Research and Practice in the Schools

TASP Texas Association of School Psychologists
A partner on the path to student success

Research and Practice in the Schools:
The Official Journal of the Texas Association of School Psychologists

Research and Practice in the Schools:
The Official Journal of the Texas Association of School Psychologists

Research and Practice in the Schools is a publication of the Texas Association of School Psychologists (TASP). It is an online, peer-reviewed journal that provides TASP members with access to current research that impacts the practice of school psychology. The primary purpose of *Research and Practice in the Schools* is to meet the needs of TASP members for information on research-based practices in the field of school psychology. To meet this need, the journal welcomes timely and original empirical research, theoretical or conceptual articles, test reviews, book reviews, and software reviews. Qualitative and case-study research designs will be considered as appropriate, in addition to more traditional quantitative designs. All submissions should clearly articulate implications for the practice of psychology in the schools.

Instructions for Authors

General Submission Guidelines

All manuscripts should be submitted in electronic form to either of the co-editors (jeremy.sullivan@utsa.edu or aeherna8@uiwtx.edu) as an email attachment. Manuscripts should be submitted in MS Word format and labeled with the manuscript's title.

It is assumed that any manuscript submitted for review is not being considered concurrently by another journal. Each submission must be accompanied by a statement that it has not been simultaneously submitted for publication elsewhere, and has not been previously published.

Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce copyrighted material from other sources. IRB approval should have been obtained and should be noted in all studies involving human subjects. Manuscripts and accompanying materials become the property of the publisher. Upon acceptance for publication, authors will be asked to sign a publication agreement granting TASP permission to publish the manuscript. The editors reserve the right to edit the manuscript as necessary for publication if accepted.

Submissions should be typed, double-spaced with margins of one inch. All articles should meet the requirements of the *APA Publication Manual, 6th ed.*, in terms of style, references, and citations. Pages should be numbered consecutively throughout the document. Illustrations should be provided as clean digital files in .pdf format with a resolution of 300 dpi or higher. Tables and figures may be embedded in the text. A short descriptive title should appear above each table with a clear legend and any footnotes below.

The Review Process

After receiving the original manuscript, it will be reviewed by the Editors and anonymously by two or more reviewers from the Editorial Board or individuals appointed on an *ad hoc* basis. Reviewers will judge manuscripts according to a specified set of criteria, based on the type of submission. Upon completion of the initial review process, feedback will be offered to the original (primary) author with either (a) a preliminary target date for publication; (b) a request for minor editing or changes and resubmission; (c) significant changes with an invitation for resubmission once these changes are made; or, (d) a decision that the submission does not meet the requirements of *Research and Practice in the Schools*.

Call for Special Issue Proposals

We invite proposals for special issues of the journal, with the goal of publishing one special issue each year in addition to the general issue. Special issues will include collections of papers related to some cohesive theme in the field of School Psychology, and will be edited by Guest Editors who will take the lead in soliciting contributions and coordinating the peer review process. In addition to special issues that focus on research and scholarship in School Psychology, we welcome special issues that cover important practical and applied issues in the field.

Special issue proposals should include a brief description of the theme to be covered by the issue, approximate number of articles to be included, qualifications and expertise of those who will serve as Guest Editors of the issue, and a plan for soliciting manuscripts and conducting the reviews. Proposals for special issues, and questions about the process, should be sent to jeremy.sullivan@utsa.edu.

Graduate Student Section

Ashley Doss, doctoral student at Stephen F. Austin State University, serves as Graduate Student Section Editor for the journal. The Graduate Student Section is devoted to publishing the work of graduate students, including research studies, comprehensive literature reviews on relevant topics, and reviews of books or psychological/educational tests published within the past two years. As with all submissions to the journal, graduate student manuscripts should highlight implications for practice in the schools. If you are a graduate student and you have questions about how you can best contribute to the journal (as an author, reviewer, or both), please email Ashley at: dossan2@jacks.sfasu.edu.

