

Scholarly Productivity of School Psychology Faculty Members in Specialist-Level Programs:

2002-2011

Jeff Laurent

Elizabeth Runia

Department of Psychology

Western Illinois University

Poster presented at the 48th Annual Convention of the National Association of School

Psychologists, New Orleans, LA

February 10-13, 2016

Author Note

The authors thank Kelli Abell, Felicia Austin, Rachel Bush, Haley Humes, Brian Mendoza, Ashley Nelson, Melissa Nemec, Kaitlyn O'Riley, Nicole Palumbo, Paige Peterson, and Jessica Satterlee for their assistance in data collection.

Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Jeff Laurent, Department of Psychology (WG 100), Western Illinois University, 1 University Circle, Macomb, IL, 61455.

Contact: jl-laurent@wiu.edu.

Abstract

The scholarly productivity of school psychology faculty members in specialist-level only programs was examined. Information was gathered from the School Psychology Program Information portion of the website for the National Association of School Psychologists. A total of 137 specialist-level only school psychology programs were identified. Authorship credit was computed for faculty members within each program based on journal articles published from 2002-2011. The 25 individuals with the highest authorship credit were identified. The number of journal publications across program faculty members was averaged, and the top 25 programs were identified. Finally, journals in which the top 25 faculty members published articles were identified. Observations about issues that arose while collecting data were presented. The study presented a snapshot of scholarship among specialist-level only programs and their faculty members during the 10-year period from 2002-2011.

KEY WORDS: school psychology, scholarly productivity, specialist-level programs

Scholarly Productivity of School Psychology Faculty Members in Specialist-Level Programs:
2002-2011

Periodically, the profession of school psychology has stepped back and examined itself. For example, Reynolds and Clark (1984) examined the trends in school psychology research from 1974 to 1980, and compared their findings to those reported by O'Callaghan (1974) regarding publications in the profession from 1963 to 1973. As part of the 2002 Future of School Psychology Conference, Curtis and colleagues presented information on the demographic trends within the profession using the database of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) (Curtis, Hunley, & Grier, 2004; Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2003, 2004). Hosp and Reschly (2002) examined regional differences in school psychology practice. More recently, Castillo, Curtis, and Gelley (2013) provided information on gender and race characteristics within the field. Armistead and colleagues (Armistead, Castillo, Curtis, Chappel, & Cunningham, 2013) surveyed school psychologists concerning their preferences and practices regarding continuing professional development (CPD). Each of these studies provides a snapshot of characteristics, opinions, and activities of school psychologists at the time data were collected. Sometimes the snapshot is of a large group, such as the membership of NASP ($n = \sim 20,000$; e.g., Curtis, Hunley, & Grier, 2004; Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2003, 2004). Other times the picture is of smaller groups (e.g., Armistead et al., 2013, $n = 510$; Hosp & Reschly, 2002, $n = 1,056$).

In addition to becoming part of the history of the profession, the information from these studies may be used for other purposes. For example, findings reported by Armistead et al. (2013) indicated popular topics for continuing education, and the potential promise of online delivery for CPD offerings. The popularity of the topics identified by these researchers is likely to change over time; however, the potential for online delivery of continuing professional

development will evolve as the technology to provide a more interactive experience is developed. As another example, the findings reported by Curtis, Hunley, and Grier (Curtis, Hunley, & Grier, 2004; Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2003, 2004) documented projected shortages of school psychology practitioners and trainers in the future. Subsequently, *School Psychology Quarterly* featured a special issue concerning the state of developing university faculty in school psychology (Akin-Little & Little, 2004). As part of this special issue, Kratochwill, Shernoff, and Sanetti (2004) presented a conceptual framework for educating and supporting graduate students considering academic careers.

An area of academic school psychology that has been surveyed from time to time has been the scholarly productivity of faculty. As Joy (2006) notes, "Scholarly productivity is an important determinant of academic success, utilized in crucial personnel decisions such as hiring, promotion, and awarding tenure, as well as in determining an academic's prestige among disciplinary peers" (p. 346). In addition to benefitting individuals, the scholarly productivity of faculty also affects programs and their reputation. For example, Carper and Williams (2004) suggested that scholarly productivity might influence the decision-making process of students and potential faculty members considering a position with a program. In effect, scholarly productivity might act as a recruitment tool. These authors also suggested that information regarding scholarly productivity could help school psychology programs seek institutional support from their universities, and act as a yardstick for program improvement.

Early researchers examined faculty scholarly productivity in terms of the school psychology literature. For example, Webster, Hall, and Bolen (1993) examined the institutional affiliations of authors who published in five school psychology journals from 1985-1991. Three were well-established journals (i.e., *Journal of School Psychology*, *School Psychology Review*,

Psychology in the Schools), while the other two were relatively new (i.e., *Professional School Psychology* [now *School Psychology Quarterly*], *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*).

Although these investigators considered school districts and agencies, the top 50 rankings that Webster et al. reported represented universities. The rankings were presented based on number of publications and on a program productivity formula.

Levinson, Barker, and Lillenstein (1994) took the work of Webster et al. (1993) one step further. These researchers examined the degree to which the 50 universities identified by Webster et al. supported and rewarded faculty scholarship. Specifically, Levinson et al. categorized the 50 universities ranked by Webster et al. using classification systems devised by the Carnegie Foundation (i.e., Research Universities I, Research Universities II, Doctorate-Granting Universities I, Doctorate-Granting Universities II, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP; Category I: Doctoral Institutions, Category IIA: Comprehensive Institutions). They then ranked universities within the Carnegie Foundation and AAUP classification systems based on number of publications and on a program productivity formula. Levinson et al. reported that doctoral institutions had higher productivity ratings than did institutions classified as comprehensive universities, at least when it came to publishing in school psychology journals.

