



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Research in Developmental Disabilities 26 (2005) 503–513

Research
in
Developmental
Disabilities

Clinical psychology Ph.D. program rankings: evaluating eminence on faculty publications and citations

Johnny L. Matson*, Carrie J. Malone, Melissa L. González,
David R. McClure, Rinita B. Laud, Noha F. Minshawi

Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

Received 25 August 2004; received in revised form 31 August 2004; accepted 7 September 2004

Abstract

Program rankings and their visibility have taken on greater and greater significance. Rarely is the accuracy of these rankings, which are typically based on a small subset of university faculty impressions, questioned. This paper presents a more comprehensive survey method based on quantifiable measures of faculty publications and citations. The most frequently published core clinical faculty across 157 APA-approved clinical programs are listed. The implications of these data are discussed.

© 2004 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Clinical psychology; Program rankings; Faculty publications

The marketing of universities and departments has grown exponentially in recent years. As a natural outgrowth of this trend to emphasize accomplishments relative to peer institutions, program rankings have become a central theme. Without a doubt, the most visible and most frequently updated of these systems are the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings, largely because they are published in a popular magazine that reaches a large general audience. When these rankings appear, universities throughout the U.S. rush to highlight graduate and undergraduate programs that are in “the top 10”, “top 50”, etc.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 225 578 8745; fax: +1 225 578 4125.

E-mail address: johnmatson@aol.com (J.L. Matson).

Faculty quotes about how these rankings show their program or department competing with “the very best” in the country typify reaction (Chitty, 2004). Faculty gush that top rankings help attract graduate students and confirm program eminence.

The *U.S. News & World Report* surveys present a list of programs and ask faculty to rate each from distinguished (5) to marginal (1). Specific faculty within clinical departments are not identified as raters, but rather materials are addressed to one or two graduate faculty, director of programs, etc., per program. Thus, not only are a small fraction of faculty sampled, but they are not necessarily in the area evaluated. In the latest *U.S. News & World Report* on Clinical Psychology Programs (2004), a 20% return rate on the questionnaires was reported. Assuming two forms were sent to each of the 183 APA-approved programs, 366 forms would have been sent and 73 returned. These are maximum numbers.

The National Research Council (NRC) ranking system is less popular but has received attention, although much less than the *U.S. News & World Report*. The NRC also uses subjective methods, but has not put out a ranking since 1995. The methodology is not specified for the NRC ranking system. The American Psychological Association emphasizes its role ‘behind-the-scenes’ to assist in a new NRC effort (Bullock, 2004). Their emphasis is on ensuring that ‘surveying’ occurs for the many areas of psychology.

It seems inconceivable that any given faculty member has the necessary data or knowledge to compare programs. In clinical psychology, for example, there are 183 APA-approved programs. If one makes a conservative estimate of 7 faculty per program, a rater would need to be aware of 1281 faculty, many of these moving or retiring from one year to another. In effect, faculty are asked to sort, in their mind, where these faculty are and their scholarly contributions along with the quality of Ph.D.’s they produce, and then rate the program relative to the many others that exist. Additionally, with *U.S. News & World Report* rankings (which at least reports a methodology), the return rate is unacceptably low. Furthermore, 130 of the programs rated achieved a score of 2.5 or higher, thus the range of scores is highly restricted. To suggest that these data are highly suspect seems self-evident. Recently, The Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania and the Harvard Business School have indicated that they will no longer participate in these popular ranking systems. Their main objection is rooted in a fundamental disagreement with the validity of these rankings (Tomsho & Golden, 2004), supporting our contention. Having said this, many universities are making internal resource allocation decisions based on this ranking information. Public relation concerns appear to be putting a great deal of pressure on those responsible for what programs to support.

Rankings then, if used at all, should be done with caution. Similarly, if they are done, objective data based on outcomes and uniform across all programs should be used. To that purpose the present study was undertaken to expand and further objectify the rankings of clinical psychology Ph.D. programs. Mean number of publications per faculty member was used along with mean citation count per faculty. Publications are largely peer reviewed, thus indicating creativity, quality of work, and cutting edge developments in the field. It has been argued that publication rate does predict program impact (Feist, 2000). Certainly, it says something about research activity in a program and the likelihood that Ph.D. students will be involved in publishable research, which is an important part of their education and an asset in the job search. There is a professional standard set by the journal.

