled Caste (SC) and Scheduled Tribe (ST) groups in higher institutions. The study noted that the proportion of SCs among total graduates increased from 3.3 percent in 1981 to 7.8 percent in 1990s, while that of Scheduled Tribe (ST) increased from 0.8 percent in 1981 to 2.7 percent in 1990s. This study critically revealed that quota system to a large extent influences the enrolment level of students, and therefore, it is a potent predictor of access to university education. Also, the issues of educational funding and school infrastructural facilities were

found to significantly influence access to university education. The studies of Karimi (2015) and Wanyama; Makatiani and Sifuna (2021) confirmed these findings. Karimi (2015) reported that the poor enrolment of university students in courses in Science and Technology was attributed to low funding. The Commission for University Education in Kenya in 2016 reported that only 29% of students were studying a course in Science and Technology, and Wanyama; Makatiani and Sifuna (2021) linked this development to poor funding of education. Therefore, they recommended that funding of public universities needs to be backed by a coherent policy which prioritizes quality and quantity in Science and Technology (Wanyama; Makatiani and Sifuna, 2021). Obviously, proper funding of education is germane to access to higher education worldwide. According to Kogan et al. (2006), the level, composition, and mechanisms of funding are part of a broader spectrum of governance arrangements that work towards helping the higher education sector achieve its three traditional goals of improving access, enhancing quality, and encouraging efficiency. Therefore, to achieve access to university education, funding is a crucial element, which should be given priority attention to achieve it. Equally, school infrastructural facilities were found to be significant to access to university education. This finding is in accord with the studies of Semako (2021); CAF Development Bank of Latin American (2016) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2009).

Semako (2021) posited that the provision, availability and utilisation of educational facility are major requirement in the accreditation of programmes/courses, admission of student and quality of teaching given to students in line with carrying capacity. Since educational facilities are connected to the admission of students, this mean that it has bearing the total number of students that will be offered admission at a particular time. Therefore, school infrastructural facilities are a function of access to education, whether at the lower or higher level. The CAF Development Bank of Latin American (2016) reported that **a good school infrastructure, with renewed spaces, makes it possible for children and youths that live in remote areas to study** and, that investments in school infrastructure have an essential role in solving access problems of students to the school system and to improve their performance. The UNICEF (2009) reported that the World Bank found that investments in school facilities in Peru to increase students' attendance rates. The point is that the availability of infrastructural facilities in schools will help to enhance the retention of students and contribute significantly to access to education, especially at the university level. This study also discovered that socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents have impact on access to university education. This finding was in tandem with the report of Organisation for Economic Co-

operation and Development(OECD)(2006) that social factors such as family income if they are not taken into consideration when awarding funding (including scholarships), can limit access of poorer students to higher education. Therefore, the socio-economic status of parents and their economic conditions are fundamental to the issue of access to education. Sidik and Satrianto (2020) observed that there was a significant positive effect of parental income, number of children and location of residence on the interest in continuing postgraduate education. Similarly, Li, and Qiu (2018) posited that family socio-economic status affects parents' educational expectations towards children and their educational participation. They further indicated that the socio-economic status of parents has a direct impact on children's quality of school attendance, education services children are receiving on market price, parental education participation, and children's academic behavior, and indirectly affects children's academic achievement. These findings are a testimony to the findings of this study, in the sense that access to university education has bearing on the socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents. Therefore, parents that are affluent are likely to send their children to alternative higher institutions if they are denied admission in government owned universities. These statements are true to the extent that in the United States, England, and Australia, for example, higher education participation rates are generally much higher for children of professional and upper income families when compared with those of working class and lower income homes(Paton, 2013 and Pell Institute, 2015)

Conclusion

This study investigated the relationship between quota system, carrying capacity, educational funding, school infrastructural facilities, socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents on one hand and access to university education on the other hand. The study has successfully come up with illuminating ideas on the factors that can predict access to education, more specifically access to university education, which has become a serious subject not only in Nigeria, but the world in general. It is clear that sometimes, access to university education can be hindered by some policies which are possibly legally designed to enhance it. These factors were critically examined to determine the extent at which they relate to access to university education. Therefore, the study showed that all the independent variables (i.e quota system, carrying capacity, educational funding, school infrastructural facilities, socio-economic status and economic conditions of parents) can individually, relatively and jointly influence access to university education. By implications, all the independent variables were significantly related to access to university education, which can be interpreted that each of the

variable has the potential to influence access to university education positively or dysfunctionally. For these variables to exert positive influence on access to university education, they must be implemented accordingly as improve the system. The idea is that it is possible to achieve greater access to university education, if administrative factors (i.e quota system and carrying capacity), social factors (i.e educational funding and school infrastructures) and structural factors (i.e socio-economic status and economic condition) were constantly improved or expanded. The expansion should be such that will be directed towards encouraging more students to gain admission into the system. However, it is important to acknowledge that government cannot overlook these factors if its policies concerning the issue of access to education at all level must be effected. The way the policies will be initiated, implemented and sustained will have bearing on the state of access to any level of education in a country.