Little (1997) expanded this line of research when he added a sixth school psychology journal to the mix, *School Psychology International*. He collected author data from 1987-1995, and reported number of publications, number of first-authored articles, and authorship credit ratings. Among the findings reported were rankings of the top 50 authors in the school psychology literature for 1987-1995, and rankings of the degree granting universities of the top authors. Davis, Gerrard-Morris, Roberts, Robinson, and Zanger conducted a series of studies that

extended the work of Little (1997). Davis, Zanger, Gerrard-Morris, Roberts, and Robinson (2005) reviewed the productivity and collaboration of authors in four school psychology journals from 1991-2003. The journals they reviewed were *Journal of School Psychology*, *School Psychology Review*, *Psychology in the Schools*, and *School Psychology Quarterly*. These investigators defined productivity by the number of articles authored. For the 20 most productive authors, Davis et al. then collected information concerning collaboration (i.e., publications with more than one author, including graduate student authors). In a second study, Roberts, Davis, Zanger, Gerrard-Morris, and Robinson (2006) further extended the Little study using data collected from 1996-2005. These researchers excluded the *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* from the original list of school psychology journals examined by Little, resulting in five journals (*Journal of School Psychology*, *School Psychology Review*, *Psychology in the Schools*, *School Psychology International*, and *School Psychology Quarterly*). Roberts et al. examined the number of publications and authorship credit ratings, and generated a list of top 50 authors for both variables. As one might suspect, the lists generated by Little (1997) and Roberts et al. (2006) reflect the differences that occur naturally over time as people retire or develop in their careers.

Several researchers provide insight into the scholarship of faculty members affiliated with school psychology doctoral programs accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA). For example, Carper and Williams (2004) examined the record of article publications of faculty at APA-accredited doctoral programs in school psychology from 1995-1999; programs accredited as of September 2000 were included in the study. Information for core school psychology faculty members from 53 programs was collected using the PsycINFO database. These authors divided journals into two categories, primary (i.e., *Journal of School Psychology*;

School Psychology International; *School Psychology Review*; *School Psychology Quarterly*; *Psychology in the Schools*) and secondary (i.e., all other educational/psychological journals indexed in the PsycINFO database). The rankings that Carper and Williams presented of programs based on authorship credit ratings and number of publications provided a snapshot of faculty productivity during the late 1990's.

Wagner, Lail, Viglietta, and Burns (2007) extended the work of Carper and Williams by examining the scholarly productivity of faculty members at 56 APA-accredited school psychology programs from 2000-2005. These researchers used the PsycINFO database to collect data on number of faculty publications. Wagner et al. presented the rankings of the top 20 faculty members by number of articles published, and the top 10 programs based on median publications by faculty. In addition, these investigators noted the mean number of publications by Carnegie Foundation research classification.

Kranzler, Grapin, and Daley (2011) also replicated the work of Carper and Williams (2004) in their examination of the productivity of the core school psychology faculty members of 59 APA-accredited programs from 2005-2009; programs accredited as of May 2010 were included in the study. In order to compare findings with those reported by Carper and Williams, Kranzler et al. examined authorship credit ratings and number of publications for the 59 programs using the PsycINFO database. Like Wagner et al. (2007), this group then examined the scholarly productivity from 2005-2009 of individual faculty members of the 59 APA-accredited school psychology programs (Grapin, Kranzler, & Daley, 2013). Specifically, Grapin et al. provided rankings of the top 25 individuals based on authorship credit ratings and number of publications. Together, the work of Carper and Williams (2004), Wagner et al. (2007), and Kranzler, Grapin

and Daley (Grapin et al., 2013; Kranzler et al., 2011) provides another snapshot of school psychology, specifically, of faculty and program productivity from 1995-2009.

Summarizing the research conducted on the scholarly productivity of faculty members in school psychology, one sees that early studies included a wide range of participants (i.e., all school psychology faculty), but a narrow range of journals (i.e., 4-6 school psychology journals). More recent studies reversed this trend, focusing on a narrow range of participants (i.e., faculty of APA-accredited programs), but a broad range of journals (i.e., those included in the PsycINFO database). The current research examined a group of school psychology faculty members that has not been studied recently – those who are employed at institutions whose only school psychology program is at the specialist level. We were interested in many of the same questions asked by previous research in the area. Specifically, who were the most productive faculty members, in terms of journal articles, among those in school psychology programs that only offered the specialist-level degree? Which programs were the most productive, in terms of journal articles? In what journals did the most productive faculty members publish? All of these questions were asked in the context of the years 2002-2011.

Method

Sample

Information was gathered on specialist-only programs in school psychology from the School Psychology Program Information portion of the website for the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) (<http://www.nasponline.org/graduate-education/grad-edu.aspx>) during the Fall 2012 semester. For the purposes of the current study, a specialist-only program was a school psychology program located in an academic unit where the terminal school psychology degree involved two years of training on-campus and an internship during the third

year. The exact degree title might vary from program to program, but the basic structure of the programs was the same. Additionally, there was no school psychology doctoral program available at the institution. Using these criteria, a total of 137 specialist-only school psychology programs were identified.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection occurred as part of a project for undergraduate psychology majors who expressed an interest in school psychology during the fall semester of 2012 and the spring semester of 2013. Twelve students participated during the fall semester of 2012; four earned 1 semester hour of credit for a research practicum and eight participated on a volunteer basis. Eight of the 12 students continued on the project during the spring semester of 2013, and one new student joined the project; the new student earned 1 semester hour of credit for a research practicum and the eight returning students continued with the project on a volunteer basis.

During the fall semester of 2012, the first stage of the project, 2-3 students were given the task of identifying specialist-only programs within assigned states from the School Psychology Program Information portion of the NASP website. Students were assigned states based on their potential interest in applying to school psychology programs within those states. For states where no student expressed a particular interest, they were randomly assigned. Once assigned states, students went to the “Programs Offered and Program Approvals” tab for each program listed on the NASP website. It was each student’s task to identify independently the institutions that did *not* have doctoral programs. These institutions became the potential pool of specialist-only school psychology programs; 144 programs were identified (when applying the criteria presented previously, the final number of programs was 137). In addition, the names of the faculty members listed under the “Faculty” tab on the NASP website were recorded for each program.