Additionally, in most cases, book and book chapter peer review occurs, and people are invited to participate in projects due to perceived competence.

Mean total citations per program were also used to gauge the recognition, and some might argue, the eminence of particular faculty. Citation counts measure somewhat different criteria, a type of scholarly impact, unlike research activity, which publication rates measure. It should be cautioned that many practitioners may change practices based on a clinical proof without citations being generated. However, scholarly theory and research practice are certainly impacted and to some extent guided by the most cited research and researchers. It is our view that citations are an important factor, although measuring a somewhat different dimension than publication rate. We should add that others hold this same position.

Number of publications and number of citations are rated as primary factors of eminence across many scientific disciplines (e.g. biology, chemistry, physics) (Feist, 1997). Furthermore, citation analysis can be an indicator of rating quality of a department (Garfield, 1977). Both of these criteria (publication and citation rate) are founded on the core values of peer evaluation and peer recognition (Feist, 2000). Clinical programs in their self-descriptions typically use the word “science” prominently in their literature (e.g. scientist practitioner), suggesting that citations are a primary outcome measure. Publications paired with citations have weaknesses but generally are the best available objective data in establishing faculty and program impact and eminence.

1. Method

Initially a listing of all APA-approved clinical psychology Ph.D. programs was obtained. This list totaled 183 programs. A list of core full-time faculty was generated by referencing each department’s website in May 2004. Deans, professor emeritus and other adjunct faculty were excluded. A list of core faculty for all 183 programs was constructed in this manner. We used this method since students will primarily have core faculty as major professors and since departments vary considerably in terms of how and if they use or list emeritus and adjunct faculty. Based on this procedure, professional schools were excluded because they typically did not list core professors and since many of these programs operate largely via part-time professors who are not active researchers. A final list of 157 schools resulted.

Faculty names were then used as individual search terms on the *PsycINFO* electronic database. *PsycINFO* contains citations of journal articles, book chapters, books and dissertations in the field of psychology published since 1872. The database also includes information on aspects of psychology in related fields such as medicine, psychiatry, nursing, sociology, education, pharmacology, physiology, linguistics, anthropology, business and law (About the Database, 2004). While *PsycINFO* searches are limited to those citations indexed in its database when compared to more comprehensive databases such as the *Web of Science*, it provides a more specific and relevant search of psychological research. For example, only initials for first names can be entered in the *Web of Science*, often resulting in spuriously high counts since two or more researcher’s data are often combined. *PsycINFO*, however, allows for the entry of first names, which dramatically

enhances search accuracy, given the type of data we were searching here. Thus, in the present examination of clinical psychology departments, *PsycINFO* was used to measure the scholarly impact of each faculty member and thus, cumulatively, the impact of each program.

Mean publications and citations were obtained for each program. This approach provided a comparable number across universities on two factors and was necessary since the number of core faculty across clinical Ph.D. programs varies considerably. As previously noted, emeritus faculty, people with purely administrative positions or faculty in medical schools were not included. Thus, the list emphasizes faculty who are actively involved in full-time doctoral training, not the universe of clinically trained researchers. However, for students picking a doctoral training program, and looking for a full-time mentor, these data may be useful. These two dependent variables produced a raw number for each clinical program. Programs were ranked from 1 to 157 on average publications per faculty member and average citations per faculty member. These rankings for each school were then averaged to give a composite ranking, which was the final variable listed. Thus, the reader can see how each program fairs individually on the two criteria, and if they care to evaluate the additive nature of these rankings, they are presented as well. We would again emphasize to the reader that they interpret these data cautiously.

1.1. Secondary analysis

Core clinical faculty were also individually ranked on publications and citations as a third indicator. The average rank for these same two dependent variables produced our list of highest impact clinical faculty on research. There are likely other more eminent clinical psychologists, but they would be employed in medical schools, as deans, emeritus faculty, or other designations outside the purview of the present study.

