Researching Professionals or Professional Researchers? A Comparison of Professional Doctorate and PhD Programs in Criminology & Criminal Justice

Jaclyn Schildkraut · Mark C. Stafford

Abstract There are many questions asked by people who are thinking of entering a PhD program in criminology or criminal justice (CCJ). In addition to standard questions about completion time and assistantships, working professionals sometimes ask questions unique to them, such as whether a PhD will help them to obtain positions as upper-level administrators in law enforcement or why is it necessary to learn research skills. These questions take on added significance today because of the emergence of "professional doctorate programs." This paper examines differences between professional doctorate and PhD programs in CCJ, with special emphasis on differences in research training and practical experience. This examination suggests that unlike other disciplines, the professional doctorate in CCJ is seen as a complementary degree to the PhD, designed to attract working professionals in the field to higher education, rather than as a competing degree as in other disciplines.

Keywords Criminal justice education · Doctoral education · Professional doctorates · PhD alternatives

Since the first criminology school was begun by August Vollmer at the University of California at Berkeley in the early 1900s (Schafer & Castellano, 2005), the field of criminology and criminal justice (CCJ) has experienced multiple changes to refine and redefine it. From early days of training police officers to the struggle to detach itself from sociology and forge a distinct identity (Frost & Clear, 2007; Wrede & Featherstone, 2012), CCJ education has faced numerous challenges. Among such challenges are the standardization of curricula (Lytle & Travis, 2008; Sever, Coram, & Meltzer, 2008), meeting students' diverse needs (Schafer & Castellano, 2005; Sever et al., 2008), and balancing traditional academic research skills with their practical application in real-world settings (Schafer & Castellano, 2005; Sever et al., 2008).

J. Schildkraut (✉) · M. C. Stafford
Texas State University, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666, USA
e-mail: j_s9@txstate.edu

🕿 Springer

Ultimately, CCJ has emerged with a multidisciplinary focus that attracts hundreds of thousands of students across campuses each year.

Though professional doctorates (PDs) have been common in the U.S. and elsewhere for nearly 100 years, these degrees have been mainly in education (Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Ellis, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Lee, Brennan, & Green, 2009; Lester, 2004; Neumann, 2005), law (Neumann, 2005), medicine (Lester, 2004), business (Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Lester, 2004; Neumann, 2005), and engineering (Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Ellis, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Lester, 2004). Recently, CCJ also has experienced emergence of PDs. A considerable body of literature has examined PDs in these other fields in the U.S., Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. As PDs in CCJ have only just begun to emerge and are limited in the number of programs, researchers have yet to examine the impact on the field. Such an examination is particularly warranted as it not only allows for speculation about the future of CCJ, but provides an understanding of its current state as well.

The present paper seeks to examine the introduction of PDs into CCJ. A brief history of both PhDs and PDs is offered first, as well as a discussion of the different characteristics of each degree. Next, the emergence of the CCJ PD is examined. Specifically, comparisons of courses between PhDs and PDs in CCJ are offered, as well as examination of the role of work experience as a replacement for traditional coursework requirements. Finally, discussion is offered about the potential implications of the introduction of PDs on CCJ and how they may both unite and divide the field and its students, faculty, and community partnerships.

History of the PhD and Professional Doctorate

The doctorate degree has an extensive history (Park, 2007), dating back to medieval Europe where it began as a credential to teach in universities and practice medicine. First conferred in the middle of the 12th century by the University of Paris, doctoral degrees were issued predominantly in theology, law, and medicine for the next six centuries (Bourner, Bowden, & Laing, 2001; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Noble, 1994). These degrees, however, were considered professional doctorates in that they had a training orientation, and were not the PhD degrees with which we are familiar today with a focus on research (Jolley, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012). Rather, the modern PhD did not emerge until the early part of the 19th century in Germany (Bourner et al., 2001; Gregory, 1995; Noble, 1994). As Gregory (1995) notes, "the PhD was 'invented' in Germany," first offered at Berlin University (p. 177; see also Bourner et al., 2001). The German model of higher education began to spread internationally (Gregory, 1995), eventually reaching the U.S. just before the Civil War (Bourner et al., 2001).

The first PhD in the U.S. was conferred by Yale University in 1861 (Bourner et al., 2001; Katz & Hartnett, 1976; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Park, 2007). Bourner et al. (2001) suggest that the expansion of the PhD can be attributed to an increased emphasis on the importance of research, as previously the main function of European universities, teaching, had been to prepare students for employment. The PhD also was introduced in Toronto in 1897, Oxford University in 1920, and most recently Melbourne in 1945 (Bourner et al., 2001; Fenge, 2010; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Winfield, 1987). The PhD continued to develop, and by 1991, there were over 50 unique doctoral degrees offered

in the U.S. (Ries & Thurgood, 1993). Today, the U.S. annually produces nearly 50,000 PhD recipients (National Science Foundation, 2010; Nerad, 2004). The PhD also is considered to be the highest academic qualification in the U.S. education system (Ellis, 2007; Jolley, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).

