Meta-Study of *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology* (JSACP) Articles from 2007-2019

LeAnn Wills
Emily Bradford
Bradley Erford
Peabody College at Vanderbilt University

Abstract

Articles published in Journal of Social Action in Counseling and Psychology (JSACP) from 2007-2019 were analyzed to determine trends over time in author characteristics (e.g., gender, work setting, authors per article) and article content (e.g., topical content, statistics, research design and methodology, participant characteristics).

Keywords: meta-study, article characteristics, author characteristics, trend, trend analysis

Meta-Study of the *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology* (JSACP) Articles from 2007-2019

Success in social justice counseling and the advancement of the counseling field rely on an understanding of the complex social systems of which individuals are a part. This understanding extends to the ways in which counselors, clients, and others work toward social change and system transformations. With its first publication in 2007, the Journal of Social Action in Counseling and Psychology (JSACP) became an open access journal that publishes the social change work and scholarship conducted by activists and professionals. The published scholars include counselor educators, researchers, and practitioners whose work addresses community change. The aim of JSACP is to build a connection between theory and practice within the area of social transformation with the goal of accomplishing peace and justice (Journal of Social Action in Counseling and Psychology [JSACP], 2021).

As time progresses, world events illuminate the pressing need for social change. JSACP provides space for this essential scholarship, periodically publishing special issues addressing these current events. JSACP's publications (2021) are action oriented and include four sections of journal focus: (a) activism and advocacy, (b) program development and evaluation, (c) policy and theory, and (d) education and training. JSACP is sponsored by Counselors for Social Justice and Psychologists for Social Responsibility and published by Ball State University's Center for Peace & Conflict Studies and University Libraries.

Just as it is important for professionals to reflect and self-evaluate on occasion to ensure they remain current in their practice, likewise, periodic evaluation of journals is essential to study the content of articles published and the trajectory or direction of important characteristics. These evaluations provide opportunities to investigate journal trends, potential challenges, and responsiveness to reader needs and societal changes. Erford et al. (2010) illuminated three primary ways a journal's evolution can be evaluated. The first involves evaluating the special issues published within the journal to assess primary issues that occurred during the publication period under study. In the current JSACP review of 2007-2019, three special issues were published: Vol 3(1) in 2011 on the 2010 Multicultural Social Justice Leadership Development Academy; Vol 5(1) in 2013 on Violence against Individuals and Communities: Reflecting on the Trayvon Martin Case; and Vol 5(2) in 2013 on Research and Social Justice. There has not been a special issue published in JSACP since 2013.

The second way to evaluate a journal's evolution is via a qualitative review and synthesis. This procedure involves synthesis by an expert scholar of the journal contributions over a specific period of time. The aspects analyzed and synthesized may include author characteristics, content themes, methodology, and statistical analysis (Erford et al., 2010). To date, no qualitative synthesis of JSACP journal content was conducted.

The third way to review a journal's evolution is through a quantitative review, called a meta-study (Erford et al., 2010), which is the methodology used in the present study. Typically, meta-studies include analysis of article and author characteristics, as well as a special focus on research articles and statistical procedures, and is used to identify trends and patterns within the articles published by the journal. This procedure can be used across publications within the same journal or across multiple journals with a focus on a particular topic of interest. In the current meta-study of JSACP articles published between 2007-2019, analyses of trends were conducted to answer the following primary questions: (a) What is published within JSACP (article characteristics) with a particular focus on research articles, and (b) Who publishes in JSACP (author characteristics). These questions were also analyzed for trends over time, to assess changes in journal characteristics across the 13 years of publication in the time period of interest for the present study. The following sections present the methodology for the present study, followed by the resulting trends and analyses of characteristics, and, finally, a discussion of the implications of such findings as JSACP continues to evolve into the future.

Method

All full text articles published between 2007 through 2019 were retrieved from JSACP's (2020) on-line archive, and either accepted or rejected into the current analysis. Scholarly publications were accepted whereas brief, less scholarly publications were rejected from subsequent analysis (e.g., first-person accounts, introductions to special issues, editorials). Independent coding was conducted by the first two authors and disagreements were discussed until consensus was reached. If consensus could not be reached, the third author was consulted for a final decision.

