

Productivity in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Scholarship in Counseling Psychology: Institutional and Individual Ratings for 1990 Through 2008

The Counseling Psychologist

38(1) 50–68

© 2010 SAGE Publications

Reprints and permission: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

DOI: 10.1177/0011000009345533

<http://tcp.sagepub.com>

 SAGE

Nathan Grant Smith¹

Abstract

This study examined individual and institutional productivity in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) scholarship published in counseling psychology-oriented journals for the years 1990 through 2008. Eight journals were included in the analyses. An author-weighted score was calculated for each scholar, using a formula developed by Howard, Cole, and Maxwell. To determine the impact of authors' work, *h* indices were calculated for the most productive scholars. Finally, institutions publishing LGBT scholarship were proportionally ranked, consistent with the work of Tinsley and Tinsley. Twenty-nine authors and 13 institutions emerged as leaders in LGBT scholarship. Data on percentage of articles published in each journal, as well as trends over time, are presented. Implications and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords

lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, research productivity

¹McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Corresponding Author:

Nathan Grant Smith, PhD, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, 3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, Quebec, H3A 1Y2, Canada
E-mail: nathan.smith@mcgill.ca

Within counseling psychology, there has been a long tradition of attempting to quantify the relative quality of research training in graduate programs. One such method has been to examine the research productivity of institutions of higher education. For example, Goodstein (1963) ranked the contributions of institutions in the first eight volumes of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology (JCP)*. Subsequent years have seen a number of studies that have quantified the research productivity of universities and other graduate training sites in the field of counseling psychology (Buboltz et al., 2005; Delgado & Howard, 1994; Diegelman, Uffelman, Wagner, & Diegelman, 2005; Howard, 1983; Tinsley & Tinsley, 1979).

Despite a long tradition of examining research productivity in general, there exist few studies examining research productivity in specific areas of counseling psychology. In a notable exception, Perez, Constantine, and Gerard (2000) examined research productivity in the field of racial and ethnic minority issues. Specifically, they examined 10 years (1988-1997) of articles published in *JCP* and identified articles that focused on racial and ethnic minority issues. They found that 12% of the articles published in *JCP* focused on ethnic and racial issues. Moreover, they identified the authors and institutions that published the most articles on racial and ethnic minority issues in *JCP*.

Perez and colleagues (2000) noted that one of the unique contributions of their work was its applicability to students seeking to identify graduate programs that focus on racial and ethnic minority issues. Given that multicultural issues have become a defining characteristic of counseling psychology (Heppner, Casas, Carter, & Stone, 2000), many students may have interest in identifying the institutions and scholars who are leading the field in this endeavor. Thus, similar quantitative data on scholarship productivity in other aspects of multiculturalism are needed (e.g., sexual orientation, gender, disability, religion).

To that end, this study sought to quantify scholarship productivity in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) issues in counseling psychology. A thorough review of the literature revealed no studies that examined scholarship productivity on this topic. However, a number of content analyses have been conducted to examine trends in scholarship in LGBT issues (Buhrke, Ben-Ezra, Hurley, & Ruprecht, 1992; Chung & Katayama, 1996; Clark & Serovich, 1997; Morin, 1977; Phillips, Ingram, Smith, & Mindes, 2003; Watters, 1986). The most recent content analysis (Phillips et al., 2003) examined articles published in the 1990s in eight journals relevant to counseling psychology. Phillips and colleagues found that 2.11% of articles published in those journals focused on lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB) issues; note that

no articles focused on transgender issues. This percentage was higher than the percentages of articles found in previous content analyses (e.g., 0.65%; Buhrke et al., 1992). Phillips et al. noted not only an increase in the integration of LGB issues into counseling psychology scholarship but also an increase in the amount of articles written from a queer-affirmative approach.¹

In addition to demonstrating that coverage of LGB issues in counseling psychology-oriented journals had increased in the 1990s, Phillips et al. (2003) provided information on the extent to which different journals were publishing this scholarship. *The Counseling Psychologist (TCP)* emerged as the leading journal, having published the highest number and percentage of articles focusing on LGB issues. It is unknown whether *TCP* is still publishing the most scholarship on queer issues among journals relevant to counseling psychology. Likewise, although the 1990s evidenced an increase in LGB scholarship, it is unknown whether that trend has continued into the 21st century.