About the same time as PhDs were introduced in England, U.S. universities were introducing alternate degrees, including the Doctor of Education (EdD) (Bourner et al., 2001; Gregory, 1995). The first EdD was conferred by Harvard University in 1921 (Anderson, 1983; Bourner et al., 2001; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Lee et al., 2009; Servage, 2009). Professional doctorates later were introduced in England in the late 1980s and Australia in the 1990s (Kot & Hendel, 2012; Lee et al., 2009). Canada's professional doctorate has a longer history, with the first professional doctorate conferred in 1898 (Jolley, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012). However, while professional doctorates have gained momentum in the U.S., England, and Australia, the momentum has declined in Canada (Kot & Hendel, 2012). Currently, both the U.S. and United Kingdom have over 50 professional doctorate programs, and Australia has nearly 20 (Halse & Mowbray, 2011; Kot & Hendel, 2012).

Other professional doctorates have emerged, including the Doctor of Psychology (PsyD), Doctor of Engineering (EngD), Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS), and Doctor of Juridical Science (SJD) since the introduction of the EdD (Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Ellis, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012). In total, there are PDs in over 20 subjects (Bourner et al., 2001). The EdD, however, remains the most popular (Bourner et al., 2001). These programs have provided alternatives in doctoral education to the PhD, and typically include a practical, clinical, or applied element in the course of obtaining the degree (Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Kot & Hendel, 2012).

Differentiating the PhD and PD

Some believe that the PhD and PD are equivalent in value (Allen, Smyth, & Wahlstrom, 2002; Neumann, 2005). Others believe the PD is second rate in comparison to the PhD, in some cases describing the PD as a watered-down PhD or questioning whether it is even a "real" doctorate (Dreher & Glasgow, 2011; Ellis, 2007). Neumann (2005) found that such a belief is also common among professional doctorate students (see also Wellington & Sikes, 2006). A third belief about PDs also has emerged as the degree has developed—that the PD "should not be a watered down version of the PhD but offer a valid alternative in doctoral education" (Fink, 2006, p. 38; see also Bourner et al., 2001; Dreher & Glasgow, 2011; Maxwell, 2003; Neumann, 2005; Taylor, 2007). Though the aims of a PD should be different from the PhD, the level of rigor and quality should be the same (Dreher & Glasgow, 2011; Ellis, 2007). This view of the PD would be what Pearson et al. (1997) call "equal but different" (p. 366; see also Jolley, 2007). This debate aside, there are numerous differences between PhDs and PDs in their design, goals, and scope. Table 1 summarizes these differences.

One of the main differences between the two degrees that is woven throughout the discourse is that of professional researchers (PhDs) versus researching professionals (PDs) (Bourner et al., 2001; Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Gregory, 1995; Lester, 2004; Maxwell, 2003; Taylor, 2007; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). In a 2003 article, Maxwell differentiated them as first- and second-generation doctorates. Specifically, first-

Table 1 Differences between PhDs and professional doctorates

	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	Professional doctorate
Career focus	Train professional researchers	Train researching professionals
Continuing professional development	Pre-service training in research	In-service professional development
Taught component	Research focused (emphasis on theory, methods, statistics)	Split focus on research training and field of study
Integration of theory and practice	Research makes a contribution to existing theory	Research makes a contribution to existing practice
Domain of research topic	Any researchable topic within the field of study	Research must make a contribution to existing professional practice
Starting point for research	Known: Review existing literature to identify a gap	Unknown: Start with a problem in need of investigation and resolution
Research focus	Significant contributions aimed at addressing gaps in the literature	Research should relate to candidate's field of practice
Research type	Original investigation not necessarily aimed at any practical application	Original investigation aimed at practical application of knowledge
Cohorts	Students enroll at various times throughout the year	Students are recruited on the basis of cohorts
Mode of study	Full-time attendance	Part-time attendance supplemented by time spent in the industry
Experience as an admissions requirement	Apprentice researchers	Experienced practitioners
Assessment	Comprehensive exams and dissertation	Taught components are individually assessed
Research Outcomes	Written dissertation	May substitute multiple research projects or portfolio of work
Duration of programs	Variable	Fixed

Adapted from Boumer et al. (2001, pp. 70–77)

generation doctorates typically are focused on coursework, plus a final dissertation project (Maxwell, 2003). Second-generation doctorates still include a research component, but focus more on situating the research in a practical setting (Ellis & Lee, 2005; Jolley, 2007; Lester, 2004; Maxwell, 2003). While PhDs were designed historically to produce scholars (Fenge, 2010), many will not work in academia (Kot & Hendel, 2012). At the same time, PDs provide students with opportunities for career enhancement, rather than a requirement for employment (Bourner et al., 2001; Kot & Hendel, 2012).

Program Focus

Dreher and Glasgow (2011) note that a key focus of PD programs should be to generate knowledge usable in the real world that is derived from practice-based evidence. In terms of professional development, PhDs have been focused on what some have termed *pre-service training* (Bourner et al., 2001; Kot & Hendel, 2012). Specifically, PhD students are trained as academic researchers, with a particularly heavy emphasis on research methodologies and data-analysis techniques (Bourner et al., 2001). These are what Maxwell (2003) and others have termed "professional researchers."

