

# Scholarly Productivity in Clinical Psychology PhD Programs: A Normative Assessment of Publication Rates

Peter K. Stewart, Michael C. Roberts, and Kimberlee M. Roy, Clinical Child Psychology Program, University of Kansas

**Scholarly productivity of 166 American Psychological Association–accredited clinical psychology PhD programs was measured to provide objective, normative data. Publications were tallied over a five-year period (2000–2004) for individual faculty members from PsycINFO entries. Scholarly productivity profiles are provided for each program, including total number of publications, mean number of publications per faculty member, and total publications by publication type. A moderate relationship was found between *U.S. News & World Report* rankings and rankings of scholarly productivity ( $r_s = .57-.64$ ). Correlations of program size and number of publications suggest that larger programs tend to produce more total publications; however, having more faculty members did not correlate with a higher mean or median publication rate per individual.**

**Key words:** clinical psychology, education and training, faculty, program evaluation, scholarly productivity. [*Clin Psychol Sci Prac* 14: 157–171, 2007]

In the winter of 2000, *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice* published a special series of articles focusing on clinical psychology program evaluation (Barlow, 2000). The focal point of these articles was a study examining which programs were training the most core faculty members in clinical psychology programs (Ilardi, Rodriguez-Hanley,

Roberts, & Seigel, 2000). While explicitly billed as only one measure of program evaluation, the study was considered significant enough to be published with commentaries by prominent individuals within the field. The collective message from this article and the commentaries is that this specific examination of a single aspect of clinical programs illuminated a generalizable assumption that clinical psychology program evaluation is a critical area for investigation. Furthermore, a recent special issue of *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice* was dedicated to an assessment of the current state and future directions of the field, demonstrating the need for ongoing evaluation of the many facets of clinical psychology in light of continual change (Kendall, 2006). Research on clinical psychology program evaluation can assist applicants to graduate schools, educational institutions, employing agencies, and the field as a whole. Moreover, it is an area with a paucity of relevant research.

Belar (2000) emphasized the paucity of empirical data in regard to clinical psychology program evaluation by calling for more publicly accessible outcome measures of clinical training programs. One reason noted was to demonstrate more “truth in advertising” about psychology programs (Belar, 2000). With explicit outcome measures available in the public realm, performance of respective programs can be analyzed and compared. Normative data can be compiled and presented to help evaluate how programs and faculty are succeeding comparatively, for reasons both internal (e.g., policy or program changes) and external (e.g., grant awards or student decisions to apply for admission) to the program. In this vein and in answering a call by Ilardi et al. (2000), another measure of training program evaluation is

---

Address correspondence to Michael C. Roberts, Clinical Child Psychology Program, University of Kansas, 2009 Dole Human Development Center, 1000 Sunnyside Avenue, Lawrence, KS 66045. E-mail: mroberts@ku.edu

performed that assesses scholarly productivity of clinical psychology PhD programs.

#### **SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY**

Scholarly productivity is only one of the many measures of clinical psychology programs, including grants, student credentials, academic coursework, licensing examination scores, and clinical training, among several other metrics. Nonetheless, scholarly productivity is a representation of the emphasis that research, broadly defined, and publication are given within a respective program. Therefore, in order to assess the scholarly activity of programs, a measure of scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, and books) is appropriate. Although scholarly publications are but one outlet for research dissemination (cf. conference presentations, lectures, grants, didactics, etc.), it is consistent with the scholarly productivity literature to operationalize scholarly publications as a representation of a program's productivity (Brems, Johnson, & Gallucci, 1996; Cox & Catt, 1977; Delgado & Howard, 1994; Golden, Kuperman, & Osmon, 1980; Hanish et al., 1995; Howard, 1983).

Cox and Catt (1977) performed one of the earliest examinations of scholarly productivity of psychology. While an attempt to objectify the evaluations of productivity, this study did not examine subfields within psychology (e.g., clinical, counseling, etc.). In today's university settings, psychology degree programs and their faculties have become continually more specialized, even within the jurisdiction of the same institution or department. Program productivity may be vastly different between psychology subfields as a whole and within the same institution (Brems et al., 1996). Thus, an examination of program scholarly productivity needs to be performed specific to clinical psychology in order to be most useful to the subfield of clinical psychology.

Congruent with this rationale, a major shift in evaluation of scholarly productivity was made by Golden et al. (1980). They were among the first to investigate scholarly productivity within the subfield of clinical psychology through an examination of publications within clinical psychology journals. Although not specifically targeting clinical psychology programs because other service agencies were included (i.e., hospitals and medical centers), Golden et al. provided an initial snapshot of scholarly productivity within clinical psychology.

However, since this time there has been little research specifically in the area of clinical psychology.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, not all specialties of psychology have neglected this assessment. Other subfields that have continued to examine scholarly productivity within their respective areas include counseling psychology (Delgado & Howard, 1994; Howard, 1983), pediatric psychology (La Greca, Stone, & Swales, 1989), industrial/organizational psychology (Howard, Maxwell, Berra, & Sternitzke, 1985; Oliver, Blair, Gorman, & Woehr, 2005), marriage and family therapy (Tatman & Bischof, 2004), and behavior analysis (Hayder & Grundt, 1996; Shabani, Carr, Petursdottir, Esch, & Gillett, 2004).

#### **GRADUATE SCHOOL/PROGRAM RANKINGS**

Subjective rankings appear to yield tremendous influence over prospective students, faculty, and agencies. In the popular press, *U.S. News & World Report (USNWR)* dominates the ranking of colleges and graduate programs. Although the specific areas measured in their methodology are maintained secretively for the most part, their method appears to be based on the opinion of department chair rankings. Recently, this survey has had a low response rate of approximately 20% and *USNWR* methods are weighted through an undisclosed process. Consequently, this type of evaluation is predominantly based on the reputation of a program and subject to biases associated with a low response rate from department chairs who are not generally the clinical program director. By definition, reputations require time to be developed and maintained. Accordingly, because of this lag, the reputational rankings may not necessarily be congruent with other, more current measures of program evaluation (e.g., scholarly productivity). Yet, the reliance upon reputational rankings to aid graduate students in applying to programs or in distribution of awards and grants continues (Hanish et al., 1995; Ilardi et al., 2000).

*USNWR* did not begin reputational rankings of graduate programs. In fact, they are a continuation of a long history beginning in the 1920s (Diamond & Graham, 2000). Nor are they the only assessors of graduate programs. The National Research Council (NRC) publishes a periodic evaluation of program productivity and performance, with the latest edition published in 1995. The NRC survey utilizes subjective rankings of programs by faculty within the field; however, it also uses

objective methods (e.g., publication counts, citations, awards; Diamond & Graham, 2000). Although this more complex evaluation appears to have greater face validity, it remains a mixture of reputation and prestige (Pomfret & Wang, 2003). Further limitations include that it is only published every 10 years and the NRC studies only “degree programs,” usually defined as a department, not specific programs of study within a department such as programs commonly described as clinical psychology (Rogers & Rogers, 1997). This type of limitation hinders the evaluation of the current state of clinical psychology due to change that can occur over a decade. A new NRC evaluation is underway that will remove some of the subjective elements (although the selection of any variable is a subjective decision).

