WHAT HISTORY REVEALS ABOUT THE EDUCATION DOCTORATE

By Jill Alexa Perry, Ph.D.

In Placing practitioner knowledge at the center of teacher education: Rethinking the policy and practice of the Education Doctorate by Margaret Macintyre Latta & Susan Wunder (Eds.) (2012)

The education doctorate (Ed.D.) is almost 100 years old. Yet, since its inception at Harvard University in 1920, the Ed.D. has suffered an identity crisis. Often labeled as the 'lesser' doctoral degree in education, the Ed.D. has for decades been at the center of debates for and against a professional school of education, the unification of education with arts and sciences, and the autonomy of schools of education (Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993). Yet this periodic concentrated discussion about the purpose and goals of the Ed.D. has done little to explain what this degree is or can become.

In this chapter, I look to the beginning of doctoral study in education and trace the 80-year discussion of the distinctions between the Ed.D. and the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) as a means to understand the roots of confusion and labels that have been applied to the education doctorate. As the end of the chapter considers, the Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate (CPED) has assumed the charge for reclaiming the education doctorate (Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, & Garabedian, 2006).

Professional Education in the United States

In 1857, teacher, lecturer, writer, and editor William Russell (1798-1873) proposed that teachers should be given control over entry into their profession. Russell wrote, "Let a teachers' association receive a charter from the State and proceed, without further authorization, to examine and pass upon applicants for membership" (in Bradley, 1999, p. 38). That same year the National Education Association (NEA) was founded as a professional association for teachers in Cincinnati , and William Russell closed its first annual convention with discussion of his notion

of teachers overseeing their profession (Wesley, 1957). Russell's notion, however, was not immediately developed and the path to the professionalization of education has since been a long and arduous process.

Between 1870 and 1910, professional preparation in the fields of law, medicine, and education emerged as a response to dissatisfaction with then-contemporary training models (Cremin, 1978), which often included apprenticeships, but no formal study. At the beginning of the 20th century, these professions sought ways to define and establish respectable training that would result in well-qualified specialists. One of the early steps taken by each of these professions was to "attach themselves to the modern American university" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 82). Such a step assumed that formal study at an institution of higher education would provide higher quality preparation.

In the late 19th century, three institutions responded to the "widespread dissatisfaction with contemporary professional training" (Cremin, 1978, p. 6). Harvard College (law), Johns Hopkins University (medicine), and Columbia College (education) were all "nascent universities" (Cremin, 1978, p. 6), with John Hopkins founding in 1876, and Harvard and Colombia in the process of becoming universities. The deans at each of these institutions, took on the task of formalizing professional education for each of these fields believed in raising the standards of each profession through tertiary study. Law Dean Christopher Columbus Langdell of Harvard, for example, believed that textbooks and lectures represented a "more efficient way of teaching the general principles of law" (Cremin, 1978, p. 6) than did the apprenticeship model. William Henry Welch believed that formal medical training needed a solid academic base reinforced by practical clinical training. At Johns Hopkins he introduced three curriculum reforms in medicine to achieve his vision—preclinical courses, clinical courses, and the teaching

hospital. While investigating medical training in the United States, education reformer Abraham Flexner (discovered a "great discrepancy [that] had opened up between medical science and medical education. [He observed that] while science had progressed, medical education had lagged behind" (Starr, 1982, p. 119). In a landmark 1910 study for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Flexner highlighted the Welch model as the basis for the reform of medical education. The Flexner Report eventually led to millions of dollars of funding from the General Education Board (a philanthropy founded by John D. Rockefeller in 1902) that solidified what we know today to be formal medical training.

Education, however, had a more difficult experience establishing itself as a professional field within the university. In 1879, the University of Michigan created a "chair in the science and art of teaching" (Hazlett, 1989, p. 11). Many other institutions followed this notion and by 1890 a total of 31 professors of education could be named across the country in established colleges and universities. Despite the proliferation of education faculty and courses at universities, the education profession faced a greater challenge in bringing teacher training into the university setting. Teacher training at the time was very sporadic. Many elementary school teachers had no training beyond their own schooling or the normal[1] courses in their high schools (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Secondary teachers were mostly prepared at normal schools—publically-funded, state controlled, vocational schools that were originally designed to provide new teachers with basic classroom management and instructional techniques. Yet, even this training was inconsistent as Learned and Bagley (1965) discovered in Missouri. They found that several teacher-training institutes were under constant pressure to become general education schools which undermined their goals of professionally training teachers, a fact they felt could be generalized to other states (Imig & Imig, 2005).

In addition to confusion and rivalries within institutions, at that time critics outside of education viewed the educators' status much like the status of clergy—with a lens of moral responsibility—believing that educators were called to their profession, but did not need to specifically train for their vocation. Despite this fragmentation in preparation, the turn of the century brought many changes to the definition of professional training that forced the field of education to abandon outdated ideas about its profession and to look toward the "new exemplar of the professional man" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 82). These new models of professional preparation came from the legal and medical professions.

