

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

Beyond the Credit Hour: Aligning Nigerian Graduate Education with Global Standards for Rigorous Research

ALUKO, Joel Ojo, JIBRIL, Nda Umar & ONASOGA Olayinka Abolore

<https://doi.org/10.54908/iljs.cisp2026.10.01.029>

Abstract

The debate about Nigerian graduate education is often framed as a choice between credit-hour programmes and research-intensive training. This policy analysis argues that the credit hour is not a cause of weak research performance. It is an administrative measure of student workload that coexists with productive doctoral systems, including the United States. The policy problem is how coursework, supervision, funding, infrastructure, research integrity, milestones, and programme accountability are configured and implemented. Using a structured comparative review of policy documents, statistical reports, quality codes, and peer-reviewed studies published from 2021 to July 2026, the paper compares Nigeria with the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, India, South Africa, Brazil, and African Centres of Excellence. Evidence shows that successful systems combine coursework with research immersion, accountable supervision, funded research environments, external examination, progress review, transferable-skills development, and programme-level evaluation. Nigerian evidence links low productivity more strongly to inadequate funding, limited research time, weak mentorship, deficient facilities, and fragmented research support than to credit accounting. The paper therefore proposes a dual architecture: retain credits for taught and transferable skills components, but make progression and graduation dependent on verified research competencies and milestone completion. Recommended reforms include a national graduate research quality framework, doctoral schools, supervisor accreditation and workload limits, student and project funding, shared research infrastructure, digital repositories, external examination, programme data dashboards, and phased performance-based review. Nigeria should move beyond treating credits as sufficient evidence of doctoral quality, rather than eliminating credit hours. Alignment with global standards requires research ecosystems, transparent governance, and enforceable outcomes.

Keywords: Graduate education, Credit hour, Research quality, Policy analysis.

Introduction

Graduate education is a central component of a national research and innovation system. It prepares advanced professionals, renews the academic workforce, supports public policy, and produces knowledge that can be translated into social and economic value. The global environment in which graduate education now operates has become more demanding. Research is increasingly collaborative, data-intensive, interdisciplinary, digitally mediated, and evaluated through explicit standards for integrity, reproducibility, societal relevance, and international visibility. Comparative education reporting also places doctoral education within wider systems of financing, participation, mobility, and labour-market outcomes (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2024). UNESCO reported that global research expenditure increased by 19.2% between 2014 and 2018 and that the worldwide researcher population grew by 13.7%, although research capacity remained highly concentrated and 80% of countries still invested less than 1% of gross domestic product in research and development (UNESCO, 2021). These inequalities mean that graduate reform in Nigeria must address the institutional conditions under which research is undertaken, not only the formal structure of curricula.

The reviewed version of this article correctly identified important weaknesses in Nigerian postgraduate education, including inadequate funding, weak supervision, deficient laboratories and libraries, limited international exposure, fragmented governance, and the migration of experienced academics. Its central weakness, however, was the treatment of the credit-hour system as the primary cause of low research quality. That argument cannot be sustained comparatively. Credit hours are used in the United States, where universities awarded 57,862 research doctorates in 2023 and 79% of those doctorates were in science and engineering fields (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics [NCSES], 2024). A credit-based system can therefore coexist with extensive research infrastructure, funded assistantships, rigorous candidacy procedures, original dissertations, external scholarly scrutiny, and strong publication cultures.

The relevant distinction is between an administrative unit and a quality-assurance architecture. A credit hour records an estimated volume of student work. It does not determine whether a doctoral candidate receives adequate supervision, has access to laboratories or data, completes defensible research milestones, follows ethical and open-science practices, or produces an original contribution. Current United States guidance defines a credit hour as an institutionally determined amount of student work approved through accreditation and expressly allows institutions to set higher standards or use other academic measures for non-federal purposes (U.S. Department of Education, 2025). Consequently, the policy question is not whether Nigeria should abolish credit hours. It is whether credits have been allowed to function as a substitute for evidence of research competence and whether the wider research ecosystem supports rigorous inquiry.

This article retains the original concern with global alignment but reframes the diagnosis. It argues that weak research performance is better explained by implementation failure and ecosystem constraints than by the existence of credits. It then uses recent comparative evidence to identify the institutional arrangements that make research-intensive graduate education possible. The resulting proposal is a dual architecture in which credits remain useful for taught components, while research progression and graduation are governed by competencies, milestones, independent assessment, and programme-level accountability.