Please note: all manuscripts submitted to the Graduate Student Section must include either a faculty co-author or a faculty sponsor who provides the student with mentorship on the process of preparing and submitting their work for peer review. When submitting their manuscripts for review, student authors should include a cover letter verifying that their work has been vetted by a faculty co-author or sponsor.

Self-Archiving Policy

Authors retain the right to self-archive the final, accepted manuscript of their submission on their own websites or deposit this version of the manuscript in any repository, provided it is only made publically available one calendar year (12 months) after publication or later. The archived version should be the final typeset article as it appears in the online issue of the Journal and the archive should include the appropriate citation and link to the Journal issue in which it appeared.

Article

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

Jeff Laurent and Elizabeth Runia
Western Illinois University

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 136 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 are presented. The study presents a snapshot of scholarship among specialist-level only programs and their faculty members during the 10-year period from 2002-2011.

Keywords: school psychology, scholarly productivity, specialist-level programs

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 agencies and school districts, 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 and the American Association of University Professors. They then ranked universities within these 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. Subsequently, a series of studies extended the work of Little. For example, 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) used data collected from 1996-2005, and 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 specifically – those who are employed at institutions whose only school psychology program is at the specialist level. Although recent interest in scholarly productivity of school psychology faculty members has focused on APA-accredited doctoral programs, specialist programs outnumber these programs and doctoral programs, in general. Of the 238 school psychology programs in the United States listed by Miller (2008), 138 were specialist-only programs, 22 were doctoral-only programs, and 78 had both doctoral and specialist programs. The distribution of programs listed on the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) website is very similar: 140 specialist-only, 25 doctoral-only, 79 doctoral and specialist programs (apps.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-education/index.aspx). The APA website lists 64 APA-accredited doctoral programs (apa.org/ed/accreditation/programs/index.

aspx). The fact that institutions offering specialist-only programs have not been considered in recent studies of scholarly productivity (e.g., Grapin et al., 2013; Kranzler et al., 2011), even though they are the most numerous type of school psychology program, suggests it is time to examine these programs.

Also, no previous study has focused specifically on scholarly productivity of faculty members in specialist-only programs. Although Webster et al. (1993) initially cast a broad net, the current trend is to examine APA-accredited programs exclusively (Grapin et al., 2013; Kranzler et al., 2011; Wagner et al., 2007). The focus on APA-accredited doctoral programs excludes information on the scholarly productivity of hundreds of school psychology faculty members. Clearly, there are differences between specialist and doctoral programs that impact scholarly productivity. The curriculum of specialist-only programs results in a three-year program with tight timelines for completion. As an outcome, these programs tend to emphasize practice over research. On the other hand, doctoral programs allow more flexibility with respect to completion of the curriculum. This allows not only for specialization in various areas of training (e.g., neuropsychology, autism, etc.), but more expectations and opportunities for research. Graduate students may choose their doctoral programs based on faculty members' research interests. This creates a mentoring relationship that benefits both faculty and graduate student, in terms of scholarship. Doctoral students interested in pursuing a career in academia are socialized in the importance of publications. Faculty members' teaching loads in doctoral programs typically reflect attempts by administration to accommodate pursuit of research programs, mentoring graduate student research, and supervision of dissertations with the expectation that reduced teaching loads will result in increased scholarly productivity. These same resources, expectations, and opportunities may not exist for faculty members in specialist-only programs, and this may be reflected in their scholarly productivity. We examined this issue by gathering information from specialist-only programs.

The current study was 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 NASP website 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 136 specialist-only school psychology programs were identified.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection occurred as part of a research project for undergraduate psychology majors who expressed an interest in school psychology during the 2012 fall semester and the 2013 spring semester. Twelve students participated during the 2012 fall semester. Eight of the 12 students continued on the project during the 2013 spring semester, and one new student joined the project.

During the 2012 fall semester, 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 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 136). 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. This approach was similar to that used in previous research cited earlier.