All accepted articles were next examined and coded for article and author characteristics. The coded author characteristics included name, gender, employment setting of all authors, and national or international domicile of lead author. Article characteristics coded include type of study (i.e., research study or not) and topic. The topic of publication was multi-coded when deemed necessary. The authors devised and agreed upon a list of article content topics in which all accepted articles were categorized.

For articles designated as research, coding of additional variables was conducted. This included: classification (i.e., intervention or non-intervention), research paradigm (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, or both), research design (i.e., true/quasi-experimental, test development, descriptive, qualitative, meta-analysis, comparative, survey), participant type (i.e., undergraduates, counselors, youth, non-human), numerical sample size and category [i.e., small, (<30), medium (30-99), large (100-499), and very large (500+)], random or non-random participant selection/assignment, statistical sophistication (i.e., basic, intermediate, advanced), and actual statistics utilized (i.e., descriptives, regression, ANOVA/ANCOVA, MANOVA/MANCOVA, factor analysis, t-test, correlation, nonparametric). The mention or consideration of effect size, validity, and reliability within each article sample was also coded.

The two independent coders inputted data into their respective Microsoft Excel coding documents. Data comparison was conducted, and all disagreements were discussed until consensus was reached. To accommodate for research studies using qualitative traditions, we assessed for whether authors included procedures to assess for dependability (reliability) or credibility/ trustworthiness (validity). Quantitative tradition studies were assessed for inclusion of the more traditional indexes of coefficient alpha (reliability) and correlation coefficients (validity). Intervention studies provided experimental control of the treatment variable (e.g., true experimental, quasi-experimental, and single subject research designs), while nonintervention studies were any other type of pre-experimental or nonexperimental design (e.g., correlational, comparative, qualitative).

The 13 years of JSACP currently under study were aggregated into convenient class intervals (i.e., 2007-2009, 2010-2014, 2015-2019) to facilitate trend analyses. Because so few articles and no research articles were published from 2007-2009, that window was removed from trend analysis. Thus, in the results and discussion sections that follow, trend analysis only compared 2010-2014 to 2015-2019. These 5-year time windows were selected to allow sufficient numbers of articles to be published to enhance statistical power and to standardize the time frames in accordance with other meta-studies so that characteristics can be compared across equivalent time periods (i.e., 2010-2014, 2015-2019). In all analyses, the independent variable was the author or article characteristic of interest and the dependent variable was the proportional frequency of occurrence within each time interval and coded category (level). SPSS 27 descriptive and univariate ANOVA statistical procedures with weighted proportions were used to identify author or article characteristic trends over time. Type I error was established at $\alpha < .05$. Because only two time windows were used, *post hoc* analysis on statistically significant findings was not required. Effect sizes were reported as eta-squared (η^2) and assigned the following interpretive range: .01 for small effect, .09 for medium effect, and .25 for large effect (Erford, 2014). Two analyses used independent *t*-tests so the effect sizes were reported as Cohen's *d*, and interpreted as .20 small, .50 medium, and .80 large.

Results

JSACP published 132 articles from 2007 to 2019, 39 of which were excluded from analyses because they involved brief, less scholarly contributions (e.g., first-person accounts, introductions to special issues, editorials). Thus, 93 articles were accepted for variable coding, and the results aggregated into convenient class time windows (i.e., 10 in 2007-2009, 46 in 2010-2014, and 37 in 2015-2019). Only the latter two time windows were appropriately powered and subsequently analyzed for trends over time.

Author Characteristics

Gender of JSACP lead authors was stable from 2010-2014 to 2015-2019 [$F(1, 81) = 0.13$, $p = .717$, $\eta^2 = .002$], as women consistently comprised 72.3% of all JSACP lead authors. Likewise, when all authors' gender was assessed, a consistent 71.4% proportion of women authors occurred [$F(1, 278) = 2.53$, $p = .113$, $\eta^2 = .009$]. The average number of authors per JSACP article also remained consistent at 3.20 in 2010-2014 and 3.59 in 2015-2019 [$t(81) = -1.00$, $p = .320$, $d = -.221$].