Aim and Policy Questions

The aim of this policy analysis is to develop an empirically grounded framework for aligning Nigerian graduate education with current global standards for rigorous research without attributing research weakness to the credit-hour system itself. The analysis addresses four questions. First, what does comparative evidence show about the relationship between credit-based curricula and research-intensive doctoral education? Second, which institutional factors most plausibly constrain research quality and productivity in Nigeria? Third, which policy mechanisms used in other national systems are transferable to the Nigerian context? Fourth, how can Nigeria implement reform in a phased, financially realistic, and accountable manner?

Methodology

This article is a comparative policy analysis based on a structured review of recent secondary evidence. It is not presented as a systematic review or meta-analysis, and it does not report original survey or interview data. The method was designed to improve transparency, analytical discipline, and reproducibility while remaining appropriate for a policy paper.

The evidence searches covered publications issued from January 2021 to 28 July 2026. Targeted searches were conducted through official government and regulatory portals, international organisation repositories, university-sector bodies, and accessible peer-reviewed publisher platforms. Search terms combined the concepts doctoral education, graduate research quality, credit hour, doctoral supervision, research funding, programme evaluation, research integrity, Nigeria, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, India, South Africa, Brazil, and African Centres of Excellence. Sources were included when they met four criteria: publication within the stated period; direct relevance to doctoral governance, research training, supervision, funding, infrastructure, assessment, or quality assurance; institutional authority or transparent empirical methods; and online accessibility sufficient for verification. Opinion pieces without a disclosed evidence base, sources published before 2021, duplicate reports, and documents concerned only with undergraduate teaching were excluded.

The final evidence base comprised 16 sources: two peer-reviewed empirical studies focused on Nigerian research conditions and fourteen official, statistical, regulatory, or sector reports from national and international organisations. Countries were selected purposively to represent different governance models and levels of development. The United States provides a direct counterexample to the claim that credit hours prevent research intensity. The United Kingdom and Germany illustrate funded doctoral training and institutional quality frameworks. India demonstrates the combination of minimum coursework credits with research advisory committees and recurring progress review. South Africa provides an African system with national doctoral statistics and qualification standards. Brazil illustrates programme-level periodic evaluation. The World Bank-supported African Centres of Excellence provide a regional example of concentrated investment, accreditation, mobility, and research output.

Analysis proceeded in three stages. First, the Nigerian problem was disaggregated into inputs, processes, outputs, and governance. Inputs included finance, facilities, databases, staffing, and researcher time. Processes included supervision, methods training, ethics, milestone review, collaboration, and examination. Outputs included theses, publications, completion, research impact, and graduate destinations. Governance included regulation, programme approval, data reporting, incentives, and accountability. Second, comparable mechanisms were extracted from each international case. Third, those mechanisms were assessed for relevance, feasibility, equity implications, and compatibility with Nigeria's existing university and TETFund structures.

The method has limitations. National systems are internally diverse, reported statistics are not always based on identical definitions, and policy documents may describe formal expectations more clearly than actual practice. Causal claims are therefore made cautiously. International arrangements are treated as policy options rather than templates for direct transplantation. The analysis identifies plausible mechanisms supported by comparative evidence, but local pilots and subsequent evaluation are required before nationwide implementation.

Reframing the Policy Problem: Beyond a False Choice

A credible reform argument must distinguish three concepts that were previously conflated: credits, coursework dominance, and research quality. Credits quantify learning volume. Coursework dominance describes a programme design in which taught modules occupy disproportionate time or carry most progression consequences. Research quality concerns the originality, methodological robustness, integrity, transparency, and significance of scholarly work. These concepts can interact, but they are not interchangeable.

The United States makes the distinction clear. Federal guidance defines credits primarily for workload and student-aid purposes, while institutions and accreditors determine programme requirements and may impose higher or alternative academic standards (U.S. Department of Education, 2025). Research doctorates are separately defined through the expectation of an original intellectual contribution and a dissertation or equivalent research product. The scale of United States doctoral production, including 57,862 research doctorates in 2023, demonstrates that credit accounting does not

preclude research intensity (NCSES, 2024). The decisive variables are the resources, incentives, supervision, admissions standards, research culture, and assessment mechanisms surrounding the credits.