During the 2013 spring semester, 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, presenting historical aspects of school psychology, or reviewing the literature in an area fell within the *Other School Psychology* category (e.g., Crespi, 2009; Flanagan & Esquivel, 2006). The *General Other* category represented articles that typically would not draw the attention of those working with children in school or clinical settings because they employed adult samples, were about psychometric methods, or were on topics somewhat unusual for school psychology (e.g., Beck, 2010; Rojahn, Wilkins, Matson, & Boisjoli, 2010; Schmitt & Sass, 2011). 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; individuals had to have at least one publication at their current institution. 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 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. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (i.e., Carnegie classification) was determined for the institutions of both the top individuals and top programs (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). 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. The Post-Baccalaureate with Arts and Sciences/Education Dominant category represents universities that award master's degrees in both arts and sciences and professional fields; the field with the largest number of graduate degrees is education. The Single Doctoral/Other Field classification includes institutions that award research doctoral degrees in a single field other than education; they may have more extensive offerings at the master's or professional level. Institutions classified as Comprehensive Doctoral No Medical/Veterinary according to the Carnegie system 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. Universities classified as Comprehensive Doctoral with Medical/Veterinary award doctorates in the humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields, graduate or professional degrees in one or more professional fields, and medical or veterinary doctoral degrees. Institutions classified as Doctoral, STEM Dominant award most of their doctorates in STEM fields. Universities classified as Doctoral, Professional Dominant 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.

Finally, a list of the journals in which the articles of the top 25 individuals appeared was created.

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 13.85 to 4.91. Gary Canivez of Eastern Illinois University (EIU) 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 and 13 were multiple-author publications where he was listed as first author. 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, EIU, is identified as a Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive university, using the Carnegie classification system. All 25 of Canivez's articles represent his affiliation with EIU. This was not the case for all those listed in Table 1. For example, T. Steuart Watson of Miami University had a total of 19 articles, 9 published at Miami and 10 published while at Mississippi State University, an institution that offers both doctoral and specialist degrees in school psychology.

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/clinical child psychology. Also noted in Table 1 is the fact that 2 individuals had no publications that fell within the *P-12* or *Other School Psychology* categories; 2 other individuals had only one publication in either of these two categories.

With respect to university affiliation, schools identified by the Carnegie classification system criteria as Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities employed 8 individuals. One individual worked at a university that fell within the Post-Baccalaureate with Arts and Sciences/Education Dominant category. Schools that were classified as Single Doctoral/Other Field (2) or Single Doctoral/Education (1) employed three individuals total. Of the 25 individuals listed in Table 1, institutions identified as Comprehensive Doctoral No Medical/Veterinary according to the Carnegie classification system employed 7. The remaining 6 individuals were from universities classified as Doctoral, Professional Dominant.

Table 2 presents the 25 universities with specialist-only programs that obtained the highest mean number of articles published for the years 2002-2011. Only faculty members' publications while at their current institution were counted. Using T. Steuart Watson as an example again, his 9 articles published while at Miami University were tallied for that university; his 10 articles published while at Mississippi State University were not counted as part of the total for Miami University. On the other hand, in the case of Lea Theodore of the College of William & Mary, 7 of her 25 publications were tallied for that school, and 9 were tallied for CUNY-Queens College (the 5 articles published while at Hofstra and 4 published as a graduate student at University of Connecticut did not contribute to any school, because of their doctoral status). The mean number of articles published by the top 25 ranked programs ranged from 14.25 to 3.00. In every case where a faculty member no longer at an institution had contributed to the tally, like Theodore, there was a "newer" faculty member with no publications. Therefore, when computing program means, the former faculty member was "substituted" for the newer faculty member.