In contrast, *TheCenter* of the University of Florida utilizes a more objective approach to graduate university rankings by selecting nine indicators to rank universities (Lombardi et al., 2003). These indicators include measures of total research expenditures, federally funded research expenditures, faculty members in the national academies, faculty awards, doctorates awarded, postdoctoral appointments, students’ Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, endowments, and annual givings. Although one may argue over the inclusion of any one of these specific criteria, the comparative evaluation appears to be a valid objective exercise and is replicable. A major limitation is that *TheCenter* only evaluates universities as “whole” and not specific programs (e.g., clinical psychology programs).

The rankings by *USNWR*, the NRC, and *TheCenter* do provide some information on how psychology programs compare regardless of any methodological criticisms, but they provide little assistance in the evaluation of clinical psychology scholarly productivity. Nevertheless, because of the popularity of the *USNWR* ranking and its specific evaluation of clinical programs, it can provide some point of comparison with data on other program characteristics (viz., scholarly productivity).

#### **METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES**

Kazdin (2000) suggested that training program evaluations be performed with the same rigor as research evaluation. Previous research methods, while an improvement on subjective measures, are not without methodological flaws (Cox & Catt, 1977; Delgado & Howard, 1994; Golden et al., 1980; Howard, 1983). These studies all utilized

similar methodology and thus are subject to similar limitations. For example, the researchers identified several journals as “critical” and representative to their respective field and defined a time frame with which to examine scholarly productivity. Unfortunately, this methodology of examining productivity within a select list of journals is highly exclusive (Pomfret & Wang, 2003). No credit is given for other types of publications (i.e., journals outside of the specified list, chapters in edited books, authored books, etc.). An accurate snapshot of scholarly productivity cannot be gained fully by utilizing such a select list of journals.

In today’s professional and scientific domains, the number of journals and publication outlets has grown exponentially. There are many reasons for the increase in journals to serve the growing work in all of psychology, and the American Psychological Association (APA) list of journals is necessarily limited in its ability to cover all aspects. Given the space limitations of APA journals, for example, even excellent and influential studies cannot always be included. Admittedly, not all journal publications are equal in influence or quality, yet there are also many publications in top-tier journals that might make less of an impact to the field than studies published in journals perceived as lesser or in books. Moreover, some journals serving specialty fields have risen in reputation and recognition. One might argue that a quality measure should be applied to a measure of scholarly productivity (e.g., weighting productivity with the journal impact factor and citation impact factor for individual articles). However, this methodology is confounded as a measure of total scholarly productivity and any measure of quality is subjective and arbitrary (Amin & Mabe, 2000; Pomfret & Wang, 2003).<sup>2</sup> Thus, an accurate evaluation requires an incorporation of a variety of publication types. Indeed, clinical psychology has become a much broader domain than can be reflected in a handful of journals.

Countering the methodological limitations of previous studies, Brems et al. (1996), Hanish et al. (1995), and Oliver et al. (2005) demonstrated an alternate methodology. These researchers utilized an electronic database of publication references (viz., PsycLIT or PsycINFO) to examine scholarly productivity. The evaluations were based on the number of references that resulted from the name of each faculty member being entered into the database search engine. Future replication is also

possible by utilizing an electronic database of publication references as a source for the measurement of scholarly productivity.

### RESEARCH GOALS

The primary purpose of the present study is to measure the scholarly productivity of APA-accredited PhD clinical psychology programs to provide normative, empirically based data resulting from a single, objective measure of program evaluation (Oliver et al., 2005; Pomfret & Wang, 2003; Roediger, 2005). In essence, the question asked is this: what programs are leading the way in terms of scholarly productivity today? Additionally, what are the publishing norms for a graduate program in clinical psychology that awards the PhD? Consequently, scholarly productivity for training programs is assessed with total number of publications by type of publication, average number of publications per faculty member, and other descriptive statistics. Moreover, individual program information data are provided, including data for the total number of publications and rankings compared to other programs. Further comparisons are executed to assess the impact of program size and number of publications. Additionally, in order to better understand the results of the present study and previous prestige rankings, a comparison is made with *USNWR* (2004) ranking of clinical psychology programs.

### METHODS

#### Participants

Scholarly productivity information was gathered on 1,927 core faculty members from 166 clinical psychology PhD programs accredited by the APA (2004a). Core faculty members were defined using standards based on Ilardi et al. (2000). These include all professorial staff faculty that were not listed as adjunct, courtesy, or clinical professor or supervisor, instructor, or professor emeritus in public information about the programs.

#### Measures

PsycINFO was the primary data source used to measure scholarly productivity for the study. Maintained by the APA, it currently contains over 2,000,000 references from 1887 to the present (APA, 2004b). This database is the most comprehensive resource for author and topic searches in psychology and allied fields. Each core faculty

member's name (and variations thereof) was entered into PsycINFO to ensure maximum capture of entries without duplication. Thus, while PsycINFO serves as an invaluable and perhaps "best" source to measure scholarly productivity in psychology, similar to any archival database, it is not perfect. Every effort was made to account for all publications by individuals entered into PsycINFO. However, because of the many name variations, reference styles, and name changes (e.g., birth names and nicknames), some entries may not have been identified. In an attempt to find all relevant publications, for all authors whose publication number was zero, program Web sites and links to vitas were checked for name changes. In this way, female faculty members were not disenfranchised as long as they had identified other publication names in program materials. In all likelihood, potential entries that were not identified are randomly distributed throughout all programs within the study. In an effort to create an equal and fair measure of scholarly productivity, the same limit on publication dates for all faculty members was used (i.e., only publications from a five-year period, January 1, 2000, to December 31, 2004, were included). A five-year window of examination is consistent with other measures of scholarly productivity and program evaluation (Ilardi et al., 2000; Oliver et al., 2005) and creates a picture of who and what programs are currently active.

#### Procedures

First, a list of the APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD programs was created. This was based on the list of accredited APA clinical psychology programs from the APA list (APA, 2004a). From the list of 223 programs, 55 were excluded from the study because they were PsyD programs and do not award a PhD. This is not to say that PsyD programs or individuals with a PsyD might not produce scholarship, but rather that there is a significant difference between the amount of emphasis on research per se published based on degree type (Barrom, Shadish, & Montgomery, 1988). Using scholarly productivity as a measure of program evaluation for a PsyD program may provide less relevant information because the variable of examination is not likely to be an emphasis of the program. Two PhD programs, New York University and the Wright Institute, were excluded from the investigation because the APA list (APA, 2004a) identified

the programs as being phased out and this was confirmed by the program's respective Web sites. The result was 166 APA-accredited clinical psychology programs awarding a PhD.

After identifying the relevant clinical psychology programs, a roster of core faculty for each program was obtained as of February 1, 2004. Following methodology consistent with Oliver et al. (2005), an e-mail was sent to the respective department chairs or contacts requesting a current list of core faculty members, as defined previously. Programs that did not respond to the initial email (40 total, 24.1%) were sent a second e-mail 2 weeks later. If no response was received from the second e-mail notice (19 total, 11.4%), then the roster of core faculty was gathered from the respective program's Web site (Oliver et al., 2005). Once the core faculty roster was compiled, data were gathered on scholarly productivity for core faculty members and then aggregated to provide an overall report of scholarly productivity for the clinical psychology programs.