India offers a second counterexample. Its 2022 doctoral regulations require a minimum of 12 credits of coursework, including research methodology and research and publication ethics. At the same time, every scholar must have a Research Advisory Committee, present progress each semester, undergo plagiarism screening, and submit the thesis to external evaluation (University Grants Commission [UGC], 2022). The policy combines credits and research milestones rather than treating them as substitutes. South Africa similarly expresses qualifications through credit values, including doctoral qualifications, while national standards and institutional processes govern the level and quality of research. In 2023, South African public universities enrolled 25,475 doctoral students and produced 3,620 doctoral graduates, with a proxy doctoral graduation rate of 14.2% (Department of Higher Education and Training [DHET], 2025). These examples disprove a general structural claim against credits.

The problem in Nigeria is more precise. Credits may become harmful when institutions count course completion as sufficient evidence of graduate quality, when research is deferred until late in the programme, or when students receive credits for nominal seminars and methods courses without demonstrating competence. In such circumstances, the failure lies in programme design and implementation. Eliminating credits without correcting funding, supervision, infrastructure, research integrity, and accountability would change the unit of measurement while leaving the production system intact.

A stronger theoretical position is therefore ecosystem-based. Research quality is produced through the interaction of adequate inputs, well-designed processes, credible assessment, and accountable governance. Under this model, the expected effect of credits is conditional rather than causal. Credits can support quality when they are attached to substantive methods training, laboratory rotations, fieldwork, data stewardship, ethics, academic writing, and transferable skills. They can weaken the quality when they reward attendance or examination performance without authentic research tasks. The reform objective should be to limit the evidentiary role of credits and strengthen direct evidence of research capability.

Empirical Diagnosis of Nigerian Graduate Research

Recent Nigerian evidence supports an ecosystem diagnosis. Igiri et al. (2021) surveyed 2,350 academics and researchers across 66 universities, research institutes, and polytechnics in Nigeria's six geopolitical zones. Among the challenges reported by respondents, 42.98% identified a lack of research funding, 17.11% identified brain drain, and 8.85% identified a lack of motivation. More than half of the respondents reported publishing at least one article only once every two years. Although the study relied partly on self-reported data and covered researchers beyond postgraduate programmes, its national spread and sample size provide a more credible basis for policy discussion than unsupported generalisation.

A complementary study of social science research found that Nigeria has a substantial research community and produces a meaningful volume of peer-reviewed work, but that output remains below the country's potential because inputs, research time, institutional support, and coordination are weak (Egbetokun et al., 2022). This finding is analytically important. It shows that the problem is not an absence of scholarly capacity. It is the system's low efficiency and uneven quality that convert human talent into sustained, visible, and societally useful research.

Funding and Research Time

Research-intensive graduate education requires predictable funding at three levels: the candidate, the project, and the institution. Candidate funding supports living costs and protects time for research. Project funding pays for data collection, laboratory materials, fieldwork, software, dissemination, and ethical compliance. Institutional funding maintains laboratories, libraries, research offices, repositories, grant-management systems, and technical staff. Nigerian interventions have often focused on discrete grants or infrastructure projects, without consistently financing the full research pathway. A laboratory cannot produce high-quality theses if reagents are unavailable, equipment is not maintained, supervisors are overloaded, and candidates work full-time elsewhere to finance their studies.

The global context makes this deficiency consequential. UNESCO (2021) showed that research expenditure and researcher numbers were expanding worldwide, but resources remained concentrated in a small group of economies. Nigerian universities, therefore, compete in an environment where

well-funded systems can provide doctoral stipends, research assistants, laboratory technicians, data specialists, and publication support. The issue is not that every Nigerian programme must replicate the expenditure of a wealthy research university. It is that programmes should admit candidates only when the minimum resources for the proposed research can be demonstrated.

Supervision, Mentorship, and Workload

Supervision is the principal mechanism through which doctoral standards are interpreted in practice. Weakness arises when supervisory appointments are based only on rank, when workloads are uncapped, when feedback is delayed, or when a single supervisor controls progression without review. The Nigerian evidence on lack of mentorship and limited research support is consistent with this concern (Igiri et al., 2021). The problem is intensified by academic migration, uneven distribution of senior researchers across institutions and disciplines, and the absence of routine supervisor development.

Research-intensive systems increasingly treat supervision as an institutional responsibility rather than a private relationship. European doctoral policy now emphasises structured supervision, candidate support services, and career development within doctoral schools and programmes (Marti & Peneoasu, 2025). India requires a committee for each scholar rather than relying exclusively on one supervisor, while semester progress presentations create a documented opportunity for correction (UGC, 2022). Nigeria can adapt these mechanisms through co-supervision, supervisory panels, workload limits, and escalation procedures that protect both candidates and standards.