2. Results

Table 1 presents a list of 157 APA-approved Ph.D. programs in clinical psychology. These programs are ranked according to the composite score. The top five universities include University of Pennsylvania, University of Rochester, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Yale University, and University of California-Berkeley. The reader will note that a few schools are clearly higher on the two criteria used for this study; there is a large middle ground and then a number of programs toward the bottom. For those students who wish to stay in a particular region or for programs where clinical skill development is the primary focus these ratings may be of limited value. However, for those who desire research training and experience as part of their overall training these data may have importance.

Since most programs describe themselves as “scientist/practitioner”, these data would seem to reflect such values. It is of note that the *U.S. News & World Report* top programs overlap very little with those reported here. We will allow the reader to draw their own conclusions concerning the merit of the respective ranking systems. However, we do tend to believe that objective data are more useful than a subjective rating from a small number of faculty, some of whom are not trained or working in the clinical area.

Table 1

Ranking of Ph.D. programs in clinical psychology based on mean numbers of publications and citations of full-time faculty

University	Publication ranking	Citation ranking	Sum	Composite ranking
University of Pennsylvania	3.0	2.0	5.0	1.0
University of Rochester	4.0	3.0	7.0	2.0
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9.0	1.0	10.0	3.0
Yale University	1.5	10.0	11.5	4.0
University of California-Berkeley	9.0	6.0	15.0	5.0
Louisiana State University	1.5	16.0	17.5	6.0
University of Iowa	14.5	5.0	19.5	7.0
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University	13.0	7.0	20.0	8.0
Temple University	14.5	8.0	22.5	9.0
University of Vermont	6.0	19.0	25.0	10.0
Indiana University	22.5	4.0	26.5	11.0
University of Texas-Austin	19.5	9.0	28.5	12.0
State University of New York-Stony Brook	16.0	13.0	29.0	13.5
University of Pittsburgh	18.0	11.0	29.0	13.5
Rutgers University-Ph.D.	5.0	28.0	33.0	15.0
University of Minnesota	22.5	12.0	34.5	16.0
Syracuse University	11.5	26.5	38.0	17.0
University of Maryland-College Park	28.0	17.0	45.0	18.0
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	7.0	39.0	46.0	19.0
University of California-LA	26.0	22.0	48.0	20.0
McGill University	30.0	20.0	50.0	21.0
University of Oregon	38.0	15.0	53.0	22.0
Case Western Reserve University	9.0	45.0	54.0	23.0
University of Rhode Island	40.5	14.0	54.5	24.0
University of Southern California	22.5	33.0	55.5	25.0
University of Kentucky	22.5	35.0	57.5	26.0
Duke University	28.0	30.0	58.0	27.0
University of Miami	40.5	18.0	58.5	28.5
University of Nevada-Reno	17.0	41.5	58.5	28.5
University of British Columbia	33.5	26.5	60.0	30.0
State University of New York-Albany	11.5	52.0	63.5	31.0
Northwestern University	36.0	29.0	65.0	32.0
State University of New York-Buffalo	42.0	25.0	67.0	33.0
Rutgers University-Psy.D.	19.5	49.5	69.0	34.5
University of Washington	38.0	31.0	69.0	34.5
University of Memphis	25.0	47.0	72.0	36.0
Arizona State University	38.0	36.0	74.0	37.5
University of Denver	51.0	23.0	74.0	37.5
Columbia University Teachers College	28.0	48.0	76.0	39.0
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	46.0	32.0	78.0	40.0
University of South Florida	35.0	43.5	78.5	41.0
Pennsylvania State University	58.5	24.0	82.5	42.0
University of Georgia	33.5	49.5	83.0	43.0
University of Arizona	31.0	56.0	87.0	44.0
University of Utah	46.0	41.5	87.5	45.0
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign	55.0	34.0	89.0	46.0
Boston University	55.0	37.0	92.0	47.0
University of Virginia	55.0	38.0	93.0	48.0