Each publication was tallied within its respective category (i.e., books, chapters, or peer-reviewed journal articles) as indicated by PsycINFO to provide every core faculty member with a total number of publications for each type within the time period being examined. A total scholarly productivity number was computed by summing the number of publications within the identified categories. For purposes of this study, equal credit was given for all types of publication within the database.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, equal credit was given for a single author, first author, or a later author in a publication with multiple authors (Pomfret & Wang, 2003). Furthermore, when multiple authors from the same institution appear on the same publication, each faculty member was credited for the publication in the database. This stems from the assumption that intradepartmental collaboration is beneficial to the field as a whole, as well as to the institutions. Many investigations require more assistance to complete and, thus, programs would not be penalized for having collaborated.

## RESULTS

### Overall Publication Statistics

The overall descriptive statistics of the program scholarly productivity data are presented in Table 1. Among all 1,927 faculty members, the total number of publication

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of overall scholarly productivity from 2000 to 2004

	All publication types	Books	Chapters	Peer-reviewed journal articles
Total	18,731	398	2,767	15,566
Mean	9.72	0.21	1.44	8.08
Median	6	0	0	5
Mode	0	0	0	0
SD	11.94	0.65	3.06	10.02

credits from the year 2000 to 2004 was 18,731. The mean number of publications for a faculty member at an APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD program was 9.75 and the median number of publications was six during the five-year window. The per year average publication rate was approximately two for a faculty member. The three measured publication types (i.e., books, chapters, and peer-reviewed journal articles) were not represented equally in the total publication number. Peer-reviewed journal articles made up the majority of publications with 15,566 (83.1%), followed by chapters, 2,767 (14.8%), and books, 398 (2.1%). The publication rates among faculty members were not equally distributed. In fact, the modes for total publications, peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, and books were all 0. Of the 1,927 faculty members in the study, 236 (12.2%) did not have a single publication during the five-year time period. Likewise, almost half of the faculty members (895 or 46.4%) had five publications or less.

### Program Statistics

Further analyses yielded a mean faculty size of 11.6 faculty members and a standard deviation of 6.45, with the smallest program containing three core faculty members and the largest containing 44 (median 10, mode 8). The individual program data are displayed in Table 2. All programs published something archived in PsycINFO during the time period, but the variability ranged from a low of 2 to a high of 853. In an attempt to control for the variability in size of programs, the mean and median number of publications are presented as well. Additionally, the standard deviations are displayed to reveal the variability of publication rates among faculty members within a specific program. Similarly, the total number of publications by publication type (i.e., books, chapters,

Table 2. Scholarly productivity data by clinical psychology PhD programs from 2000 to 2004

USNWR rank	Total rank	Mean rank	Median rank	Institution	# Fac	Total	Mean	Median	SD	BK	CH	PJ
120	94	127	152	Adelphi University	14	79	5.64	1.5	10.37	1	6	72
n/a	153	157	154	Alliant International University	9	22	2.44	1	3.32	0	9	13
77	126	113	112	American University	8	54	6.75	4.5	7.59	0	4	50
38	19	23	34	Arizona State University	13	193	14.85	11	8.86	3	33	157
68	137	143	112	Auburn University	10	44	4.40	4.5	3.50	0	6	38
68	48	42	87	Binghamton University/ State University of New York	10	125	12.50	6.5	12.31	4	20	101
n/a	125	155	154	Biola University	21	55	2.62	1	3.37	2	8	45
32	8	38	118	Boston University	21	279	13.29	4	18.24	13	33	233
77	79	86	62	Bowling Green State University	10	91	9.10	8	9.98	2	11	78
92	76	79	105	Brigham Young University	10	94	9.40	5	13.67	2	16	76
n/a	161	163	154	California School of Professional Psychology-Fresno	11	16	1.45	1	1.57	3	1	12
n/a	139	160	154	California School of Professional Psychology-Los Angeles	23	43	1.87	1	2.28	0	19	24
n/a	114	134	118	California School of Professional Psychology-San Diego	12	62	5.17	4	4.93	1	21	40
n/a	166	166	165	Carlos Albizu University-San Juan Campus	12	2	0.17	0	0.39	0	0	2
55	18	37	132	Case Western Reserve University	15	201	13.40	3	19.01	4	32	165
92	135	82	62	Catholic University of America	5	46	9.20	8	2.68	0	7	39
n/a	147	140	112	Central Michigan University	8	36	4.50	4.5	2.20	2	5	29
113	131	145	112	City University of New York at City College	12	50	4.17	4.5	2.69	4	12	34
68	131	67	62	Clark University	5	50	10.00	8	7.25	3	10	37
n/a	58	88	78	Concordia University	13	118	9.08	7	7.94	0	14	104
n/a	25	10	4	Dalhousie University	9	177	19.67	18	18.62	1	9	167
92	28	58	143	DePaul University	16	173	10.81	2	21.39	8	23	142
n/a	30	100	78	Drexel University	21	170	8.10	7	6.59	7	29	134
11	32	30	24	Duke University	12	167	13.92	12	11.76	1	22	144
n/a	143	152	143	Duquesne University	14	40	2.86	2	2.57	2	10	28
20	26	36	62	Emory University	13	175	13.46	8	12.86	7	32	136
n/a	83	138	143	Fairleigh Dickinson University	19	90	4.74	2	5.76	6	9	75
44	20	24	62	Florida State University	13	190	14.62	8	30.85	4	22	164
100	54	71	87	Fordham University	12	119	9.92	6.5	10.16	2	20	97
n/a	86	130	112	Fuller Theological Seminary	16	87	5.44	4.5	5.54	3	10	74
n/a	163	161	154	Gallaudet University	6	11	1.83	1	2.64	0	3	8
n/a	106	94	60	George Mason University	8	69	8.63	8.5	6.39	2	17	50
77	136	128	87	George Washington University	8	45	5.63	6.5	3.85	0	3	42
100	54	83	62	Georgia State University	13	119	9.15	8	5.91	1	7	111
n/a	155	158	152	Howard University	10	20	2.00	1.5	1.89	2	4	14
n/a	150	141	118	Idaho State University	7	31	4.43	4	3.60	0	3	28
113	159	151	141	Illinois Institute of Technology	6	18	3.00	2.5	2.53	1	3	14
4	11	32	22	Indiana University	18	248	13.78	12.5	9.25	3	23	222
113	79	52	78	Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	8	91	11.38	7	12.94	0	7	84
n/a	165	165	165	Jackson State University	15	9	0.60	0	1.24	0	1	8
77	7	66	60	Kent State University	28	282	10.07	8.5	7.75	5	44	233
n/a	158	150	154	Loma Linda University	6	19	3.17	1	4.17	0	1	18
n/a	111	139	141	Long Island University	14	65	4.64	2.5	6.85	1	13	51
77	101	17	10	Louisiana State University	4	71	17.75	17	10.28	1	2	68
77	117	112	105	Loyola University of Chicago	9	61	6.78	5	5.85	0	11	50
113	161	133	105	Marquette University	3	16	5.33	5	4.51	0	1	15
n/a	47	40	22	McGill University	10	128	12.80	12.5	8.31	1	7	120
100	114	118	132	Miami University (OH)	10	62	6.20	3	7.94	2	14	46
49	72	62	39	Michigan State University	10	103	10.30	10.5	6.13	1	9	93
120	89	96	78	Northern Illinois University	10	85	8.50	7	6.87	0	6	79
11	101	91	92	Northwestern University	8	71	8.88	6	8.15	6	16	49
44	44	75	50	Northwestern University Medical School	14	135	9.64	9	9.32	2	15	118
100	9	95	105	Nova Southeastern University	31	265	8.55	5	10.30	11	39	215
38	159	146	154	Ohio State University	5	18	3.60	1	4.93	1	4	13
77	83	108	76	Ohio University	12	90	7.50	7.5	5.78	1	6	83
100	137	137	118	Oklahoma State University	9	44	4.89	4	5.11	0	1	43
n/a	23	93	118	Pacific Graduate School of Psychology	21	183	8.71	4	12.57	8	33	142