Infrastructure, Data, and Digital Research Capacity

The original article correctly identified outdated laboratories, weak library access, unstable connectivity, and limited access to journals and databases. These conditions affect different disciplines differently. Laboratory sciences require equipment, consumables, safety systems, and calibration. Social sciences require reliable data access, fieldwork funding, software, and secure data management. Humanities require archives, digitised collections, and research libraries. Across disciplines, candidates now require reference management, statistical or qualitative analysis tools, research data management, cybersecurity, and responsible use of artificial intelligence.

Infrastructure policy should therefore move from isolated procurement to lifecycle management. Procurement decisions should include utilisation plans,

technical staffing, maintenance contracts, power requirements, consumables, user access rules, and performance reporting. Shared regional facilities are preferable where sophisticated equipment would be underused by a single institution. Digital repositories and persistent researcher identifiers can also improve discoverability, reduce duplication, and preserve theses and datasets.

Research Integrity and Assessment

A thesis can satisfy formal length and formatting requirements while remaining methodologically weak. Quality assurance must therefore examine the research process, not only the final document. Minimum safeguards include approved protocols, ethics review where applicable, data-management plans, documented analysis, originality screening, transparent use of artificial intelligence, pre-submission seminars, and independent examination. Publication requirements should be used cautiously. Requiring an article can encourage scholarly communication, but a rigid rule may also drive candidates toward predatory journals or superficial salami publication. The stronger standard is a defensible original contribution assessed by competent independent experts, with publication support and journal-quality guidance.

Current global frameworks increasingly combine institutional responsibility with external scrutiny. The 2024 UK Quality Code frames academic standards and quality enhancement as responsibilities that providers must evidence through coherent processes (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education [QAA], 2024). Brazil's CAPES system evaluates graduate programmes periodically and publishes programme ratings, connecting programme performance with national oversight rather than leaving quality to individual theses alone (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior [CAPES], 2026). Nigeria requires a comparable shift from episodic accreditation toward continuing programme evidence.

Governance, Incentives, and Data Deficits

Fragmented responsibility weakens implementation. The National Universities Commission regulates programme standards, TETFund finances major interventions, universities control admissions and supervision, professional bodies influence some disciplines, and external examiners assess theses. These roles are individually legitimate but are not always connected through a shared graduate research performance framework. Consequently, the system lacks a consistent national dataset on doctoral admissions, funding status, supervisory

loads, time to degree, attrition, examination outcomes, publications, research integrity cases, employment destinations, and international collaboration.

Incentives also matter. When promotion systems reward publication counts without sufficient attention to quality, academics may prioritise volume. When departments receive reputational benefits from enrolment and completion but bear few consequences for attrition or poor examination, throughput can dominate. When candidates pay fees for extended periods, institutions may have conflicting incentives regarding timely completion. Policy reform must align incentives with credible outputs, ethical conduct, timely completion, and demonstrable societal or scholarly contribution.

Comparative Policy Evidence and Transferable Lessons

United States: Credit Accounting Plus Research Intensity

The United States is the most important comparator because it directly contradicts the claim that credit hours inherently undermine doctoral research. Credits are widely used, but doctoral quality is built through selective admission, funded research groups, laboratory or field immersion, qualifying examinations, candidacy, dissertation committees, research assistantships, and an original dissertation. NCSES data show both the scale and disciplinary breadth of the system: 57,862 research doctorates were awarded in 2023, and 79% were in science and engineering (NCSES, 2024). The lesson for Nigeria is not to copy a decentralised American model wholesale. It is to recognise that workload metrics and research standards perform different functions. Nigerian regulation should state explicitly that credit completion is necessary only for specified taught components and is never sufficient for the award of a research degree.

United Kingdom and Europe: Quality Codes, Doctoral Structures, and Career Development

The United Kingdom combines institutional autonomy with sector-wide reference points. The 2024 UK Quality Code articulates principles for securing academic standards and enhancing quality, while UK Research and Innovation reorganised doctoral funding around focal and landscape awards and announced more than £500 million for doctoral studentships in 2024 (QAA, 2024; UK Research and Innovation [UKRI], 2024). The funding model is linked to expectations for recruitment, training, research outcomes, and wider professional development.