James Earl Russell (1898-1926), no relation to previously mentioned William Russell, sought to bring this new model of professional preparation to the nascent Teachers College at Columbia University. In 1898, the year he became Dean of Teachers College 12 years after it was founded, James Earl Russell wrote, "The true educator must know the nature of the mind, he must understand the process of learning, the formation of ideals, the development of will, and the growth of character. The artist in every vocation must have consummate skill in the use of his tools" (Cremin, 1978, p. 10). As Dean, Russell employed this notion of "educator as artist" as the basis for a curricular reform at Teachers College. His reform strove to give the "novice what he will need in his practice" (Russell, 1924, p. 210). He changed the existing curriculum to include four central components—*general culture* (preparation equal to undergraduate education at the time and the ability to see relationships to other fields), *special scholarship* (reflective inquiry and continued learning), *professional knowledge* (systematic inquiry into the theory and practice of education), and *technical skill* (expert ability acquired in experimental schools or laboratories) (Cremin, 1978, p. 10). His goal was to marry professional knowledge with technical skills, a marriage he thought relevant to teacher abilities. In doing so, Russell raised admissions standards

and length of time to degree and he aligned departments of education with professional associations.

Graduate (master's level) courses in pedagogy first appeared in 1893 at the University of Minnesota (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Shortly thereafter, the Universities of Iowa and Michigan began offering education courses to graduate students. The proliferation of graduate study in education was a direct response to "city, state, and federal officials in education [looking] increasingly to the university for manpower" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 72). Just as law and medicine began adopting professional credentials to demonstrate competence, education saw "younger men substitute university credentials and contacts for the traditional experience" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 73) in order to obtain new administrative positions.

Within this proliferation of graduate study, the development of doctoral programs in education can be traced to three key events which mark the rise of the doctorate of philosophy (Ph.D.) in education and the doctorate of education (Ed.D.). First, Teachers College (at the time named the Industrial Education Association) offered the first Ph.D. program in education in 1893 with its first graduate in 1899. The influence of this degree rose during James Earl Russell's tenure as Dean. Russell applied his curricular reforms to this degree and included work in educational psychology, history of education, and philosophy of education. In addition, students were expected to complete two practica in specialized areas, take graduate work outside of education, and write a dissertation that demonstrated "power of independent thought and capacity to advance knowledge" (Cremin, 1978, p. 14). Russell's curriculum emphasized the "systematic study of practice within a carefully designed instructional environment—the model school" (Cremin, 1978, p. 14)—and though its intention was the continued education of teachers,

the degree was designed, in actuality, for individuals who sought to assume administrative positions in schools.

Cremin (1978) points out, however, two elements in this curriculum did not align with Russell's original idea of professional education. First, Cremin notes, the practica undertaken by the students was "much more closely related to professional knowledge than technical skill" (Cremin, 1978, p. 14). That is, the practicum experiences were more closely aligned to advanced courses that taught knowledge development rather than to the field experiences that provide the skills necessary for a profession. Second, Cremin (1978) suggests that the dissertations produced at Teachers College at the time focused more on a "historical and statistical approach [rather than a technical approach] to the institutions and processes of education" (p. 14). Cremin's criticisms are important highlighting that confusion and incoherence in doctoral preparation in education existed from the beginning.

At Harvard, a different story of professional preparation in education transpired. In 1865, Thomas Hill, then-president of Harvard, wrote about the distinction between liberal education and professional education while considering the goal of Harvard College becoming a university. Hill wrote that liberal education served "the general perfection and improvement of the pupil," while professional education provided the "culture and instruction which fits . . . for some chosen walk of life" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 3). Hill recommended that normal schools become a part of the university to provide a bachelor of arts in education that would raise teacher standards and establish the profession of teaching (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 3). In 1890, the new Harvard College president, Charles Eliot, a leader in championing "specialization [of university study] to foster social usefulness" (Sullivan, 2005, p. 94), established a "normal course" for teachers and hired Paul Henry Hanus to coordinate the new teacher education program. Eliot,

despite his strong belief in professional education, did not intend to create a burgeoning teacher preparation program at Harvard, however. Rather, his intention was to have greater influence over high schools by disseminating educational ideals articulated by Harvard faculty (Powell, 1980) into the greater Boston school districts and their governing bodies. Hanus did not agree with Eliot's vision and defiantly sought to expand the role of the normal school at Harvard College. As a result, he received little support from Eliot.

In addition to a mismatched philosophy with Eliot, Hanus encountered much difficulty working with a faculty that self-identified in other fields, such as history and philosophy (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Powell, 1980). Many faculty members denied that education could be a science. Josiah Royce (1891), in Harvard's Department of Philosophy, for example, argued that "pedagogical formulas will seldom prove sufficient for the control and education of children" (p. 121). Teachers, in Royce's view, were naturalists, possessing a gift for teaching rather than requiring training [in teaching skills and knowledge] (Royce, 1891). Frustrated, Hanus turned his own work to a new area, the study of administrative and bureaucratic issues found in the growing public education sector. He proclaimed himself an expert in school superintendency and educational administration (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988), which were both largely unrecognized areas within academia at the time. He believed strongly in educational research, a trait that should have won him favor with Lawrence Lowell, who succeeded Eliot as president to Harvard in 1909. Lowell, however, disliked Hanus and did everything he could to push him out of his position (Powell, 1980). As a result, Hanus had a difficult time raising the status of education at Harvard and, while on leave in 1911-1912, was replaced by Henry Holmes who assumed the head of the division of education (Powell, 1980).