Table 2. Continued

USNWR rank	Total rank	Mean rank	Median rank	Institution	# Fac	Total	Mean	Median	SD	BK	CH	PJ
20	37	76	62	Pennsylvania State University	16	154	9.63	8	7.12	4	23	127
38	110	122	143	Purdue University	11	66	6.00	2	12.17	0	5	61
n/a	5	80	76	Queen's University	32	299	9.34	7.5	6.52	4	41	254
92	109	121	132	Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science	11	67	6.09	3	6.69	0	4	63
26	16	34	20	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	15	204	13.60	13	9.40	9	40	155
38	1	4	15	San Diego State University/ University of California, San Diego	35	853	24.37	15	22.01	5	56	792
n/a	103	124	112	Simon Fraser University	12	70	5.83	4.5	5.54	1	16	53
92	134	129	118	Southern Illinois University	9	49	5.44	4	4.00	0	3	46
113	92	109	62	St. John's University	11	81	7.36	8	4.48	10	15	56
100	149	147	132	St. Louis University	9	32	3.56	3	3.40	0	5	27
15	36	18	17	Stony Brook University/ State University of New York	9	159	17.67	14	14.41	3	25	131
n/a	98	142	143	Suffolk University	17	75	4.41	2	7.00	2	16	57
62	17	3	8	Syracuse University	8	203	25.38	17.5	19.21	2	14	187
62	79	14	4	Teachers College, Columbia University	5	91	18.20	18	10.18	2	16	73
32	14	19	42	Temple University	13	226	17.38	10	20.27	4	28	194
55	34	33	24	Texas A&M University	12	164	13.67	12	10.80	2	24	138
113	141	111	92	Texas Tech University	6	42	7.00	6	3.35	0	7	35
n/a	144	164	164	The Fielding Institute	36	38	1.06	0.5	1.33	4	8	26
n/a	95	105	105	The New School for Social Research	10	78	7.80	5	7.60	2	16	60
92	67	46	62	The University of Memphis	9	110	12.22	8	13.23	3	26	81
77	117	107	50	Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences	8	61	7.63	9	4.53	0	10	51
38	77	50	39	University at Albany/ State University of New York	8	92	11.50	10.5	7.80	4	10	78
44	35	50	128	University at Buffalo/ State University of New York	14	161	11.50	3.5	16.70	2	20	139
68	12	25	78	University of Alabama	17	245	14.41	7	18.72	2	69	174
62	10	123	132	University of Alabama at Birmingham	44	260	5.91	3	7.28	3	28	229
26	73	67	62	University of Arizona	10	100	10.00	8	6.09	0	22	78
120	126	35	24	University of Arkansas	4	54	13.50	12	8.96	2	17	35
n/a	46	39	20	University of British Columbia	10	129	12.90	13	4.77	4	13	112
2	29	2	3	University of California, Berkeley	6	171	28.50	18.5	21.83	4	30	137
1	6	11	12	University of California, Los Angeles	15	289	19.27	16	12.15	3	52	234
n/a	121	99	50	University of Central Florida	7	57	8.14	9	3.39	0	6	51
100	37	63	118	University of Cincinnati	15	154	10.27	4	17.58	2	4	148
15	53	67	48	University of Colorado at Boulder	12	120	10.00	9.5	9.72	1	26	93
55	126	113	128	University of Connecticut	8	54	6.75	3.5	8.01	0	3	51
62	65	65	42	University of Delaware	11	112	10.18	10	7.73	1	12	99
49	83	67	62	University of Denver	9	90	10.00	8	12.63	4	17	69
n/a	164	158	154	University of Detroit Mercy	5	10	2.00	1	2.35	0	0	10
20	4	89	92	University of Florida	37	332	8.97	6	8.58	10	60	262
32	62	26	24	University of Georgia	8	115	14.38	12	10.73	2	22	91
68	79	86	50	University of Hawaii at Manoa	10	91	9.10	9	6.81	1	10	80
77	71	101	62	University of Houston	13	104	8.00	8	6.34	2	14	88
49	92	49	42	University of Illinois at Chicago	7	81	11.57	10	9.02	1	4	76
8	65	55	24	University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign	10	112	11.20	12	6.66	4	23	85
15	33	22	8	University of Iowa	10	166	16.60	17.5	9.88	3	31	132
32	58	47	128	University of Kansas	10	118	11.80	3.5	17.76	8	42	68
26	90	8	2	University of Kansas—Child	4	83	20.75	19	11.67	5	24	54
49	21	13	13	University of Kentucky	10	188	18.80	15.5	12.56	2	28	158
100	120	125	103	University of Louisville	10	58	5.80	5.5	5.39	0	6	52
113	142	98	50	University of Maine	5	41	8.20	9	3.70	1	2	38
n/a	152	162	154	University of Manitoba	13	23	1.77	1	2.17	1	4	18
77	50	43	31	University of Maryland Baltimore County	10	124	12.40	11.5	8.34	6	21	97
38	42	21	16	University of Maryland College Park	8	137	17.13	14.5	11.92	2	20	115
44	108	126	128	University of Massachusetts at Amherst	12	68	5.67	3.5	6.01	6	13	49
77	62	78	118	University of Massachusetts at Boston	12	115	9.58	4	9.24	4	23	88