Although the content analyses by Phillips et al. (2003) and those that preceded help to elucidate trends and themes in counseling psychology scholarship in LGBT issues, they do not provide information on who published the scholarly articles or where the scholarship occurred. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine scholarship productivity in LGBT issues in counseling psychology. Consistent with Perez et al. (2000), I sought to identify both the authors and the institutions that produced the scholarship; consistent with Phillips et al., I focused on articles published in eight journals relevant to counseling psychology. A secondary purpose of this study was to compare the coverage of queer issues in the 1990s with the coverage of queer issues in the first 9 years of the 21st century. Specially, I sought to examine differences between the two periods with regard to the number and percentage of published LGBT articles and the distribution of those articles by journal.

Method

I examined articles in eight counseling psychology-related journals for the years 1990 through 2008. Consistent with the Phillips et al. study (2003), the journals I examined were as follows: *Journal of College Student Development (JCSD)*, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology (JCCP)*, *Journal of Counseling and Development (JCD)*, *JCP*, *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development (JMCD)*, *Journal of Vocational Behavior (JVB)*, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice (PPRP)*, and *TCP*. I selected these journals for a number of reasons. First, *JCP*, *TCP*, *JCCP*, *JCD*, and *JVB* have been identified as the most common journals in which counseling

psychologists publish (Howard, 1983). Second, Buhrke and colleagues (1992) examined those five journals in their content analysis of lesbian and gay issues in counseling psychology. They also included *JCS*, which they identified as an important venue for use by counselors and counseling psychologists. Moreover, given that many counseling psychologists work in college settings or with college populations, *JCS*'s focus on college students is germane to counseling psychology. Finally, as Phillips et al. pointed out in their content analysis of LGB issues in counseling psychology, *PPRP* and *JMCD* are also important to counseling psychology. The authors noted that *PPRP* has an applied focus and a wide readership and is connected to research in counseling psychology. Indeed, Flores, Rooney, Heppner, Browne, and Wei (1999) found that major contributions in *TCP* were frequently cited in *PPRP*. Phillips et al. also noted that *JMCD* was important to include in studies of LGB scholarship because of the inclusion of sexual orientation within multiculturalism. In addition, I chose *JMCD* because multiculturalism is a core characteristic of counseling psychology (Heppner et al., 2000). Thus, the eight journals that I chose for inclusion have been consistently identified as being important to the field of counseling psychology and have been included in analyses of LGB issues in counseling psychology.

For the years 1990 through 1999, I included all articles identified by Phillips et al (2003). For the years 2000 through 2008, I conducted PsycInfo searches to identify articles related to LGBT issues. I also examined the tables of contents for articles missed by the PsycInfo searches. I included full-length articles and brief reports. In addition, I included commentaries, introductions to special issues, and reactions/rejoinders (consistent with the Phillips et al. analysis). Although these types of articles tend to not be peer reviewed, they serve an important role in moving forward a scholarly topic and framing it within the larger field of professional psychology. Indeed, Meara (1999) noted that reactions and rejoinders are "critically important in developing the subject at hand, in framing critical issues of the discipline, and in providing a social and cultural context for the work" (p. 100).

To determine individual author productivity, I utilized the following author-weighted formula, developed by Howard, Cole, and Maxwell (1987):

$$\text{individual credit} = \frac{1.5^{(n-i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^n 1.5^{i-1}},$$

where n refers to the total number of authors and i refers to the ordinal position of the individual author. Thus, for an article with two authors, the

first author received a credit of .60 and the second author received a credit of .40. For an article with three authors, the first author received a credit of .47; the second author, a credit of .32; and the third author, a credit of .21. The author of a single-authored publication received 1.00 credit.

After identifying the most productive authors, I utilized the h index (Hirsch, 2005) to determine the impact of each author's articles. The h index is calculated by determining how many times each author's articles have been cited by other articles. Specifically, "a scientist has index h if h of his or her N_p papers have at least h citations each and the other $(N_p - h)$ papers have $\leq h$ citations each" (p. 16569). To determine the h index, an author's articles are first rank ordered by number of citations such that the first article has been cited the most, the second article has been cited the next most, and so forth. The h index is "the number of times an author's article has been cited . . . that is equal to, or greater than, the ranking of the article" (Duffy, Martin, Bryan, & Raque-Bogdan, 2008, p. 521).