Across Europe, doctoral schools have become important organisational structures for supervision, training, candidate services, mobility, and career development. European sector reviews emphasise structured doctoral provision, supervisory practice, candidate support services, and preparation for diverse careers rather than treating the doctorate as an isolated apprenticeship (European University Association, 2022; Marti & Peneoasu, 2025). Nigeria can adopt the organisational logic of doctoral schools without creating expensive new bureaucracies. A doctoral school can be a coordinated institutional platform that provides common methods courses, ethics training, data support, supervisor development, milestone monitoring, and international partnerships across faculties.

Germany: Concentrated Funding and Structured Research Training

Germany's Research Training Groups demonstrate how competitive funding can build cohorts around defined research themes. In 2024, the German Research Foundation approved 17 new groups with approximately EUR123 million for an initial five-year period and reported funding 214 groups in total, including 26 international groups (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft [DFG], 2024). These groups combine high-level disciplinary research with structured training and, in some cases, international partners. The transferable lesson is the value of concentration. Rather than dispersing limited funds across every department, Nigeria should fund competitive thematic doctoral clusters with clear staffing, infrastructure, candidate support, and output commitments.

India: Credits Combined with Advisory Committees and Milestones

India's 2022 regulations show that coursework credits can be retained while research governance is strengthened. The framework requires at least 12 coursework credits, including research methodology and research and publication ethics. It also creates a Research Advisory Committee for every doctoral scholar, requires semester progress presentations, mandates integrity screening, and provides for external thesis evaluation (UGC, 2022). This combination is directly relevant to Nigeria because both systems include large, diverse higher education sectors and uneven institutional capacity. The practical lesson is to attach credits to demonstrable competencies while making progression dependent on committee-reviewed research milestones.

South Africa: National Statistics and Qualification-Level Accountability

South Africa provides a regional comparator with a differentiated university system and formal qualification standards. Public universities enrolled 25,475 doctoral students and awarded 3,620 doctorates in 2023. The reported proxy graduation rate for doctoral qualifications was 14.2% (DHET, 2025). These data do not prove quality by themselves, but their regular publication makes system performance visible and supports planning. Nigeria's immediate lesson is the need for a national graduate education data system that reports enrolment, completion, field, gender, institution, funding, and time-to-degree using stable definitions.

Brazil: Periodic Programme Evaluation

Brazil's CAPES model evaluates *stricto sensu* graduate programmes through disciplinary committees and periodic national review. Results of the 2021-2024 evaluation were published in 2026, with programme scores, reconsideration procedures, and public reporting mechanisms (CAPES, 2026). The central policy insight is that quality should be assessed at the programme level, not inferred solely from institutional accreditation or individual thesis examination. A programme that repeatedly shows excessive attrition, weak outputs, inadequate supervision, or integrity failures should enter improvement status, face reduced admissions, or lose approval.

African Centres of Excellence: Regional Scale and Accountable Investment

The African Centres of Excellence programme demonstrates that research capacity can be built within African universities when investment, specialisation, regional collaboration, accreditation, and measurable outputs are connected. By 2025, the programme had established more than 80 centres in over 50 universities across 20 countries, enrolled more than 90,000 students, including 7,650 doctoral candidates, supported over 130 internationally accredited programmes, and generated more than 10,350 internationally peer-reviewed publications (World Bank, 2025). These figures are programme-reported and should not be interpreted as an independent causal evaluation. They nevertheless show the scale that can be achieved through concentrated, monitored, cross-border investment. Nigeria should expand participation in such networks and apply similar accountability to nationally funded centres.

A Policy Framework for Nigeria

The evidence supports a reform strategy that moves beyond the credit hour as the dominant proof of academic progress while retaining it where it remains useful. The proposed model has two connected layers. The taught layer uses credits for advanced theory, research methods, ethics, data analysis, academic writing, pedagogy, innovation, and professional skills. The research layer uses verified milestones and competencies. No candidate should graduate because a prescribed number of credits has been accumulated. Graduation should require an independently examined original contribution and a documented record of responsible research practice.

National Graduate Research Quality Framework

The National Universities Commission, in collaboration with universities, TETFund, professional bodies, research institutes, employers, and doctoral candidates, should establish a National Graduate Research Quality Framework. The framework should specify minimum outcomes rather than impose a uniform curriculum. Required outcomes should include advanced disciplinary knowledge, methodological competence, ethical judgement, data stewardship, capacity to communicate research, ability to situate findings within international literature, and evidence of an original contribution.