Part from this, the finding that these variables have the potential to individually, relatively or jointly influence access to university education, therefore, give the impression that they are vital issues that should be given the level of attention required in order to make them available in the required quantity and quality for maximum sustenance of access to education, especially university education in the country. The issue of access to education is a human rights phenomenon, which demands that as many that are willing and ready to go school should not be denied the opportunity. This is because when access to any level of education that people are ready to consume is sustained and guaranteed, it will result in long term improvements in the productivity of the receiver, eradicate poverty, reduce unemployment promote proper health care and reduce inequality in societies. This is understandable because societal development goals are anchored on the nature of education provided for people. Therefore, education must be provided in such a way that it will promote inclusiveness and guarantee access. The consideration of administrative, social and structural factors in relations to access to university education is an awakening call to remind societies of the imperativeness of promoting access at all level of education in order to improve lives and consequently the growth of their societies. This critically brings out the fact that education is the bedrock of human and societal development. In view of this, the following recommendations become imperative:

- i. Quota System should be redefined in such a way that it will prevent inequality and promote merit in its implementation in education to encourage access and increase the number of people that will be offered admission in the university.

- ii. To increase the carrying capacity of tertiary institutions more structures and school facilities should be provided and quality and excellence should be ensured so that qualitative education can be provided for more students.
- iii. University education should be adequately and timely funded by the different levels of government. Private individuals or organizations such as Non Governmental Organisations, religion organizations and other philanthropists should be given the opportunity to support governments at various levels to ensure that education is properly funded to promote and improve access to education in the country.
- iv. Sufficient, qualitative and relevant infrastructure facilities should be provided to ensure access to university education in the country. This is because the expansion of school facilities is very important if access to education must be achieved. This should be done systematically to ensure that required and qualitative facilities are provided in the university setting.
- v. The government should ensure that the socio-economic conditions of people are improved by augment the per capita income of citizens. This can be achieved by improving the state of the economy through structural and technological overhauling of the nation. This is necessary because of the place of socio-economic conditions of people in the promotion of access in education.
- vi. Government should ensure that actions are taken to make it mandatory for all universities to establish distance-learning programme so that more students can gain access to university education. This will encourage workers, who do not have time to attend the regular type of education to enroll.

References

- Abdu, H. and Joshua, S. (2019) Quota system and University Admission in Nigeria: Equity Perspective. Being a Research Report Submitted to Centre LSD and Ford Foundation, Nigeria.
- Abdulkareem, A. Y and Muraina, M. B. (2014) Issues and Challenges of Access and Management of Admission in Universities in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(6):449-460
- Ajayi, K. and Adeniji, A. (2009). Access to university education in Nigeria. In B.G. Nworgu and E.I. Eke. (Eds.), *Access, quality and cost in Nigerian education* (Pp.35- 60). Published Proceeding of the 23rd Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education
- Akpan C.P. and Undie J.A. (2007). *Access to University Education in Nigeria: Issues and Problems. Access, Equity and Quality in Higher Education.*
- Alimba, C.N.(2020)Why, Where, When, And How To Domesticating Peace Education in the Educational System In Nigeria? *Philosophy of Education, Skhid* No. 5 (169) September-October: 28-38
- Aluede O., Idogho, P. O. and Imonikhe, J. (2012).Increasing Access to University Education in Nigeria: Present Challenges and Suggestions for the Future. *The African Symposium: An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network* , 3 (1).
- CAF Development Bank of Latin American(2016) The importance of having a good school infrastructure. Access on the June, 2022 from <https://www.caf.com/en/currently/news/2016/10/the-importance-of-having-a-good-school-infrastructure>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.

Encyclopedia (2018) Quotas. Retrieved on March 2022 from
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law/sociology-and-social-reform/sociology-general-terms-and-concepts/quotas>

Enaohwo, J.K. (2009). Access, Cost and Quality in Nigerian Education. In B.G. Nworgu & E.I. Eke (Eds.), Access, Quality and Cost in Nigerian Education (pp.3-19). Published Proceeding of the 23rd Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education.