JSACP author employment affiliation (i.e., university and non-university settings) was a steady proportion of 98.8% university affiliation for lead authors [$F(1, 81) = 0.80$, $p = .373$, $\eta^2 = .010$], and 95.7% for all authors from 2010-2019 [$F(1, 278) = 0.59$, $p = .444$, $\eta^2 = .002$]. At the same time, the proportion of internationally domiciled lead authors publishing in JSACP trended toward a decrease over time [$F(1, 81) = 2.87$, $p = .094$, $\eta^2 = .034$], from 13.0% in 2010-2014 to 2.7% in 2015-2019.

From 2007-2019, the following universities supported the highest number of JSACP lead authors: (1) University of North Carolina - Greensboro (5 articles) (2) University of Miami (4 articles); and (3-tie) Boston University, Victoria University, University of California – Santa Barbara, and University of Iowa (3 articles each). Leading individual scholar contributions were not determined because no author published more than two articles in JSACP from 2007-2019.

Article Characteristics

Topical content appearing in JSACP publications was very consistent from 2010-2019 [$F(1, 195) = 0.20$, $p = .659$, $\eta^2 = .001$] (see Table 1). The largest proportions of topics included 18.9% for counselor training/supervision, 18.9% for advocacy/activism, and 17.9% for multicultural issues; all other topics ranged from a prevalence of 4.7% to 8.0%. In the most significant change of all variables in this meta-study, after publishing no research articles in 2007-2009, JSACP substantially increased the proportion of research articles published from about 26.1% from 2010-2014 to 62.2% from 2015-2019 [$F(1, 81) = 12.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .132$]. Various characteristics of the 35 research articles published in JSACP between 2010 and 2019 are reviewed in the remainder of this Results section.

The proportion of JSACP qualitative research studies was very high and stable over the past 10 years at a proportion of 85.0% [$F(1, 38) = 0.01$, $p = .928$, $\eta^2 = .000$]. Likewise, Table 2 shows the various types of research designs appearing in JSACP were also highly stable [$F(1, 47) = 0.00$, $p = .965$, $\eta^2 = .000$]. Qualitative/ethnographic research designs comprised 42.9% of the research studies, while descriptive and survey designs composed 26.5% and 14.3%, respectively. Quasi-experimental or true experimental designs composed only 4.1% of JSACP research designs over the past 10 years. This lower rate of quasi- and true-experimental designs was also reflected in a stable overall intervention study rate of just 2.9% [$F(1, 33) = 1.97$, $p = .170$, $\eta^2 = .056$].

All four JSACP sample or participant characteristics assessed were stable over the 10-year window of 2010-2019. Research article categorical sample sizes were very stable over time [$F(1, 32) = 0.89$, $p = .354$, $\eta^2 = .027$]. The proportions of small (<30), medium (30-99), and large samples (100-499) participants composed 52.9%, 26.5%, and 20.6% of research studies, respectively. This was supported by the observation that actual sample sizes from the 2010-2014 to 2015-2019 time windows were not statistically different: $t(32) = -1.34$; $p = .188$; $d = -.482$; although this effect size was small to medium. Not surprisingly, with qualitative studies composing a majority of research articles in JSACP, sample sizes were small overall. Indeed, no research study published in JSACP had a very large sample size (>500 participants). Proportions of types of participant groups (e.g., adults, undergraduates) were

consistent over time in JSACP research studies [$F(1, 38) = 0.33$; $p = .568$; $\eta^2 = .009$], and were nicely distributed across the participant categories: 37.5% adults, 25.0% counselors/professionals, 15.0% graduate students or counselor trainees, and 12.5% undergraduates. Finally, randomization in selection and assignment procedures displayed stable proportions [$F(1, 33) = 0.51$; $p = .478$; $\eta^2 = .015$] at a consistent rate of only 2.9% of research studies.