Table 2. Continued

USNWR rank	Total rank	Mean rank	Median rank	Institution	# Fac	Total	Mean	Median	SD	BK	CH	PJ
26	61	90	50	University of Miami (FL)	13	116	8.92	9	7.14	4	24	88
15	24	29	50	University of Michigan	13	181	13.92	9	16.60	5	59	117
4	42	6	10	University of Minnesota	6	137	22.83	17	15.80	1	9	127
92	113	101	87	University of Mississippi	8	64	8.00	6.5	7.41	0	15	49
26	30	27	48	University of Missouri–Columbia	12	170	14.17	9.5	11.23	1	26	143
100	144	117	78	University of Missouri–St. Louis	6	38	6.33	7	3.88	0	3	35
120	155	152	154	University of Montana	7	20	2.86	1	3.53	0	2	18
62	97	57	24	University of Nebraska–Lincoln	7	76	10.86	12	3.58	2	9	65
55	40	12	31	University of Nevada, Reno	8	153	19.13	11.5	19.66	14	52	87
n/a	131	110	92	University of New Brunswick	7	50	7.14	6	5.18	3	6	41
68	64	53	92	University of New Mexico	10	113	11.30	6	14.77	4	14	95
8	41	41	34	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	11	138	12.55	11	11.54	4	19	115
55	148	135	105	University of North Carolina at Greensboro	7	35	5.00	5	3.42	1	4	30
120	154	148	143	University of North Dakota	6	21	3.50	2	4.93	0	2	19
120	122	148	143	University of North Texas	16	56	3.50	2	4.69	0	3	53
20	96	76	92	University of Oregon	8	77	9.63	6	9.78	2	13	62
n/a	103	132	118	University of Ottawa	13	70	5.38	4	5.04	0	6	64
10	3	5	4	University of Pennsylvania	20	480	24.00	18	26.32	12	107	361
20	2	7	17	University of Pittsburgh	29	634	21.86	14	24.19	10	62	562
100	103	106	92	University of Rhode Island	9	70	7.78	6	9.32	1	15	54
44	68	15	103	University of Rochester	6	109	18.17	5.5	22.20	3	23	83
n/a	155	152	143	University of Saskatchewan	7	20	2.86	2	1.77	1	2	17
92	44	104	78	University of South Carolina	17	135	7.94	7	5.85	3	24	108
n/a	114	118	132	University of South Dakota	10	62	6.20	3	8.78	0	6	56
55	58	60	92	University of South Florida	11	118	10.73	6	9.60	3	14	101
20	48	31	34	University of Southern California	9	125	13.89	11	9.12	3	15	107
n/a	129	116	118	University of Southern Mississippi	8	51	6.38	4	7.21	0	2	49
77	86	56	50	University of Tennessee, Knoxville	8	87	10.88	9	8.06	0	6	81
11	90	61	34	University of Texas at Austin	8	83	10.38	11	6.16	0	5	78
68	99	136	132	University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas	15	74	4.93	3	6.25	1	9	64
n/a	74	44	50	University of Toledo	8	99	12.38	9	12.60	1	27	71
n/a	88	59	31	University of Tulsa	8	86	10.75	11.5	6.45	0	19	67
55	70	74	62	University of Utah	11	107	9.73	8	7.43	2	29	76
49	52	20	24	University of Vermont	7	121	17.29	12	19.81	2	5	114
n/a	77	64	42	University of Victoria	9	92	10.22	10	7.79	2	9	81
15	106	72	42	University of Virginia	7	69	9.86	10	6.20	1	11	57
100	151	144	132	University of Virginia (Curry)	7	30	4.29	3	4.54	0	2	28
4	15	16	13	University of Washington	12	216	18.00	15.5	9.86	4	29	183
n/a	129	96	39	University of Waterloo	6	51	8.50	10.5	3.94	1	7	43
n/a	100	85	87	University of Western Ontario	8	73	9.13	6.5	7.45	1	13	59
n/a	139	156	143	University of Windsor	17	43	2.53	2	2.53	0	1	42
2	13	1	1	University of Wisconsin–Madison	8	239	29.88	22	23.14	6	29	204
100	117	120	132	University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	10	61	6.10	3	8.08	0	5	56
100	122	81	78	University of Wyoming	6	56	9.33	7	5.75	0	10	46
11	26	48	34	Vanderbilt University	15	175	11.67	11	6.75	1	23	151
68	69	73	78	Virginia Commonwealth University	11	108	9.82	7	8.07	3	3	102
62	37	28	42	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	11	154	14.00	10	15.38	1	21	132
77	122	101	50	Washington State University	7	56	8.00	9	4.36	0	5	51
32	50	54	62	Washington University	11	124	11.27	8	9.95	0	6	118
68	54	83	92	Wayne State University	13	119	9.15	6	9.42	1	10	108
49	74	44	19	West Virginia University	8	99	12.38	13.5	5.66	1	25	73
120	144	131	92	Western Michigan University	7	38	5.43	6	3.31	0	2	36
4	54	9	4	Yale University	6	119	19.83	18	13.56	6	25	88
n/a	22	92	92	York University	21	185	8.81	6	11.19	5	60	120
n/a	111	115	105	York University–Developmental emphasis	10	65	6.50	5	6.95	1	15	49

Note: BK, total number of books published; CH, total number of chapters published; # Fac, number of faculty in the respective program; Mean, mean number of publication per faculty member; Mean rank, rank by mean number of publications; Median, median number of publications per faculty member; Median rank, rank by median number of publications; PJ, total number of peer-reviewed journal articles published; SD, standard deviation; Total, total number of publications; Total rank, rank by total number of publications; USNWR rank, 2004 rank by USNWR.

**Table 3.** Top 25 programs ranked by total publications

Total rank	Mean rank	Median rank	USNWR rank	Institution	# Fac	Total	Mean	Median	SD	CH	BK	PJ
1	4	15	38	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	35	853	24.37	15	22.01	56	5	792
2	7	17	20	University of Pittsburgh	29	634	21.86	14	24.19	62	10	562
3	5	4	10	University of Pennsylvania	20	480	24.00	18	26.32	107	12	361
4	89	92	20	University of Florida	37	332	8.97	6	8.58	60	10	262
5	80	76	n/a	Queen's University	32	299	9.34	7.5	6.52	41	4	254
6	11	12	1	University of California, Los Angeles	15	289	19.27	16	12.15	52	3	234
7	66	60	77	Kent State University	28	282	10.07	8.5	7.75	44	5	233
8	38	118	32	Boston University	21	279	13.29	4	18.24	33	13	233
9	95	105	100	Nova Southeastern University	31	265	8.55	5	10.30	39	11	215
10	123	132	62	University of Alabama at Birmingham	44	260	5.91	3	7.28	28	3	229
11	32	22	4	Indiana University	18	248	13.78	12.5	9.25	23	3	222
12	25	78	68	University of Alabama	17	245	14.41	7	18.72	69	2	174
13	1	1	2	University of Wisconsin–Madison	8	239	29.88	22	23.14	29	6	204
14	19	42	32	Temple University	13	226	17.38	10	20.27	28	4	194
15	16	13	4	University of Washington	12	216	18.00	15.5	9.86	29	4	183
16	34	20	26	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	15	204	13.60	13	9.40	40	9	155
17	3	8	62	Syracuse University	8	203	25.38	17.5	19.21	14	2	187
18	37	132	55	Case Western Reserve University	15	201	13.40	3	19.01	32	4	165
19	23	34	38	Arizona State University	13	193	14.85	11	8.86	33	3	157
20	24	62	44	Florida State University	13	190	14.62	8	30.85	22	4	164
21	13	13	49	University of Kentucky	10	188	18.80	15.5	12.56	28	2	158
22	92	92	n/a	York University	21	185	8.81	6	11.19	60	5	120
23	93	118	n/a	Pacific Graduate School of Psychology	21	183	8.71	4	12.57	33	8	142
24	29	50	15	University of Michigan	13	181	13.92	9	16.60	59	5	117
25	10	4	n/a	Dalhousie University	9	177	19.67	18	18.62	9	1	167

Note: BK, total number of books published; CH, total number of chapters published; # Fac, number of faculty in the respective program; Mean, mean number of publication per faculty member; Mean rank, rank by mean number of publications; Median, median number of publications per faculty member; Median rank, rank by median number of publications; PJ, total number of peer-reviewed journal articles published; SD, standard deviation; Total, total number of publications; Total rank, rank by total number of publications; USNWR rank, 2004 rank by USNWR.

and peer-reviewed journal articles) is presented to demonstrate the variability, or lack of, within the publications by a specific program. Table 3 provides a rank of the top 25 programs by total publications. Note the presence of four programs in this rank that were not included within the USNWR ranking. In addition, as a means for comparison, Table 4 provides the top 25 programs by mean number of publications per faculty member. This list includes 12 programs that were not ranked in Table 3, demonstrating the variability of the ranks when size of program is taken into account. Incidentally, there was a strong relationship between the total publications of a program and the mean number of publications per faculty member ( $r_s = .80, p < .001$ ).

