

Researchers have addressed many clinician and client attributes in relation to the accuracy of judgments made by mental health professionals. One such moderator addressed clinicians' judgment accuracy in relation to experience. Contrary to what many clinicians expect, a number of studies have failed to demonstrate a positive correlation between judgment accuracy and experience (e.g., Berman & Berman, 1984; Ruscio & Stern, 2005; Schinka & Sines, 1974). In Spengler et al. (2009), the relationship between judgment accuracy and experience was assessed via a large-scale meta-analysis that examined studies of clinical judgment and experience from 1970 to 1996. The result was a small but reliable, homogeneous effect demonstrating a positive correlation between judgment accuracy and experience. The Spengler et al. meta-analysis found relatively few significant moderator effects influencing the experience-accuracy effect, namely the type of judgment made by clinicians, the criterion validity of accuracy measures used, and publication source. In the present study, results from clinical judgment and experience studies from 1997 to 2010 were combined in a meta-analysis. An update and extension allowed for cross-validation of the Spengler et al. meta-analysis with more recent research as well as an exploration of additional moderator variables, such as profession type and inclusion of non-mental health participants. The overall effect was .16, with a 95 percent confidence interval that was above zero (CI = .05 to .26). This overall effect indicated experience significantly impacted judgment accuracy, consistent with expectations. The overall effect was shown to be heterogeneous, indicating the *Q* statistic was sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis regarding homogeneity of the effect size distribution. Exploratory analyses revealed the presence of two significant moderator variables, namely judgment type and publication source. Limitations included lack of variability of judgment type and difficulty with or complete inability to assess other potential moderators of interest, such as feedback and utilization of test protocols for the stimulus measure. Other limitations included utilization of a less exhaustive search strategy, in which some relevant studies may have been missed. Despite limitations, the results of the present meta-analysis largely replicated those of the Spengler et al. meta-analysis.