
Top Producers of Scholarly Publications in Clinical Psychology PhD Programs

▼
Peter K. Stewart, Yelena P. Wu, and Michael C. Roberts
University of Kansas

Publication productivity of 1,927 core faculty members in clinical psychology training programs was tallied over a 5-year period (2000–2004) from their PsycINFO database entries (<http://www.apa.org/psycinfo/>). The top-producing faculty members are presented with rank by total number of publications and rank by number of peer-reviewed journal articles. In this report, the authors recognize those productive clinical psychologists in accredited clinical programs who have advanced the field through their substantial contributions to the literature base. © 2007 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. *J Clin Psychol* 63: 1209–1215, 2007.

Keywords: clinical psychology; program evaluation; scholarly productivity; education and training; faculty

Research into professional issues in clinical psychology enhances understanding of the field and its multiple components (Korn, Davis, & Davis, 1991). Investigations have been made into such components as professional attitudes, clinical training, relationship of clinical practice and research, therapist competence, clinical supervision, and ethics. In particular, scholarly productivity is an essential force that moves the field of professional psychology forward. There have been a number of reports of scholarly productivity or “eminence” within American Psychological Association (APA) divisions and subfields of psychology (e.g., Brems, Johnson, & Gallucci, 1996; Gordon & Vicari, 1992; Horan, Hanish, Keen, Saberi, & Hird, 1993; Mayer & Carlsmith, 1997), and among APA presidents (Gibson, 1990). Studies have assessed eminence and research productivity to identify those individuals who are associated with important psychological theories (Mayer & Carlsmith, 1997) and constitute the majority of eponyms used in textbooks (Roekelein, 1996), to compare research productivity between different subfields of psychology (Brems et al., 1996), and to identify training programs that have a high level of research

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Michael C. Roberts, 2009 Dole Human Development Center, 1000 Sunnyside Avenue, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045. E-mail: mroberts@ku.edu

productivity (Diegelman, Uffelman, Wagner, & Diegelman, 2005). Previous reports of scholarly productivity and eminence, however, have used a variety of methods, such as citation counts in textbooks (e.g., Roeckelein, 1996) and ratings of eminence based on the opinions of psychology historians and psychology department chairpersons (Korn et al., 1991).

Golden, Kuperman, and Osmon (1980) were among the first to investigate scholarly productivity in clinical psychology through an examination of clinical psychology journals. Although not specifically targeting clinical psychology programs (service agencies such as hospitals and medical centers were also included), Golden et al. provided an initial snapshot of scholarly productivity within clinical psychology.

Similar examinations of scholarly productivity within clinical psychology appear to have slowed until recent studies by Stewart, Roberts, and Roy (2007) and Roy, Roberts, and Stewart (2006). Stewart et al. (2007) examined program-specific scholarly productivity and reported average productivity rates for clinical psychology faculty over a 5-year period ($M = 9.72$, $SD = 11.94$). Highlighting the importance of such updated analyses of scholarly productivity and eminence is the fact that these variables can change over time (Wright, 2000). The scholarly productivity of a single researcher can have tremendous impact on a training program's aggregated productivity and consequently, rankings based on total publications and mean number of publications by program (Stewart et al., 2007). Given the range of productivity, including a sizable number of nonproducers, attention to the highest producers is an important further step in the analysis of scholarly productivity in clinical psychology. The purpose of the present report is to use citations in a widely used psychology literature database to identify, acknowledge, and credit those core faculty members who have made significant contributions in their quantity of scholarly publications (i.e., books, chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles).

Method

The current study is an extension of a database created earlier to measure scholarly productivity of clinical psychology PhD programs. Interested readers are referred to Stewart et al. (2007) for a more detailed description of the methods. Information on scholarly productivity was gathered on 1,927 core faculty members from 166 clinical psychology PhD programs accredited by the APA (2004). Core faculty members were defined as all professional staff faculty that were not listed in public information about the programs as an adjunct, courtesy, or clinical professor or supervisor, instructor, or professor emeritus (Ilardi, Rodriguez-Hanley, Roberts, & Seigel, 2000). The PsycINFO database was the primary data source to measure scholarly productivity for the study. This database, maintained by the APA, contains over 2,000,000 references and is the most comprehensive resource for author and topic searches in psychology and allied fields.

Procedures are broken down into three steps. First, 166 APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD programs were identified. Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) programs were excluded from the current study because scholarly productivity is not an emphasis of the mission of the PsyD program. After the list of programs was created, a roster of core faculty was compiled. Next, the publication database was created by extracting bibliographic references from PsycINFO for each core faculty member for a five year publication period (i.e., publications from January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2004) which is consistent with other examinations of program characteristics (Ilardi et al., 2000; Ilardi & Roberts, 2002; Oliver, Blair, Gorman, & Woehr, 2005).