#### Publication Rate and Program Size Correlations

Further exploratory correlations were performed to assess the relationship between the publication rate of a program and the number of faculty or size of the program. Table 5 displays this relationship. There was a

significant positive correlation between the number of faculty and the total number of publications ( $r = .61, p < .001$ ), total number of peer-reviewed journals ( $r = .60, p < .001$ ), total number of chapters ( $r = .51, p < .001$ ), and total number of books ( $r = .44, p < .001$ ). Thus, larger programs produced more publications. Other comparisons as shown in Table 5 were not significant. Although programs with larger faculties tended to produce more publications overall, the mean number of publications per faculty member tended to remain the same regardless of program size.

#### Correlations With USNWR

The scholarly productivity data were correlated with the 2004 USNWR ranking. These data were ranked by three different methods: total number of publications, mean number of publications, and median number of publications. Each of these rankings was correlated with the USNWR ranking using a Spearman's rho correlation. Table 6 displays the results of these correlations. The

**Table 4.** Top 25 programs ranked by mean number of publications per faculty member

Mean rank	Total rank	Median rank	USNWR rank	Institution	# Fac	Total	Mean	Median	SD	CH	BK	PJ
1	13	1	2	University of Wisconsin–Madison	8	239	29.88	22	23.14	29	6	204
2	29	3	2	University of California, Berkeley	6	171	28.50	18.5	21.83	30	4	137
3	17	8	62	Syracuse University	8	203	25.38	17.5	19.21	14	2	187
4	1	15	38	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	35	853	24.37	15	22.01	56	5	792
5	3	4	10	University of Pennsylvania	20	480	24.00	18	26.32	107	12	361
6	42	10	4	University of Minnesota	6	137	22.83	17	15.80	9	1	127
7	2	17	20	University of Pittsburgh	29	634	21.86	14	24.19	62	10	562
8	90	2	26	University of Kansas–Child	4	83	20.75	19	11.67	24	5	54
9	54	4	4	Yale University	6	119	19.83	18	13.56	25	6	88
10	25	4	n/a	Dalhousie University	9	177	19.67	18	18.62	9	1	167
11	6	12	1	University of California, Los Angeles	15	289	19.27	16	12.15	52	3	234
12	40	31	55	University of Nevada–Reno	8	153	19.13	11.5	19.66	52	14	87
13	21	13	49	University of Kentucky	10	188	18.80	15.5	12.56	28	2	158
14	79	4	62	Teachers College, Columbia University	5	91	18.20	18	10.18	16	2	73
15	68	103	44	University of Rochester	6	109	18.17	5.5	22.20	23	3	83
16	15	13	4	University of Washington	12	216	18.00	15.5	9.86	29	4	183
17	101	10	77	Louisiana State University	4	71	17.75	17	10.28	2	1	68
18	36	17	15	Stony Brook University/State University of New York	9	159	17.67	14	14.41	25	3	131
19	14	42	32	Temple University	13	226	17.38	10	20.27	28	4	194
20	52	24	49	University of Vermont	7	121	17.29	12	19.81	5	2	114
21	42	16	38	University of Maryland College Park	8	137	17.13	14.5	11.92	20	2	115
22	33	8	15	University of Iowa	10	166	16.60	17.5	9.88	31	3	132
23	19	34	38	Arizona State University	13	193	14.85	11	8.86	33	3	157
24	20	62	44	Florida State University	13	190	14.62	8	30.85	22	4	164
25	12	78	68	University of Alabama	17	245	14.41	7	18.72	69	2	174

Note: BK, total number of books published; CH, total number of chapters published; # Fac, number of faculty in the respective program; Mean, mean number of publication per faculty member; Mean rank, rank by mean number of publications; Median, median number of publications per faculty member; Median rank, rank by median number of publications; PJ, total number of peer-reviewed journal articles published; SD, standard deviation; Total, total number of publications; Total rank, rank by total number of publications; USNWR rank, 2004 rank by USNWR.

**Table 5.** Pearson correlation of total number of faculty per program with program publication rates

	Total faculty #
Total	.61*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Mean total	-.03
<i>p</i>	.732
Median total	-.15
<i>p</i>	.056
SD total	.14
<i>p</i>	.075
bk total	.44*
<i>p</i>	< .001
CH total	.51*
<i>p</i>	< .001
PJ total	.60*
<i>p</i>	< .001

\**p* < .01; BK, books; CH, chapters; PJ, peer-reviewed journal articles.

USNWR ranking was significantly correlated with all three different rankings (i.e., rank based on total publications, mean publications, and median publications) based on the scholarly productivity data. The highest correlation was

**Table 6.** Spearman's rho correlation of USNWR ranking with ranking based on respective criteria

	USNWR rank
Total	.60*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Mean	.64*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Median	.57*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Total BK	.47*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Total CH	.57*
<i>p</i>	< .001
Total PJ	.56*
<i>p</i>	< .001

\**p* < .01; BK, books; CH, chapters; PJ, peer-reviewed journal articles.

with the ranking by mean number of publications ( $r_s = .64$ ), which means a high-producing faculty member helps some, but not as much as several productive faculty members in terms of enhancing a program's reputation.

**Table 7.** Spearman's rho correlation of *USNWR* rankings by quartile and 3 other rankings (i.e., rank by total publications, total mean publications, and total median publications) by quartile

	Total rank	Mean rank	Median rank
<i>USNWR</i> 1st Q	.23	.44	.53*
<i>p</i>	.214	.015	.003
<i>USNWR</i> 2nd Q	.2	.15	-.02
<i>p</i>	.260	.436	.921
<i>USNWR</i> 3rd Q	.18	.15	-.35
<i>p</i>	.436	.517	.109
<i>USNWR</i> 4th Q	.29	.27	.11
<i>p</i>	.143	.178	.581

\*  $p < .004$ .

Further correlations were computed by quartiles to examine whether there were differences based on where programs were ranked within the *USNWR* rankings. Table 7 provides the results of this comparison. The highest correlations were found by comparing the rank of median ( $r_s = .53$ ) and mean publications ( $r_s = .44$ ) with the top quartile of the *USNWR* rankings; however, after a Bonferroni correction for type I error, rank by median was the only significant correlation ( $p = .003$ ). The correlation of the first quartile with the rank by total number of publications and mean number of publications were not statistically significant. There were no significant correlations among the other comparisons with other quartiles of the *USNWR* rankings. Nevertheless,

the correlational data support the observation that the *USNWR* rankings were most consistent with the rankings by scholarly productivity in the highest quartile with the greatest variations between the rankings in the second and third quartiles. This suggests that for the highest ranked programs (by *USNWR*) some of their reputation may be determined by their scholarship. Additionally, Table 8 provides data for the programs that had the largest rank differences based on scholarly productivity rank and *USNWR* rankings, demonstrating that some clinical programs are underrated in terms of prestige ranking. These programs demonstrated large differences between prestige ranking and ranking based on total productivity or mean productivity rate per faculty member.<sup>4</sup>

## DISCUSSION

This study revealed several key facts about the scholarly productivity of clinical PhD programs, providing a clearer, more comprehensive picture of the field. Primarily, the results of this study allow for a set of normative data, and not a continuation of the current trend of reputational or prestige rankings. Data are provided for each program that present the total number of publications, as well as the mean publications per faculty member. Within these normative data, there is significant variability within programs and between programs. The mode for publications