Duffy and colleagues (2008) provide an excellent example for determining an author's h index:

Imagine an author has 10 total articles. When these articles are rank ordered from the most cited to the least cited, the following values are revealed (article number, number of times cited): (1, 78), (2, 61), (3, 41), (4, 24), (5, 11), (6, 5), (7, 4), (8, 2), (9, 2), and (10, 1). In this case, the author's h -index score would be a 5, because the first five of this author's articles have been cited at least five times. If this author's sixth article had been cited six or more times, the h -index score would equal 6. (p. 521)

Note that for both the h index and the author-weighted score, only the articles within the eight journals published between 1990 and 2008 were used.

To determine institutional credit, I used the following method: For articles that had one or more authors from a single institution, that institution received a credit of 1.00. For articles with authors from multiple institutions, each institution received partial credit. Partial credit was based on the number of authors from a given institution. For example, if two authors were at one institution and a third author was a second institution, the institution with two authors received .67 credits and the institution with one author received .33 credits. If two authors came from two different institutions, each institution received .50 credits. This approach is consistent with the work of Tinsley and Tinsley (1979) and Perez et al. (2000). Also consistent with Perez et al., I included institutional data for authors; these data were obtained from the online membership directory of the American Psychological Association.²

Table 1. Distribution of Articles by Journal as Related to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues: 2000-2008

Journal	Articles		
	Total (n)	LGBT (n)	%
<i>The Counseling Psychologist</i>	404	30	7.43
<i>Journal of College Student Development</i>	359	17	4.74
<i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development</i>	192	8	4.17
<i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>	479	16	3.34
<i>Journal of Counseling and Development</i>	489	14	2.86
<i>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice</i>	909	20	2.20
<i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>	1,109	12	1.08
<i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>	551	1	0.18

Table 2. Distribution of Articles by Journal as Related to Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues: 1990-1999

Journal	Articles		
	Total (n)	LGB (n)	%
<i>The Counseling Psychologist</i>	419	23	5.49
<i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>	458	12	2.62
<i>Journal of College Student Development</i>	866	22	2.54
<i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>	567	11	1.94
<i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>	1,257	22	1.75
<i>Journal of Counseling and Development</i>	943	15	1.59
<i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development</i>	216	3	1.39
<i>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice</i>	902	11	1.22

Adapted from Phillips et al. (2003)

I individually contacted authors whose institutional data were missing or incomplete in the directory.

Results

For the years 2000 through 2008, a total of 4,492 articles were published in the eight journals, of which 118 (2.63%) focused on LGBT issues. Table 1 displays results for individual journals. As shown, *TCP* published the greatest proportion of LGBT-related articles. Table 2 presents information on articles published by each journal for the years 1990 through 1999 (also available in

Phillips et al., 2003); as noted earlier, these articles make no mention of transgender issues.

For the years 1990 through 2008, a total of 10,120 articles were published in the eight journals, of which 237 (2.34%) focused on LGBT issues. The mean author-weighted score was .57 ($SD = .76$). Table 3 includes the weighted scores of authors whose scores were one standard deviation above the mean ($n = 29$); also included in the table is each author's h index. Between 1990 and 2008, a total of 158 institutions (including private practices and authors who did not list an affiliation) were represented in the journal articles. Most institutions (86%) were colleges or universities, with the remaining (14%) being community agencies, private practice, hospitals, and unaffiliated authors. The mean institutional productivity score was 1.50 ($SD = 2.24$). Table 4 presents institutions whose productivity score was one standard deviation above the mean.

Discussion

Between the years 1990 and 2008, a total of 237 articles that focused on LGBT issues were published in the eight journals. There was a slight increase in the number of articles focusing on LGBT issues published between 2000 and 2008, during which 2.63% of articles focused on LGBT issues (whereas between 1990 and 1999, only 2.11% of articles published focused on LGBT issues; Phillips et al., 2003). Note that when discussing Phillips et al., I exclude transgender issues because those authors identified no articles that focused on transgender issues between 1990 and 1999. However, between 2000 and 2008, one article focused exclusively on transgender issues, and nine included the word *transgender* in the title or abstract.

Between 2000 and 2008, *TCP* published the greatest number of, as well as the highest percentage of, articles focusing on LGBT issues. This finding is consistent with that of Phillips et al. (2003), who found that *TCP* published the highest percentage and greatest number of articles. *JMCD* increased both the number and the percentage of articles focusing on LGBT issues. Between 1990 and 1999, *JMCD* published 3 articles (1.39%), compared to 8 articles (4.17%) between 2000 and 2008. Yet, *JVB* published only 1 article (0.18%) between 2000 and 2008, whereas between 1990 and 1999, *JVB* published 12 articles (2.62%). However, *JVB* published a special issue of 10 articles in 1996 on "vocational issues of lesbian women and gay men."