Conversely, PDs focus on *in-service training* (Bourner et al., 2001). This refers to the fact that many of the PD students also are employed in their area of study. By focusing on in-service training, students are able to address concerns in their workplaces and the needs of their communities through their coursework (Bourner et al., 2001; Fink, 2006; Malfroy, 2004). While they still may receive research training similar to PhD students, it is focused more on generating research that can be applied to practical settings (Bourner et al., 2001; Ellis & Lee, 2005). PD programs also focus on career development for practitioners through research-based practices (Bourner et al., 2001; Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Ellis & Lee, 2005). The melding of the professional workplace with academic training is what Maxwell (2003) and others have denoted as "researching professionals."

Conducting Research

While conducting research is a component of both the PhD and the PD, there are differences in the type and focus of the research, how the research project is developed, and even the areas that can be researched. Research conducted by PhD students typically is focused on generating information that is generalizable to larger groups (Dreher & Glasgow, 2011). Further, such research often is aimed at making a theoretical contribution to a body of literature on diverse topics (Bourner et al., 2001). Conversely, PD students often are encouraged to generate findings that can be applied to a specific field of practice (Ellis & Lee, 2005; Fenge, 2010; Fink, 2006; Lester, 2004; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Research in PD programs typically is conducted within a student's workplace or field, and findings are considered to be significant only if they impact it (Evans, 2002; Fink, 2006; Neumann, 2005; Servage, 2009; Taylor, 2007; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Additionally, while research is the primary focus of PhD students, PD students view research in a supporting role to enhance their skills as practitioners (Ellis & Lee, 2005; Lester, 2004; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Publication for PD students is not always a required outcome of research; if it is, it is not the primary outcome.

PhD students often follow a standard procedure for conducting research that is grounded in decade-long practices. The first step for academic researchers is to review existing literature on a given research topic (Bourner et al., 2001). Once they have reviewed enough of the literature, they should be able to identify a gap in need of addressing through new and original research (Bourner et al., 2001). Conversely, PD students begin with an existing problem that is plaguing their field and conduct research in order to resolve it (Bourner et al., 2001). While research in both PhD and PD programs emphasizes original insight and enhancing knowledge in a particular subject area, PD students are required to focus on the practical application of their work, rather than focusing on publication of the results (Bourner et al., 2001; Ellis & Lee, 2005).

Cohorts

Though groups of students will enter PhD programs at the same time, thus being labeled a "cohort," the experience is different in a PD program. Students in PhD programs often are regarded as "independent, autonomous scholars" (Taylor, 2007, p. 155). Particularly, once students begin the dissertation phase, they work alone with limited supervision from their advisors (Jolley, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009; Nerad, 2004; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Jolley (2007) also notes that PhD students can be seen as lacking social support from peers and supervisors. PD programs, on the other hand, encourage continued camaraderie among students within a given cohort (Ellis & Lee, 2005; Fink, 2006; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Rather than students coming from an array of backgrounds, as in PhD programs, PD cohorts include people with similar backgrounds (Bourner et al., 2001; Fink, 2006; Lester, 2004; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). This homogeneity in a cohort helps to foster growth and share ideas, which supports the main goal of improving fields in which they work and addressing work-related concerns (Ellis & Lee, 2005; Wellington & Sikes, 2006).

While PhD programs usually are organized for full time students, PD programs often are created for part-time students (Bourner et al., 2001; Ellis, 2007; Evans, 2002; Frost & Clear, 2007; Jolley, 2007; Servage, 2009). Specifically, these programs target potential students who are older, working professionals within their respective fields (Bourner et al., 2001; Doncaster & Thorne, 2000; Ellis, 2007; Fink, 2006; Lester, 2004; Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009; Neumann, 2005; Servage, 2009). The criteria for admission to PD programs also differ from PhD programs in that professional experience and leadership potential are weighted more favorably than standardized test scores and transcripts of grades (Bourner et al., 2001; Maxwell, 2003; Neumann, 2005; Servage, 2009). Conversely, admissions into a PhD program often heavily weight previously earned degrees and coursework (Bourner et al., 2001).

Earning A Degree

In most PhD programs, a dissertation is the measuring rod for a student's research abilities (Bourner et al., 2001; Fink, 2006; Jolley, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009). Maxwell and Kupczyk-Romanczuk (2009) note that while dissertations may provide a focused, in-depth analysis of a given topic, the research undertaken is typically narrow in scope. In addition to the dissertation, PhD

students often are required to complete comprehensive exams, which can be either oral or written or both (Bourner et al., 2001). These typically focus on substantive areas, such as research methods, statistics, and theory—all fundamental skills necessary to complete the dissertation requirement.

In PD programs, the research outcomes may be very different. Rather than completing a dissertation, students can be assessed over different outcomes, such as small-scale research projects, published articles, or portfolios (Bourner et al., 2001; Fink, 2006; Lester, 2004; Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009; Neumann, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2008a, 2008b; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Portfolios, in particular, provide a unique method of assessment as the work typically is conducted as collaboration between a student, academy, and employers (Fink, 2006; Malfroy, 2004; Neumann, 2005; Wellington & Sikes, 2006). Further, PD portfolios often are aimed at addressing the community of practice rather than reviewers or dissertation-committee members (Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009). This enables projects in PD programs to have greater breadth in communication, resources, and expertise (Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009).