The framework should distinguish master's degrees by coursework, professional master's degrees, research master's degrees, professional doctorates, and research doctorates. Different awards require different balances of taught learning and research, but each must have explicit outcome statements. Universities should retain autonomy to exceed the minimum and to design discipline-appropriate routes.

Milestone-Based Progression

Doctoral progression should be organised around a national minimum sequence with room for disciplinary adaptation. The sequence should include: an approved research concept and resource plan at admission; completion of required methods and integrity training; confirmation of candidature after proposal defence; ethics approval where applicable; annual or semester progress review; data or evidence audit; pre-submission seminar; originality and integrity checks; independent external examination; and oral defence where required. Each milestone should have written criteria, a decision record, corrective actions, and an appeal route.

Credits may be attached to methods courses, laboratory rotations, fieldwork preparation, or transferable skills, but milestone decisions should be based on performance. For example, passing a statistical methods course should not substitute for demonstrating that the candidate can select, justify, execute, and interpret an analysis appropriate to the thesis.

Doctoral Schools and Research Clusters

Universities with sufficient scale should establish doctoral schools or equivalent coordinated structures. Smaller institutions should form regional or thematic consortia. These structures should pool methods teaching, integrity training, data services, writing support, grant development, and career preparation. They should also maintain candidate records and intervene when supervision fails.

Competitive national funding should support thematic research clusters in areas linked to Nigeria's scientific, social, cultural, industrial, and policy priorities. Selection should be based on demonstrated supervisory capacity, infrastructure, partnerships, data access, and a credible candidate-support plan. Funding should be multi-year and subject to mid-term review. Concentration is necessary because distributing small amounts to every programme may create formal inclusion without research viability.

Supervisor Accreditation, Teams, and Workload Limits

Supervision should be recognised as specialised academic work. Eligibility should require recent research activity, integrity training, supervision development, and knowledge of institutional procedures. New supervisors should work within teams before serving as principal supervisors. Every doctoral candidate should have at least two supervisors or a supervisor plus an advisory panel, with one member independent of the immediate unit where feasible.

Universities should publish maximum supervisory loads by discipline and degree level. Workload allocation must account for the intensity of laboratory, field, clinical, creative, and data-intensive research. Annual candidate feedback should be reviewed at programme level, not used as the sole measure of supervisor performance. Persistent delay, non-response, conflict of interest, or ethical breach should trigger remediation or suspension of supervisory eligibility.

Funding Reform

TETFund and other public funders should move toward integrated graduate research packages. TETFund's annual reporting provides an institutional base from which more transparent graduate-research funding, utilisation, and outcome reporting can be developed (Tertiary Education Trust Fund [TETFund], 2023). A package may combine a candidate stipend or fee support, project costs, supervisor or technical support, infrastructure access, research dissemination, and institutional indirect costs. Competitive selection should be transparent and should protect equitable access across regions, institutions, disciplines, gender, and disability status.

Funding should be released against verified milestones rather than calendar time alone. Institutions should report expenditure, outputs, delays, and equipment utilisation. Programmes should not admit candidates into resource-intensive projects without a documented funding and facility plan. Private-sector and philanthropic participation should be encouraged, but academic independence, publication rights, conflict-of-interest disclosure, and data governance must be protected.

Shared Infrastructure and Digital Transformation

Nigeria should develop a network of shared research facilities rather than replicate expensive equipment in every university. Each facility should publish access rules, pricing or subsidy arrangements, maintenance status, technical expertise, and utilisation data. National procurement should prioritise interoperability, service contracts, spare parts, power resilience, and technician training.

Every approved doctoral programme should provide access to current scholarly literature, institutional repositories, plagiarism and similarity tools, secure data storage, statistical or qualitative software, and research data management support. Theses should be deposited in interoperable repositories with persistent identifiers, subject to ethical or security restrictions. Open science should be promoted through appropriate data and protocol sharing, while recognising confidentiality, indigenous knowledge rights, commercial sensitivity, and national security.

Internationalisation and Industry Collaboration

Internationalisation should be designed around research value rather than symbolic agreements. Priority mechanisms include joint supervision, cotutelle degrees, visiting scholars, shared seminars, regional methods schools, access to specialised facilities, collaborative grants, and reciprocal mobility. Participation in African research networks should receive equal policy attention with partnerships outside the continent.