Overall, these results suggest that the inclusion of LGBT issues in counseling psychology-oriented journals continues to increase. Moreover, the increase in the coverage of LGBT issues in *JMCD* suggests that sexual minority issues

(text continues on p. 61)

Table 3. Author-Weighted Scores and *h* Indices for Published Scholarship Related to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues: 1990-2008

Name	Weighted Score	<i>h</i> Index	Articles (<i>n</i>)	Affiliations
James M. Croteau	8.67	7	16	1990-present, faculty, Western Michigan University; 1984-1990, counselor, Ithaca College Counseling Center; PhD, 1986, counseling psychology, Southern Illinois University
Ruth E. Fassinger	5.90	7	10	2008-present, dean, California State University, Stanislaus; 1988-2008, faculty, University of Maryland; 1987-1988, counseling psychologist, Counseling and Consultation, Arizona State University; PhD, 1987, counseling psychology, Ohio State University
Kathleen J. Bieschke	4.33	5	8	1991-present, faculty, Pennsylvania State University; PhD, 1991, counseling psychology, Michigan State University
Jonathan J. Mohr	4.07	5	7	2005-present, faculty, George Mason University; 2001-2005, faculty, Loyola College in Maryland; PhD, 2001, counseling psychology, University of Maryland
Susan L. Morrow	3.88	4	6	1993-present, faculty, University of Utah; 1975-1993, counselor, Fourth World, Tempe; PhD, 1992, counseling psychology, Arizona State University
Dawn M. Szymanski	3.86	5	7	2006-present, faculty, University of Tennessee-Knoxville; 2002-2006, faculty, University of Missouri-St. Louis; 2001-2002, adjunct faculty, Georgia School of Professional Psychology at Argosy University; postdoctoral fellow, Counseling and Testing Center, Georgia State University; PhD, 2001, counseling psychology, Georgia State University

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Name	Weighted Score	<i>h</i> Index	Articles (<i>n</i>)	Affiliations
Roger L. Worthington	3.67	4	7	1997-present, faculty, University of Missouri-Columbia; 1995-1997, faculty, Boston College; 1994-1995, instructor, Boston College; PhD, 1995, counseling psychology, University of California, Santa Barbara
Douglas C. Haldeman	3.12	3	4	1983-present, counseling psychologist, Elliot Bay Therapy Association and private practice; 1982-1983, psychology intern, Olympic Mental Health Association; 1980-1982, intake director and staff therapist, Seattle Counseling Service; PhD, 1984, counseling psychology, University of Washington
Laura S. Brown	2.72	3	4	1980-present, private practice; 2001-2006, faculty, Argosy University-Seattle; 1978-1997, clinical faculty, University of Washington; PhD, 1977, clinical psychology, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Susan Kashubeck-West	2.51	4	6	2001-present, faculty, University of Missouri-St. Louis; 1993-2001 faculty, Texas Tech University; 1989-1993, faculty, Drake University; PhD, 1989, counseling psychology, Ohio State University
Julia C. Phillips	2.36	4	5	1994-present, associate director of training, counseling, testing and career center, University of Akron; 1992-1994, psychologist, University Counseling Center, Texas Tech University; PhD, 1992, counseling psychology, Ohio State University

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Name	Weighted Score	<i>h</i> Index	Articles (<i>n</i>)	Affiliations
Susan D. Cochran	2.33	4	5	1996-present, faculty, Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of California-Los Angeles; 1989-1996, research psychologist, University of California-Los Angeles; 1985-1996, faculty, Department of Psychology, California State University-Northridge; PhD, 1982, clinical psychology, University of California-Los Angeles
Nancy J. Evans	2.32	3	4	1981-present, faculty, University of Pittsburgh; 1980-1981, faculty, Mount Holyoke College; 1979-1980, visiting instructor, Colgate University; PhD, 1997, experimental psychology, Duke University
Jeffrey A. Kelly	2.10	5	5	1990-present, faculty, Medical College of Wisconsin; 1975-1990, faculty, University of Mississippi Medical Center; PhD, 1975, clinical psychology, University of Kentucky
Ritch Savin-Williams	2.00	2	2	1977-present, faculty, Cornell University; 1993, respecialization in clinical psychology, University of Massachusetts; PhD, 1977, human development, University of Chicago
Julianne S. Lark	1.83	4	5	1997-present, private practice; PhD, 1998, counseling psychology, Western Michigan University
Jeffrey A. Hayes	1.79	3	4	1993-present, faculty, Pennsylvania State University; 1992-1993, visiting faculty, Wittenberg University; 1991-1992, staff member/psychology resident, Counseling and Consultation Service, Ohio State University; PhD, 1991, counseling psychology, University of Maryland-College Park