Another important draw of PD programs is the greater amount of structure they provide to students, compared to PhD programs (Ellis, 2007; Jolley, 2007; Neumann, 2005). Typically, PDs are structured in modular sections (Bourner et al., 2001). Beyond the program's designs, PhDs and PDs also typically vary in terms of the time it takes to complete them. By constructing PD programs in modules, the time to degree completion is essentially fixed (Bourner et al., 2001). Conversely, the length of time to complete a PhD program is often variable (Bourner et al., 2001), usually due to the length of time needed to complete the dissertation (U.S. Department of Education, 2008a).

The Emergence of the CCJ Professional Doctorate

Doctoral education in CCJ is younger than the discipline. Florida State University, admitted its first doctoral student in criminology in 1958, marking the beginning of doctoral education in CCJ (Frost & Clear, 2007). Since that time, the number of schools offering doctoral programs has increased steadily (Frost & Clear, 2007). The Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice (ADPCCJ), an organization dedicated to manage information on current CCJ doctoral programs, currently includes 42 member universities (ADPCCJ, n.d.).[1] However, many of these doctoral programs did not admit their first students until after 1990 (Frost & Clear, 2007). Appendix presents a list of the member organizations, along with their major course of study.

Still, an even newer facet of doctoral education has emerged with the introduction of the CCJ PD. The first program began in 2001, and to date, six schools across the U.S. are offering PDs in criminal justice-related education. Within these six schools, there are 11 different degrees related to CCJ. What is perhaps most interesting is that the degrees offered are not limited solely to the PhD, and those that are listed as PhD

---

[1] Of these universities, 40 are located within the U.S. The remaining two universities are international – one from Canada and one from Slovania (ADPCCJ, n.d.)

degrees are not in criminology or criminal justice per se. Instead, variations of the CCJ doctorate are offered in the form of the Doctorate of Business Administration (DBA), the Doctorate of Strategic Security (DSS), the Doctor of Management (DM), and the Doctorate of Psychology (PsyD). Though appearing to be PD programs because of their appeals to working professionals and part-time students, two of the universities, Capella and Walden, still label their degrees as PhDs. Doctoral education in four of the universities—Henley-Putnam, Capella, Walden, and Northcentral University (NCU)—is offered entirely online, while the other two—University of the Rockies and Colorado Technical University—offer classes online, face-to-face, or a blend of the two modes. Table 2 presents an overview of these universities and their degree offerings.

It is important to acknowledge that there are differences between these degrees and traditional PhDs beyond just the program focuses. One of the most important differences is that between traditional, in-class learning and online courses. While the body of literature comparing these different modes of course delivery is vast (see, for example, U.S. Department of Education, 2010, which identifies over 1,000 empirical studies of online learning between 1996 and 2008), there are a few consistent findings that bear consideration for comparing PD programs with those offering traditional PhDs. Students who take online courses have been found to perform better than those learning the same material in traditional classrooms, and students who received blended courses—those utilizing both face-to-face and online delivery—scored among the highest (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Additionally, because of the array of techniques that can be utilized with an online course, different types of learners and students of various courses can have their needs more easily met (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

While face-to-face classes often are taught in a linear fashion (Dabbagh & NannaRitland, 2005), online courses utilize an array of teaching practices that

Table 2 Overview of professional doctorates in criminology and criminal justice

Institution	Degree	Concentration
Capella University	PhD in Public Safety	Criminal Justice
Henley-Putnam University	Doctor of Strategic Security (DSS)	–
University of the Rockies	Doctor of Psychology (PsyD)	Psychology, Criminology, and Justice Studies
Colorado Technical University	Doctor of Management (DM)	Homeland Security
Northcentral University	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)	Homeland Security Leadership and Policy
	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)	Criminal Justice
	PhD in Business Administration	Homeland Security Leadership and Policy
	PhD in Business Administration	Criminal Justice
Walden University	PhD in Public Policy and Administration	Criminal Justice
	PhD in Public Policy and Administration	Homeland Security Policy and Coordination
	PhD in Public Policy and Administration	Terrorism, Mediation, and Peace

emphasize active student learning (Baker, 2003; Browne, 2005; Keengwe & Kidd, 2010). Further, while face-to-face classes are constrained by time and space, in that both the professor, who controls the learning environment, and students must be present (Dabbagh & NannaRitland, 2005), online courses do not have such constraints (Keengwe & Kidd, 2010). Instead, the latter are more dynamic, foster greater collaboration and ownership between the students and professor, may use a variety of teaching techniques (e.g., videos, chat rooms, threaded conversations, and other forms of multimedia), and work may be completed on the students' timetable rather than during a fixed class time (Cao, Park, & Honda, 2008; Heuer & King, 2004; Keengwe & Kidd, 2010). Online degrees also typically allow students to complete their degrees for less money, both in terms of tuition and in time spent away from their jobs in which they earn their living (Simpson, 2012).

Course Comparisons Between PhDs and PDs

Conventional PhD programs focus on cultivating advanced research skills among their students. As such, PhD programs usually require courses in research methodologies (typically quantitative in nature), criminological theory, and statistics or data analysis. Examination of the course requirements of the 42 member universities with membership in the ADPCCJ supports this institutional goal, as nearly all require at least one course in each of these three areas. Conversely, while all of the CCJ PD programs require a research methods course, only two schools (Capella and University of the Rockies) require a theory course. Further, while both University of the Rockies and NCU require statistics courses, these courses are only required at NCU in the PhD tracts. Students who select the DBA degree at NCU are not required to take statistics courses.