Both statistics variables showed stability in the use of various statistical procedures over time. Statistical sophistication was categorically coded as basic, intermediate, or advanced, and was stable over time in JSACP research studies [$F(2, 112) = 0.64$; $p = .529$; $\eta^2 = .011$]. Over the past 10 years, 83.3% of research studies used a basic statistical procedure (e.g., content analysis, descriptive, correlation), 11.9% used an intermediate statistical procedure (e.g., ANOVA, regression analysis), and only 4.8% used an advanced procedure (e.g., MANOVA, factor analysis). Likewise, when use of those specific statistical procedures (e.g., correlation, regression, MANOVA) between 2010-2019 were analyzed, consistency over time was again observed (see Table 3)[$F(1, 40) = 1.33$; $p = .256$; $\eta^2 = .032$].

Finally, three reporting standards variables (effect sizes, score reliability, and score validity) were coded, and only the report of validity (generalization) trended positive over time, although all three variables had very low levels of compliance. The reporting of study effect sizes was a consistent 5.7% [$F(1, 33) = 1.08$; $p = .307$; $\eta^2 = .032$]. Reports of sample reliability were also very stable [$F(1, 33) = 2.38$; $p = .132$; $\eta^2 = .067$], maintaining an overall reporting rate of 11.4%, even though the proportions actually moved from 0% in 2010-2014 to 17.4% in 2015-2019. Finally, the report of sample score validity changed significantly across the two time windows [$F(1, 33) = 6.03$; $p = .019$; $\eta^2 = .155$], as the proportion increased from 0% in 2010-2104 up to 34.8% in 2015-2019 as reports of generalizability and validity coefficients became more commonplace.

Discussion

Since 2007, JSACP has provided scholarly information for counseling and psychological professionals and students-in-training to integrate advocacy into practice to help build a more equitable and just society. In pursuit of this goal, JSACP responds to dynamic professional and societal issues. This Discussion section continues to address and answer the two main questions of this meta-study: Who publishes in JSACP, and what is being published in JSACP? Along with the associated trends relative to these foci.

Author Characteristics: Who Publishes in JSACP?

The 83 articles submitted to analysis from 2010-2019 indicated that a consistent and stable proportion of 72% of lead authors and all authors publishing in JSACP were women._While all counseling journals except JHC (Sylvester et al., in press) were majority female in the most current five-year window [2015-2019; e.g., *Journal of Counseling & Development* (JCD; Anderson et al., 2021); *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation* (CORE; Johnson et al., 2021); *Counseling & Values Journal* (CVJ; Alder et al., 2021); *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* (JMHC; Menzies et al., 2020); *Adultspan* (Rippeto et al., 2021); Journal of College Counseling (JCC; Milowsky et al., in press)].

JSACP non-university-affiliated lead author proportions of 2.2% over the past 13 years, means that 97.8% of all lead authors were university affiliated. In 2015-2019, no lead authors (0%) were non-university-affiliated, the lowest of any counseling–related journal assessed. Not surprisingly, most counseling journals had non-university affiliation rates equal to or less than 6.5% [*The Professional Counselor* (6.5%; Williams et al., in press), JMHC 6.0% (Menzies et al., 2020), CORE 6.7% (Johnson et al., 2021)] except for *Counseling and Values* (CVJ; Alder et al., 2021) which had a 14.9% lead author affiliation rate. The voices of non-university practitioners have been diminishing in nearly all counseling journals over the past several decades (Erford et al., 2010). That said, JSACP has an opportunity to highlight and enhance the voices of practitioners as the journal remains fertile ground for practical approaches to systemic and individual advocacy and social justice. Practitioners in the field aligned with

specific causes are using innovative approaches to instigating and accomplishing social change and university scholars and researchers can partner with these innovators to help with writing and other facets of a manuscript. It is also possible that authors may have dual affiliations, but only report a university affiliation in the author note. Practitioner-authors should be encouraged to include these practitioner affiliations in author notes.