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Name	Weighted Score	<i>h</i> Index	Articles (<i>n</i>)	Affiliations
Elisa S. Abes	1.67	2	3	2005-present, faculty, Miami University; 2003-2005, faculty, University of South Florida; PhD, 2003, higher education and student affairs, Ohio State University
Ellen D. B. Riggle	1.66	2	4	1989-present, faculty, University of Kentucky; PhD, 1990, political science, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Anthony R. D'Augelli	1.60	2	2	1972-present, faculty, Pennsylvania State University; PhD, 1972, clinical psychology, University of Connecticut
Michael Mobley	1.60	2	2	2008-present, faculty, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; 1997-2008, faculty, University of Missouri-Columbia; PhD, 1998, counseling psychology, Pennsylvania State University
Esther D. Rothblum	1.53	3	3	2005-present, faculty, San Diego State University; 1982-2005, faculty, University of Vermont; 1980-1982, postdoctoral fellow, Yale University; PhD, 1980, clinical psychology, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Frank R. Dillon	1.52	3	4	2007-present, faculty, Florida International University; 2006-2007, faculty, Nova Southeastern University; 2002-2006, faculty, University of Miami; PhD, 2002, counseling psychology, University of Missouri-Columbia.
Sharon Scales Rostosky	1.52	2	4	1999-present, faculty, University of Kentucky; PhD, 1998, counseling psychology, University of Tennessee

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Name	Weighted Score	<i>h</i> Index	Articles (<i>n</i>)	Affiliations
Ann R. Fischer	1.48	3	5	2004-present, faculty, Southern Illinois University Carbondale; 2002-2004, faculty, Ball State University; 1995-2002, faculty, University of Akron; PhD, 1995, counseling psychology, University of Missouri-Columbia
Robin A. Buhrke	1.41	2	3	1992-present, senior coordinator of research, Counseling and Psychology Services, Duke University; PhD, 1982, counseling psychology, Southern Illinois University
Louise A. Douce	1.40	2	2	1988-present, director, Counseling and Consultation Service, Ohio State University; 1982-present, private practice; 1977-1988, psychologist, Counseling and Consultation Service, Ohio State University; PhD, 1977, counseling psychology, University of Minnesota
Jane M. Simoni	1.40	2	2	2001-present, faculty, University of Washington; 1996-2000, faculty, Yeshiva University; 1995-1998, postdoctoral fellow, Columbia University; PhD, 1993, clinical psychology, University of California-Los Angeles
Michael H. Antoni	1.34	4	4	1987-present, faculty, University of Miami-Coral Gables; PhD, 1986, clinical psychology, University of Miami-Coral Gables

may be becoming more integrated into the larger discourse on multicultural issues. However, the lack of coverage of LGBT issues in *JVB* poses questions about the extent to which career issues are being addressed for this population. It is possible, however, that career issues are being addressed in other journals.

Table 4. Institutional Productivity Scores for Published Scholarship Related to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues: 1990-2008

Institution	Score
1. University of Maryland, College Park	15.57
2. Pennsylvania State University	14.24
3. Western Michigan University	13.25
4. University of Akron	6.83
5. University of Missouri, Columbia	6.67
6. Private practice	6.45
7. University of Miami	6.05
8. University of Utah	5.50
9. University of California, San Francisco	5.17
10. University of Washington	4.87
11. University of Missouri, St. Louis	4.51
12. University of California, Los Angeles	4.27
13. Iowa State University	3.75

Although the inclusion of LGBT issues is increasing in counseling psychology-oriented journals, the increase from 1990 to 2008 is small in comparison to the increase from the 1980s to the 1990s. Buhrke et al. (1992) found that only 0.65% of articles published between 1978 and 1989 focused on LGB issues, whereas Phillips et al. (2003) found that 2.11% of articles published between 1990 and 1999 focused on such issues. The increase of 1.41% from the 1980s to the 1990s is larger than the 0.52% increase from 1990 to 2008. This small increase is surprising in light of recent increased political activity surrounding same-sex marriage (six states had legalized same-sex marriage between 2004 and mid-2009) and the increasing support for the rights of lesbian and gay individuals (e.g., Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2006).