Industry and public-sector collaboration can improve relevance, provide data and facilities, and broaden graduate careers. However, industry-linked doctorates require clear agreements on intellectual property, publication, confidentiality, ethics, and candidate assessment. Research questions should remain academically defensible and should not be reduced to consultancy deliverables.

Programme-Level Evaluation and Public Data

Nigeria should introduce a periodic national review of graduate programmes, drawing selectively on Brazil's programme-level evaluation and South Africa's statistical reporting. Evaluation should combine quantitative indicators with peer judgement. Core indicators should include admissions selectivity, funding coverage, supervisory loads, candidate-to-completion progression, time to degree, attrition, examination outcomes, publication quality, research integrity, graduate destinations, international collaboration, societal engagement, and candidate experience.

Indicators must be interpreted by discipline and should not reward raw publication counts. Humanities monographs, creative outputs, policy datasets, patents, clinical guidelines, and community-based outcomes require appropriate recognition. Programme ratings should have consequences. High-performing programmes may receive development grants and expanded admissions. Programmes with correctable deficiencies should enter monitored improvement. Programmes that cannot meet minimum research conditions should suspend admissions until capacity is restored.

Phased Implementation Roadmap

Phase 1: Foundation, 0-2 Years

The first phase should establish definitions, data, and minimum safeguards. The NUC should convene a national working group and issue the Graduate

Research Quality Framework. Universities should map all graduate programmes, candidates, supervisors, facilities, completion patterns, and integrity procedures. New doctoral admissions should require a resource statement and supervisory capacity check. Institutions should introduce advisory panels, standard progress reports, supervisor training, candidate handbooks, and accessible grievance mechanisms. A national graduate education dashboard should begin with a limited set of auditable indicators.

Phase 2: Capacity Building and Pilots, 3-5 Years

The second phase should fund competitive doctoral schools, thematic clusters, and shared facilities. TETFund should pilot integrated candidate and project awards in selected disciplines and institutions. Programme-level review should begin with a developmental cycle that identifies gaps without immediate punitive consequences. Joint supervision, regional consortia, and international partnerships should be expanded. Digital thesis repositories and research data support should become mandatory for accredited programmes.

Phase 3: Performance-Based Consolidation, 6-10 Years

The third phase should connect programme approval, admissions, and funding to verified performance. Periodic national evaluation should be fully operational, with published results and decisions on improvements. Funding formulas should reward completion quality, integrity, collaboration, and equitable candidate development rather than enrolment volume. Programmes unable to sustain minimum standards should merge, enter consortia, or suspend admissions. Successful clusters should receive longer-term support and stronger pathways to commercialisation, policy translation, or public engagement.

Implementation Risks and Safeguards

Reform can fail if new requirements become additional paperwork without resources. Milestones should therefore replace redundant approvals rather than accumulate on top of them. Digital reporting should reuse institutional data and be audited selectively. Smaller and newer universities should receive consortium options and capacity grants rather than being permanently excluded.

Performance funding can also create gaming. Publication counts may encourage low-quality outlets, completion targets may lower examination

standards, and internationalisation metrics may reward superficial partnerships. Balanced peer review, field-normalised indicators, integrity audits, candidate feedback, and transparent qualitative evidence are necessary safeguards. No single metric should determine programme status.

Equity must be built into implementation. Full-time, well-funded doctoral models may exclude candidates who work, care for dependents, or live far from campus. Programmes should offer transparent part-time routes with realistic milestones and equivalent standards. Funding competitions should monitor participation and success by gender, disability, region, socioeconomic background, and institution type. International mobility should not be the only route to quality because many candidates cannot travel.

Finally, reform requires political and institutional stability. Multi-year funding commitments, protected academic decision-making, open procurement, and public reporting are necessary to prevent policy discontinuity. A national framework should set the floor, but disciplinary communities and universities must retain sufficient autonomy to innovate above it.

Conclusion

Nigeria's graduate education challenge cannot be explained by the credit-hour system alone. Comparative evidence shows that credit-based structures coexist with highly research-intensive doctoral programmes. The United States uses credits while producing tens of thousands of research doctorates. India combines minimum coursework credits with advisory committees, recurring progress review, integrity safeguards, and external examination. South Africa uses credit-based qualification structures and publishes national doctoral data. The United Kingdom, Germany, Brazil, and African Centres of Excellence demonstrate the importance of funded training, doctoral structures, periodic programme review, and concentrated research investment.