Another difference in PhD and PD doctorates in CCJ can be found in the additional coursework, including electives, required for completion of the degree. In PhD programs, students can be required or opt to complete electives with advanced statistics and research methods courses (including qualitative research). Additionally, they may enroll in courses, such as ethics, philosophy of law, race and ethnicity, courts, corrections, and policing. However, each of these courses has a common thread—they are all designed to advance research skills and critical thinking as they relate to the CCJ field.

Conversely, students in PD programs enroll in courses that have a more practical application or that are focused on very narrow topics within the broader CCJ field. For example, students at Capella University (n.d.) are offered courses in public safety and leadership. At University of the Rockies (n.d.), students are required to complete coursework in psychology treatment that teaches them to diagnose mental illnesses. Both Henley-Putnam University (n.d.a) and NCU (n.d.) require completion of coursework in intelligence, strategy, and security. The main focus of all of these courses is teaching students practical and applicable skills needed to advance their careers within their areas of specialization. Interestingly, however, two of the schools—Henley-Putnam University[2] and the University of the Rockies[3]—do not require or even offer internship opportunities to facilitate their students getting more "hands on" training.

---

[2] D. Nguyen, personal communication, January 7, 2014.
[3] A. Morgan, personal communication, January 6, 2014.

As stated earlier, doctoral coursework typically culminates in a dissertation that is designed to show a student's ability to conduct research (Bourner et al., 2001; Fink, 2006; Jolley, 2007; Kot & Hendel, 2012; Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009). While these are more often characteristic of the PhD than the PD, five of the six schools offering CCJ PDs require the successful completion and defense of a dissertation.[4] Students in PD programs also must successfully assemble and work under the supervision of a dissertation committee. However, given the detachment between students and their faculty due to the online format of the programs, dissertation committees may be formed by selecting pre-approved faculty from a database, as compared to PhD students who rely on their time in class or in collaborative research to forge relationships with potential committee members.

Another noticeable difference between the CCJ PhD and PD programs concerns comprehensive exams. For conventional PhD programs, students often are required to pass "comps" before they can defend a dissertation proposal and advance to candidacy. While the format of such exams varies based on the school, they typically focus on testing students' cumulative knowledge in substantive research areas, including methods, theory, and statistics. In contrast, only two of the six PD universities (Capella and NCU) require comprehensive exams before students can begin a dissertation.

Despite the different course emphases, class sizes in the PD programs do not vastly differ from traditional PhD programs. Henley-Putnam University typically has around five students per course, though class enrollments may be higher depending on the course.[5] At University of the Rockies, class sizes may be reach as high as 25.[6] At the same time, when examining enrollment in courses of specialization, class sizes may be as small as just two students.[7]

Differences between the PD and the PhD, however, are more observable when examining the backgrounds of the faculty. In traditional PhD programs, professors typically join faculty straight out of their own doctorate programs, joining the ranks as assistant professors. Like their students, many of these faculty members have been trained as professional researchers. In PD programs, however, practical experience is a requirement. Faculty from Henley-Putnam University (n.d.b) have served at high ranking positions with the FBI, CIA, NSA, and British Intelligence, as well as in special military branches, such as Delta Force and the Navy Seals. On average, faculty members have around 17 years of experience in these agencies (Henley-Putnam University, n.d.b). University of the Rockies also requires faculty members to have recent practical experience and to keep current within their respective areas.[8]

It also is important to consider where graduates are getting placed after they complete their degrees. While many PhD students will continue in academia by obtaining assistant professor positions after graduation, some will take jobs outside of academia, either working with government agencies (e.g., the Bureau of Justice

---

[4] Colorado Technical University (n.d.) requires the completion of a defense or a series of articles. Students may select either outcome, pending the approval of their committee (Colorado Technical University, n.d.).
[5] See footnote 3.
[6] See footnote 4.
[7] Enrollment statistics for the overall programs were not publically available according to the admissions counselors with whom the authors consulted (A. Morgan, personal communication, January 6, 2014).
[8] See footnote 4.

Statistics or the FBI's Behavioral Analysis Unit) or accepting consulting positions in either the public or private sectors. Graduates of PD programs, however, rarely will end up in academic positions. Instead, these students are working to further their careers, as a number already hold either high rank positions in the military or senior-level positions in corporations and law enforcement agencies.[9] Thus, these degrees are used more as an enhancement to existing skill sets than a gateway into a new career.

Discussion

In many disciplines that have experienced emergence of professional doctorates, concerns have arisen over a perceived disconnect between the PD and the PhD. In some instances, such as medical PDs (e.g., the MD or the DDS) and social science PDs (e.g., the Doctor of Social Work (DSW)), these degrees are not recognized as holding the same value as the PhD (Jolley, 2007; Lester, 2004). In such programs, the focus typically is on professional extension rather than academic research as a defining characteristic (Lester, 2004).