Brigham Young University was ranked as the program with the highest mean number of articles published during the 10 years included in the

Table 1 *Top 25 Faculty Members Based on Authorship Credit*

Rank	Name/University	Doctoral Training	Carnegie Classification	SP/P-12	SP/Other	College	Other	Number of Pubs / Solo / 1st	Number of Pubs at Curr/Prev	Author Credit
1	Gary Canivez/ Eastern Illinois University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology & Counseling); Southern Illinois University - Carbondale	Postbac – Comp	23	2			25/4/13	25/0	13.85
2	Richard Beck/ Abilene Christian University	Experimental Psychology; Southern Methodist University	Postbac – Comp			14	4	18/9/6	18/0	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			19/4/13	19/0	12.29
4	Johannes Rojahn/ George Mason University	Unspecified/University of Vienna	CompDoc/NMedVet	13	2	2	15	32/0/12	31/1	10.41
5	Jennifer Bonds-Raacke/ Fort Hays State University	Cognitive/Human Factors; Kansas State University	Postbac – Comp			11	3	14/5/5	3/11	9.02
6	Daniel Sass/ University of Texas – San Antonio	Educational Psychology (Measurement & Statistics); University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	CompDoc/NMedVet	6	1	1	10	18/2/8	11/7	8.95
7	Jeremy Sullivan/ University of Texas – San Antonio	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Texas A&M University	CompDoc/NMedVet	5	2	3	7	17/2/10	11/6	8.14
8	Tony Crespi/ University of Hartford	Student Development (School Psychology); University of Massachusetts - Amherst	S-Doc/Other		10	1	1	12/3/8	12/0	8.07
9	Timothy Smith/ Brigham Young University	Combined Program Clinical, Counseling, School; Utah State University	Doc/Prof	1		7	12	20/0/11	20/0	7.87

Table 1 continued

Rank	Name/University	Doctoral Training	Carnegie Classification	Publication Categories				Number of Pubs / Solo / 1st	Number of Pubs at Curr/Prev	Author Credit
				SP/ P-12	SP/ Other	College	Other			
10	Jon Lasser/ Texas State University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Texas – Austin	Doc/Prof	3	8		2	13/1/10	13/0	7.27
11	Paul McCabe/ CUNY – Brooklyn College	Clinical-School Psychology; Hofstra University	Postbac – Comp	5	8			13/3/4	11/2	7.13
12	Stefan Dombrowski/ Rider University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Georgia	Postbac – A&S/Ed	5	12			17/0/11	17/0	6.95
13	Kristin Powers/ California State University – Long Beach	Educational Psychology; University of Minnesota	Postbac – Comp	9	5			14/2/7	14/0	6.51
14	Rosemary Flanagan/ Touro College	School-Community Psychology; Hofstra University	Doc/Prof	1	9			10/3/5	4/6	6.46
15	Sylvia Ramirez/ University of Texas – Pan American	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Wisconsin - Madison	Doc/Prof	2	6	2	4	14/1/6	14/0	6.12
16	T. Steuart Watson/ Miami University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Nebraska – Lincoln	CompDoc/NMedVet	11	5	2	1	19/1/2	9/10	6.09

Table 1 continued

Rank	Name/University	Doctoral Training	Carnegie Classification	Publication Categories				Number of Pubs / Solo / 1st	Number of Pubs at Curr/Prev	Author Credit
				SP/ P-12	SP/ Other	College	Other			
17	Frank Gardner/ Kean University	Clinical Psychology; Hofstra University	Postbac – Comp		1	3	6	10/2/4	3/7	6.00
18	Ellie Young/ Brigham Young University	Educational and Psychological Studies (School Psychology); University of South Florida	Doc/Prof	11	9		1	21/0/8	21/0	5.69
19	Lea Theodore/ College of William and Mary	School Psychology; University of Connecticut	CompDoc/NMedVet	12	13			25/0/6	7/18	5.61
20	Susanne Denham/George Mason University	Applied Developmental Psychology; University of Maryland – Baltimore County	CompDoc/NMedVet	6	6			12/2/5	12/0	5.59
21	Alexander Beaujean/ Baylor University	Educational, School & Counseling Psychology (School Psychology) and (Statistics & Measurement); University of Missouri	CompDoc/NMedVet	1	1	4	5	11/1/8	8/3	5.54
22	Melissa Heath/ Brigham Young University	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); Texas A&M University	Doc/Prof	3	16		1	20/0/8	20/0	5.37
23	Stephen Brock/ California State University - Sacramento	Education (Psychological Studies); University of California – Davis	S-Doc/Other	1	10			11/1/5	11/0	5.32