Publications were tallied within their respective categories (i.e., books, chapters, or peer-reviewed journal articles) for each faculty member. For purposes of this report,

equal credit was given for all types of publication. Similarly, equal credit was given for single, first, or other author in a publication with multiple authors (Pomfret & Wang, 2003). When multiple authors from the same institution appeared on the same publication, each faculty member was credited for the publication. This stems from the assumption that interdepartmental collaboration is beneficial to the field as a whole, as well as to institutions.

Results

Across the 1,927 core faculty members and 166 programs examined, there was significant variability in terms of scholarly productivity by individual faculty members. Table 1 displays the top-producing core faculty members and their institutional affiliations. The faculty members are presented in alphabetical rather than rank order as a means to provide credit to the group of individuals. Productivity tallies are reported for number of books, chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, and total number of publications (i.e., the sum of the previous three categories). Rankings are provided in two different metrics: rank by total number of publications and rank by number of peer-reviewed journal articles. The individuals in this table are the top producers of scholarly publications by at least one of the rankings during the period of investigation.

The top producers of scholarly publications (i.e., total publications) have produced at least 39 publications during the period of investigation, which is almost 3 standard deviations above the mean for the overall group of 1,927 faculty members. These 55 core faculty members collectively produced a total of 3,019 (16.1%) publications in this 5-year period. In other words, 2.8% of the faculty members in the sample accounted for over 16% of the total number of scholarly publications.

Similarly, the top producers of peer-reviewed journal articles have produced at least 30 articles which is over 2 standard deviations above the mean ($M = 8.08$, $SD = 10.02$). The individuals included in this ranking accounted for 2,487 (16%) of the publications in peer-reviewed journal articles in this 5-year period. Fifteen new individuals were ranked as the top producers of peer-reviewed journal article publications that were not included in the ranking by total number of publications (and 14 were not included in the journal publication list). A measure of total publications may favor faculty that are more experienced and recognized in specialty areas, and are thus more likely to be invited to write chapters or edit books. In contrast, peer-reviewed journal articles represent the frontlines of research and embody the most current scholarly research. The latter may provide more of an unbiased measure of productivity, although it is certainly an imperfect measure at best.

Collectively, the two sets of rankings included 70 individuals of which 41 individuals were ranked as the top producers on both metrics. There were 44 institutions represented that employed the individuals identified in this study as top producers. Although not intended to create any sense of superiority for these individuals, in this report credit is given to those individuals who have contributed substantially to the research foundation in psychology.

Discussion

This study highlights the significant contributions of clinical faculty members who have gone beyond their peers in their efforts to contribute to the field of clinical psychology. 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

Table 1
The Top Producers of Scholarly Publications From 2000 Through 2004 in Alphabetical Order^a

Faculty names	Institution	Total	BK	CH	PJ	Rank total ^b	Rank PJ
Barber, Jacques P.	University of Pennsylvania	36	0	5	31	—	48
Barlow, David H.	Boston University	56	9	11	36	17	36
Baum, Andrew	University of Pittsburgh	48	4	16	28	30	—
Beach, Steven R. H.	University of Georgia	39	2	15	22	53	—
Beutler, Larry E.	Pacific Graduate School of Psychology	54	4	10	40	19	28
Bond, Gary R.	Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis	41	0	2	39	47	31
Brodsky, Stanley L.	University of Alabama	75	1	54	20	5	—
Brown, Sandra A.	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	50	0	3	47	27	17
Burgio, Louis D.	University of Alabama	32	0	1	31	—	48
Cannon, Tyrone D.	University of California, Los Angeles	33	0	2	31	—	48
Carey, Kate B.	Syracuse University	48	0	0	48	30	13
Carey, Michael P.	Syracuse University	48	1	2	45	30	21
Chang, Edward C.	University of Michigan	39	3	8	28	53	—
Cicchetti, Dante	University of Rochester	54	2	6	46	19	20
Courchesne, Eric	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	31	0	0	31	—	48
Craske, Michelle G.	University of California, Los Angeles	47	0	5	42	36	25
Crits-Christoph, Paul	University of Pennsylvania	44	0	9	35	42	38
Davidson, Richard J.	University of Wisconsin—Madison	71	4	16	51	6	11
Drotar, Dennis D.	Case Western Reserve University	63	2	18	43	9	23
Foa, Edna B.	University of Pennsylvania	114	2	22	90	3	3
Forehand, Rex L.	University of Vermont	42	1	0	41	44	26
Frank, Ellen	University of Pittsburgh	118	1	8	109	1	1
Greenberg, Leslie S.	York University	54	2	37	15	19	—
Harvey, Allison G.	University of California, Berkeley	52	1	11	40	24	28
Hayes, Steven C.	University of Nevada—Reno	63	4	25	34	9	44
Heaton, Robert K.	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	44	1	5	38	42	35
Heimberg, Richard G.	Temple University	68	2	7	59	7	6
Hilsenroth, Mark J.	Adelphi University	40	0	1	39	49	31
Hinshaw, Stephen P.	University of California, Berkeley	60	1	6	53	12	8
Hoza, Betsy	Purdue University	42	0	3	39	44	31
Iacono, William G.	University of Minnesota	50	0	3	47	27	17
Jason, Leonard A.	DePaul University	87	5	12	70	4	4
Joiner, Thomas E. Jr.	Florida State University	116	4	15	97	2	2
Kazdin, Alan E.	Yale University	42	4	11	27	44	—
Keefe, Frank	Duke University	36	0	3	33	—	46
Kendall, Philip C.	Temple University	48	2	7	39	30	31
Klein, Daniel N.	Stony Brook University/State University of New York	50	0	2	48	27	13
Lambert, Michael J.	Brigham Young University	45	1	11	33	40	46
Lejuez, Carl W.	University of Maryland, College Park	37	0	2	35	—	38
Levant, Ronald F.	Nova Southeastern University	39	2	11	26	53	—
Lilienfeld, Scott O.	Emory University	38	2	5	31	—	48
Loeber, Rolf	University of Pittsburgh	47	0	4	43	36	23
Lynn, Steven J.	Binghamton University/State University of New York	40	3	10	27	49	—
Lyons, John S.	Northwestern University Medical School	37	0	2	35	—	38
Maisto, Stephen A.	Syracuse University	48	0	0	48	30	13
Matson, Johnny L.	Louisiana State University	30	0	0	30	—	55
Matthews, Karen A.	University of Pittsburgh	56	0	4	52	17	10
McGrath, Patrick J.	Dalhousie University	46	1	1	44	39	22
Miller, William R.	University of New Mexico	52	3	8	41	24	26
Moffitt, Terrie E.	University of Wisconsin—Madison	58	2	3	53	14	8
Morey, Les C.	Texas A&M University	35	1	3	31	—	48
Neimeyer, Robert A.	The University of Memphis	47	3	20	24	36	—
Ollendick, Thomas H.	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University	54	1	13	40	19	28
Otto, Michael W.	Boston University	65	0	3	62	8	5
Overholser, James C.	Case Western Reserve University	40	1	10	29	49	—

continued

Table 1 Continued

Faculty names	Institution	Total	BK	CH	PJ	Rank total ^b	Rank PJ
Pelham, William E. Jr.	University at Buffalo/State University of New York	59	0	3	56	13	7
Penn, David L.	University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill	33	1	2	30	—	55
Pennington, Bruce F.	University of Denver	40	1	4	35	49	38
Perkins, Kenneth A.	University of Pittsburgh	36	0	1	35	—	38
Peterson, Christopher	University of Michigan	58	1	38	19	14	—
Seligman, Martin E. P.	University of Pennsylvania	62	3	34	25	11	—
Sher, Kenneth J.	University of Missouri–Columbia	41	0	6	35	47	38
Shiffman, Saul	University of Pittsburgh	51	0	3	48	26	13
Snyder, C. R. ^c	University of Kansas	57	5	24	28	16	—
Stewart, Sherry H.	Dalhousie University	54	0	4	50	19	12
Swerdlow, Neal R.	San Diego State University/University of California, San Diego	35	0	1	34	—	44
Westen, Drew	Emory University	37	0	6	31	—	48
Widiger, Thomas A.	University of Kentucky	45	2	18	25	40	—
Youngstrom, Eric A.	Case Western Reserve University	36	0	0	36	—	36
Zvolensky, Michael J.	University of Vermont	48	0	1	47	30	17

Note. BK = Book; CH = chapter; PJ = article in peer-reviewed journal; Rank total = rank by number of total publications; Rank PJ = rank by number of peer-reviewed journal articles.

^aBased on core faculty members in PhD-granting clinical psychology programs listed in alphabetical order.

^b“—” indicates that the rank for the respective category was greater than 50.

^cNow deceased, but was actively producing at the time the data were captured from PsycINFO.

biases. This is a single piece of the mosaic picture of what faculty members contribute to clinical psychology PhD programs and to the field. Furthermore, we should acknowledge that the top producers come from a team of faculty at their respective institutions. The recognition of the top producers does not in any way discount credit to the other faculty members at their institutions who contribute and produce. Instead, the recognition in this list for the individual contributors reflects positively on the programs that they represent. Additionally, the results provide evidence of the diversity within the field of clinical psychology. The rankings spanned across 44 institutions and represented a variety of topical areas within the specialty of clinical psychology including, for example, health psychology, community psychology, psychology and law, interventions, outcomes, psychopathology, positive psychology, and clinical child psychology. Clinical psychology continues to expand and grow with a continuing increase in outlets for scholarly publications, providing ample room for many high producers of scholarship.