In 1920, after much effort to raise 2 million dollars, including a $500,000 gift from the General Education Board, the Harvard Graduate School of Education was established under Holmes, who was named its first Dean (Powell, 1980). Though Holmes was not an advocate of research, nor did he hold a Ph.D., he saw value in increasing Harvard's role in the professional training of educators. One of Holmes' first successes was the establishment of the doctorate of education, or Ed.D., for students who had had a successful teaching experience, possessed a "working knowledge of biology, psychology, and the social sciences" (Cremin, 1978, p. 15), and who sought a higher position within the school system. The program of study comprised five areas of education plus the study of social theory in education, history of education, and educational psychology. The dissertation served to teach the student to conduct an independent investigation utilizing existing knowledge and producing a "constructive result of importance and value" (Cremin, 1978, p. 15). The purpose of the Ed.D. was to offer a rigorous course of study that would enhance candidates' prior knowledge and skills and better prepare them to lead as school practitioners (Cremin, 1978).

Holmes saw great promise for his graduate school by having it train older, experienced male teachers who aspired to become school administrators. Holmes also envisioned the need for independence of the Graduate School of Education from the Harvard School of Arts and Sciences. This he touted, would "signify acceptance of education's professional claims, [and] would be a potent lure to attract more graduate students" (Powell, 1980, p. 133). Holmes believed that the establishment of the Doctorate in Education (Ed.D.) and the Master of Education (Ed.M.) would profoundly mark the separation of education from the arts and sciences as well as "symbolize education's prestige and autonomy" (Powell, 1980, p. 137). Many of Holmes' colleagues, however, worried that the new degrees would be viewed as less valuable

than the Ph.D. and the Master of Arts (M.A.) These concerns caused Holmes to work to keep the Ph.D. as well. President Lowell, however, believed in academic decentralization at Harvard and saw little reason for two degrees. He "gave monopoly of the Ph.D. to the School of Arts and Sciences" (Powell, 1980, p. 137) and control of the Ed.D. to the new Graduate School of Education, essentially establishing its independence and making the Ed.D. the only doctoral degree available for award at Harvard.

Cremin (1978), in reviewing the curriculum of the Harvard Ed.D., offers two observations. First, he notes the "paucity of course offerings" (p. 15) in comparison to the offerings at Teachers College. Second, he suggests the degree requirements of Harvard's Ed.D. were quite similar to those of the Ph.D. at Teachers College. The only exception was that the dissertation for the Harvard Ed.D. offered a wider range of topic possibilities. Upon closer examination of actual dissertations from the two institutions, Cremin (1978) found there was a great deal of similarity between dissertations produced at the two schools during the 1920s.

The reality of what was occurring at Harvard at the time supports Cremin's claims. Throughout the 1920s, numerous Harvard students and faculty were unclear about the nature of the Ed.D., which had been "designed to serve similar ends [as the Ph.D.] despite rhetorical claims that its purposes were professional rather than scholarly" (Powell, 1980, p. 154). The Graduate School of Education never offered the explanation that the Ph.D. served research intentions while the Ed.D. served professional intentions (Powell, 1980). Rather, it offered a definition of the Ed.D. that "create[d] the appearance of a functional difference between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D., when in fact no such difference existed" (Powell, 1980, p. 154). Also, during this same time period, the Graduate School touted the *Ed.M.*, or Masters in Education, as

the terminal degree for practitioners which further complicated understanding of doctoral training in education at Harvard.

A third key event in the development of doctoral programs in education was the creation of an Ed.D. in 1934 at Teachers College under President William Fletcher Russell, the son of James Earl Russell. The younger Russell desired to incorporate his father's central curriculum ideas into this new degree. The result was the Teachers College Ed.D., which was a companion degree to its Ph.D. The Teachers College Ed.D. involved three years of coursework, written and oral examinations, and a project report. The courses included work "covering issues common to workers in the educational field" (Cremin, 1978, p. 15) which initially meant foundation courses such as history, philosophy, and psychology. Later, however, the program incorporated courses in "educational administration, guidance, and curriculum and instruction" (Cremin, 1978, p. 16). The final project reports were to cover topics beyond those of the Ph.D. dissertation and often included investigations of curriculum development and administrative and institutional reform issues (Cremin, 1978).

Cremin (1978) suggests that, as professional preparation doctoral programs developed at these two institutions, confusion between the purpose and goals of the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. also evolved. At Teachers College, for example, though James Earl Russell had "high aspirations to create a profession of education comparable to the professions of law and medicine" (p. 19), these aspirations gradually diminished over time and his four central program components lost meaning and purpose as other program components were defined. The general culture requirement was often assumed, but not mandated. The special scholarship requirement was initially enforced in the Ph.D. programs, but not in Ed.D. programs, and ultimately was removed from the former. The technical skill requirement was "acknowledged rhetorically, but neither

honored nor enforced it programmatically" (Cremin, 1978, p. 16). The final requirement, professional knowledge, was the one that remained most intact, but minimally through a set of core courses—history, philosophy, and psychology of education. The ultimate disconnect between preparation and apprenticeship "wreaked havoc with the integrity and coherence of the Russell model" (Cremin, 1978, p. 16). Furthermore, Cremin (1978) suggests that students who returned for graduate work had learned their professional roles while in practice and returned largely for paper credentials rather than actual acquisition of new skills and knowledge. The program model created by Russell resulted in a "fragmentation of the professional curriculum and a loss of coherence among its parts" (Cremin, 1978, p. 16).