Table 1 continued

Rank	Name/University	Doctoral Training	Carnegie Classification	SP/ P- 12	SP/ Other	College	Other	Number of Pubs / Solo / 1st	Number of Pubs at Curr/Prev	Author Credit
				Publication Categories						
24	Jeremy Jewell/ Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville	Educational Psychology (School Psychology); University of Texas – Austin	Postbac – Comp	7	2	2	1	12/0/9	12/0	4.95
25	Stephen Hupp/ Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville	Clinical Child Psychology; Louisiana State University	Postbac – Comp	9	3	2	1	15/0/5	13/2	4.91

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-oriented articles with samples from Grades Preschool – 12; SP/Other = articles that are school psychology-related topics.
Number of Pubs/Solo/1st = Total number of publications/number of solo authored articles/number of publications on which the person was listed as first author.
Number of Pubs at Curr/Prev = Number of publications at the author's current institution/number of publications at previous institutions including as a graduate student.

Table 2 *Top 25 Programs Based on Average Number of Journal Articles Published by Faculty Members*

Rank	University	Carnegie Classification 2010	Number of Pubs	Number of Faculty	Average	Range
1	Brigham Young University	Doc/Prof	57	4	14.25	7 – 19
2	University of Central Florida	CompDoc/NMedVet	38	3	12.67	9 - 18
3	George Mason University	CompDoc/NMedVet	46*	4	11.50	0 – 31
4	Eastern Illinois University	Postbac – Comp	27	3	9.00	0 – 25
5	Rider University	Postbac – A&S/Ed	17	2	8.50	0 – 17
6	University of Texas–San Antonio	CompDoc/NMedVet	30	5	6.00	0 – 11

Table 2 continued

Rank	University	Carnegie Classification 2010	Number of Pubs	Number of Faculty	Average	Range
7	Southern Illinois University–Edwardsville	Postbac – Comp	22	4	5.50	1 – 13
8	California State University–Long Beach	Postbac – Comp	16	3	5.33	0 – 12
9	Eastern Kentucky University	Postbac – Comp	15	3	5.00	2 – 13
10	California State University–Sacramento	S-Doc/Other	14	3	4.67	0 – 10
10	University of Nebraska–Omaha	Doc/Prof	14	3	4.67	2 – 9
12	Arkansas State University	Doc/Prof	9	2	4.50	3 – 6
13	Miami University	CompDoc/NMedVet	19*	5	3.80	0 – 9
14	California State University–San Bernardino	Postbac – Comp	11	3	3.67	2 – 6
14	University of Northern Iowa	Doc/Prof	11*	3	3.67	0 – 6
14	Fort Hays State University	Postbac – Comp	11*	3	3.67	3 – 4
14	University of Dayton	Doc/STEM	11	3	3.67	0 – 9
18	City University New York–Queens College	Postbac – Comp	18*	5	3.60	0 – 9
19	University of Hartford	S-Doc/Other	14	4	3.50	1 – 10
20	City University New York–Brooklyn College	Postbac – Comp	20	6	3.33	0 – 11
20	Abilene Christian University	Postbac – Comp	20	6	3.33	0 – 17
20	Oswego State University of New York	Postbac – Comp	10	3	3.33	0 – 10
23	University of Texas–Pan American	Doc/Prof	13	4	3.25	0 – 11
24	Florida International University	CompDoc/NMedVet	12	4	3.00	0 – 7
24	New Mexico State University	CompDoc/NMedVet	12*	4	3.00	1 – 5
24	University of Toledo	CompDoc/MedVet	6	2	3.00	0 – 6

Note. Ranking based on average number of publications. * Indicates publications included from a faculty member no longer at the institution.
Carnegie Classifications: Postbac-Comp = Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive; CompDoc/MedVet = Comprehensive Doctoral with Medical/Veterinary; 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.