Sexual minority scholarship is taking place at many institutions. Between 1990 and 2008, a total of 158 institutions were identified. This range helps to ensure that scholarship into LGBT issues is occurring across geographic regions. Twelve institutions and private practices emerged as leaders in the field of LGBT scholarship. These institutions also represent an array of geographic regions.

Twenty-nine authors emerged as leaders in the field of LGBT scholarship. Many of the most productive scholars were housed at the most productive institutions. For example, James M. Croteau, Ruth E. Fassinger, and Kathleen J. Bieschke, the three authors with the highest author-weighted scores, are currently or were previously housed within the three institutions with the highest productivity scores.

Of note, individuals in private practice had the sixth-highest productivity ranking. Likewise, several of the most productive scholars are in private practice (Douglas C. Haldeman, Laura S. Brown, and Julianne S. Lark). These results are encouraging, given the additional costs for individuals in private practice who conduct research. These costs include the loss of time otherwise devoted to serving clients, as well as the concomitant loss of income from time used outside of billable hours (Warren & Thomas, 2003). Loss of income may be attenuated by agencies that provide release time for clinicians to conduct research; for example, some HMOs provide time for research on empirically supported treatments. Also note that several of the most productive authors work at university counseling centers. Like individuals in private practice, those at university counseling centers may have similar disincentives to engage in research.

Of the authors, only 4 of 29 (13.79%) are early career professionals—that is, 7 or fewer years from receipt of the doctorate (Elisa A. Abes, Frank R. Dillon, Jonathan J. Mohr, and Dawn M. Szymanski). Several reasons may explain the low representation of early career individuals among the most productive scholars. First, developing a program of research and publishing articles take time. More senior scholars would be expected to have published greater numbers of articles simply by virtue of their being in the field longer. Second are the possible barriers to early professionals' engaging in or publishing articles on LGBT issues, such as lack of funding, lack of support from university administrators, fears of jeopardizing attainment of tenure, and the relative difficulty of recruiting community participants versus readily available undergraduate participants. As such, early career scholars should be given support for their efforts to conduct and publish research in LGBT issues. Indeed, the American Psychological Association has recently highlighted the importance of focusing on the needs of early career psychologists, as evident in the formation of the Committee on Early Career Psychologists (Paige, 2005) and the Division 17 Committee on Early Professionals.³

A number of the leading scholars received their doctoral degrees in areas outside of counseling psychology. This finding may be the result of including journals that have scopes outside of counseling psychology. Another possibility is that counseling psychology-oriented journals are attracting scholars from a variety of disciplines. Scholars interested in multicultural issues may find counseling psychology-oriented journals more receptive than other journals because of counseling psychology's focus on multiculturalism.

Taken together, these results suggest, first, that coverage of queer scholarship (which now includes transgender issues) is continuing to increase in counseling psychology and, second, that a variety of scholars throughout the

United States are publishing queer scholarship. Despite the continued increase in the number and percentage of published articles on LGBT issues, still less than 3% of scholarship focuses on this population. Moreover, since the 1990s, the ascending rate of articles focusing on LGBT issues has slowed. As such, counseling psychology should continue to focus on increasing the representation of queer research and theory in its scholarly outlets. Moreover, given that transgender issues were absent in the 1990s (Phillips et al., 2003), counseling psychology needs to attend to scholarship focusing on transgender persons.

Whereas the amount of scholarship on LGBT issues remains relatively low, the diversity of scholars and institutions appears high. The majority of the top scholars are counseling psychologists (18 of 29), but they are joined by scholars from clinical psychology, experimental psychology, human development, higher education/student affairs, and political science. The top scholars are housed at institutions throughout all major geographic regions of the United States. As such, continued support of scholars throughout the United States is important. However, given the absence of international scholars and institutions, we need to reach out to our international colleagues in the field of counseling psychology. Finally, as noted earlier, the representation of early career scholars was low. This finding is somewhat similar to Perez and colleagues' results (2000) regarding research productivity in racial and ethnic minority issues. Examination of the most productive scholars identified by Perez et al. revealed that 21.05% of scholars (4 out of 19) were early career professionals. The percentage of early career professionals identified in the current study (13.79%) is slightly lower. As such, the field should work to support and encourage its newest generation of psychologists to pursue and publish scholarship on multicultural issues, including LGBT issues.