Table 1 (Continued)

University	Publication ranking	Citation ranking	Sum	Composite ranking
University of North Texas	46.0	51.0	97.0	49.0
Vanderbilt University	76.5	21.0	97.5	50.0
University of New Mexico	58.5	43.5	102.0	51.0
University of Hawaii-Manoa	46.0	58.5	104.5	52.5
University of Michigan	46.0	58.5	104.5	52.5
Catholic University of America	51.0	54.0	105.0	53.0
Emory University	62.0	46.0	108.0	54.0
New School University	32.0	78.5	110.5	55.0
Kent State University	46.0	68.0	114.0	56.0
University of Denver	80.0	40.0	120.0	58.0
Loyola University	55.0	67.0	122.0	59.5
Ohio State University	62.0	60.0	122.0	59.5
Ohio University	62.0	63.0	125.0	61.0
University of Kansas	55.0	70.5	125.5	62.0
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	68.0	61.5	129.5	63.0
University of Illinois-Chicago	80.0	53.0	133.0	64.0
Texas A&M University	62.0	72.0	134.0	65.5
University of Colorado-Boulder	68.0	66.0	134.0	65.5
Nova Southeastern University	51.0	84.5	135.5	67.0
Washington University	71.5	64.5	136.0	68.0
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology	62.0	76.0	138.0	69.5
University of Delaware	76.5	61.5	138.0	69.5
State University of New York-Binghamton	46.0	93.5	139.5	71.0
Florida State University	76.5	64.5	141.0	72.0
Virginia Commonwealth University	71.5	70.5	142.0	73.0
University of Houston	68.0	77.0	145.0	74.0
San Diego State University	65.0	81.0	146.0	75.0
University of Alabama	73.5	73.0	146.5	76.0
Northern Illinois University	68.0	86.0	154.0	77.0
West Virginia University	68.0	87.0	155.0	78.0
University of Missouri-Columbia	100.0	57.0	157.0	79.0
George Mason University	89.5	74.0	163.5	80.0
University of South Carolina	82.5	83.0	165.5	81.0
University of Florida	100.0	69.0	169.0	82.0
Concordia University-Canada	85.5	84.5	170.0	83.0
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale	73.5	97.0	170.5	84.0
Purdue University	94.0	78.5	172.5	85.0
Bowling Green State University	100.0	75.0	175.0	86.5
University of West Ontario	94.0	81.0	175.0	86.5
Clark University	121.5	55.0	176.5	88.0
Finch University of Health Sciences	100.0	81.0	181.0	89.5
Fordham University	82.5	98.5	181.0	89.5
Northwestern University Medical School	94.0	90.0	184.0	91.0
Brigham Young University	94.0	91.0	185.0	92.0
University of Tennessee-Knoxville	85.5	102.0	187.5	93.0
Michigan State University	85.5	105.0	190.5	94.0
Miami University-Ohio	100.0	92.0	192.0	95.0
DePaul University	76.5	117.5	194.0	96.5
New York University	80.0	114.0	194.0	96.5
Drexel University	100.0	95.0	195.0	98.0

Table 1 (Continued)