The number of authors per JSACP article was stable but very high at 3.59 for the 2015-2019 time window, the highest of any counseling journal assessed, even though most counseling journals have also experienced increases in author collaborations in recent years. Other counseling journals with the highest author per article collaborations are currently (2015-2019) *Journal of College Counseling* (JCC) at 3.20 authors per article (Milowsky et al., in press), MECD at 3.21 authors per article (Saks et al., 2020), and JCD at 3.18 authors per article (Anderson et al., 2021). It is likely that enhanced mentorship (Anderson et al., 2021) and the increased use of research and writing teams (Erford et al., 2012) contribute to these increased author per article averages.

Lead author domicile data indicated a trend ($p < .10$) of a smaller proportion of international lead authors from 2015-2019 (2.7%) than during 2010-2014 (13.0%). The 2.7% proportion from 2015-2019 places JSACP near the bottom of the list compared to other counseling journals [e.g., 0.9% between 2015-2109 for JMHC (Menzies et al., 2020); 1.7% from 2000-2019 for JCC (Milowsky et al., 2020)]. On the other hand, the 13% occurrence from 2010-2014 is very good for a counseling journal and higher than all but three counseling journals: JEC at greater than 50% (Siegler et al., 2020), *Career Development Quarterly* (CDQ; Gonsalves et al., in press) at 32.4%, and MECD (Saks et al., 2020) at more than 30% from 2015-2019.

Article Characteristics: What is Published in JSACP?

A statistically significant and welcomed trend displayed within the current results was the increased proportion of JSACP research studies. No research studies were published in JSACP from 2007-2009. From 2010-2014, 26.1% of the articles published in JSACP were research based, and then the rate increased significantly to 62.2% in 2015-2019. Interestingly, nearly all other counseling journals increased their proportions of research studies published and all except the *Journal of Humanistic Counseling* (48.6%) and the *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health* (35.8%) publish research articles at greater than the 50% rate. Still, a 62.2% proportion of research articles is low compared to other counseling journals as nearly half of all counseling journals now exceed the 75% threshold of published articles being research articles (i.e., CDQ, Gonsalves et al., in press; CORE, Johnson et al., 2021; CES, Johnsen et al., 2021; JAOC, MacInerney et al, 2020; JCD, Anderson et al., 2021; JCC, Milowsky et al., in press; JMCD, Pesavento et al., in press; MECD, Saks et al., 2020), a welcomed focus for a science-based discipline.

Non-experimental research designs (see Table 2; i.e., qualitative/ethnographic, survey, descriptive, comparative, correlational) composed a stable 92% of all JSACP research articles. At the same time, intervention studies were steady at 2.9%, tracking the 4.1% rate of experimental (true and quasi-experimental) research studies. These rates of experimental and intervention studies are among the lowest in all counseling journals, although not as low as some; *Adultspan, Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling,* and *Journal of College Counseling* registered no true or quasi-experimental studies in 2015-2019.

A related research design variable involved the proportions of qualitative versus quantitative methodology. JSACP, by far, had the highest proportions of qualitative approaches represented in the 35 research articles at a consistent 85%. Only three other counseling journals had qualitative proportions above 50%: JCMH at 60.5% (Zhang et al., in press); CES (Johnsen et al., 2021) at 56.4%; and *Adultspan* (Rippeto et al., 2021) at 52%. In summary, JSACP is heavily weighted toward qualitative and nonexperimental research designs. Inducing theories and exploring the lived experiences of participants is essential in social justice and social action research, but it is equally important to study what works in social justice initiatives and how well it works. For the future, the JSACP editorial board should encourage authors to submit higher proportions of experimental studies, including true or quasi-experimental designs or single case studies to help practitioners understand potential causal inferences of these more robust experimental designs that allow greater generalizability to populations of interest.