The links to the program websites were accessed in order to check the consistency between the faculty members listed on the NASP website and those listed on the program website.

Next, students searched the ERIC and PsycINFO databases to obtain citations for each faculty member's journal publications from 2002-2011. Students were instructed to obtain citations for journal articles only. Excluded from consideration were books, book chapters, book reviews, test reviews, commentaries or replies, obituaries or memoriam, online journals, newsletters (i.e., *Communique* [NASP], *The School Psychologist* [APA Division 16]), reports and ERIC ED documents.

During the spring semester of 2013, the second stage of the project, pairs of students reviewed the information gathered the previous semester. Specifically, these pairs of students would select a state (e.g., California) and compare the programs that had been identified and the faculty members listed for programs by the individuals who collected the information during the fall semester. If discrepancies existed, the pair of students went back to the NASP website or on occasion to the program website in an attempt to resolve the differences. Resolution of the discrepancies might have required additional searches of the ERIC and PsycINFO databases. Once discrepancies were resolved and additional searches completed, students assigned the journal publications of each faculty member to one of three broad categories based on the sample employed in the publication. The first category, *P-12*, was used to indicate studies that employed children, teachers, parents or administrators of infant through high school-aged youths. The second category, *College*, was used to indicate studies that employed a college sample. The third category, *Other*, was for articles that did not fit the other two categories. Assignment of an article to a category was done after reviewing the title and abstract.

The final stage occurred during the 2013-2014 academic year and involved the authors' verifying the information gathered in the second stage of the project. Specifically, the authors directly accessed the articles found for each faculty member and reviewed the initial classifications assigned by the teams during the second stage. At this point, the authors decided to further divide the *Other* category into *General Other* and *Other School Psychology* categories. The latter consisted of a broad array of articles that would interest school psychologists, but did not have a sample of participants. For example, articles dealing with legal issues related to the profession, describing the response-to-intervention model, or presenting historical aspects of school psychology fell within the *Other School Psychology* category. Normally, the authors reviewed and verified or reclassified articles in tandem during weekly meetings. If the verification process occurred individually, questions that arose were discussed and determination through consensus of classifications occurred as part of the weekly meetings.

As part of the final stage of the project, order of authorship on each journal article for each faculty member was noted. Authorship credit was then computed using the formula first presented by Howard, Cole, and Maxwell (1987): $Credit = (1.5^{n-i}) / (\sum 1.5^{i-1})$. This formula is commonly used in productivity research, and was employed by the studies cited earlier that did not merely count number of publications. In effect, the formula weights the order of authorship; the authorship credit for an article always equals 1.00. The higher author receives proportionally more credit than subsequent authors. A list of the 25 individuals with the highest authorship credit was created. The program websites for those individuals were searched in order to obtain information from their vitae regarding the university from which they obtained their doctoral degrees. Also, a list of the publications in which their articles appeared was created. Finally, a list of the 25 programs with the highest mean number of publications was created. This was done

by summing the number of journal articles across faculty members affiliated with the program and dividing by the number of faculty members. If there were multiple authors from the same institution on an article, the article was only counted once for the university.

Results

Table 1 contains the names and other information for the 25 individuals who obtained the highest authorship credit ratings for the years 2002-2011. These top 25 individuals had authorship credit ratings ranging from 13.35 to 3.39. Gary Canivez of Eastern Illinois University was ranked as the faculty member with the highest authorship credit rating during this 10-year time span. Canivez published 25 articles that were cataloged in the ERIC and/or PsycINFO databases during this time; 4 were solo-authored publications. Twenty-three of these publications involved samples that fell within the *P-12* category. A closer examination revealed that several of the studies were psychometric in nature and employed normative data sets from commercially-published assessment instruments. Canivez earned his doctoral degree in Educational Psychology with an emphasis in School Psychology and Counseling from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, a department that no longer offers degrees in school psychology. The institution at which he was employed during the time period covered by the current study, Eastern Illinois University, is identified as a Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive university, according to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010) criteria. A Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive institution awards master's degrees in the humanities, social sciences, and science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields, as well as degrees in one or more professional fields.

Further examination of Table 1 revealed that several of the faculty members affiliated with school psychology programs whose scholarly productivity led these individuals to be ranked in the top 25 did not receive degrees in school psychology. Doctoral degrees in other areas included experimental psychology, measurement and statistics, applied developmental psychology, and clinical child psychology. Also noted in Table 1 is the fact that only 1 individual had no publications that fell within the *P-12* or *Other School Psychology* categories; 3 other individual had only one publication in either of these two categories.

With respect to university affiliation, schools identified by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010) criteria as Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities employed 6 individuals. One individual worked at a university that fell within the Post-Baccalaureate with Arts and Sciences/Education Dominant category. According to the Carnegie classification system, these universities award Master's degrees in both arts and sciences and professional fields; the field with the largest number of graduate degrees is education. Two individuals were employed by schools that were classified as Single Doctoral/Other Field, which indicates that the institution awards research doctoral degrees in a single field other than education; they may have more extensive offerings at the Master's or professional level. Of the 25 individuals listed in Table 1, institutions identified as Comprehensive Doctoral No Medical/Veterinary according to the Carnegie classification system employed 9. Universities with this classification award research doctoral degrees in the humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields, and offer professional education in fields such as business, education, engineering, law, public policy, social work, or health professions other than medicine, dentistry, or veterinary medicine. The remaining 7 individuals were from universities classified as Doctoral, Professional Dominant. These schools

award research doctoral degrees in a variety of areas with the largest number of doctorates in professions other than engineering, such as education, health professions, public policy, or social work. They may also offer professional education in law or medicine.