University	Publication ranking	Citation ranking	Sum	Composite ranking
Georgia State University	109.0	88.5	197.5	99.0
University of Manitoba	89.5	109.0	198.5	100.0
University of Virginia (School of Education)	100.0	101.0	201.0	101.0
Wayne State University	109.0	93.5	202.5	102.0
Simon Fraser University	109.0	96.0	205.0	103.0
Auburn University	109.0	98.5	207.5	104.0
University of Southern Mississippi	89.5	119.5	209.0	105.0
University of North Carolina-Greensboro	121.5	88.5	210.0	106.0
University of Massachusetts-Amherst	85.5	126.0	211.5	107.0
University of Arkansas	109.0	106.5	215.5	108.5
University of Ottawa	109.0	106.5	215.5	108.5
University of Wyoming	94.0	123.0	217.0	110.0
University of Connecticut	118.0	100.0	218.0	111.0
University of Louisville	109.0	110.5	219.5	112.0
Oklahoma State University	109.0	115.0	224.0	113.0
American University	121.5	103.0	224.5	114.0
St. John's University	89.5	136.0	225.5	115.0
St. Louis University	109.0	119.5	228.5	116.0
University of Waterloo	127.0	104.0	231.0	117.5
York University	118.0	113.0	231.0	117.5
University of Mississippi	109.0	127.0	236.0	119.0
University of Cincinnati	115.5	121.0	236.5	120.0
Adelphi University	109.0	129.0	238.0	121.0
University of Alabama-Birmingham	127.0	112.0	239.0	122.0
City University of New York	118.0	122.0	240.0	123.0
Baylor University	127.0	116.0	243.0	124.0
Illinois Institute of Technology	134.5	110.5	245.0	125.0
University of Toledo	138.5	108.0	246.5	126.0
University of Missouri-St. Louis	115.5	132.0	247.5	127.0
University of Windsor	124.0	128.0	252.0	128.0
Washington State University	131.0	125.0	256.0	129.0
University of Maine	127.0	133.0	260.0	130.0
Utah State University	137.0	124.0	261.0	131.0
Pepperdine University	145.5	117.5	263.0	132.0
Indiana State University	134.5	130.0	264.5	133.0
Texas Tech University	127.0	138.5	265.5	134.0
Farleigh Dickinson University	121.5	145.5	267.0	135.5
Long Island University-Brooklyn	131.0	136.0	267.0	135.5
Western Michigan University	138.5	131.0	269.5	137.0
Fuller Theological Seminary	131.0	140.0	271.0	138.0
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	134.5	138.5	273.0	139.0
University of North Dakota	134.5	144.0	278.5	140.0
Central Michigan University	145.5	134.0	279.5	141.0
Virginia Consortium Program	141.5	143.0	284.5	142.0
George Washington University	145.5	141.0	286.5	143.0
University of Montana	145.5	142.0	287.5	144.0
Howard University	141.5	148.0	289.5	145.0
Pacific University	155.5	136.0	291.5	146.0
Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus	141.5	150.5	292.0	147.0
Florida Institute of Technology	148.5	145.5	294.0	148.0

Table 1 (Continued)

University	Publication ranking	Citation ranking	Sum	Composite ranking
Wright State University	141.5	154.0	295.5	149.0
Spalding University	151.0	147.0	298.0	150.0
Widener University	148.5	150.5	299.0	151.0
Biola University-Ph.D.	151.0	150.5	301.5	152.5
University of South Dakota	151.0	150.5	301.5	152.5
University of Hartford	153.0	150.5	303.5	154.0
George Fox University	154.0	155.0	309.0	155.0
Yeshiva University	155.5	157.0	312.5	156.0
University of Detroit Mercy	157.0	156.0	313.0	157.0

The most published and most cited faculty are listed in Table 2. It does seem that the most productive people tend to be in the most productive departments. It is a bit difficult to compare faculty in that most of these most published and cited persons are in disparate research areas. However, students may wish to take note of where these people are located and what their areas of research entail.

Table 2

Rank of individual faculty on number of publications and citations from the total number of full-time faculty in all 157 APA-approved clinical psychology Programs