Fabumi, M.(2003) Social and Political Context of Educational Planning and Administration, Ibadan: Distance Learning Centre, University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Karimi, K. F. (2015). Academic Programmes in Universities in East Africa: A catalyst to Development. International Journal of Higher Education., 4(3) 140-155 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.543/ijhe.v4n3p14>

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., and Henkel, M. (eds) (2006), Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study, Dordrecht, Springer.

Lee, R.A. (1999). The evolution of affirmative action. Public personnel management 28, 393-407

Li, Z. and Qiu, Z(2018) How does family background affect children's educational achievement? Evidence from Contemporary China. *The Journal of Chinese Sociology*, 5:13 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40711-018-0083-8>

Nwogu, G.A.I (2015) Barriers to Equality of Access to Educational Opportunity in Nigeria: A Philosophical Perspective. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(4):148-152

Ojo, G.O.(2008) Education Reformation in Nigeria. In Babalola,J.B; Popoola, L; Onuka, A; Oni, S; Olatokun, W and Aghoiahor R (eds) Reforming Higher Education in Africa. Higher Education Research and Policy Network, University of Ibadan.

Omeje, J.C.; Egwa, E.I. & Adikwu, V.O. (2016). Impact of quota system and catchment of education in universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. International Journal of Research in Education 9(4), 325-332.

Okebukola, P. A. (2013). An African perspective on rankings in higher education . Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education , 141.

Opara, J. (2017) University quota system – Pushing fairness or mediocrity? University World News, African Edition, 10 February,

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development(OECD)(2006) Funding Systems and Their Effects on Higher Education Systems: Country Study – Latvia. Accessed on June 2022 from <https://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/38308028.pdf>

Paton, G. (2013) Teaching in Primary schools still seen as a woman’s job. The Telegraph. Accessed on 10th May 2022 from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/Teaching-in-primary-schools-still-as-a-womans-job.html> (Accessed on 11/02/2013)

Premium Times (2021) Buhari’s 2021 budget share for education is Nigeria’s lowest in 10 years. Retrieved on May 2022 from <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/422829-buharis-2021-budget-share-for-education-is-nigerias-lowest-in-10-years.html>

Salmi, J. and Bassett, R.M.(2012) Opportunities for All? The Equity Challenge in Tertiary Education. Salzburg Global Seminars, October 2-7, Salzburg, Austria.

Semako, G.E.(2021) Educational Facilities and Quality Teaching in Universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science, 9(5): 01-07

Shackman, A. J. (2017). Dispositional negativity in the wild: Social context governs momentary emotional experience. Talk presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Psychological Science. Chaired by E. P. Lemay & R. Venaglia, Boston, MA.

Sidik, M.I and Satrianto, A.(2020) The Effect of Parents' Socio-Economic Status on Student Interest Continuing Postgraduate Education. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 152:297-309

Statista (2021) society, education and science. Retrieved on April 2022 from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1130701/number-of-universities-in-nigeria/>

Steers Business (2021) Why 65% of students who write JAMB fail to secure admission. Accessed on May, 2022 from <https://www.steersng.com/article/why-65-of-students-who-write-jamb-fail-to-secure-admission/>

The Pell Institute (2015) Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States. Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. United States. Retrieved on February 20, 2022 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555865.pdf>

Thorat, S.(2006) Affirmative Action in India. Overseas Development Institute, Policy Brief 14, UK Department for International Development, Britain.

UNICEF United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2009). 'Location, design and construction'. In: *Child Friendly Schools Manual*. New York: UNICEF. Retrieved from: <https://www.unicef.org/media/66486/file/Child-Friendly-Schools-Manual.pdf>

Wanyama, B.W; Makatiani, M.I and Sifuna, D.N.(2021) Influence of Funding on Students' Participation in Science and Technology Bachelor Degree Programmes in Public Universities, Kenya. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 11(3): 12-26

Woldegiorgis, A.(2015) The Jordanian Attitude Towards the Women's Quota System. Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection. 2059. https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2059

World Bank (2022) Deep Structural Reforms Guided by Evidence Are Urgently Needed to Lift Millions of Nigerians Out of Poverty. Retrieved on June 2022 from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2022/03/21/afw-deep-structural-reforms-guided-by-evidence-are-urgently-needed-to-lift-millions-of-nigerians-out-of-poverty>