Table 2 presents the 25 universities with specialist-only programs that obtained the highest mean number of articles published for the years 2002-2011. The mean number of articles published by the top 25 ranked programs ranged from 14.25 to 2.40. Brigham Young University was ranked as the program with the highest mean number of articles published during the 10 years included in the current study. The four faculty members at BYU published 57 articles during this time period or a mean number of articles per faculty member of 14.25. Table 2 also contains the Carnegie classification for each program. Eight schools were identified as Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities. One university fell within the Post-Baccalaureate with Arts and Sciences/Education Dominant category. Two programs were classified as Single Doctoral/Other Field. Six institutions were identified as Comprehensive Doctoral No Medical/Veterinary according to the Carnegie classification system. Six programs were located within universities classified as Doctoral, Professional Dominant. The remaining 2 programs were identified as Doctoral, STEM Dominant. These universities award research doctoral degrees in a range of fields with the largest number of research doctorates in the STEM fields: they may also offer professional education at the doctoral level or in fields such as law or medicine.

It is worth noting that 12 of the 25 individuals listed in Table 1 come from 5 programs: Brigham Young University (3); University of Texas – San Antonio (3); George Mason University (2); Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville (2); and University of Central Florida (2). Also, these 5 programs were ranked among the top 7 listed in Table 2. Four of the 5

programs were at doctoral-granting institutions; only 1, Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville, was located within a Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive university.

Finally, Table 3 provides a partial list of journals in which the identified top 25 faculty members published articles. These individuals published 343 articles in 157 different journals during the time period examined. Of the top 10 journals, 6 are familiar to school psychologists: *Psychology in the Schools*, *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *School Psychology Quarterly*, *School Psychology International*, *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, and *California School Psychologist* (now *Contemporary School Psychology*). The remaining 4 journals in the top 10 were perhaps less familiar within traditional school psychology circles: *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, *Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools*, and *Journal of School Violence*. The journal with the highest frequency of articles from these faculty members was *Psychology in the Schools*. A closer examination of publications in this journal revealed that 11 individuals accounted for 18 articles; the highest number of articles by a single faculty member was 4. Next in line was *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, where 5 faculty members contributed to a total of 15 articles; one faculty member published 7 articles in this journal. There were instances where a single faculty member accounted for virtually all the publications within a journal. For example, 9 of the 10 articles published in *Journal of Psychology and Theology* were from a single faculty member.

Discussion

The current study adds to the periodic snapshots of faculty productivity within the field of school psychology. Because recent studies focused on faculty members of APA-accredited doctoral programs (Carper & Williams, 2004; Grapin et al., 2013; Kranzler et al., 2011; Wagner

et al., 2007), we were interested in faculty who were affiliated with specialist-only school psychology programs. Employing the commonly used metric of journal authorship credit, we identified the 25 individuals who were most productive in the years 2002-2011.

Previous studies used various lengths of time in their examination of scholarly productivity, so direct comparisons between data from the current study and past research is difficult. However, there was one study that also examined scholarly productivity over a 10 year period, as was done in the current study. Roberts et al. (2006) reported on the top contributors to the school psychology literature from 1996-2005. We considered a broader range of journals, and did not limit ourselves to 5 school psychology journals. Nevertheless, it was informative to examine the range on authorship credit for the Roberts et al. study and our data. The range of authorship credit for the top 25 faculty members in the Robert et al. study was 11.72 to 4.96. That compares to the range of 13.85 to 3.39 in the current study. The range in number of articles published by the top 25 contributors in the Robert et al. study was 39 to 12, compared to 31 to 5 in the current study. Although potentially interesting, these comparisons should be viewed cautiously, because the limited number of journals included in the Roberts et al. study likely deflated the authorship credits for the top 25 contributions in their data set. In other words, it is likely that at least some, if not all, of the individuals in the Roberts et al. study published in other journals than those included in their study.

Are faculty members in doctoral programs more productive than faculty members in specialist-only programs in terms of journal publications? Unfortunately, differences in time spans and databases examined across published studies on the scholarly productivity of school psychology faculty members and the current study makes this question difficult to answer. However, observations made by Joy (2006) regarding scholarly productivity of academic

psychologists, in general, may be applicable to school psychology. He notes that faculty members at research universities and doctoral institutions publish the most and tend to continue to publish throughout their careers. Joy further states that faculty members at master's universities publish less. After receiving tenure, Joy noted that faculty members at master's universities tend to publish even less or stop publishing altogether. It should be noted that Joy's research was limited to universities in the northeastern part of the United States. Nevertheless, Joy's work suggests that institutional expectations/climate may contribute to scholarly productivity. This reinforces the findings of Levinson et al. (1994) that school psychology programs located in doctoral institutions had higher productivity ratings than those located in comprehensive universities.

An examination of Tables 1 and 2 revealed that a majority of the top ranked individuals (64%) and top ranked programs (56%) were at doctoral institutions; Single Doctoral and Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive were treated the same when determining these estimates. As noted by Joy (2006) and Levinson et al. (1994), institutional factors may provide opportunities that increase scholarly productivity. Nonetheless, the top 2 individuals during the period examined were from Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities, suggesting that there are individual variables that likely also influence a faculty member's scholarly productivity (e.g., motivation, desire to contribute to the field, etc.). Future researchers might consider examining personality characteristics of those who are among the most productive scholars in the field. In fact, Martínez, Floyd, and Erichsen (2011) examined the responses of highly productive school psychology scholars to a questionnaire regarding research strategies. Among the seven categories into which they placed responses was one labeled, "personal character traits that foster productivity." The top two responses in that category were: "Persistence, discipline, and really

hard work,” and “Interest, curiosity, flexibility, creativity, and passion.” Research like this might tease out environmental versus individual characteristics that contribute to scholarly productivity. In terms of environmental influences, it is possible that in a department that offers doctoral degrees in areas other than school psychology, there is the expectation that school psychology faculty members serve on dissertation committees. Serving on a dissertation committee may or may not lead to collaborative publication opportunities that are not available in institutions that do not have doctoral programs. Similarly, school psychology programs located in a Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive university where a thesis is required also may lead to publications opportunities that are not available in programs in Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities that do not require a thesis to meet research requirements.