Faculty	University	Publication ranking	Citation ranking	Sum	Composite ranking
Alan E. Kazdin	Yale University	3.0	5.0	8.0	1
David H. Barlow	Boston University	2.0	9.0	11.0	2
Charles Carver	University of Miami (FL)	14.0	3.0	17.0	3
Dante Cicchetti	University of Rochester	9.0	11.0	20.0	4
Philip Kendall	Temple University	7.0	14.0	21.0	5
Rex Forehand	University of Vermont	4.0	19.0	23.0	6
Richard J. Davidson	University of Wisconsin-Madison	17.0	7.0	24.0	7
Edward Blanchard	State University of New York-Albany	1.0	24.0	25.0	8
William Richard Miller	University of New Mexico	11.0	16.0	27.0	9
Martin Seligman	University of Pennsylvania	26.0	4.0	30.0	10
Johnny L. Matson	Louisiana State University	6.0	28.0	34.0	11
Richard Heimberg	Temple University	16.0	21.0	37.0	12
James Prochaska	University of Rhode Island	33.0	6.0	39.0	13
David Watson	University of Iowa	37.5	2.0	39.5	14
William Iacona	University of Minnesota	15.0	30.0	45.0	15
G. Terence Wilson	Rutgers University-Ph.D.	13.0	33.0	46.0	16
James W. Pennebaker	University of Texas-Austin	42.5	13.0	55.5	17
Thomas E. Joiner	Florida State University	21.5	40.0	61.5	18
Thomas H. Ollendick	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	10.0	52.0	62.0	19
Terrie Moffitt	University of Wisconsin-Madison	56.5	8.0	64.5	20
Frank D. Fincham	State University of New York-Buffalo	45.0	20.0	65.0	21
Richard Rogers	University of North Texas	20.0	51.0	71.0	22
Samuel M. Turner	University of Maryland-College Park	35.5	39.0	74.5	24
Timothy Smith	University of Utah	47.5	27.0	74.5	24
Steven C. Hayes	University of Nevada-Reno	12.0	63.0	75.0	25

3. Discussion

Despite the popularity of rankings, methodologies are rarely analyzed. To our knowledge this is the first study to rank clinical psychology Ph.D. programs on objective and systematic data of individual faculty. Furthermore, the number of publications and citations are typically used to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure, giving these measures a level of validity in assessing prominence that is not present in survey data as used by *U.S. News & World Report* rankings. While these publication and citation criteria measure only some aspects of a training program, they certainly are important ones and seem more relevant than awards won, which are often political and would be difficult to weight (e.g., are two state awards equal to one national one) as a measure of eminence (Haggbloom et al., 2002). Furthermore, for reasons noted earlier, these data appear to use a more reliable and valid methodologically than *U.S. News & World Report* survey data. The methods we used here have weaknesses. However, if psychologists are to objectively rank programs, then criteria that are typically used in the internal evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion should be appropriate. Further, it is upon these criteria that students are often evaluated on progress through a program and potential for employment.

The wholesale acceptance of university department program rankings without a critical evaluation of the methodology is disconcerting. *U.S. News & World Report* simply refers to their publication as “America’s Best Graduate Schools” without any acknowledgement of the inherent inaccuracies of their ranking system (Graduate School Rankings by *U.S. News & World Report*, 2004). We do not suggest that our list constitutes a precise ranking of “the best” of anything. By providing these data, the reader can draw their own conclusions concerning the merits of the respective clinical programs.

Many programs release media reports that highlight *U.S. News & World Report* rankings for the whole university as well as specific programs. Indiana University’s official website states, regarding the *U.S. News* overall rating of their university, that “We are genuinely pleased to retain our overall third place rank behind two older private schools—evidence, we believe, of our school’s unflagging energy, ambition and commitment to its mission.” (Vlahakis, 2004). Ohio State University concludes from the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings that it is “Ohio’s best in every category” (*U.S. News ‘America’s Best Graduate Schools’*, 2004). The University of Virginia uses an interesting twist. The school is rated 21st overall but the press release begins by stating, “Virginia is number one among public universities” (the 20 ahead of them are private institutions) (*University of Virginia*, 2004). These official news releases are typical of most universities. Frankly, almost without exception, any university that ranks highly in the *U.S. News & World Report* system on anything publicizes them. The only site we found where methodology was addressed was the University of Michigan. Information “is from sources that use surveys of university administrators and/or faculty as the basis for rankings of academic reputation of institutions and programs. Though not perfect, this indicator of academic quality is commonly used by publishers of college rankings and is generally agreed to be ‘fairly reliable’ ” (*Recent Rankings for Academic Programs at University of Michigan-Ann Arbor*, 2004). At least they address this point. However, our view based on the available research and supported by this study, which admittedly is for a specific program versus the

entire university, is that the reliability and validity of these survey ranking systems is questionable.