JSACP participant sample characteristics were very consistent from 2010-2014 to 2015-2019. JSACP participant types are appropriately mixed as the proportion of each of the five human categories ranged from 7.5% (children/adolescents) to 37.5% (adults). Given the focus of the journal, it is quite appropriate that 62.5% of all participant types would involve adults and counselors or other professionals. Counseling professionals (25.0%) and graduate students in training (15.0%) are the primary audience of JSACP and the focused inclusion of adult participants (37.5%) and undergraduates (12.5%) are the primary stakeholder groups for study and change. Sample size configurations also were very stable over time, both in terms of sample size categorization (i.e., small, medium, large), and actual numerical sample sizes. No large samples (>500 participants) were noted, and only about one in five samples had more than 99 participants. This is not surprising give the substantial occurrence of the qualitative approach in the 35 JSACP research articles (85%), which tend toward smaller sample sizes.

JSACP was one of only two counseling journals assessed to not have at least one sample exceeding 500 participants, the other being JCMH (Zhang et al., in press) which publishes the second highest proportion of qualitative studies. Indeed, the overall median sample size for JSACP research articles was just under 30 participants. Finally, use of randomization was a low, consistent 2.9% from 2010-2019, commensurate with the rate of intervention studies and experimental designs, but still smaller than all other counseling journals except the *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling* (Gayowsky et al., 2021). JSACP authors and editorial board members should strive to increase use of intervention studies, experimental designs, and randomization procedures in sampling and assignment to enhance causal connections and sample generalizability. Such studies are also helpful is addressing limitations associated with nonrandomized sampling and pre-experimental and non-experimental designs (Erford et al., 2012).

Use of statistical procedures in JSACP research articles were very consistent over time in both the types of statistics and sophistication level of statistics used. About 83% of the statistical techniques used were basic (correlation, descriptives, thematic coding), while 12% were intermediate (ANOVA, regression) and 4.8% used advanced statistics. This was mirrored in Table 4 by low proportions of MANOVA and factor analysis (advanced statistics), and a 4.8% advanced statistics usage proportion is among the lowest of all counseling journals (e.g., 4.1% in CORE, Johnson et al., 2021; 3.9% in JMHC, Menzies et al., 2020; 1.5% in JCMH, Zhang et al., in press). Counseling journal leaders in the use of advanced statistics included MECD (16.9%, Saks et al., 2020), JMCD (18.2%, Pesavento et al., in press), JCC (18.4%, Milowsky et al., in press), and JAOC (20%, MacInerney et al., 2020).

Research article reporting standards on effect size, and sample reliability and validity are important metrics of research quality. Over the past 13 years, JSACP was steady, but on the low end of proportions for each of these standards. For example, JSACP reported sample effect sizes in only 8.7% of research articles from 2015-2019, the lowest proportion among counseling journals. This was also the case for providing sample reliability evidence, at a JSACP rate of 11.4%. Regarding provision of sample validity evidence, JSACP did much better as the rate of 22.9% was just below the median proportion for counseling journals. Increasing the proportions of these metrics should be a goal of the JSACP editorial board and contributing authors over the next decade.

Study Limitations and Conclusion

Systematic reviews, such as meta-studies, help identify trends, quality indicators, growth opportunities, and insights for editorial board members, authors, researchers, and journal consumers to continuously raise the bar on quality counseling publications. However, all research designs have limitations and potential weaknesses, and meta-studies are no exception. This study involved descriptive and comparative analyses, so no causal link can be inferred from the results. This caution is particularly warranted when attempting to generalize findings or conclusions. We tried to stay grounded at all times in the data and results when describing aspects of JSACP author and article characteristics.

Coding procedures and results were cross-checked by two researchers independently for concordance and agreement. Despite rigorous adherence to standardized data collection, coding, and analytic procedures, it is possible that errors occurred. To enhance statistical power and standardize comparisons across other counseling journals, we collapsed results into 5-year convenient class intervals (2010-2014 and 2015-2019). It is possible that other research teams may have preferred shorter or longer time windows. Likewise, the variables coded for this meta-study were standardized to allow comparisons with other counseling journals as well as derive descriptions of important characteristics of JSACP publications. Other research teams may choose more, fewer, or even different variables to elucidate relevant author and article characteristics. Subjectivity could also play a part in the variables that allowed for response multi-coding, such as occurred for statistics used and topical content. We attempted to mitigate all of these potential problems through training, independence of coding, cross-checking and consensus procedures. In the case of coder disagreements, consensus procedures were pursued with the third author serving as final arbiter of disagreements.