Between 1925 and 1940 many institutions, including the University of California-Berkeley, Stanford University, and the University of Michigan followed the steps of Columbia and Harvard and established schools and colleges of education that offered graduate study and eventually, the two doctoral degrees. Despite this growth, however, these and other schools of education struggled to establish their identity as professional schools and were perpetually engulfed in debate over the purpose of the Ed.D. Several factors contributed to the debate. First, offering two doctoral degrees resulted in constant conflict between the "demands of theory and those of practice" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 49). Ellwood P. Cubberley of Stanford, who in 1897 saw no division between the academic/theoretical and the professional/vocational needs of education, later changed his view as difficulties in the school of education grew. By 1923, Cubberley was attempting to quell the debate between theoretical and practical training once and for all by stating, "the distinctive function of a university is, not action, but thought" (Cubberley, 1923 in Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 91). James Earl Russell also witnessed the rise of tensions among faculty and cautioned that "academic and professional workers are uneasy colleagues,"

noting that academics are concerned with what "the subject he teaches will do for the student" and the professional teacher is concerned with "what the student can do with the subject" (Russell, 1924, p. 210).

Second, the advancement of professional training was further complicated as schools of education competed with schools of arts and sciences. Graduate programs in arts and sciences were older and more established. Traditionally arts and science faculty offered doctoral preparation in the form of the Ph.D. Both the school of arts and sciences and its faculty had difficulty relinquishing their expertise in doctoral studies or in acknowledging the need for a professional doctorate degree. Clifford and Guthrie (1988) note that the academic profession "resisted the campaigns of professional schools to offer doctoral degrees independent of the administrative control of graduate schools" (p. 148). Despite these protests, however, some schools of education were able to gain independence. Stanford, for example, established its Ed.D. in 1927 under the control of its school of education. Harvard and Columbia also managed to keep governance of the Ed.D. separate from the Ph.D. and housed in their respective schools of education. Berkeley's School of Education, though it had "shared authority" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 149) of its Ed.D., established in 1921, was unable to establish any real control and the degree was governed by the School of Arts and Sciences (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988).

Third, from the inception of both doctoral degrees in education, unclear goals and similar programmatic content have confused the degree purposes and plagued professionalization efforts. Cremin (1978) suggests that early development of professional training in education solidified the foundation for the persistent confusion between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. Cremin (1978) notes that James Earl Russell's notion of professional training for teachers was in truth a program aimed at preparing educational leaders. In this regard, Cremin (1978) insists Russell

missed the opportunity to fully establish a professional career beyond that of teacher. He goes on to suggest that a major difference between professional training in education, opposed to its counterparts in law and medicine, was that much of the curriculum was often found outside of the professional school, or school of education. The general cultural components were frequently taught at the undergraduate level, while the special scholarship component relied on study in academic departments outside of education. Professional knowledge and skills were the only components that remained solely within the schools of education (Cremin, 1978). Finally, and perhaps a more crucial point, was the fact that the "non-professional graduate schools" (Cremin, 1978, p. 12), such as the arts and sciences, were developing alternative programs in education that focused on scholarly inquiry into the problems of education. The Ed.D. was in direct competition with research doctorates in schools of arts and science that focused on education in areas as diverse as philosophy and economics, and that challenged the knowledge base of the Ed.D.

Finally, the professoriate in schools of education contributed greatly to the difficulties of developing professional education in education. James Earl Russell was keenly aware of the tensions at Teachers College between "professors of academic [disciplines] and [those with] professional orientations" (Hazlett, 1989, p. 17). The academic professors, he observed, valued the "cultivation and expansion" (Hazlett, 1989, p. 17) of systematic knowledge. The professional professors, on the other hand, concentrated on training and job skills. He recognized that the differences between these two groups manifested themselves in various aspects of the college and made realizing a profession of education more difficult. He once noted that as an administrator supervising the two groups, "he was lucky if he could get on without bloodshed"

(Hazlett, 1989, p. 17). By 1924, Russell "deplored the merging of [academic and professional workers] in the same institution" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 91).

Consequently, as schools of education continually struggled with these issues, the inability to distinguish between the two degrees grew and enhanced the challenges of firmly establishing a profession in education. If schools of education had been better able to differentiate between the outcomes and expectations for doctoral candidates – those that choose to become professional practitioners (Ed.D.) and those who wanted to do research and teach in academic institutions (Ph.D.) then better preparation programs could have been developed for each degree and ultimately lead to better alignment between the needs of PK-20 schools and the scholarship and practices of university education scholars. The central problem in distinguishing the two doctoral degrees, however, was essentially the distinction between the "high prestige of research [degrees] when compared to professional practice [degrees]" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 150) which influenced the enrollment of practitioners into research degree programs. Compounding this problem were degree requirements that were the same, dissertation topics that were similar, and students who increasingly chose the Ph.D. or transferred into a Ph.D. program shortly after entering an Ed.D. program.

By the late 1950s, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education was called upon by academics to establish clear distinctions between the two degrees (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Ultimately, the lasting confusion and obvious similarities between the two degrees, led Levine (2007) to contend, "from the very beginning, the clear differentiation between the degrees [has been] blurred" (p. 40). Defining what a doctorate in education represented became virtually impossible with uncertainty that perpetually "fragmented the field"

and "loosened the bonds between professional practice and professional education" (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 117).

The Ed.D. vs. Ph.D. Debate

Over the last 80 years, several studies and articles have attempted to make sense of the two doctoral degrees in education. Some have drawn conclusions that call for the elimination of one or the other. Yet, despite considerable attention, very little reform of either degree has happened, and the debate continues today. The following section presents a review of the seemingly endless discussion of the distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. and establishes that clear action is necessary to settle this debate once and for all.