**Table 8.** Top 10 underrated programs based on total productivity output and mean productivity output per faculty member

<i>USNWR</i> rank	Total productivity rank	Rank difference	Institution	Total publications
100	9	91	Nova Southeastern University	265
77	7	70	Kent State University	282
92	28	64	DePaul University	173
100	37	63	University of Cincinnati	154
68	12	56	University of Alabama	245
62	10	52	University of Alabama at Birmingham	260
92	44	48	University of South Carolina	135
100	54	46	Georgia State University	119
100	54	46	Fordham University	119
62	17	45	Syracuse University	203
<i>USNWR</i> rank	Mean rank	Rank difference	Institution	Mean publications
120	35	85	University of Arkansas	13.50
113	52	61	Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis	11.38
77	17	60	Louisiana State University	17.75
62	3	59	Syracuse University	25.38
62	14	48	Teachers College, Columbia University	18.20
92	46	46	The University of Memphis	12.22
55	12	43	University of Nevada, Reno	19.13
68	25	43	University of Alabama	14.41
100	63	37	University of Cincinnati	10.27
49	13	36	University of Kentucky	18.80

was 0, indicating that many professors failed to produce any publications archived in PsycINFO during the time period examined, although faculty members on average produced about two publications a year. Admittedly, there are many other activities that faculty are required to participate in such as administrative assignments, grant work, teaching assignments, and supervisory roles. Even long-term book projects might curtail some immediate publication productivity, but one would expect these activities might be similar across programs. Pomfret and Wang (2003) argued that the total number of publications indicates more about the reputation of the program, whereas the mean number of faculty publications represents a program's productivity. While this interpretation may be subject to further investigation, these norms can be used by programs to perform self-evaluation and measure the status and progress of their own program. These results can also be used by prospective applicants in deciding which program to attend or apply to.

Second, program sizes vary; larger programs tend to produce more total publications overall. However, having more faculty members does not correlate with a higher mean or median publication rate for individual faculty members. Thus, a large program does not guarantee that all faculty members will be high producers, but rather, there is a higher probability that a high producer will be in that program. Nor does this finding suggest that the presence of a high producer within a faculty will stimulate more productivity from other faculty members. A longitudinal examination of individual programs might test a number of these hypothesized relationships.

Third, the *USNWR* rankings appear to be closely associated with the scholarly productivity of programs. Yet, it is important to remember that the correlation in the present study is for the rankings overall and not for specific programs. All rankings are subject to the biases and decisions of those who are performing the ranking (e.g., who is included, time period, etc.) and one must be cautious about placing too much weight on rank differences (Pomfret & Wang, 2003). Specifically, one cannot assume the level of scholarly productivity for an individual program based on the *USNWR* rankings, because there was not a perfect correlation, but rather a significant correlation. Results from quartile comparisons of *USNWR* and scholarly productivity rankings

add support to the caution of using the *USNWR* ranking to estimate scholarship. This was especially true for programs in the second and third quartiles. Table 8 provided examples of discrepancies between *USNWR* ranking and rank by scholarly productivity. Furthermore, there were 44 programs that were not included in the *USNWR* ranking and in a strict reliance on the *USNWR* rankings, these programs may be overlooked. Notably, there were programs that had high scholarly productivity scores that were not included in the *USNWR* rankings, specifically APA-accredited programs located in Canada. Consequently, the *USNWR* rankings should be used with caution, although they do appear to be tapping into the same underlying construct that rank by scholarly productivity does.

This study has attempted to provide one snapshot of the productivity of clinical psychology by examining the scholarly productivity of APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD programs. The study utilized archival data, which is retrievable, replicable, and not dependent on survey results with low return rates, poor or unknown psychometrics, and self-reporting biases. This study is a colorful piece of the mosaic picture of what clinical psychology programs do or what faculty members contribute. Other pieces of this mosaic may include the placement of graduates into faculty positions (Ilardi et al., 2000), which programs are producing the most productive researchers in their graduates (Roy, Roberts, & Stewart, 2006), or the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology scores of graduates (Yu et al., 1997), among others. Most importantly, the current study and others provide information about what is happening in the programs, but it is recognized that these studies are measures of single aspects of multifaceted programs and in no way can provide a complete evaluation of programs.

#### Limitations

There are limitations noted for the present study. First, this study made every attempt to have an accurate roster of core faculty for each program while trying to maintain an unbiased source of information. However, the rosters may have contained errors of commission and omission. These errors are likely due to inaccurate information from Web sites. Any inaccuracy will likely have been generalized over all the programs. Undoubtedly,

there may have been publications that individuals have produced that were not accounted for in this evaluation, primarily due to unexplored name variations or publications that may not have been included within PsycINFO. In order to assist further research, it would be helpful for ease in tracking publications by a single author that faculty members publish under a consistent name. It may also be beneficial for individual faculty members to take the time to enter their own names, and any variation thereof, into PsycINFO to assess whether there may be errors in the bibliographic database so they can be corrected. For faculty members who have undergone name changes in their careers (most often due to marriage), it may also be important to make this clear not only in their vitas, but in published program information. This information would help keep lines of research more clearly measurable.

The present study only includes publications from 2000 to 2004 and does not claim to be an exhaustive list of publications by faculty members of programs. Publications before the current window of examination were not accounted for. This particular limitation may have disadvantaged programs that may have professors who are toward the end of their career and who are perhaps not quite as productive as new assistant professors that are working toward promotion and tenure. Variability within a program is another limitation, because the high productivity of single individuals within the programs may have skewed the program results somewhat. In the same vein, some programs may include large numbers of faculty or long authorship lists which may also skew the data.

Finally, this study was purely a measure of the quantity of scholarship and not quality. Quality might be measured by publications within a select list of journals that have been deemed as “influential” to the field, citation impact factors, or other means such as ratings by reviewers. A weighting of some journals, books, etc., may change the results, but would introduce more elements of subjectivity than the present methodology. Although a comprehensive examination of the quality or amount of contribution to the field might be beneficial, it is beyond the scope of this project.

#### **Future Research**

There are additional examinations that can be performed to help gain an even more comprehensive picture of

scholarly productivity and clinical psychology programs as a whole. For example, these include an examination of the year of degree or year of employment at a program to examine if productivity is related to seniority. Similarly, a comparison of scholarly productivity based on faculty rank (i.e., associate, assistant, etc.) or an assessment of grants received by programs could be performed. Further studies could investigate subsets within the broad umbrella of clinical psychology (e.g., clinical child, geropsychology). While possibly more subjective in nature, an investigation of the quality of publications would be useful.

Clinical psychology is continuing to produce graduates, publications, and grants, but it is also in continual flux. Updated and current evaluations of clinical psychology programs are critical to individual program growth and almost more importantly, the subfield of clinical psychology as a whole. This study attempted to make the direction more clear. Individual programs can now assess if the direction will lead to a destination consistent with their respective mission and goals, and act accordingly.