Along with the findings from the current study, we made a number of observations during data collection that might benefit others interested in conducting similar research. For example, the advent of the School Psychology Program Information portion of the NASP website greatly facilitated the data collection process. Annually, school psychology programs are encouraged to provide updated information about faculty members. Reminders are provided on the school psychology trainers’ listserv. Despite best efforts, it is not clear whether all possible school psychology programs are included on this website. Also, whether a program’s information actually is the most current available may depend when the website is consulted. It is useful to verify the information on the NASP website by going directly to the program website. As part of the program information, the NASP website typically contains a link to the program page at their university. Although not all links on the NASP website were correct, it was fairly easy to find the websites for universities. As might be expected, some university and school psychology program websites were easier to navigate than others.

Another issue that arose quickly was determination of what constituted a school psychology faculty member. Does one have to be trained as a school psychologist to be a faculty member of a school psychology program? The NASP website listed the faculty members provided by the programs. It was evident that some programs listed only core school psychology faculty members, while other programs listed all faculty members who taught courses taken by school psychology students. Our intent was to examine the scholarly productivity of core school psychology faculty members. Consulting program handbooks, when available on program websites, often was helpful in differentiating core school psychology faculty members from faculty members affiliated with a program through teaching a specialized class like research methods or statistics. Ultimately, however, we allowed programs to define their faculty members, especially if there was no clear differentiation between core faculty and affiliated faculty. Perhaps the way in which those who coordinate the NASP website ask the question of programs could clarify this issue in the future. Asking programs to identify core school psychology faculty, rather than a more generic listing of school psychology faculty, might clarify this issue.

When searching the PsycINFO and ERIC databases, it became evident that some faculty members contribute to the school psychology literature through books and book chapters rather than journal articles. Traditionally, only journal articles have been considered when examining scholarly productivity. Generally, the peer-review process associated with journal articles is viewed as lending some degree of quality control to the publication process. Unfortunately, that viewpoint negates the contributions made by faculty authors of well-done books or book chapters in school psychology or related areas. Increasingly, peer-review is used for publications like the *Best Practices in School Psychology* series. Likewise, peer-review also is used when

considering contributions to school psychology newsletters such as the *Communique* (NASP) and *The School Psychologist* (APA Division 16). Some articles in these newsletters look more and more like journal articles. This was especially true of *The School Psychologist* before recent changes that occurred when APA became involved in production of this newsletter. The *Communique* is included in the ERIC database. Another publication, *Trainers' Forum*, is evolving into its own journal. Journal articles have been the focus of research on scholarly productivity, but it may be time to broaden the definition to include additional forms of scholarship. Future researchers should consider expanding the traditional approach that relies solely on journal articles with respect to scholarly productivity.

We also discovered that databases are not always accurate. Whenever possible, we attempted to match the output from our database searches with individual vitae on programs' or faculty members' websites. On some program websites, faculty members listed representative publications or presentations. On others, there were links to complete vitae of faculty members. When complete vitae were available, it was obvious that some faculty members were more diligent than others in providing up-to-date information. We also discovered that some publications in well-known journals did not always appear in our searches of authors' names. If we discovered a journal publication on a faculty member's vita within the target time period, we reran the search on PsycINFO and ERIC using the article title, and the article would appear. The fact that an article might not appear when searching by author's name, but would appear when searching on article title listed on a vita, suggests that the PsycINFO and ERIC databases are not 100% reliable when it comes to identifying all possible publications. In the current study, we attempted to be as thorough and accurate as possible by comparing information from the databases and websites. It also should be remembered that databases do limit the journals they

cover. Therefore, by examining only the PsycINFO and ERIC databases, perhaps not all journals in which school psychology faculty members might publish were captured in our study. Both database accuracy and coverage issues could influence authorship credit and resulting rankings of faculty members and programs.

There were other observations that occurred through the data collection process. For example, some women's names changed with their marital status. Sometimes these changes were in the form of hyphenated last names. Other times, the last name changed completely with change in marital status. In the case of hyphenated last names, the databases generally were good at providing publications that included maiden names as part of the last name. When last names changed as a result of change in marital status, the task of identifying articles became more challenging. Again, if individuals included information about publications at their programs' websites or on vitae that included their maiden names, searches were then done with both their maiden names and married names. Occasionally, we were able to discover maiden names through articles with collaborators, information contained in notes to articles, or other serendipitous methods. As with the database accuracy and coverage issues, our ability to link married to maiden names could influence authorship credit and resulting rankings of faculty members and programs.

Also, the time span chosen for a project such as the current study can influence the results. A longer time span allows more articles to be considered, potentially boosting authorship credit and resulting rankings. Previous studies of scholarly productivity among school psychology faculty members have ranged from 5 years (Carper & Williams, 2004; Grapin et al., 2013) to 13 years (Davis et al., 2005). To be truly accurate, all faculty members would need to be employed as academics during the entirety of the time span considered. This is more likely to occur over

shorter time spans, but even in these situations, it is inevitable that levels of experience will fluctuate. In any given time span, it is likely that you will be examining individuals at various times in their careers. In other words, some individuals may be in the prime of their careers, while others may be transitioning to retirement. Still other faculty members will be entering academia and in the initial stages of establishing themselves and navigating the balance of teaching and scholarship. In the case of the current study, that might mean that some individuals were active all 10 years covered, others may have been publishing articles initially during the time span, but were less focused on this aspect of their careers as they transitioned to retirement, and new faculty members may have been contributing articles to the literature for as little as 1 year. Obviously, those who were active during all 10 years covered had the potential for higher authorship credit and resulting rankings.