As early as 1930, Professor Walter Monroe of George Washington University undertook a survey of doctoral preparation in education (Freeman, 1931). His survey identified five institutions that offered the Ed.D. as a supplement to or substitute for the Ph.D. degree—Boston University, Harvard College, Johns Hopkins University, University of Southern California, and Stanford University. Monroe found that these institutions frequently "set up somewhat different requirements [than those] for the traditional requirements for the Ph.D." (Freeman, 1931, p.1).

In his book, *Practices of American Universities in Granting Higher Degrees in Education: A Series of Official Statements*, Frank Freeman (1931) built upon Monroe's survey and included statements from thirteen doctoral granting institutions that awarded the Ph.D. in education through their graduate school of arts and sciences and seven institutions that awarded the Ed.D. through their schools of education. The intent of the study was to outline the differences in the degree requirements between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. For core requirements, Freeman (1931) found that the foreign language requirement, originally required of both degrees, had been largely eliminated from the Ed.D. In addition, professional experience was required for

all Ed.D. students but not for Ph.D. candidates. Regarding the inquiry requirement, the study concluded that the culminating thesis for the Ed.D. was expected to "organize existing knowledge instead of discovering new truths" (Freeman, 1931, p. 1), a standard expectation for the Ph.D.

Consideration of the differences between the two degrees surfaced again in the late 1950s when the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) sponsored a study to investigate the differences in response to concerns about the superiority of one degree over the other. At the time, it was generally understood that the Ph.D. "was intended to be an academic-research degree" and the Ed.D. "was intended to be a practitioner professional degree" (Ludlow, 1964, p. 22). To confirm or deny this understanding, H. Glenn Ludlow (1964) surveyed doctoral recipients from 91 institutions over a two-year period, 1956-58, to examine the abilities, career motivations, and job satisfaction of both Ed.D. and Ph.D. recipients. Ludlow (1964) found that no significant differences in intelligence or in the abilities and achievements in certain types of professional positions existed between holders of the two doctoral degrees.

Also during this time, Walter Eells (1963) conducted a study of comparison of the two degrees. He looked at characteristics such as the entrance requirements, the nature of the qualifying exams, the nature of the dissertation, and how the degrees were each classified. He concluded that based on these characteristics, the degrees were indistinguishable.

In 1966, L.D. Brown was funded by AACTE to conduct a follow-up to Ludlow's (1964) study. His goal was to fully understand the similarities and differences of the holders of both degrees. Brown (1966) believed, "the success of the nation's educational system is in no small measure in the hands of these professionals holding the doctorate degree" (p. 1). By surveying students from 1963-64, he sought to understand the motivations and characteristics of doctoral

recipients and to compare his findings to those of Ludlow (1964). He discovered an increase in degrees awarded and a growing body of students interested in pursuing doctoral studies in education. He also discovered that more than half of those surveyed went back to the job they had prior to entering the program. In comparison to Ludlow's (1964) study, Brown (1966) found that more degrees were awarded, programs had been shortened, the average age of recipients had stayed the same, and more men than women had entered doctoral studies.

Despite the fact that concrete evidence produced from both of these studies demonstrated the existence of very little practical distinction between the two degrees, programs continued on the same course. The debate was quiet from the mid-1960s until the early 1970s when Steven Spurr (1970) attempted to trace the development of the two degrees. He concluded that the reason for the development of the Ed.D. was to escape "too literal application of standards imposed by dominant faculty from older more traditional disciplines" (in Dill & Morrison, 1985, p. 170). That is, the Ed.D. established the independence of schools of education and released it from pressures and regulations of the graduate school of arts in sciences.

Dale Anderson (1983), in response to an issue of degree differentiation in the Washington State University College of Education, undertook a survey to "ascertain the similarities and differences between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D" (p. 55). Though he looked mainly at programmatic requirements and employment patterns of graduates for both degrees, he discovered much more about the distinction between them. Initially, the survey revealed few differences between the two degrees. Anderson (1983) found a strong similarity for admissions, preparation, and graduation requirements for both degrees, but in looking at the culminating project, he found a "substantial difference between the two degrees in the acceptance of a practical problem for the Ed.D. as a substitute for a basic research study" (p. 56). He also discovered that both the number

of institutions offering the two degrees and the number of students receiving both degrees had grown over time. Citing the earlier study by Monroe, Anderson found that in 1930, only six institutions offered the Ed.D. By 1982, 128 institutions were offering the Ed.D.; 86 of those 128 institutions offered both the Ed.D. and Ph.D. Finally, though his survey did not seek to investigate the philosophical reasons behind the differences between the two degrees, he discovered that the "Ph.D. is [considered to be] a scholarly degree, preparation for which is oriented toward the conduct of research, while the Ed.D is [viewed as] a professional degree preparation for which is orientated toward practice" (p. 57). In other words, the difference in degrees continued to be more in status and reputation than actual content.

In 1985, Dill and Morrison conducted a study of 81 institutions to determine the nature of their research objectives for doctoral study. While they were not surprised to learn that Ph.D. programs required more research courses, they did highlight that most institutions did not have different methods requirements between the two degrees. Their research also revealed three compelling reasons for the distinction of the two degrees. The first was a call in 1979 from the Association of Graduate Schools to establish standards for the Ph.D. (Dill & Morrison, 1985) that would separate it from practitioner-oriented degrees. Second, pressures to increase research training for the Ph.D. was a prominent notion during this same time period. Finally, there was a simultaneous increase in students seeking preparation for jobs outside of academia, pursuing part-time degrees and who had orientations toward practice rather than research.