#### **NOTES**

1. Another examination of scholarly productivity based on faculty publication and citation counts was performed by Matson et al. (2005). The study of Matson et al. was published after the present study was conducted. Although an example of an examination of scholarly productivity, the study had several methodological differences from the present study. Of most importance is the time period of examination. Matson et al. evaluated faculty based on lifetime productivity and the present study provides scholarly productivity data over a recent five-year period (2000–2004). A five-year window of examination is consistent with other research (Ilardi et al., 2000; Oliver et al., 2005). Any time frame is arbitrary. Lifetime publication rates do not provide evidence about the current state of the field. Analogously, this would be similar to a proposition that the Boston Celtics are the best team in the NBA because they have won more championships than any other team (16 titles), yet they have not won a title since 1986. Does this make them the best team today? To gain a snapshot of the present field in terms of who is active today and leading scholarly productivity in the new millennium, a current time frame is required rather than a lifetime analysis of productivity.

2. For a more comprehensive explanation of the limits and biases of impact factors (i.e., citation inflation based on “uncitables” cited within a journal), see Amin and Mabe (2000), Begley (2006), and Moed and Van Leeuwen (1995).

3. Coauthors can make just as large of a contribution to the publication as the first author, yet how would one quantify this contribution? There are different formulas used in previous research that attempt to account for a weighting of author contributions (e.g., Howard, 1983) in which first, second, third, etc. authors are assigned subjectively determined weights of credit, yet author order may not truly reflect the level of contributions by the authors. Furthermore, the psychometric properties of the weighting methods are unknown and the method of weighting publications based on author number or order has been found to yield no additional useful information in comparison to simple publication counts (Hanish, 2001). Likewise, what is to be done about student authors (e.g., if a faculty member is third author on an article with several students) further complicates the weighting process. APA ethics require author order to be based on level of contribution, but this is not always the case because types of contributions are multiply determined. Finally, another confound is that the medical tradition for authorship is different from psychology and many psychologists publish in these journals. In the medical field, the author considered to provide the highest contribution is listed as the last author. A standard author order weighting equation would not represent this tradition. Nevertheless, without a perfect method for assigning credit for multiple-author publications, the chosen method of this study (i.e., assigning equal credit for all authors) is an acknowledged limitation.

4. Table 8 displays the programs that were “underrated” in terms of scholarly productivity by the *USNWR* ranking. There are two additional tables that are available from the authors that report programs that had the largest differences between reputational ranking and rankings based on scholarly productivity (i.e., scholarly productivity rankings were lower than their prestige ranking).

## REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2004a). *Accredited programs in clinical psychology*. Retrieved August 18, 2004, from <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/clinpsyal.html>
- American Psychological Association. (2004b). *PsycINFO literature coverage*. Retrieved September 25, 2004, from <http://www.apa.org/psycinfo/about/cov.info.html>
- Amin, M., & Mabe, M. (2000). Impact factors: Use and abuse. *Perspectives in Publishing*, 1, 1–6.
- Barlow, D. H. (2000). Editorial. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 345.
- Barrom, C. P., Shadish, W. R., & Montgomery, L. M. (1988). PhDs, PsyDs, and real-world constraints on scholarly activity: Another look at the Boulder Model. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19, 93–101.
- Begley, S. (2006, June 5). Science journals artfully try to boost their rankings. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. B1.
- Belar, C. D. (2000). Revealing data on education and training. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 368–369.
- Brems, C., Johnson, M. E., & Gallucci, P. (1996). Publication of clinical and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52, 723–725.
- Cox, W. M., & Catt, V. (1977). Productivity rating of graduate programs in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 32, 793–814.
- Delgado, E. A., & Howard, G. S. (1994). Changes in research productivity in counseling psychology: Revising Howard (1983) a decade later. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 69–73.
- Diamond, N., & Graham, H. D. (2000). How should we rate research universities? *Change*, 32, 20–33.
- Golden, C. J., Kuperman, S. K., & Osmon, D. C. (1980). Productivity ratings of psychology programs based on publications in clinical journals. *Professional Psychology*, 11, 797–806.
- Hanish, C. (2001). *Norms and psychometric properties of indices of scholarly behavior in counseling psychology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Hanish, C., Horan, J. J., Keen, B., St. Peter, C. C., Ceperich, S. D., & Beasley, J. F. (1995). The scientific stature of counseling psychology training programs: A still picture of a shifting scene. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 23, 82–101.
- Hayder, S. C., & Grundt, A. M. (1996). The top 50 researchers and institutions in behavior analysis and therapy, 1974–1994. *The Behavior Therapist*, 19, 141–142.
- Howard, G. S. (1983). Research productivity in counseling psychology: An update and generalization study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 600–602.
- Howard, G. S., Maxwell, S. E., Berra, S. M., & Sternitzke, M. E. (1985). Institutional research productivity in industrial/organizational psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 233–236.
- Illardi, S. S., Rodriguez-Hanley, A., Roberts, M. C., & Seigel, J. (2000). On the origins of clinical psychology faculty: Who is training the trainers? *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 346–354.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2000). Evaluating the impact of clinical psychology training programs: Process and outcome issues. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 357–360.
- Kendall, P. C. (2006). The present and future of clinical psychology. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 13, 203–204.
- La Greca, A. M., Stone, W. L., & Swales, T. (1989). Pediatric psychology training: An analysis of graduate, internship,

- and postdoctoral programs. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 14, 103–116.
- Lombardi, J. V., Capaldi, E. D., Reeves, K. R., Craig, D. D., Gater, D. S., & Rivers, D. (2003). *The Center: The top American research universities*. Retrieved September 15, 2004, from <http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research2003.pdf>
- Matson, J. L., Malone, C. J., Gonzalez, M. L., McClure, D. R., Laud, R. B., & Minshawi, N. F. (2005). Clinical psychology PhD program rankings: Evaluating eminence on faculty publications and citations. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 26, 503–513.
- Moed, H. F., & VanLeeuwen, T. N. (1995). Improving the accuracy of Institute for Science Information's journal impact factors. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 46, 461–467.
- Oliver, J., Blair, C. A., Gorman, A., & Woehr, D. J. (2005). Research productivity of I-O psychology doctoral programs in North America. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 43, 55–63.
- Pomfret, R., & Wang, L. C. (2003). Evaluating the research output of Australian universities' economics departments. *Australian Economic Papers*, 42, 418–441.
- Roediger, H. L. (2005). Should we rank ourselves? *The Academic Observer*, 18, 45–48.
- Rogers, E., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). "High science" versus "just selling magazines"? How the NRC and US News graduate rankings compare. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*, 49, 7–10.
- Roy, K. M., Roberts, M. C., & Stewart, P. K. (2006). Research productivity and academic lineage in clinical psychology: Who is training the faculty to do research? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 62, 893–905.
- Shabani, D. B., Carr, J. E., Petursdottir, A. I., Esch, B. E., & Gillett, J. N. (2004). Scholarly productivity in behavior analysis: The most prolific authors and institutions from 1992 to 2001. *The Behavior Analyst Today*, 5, 235–243.
- Tatman, A. W., & Bischof, G. H. (2004). Contribution patterns in major US marital and family therapy journals: 1992 through 2002. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 26, 83–95.
- U.S. News & World Report. (2004). *Health disciplines: Clinical psychology (doctorate)*. Retrieved November 11, 2004, from <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/health/premium/cps.php>
- Yu, L. M., Rinaldi, S. A., Templer, D. I., Colbert, L. A., Siscoe, K., & van Patten, K. (1997). Score on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology as a function of attributes of clinical psychology graduate programs. *Psychological Science*, 8, 347–350.

Received February 26, 2006; revision 1 June 14, 2006;  
 revision 2 September 21, 2006; revision 3 October 13, 2006;  
 accepted October 18, 2006.