A final comment deals with the approach taken in determining scholarly productivity for individuals versus programs. One could examine an individual's scholarly productivity for the entire period from 2002-2011, regardless of university. Alternatively, the person's scholarly productivity at their current institution could be examined. Examining the scholarly productivity across institutions becomes problematic, because resources can vary. As noted earlier, Joy (2006) and Levinson et al. (1994) found that expectations typically differ at different level institutions. Because research is typically emphasized more at doctoral-level research universities, course loads tend to be less than at comprehensive master's degree granting institutions. Funding also varies across universities, with those granting doctoral degrees typically attracting more outside funding. Because of these potential differences, the decision was made to examine scholarly productivity of individuals at their current institutions. In essence, this placed the reputation of the institution over the reputation of the individual. Because

those collecting the data in the current study were undergraduate students who were potentially interested in attending school psychology programs, it was decided that the program ranking would be more impactful than the ranking of an individual faculty member. Among school psychology faculty members, the opposite likely is the case.

The decision to examine scholarly productivity of faculty members only at their current institution did affect the rankings. For example, T. Steuart Watson, whose scholarly productivity resulted in a rank of 24 (see Table 1), was at Miami University when our data collection occurred. His authorship credit for the 9 publications while at Miami University was 3.52. Prior to his position at Miami, Watson was a faculty member of the school psychology doctoral program at Mississippi State University, where he had 10 articles published within the 2002-2011 time span covered in the current study. If credit for these 10 additional articles was included, Watson's authorship credit becomes 6.09, which would have resulted in a rank of 13. This example demonstrates that individuals were rewarded for remaining at the same school for the time period covered in the current study. Again, the decision was to place the productivity of the program above that of the individual, because it is more likely that an undergraduate student making a choice to pursue training in school psychology will be looking at the reputation of the program rather than considering the scholarly productivity of an individual faculty member. We suspect that this is particularly true when the program does not require a thesis. When applying to doctoral programs, prospective students are encouraged to consider the match between their research interests and those of faculty members due to the need to complete a dissertation. The research experiences and expectations in specialist-only programs typically are not as extensive as those found in doctoral program, so the scholarly productivity of individual faculty members

may not influence the decisions of prospective students to the same degree. However, the scholarship within a program as a whole may be used in recruitment materials.

The aforementioned observations might suggest limitations of the current study or at least issues to be considered in future investigations of the topic of faculty scholarly productivity. Every attempt was made to gather complete information on each program and faculty members within programs. Nevertheless, as noted, issues related to the databases chosen and the accuracy of those databases, and accuracy of information on the NASP, university and program websites may have influenced findings. Also, the decision to limit publications included in the current study to those at an individual's current institution might be questioned, as it did influence outcomes. Some might take issue with the use of authorship credit as a meaningful indicator of scholarly productivity. This is the metric commonly used when examining scholarly productivity with respect to school psychology. Authorship credit proportions credit to reflect contribution to an article, but it does not reflect impact of the article. It could be argued that 100 articles each read by only one person are less impactful than one article read by 100 people. The PsycINFO database does provide indirect information about impact with inclusion of "Times Cited in this Database" for an article; the ERIC database does not include this information. The Google Scholar database also provides indirect information about impact through its "Cited by" statistic for articles. Others have advocated other means to determine impact, such as the *h* index proposed by Hirsch (2005). The website ResearchGate.net has developed an RG Score that is calculated based on the publications in an individual's profile and how other researchers interact with that individual's content on ResearchGate. Just as with authorship credit, there are issues with the accuracy of these impact measures (Seglen, 1997). For example, the RG Score relies on individuals' willingness to provide information or the ability of the organization's search engine

to accurately identify articles for individuals who are members of the website. PsycINFO limits citations to other journals within that database. As a result, there can be large differences between the times an article is cited in the PsycINFO database compared to Google Scholar.

Despite the issues noted, the current study contributes to the 40-plus years of research on the scholarly productivity of school psychology programs and/or faculty members. Like the studies before it, the current study provides a snapshot of scholarly productivity, in this case for the years 2002-2011. As such, the current study contributes to the historical scrapbook of academic school psychology.

References

- Akin-Little, K. A., & Little, S. G. (Eds.). (2004). The state of developing university faculty in school psychology: Current status and perspectives on the future [Special Issue]. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *19*(4).
- Armistead, L. D., Castillo, J. M., Curtis, M. J., Chappel, A., & Cunningham, J. (2013). School psychologists' continuing professional development preferences and practices. *Psychology in the Schools*, *50*, 415-432. doi: 10.1002/pits.21684
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2010). Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu>
- Carper, R. M., & Williams, R. L. (2004). Article publications, journal outlets, and article themes for current faculty in APA-accredited school psychology programs: 1995-1999. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *19*, 141-165. doi: 10.1521/scpq.19.2.141.33312
- Castillo, J. M., Curtis, M. J., & Gelley, C. D. (2013). Gender and race in school psychology. *School Psychology Review*, *42*, 262-279.
- Curtis, M. J., Grier, J. E. C., & Hunley, S. A. (2003). The changing face of school psychology: Trends in data and projections for the future. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *18*, 409-430. doi: 10.1521/scpq.18.4.409.26999
- Curtis, M. J., Grier, J. E. C., & Hunley, S. A. (2004). The changing face of school psychology: Trends in data and projections for the future. *School Psychology Review*, *33*, 49-66.
- Curtis, M. J., Hunley, S. A., & Grier, E. C. (2004). The status of school psychology: Implications of a major personnel shortage. *Psychology in the Schools*, *41*, 431-442. doi: 10.1002/pits.10186