By the late 1980s, the debate had turned to whether or not both doctoral degrees were necessary for the field of education. In their book, *Ed Schools*, Geraldine Clifford and James Guthrie (1988) looked at schools of education at leading universities in America and called for drastic and dire reform. Seeking to fully professionalize education, they suggested that schools of

education should focus on preparing teachers and educational leaders rather than on producing research. Their most important recommendation was to eliminate the Ph.D. in favor of the professional practice Ed.D. as the degree of choice for educators, and proposed that the field of education focus on professional training rather than on creating knowledge and generating research. The reasoning behind this bold statement stemmed from Clifford and Guthrie's (1988) insights and their belief that "productive professional training . . . might hold the promise of maintaining and perhaps enhancing the effectiveness of the teacher workforce" (p. 37).

In a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual conference, L.D. Brown (1991) responded to Clifford and Guthrie (1988) by arguing that eliminating either degree was absurd. Tracing historical data, Brown (1991) explained that interest in obtaining an Ed.D. increased from the 1920s through the 1950s but fell in the 1960s, largely as a result of the push for more scientific research and the increase in federal funding for such studies. By the 1970s, the number of Ph.D. graduates surpassed those obtaining the Ed.D. The steady decline in the number of Ed.D. recipients prompted Brown (1991) to question the survival and utility of the degree. In a study consisting of 42 institutions, he interviewed faculty and students about program characteristics, employment ambitions, and degree distinctions. Brown (1991) concluded that doctoral programs at schools of education are "structurally well within the tradition of doctoral programs throughout the university" (p. 15). Interviews with deans, faculty, and students indicated that although the degrees are similar in all areas except the type of research taught and completed, there was "little dissatisfaction of a general sort with the fact that the Ph.D. is the more popular degree" (p. 24). He concluded his argument by dismissing the Clifford and Guthrie (1988) call for eliminating the Ph.D.

In 1993, Osguthorpe and Wong surveyed all U.S. schools of education that offered doctoral programs in the prior decade to determine trends around the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. They discovered that there was no clear trend towards offering one degree or the other and that the Ed.D. was more frequently offered at comprehensive universities while the Ph.D. was offered at research-intensive institutions (although of course many offered both). Their study also revealed similar program requirements for both degrees. Their study concluded with a call for a national discussion "to strengthen the education profession by reducing confusion between its two doctoral degree titles" (Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993, p. 60).

Insert Table 3.1 About Here

Reference this table in the text of your paper somewhere

In 1998, Thomas Deering took up the debate and called for the elimination of the Ed.D. He claimed that while the original purpose of the Ed.D. was to "improve the skills and add to the knowledge of the field-based educator," (p. 242), the perpetual confusion between the two degrees needed to be resolved with the elimination of the Ed.D. He examined the two degrees at 50 institutions that were members of the Holmes Group. To illustrate the difference between the two degrees he examined the treatment of the dissertation, the types of research taught and utilized by each degree program, and the hiring patterns of Ed.D. and Ph.D. graduates respectively at the 50 schools of education. He found that by comparing the dissertations the key difference was the common understanding of the purpose of each degree—the function and form of a Ph.D. dissertation served to create knowledge, while the Ed.D. dissertation was said to investigate practical issues. In practice however, Deering (1998) found that the "distinction is of

little consequence" given that students in both degree programs produce comparable dissertations using both quantitative and qualitative methodology.

Finally, Deering (1998) demonstrated that graduates from across all types of institutions—from large prestigious research universities to smaller less-renowned colleges—holding both degrees were hired at schools of education. With these conclusions, he asserted that the Ed.D. should be eliminated. He also accused schools of education of perpetuating the continuing confusion stating "by offering the two terminal degrees that are more similar than different, colleges and departments of education unwittingly cause confusion among students and faculty undermining the standing of all terminal degrees in education" (p. 247).

In 2006, Shulman et al. engaged in the debate over the distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. However, they argued not for the elimination of either degree, but rather for strengthening of both degrees. They urged schools of education to confront the problems of the education doctorate or "risk becoming increasingly impotent in carrying out their primary missions—the advancement of knowledge and the preparation of quality practitioners" (p. 25). The authors asserted that the Ed.D. "has failed to do its job" (p. 27). They argued that training for practitioners more closely resembled training for research scholars in Ph.D. programs and that the Ed.D. was currently defined by "subtraction, with fewer requirements than the Ph.D. and much less emphasis on full-time study and residency" (p. 27). The result was a degree often known as the "Ph.D. lite" (p. 27).

As a solution, the authors proposed the creation of a degree that would prepare practitioners at the highest levels, the *Professional Practice Doctorate* (P.P.D.). They admitted that the name of this new degree was not the central concern, but offered it as a way to strengthen doctoral training and to clearly delineate between the two degrees. They then

challenged members of the Council of Academic Deans from Research Education Institutions (CADREI) to distinguish the education doctorate by looking at assessments of professional practitioners and by thinking about how schools of education could unite to "reclaim" the Ed.D. (Shulman, *et al*., 2006). The authors contended that professional doctoral preparation should value the work experience and part-time status of its students, and should teach applied research methods in a manner that was equally as rigorous as how Ph.D. students learned to produce scholarly research.