As many CCJ PhD programs are comprised of students who are both (professional) researchers and (researching) professionals, the introduction of the PD in this discipline provides a unique opportunity to those who seek to advance their skill sets as practitioners and fill a void that is potentially created by research-focused programs. Indeed, the curriculum of CCJ programs has long been debated (Sever et al., 2008). Early programs focused on the needs of law enforcement personnel, correctional officers, and other criminal justice agents (Carter, Sapp, & Stevens, 1989; Frost & Clear, 2007; Sever et al., 2008). Typically, these programs focused on such courses as administration, law, corrections, and courts (Carter et al., 1989).

As the discipline continued to grow, however, the courses become more research-focused. Today, the majority of doctoral programs in CCJ focus on turning out researchers rather than enhancing professionals. This shift also has created a revision of the focus of CCJ coursework. Rather than offering classes with "real world" applicability, program requirements now hinge on methods, statistics, and theory—the essential tools of the professional researcher (Brown, 1982; Bufkin, 2004; DiChristina, 1997; Lytle & Travis, 2008; Worrall, 2000). This also has created the need for law enforcement personnel obtaining degrees in CCJ to adapt to the program requirements, rather than programs offering components that complement their professional practices.

Such a dichotomy in needs could lead to a fracturing of students in the discipline if all needs are not met. As Sever et al. (2008) note, CCJ departments can either become "a 'cop shop,'" or they can become "a 'research center' that concentrates on theory and research with little focus on the issues pertinent to the practitioners of criminal justice" (p. 246). While some doctoral programs take these concerns into consideration when designing their curriculum, it is difficult for a single program to meet the needs of both researching and practicing students. CCJ PD programs can be used to meet the needs of law enforcement and criminal justice practitioners who are looking to enhance, rather than replace, their careers. This distinction in program goals also reflects a current tension in CCJ departments for both students and faculty who believe that one must be either a researcher or a practitioner, but rarely both.

---

[9] See footnote 3.

At the same time, it should be noted that there are potential drawbacks from taking the stance that PhD programs should only cater to researchers and PD programs should be focused on meeting needs of practitioners. At present, CCJ PhD programs are comprised of many professionals from the field. Additionally, many CCJ PhD programs rely on relationships with outside criminal justice agencies. Many of these partnerships are cultivated or facilitated by students within the programs who work for the agencies. Losing students to PD programs can lead to a loss of resources for PhD programs.

Several schools have provided potential alternatives to meet the needs of practitioners. Texas Southern University, for example, currently offers a PhD in the Administration of Justice. Their curriculum still includes the traditional research-focused components, but incorporates a practical application that has been characteristic of PD programs (Texas Southern University, n.d.). In addition to the traditional master's degree in criminology, the University of South Florida (n.d.) also offers a weekend program that focuses on management and administration, decision making, and technical skills needed within the criminal justice field. A particularly noteworthy aspect of this program is that the CJ administration program is *only* available to working professionals, whereas traditional researching students may enroll in the criminology program offered (University of South Florida, n.d.). Thus, the University of South Florida has recognized a niche market for housing separate programs for different students' needs within the same school. More doctoral programs in CCJ might benefit from considering this unique approach.

While there has yet to be a definitive split between CCJ PDs and PhDs, the discipline is still young and maturing. Such a divide may emerge as more PD programs develop and as there become more opportunities for electronic and distance learning that adapt to the needs of practitioners with full-time careers seeking part time educations. Interestingly, none of the PD programs are a part of the ADPCCJ, yet their end goal—producing CCJ doctorates—falls within the scope for membership in the organization. Further, at present, the organization only has provisions for including traditional PhD programs as members; inclusion of PD programs in the organization would require a discussion among the existing members (B. Huebner, personal communication, January 12, 2013). Part of that discussion is likely to involve degree of product similarity. In particular, do PD graduates have the same theoretical, methodological, and statistical skills as graduates of PhD programs? The question is akin to what has been asked about the training of law school graduates as compared to PhD graduates (see Enriquez, 2007, 2008, Hemmens, 2008, and Hunter, 2008 for discussion of the training of JDs and their role in CCJ education). Another part of the discussion is likely to involve faculty credentials. Simply put, should faculty members in PD programs have the same degrees as faculty in PhD programs?

Finally, contrary to the situation in other fields, the few existing PD programs in CCJ do not appear presently to be a distinct departure from PhD programs. This, however, warrants further consideration as both CCJ as a whole, and PDs within the field, continue to develop. The question remains as to whether PDs will continue on the trajectory of being more flexible CCJ doctorates, continuing to run parallel to PhD programs, or if they will eventually diverge and develop into their own distinct programs that bear little resemblance to the CCJ PhD. Regardless, the emergence of PD programs in CCJ provides a new dimension for understanding the continued growth of a discipline that continues to forge a distinct identity.