I should note the limitations of this study. Given the numerous ways of determining scholarship productivity, these results are contingent on the methods used. Although the inclusion of eight journals is a strength, counseling psychologists publish research on LGBT issues through a number of other venues (e.g., *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *Journal of Homosexuality*, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *Sex Roles*). Finally, I used more liberal inclusion criteria for articles (consistent with Phillips et al., 2003; cf. Perez et al., 2000), including full-length articles, brief reports, commentaries, introductions to special issues, and reactions/rejoinders. As such, the articles included work outside of empirically based research.

These results can be helpful to students who are seeking to identify graduate training programs that are affirming of LGBT issues. Although a number

of factors make graduate programs affirming of such issues, this study provides information on the individuals and institutions that are leaders in the field of LGBT scholarship.

Directions for future research include conducting an analysis of the content of the articles published in the eight journals. Such a content analysis would likely be most helpful if conducted after the end of 2009 so that the entire first decade of the 21st century can be analyzed. Focusing on the content of research that spans a decade is consistent with many prior content analyses (e.g., Buhrke et al., 1992; Phillips et al., 2003). A content analysis of 2000 through 2009 would provide information on the types of topics currently being covered in LGBT scholarship. This information could help to identify current trends in research and theory, as well as highlight possible differences in topics between this decade and the last. Future studies should also focus on research productivity for additional multicultural issues. This study and the study conducted by Perez et al. (2000) provide insight into the leaders in scholarship on sexual orientation/gender identity and racial/ethnic issues, respectively. Similar studies that focus on issues such as gender, disability, and religion and spirituality would help to provide a fuller picture of the leaders in multicultural counseling psychology.

Finally, future research should examine the factors that facilitate research productivity in LGBT issues among counseling psychologists. For example, in discussing the training of graduate students in LGBT research, Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, and Croteau (1998) offer several suggestions for creating environments that are conducive to LGBT research productivity. The authors note that environments need to be supportive of research in general, supportive of research on LGBT issues, and supportive of LGBT individuals. In addition, individuals need to feel efficacious in conducting LGBT research.

Regarding environmental factors, environments that are more supportive of research will likely produce scholars who are more productive. Support for research could be demonstrated by the following: reduced teaching, administrative, and client loads; the presence of support staff; the availability of motivated and quality research assistants; and funding for research. Next, environments that are supportive of LGBT research and individuals will likely produce fewer obstacles to conducting such research. Support for LGBT-focused research can be present at many levels of individuals and formal groups, including mentors, collaborators, administrators, institutional review boards, and granting agencies. Organizations that are supportive of LGBT individuals may be more likely to create atmospheres in which scholars feel free to pursue LGBT-focused research. Such organizational support could be demonstrated by antidiscrimination policies; by the active recruitment of LGBT faculty,

staff, and students; by same-sex partner benefits; and by standing queer equity committees.

Regarding individual factors, researchers who feel more efficacious in conducting LGBT research will likely be more productive. Researchers' self-efficacy may decrease because of problems recruiting LGBT participants, because of discouragement to conduct LGBT research, because of an inability to obtain funding, and because of a lack of collaborators. Employing different methods of recruitment (e.g., Internet data collection), seeking out mentors and collaborators, and pursuing nontraditional funding agencies may all help to increase self-efficacy in LGBT research. These are just some of the individual and institutional factors that may facilitate or hamper productivity in LGBT scholarship. Empirical inquiry into these and other factors will help to determine what allows researchers and institutions to be most productive in LGBT scholarship.

Notes

1. In this article, the term *queer* is used interchangeably with the abbreviation *LGBT*. This usage is consistent with APA style (American Psychological Association, n.d.) and recent scholarship in LGBT issues (Smith, Blakeslee, & Rosenthal, 2008).
2. See <http://memforms.apa.org/apa/cli/mbdirsearch/index.cfm?formtype=MEMBER>.
3. See <http://www.div17.org/Newsletter/SCP%20Newsletter%20Spring%202006.pdf>.