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. The number of articles published by individual BYU faculty members ranged from 7 to 19. Table 2 also contains the Carnegie classification for each program. Ten 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. Five programs were located within universities classified as Doctoral, Professional Dominant. The remaining 2 programs were identified as Doctoral, STEM Dominant (1) or Comprehensive Doctoral with Medical/Veterinary (1).

It is worth noting that 9 of the 25 individuals listed in Table 1 come from 4 programs: Brigham Young University (3); University of Texas-San Antonio (2); George Mason University (2); and Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville (2). Also, these 4 programs were ranked among the top 7 listed in Table 2. Three of the 4 programs were at doctoral-granting institutions; only 1, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, was located within a Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive university. Also, at 16 of the 26 institutions listed in Table 2, there was at least one faculty member with no publications, as defined in the current study.

Finally, Table 3 provides a partial list of journals in which the identified top 25 faculty members published articles. These individuals published 412 articles in 152 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*, *Journal of Applied School Psychology* (formerly *Special Services in the Schools*), *School Psychology International*, and *Contemporary School Psychology* (formerly *The California School Psychologist*). The remaining 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 Instructional Psychology*, *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 39 articles; the highest number of articles by a single faculty member was 14. Note that *Psychology in the Schools* published 6-10 issues each year from 2002-2011, whereas many journals published 4 issues per year. As a result, there were more opportunities for articles to appear in this journal. Next in line was *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, where 7 faculty members contributed to a total of 17 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 (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 ratings for the Roberts et al. study and our data.   The range of authorship credit in school

Table 3 *Journals in Which the Top 25 Faculty Members Published Articles*

Journal	Number of Articles	Number of Faculty	Most by an Author
Psychology in the Schools	39	11	14
Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment	17	7	7
School Psychology Quarterly	14	5	4
Journal of Applied School Psychology (Special Services in the Schools)	13	7	5
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 Instructional Psychology	9	4	3
Contemporary School Psychology (California School Psychologist)	8	2	5
Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools	8	4	4
Journal of School Violence	8	4	4
Behavior Modification	6	3	4
School Psychology Review	6	5	2
College Student Journal	5	4	2
Intelligence	5	3	2
Journal of Early Childhood and Infant Psychology	5	1	5
Journal of Psychology and Christianity	5	1	5
Professional Psychology: Research and Practice	5	3	3
Professional School Counseling	5	5	1
Canadian Journal of School Psychology	4	2	2
Child & Family Behavior Therapy	4	2	3
Educational and Psychological Measurement	4	3	2
Journal of Child and Family Studies	4	2	3
Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology	4	1	4
Journal of Counseling Psychology	4	2	3
Personality and Individual Differences	4	1	4
Psychological Reports	4	3	2
Research in Developmental Disabilities	4	2	3

Note. Number of Faculty = number of faculty members who have a publication in the journal; Most by an Author = the highest number of articles by a single faculty member.

psychology journals for the top 25 faculty members in the Roberts et al. study was 11.72 to 4.96. That compares to the range of 13.85 to 4.91 in the current study that did not restrict publications to only school psychology journals. The range in number of articles published by the top 25 contributors in the Roberts et al. study was 39 to 12, compared to 32 to 10 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.

Grapin et al. (2013) did not restrict publications to school psychology journals, similar to the current study, but looked only at faculty members in APA-accredited programs over a 5-year time span. The authorship credit for their top 25 faculty members ranged from 18.88 to 6.37, with number of articles ranging from 40 to 11. In the context of the current study, it may be tempting, but would be too simplistic to merely "multiply by 2" to compare our authorship credit ratings over a 10 year period to those of Grapin et al. over a 5 year time span. Alternatively, authorship credit ratings could be compared by calculating yearly averages for the Grapin et al. study and the current study. The ranges that resulted, 3.78 – 1.27 (Grapin et al., 2013) and 1.39 – 0.49 (current study), need to be viewed cautiously, due to the differences between APA-accredited doctoral programs versus specialist-only programs.

Perhaps more than anything else, comparing findings from the Grapin et al. and Roberts et al. studies demonstrates how restricting school psychology faculty members' scholarly productivity to school psychology journals likely results in an underestimation of scholarship. Future research should recognize that school psychology faculty members publish in journals other than those in the discipline, and consider the broad spectrum of scholarly outlets that exist in clinical, child clinical, developmental and other areas of psychology and education.

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 Table 1 revealed a fairly equal distribution of top faculty at doctoral (52%) versus non-doctoral (48%) institutions when the Carnegie classification of Single Doctoral was collapsed with Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive. Data in Table 2 revealed a 50%-50% distribution of the top ranked programs across doctoral and non-doctoral institutions, again, combining Single Doctoral and Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive institutions. As noted by Joy (2006) and Levinson et al. (1994), institutional factors may provide opportunities that increase scholarly productivity. Many assume that a faculty position at a doctoral institution provides the opportunity for or requires more scholarly productivity. Nonetheless, the top 2 individuals during the period examined (i.e., Canivez and Beck) 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 (e.g., BYU), 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 publication opportunities that are not available in programs in Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive universities that do not require a thesis to meet research requirements. Future research might consider whether there are program and/or department characteristics that promote scholarly productivity (e.g., reduced teaching loads and/or service expectations for faculty, student 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 on 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 changes that occurred when APA became involved in production of this newsletter; this publication is returning to its earlier format, so it may again become a viable outlet. The *Communique* is included in the ERIC database. Another publication, *Trainers' Forum*, is evolving into its own journal, and regional journals, such as *Research and Practice in the Schools*, that provide online access are being developed. 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 by 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 names changed with 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 stages 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. We examined an individual's scholarly productivity for the entire period from 2002-2011, regardless of university, which resulted in 11 of the top 25 individuals with publications at multiple institutions. 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. This potential confound was controlled to some degree in the approach to ranking programs, where we counted publications at current institutions, also crediting previous non-doctoral institutions with publications by faculty members who had relocated. In the case of Theodore, this allowed both her current program at the College of William & Mary and the previous program at CUNY-Queens College where she was employed to receive credit for her scholarship. Of course, attempts at portraying program scholarship are influenced by the career development issues mentioned earlier.

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. Some might take issue with the use of authorship credit ratings as a meaningful indicator of scholarly productivity. This is the metric commonly used when examining scholarly productivity with respect to school psychology. Authorship credit ratings proportion credit to reflect contribution to an article, but it does not reflect impact of the article. Future research might consider incorporating indirect information about impact through inclusion of "times cited in this database" from PsycINFO or the "cited by" statistic for articles in the Google Scholar database.

Despite the issues noted, the current study contributes to the 20-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

Beck, R. (2010). The moral and psychological landscape of chit chat: Toward a theological hermeneutic of everyday conversation. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 29,* 41-45.

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

Crespi, T. D. (2009). Group counseling in the schools: Legal, ethical, and treatment issues in school practice. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*, 273-280. doi: 10.1002/pits.20373

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.

Flanagan, R., & Esquivel, G. B. (2006). Empirical and clinical methods in the assessment of personality and psychopathology: An integrative approach to training. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 513-526.

doi: 10.1002/pits.20165

Grapin, 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

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 Psychologist, 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., Grapin, 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.jsp2011.10.004

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

Miller, D. C. (2008). Appendix VII: School psychology training programs. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. clv-cxcviii). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

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

Rojahn, J., Wilkins, J., Matson, J. L., & Boisjoli, J. (2010). A comparison of adults with intellectual disabilities with and without ASD on parallel measures of challenging behavior: The Behavior Problems Inventory-01 (BPI-01) and Autism Spectrum Disorders-Behavior Problems for Intellectually Disabled Adults (ASD-BPA). *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 23*, 179-185. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-3148.2009.00519.x

Schmitt, T. A., & Sass, D. A. (2011). Rotation criteria and hypothesis testing for exploratory factor analysis: Implications for factor pattern loadings and interfactor correlations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 71*, 95-113. doi: 10.1177/013164410387348

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