- Davis, K. S., Zanger, D., Gerrard-Morris, A., Roberts, G., & Robinson, D. H. (2005). Productivity and collaboration of authors in school psychology journals, 1991-2003. *The School Psychologist, 59*, 129-133.
- Grabin, S. L., Kranzler, J. H., & Daley, M. L. (2013). Scholarly productivity and impact of school psychology faculty in APA-accredited programs. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*, 87-101. doi: 10.1002/pits.21658
- Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102*, 16569-16572. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0507655102
- Hosp, J. L., & Reschly, D. J. (2002). Regional differences in school psychology practice. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 11-29.
- Howard, G. S., Cole, D. A., & Maxwell, S. E. (1987). Research productivity in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologists, 42*, 975-986. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.42.11.975
- Joy, S. (2006). What should I be doing, and where are they doing it? Scholarly productivity of academic psychologists. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 346-364. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00020.x
- Kranzler, J. H., Grabin, S. L., & Daley, M. L. (2011). Research productivity and scholarly impact of APA-accredited school psychology programs: 2005-2009. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*, 721-738. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2011.10.004
- Kratochwill, T. R., Shernoff, E. S., & Sanetti, L. (2004). Promotion of academic careers in school psychology: A conceptual framework of impact points, recommended strategies, and hopeful outcomes. *School Psychology Quarterly, 19*, 342-364. doi: 10.1521/scpq.19.4.53499

- Levinson, E. M., Barker, W., & Lillenstein, D. (1994). Publication productivity in selected school psychology journals: A reconsideration based on institutional mission. *Psychology in the Schools, 31*, 120-127. doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(199404)31:2<120::AID-PITS2310310206>3.0.CO;2-W
- Little, S. G. (1997). Graduate education of the top contributors to the school psychology literature: 1987-1995. *School Psychology International, 18*, 15-27. doi: 10.1177/0143034397181002
- Martínez, R. S., Floyd, R. G., & Erichsen, L. W. (2011). Strategies and attributions of highly productive scholars and contributors to the school psychology literature: Recommendations for increasing scholarly productivity. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*, 691-720. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2011.10.003
- O'Callaghan, S. (1974). Publication trends in school psychology: 1963-1973. *Journal of School Psychology, 12*, 269-275. doi: 10.1016/0022-4405(74)90046-6
- Reynolds, C. R., & Clark, J. H. (1984). Trends in school psychology research: 1974-1980. *Journal of School Psychology, 22*, 43-52. doi: 10.1016/0022-4405(84)90050-5
- Roberts, G. A., Davis, K. S., Zanger, D., Gerrard-Morris, A., & Robinson, D. H. (2006). Top contributors to the school psychology literature: 1996-2005. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 737-743. doi: 10.1002/pits.20183
- Rossen, E., & von der Embse, N. (2014). The status of school psychology graduate education in the United States. In A. Thomas & P. Harrison (Eds.) *Best practices in school psychology VI: Foundations* (pp. 503-512). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

- Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *British Medical Journal*, *314*, 498-502.
- Wagner, A. R., Lail, K. E., Viglietta, E., & Burns, M. K. (2007). Faculty publications in APA-accredited school psychology training programs between 2000 and 2005. *The School Psychologist*, *61*, 16-21.
- Webster, R. E., Hall, C. W., & Bolen, L. M. (1993). Publication productivity in selected school psychology journals: 1985-1991. *Psychology in the Schools*, *30*, 136-142. doi 10.1002/1520-6807(199304)30:2<136::AID-PITS2310300206>3.0.CO;2-K

Table 1.

Top 25 Faculty Members Based on Authorship Credit

Rank	Name/University	Doctoral Training	Carnegie Classification	Publication Categories					Number of Pubs/Solo	Author Credit
				SP/P-12	SP/Other	College	Other			
1	Gary Canivez/Eastern Illinois University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology & Counseling); Southern Illinois University - Carbondale	Postbac - Comp	23	2			25/4	13.85	
2	Richard Beck/Abilene Christian University	Experimental Psychology; Southern Methodist University	Postbac - Comp			14	4	18/9	12.90	
3	Oliver Edwards/University of Central Florida	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Florida Educational Leadership (Administration & Supervision); Florida International University	CompDoc/NMedVet	5	14			19/4	12.29	
4	Johannes Rojahn/George Mason University	Unspecified/University of Vienna	CompDoc/NMedVet	13	2	2	14	31/0	10.13	
5	Tony Crespi/University of Hartford	Student Development (School Psychology); University of Massachusetts - Amherst	S-Doc/Other		10	1	1	12/3	8.07	
6	Timothy Smith/Brigham Young University	Combined Program Clinical, Counseling, School; Utah State University	Doc/Prof	1		7	12	20/0	7.87	
7	Jon Lasser/Texas State University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Texas - Austin	Doc/Prof	3	8		2	13/1	7.27	
8	Stefan Dombrowski/Rider University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Georgia	Postbac - A&S/Ed	5	12			17/0	6.95	

9	Kristin Powers/ California State University – Long Beach	Educational Psychology; University of Minnesota	Postbac – Comp	9	5			14/2	6.51
9	Jeremy Sullivan/ University of Texas – San Antonio	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Texas A & M University	CompDoc/NMedVet	5	2	3	1	11/2	6.51
11	Paul McCabe/ CUNY – Brooklyn College	Clinical-School Psychology; Hofstra University	Postbac – Comp	3	8			11/3	6.13
12	Sylvia Rameriz/ University of Texas – Pan American	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Wisconsin - Madison	Doc/Prof	2	6	2	4	14/1	6.12
13	Daniel Sass/ University of Texas – San Antonio	Educational Psychology (Measurement & Statistics); University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	CompDoc/NMedVet	5		1	5	11/2	5.83
14	Ellie Young/ Brigham Young University	Educational and Psychological Studies (School Psychology); University of South Florida	Doc/Prof	11	9		1	21/0	5.69
15	Susanne Denham/George Mason University	Applied Developmental Psychology; University of Maryland – Baltimore County	CompDoc/NMedVet	6	6			12/2	5.59
16	Melissa Heath/ Brigham Young University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Texas A & M University	Doc/Prof	3	16		1	20/0	5.37
17	Stephen Brock/ California State University - Sacramento	Education (Psychological Studies); University of California – Davis	S-Doc/Other	1	10			11/1	5.32
18	Jeremy Jewell/ Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Texas -- Austin	Postbac – Comp	7	2	2	1	12/0	4.95
19	Stephen Sivo/ University of Central Florida	Educational Psychology (Research, Measurement & Statistics); Texas A & M University	CompDoc/NMedVet	1		5	6	12/0	4.55
20	Norma Guerra/ University of Texas – San Antonio	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Texas A & M University	CompDoc/NMedVet		1	6	2	9/3	4.37