In summary, this meta-study sought to analyze and evaluate trends over time evident in numerous author and article characteristics published in JSACP from 2007-2019, the first effort in the journal's short history. Interestingly, only two of the 25 coded variables demonstrated significant change over time: the proportion of research studies published and the proportion of sample research articles reporting sample validity. Thus, for such a new journal, the editorial board is already demonstrating admirable stability is author and article characteristics. Several areas of improvement were noted, particularly related to research article reporting standards and diversification of some author characteristics. But, overall, JSACP is on a good trajectory in most areas and achieving its mission and goals. As JSACP continues to evolve and grow in the years ahead, we hope this information on current publication trends and issues provides profession leaders, researchers, authors, and editorial board members with helpful information to guide desired changes.

Author Correspondence

Correspondence should be sent to Bradley T. Erford at PMB 90, Peabody College at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203-5721; bradley.t.erford@vanderbilt.edu.

References

Alder, C., Yu, C., & Erford, B. T. (2021). A meta-study of the *Counseling and Values: Spirituality, Ethics, and Religion in Counseling* (CVJ): An analysis of publication characteristics, 2000-2019. *Counseling and Values: Spirituality, Ethics, and Religion in Counseling.*

Anderson, B., Barstack, S., & Erford, B. T. (2021). A meta study of the *Journal of Counseling & Development:* An analysis of publication characteristics, 2000-2019. *Journal of Counseling & Development.*

Erford, B. T., Miller, E. M., Duncan, K., & Erford, B. M. (2010). *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development* (MECD) submission patterns: MECD author and article characteristics from 1990-2009. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 42*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175609354619

Erford, B. T., Miller, E. M., Schein, H., McDonald, A., Ludwig, L., & Leishear, K. (2011). *Journal of Counseling & Development* publication patterns: Author and article characteristics from 1994-2009. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*(1), 73-80. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00062.x

Gayowsky, J., Choi, J., & Erford, B. T. (2021). Meta-study of *Journal of LGBTQ Issues in Counseling* publication patterns from 2006–2019. *Journal of LGBTQ Issues in Counseling,* 15(1), 2-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2021.1868379

Gonsalves, G., Menzies, A., Erford, B. T., Zhou, Y., Crockett, S. A., & Byrd, R. R. (in press). *Career Development Quarterly*: Author and article characteristics from 2000 to 2019. *Career Development Quarterly.*

Johnsen, S., Watson, K., Erford, B. T., Crockett, S., & Byrd, R. (2021). *Counselor Education and Supervision* (CES): An analysis of publication characteristics from 2000-2019. *Counselor Education and Supervision.*

Johnson, A., West, C., Erford, B. T., & Karkhanis, S. (2021). A meta-study of *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation* (CORE): An analysis of publication characteristics from 2010-2019. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 2021*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2020.1829967

Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology. (JSACP). (2020). Archives. https://openjournals.bsu.edu/jsacp/issue/archive

Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology. (JSACP). (2021). *About the journal.* https://openjournals.bsu.edu/jsacp/about

MacInerney, E. K., Johnsen, S. T., Cobb, N., Smith, H., & Erford, B. T. (2020). *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling* publication patterns from 1998 to 2017: Author and article characteristics. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling, 41*(2), 82-96. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaoc.12082

Menzies, A., Kepley, L., Crockett, S. A., Erford, B. T., Byrd, R., & Aier, B. (2020). A meta-study of the *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*: An analysis of publication characteristics 2000-2019. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 42*(3), 206-219. https://doi.org/10.17744/mehc.42.3.02

Milowsky, A. I., Haffner, A. M., Bardhoshi, G., Erford, B. T., Byrd, R., & Crockett, S. A. (in press). A meta-study of *Journal of College Counseling* (JCC): An analysis of publication characteristics from 2000-2019. *Journal of College Counseling.*

Pesavento, A. R., Muller, L. A., Smith, H., Cobb, N., & Erford, B. T. (in press). *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* (JMCD) author and article characteristics from 1998-2017. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development.*

Rippeto, M., Stewart, E., Chowning, M., Karkhanis, S., Erford, B. T., & Kepley, L. (2021). A metastudy of *Adultspan Journal*: Publication characteristics from 1999 to 2019. *Adultspan Journal*, 20(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1012/adsp.12103

Saks, J., Fuller, A., Erford, B. T., & Bardhoshi, G. (2020). Meta-study of M*easurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development* (MECD) publication patterns from 2000–2019. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 53*(4), 279-288. https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2020.1735222

Siegler, E., Stafford, C., Crockett, S., Zhou, Y., & Erford, B. T. (2021). A meta-study of *Journal of Employment Counseling* (JEC): An analysis of publication patterns from 2010-2019. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 57*(4), 178-189.https://doi.org/10.1002/joec.12153

Sylvester, A-M., Wary, S., Reilly, J., Erford, B. T., & MacInerney, E. (2021). A metastudy of *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling:* An analysis of publication characteristics from 2000 to 2019. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 60*(2), 101-116. https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12159

Williams, D., Melanson, M., & Erford, B. T. (2021). *The Professional Counselor*: Author and article characteristics from 2011 to 2019. *The Professional Counselor,* 11(1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.15241/dw.11.1.61

Table 1. Issue Categories in JSACP Articles from 2000-2019

Content Topic	2007-2009	2010-2014	2015-2019	Total
Counselor Education/Training	4(26.7%)	16(15.0%)	20(22.2%)	40(18.9%)
Advocacy/Activism	6(40.0%)	21(19.6%)	12(13.3%)	39(18.4%)
Multicultural Issues	1(6.7%)	21(19.6%)	16(17.8%)	38(17.9%)
Causes (homeless, poverty)	0(0.0%)	11(10.3%)	6(6.7%)	17(8.0%)
Community	0(0.0%)	9(8.4%)	7(7.8%)	16(7.5%)
Research/Interventions	1(6.7%)	10(9.3%)	5(5.6%)	16(7.5%)
Youth	0(0.0%)	5(4.7%)	10(11.1%)	15(7.1%)
Immigration	0(0.0%)	6(5.6%)	5(5.6%)	11(5.2%)
Health and Wellness	3(20.0%)	3(2.8%)	4(4.4%)	10(4.7%)
Trauma/Violence	0(0.0%)	5(4.7%)	5(5.6%)	10(4.7%)
Total	15	107	90	212

Note: Many articles were coded to reflect multiple content issues. Thus, totals exceed the number of accepted articles.

Table 2. Proportion of research designs used in JSACP research studies

Time	2007-2009	2010-2014	2015-2019	Total
Qualitative	0(0.0%)	9(56.3%)	12(36.4%)	21(42.9%)
Survey	0(0.0%)	2(12.5%)	11(33.3%)	13(26.5%)
Descriptive	0(0.0%)	2(12.5%)	5(15.2%)	7(14.3%)
Comparative	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	2(6.1%)	3(6.1%)
True/Quasi-experimental	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	1(3.0%)	2(4.1%)
Correlation	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.0%)	1(2.0%)
Test Development	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.0%)	1(2.0%)
Action Research	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	0(0.0%)	1(2.0%)
Totals	0	16	33	49

Table 3. Proportion of various statistical procedures used in JSACP research studies

Time	2007-2009	2010-2014	2015-2019	Total
Thematic Coding	0(0.0%)	5(31.3%)	14(34.1%))	19(33.3%)
Descriptive	0(0.0%)	7(43.8%)	11(33.3%)	18(31.6%)
ANOVA/t	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	4(9.8%)	4(7.0%)
Nonparametric	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	3(7.3%)	4(7.0%)
Correlation	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	4(9.8%)	4(7.0%)
MANOVA	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	2(4.9%)	3(5.3%)
Factor Analysis	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	2(4.9%)	3(5.3%)
Regression	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	1(2.4%)	3(5.3%)
Totals	0	16	41	57