In response to this call to "reclaim" the education doctorate and make a clear distinction between professional training and scholarly output, former Teachers College President Arthur Levine (2007) responded by stating that it was an "impossible mission for schools of education" to do (p. 43), but he acknowledged that a distinction between the two degrees would be beneficial for the field of education. He outlined six disincentives that he maintained would prevent schools of education from making this distinction. First, practitioner-driven programs helped to keep the "school of education boat afloat financially" (p. 43). Preparing scholars was time consuming and costly, whereas training large numbers of practitioners was more cost effective. Second, it was relatively easy for "masters granting institutions that want to raise their statures" (p. 44) to seek state approval to award the Ed.D.. Third, the Ed.D. typically remained under the control of the school of education and thus was a means for securing autonomy Fourth, the Ph.D. was perceived as more prestigious, thus some students pursued it regardless of whether or not they planned to pursue research careers. Fifth, to keep in line with other professions such as law and medicine, those in education desired to grant their own degrees. Finally, politics and inertia were said to inhibit schools of education from change. The reality, according to Levine

(2007), was that the Ed.D. served academic, political, and autonomy-related purposes for schools of education.

Still, in spite of Levine's list of disincentives for changing the Ed.D., 25 institutions responded to the Shulman et al. (2006) call for reclaiming the education doctorate. In 2007, CPED was established to do more than just study the current state of the Ed.D. This initiative sought action by engaging 25 institutions over three years in a collaborative effort to define and develop a new professional practice doctorate that aimed to produce highly-qualified practitioners to serve our nation's education system. Perry and Imig (2008) reported that after the first year of the initiative, "creative thinking and deep reflection among peers" (p. 45) had proven successful. The pilot efforts to redesign the Ed.D. obliged each institution to review its core curriculum, signature pedagogies, practical experiences, and the capstone experience of professional preparation, while also bringing faculty from the participating colleges of education to the same table to examine these issues in a national, inter-institutional dialogue. More recently, after three years of discussion, design, and experimentation, the CPED consortium asserted a formal definition of the Ed.D. as well as six working principles for Ed.D. programs and six characteristics essential for Ed.D. graduates.

Aligning their work with the Council of Graduate Schools' (2005) definition of professional preparation, the CPED consortium concluded, "The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession" (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2009b). With this understanding, the consortium also generated six statements of working principles for doctoral preparation programs. It has been the intent of the

consortium to test these working principles in the coming phase of the initiative (ongoing as of this writing). The six statements about the professional doctorate in education are that it:

1. Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
2. Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
3. Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
4. Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
5. Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
6. Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice. (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2009b)

Additionally, the consortium identified six characteristics of graduates that should result from preparation in a CPED-influenced Ed.D. program. These characteristics—*equity stance, inquiry stance, leadership capabilities, commitment to continuous change, community engagement/social responsiveness,* and *harnessing human capital* (Imig, Perry, & Syed, 2009)—were generated from looking across each institution's programmatic outcomes and establishing commonalities. These characteristics will also be tested, refined, and further developed in the second phase of the CPED initiative.

Conclusion

Since the early 1900s, many American institutions of higher education have created doctoral programs in education, both Ph.D.s and Ed.D.s. In essence they have created institutional educational policies and converted them to practice. For almost as long, researchers have sought to distinguish the Ed.D. from the Ph.D. by considering the types of curriculum, the nature of research training, the structure of examinations and dissertations, and the career aspirations of graduates. These studies have produced ample evidence that from the inception of each degree in education, no single, clear understanding of each has prevailed. Yet, despite a near-century of studies, the evidence has done little to quell either the endless confusion about the purpose of the two degrees or the calls for distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. Perhaps this debate calls for more directed action.

Not until recently, has any scholar or group attempted to make the distinction of the two through a concerted and coordinated effort to change each degree. CPED is the first national effort that has undertaken to distinguish the two degrees through clear examination of the purpose and goals of the Ed.D. and with the secondary goal of strengthening the Ph.D. With the development of programs that incorporate new ways of thinking about professional preparation—such as the infusion of strong inquiry skills focused on problems of practice, the development of decision-making skills in uncertain circumstances, and the use of student work places as laboratories in which to test and develop their skills—these CPED-influenced Ed.D. degrees seek first to understand the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for successful practice; and second, to develop programs that will prepare teacher, school, and university leaders to be successful in practice-oriented environments. As such, CPED is an empirically grounded policy initiative, initiated with help of the Carnegie Corporation but co-created and put

into practice by each participating campus. In the coming years, as the original 25 CPED institutions design and implement these new professional preparation programs, the evidence will lie in the success of their graduates in educational institutions. In the meantime, CPED will continue to test and refine its work to ensure that the Ed.D. is distinguished as the preferred degree for educational practitioners.

Notes

[1] Normal courses and normal schools were part of the Horace Mann's common school for the preparation of new teachers. The name "normal" comes from the French name, *Ecole Normale*, and refers to the education of teachers in general or "normal" fields of study (Rousmaniere, 2005).

References

Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(3), 55-58.

Bradley, A. (1999). Educating the educators. *Education Week, 19*(2), 38-40.

Brown, L. D. (1966). *Doctoral graduates in education. An inquiry into their motives, aspirations, and perceptions of the program*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Brown, L. D. (1991). *A perspective on the Ph.D.—Ed.D. discussion in schools of education*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2009a). *Creating rubrics for the assessment of the Ed.D.: Narrative report to the Spencer Foundation*. College Park, MD: Author.

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2009b). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education*. College Park, MD: Author.

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2010). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education*. College Park, MD: Author.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for a professional education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Council of Graduate Schools. (2005). *Task force report on the professional doctorate*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cremin, L. (1978). *The education of the educating professions*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum, 62*, 243-248.

Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). Ed.D. and Ph.D. research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *Review of Higher Education, 8*(2), 169-182.