Appendix

Table 3 PhD granting member in-
stitutions of the ADPCCJ*

Institution	Degree concentration
Arizona State University	Criminology and Criminal Justice
Florida State University	Criminology and Criminal Justice
Georgia State University	Criminal Justice and Criminology
George Mason University	Criminology, Law, and Society
Indiana University	Criminal Justice
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Criminology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice
Michigan State University	Criminal Justice
North Dakota State University	Criminal Justice and Political Science
Northeastern University	Criminal Justice
Old Dominion University	Sociology and Criminal Justice
Penn State University	Sociology
Prairie View A&M University	Juvenile Justice and Psychology
Rutgers University, Newark	Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University	Criminal Justice
Simon Fraser University	Criminology
Southern Illinois University	Criminology and Criminal Justice
Temple University	Criminal Justice
Texas Southern University	Administration of Justice
Texas State University	Criminal Justice
The American University	Justice, Law, and Society
University at Albany, SUNY	Criminal Justice
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Criminal Justice
University of California, Irvine	Criminology, Law, and Society
University of Central Florida	Criminal Justice
University of Cincinnati	Criminal Justice
University of Delaware	Sociology and Criminal Justice
University of Florida	Criminology, Law, and Society
University of Illinois at Chicago	Criminology, Law, and Justice
University of Louisville	Justice and Administration
University of Maribor	Criminal Justice and Security
University of Maryland	Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Massachusetts—Lowell	Criminology and Justice Studies
University of Missouri, St. Louis	Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Nebraska, Omaha	Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of New Haven	Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences
University of North Dakota	Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina	Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of South Florida	Criminology
University of Southern Mississippi	Criminal Justice
University of Texas—Dallas	Criminology and Sociology
Washington State University	Criminal Justice and Criminology

* Information compiled from
http://www.adpccj.com/members.
html

References

Allen, C. M., Smyth, E. M., & Wahlstrom, M. (2002). Responding to the field and to the academy: Ontario's evolving PhD. *Higher Education Research and Development, 21*(2), 203–214.

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

Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice (ADPCCJ). (n.d.). Membership directory. Retrieved from http://www.adpccj.com/members.html.

Baker, A. (2003). Faculty development for teaching online: educational and technological issues. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 34*(6), 273–278.

Bourner, T., Bowden, R., & Laing, S. (2001). Professional doctorates in England. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(1), 65–83.

Brown, S. (1982). Research methods and criminal justice curricula: surmounting the obstacles. *Criminal Justice Review, 7*(1), 11–16.

Browne, E. (2005). Structural and pedagogic change in further and higher education: a case study approach. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 29*(1), 49–59.

Bufkin, J. (2004). Criminology/criminal justice master's programs in the United States: searching for commonalities. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*(2), 239–262.

Cao, Y., Park, J. S., & Honda, H. (2008). The two worlds of adult MBA education: Online v. traditional courses in student background and performance. Paper presented at the Adult Higher Education Alliance Conference, Saratoga Springs, NY. Retrieved from http://ahea.org/files/pro2010cao.pdf.

Capella University. (n.d.). Online PhD in criminal justice degree program: Courses. Retrieved from http://www.capella.edu/online-degrees/phd-criminal-justice/courses.

Carter, D., Sapp, A., & Stevens, D. (1989). *The state of education policy direction for the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Dabbagh, N., & NannaRitland, B. (2005). *Online learning: concepts, strategies and application.* New Jersey, NJ: Upper Saddle River.

DiChristina, B. (1997). The quantitative emphasis in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 8*(2), 181–199.

Doncaster, K., & Thorne, L. (2000). Reflection and planning: essential elements of professional doctorates. *Reflective Practice, 1*(3), 391–399.

Dreher, H. M., & Glasgow, M. E. S. (2011). Global perspectives on the professional doctorate. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 48*(4), 403–408.

Ellis, L. (2007). Academics' perceptions of the professional or clinical doctorate: findings of a national survey. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(12), 2272–2279.

Ellis, L. B., & Lee, N. (2005). The changing landscape of doctoral education: introducing the professional doctorate for nurses. *Nurse Education Today, 25*(3), 222–229.

Enriquez, R. (2007). The vanishing JD-How ACJS certification ensures extinction of the species. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(2), 254–260.

Enriquez, R. (2008). Criminal justice faculty credentials: a response to Drs. Hemmens and Hunter. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19*(2), 205–212.

Evans, T. (2002). Part-time research students: are they producing knowledge where it counts? *Higher Education Research and Development, 21*(2), 155–165.

Fenge, L. (2010). Sense and sensibility: making sense of a professional doctorate. *Reflective Practice, 11*(5), 645–656.

Fink, D. (2006). The professional doctorate: its relativity to the PhD and relevance for the knowledge economy. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 1*, 35–44.

Frost, N. A., & Clear, T. R. (2007). Doctoral education in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(1), 35–52.

Gregory, M. (1995). Implications of the introduction of the doctor of education degree in British universities: can the EdD reach parts the PhD cannot? *Vocational Aspect of Education, 47*(2), 177–188.

Halse, C., & Mowbray, S. (2011). The impact of the doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(5), 513–525.

Hemmens, C. (2008). Waist deep in the big muddy: the JD/PhD debate in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19*(1), 19–29.

Henley-Putnam University. (n.d.a). Doctorate in strategic security: Core requirements. Retrieved from http://www.henley-putnam.edu/programs/doctoral/strategic-security.aspx.

Henley-Putnam University. (n.d.b). HUMINT Faculty. Retrieved from http://www.henley-putnam.edu/military/faculty.aspx.