21	Stephen Hupp/ Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville	Clinical Child Psychology; Louisiana State University	Postbac – Comp	7	3	2	1	13/0	4.35
22	Franci Crepeau-Hobson/ University of Colorado – Denver	School Psychology; University of Northern Colorado	Doc/Prof	2	3			5/2	3.80
23	Alexander Beaujean/ Baylor University	Educational, School & Counseling Psychology (School Psychology) and (Statistics & Measurement); University of Missouri	CompDoc/NMedVet	1		2	5	8/0	3.70
24	T. Steuart Watson/ Miami University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Nebraska – Lincoln	CompDoc/NMedVet	4	4	1		9/1	3.52
25	Lisa Kelly-Vance/ University of Nebraska – Omaha	Counseling & Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Indiana University	Doc/Prof	9				9/0	3.39

Note. Carnegie Classifications: Postbac-Comp = Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive; CompDoc/NMedVet = Comprehensive Doctoral

No Medical/Veterinary; S-Doc/Other = Single Doctoral Other Field; DocProf = Doctoral, Professional Dominant; Postbac-A&S/Ed =

Post-Baccalaureate with Arts & Sciences Education Dominant. Publication Categories: SP/P-12 = School Psychology Grades

Preschool – 12; SP/Other = School Psychology Other. Number of Pubs/Solo = Number of Publications listed before the slash and number of solo authored articles after the slash.

Table 2.

Top 25 Programs Based on Average Number of Journal Articles Published by Faculty Members

<u>Rank</u>	<u>University</u>	<u>Carnegie Classification</u>	<u>Number of Pubs</u>	<u>Number of Faculty</u>	<u>Average</u>
1	Brigham Young University	Doc/Prof	57	4	14.25
2	University of Central Florida	CompDoc/NMedVet	38	3	12.67
3	George Mason University	CompDoc/NMedVet	45	4	11.25
4	Eastern Illinois University	Postbac – Comp	27	3	9.00
5	Rider University	Postbac – A&S/Ed	17	2	8.50
6	University of Texas – San Antonio	CompDoc/NMedVet	30	5	6.00
7	Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville	Postbac – Comp	22	4	5.50
8	California State University – Long Beach	Postbac – Comp	16	3	5.33
9	Eastern Kentucky University	Postbac – Comp	15	3	5.00
10	California State University – Sacramento	S-Doc/Other	14	3	4.67
10	University of Nebraska – Omaha	Doc/Prof	14	3	4.67
12	Arkansas State University	Doc/Prof	9	2	4.50
13	California State University – San Bernardino	Postbac – Comp	11	3	3.67
13	University of Dayton	Doc/STEM	11	3	3.67
15	University of Hartford	S-Doc/Other	14	4	3.50
16	Abilene Christian University	Postbac – Comp	20	6	3.33
16	CUNY – Brooklyn College	Postbac – Comp	20	6	3.33
16	Oswego State University of New York	Postbac – Comp	10	3	3.33
19	University of Texas – Pan American	Doc/Prof	13	4	3.25

20	Florida International University	CompDoc/NMedVet	12	4	3.00
20	Miami University	CompDoc/NMedVet	15	5	3.00
22	Baylor University	CompDoc/NMedVet	13	5	2.60
22	Sam Houston State University	Doc/Prof	13	5	2.60
24	Texas State University	Doc/Prof	15	6	2.50
25	University of Tennessee – Chattanooga	Doc/STEM	12	5	2.40

Note. Carnegie Classifications: Postbac-Comp = Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive; CompDoc/NMedVet = Comprehensive Doctoral

No Medical/Veterinary; S-Doc/Other = Single Doctoral Other Field; DocProf = Doctoral, Professional Dominant; Postbac-A&S/Ed =

Post-Baccalaureate with Arts & Sciences Education Dominant; Doc/STEM = Doctoral, Science, Technology, Engineering and Math

Dominant.

Table 3.

Journals in Which the Top 25 Faculty Members Published Articles

<u>Journal</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>Number of Faculty</u>
Psychology in the Schools	18	11/4
Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment	15	5/7
School Psychology Quarterly	11	4/4
Journal of Psychology and Theology	10	2/9
School Psychology International	10	6/3
Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities	9	4/5
Journal of Applied School Psychology	8	5/3
California School Psychologist (now Contemporary School Psychology)	7	2/5
Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools	7	3/4
Journal of School Violence	7	4/4
Journal of Instructional Psychology	6	3/3
Journal of Early Childhood and Infant Psychology	5	1/5
Journal of Psychology and Christianity	5	1/5
Child & Family Behavior Therapy	4	2/3
Educational and Psychological Measurement	4	3/2
Intelligence	4	3/2
Journal of Child and Family Studies	4	2/3
Journal of Counseling Psychology	4	2/3

Professional Psychology: Research and Practice	4	2/3
Research in Developmental Disabilities	4	2/3
Adolescence	3	2/2
Applied Neuropsychology	3	2/2
Assessment for Effective Intervention	3	2/2
Career Development for Exceptional Individuals	3	1/3
College Student Journal	3	3/1
Educational Psychology in Practice	3	2/2
Intervention in School and Clinic	3	2/2
Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities	3	1/3
Journal of Clinical Psychology	3	2/2
Journal of Mental Health Research in Intellectual Disabilities	3	1/3
Journal of School Psychology	3	3/1
Personality and Individual Differences	3	1/3
Principal Leadership	3	3/1
Professional School Counseling	3	3/1
Psychological Reports	3	2/2
Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders	3	1/3
Structural Equation Modeling	3	1/3

Note. Number of Faculty = number before the slash is the number who have a publication in the journal; number after the slash is the highest number of articles by a single faculty member.