Eells, W. C. (1963). *Degrees in higher education*. Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

Freeman, F. N. (1931). *Practices of American universities in granting higher degrees in education: A series of official statements* (Vol. 19). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hazlett, J. S. (1989). Education professors: The centennial of an identity crisis. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 11-29). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Imig, D., & Imig, S. (2005, September/October). The learned report on teacher education: A vision delayed. *Change, 37*(5), 59-65.

Imig, D., Perry, J. A., & Syed, S. (2009). *Creating rubrics for the assessment of the Ed.D.: Narrative report to the Spencer Foundation*. College Park, MD: Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate.

Learned, W. S., & Bagley, W. C. (1965). Purpose of a normal school. In M. L. Borrowman (Ed.), *Teacher education in America: A documentary history* (pp. 122-140). New York, NY: Teachers College Columbia University.

Levine, A. (2007). *Educating researchers*. New York, NY: The Education Schools Project.

Ludlow, H. G. (1964). *The doctorate in education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The Ph.D. versus the Ed.D.: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education, 18*(1), 47-63.

Perry, J. A., & Imig, D. G. (2008, November/December). A stewardship of practice in education. *Chang*, *40*(6), 42-48.

Powell, A. G. (1980). *The uncertain profession*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rousmaniere, K. (2005). In search of a profession: A history of American teachers. In D. M. Moss, W. J. Glenn, & R. L. Schwab (Eds.), *Portrait of a profession* (pp. 1-27). Plymouth: First Rowman & Littlefied Education.

Royce, J. (1891). Is there a science of education? In M. L. Borrowman (Ed.), *Teacher education in America: A documentary history* (pp. 65-80). New York, NY: Teachers College Columbia University.

Russell, J. E. (1924). A summary of some of the difficulties connected with the making of a teacher college. In M. L. Borrowman (Ed.), *Teacher education in America: A documented history* (pp. 21-30). New York, NY: Teachers College Columbia University.

Shulman, L. S., Golde, C. M., Bueschel, A. C., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher, 35*(3), 25-32.

Spurr, S. H. (1970). *Academic degree structures: Innovative approaches*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Starr, P. (1982). *The social transformation of American medicine: The rise of a sovereign profession and the making of a vast industry*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Sullivan, W. (2005). *Work and integrity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wesley, E. B. (1957). *NEA: The first hundred years. The building of a teaching profession*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Table 3.1

A Chronology of the Ed.D.

Date	Who	Event	Results
1893	Teachers College, J. Russell	First Ph.D. in Education	To develop a professional degree
1920	Harvard Graduate School of Education, Henry Holmes	First Ed.D. in Education	To establish independence from School of Arts and Sciences
1930	Monroe, W.	Survey of 5 institutions with Ed.D. & Ph.D. programs	Curriculum between the two very similar with small difference
1931	Freeman, F. N.	Extended Monroe study to 13 institutions	Ed.D. served to "organize existing knowledge instead of discovering new truths" (p. 1).
1934	Teachers College, William Russell	Develops Ed.D.	Attempts to establish independence and follow national trends
1925-1940	Ed.D. proliferation	Stanford, Berkeley, Michigan, etc. all develop Ed.D.	The Ed.D. degree spread widely among schools of education but with little distinction of purpose either academically or institutionally.
1963	Eells, W. C.	Survey of characteristics of each degree—admissions, nature of exams & dissertation, classification of each degree	Determined the degrees are indistinguishable
1964	AACTE & Ludlow, H. G.	Survey of abilities, career motivation, & job satisfaction in graduates at 91 institutions	Ph.D. "intended to be an academic-research degree"; Ed.D. "intended to be a practitioner professional degree" (p. 22). No difference in intelligence or ability
1966	AACTE & Brown, L. D.	Follow up to Ludlow study to determine similarities and difference of degree holders	Despite increase in degrees awarded, most graduates went back to prior job

Date	Who	Event	Results
1983	Anderson, D. G.	Study of his academic department at Univ. of Washington to determine similarities and differences between degrees—program requirements and job aspirations	Strong similarity in admission preparation and graduation requirements; However, Ph.D. considered to be scholarly while Ed.D. viewed as professional degree.
1985	Dill & Morrison	Study of research requirements at 81 institutions	Found methods of inquiry similar
1988	Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W.	Study examined Ed Schools in the US	Call for elimination of Ph.D. to fully professionalize education and make Ed.D. degree of choice
1991	Brown, L. D.	Response to Clifford & Guthrie utilizing historical data on both degrees	Flux in both suggest each are valid degrees
1993	Osguthorpe & Wong	Study of trends in doctoral education	Found no trend in moving to offer one or other, Ed.D. more likely found at comprehensive institutions. Called for national discussion to distinguish.
1998	Deering, T. E.	Examined dissertations, research taught, and utilization of each degree at 50 institutions	Dissertation differences consistent with purpose of each degree—Ph.D. creates knowledge; Ed.D. investigates practical issues; both taught qualitative and quantitative methods
2006	Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, & Garabedian	Response to work of CID; historical review of doctoral preparation	Called for reclaiming of the Ed.D. as the professional practice degree in education
2007	Levine, A.	Response to Shulman et al.	Six disincentives that will keep schools of Ed from distinguishing.
2007	Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate	Consortium to rethink the Ed.D.	25 Colleges and Schools of Education come together to redesign purpose and goals of Ed.D. Outcomes include definition of Ed.D., working principles for programs, and characteristics of graduates