Heuer, B. P., & King, K. P. (2004). Leading the band: the role of the instructor in online learning for educators. *The Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 3*(1), 1–11.

Hunter, R. D. (2008). Why we need certification standards in criminal justice education and what the impacts will be: a response to the concerns of JDs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19*(2), 193–204.

Jolley, J. (2007). Choose your doctorate. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(2), 225–233.

Katz, J., & Hartnett, R. T. (1976). *Scholars in the making: the development of graduate and professional studies*. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Keengwe, J., & Kidd, T.T. (2010). Towards best practices in online learning and teaching in higher education. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 6*(2). Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no2/keengwe_0610.htm.

Kot, F. C., & Hendel, D. D. (2012). Emergence and growth of professional doctorates in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and Australia: a comparative analysis. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(3), 345–364.

Lee, A., Brennan, M., & Green, B. (2009). Re-imagining doctoral education: professional doctorates and beyond. *Higher Education Research and Development, 28*(3), 275–287.

Lester, S. (2004). Conceptualizing the practitioner doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(6), 757–770.

Lytle, D. J., & Travis, L. F. (2008). Graduate education in criminology or criminal justice: assessing course requirements. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 19*(3), 339–350.

Malfroy, J. (2004). Conceptualisation of a professional doctorate program: focusing on practice and change. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 31*(2), 63–80.

Maxwell, T. W. (2003). From first to second generation professional doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education, 28*(3), 279–291.

Maxwell, T. W., & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, G. (2009). Producing the professional doctorate: the portfolio as a legitimate alternative to the dissertation. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46*(2), 135–145.

National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics. (2010). *Doctorate recipients from U.S. Universities: 2009* (Special Report NSF 11-306). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/nsf11306/.

Nerad, M. (2004). The PhD in the US: criticisms, facts, and remedies. *Higher Education Policy, 17*, 183–199.

Neumann, R. (2005). Doctoral differences: professional doctorates and PhDs compared. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27*(2), 173–188.

Noble, K. A. (1994). *Changing doctoral degrees: an international perspective*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Northcentral University. (n.d.). Criminal justice specialization: Doctor of business administration. Retrieved from http://www.ncu.edu/northcentral-programs/specializations/BUS/dba/criminal-justice.

Park, C. (2007). Redefining the doctorate. Retrieved from The Higher Education Academy website: http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/research/redefining_the_doctorate.pdf.

Pearson, A., Borbasi, S., & Gott, M. (1997). Doctoral education in nursing for practitioner knowledge and for academic knowledge: the University of Adelaide, Australia. *The Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 29*(4), 365–368.

Ries, P., & Thurgood, D. (1993). *Summary report 1991: doctoral recipients from United States universities*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Schafer, J. A., & Castellano, T. C. (2005). Academe versus academy: faculty views on awarding academic credit for police training. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 16*(2), 300–317.

Servage, L. (2009). Alternative and professional doctorate programs: what is driving the demand? *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(7), 765–779.

Sever, B., Coram, G., & Meltzer, G. (2008). Criminal justice graduate programs at the beginning of the 21st century. *Criminal Justice Review, 33*(2), 221–249.

Simpson, O. (2012). *Supporting students in online, open, & distance learning* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Taylor, A. (2007). Learning to become researching professionals: the case of the doctorate of education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 19*(2), 154–166.

Texas Southern University. (n.d.). TSU AJ brochure. Retrieved from http://www.tsu.edu/PDFFiles/academics/public/programs/TSU%20AJ%20Brochure.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education. (2008a). Structure of U.S. education: First professional degrees. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/edlite-structure-us.html.

U.S. Department of Education. (2008b). Structure of U.S. education: Research doctorate degrees. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/edlite-structure-us.html.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://eprints.cpkn.ca/7/1/finalreport.pdf.

University of South Florida. (n.d.). Criminology: USF's College of Behavioral & Community Sciences. Retrieved from http://criminology.cbcs.usf.edu/.

University of the Rockies. (n.d.). Doctor of psychology, criminology and justice studies: Courses. Retrieved from http://www.rockies.edu/psydcriminology-courses.htm.

Wellington, J., & Sikes, P. (2006). 'A doctorate in a tight compartment': why do students choose a professional doctorate and what impact does it have on their personal and professional lives? *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(6), 723–734.

Winfield, G. (1987). *The social science PhD: the ESRC inquiry on submission rates*. London: Economic and Social Research Council.

Worrall, J. (2000). In defense of the "quantoids": more research on the emphasis in criminal justice and research. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 11*(2), 353–361.

Wrede, C., & Featherstone, R. (2012). Striking out on its own: the divergence of criminology and criminal justice from sociology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 23*(1), 103–125.

Jaclyn Schildkraut is a doctoral student in the School of Criminal Justice at Texas State University. Her research interests include school shootings, homicide trends, mediatization effects, and crime theories. She has published in *Homicide Studies*, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Fast Capitalism*, and *Criminal Justice Studies*.

Mark C. Stafford is the Doctoral Program Director of the School of Criminal Justice at Texas State University. He also has held faculty positions at the University of Texas at Austin and Washington State University. He has published in *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *Quantitative Criminology*, and *Journal of Criminal Justice*.