The central Nigerian weakness is therefore not the existence of credits but the tendency to treat course completion as sufficient proof of graduate quality within an under-resourced and inconsistently governed research ecosystem. The original concerns about funding, supervision, infrastructure, global exposure, policy coherence, and academic migration remain valid, but they must be supported by evidence and connected through a defensible causal model.

Nigeria should retain credit for taught and professional development components while making research progression and graduation dependent on competencies, milestones, integrity, and independent assessment. A national graduate research quality framework, doctoral schools, trained supervisory teams, integrated funding, shared facilities, digital research systems, international and industry collaboration, and programme-level evaluation provide a practical reform architecture. The policy objective is not to move away from credits as an administrative tool. It is to move beyond credits as a proxy for rigorous research. Global alignment will depend on whether Nigeria builds and sustains the institutional conditions in which original, ethical, well-supported, and internationally credible research can be produced.

References

- Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. (2026, May 27). Resultado da Avaliação Quadrienal 2021-2024. Government of Brazil. <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/acoes-e-programas/avaliacao/avaliacao-quadrienal/resultado-da-avaliacao-quadrienal-2021-2024>
- Department of Higher Education and Training. (2025). Statistics on post-school education and training in South Africa: 2023. Government of South Africa. <https://www.dhet.gov.za/Reports%20Doc%20Library/2023%20Statistics%20on%20Post-School%20Education%20and%20Training%20in%20South%20Africa.pdf>
- Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. (2024, May 10). DFG to fund 17 new Research Training Groups. <https://www.dfg.de/en/service/press/press-releases/2024/press-release-no-19>
- Egbetokun, A., Olofinyehun, A., Sanni, M., Ayo-Lawal, A., Oluwatope, O., & Yusuff, U. (2022). The production of social science research in Nigeria: Status and systemic determinants. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9, Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-01017-z>
- Igiri, B. E., Okoduwa, S. I. R., Akabuogu, E. P., Okoduwa, U. J., Enang, I. A., Idowu, O. O., Abdullahi, S., Onukak, I. E., Onuruka, C. C., Christopher, O. P. O., Salawu, A. O., Chris, A. O., & Onyemachi, D. I.

- (2021). Focused research on the challenges and productivity of researchers in Nigerian academic institutions without funding. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 6, Article 727228. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.727228>
- Marti, S., & Peneoasu, A.-M. (2025). Doctoral education in Europe today: Enhanced structures and practices for the European knowledge society. European University Association. <https://www.eua.eu/publications/reports/doctoral-education-in-europe-today-enhanced-structures-and-practices-for-the-european-knowledge-society.html>
- National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2024). Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2023 (NSF 25-300). National Science Foundation. <https://ncses.nsf.gov/doctorate-recipients-from-u-s-universities-2023>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Education at a glance 2024: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en>
- Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2024). UK Quality Code for Higher Education. <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/the-quality-code>
- Tertiary Education Trust Fund. (2023). Annual report 2023. <https://tetfund.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/TEFFund-2023-ANNUAL-REPORT-Corrected-2-1.pdf>
- UK Research and Innovation. (2024, January 30). Update on UKRI doctoral funding and training. <https://www.ukri.org/news/update-on-ukri-doctoral-funding-and-training/>
- UNESCO. (2021). UNESCO science report: The race against time for smarter development (S. Schneegans, T. Straza, & J. Lewis, Eds.). UNESCO Publishing. <https://www.unesco.org/reports/science/2021/en>
- University Grants Commission. (2022). University Grants Commission (Minimum Standards and Procedures for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, 2022. Government of India. https://www.ugc.gov.in/pdfnews/0909572_Minimum-Standards-and-Procedure-for-Award-of-PhD-Degree.pdf

- U.S. Department of Education. (2025). 2025-2026 Federal Student Aid Handbook: Volume 2, Chapter 2, Program eligibility, written arrangements, and distance education. <https://fsapartners.ed.gov/knowledge-center/fsa-handbook/2025-2026/vol2/ch2-program-eligibility-written-arrangements-and-distance-education>
- World Bank. (2025, April 7). Africa's Higher Education Centers of Excellence: Celebrating a decade of transformative journey in revolutionizing Africa's contribution to global research and innovation. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2025/04/07/africa-higher-education-centers-of-excellence-africa-contribution-to-global-research-and-innovation>
- European University Association. (2022). Doctoral education in Europe: Current developments and trends. <https://www.eua.eu/publications/reports/doctoral-education-in-europe-current-developments-and-trends.html>