There are several limitations noted for the present study. Undoubtedly, there are publications that individuals produced that were not accounted for, primarily due to unexplored name variations and publications that may not have been included in PsycINFO. For example, some books and book chapters may not have been indexed in PsycINFO as of the dates of data collection (July, 2005). Furthermore, individuals who contributed to group authorship (corporate authors) may not have received individual credit for these publications. Although some of these limitations may be difficult to address, one way in which members of the field could assist future research on scholarly productivity is to publish under a consistent name or for named research groups to have individual contributors also entered as authors in PsycINFO and other archives. Thus, the present study does not claim to be an exhaustive list of scholarly publications by faculty members in APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD programs. In addition, this is an examination of publications from 2000 to 2004 only, and does not claim to be a list of the top producers over any other period. Consequently, the current analysis does not provide recognition to

major contributors to the field in previous periods. In regards to which faculty members were included in the searches, the faculty affiliations used were current as of February 1, 2005. Given the fluidity of academic professionals, some changes might be expected. Additionally, this study examined faculty members in APA-accredited clinical psychology PhD programs and not clinical psychologists whose affiliations are in other settings (e.g., medical centers), who may have similarly exceptional records of productivity. The present study, however, provides a preliminary method of identifying whom to study. Finally, this study was purely a measure of the quantity of research and not quality. Quality might be measured by publications within a select list of journals identified as influential in the field, citation impact factors, or by other means such as ratings by reviewers.

There are additional examinations that would achieve an even more comprehensive picture of scholarly productivity within clinical psychology PhD programs. For example, these include an examination of faculty members' year of degree or first year of employment at a program to determine whether productivity is related to seniority. Similarly, a comparison of scholarly productivity based on faculty rank (i.e., associate, assistant, etc.) might be performed. Future studies could investigate scholarly productivity of specialties related to the omnibus subject area of clinical psychology (e.g., clinical child, geropsychology, clinical health, clinical neuropsychology). One may also examine which programs hold the most productive researchers through an assessment of grants received by programs.

Again, our hope is that the present study recognizes those core faculty members who have advanced the field of clinical psychology through their substantial contributions to the literature base. Scholarly publications are the catalyst for advancement of the field and we applaud the efforts of those dedicated to this purpose.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2004). Accredited programs in clinical psychology. Retrieved August 18, 2004, from <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/clinspsy.html>
- Brems, C., Johnson, M. E., & Gallucci, P. (1996). Publication productivity of clinical and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52*, 723–725.
- Diegelman, N. M., Uffelman, R. A., Wagner, K. S., & Diegelman, S. A. (2005). Current institutional trends in research productivity in counseling psychology journals. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 327–339.
- Gibson, K. R. (1990). Eminence of the APA presidents. *American Psychologist, 27*, 582–583.
- Golden, C. J., Kuperman, S. K., & Osman, D. C. (1980). Productivity ratings of psychology programs based on publications in clinical journals. *Professional Psychology, 11*, 797–806.
- Gordon, R. A., & Vicari, P. J. (1992). Eminence in social psychology: A comparison of textbook citation, social sciences citation index, and research productivity ratings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 26–38.
- Horan, J. J., Hanish, C., Keen, B., Saberi, D., & Hird, J. S. (1993). When examining the cerebral function of division 17, which organ should we dissect? *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*, 307–315.
- Korn, J. H., Davis, R., & Davis, S. F. (1991). Historians' and chairpersons' judgments for eminence among psychologists. *American Psychologist, 46*, 789–792.
- Ilardi, S. S., & Roberts, M. C. (2002). Program proficiency in training graduate students for clinical faculty careers: Does program size matter? *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 9*, 108–111.

- Hardi, 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.
- Mayer, J. D., & Carlsmith, K. M. (1997). Eminence rankings of personality psychologists as a reflection of the field. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 707–716.
- Oliver, J., Blair, C. A., Gorman, A., & Woehr, D. J. (2005). Scholarly 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.
- Roeckelein, J. E. (1996). Contributions to the history of psychology: CIV. Eminence in psychology as measured by name counts and eponyms. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 243–253.
- 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.
- Stewart, P. K., Roberts, M. C., & Roy, K. (2007). Scholarly productivity in clinical psychology PhD programs: A normative assessment of publication. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 14, 157–171.
- Wright, R. A. (2000). Recent changes in the most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 117–128.