The career services program at the University of Pennsylvania, which had the top composite score for a clinical psychology program in this study, notes that “top-ranked” clinical psychology programs tend to place greater focus on research (Career Services, 2004). Previous comparisons of a few sample programs show that research productivity of faculty compared to faculty rankings are very different (Matson, Lott, & Bielecki, 2003). The present study, which used an even more comprehensive data-based model compared to the previous study, showed major discrepancies in subjective ratings versus research productivity (publications), and recognition of other researchers of their work (citations). There is very little relationship between *U.S. News* rankings and our data. While far from perfect, this method would appear to be more reliable and valid than existing ranking systems. At the very least, this study is valuable in showing who and which programs have the most productive and cited research faculty. Programs that stress a scientist/practitioner model should consider these data in reporting on their programs’ general standing in the academic community since they highlight what most academics consider as criteria for success (publications and citations). The active scholarship of faculty members contributes to the quality of graduate student theses and dissertations, helps budding professionals see the relationship between generating new/state of the art clinical knowledge, as well as enhances employability. Given the high value that universities seem to have for rankings, publicizing the results and making resource allocation decisions based on the findings, it is hoped that more reliable and valid methods to draw these conclusions would be used.

References

- About the Database, PsycInfo.* (2004). Retrieved on May 24, 2004 from EBSCOhost. PsycInfo web site: <http://libezp.lib.lsu.edu>.
- Bullock, M. (2004). Ranking graduate programs in psychology: APA works for you behind the scenes. *Psychological Science Agenda: Science Directorate of the American Psychological Association*, 17(1). Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from the APA web site: <http://www.apa.org/science/psa/novgradprint.html>.
- Career Services Resources for Students Considering Graduate and Professional School.* (2004). Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from University of Pennsylvania. Career Services web site: <http://www.vpul.upenn.edu/careerservices/gradprof/grad/gradpsych.html>.
- Chitty, H. (2004). CU’s graduate programs among best in the nation. *Campus Press*. Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from <http://bcn.boulder.co.us/campuspress/messages/1771.html>.
- Feist, G. J. (1997). Quantity, quality, and depth of research as influences on scientific eminence: Is quantity most important? *Creativity Research Journal*, 10, 325–335.
- Feist, G. J. (2000). Distinguishing ‘good’ science from ‘good enough’ science [Electronic version]. *The Scientist*, 14(14), 31.
- Garfield, E. (1977). One imperfect application does not destroy the value of citation analysis [Electronic version]. *Canadian Psychological Review*, 18(4), 372.
- Graduate School Rankings by U.S. News & World Report: Clinical Psychology (Doctorate)* [Electronic version]. (2004). U.S. News & World Report Graduate School Rankings, 2004. Retrieved May 28, 2004 from <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/hea/premium/cps.php>.
- Haggblom, S. J., Warnick, R., Warnick, J. E., Jones, V. K., Yarbrough, G. L., Russell, T. M., et al. (2002). The 100 most eminent psychologist of the 20th century. *Review of General Psychology*, 6(2), 139–152.

- Matson, J. L., Lott, J. D., & Bielecki, J. (2003). A data-based method of ranking department, faculty and journals in professional impact. *Higher Education Policy*, *16*, 109–120.
- Recent Rankings for Academic Programs at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor*. (2004) Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from University of Michigan program ranking table web site: <http://www.umich.edu/~oapainfo/TABLES/Pro-Rank.html>.
- Tomsho, R., & Golden, D. (2004, April 7). Elite schools move against rankings. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. D1, D4.
- University of Virginia, facts at a glance: Rankings*. (2004). Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from University of Virginia rankings web site: http://www.virginia.edu/Facts/Glance_Rankings.htm.
- U.S. News "America's Best Graduate Schools" 2004 Rankings*. (2004). The Ohio State University. Head of State. Retrieved on May 14, 2004 from The Ohio State University, rankings 2004 web site: <http://www.osu.edu/dosomethinggreat/rankings03/>.
- Vlahakis, G. (2004). *IU graduate programs again ranked highly by U.S. News & World Report*. Retrieved May 14, 2004 from Indiana University, Media Relations web site: <http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/1382.html>.