Acknowledgments

Portions of this article were presented at the 117th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 2009. Thanks to Anthony Renwick and Susanna Wetherington for their assistance with data collection.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Reducing bias by topic: Sexual orientation*. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from <http://supp.apa.org/style/pubman-ch03.13.pdf>

- Bieschke, K. J., Eberz, A. B., Bard, C. C., & Croteau, J. M. (1998). Using social cognitive career theory to create affirmative lesbian, gay, and bisexual research training environments. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 735-753.
- Buboltz, W. C., Jenkins, S. M., Thomas, A., Lindley, L. D., Schwartz, J. P., & Loveland, J. M. (2005). Research productivity in counseling psychology: An update. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 709.
- Buhrke, R. A., Ben-Ezra, L. A., Hurley, M. E., & Ruprecht, L. J. (1992). Content analysis and methodological critique of articles concerning lesbian and gay male issues in counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 91-99.
- Chung, Y. B., & Katayama, M. (1996). Assessment of sexual orientation in lesbian/gay/bisexual studies. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*, 49-62.
- Clark, W. M., & Serovich, J. M. (1997). Twenty years and still in the dark? Content analysis of articles pertaining to gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues in marriage and family therapy journals. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 23*, 239-253.
- Delgado, E. A., & Howard, G. S. (1994). Changes in research productivity in counseling psychology: Revisiting Howard (1983) a decade later. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 69-73.
- Diegelman, N. M., Uffelman, R. A., Wagner, K. S., & Diegelman, S. A. (2005). Current institutional trends in research productivity in counseling psychology journals. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 327.
- Duffy, R. D., Martin, H. M., Bryan, N. A., & Raque-Bogdan, T. L. (2008). Measuring individual research productivity: A review and development of the integrated research productivity index. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*, 518-527.
- Flores, L. Y., Rooney, S., Heppner, P., Browne, L. D., & Wei, M.-F. (1999). Trend analyses of major contributions in *The Counseling Psychologist* cited from 1986 to 1996: Impact and implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 73-95.
- Goodstein, L. D. (1963). The institutional sources of articles in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 10*, 94-95.
- Heppner, P. P., Casas, J. M., Carter, J., & Stone, G. L. (2000). The maturation of counseling psychology: Multifaceted perspectives, 1978-1998. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 3-49). New York: Wiley.
- Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102*, 16569-16572.
- Howard, G. S. (1983). Research productivity in counseling psychology: An update and generalization study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 600-602.
- 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.
- Meara, N. M. (1999). Different voices: Constructing and recording an applied specialty. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 96-103.

- Morin, S. F. (1977). Heterosexual bias in psychological research on lesbianism and male homosexuality. *American Psychologist, 32*, 629-637.
- Paige, R. U. (2005). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association for the legislative year 2004: Minutes of the annual meeting of the Council of Representatives, February 20-22, 2004, Washington, DC, and July 28 and 30, 2004, Honolulu, Hawaii, and minutes of the February, April, June, August, October, and December 2004 meetings of the Board of Directors. *American Psychologist, 60*, 436-511.
- Perez, R. M., Constantine, M. G., & Gerard, P. A. (2000). Individual and institutional productivity of racial and ethnic minority research in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 223-228.
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2006). *Less opposition to gay marriage, adoption and military service; only 34% favor South Dakota abortion ban*. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from <http://people-press.org/report/273/less-opposition-to-gay-marriage-adoption-and-military-service>
- Phillips, J. C., Ingram, K. M., Smith, N. G., & Mindes, E. J. (2003). Methodological and content review of lesbian-, gay-, and bisexual-related articles in counseling journals: 1990-1999. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 25.
- Smith, N. G., Blakeslee, J., & Rosenthal, H. (2008). *The psychology of sexual orientation: A modular lesson plan/teaching resource for high school psychology teachers*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tinsley, D. J., & Tinsley, H. E. A. (1979). Trends in institutional contributions to the *Journal of Counseling Psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26*, 152-158.
- Warren, R., & Thomas, J. C. (2003). Research in private practice. In J. C. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Understanding research in clinical and counseling psychology* (pp. 379-396). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Watters, A. T. (1986). Heterosexual bias in psychological research on lesbianism and male homosexuality (1979-1983), utilizing the bibliographic and taxonomic system of Morin (1977). *Journal of Homosexuality, 13*, 35-58.

Bio

Nathan Grant Smith, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Faculty of Education at McGill University. He received his doctorate in counseling psychology from Virginia Commonwealth University in 2002. His research interests include stress and coping, with an emphasis on LGBT individuals and individuals living with HIV, and professional and training issues in counseling psychology. He has held numerous leadership positions within APA and Division 17, including chairing the APA Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns.