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Journal of Career Development: A 36-Year Content Analysis (1972–2007)
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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to perform a comprehensive analysis of 830 articles published in the Journal of Career Development (JCD) between 1972 and 2007 and provide a chronicle of the publication trends since the journal’s establishment. The analysis focused on six main areas (e.g., authors and institutions, type of article, major constructs/variables, career theories, type of methodologies, and sample characteristics). The results revealed that JCD published articles with a wide range of topics consistent with its mission statement. Recommendations for future publication agenda are presented.
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The area of vocational psychology, which has a primary goal to advance the knowledge pertaining to vocational behaviors through rigorous empirical research,
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has contributed considerably to the field of psychology (Savickas & Baker, 2005). Since 1972, the Journal of Career Development (JCD; formerly known as Journal of Career Education) has documented numerous investigations in vocational psychology. As one of the four major peer-reviewed journals devoted solely to vocational psychology, JCD’s main mission is to provide “professionals in counseling, psychology, education, student personnel, human resources, and business management with the most up-to-date concepts, ideas, and methodology in career development theory, research, and practice” (Journal of Career Development, n.d.). Over the past three decades, JCD has published articles on a variety of topics such as the application of career theories, innovative career counseling techniques, generation of emerging theoretical approaches/advances, career and leisure, interventions and approaches, and career issues in schools/workplace. The impact of JCD on the field is apparent, given its longevity. Nevertheless, a review of the articles or content published in JCD can further determine its overall quality (White & White, 1977), examine development of a research area (Flores et al., 2006; Hill, Nutt, & Jackson, 1994), and provide an objective historical report of the progress and growth of a field (Buboltz, Miller, & Williams, 1999). Such an investigation can also (a) help identify topic areas that editors and scholars deemed important, (b) provide information about the inclusion of participants in research activities, (c) identify methods most commonly used, and (d) offer recommendations for future trends (e.g., Buboltz et al., 1999; Nilsson et al., 2003). Thus, the purpose of the current study was to perform a comprehensive analysis of 830 articles published in JCD and provide a chronicle of the publication trends during the years reviewed since the journal’s establishment.

Several content analysis studies have been conducted on premier, peer-reviewed journals in counseling psychology. For example, Nilsson and colleagues (2003) reviewed the content and sample used in empirical studies published in Professional Psychology: Research and Practice (PPRP) between 1990 and 2000. They discovered that although PPRP was fulfilling its mission by publishing a wide range of topics, the journal might be improved by (a) further addressing multicultural/diversity issues, particularly sexual orientation and religion, (b) including more articles using qualitative methodologies, and (c) including more studies that address clinical issues with more detailed descriptions of the demographic samples. Another example of a content analysis study was conducted on Journal of Counseling Psychology (JCP). Buboltz, Miller, and Williams (1999) analyzed the content of 2,027 articles published in JCP between 1973 and 1998. The results of their study indicated that the publishing pattern of JCP seemed to correspond with its mission statement. They also reported the observed trends (e.g., the use of mixed-gender samples and inclusion of racial/ethnic samples) that JCP was moving toward and provided recommendations for improvement (e.g., diversification of research practices beyond college population). The two aforementioned examples demonstrate the potential contributions of a content analysis study.

Relevant to vocational psychology, Flores and colleagues (2006) conducted a content analysis of the Journal of Vocational Behavior, the Career Development
Quarterly (CDQ), the Journal of Career Assessment (JCA), and JCD between 1969 and 2004 with a specific focus on vocational research related to racial/ethnic minorities. The authors found that more career articles related to racial/ethnic minority were being published but that a relatively small proportion was devoted to the career concerns of racial/ethnic minorities. Although this article provided essential information for scholars in vocational psychology, it was limited in its focus, and other important areas (e.g., methodology, theories, and statistical analysis) were not examined. Therefore, a more comprehensive content analysis can significantly contribute to the literature of vocational psychology.

Given the potential benefits of a content analysis study as previously described, the purpose of this study was to perform a comprehensive analysis of the articles published in JCD between 1972 and 2007. Our goal was to provide a chronicle of publication directions that JCD has taken since its establishment. More specifically, we were interested in (a) reporting the most frequently contributing first authors and their institutions, (b) describing the different types of articles that were most often published, (c) identifying the major constructs/variables investigated, (d) examining the theories most frequently applied, (e) indicating the type of methodologies most often used in empirical studies, and (f) describing the sample characteristics.

Method

Sample

All the articles that were published in the JCD between 1972 and 2007 were compiled for this study. Editorials, introductions, and notes were excluded, which resulted in a final data set of 830 articles. Articles were obtained from electronic databases (e.g., Sage and PsycINFO) and from print copies of the journal.

Researchers

The content analysis research team consisted of six doctoral students in counseling psychology including a 30-year-old, Chinese female; a 44-year-old, Arab American male; a 35-year-old, Polynesian American male; a 27-year-old, Taiwanese female; a 27-year-old, Asian American; and a 26-year-old, Mexican American. The research team was supervised by a faculty member who has extensive experience in conducting content analysis research.

Coding System

A coding system was developed through a series of discussions and consultations among the team members and the faculty supervisor. The coding consisted of six main categories including (a) basic information of each article (e.g., article title, year published, volume, author name, and institution), (b) type of scholarly contributions (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed method, review of literature, and conceptual/
theoretical), (c) major constructs/variables (e.g., career aspiration/goals/choices, career assessment, vocational identity, career developmental stages, and job satisfaction), (d) career theories (e.g., trait and type theories and life/span/development), (e) research methodology for empirical study (e.g., longitudinal study, grounded theory, instrument development, and cluster analysis), and (f) sample characteristics (e.g., sample size, race/ethnicity, gender, and social class).

For the coding of major constructs/variables and career theories, a list of possible coding categories was obtained from the editor of JCD, which is a similar list of keywords for authors to select when they submit a manuscript to JCD. Additional coding words were added when appropriate. For example, categories such as “career/educational resources” and “self-esteem” were added to the list for major constructs/variables. In regard to social class, a list of possible coding was developed based on the recommendation by Liu and colleagues (2004). The social class coding variables included (a) if social class was reported, (b) how it was used in empirical research (e.g., data gathered, analyzed, and discussed), and (c) how it was used in theoretical research (e.g., primary aspect of research). A copy of the coding system is available from the first author.

**Procedure**

Under close supervision by the faculty member, one member of the research team with significant amount of experience in conducting content analyses trained the remaining five members on the coding system. During this training, the six members reviewed and coded several articles collectively and discussed discrepancies to accurately understand the coding system. Each member later coded six additional articles independently. Team members compared their coding and clarified the coding system until a common understanding and consensus was reached. Through this process, written guidelines and coding instructions for the coding system were created to maximize consistency. Open communications between all team members continued throughout the entire coding process to address questions or issues regarding the coding.

To further increase the reliability of coding, the research team was divided into three coding teams of two members. Each coding team was assigned articles that covered a distinct 12-year period. In each coding team, the two members first used an open coding procedure and coded articles independently (Cresswell, 2007). The percentage of agreement between the two members in each of the three coding teams was calculated. The average percentage of agreement across the teams was approximately 92%. Then, the two members compared, discussed, and revised their coding until they mutually agreed for each article. This procedure increased the averaged percentage of agreement to 96%. When consensus could not be reached (i.e., \( n = 34, 4\% \)), a third member reviewed the article and coding to make the final determination. It was observed that the majority of disagreements in coding were related to
major constructs/variables. Finally, all coding was entered into SPSS 17.0 for further statistical analyses.

**Results and Discussion**

**Authors and Institutions**

Due to the large number of articles included in this study, only the tallies of first authors were calculated to understand the productivity of researchers between 1972 and 2007. Among 24 first authors who published more than two articles in *JCD*, the following 6 authors had the most publications: (a) Kenneth B. Hoyt, (b) James Sampson, (c) Harry Drier, (d) Andrew V. Beale, (e) Edwin L. Herr, and (f) Andrew A. Helwig, respectively. It should be noted that most of these authors published their articles prior to 2000 and that most of these articles were nonempirical with an exception of some articles by Helwig.

Regarding institutional productivity, we calculated the frequency of the first authors’ affiliations at the time of their publications. The results suggested that the University of Missouri at Columbia (*n* = 69) ranked the highest among the institutions that produced more than eight articles, followed by Florida State University (*n* = 16), American Institutes for Research (*n* = 12), Kansas State University (*n* = 12), University of Minnesota (*n* = 11), the United States Office of Education and Department of Education (*n* = 11), University of Georgia (*n* = 10), Ohio State University (*n* = 9), North Carolina State University (*n* = 8), Pennsylvania State University (*n* = 8), and Virginia Commonwealth University (*n* = 8). Considering that *JCD* has been housed at the University of Missouri at Columbia as well as its strong emphasis on vocational psychology, this result was expected. Other institutions with high productivity in *JCD* also seem to have a close tie to vocational psychology and/or counseling psychology in general. Overall, these results suggested that the training provided by the aforementioned institutions seem to be consistent with the visions of *JCD*’s editors.

**Type of Articles**

A frequency analysis revealed that a total of 830 articles were published in *JCD* between 1972 and 2007, excluding editorials, introductions to special issues, and notes. To further understand trends and changes, we divided the years reviewed into seven periods of five years (i.e., 1972–1977, 1978–1982, 1983–1987, 1988–1992, 1993–1997, 1998–2002, and 2003–2007). The tallies and percentages of articles associated with each article type by year and across the seven periods are shown in Table 1.

Among the articles, 33.4% (*n* = 278) were empirical studies, consisting of 26.5% quantitative studies (*n* = 220), 5.5% qualitative studies (*n* = 46), and 1.4% mixed method studies (*n* = 12). About 66.6% of the articles (*n* = 552) were nonempirical, including 21.6% conceptual/theoretical (*n* = 179), 19.9% commentaries/reactions (*n* = 165), 11.8% program description/evaluation (*n* = 98), 11.6% review of literature (*n* = 96), 0.2% biography (*n* = 2), and 1.4% other (*n* = 23). Although these results
Table 1. Tallies and Percentage of Articles Associated With Each Type by Year and by Seven Periods of Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Empirical</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
## Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Empirical</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.76</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *JCD* did not publish any articles in 1973. Biography (*n* = 2) was excluded from the table. Dashes indicate years in which no such article type was published. Numbers in boldface indicate summary of each period.
indicate that *JCD* published slightly more nonempirical than empirical articles, a closer visual inspection of Table 1 revealed that *JCD* has increasingly published empirical studies, while decreasing the number of nonempirical articles over time. This significant shift in the type of articles (empirical vs. nonempirical) published in *JCD* between 1972 and 2007 is confirmed by the correlation between percentage of empirical studies and their year of publication in *JCD*, which was .83 (\(p < .001\)).

Among the empirical articles, an overwhelming majority was quantitative in nature. This finding seems consistent with the content analysis of *PPRP* conducted by Nilsson and colleagues (2003). The similarities of these findings may reflect the overall preference for quantitative research in psychology, which was described in the following statement by Nilsson and colleagues: “Although the opinions in the field are changing, one reason for this lack of methodological diversity may be that qualitative research continues to carry the stigma of failing to meet standards of scientific rigor among many scholars” (p. 614). This opinion may in turn influence vocational psychologists, who are providing and receiving training, to feel less competent in conducting qualitative research. Similarly, reviewers of *JCD* may be less familiar with qualitative methodology and review manuscripts using such methods less favorably than those using quantitative methodology. We also found that *JCD* had increased its publications of qualitative studies by 41.3% (\(n = 19\)) and mixed method studies by 50% (\(n = 6\)) after 2000. This finding may be a reflection of an increased attention to qualitative and mixed methods among vocational psychologists and the editorial board of *JCD*.

**Major Constructs/Variables**

The coding procedure resulted in 1,627 units of data (i.e., some articles had more than one major constructs/variables). The coding was organized into eight main themes (i.e., Career Counseling & Interventions, Multicultural Issues, Career Choice Readiness, Career Choice Process, Career Assessment, Career Issues “At Work,” and Career Issues “At School”) per recommendation of an expert in career research. Table 2 presents frequency and percentages of the articles that were classified by their themes. As revealed in Table 2, articles related to the theme, Career Counseling & Interventions, had been published most frequently in *JCD*. In addition, we found that the five most frequently studied constructs/variables were career guidance (20.28%, \(n = 330\)), career programming/interventions (10.08%, \(n = 164\)), cross-cultural issues (7.81%, \(n = 127\)), career counseling process and outcome (5.53%, \(n = 90\)), and career aspirations (3.69%, \(n = 60\)). Most of the articles on career guidance were published prior to 1990s, which coincided with the vocational guidance movement originated by Frank Parson between 1970s and 1980s. In addition, most of these articles were nonempirical with an emphasis on introducing, describing, and/or evaluating various career guidance or educational programs.

In contrast, the five least often studied constructs/variables were academic retention (0.06%, \(n = 1\)), career certainty (0.12%, \(n = 2\)), employee assistance program
(0.12%, n = 2), career issues related to social class (0.18%, n = 3), and academic achievement (0.18%, n = 3). One possible explanation for these findings is that although JCD welcomes such constructs/variables, researchers may perceive other journals (e.g., Journal of Vocational Behavior; Journal of Occupational Psychology; Employment, and Disability; and Journal of Educational Psychology) as more suitable outlets for their studies. Alternatively, this finding may reflect a general lack of attention to those construct/variables in the field of vocational psychology.

Indeed, the results from the content analysis indicated that JCD has addressed a wide range of topics related to career development. In its mission statement, the editorial staff states that the most critical topics covered by JCD include (a) application of career theories, (b) generation of emerging theoretical approaches/advances, and (c) career development across the life span, to name a few others. Our findings suggested that JCD has consistently provided readers with the type of content stated in its mission statement.

### Career Theories

In examining career theories that were applied in the articles published in JCD between 1972 and 2007, the results revealed that 10.24% (n = 85) of the authors...
explicitly reported using specific career theories to guide their articles. We also divided the articles into the seven periods of 5 years to further investigate changes and trend over time in the career theories that were studied in JCD publications. The results revealed that JCD had increasingly published articles that are driven by career theories overtime. The significant change was observed between the period of 1988–1992 and 1993–1997 (i.e., from 8 to 20 articles) as well as 1998–2002 and 2003–2007 (i.e., from 22 to 40 articles).

Among the five major categories of career theories used, Life Span/Development theories were used most frequently (35.29%, n = 30), followed by Social Learning and Cognitive theories (34.12%, n = 29), Trait and Type theories (24.71%, n = 21), Parental Influence theories (4.71%, n = 4), and Career Constructive/Post modern approaches (3.53%, n = 3). Moreover, Super’s Life Span theories (39.29%, n = 11), Social Cognitive Career Theory (89.66%, n = 26), and Holland’s theories of types (76.19%, n = 16) were the most often used subcategorical theories in Life Span/Development theories, Social Learning and Cognitive theories, and Trait and Type theories, respectively. Although these results may represent the long history and popularity of such theories, it should be noted that the number of career theories from multicultural, cross-cultural, and/or international perspectives was extremely limited. Furthermore, in our review, we found it surprising that only about 9.71% (n = 27) of overall empirical studies (n = 278) were driven by any career theories.

**Type of Methodologies**

To identify the type of methodologies most frequently used in the empirical studies published in JCD, additional frequency analyses were conducted. The results revealed that, among quantitative and mixed method studies (n = 232), analysis of variance/multivariate analysis of variance (39.66%, n = 92) was most often used, followed by multiple regression (19.4%, n = 45), Pearson product–moment correlation (18.53%, n = 43), t test (15.95%, n = 37), and chi-square (13.79%, n = 32). Among qualitative studies and mixed method studies (n = 58), interview method was used most frequently (20.69%, n = 12), followed by case study (13.79%, n = 8), grounded theory (10.34%, n = 6), phenomenology (6.9%, n = 4), and constant comparison (5.17%, n = 3). Although it is important that research methods and statistical analyses are selected based on research questions and hypotheses, we had expected to see more advanced analytical techniques (e.g., Structural Equation Modeling, Hierarchical Linear Modeling, and Consensual Qualitative Research) among empirical studies. This trend may be related to changes in the historical opinions of what constitutes suitable research and statistical analyses in the field of psychology.

**Sample Characteristics**

A frequency analysis was used to determine how often demographic variables (i.e., gender, sexual orientation, age, race/ethnicity, and social class) were reported among
the 278 empirical articles. The majority (74.1%, \( n = 206 \)) of the articles reported gender of participants, while most of the articles did not report participants’ sexual orientation (97.1%, \( n = 270 \)). Moreover, 55.4% (\( n = 154 \) ) of the articles reported the age of participants and 48.92% (\( n = 136 \) ) reported participants’ race/ethnicity. With regard to social class, 17.63% (\( n = 49 \) ) of the studies reported relevant information identified by keywords (e.g., socioeconomic status [SES], financial background, prestige, and impoverished). Among these studies, 61.22% (\( n = 30 \) ) gathered, analyzed, and discussed the data associated with the participants’ social class, whereas 12.24% (\( n = 6 \) ) presented the data regarding social class but did not integrate such information into analyses, and 18.37% (\( n = 9 \) ) only mentioned relevant information related to social class. Although age, gender, and race/ethnicity of participants were commonly reported, a significant number of articles did not include this important information that might help readers determine the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, sexual orientation and information related to social class were reported even less frequently.

Additional frequency analyses revealed that only 2.52% (\( n = 7 \) ) of the articles reported using a sample of children/youth, whereas 5.04% (\( n = 14 \) ) used middle school students, 14.39% (\( n = 40 \) ) used high school students, 16.5% (\( n = 46 \) ) used college students, 19.06% (\( n = 53 \) ) used adult employees, and 0.72% (\( n = 2 \) ) used elderly employees. Similarly, 14.75% (\( n = 42 \) ) of empirical studies reported using an international sample exclusively and 0.36% (\( n = 1 \) ) reported that more than half of the study’s sample was international participants. These findings can be explained in two different ways. First, most of the articles published in JCD did not provide their sample characteristics. Therefore, it is possible that the sample compositions were more diverse than we reported because of the absence of sample descriptions in the majority of the articles. However, these results may suggest that there were several underrepresented groups of participants (e.g., Asian American, Latina/o American, Native American, children/youth, middle school students, elderly employees, and international sample). Consequently, additional studies with these underrepresented groups seem warranted.

Finally, the results of the frequency analysis suggested that 62.9% (\( n = 175 \) ) of the studies indicated the geographic location of their participants. Among these articles, the most frequent locations include 25.14% (\( n = 44 \) ) from Midwest, 9.14% (\( n = 16 \) ) from the East, and 4.57% (\( n = 13 \) ) from the South. In addition, 9.71% (\( n = 17 \) ) of the studies included a national sample. Regarding studies using international participants, 10.86% (\( n = 19 \) ) of the articles reported using participants from Asia, 6.86% (\( n = 12 \) ) from Europe, 5.14% (\( n = 9 \) ) from Australia, 2.86% (\( n = 5 \) ) from North America, and 2.29% (\( n = 4 \) ) from Africa. Again, these results reflect an overall need for empirical studies published in JCD to include necessary sample characteristics.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on our review, JCD has published more than 830 articles with a wide range of topics that addressed the needs of society, the field of vocational psychology, and
psychology in general. These topics are consistent with its mission statement, which is to provide “professionals in counseling, psychology, education, student personnel, human resources, and business management with the most up-to-date concepts, ideas, and methodology in career development theory, research, and practice” (JCD, n.d.). To facilitate the continuation of this excellence, we offer the following recommendations. First, we encourage JCD to continue striving to publish a balance between empirical and nonempirical articles as both are of value to professionals in the field. Although an increase in the number of empirical studies was observed over time, the majority of articles in JCD are nonempirical. Furthermore, we suggest empirical studies using qualitative methodologies be targeted for publication. As suggested by Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold (1999), qualitative research can examine individual perspectives in context and offers a complex understanding of people’s lives. Therefore, such an approach would provide valuable information for the readers of JCD, which may not otherwise be achievable.

Additionally, the results from this study revealed that the majority of articles published in JCD did not report using a specific career theory nor did they use advanced methodologies. Based on these results, we recommend that JCD’s editors consider soliciting empirical studies that use contemporary advanced methodologies such as structural equation modeling, hierarchical linear modeling, and consensual qualitative research. We also encourage JCD to publish articles that integrate career theory into their conceptualization. More importantly, similar to the recommendation by Flores and colleagues (2006), we believe that the readers of JCD can significantly benefit from articles that incorporate culture-specific career theory as the population demographics in the United States and across the world continue to change.

We also recommend that JCD promote more comprehensive description of sample characteristics used in each empirical study. For example, although most of the empirical studies reported participants’ gender, age, race/ethnicity, and geographical location, less than 20% provided specific information about the participants’ sexual orientation and social class. In situations where acquiring such information may be difficult and/or sensitive to participants (e.g., study that focuses on high school students), we believe that it is important for researchers to articulate such limitations to allow readers to determine the applicability and generalizability of research findings published in JCD. Furthermore, such information will allow future content analyses to study sample characteristics more accurately. Our sample analysis in this study is limited by the fact that the majority of the articles neglected to fully describe their sample characteristics, which seems consistent with previous studies (e.g., Delgado-Romero, Galvan, Maschino, & Rowland, 2005; Wells, Delgado-Romero, & Shelton, 2010).

Nevertheless, among the articles that provided adequate characteristics of their sample, we discovered that there were several underrepresented groups (i.e., racial/ethnic minority, sexual minority, children/youth, middle school students, elderly employees, and international sample). These findings appear to be
consistent with the examination of career-related articles published across four premier journals in vocational psychology (Flores et al., 2006; Wells et al., 2010). Similarly, several researchers have highlighted the need to include more diverse populations in the studies of vocational psychology (e.g., Miller & Kerlow-Meyers, 2009; Nilsson et al., 2007). Therefore, we recommend that *JCD* consider increasing its inclusiveness of these underrepresented groups. Several strategies could assist *JCD* in realizing this goal such as special focus sections/volumes or a specific call for papers. With respect to international samples, we commend *JCD* for publishing over 40 articles with an emphasis on “the neglected 95%” (Arnett, 2008). We anticipate that *JCD* will continue to attract high-quality studies focusing on vocational psychology beyond the United States, will increase the number of publications with such emphasis, and will become an internationally known publication outlet.

Due to the limitations of this study, the results, implications, and recommendations that we offer should be evaluated with caution. First, it is important to acknowledge that although we implemented multiple ways to maximize the reliability and the objectivity of our coding (e.g., intensive training, written instruction/guideline for coding system, consultation and discussion, open coding, and multiple coders), with a nature of large-scale content analysis, the results from this study may have been influenced by our worldview and biases. It is possible that other researchers might have coded articles somewhat differently. In addition, due to the extensiveness of the coding procedure, it should be noted that our method of calculating the degree of agreement between the two members in each coding team might be limited. Although the degree of agreement was satisfactory, a more accurate assessment (e.g., Cohen’s Kappa) would have been preferable. Another limitation is our method of calculating the productivity of authors and institutions, which was to examine solely the frequency of first authors and their affiliations. This calculation does not take into account the contributions of coauthors and their institutions. An examination of all authors, regardless of authorship position, is likely to produce a broader list of significant contributors to *JCD* over the years. We highly recommend future content analysis studies to use the formula developed by Howard, Cole, and Maxwell (1987) to address this limitation.

In summary, despite the aforementioned limitations, we hope that career counselors and vocational psychologists that submit manuscripts to *JCD* find the results of this study informative. Specifically, we hope that this study stimulates scholars to continue producing empirical studies (particularly qualitative research) that use advanced data analysis techniques, use samples that are underrepresented, and possibly integrate culture-specific career theories into its conceptualization. We also encourage editors to require authors to include a more thorough description of samples and to discuss their results in the context of the samples’ characteristics. Finally, as our findings suggested, *JCD* has fulfilled its mission statement as well as tradition of excellence since 1972.
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