A Scholarly Writing Resource for Counselor Educators and Their Students

Glenn W. Lambie, Shari M. Sias, Keith M. Davis, Gerard Lawson, and Patrick Akos

Graduate students and new faculty in counselor education are often required to contribute scholarly works. However, graduate schools do not always provide appropriate preparation in scholarly writing. This article outlines the basic components of a scholarly manuscript or paper, identifies prevalent writing errors, and offers suggestions for how counselor educators can teach and mentor new faculty and their students.

Dissemination of research findings and sharing clinical perspectives are foundational to counselor education and in enhancing the profession of counseling. According to the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2001), counselor preparation programs should promote the "use of research to improve counseling effectiveness" (Section II, K.8.e.). The *Ethical Standards for School Counselors* of the American School Counselor Association (2004) states that an ethical counseling professional "conducts appropriate research and report findings in a manner consistent with acceptable educational and psychological research practices" (Standard F.1.c). Finally, the American Counseling Association's (ACA; 2005) *ACA Code of Ethics* states that ethical "counselors report the results of any research of professional value. Results that reflect unfavorably on institutions, programs, services, prevailing opinions, or vested interests are not withheld" (Standard G.4.b.). Therefore, scholarly writing is not only an academic exercise but also an ethical and professional responsibility for all counseling professionals.

Often, the achievements of counselor educators working as academicians are assessed through their scholarship activities (Hill, 2004; Magnuson et al., 2003; Ramsey, Cavallaro, Kiselica, & Zila, 2002; Seipel, 2003; Smaby, 1998). Additionally, graduate students in counselor education need to learn about writing and the publication process (Hill, 2004; Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001) because constructing works for publication (i.e., journal articles, books, and conference presentation papers) is an essential part of scholarship and routinely a necessity for graduation (e.g., thesis, dissertation). Given the importance of writing style in the publication process, counseling professionals need preparation in the construction of scholarly works. This is a developmental process, and growth can best be facilitated through mentoring in which new writers work collaboratively with more experienced and published authors.

The components of a manuscript to be submitted for publication are delineated in the American Psychological Association's (APA; 2001) *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (hereinafter referred to as the *Publication Manual*). However, scholarly writing is a "unique genre" (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005, p. 142) with its own norms. Writing is also a personal process, and the judgments of authors, reviewers, and educators often vary (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 2008). Thus, in the field of professional counseling, there are both general standards and personal and contextual components in writing for publication.

Furthermore, getting a manuscript accepted for publication can be challenging. According to McGowan and Scholl (2004), it is rare for a manuscript to be accepted outright on the first submission. Additionally, many manuscripts that might possibly provide significant contributions to the field of counseling are poorly written and may never be published. Scholarly works that do not adhere to APA's (2001) *Publication Manual* are often confusing to read and are thus not likely to be accepted for publication, and their potential contributions are lost. According to Thompson (1995), one's writing style is the foundational ingredient in successful scholarly writing. Therefore, the preparation of a well-written manuscript may be the most critical step in the publication process. Glatthorn and Joyner (2005) noted that "the best scholarly writing is lucid, even to someone not expert in the field" (p. 143).

This article was constructed by counselor educators from several universities who have editorial board experience and have successfully published in ACA-refereed journals. The article is intended to serve as a practical resource for both counselor educators and their students in order to support their scholarly production. Specifically, the article (a) outlines the basic components of a scholarly manuscript or paper, (b) identifies prevalent writing errors, and (c) offers suggestions for counselor educators and their students to improve their scholarly writing.

Glenn W. Lambie, Department of Child, Family & Community Sciences, University of Central Florida; **Shari M. Sias,** Department of Rehabilitation Studies, East Carolina University; **Keith M. Davis,** Department of Human Development & Psychological Counseling, Appalachian State University; **Gerard Lawson,** Counselor Education Program, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; **Patrick Akos,** School Counseling Program, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Glenn W. Lambie, College of Education, Department of Child, Family & Community Sciences, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816-1250 (e-mail: glambie@mail.ucf.edu).

Basic Components of Scholarly Work

There are some general guiding principles for the production of scholarly works. First, the purpose of a research review is to analyze and synthesize the most relevant and meaningful information about a chosen topic. Therefore, it is necessary to be both thorough and selective in the literature review process. Writers (referring to new authors) must first evaluate the most current literature to increase their understanding of the counseling issue investigated. Additionally, prior to constructing a scholarly manuscript/paper, writers must learn some fundamental writing guidelines, including appropriate citing and appropriate organization (typically the title page, abstract, introduction [rationale and literature review], discussion [conclusion, limitations, and implications], and references). The following section provides an orientation to these components of scholarly written works.

Appropriate Citation

Writers need to support their positions, statements, and arguments with appropriate citations. According to Glatthorn and Joyner (2005), one mark of scholarly writing is that assertions are documented and supported; that is, the writer provides evidence for his or her statements or claims that may be "reasonably challenged" (p. 145). In most cases, it is best to use only the most current references (less than 10 years old) and landmark "older" articles and writings (e.g., a theorist's seminal publication). McGowan and Scholl (2004) suggested that most cited references be published within the prior 5 years. Additionally, writers should reference rigorous academic journals (peer-reviewed) and avoid heavy reliance on the popular press and textbooks. Furthermore, writers should avoid secondary sources of information and use the original work whenever possible. Writers should use direct quotations sparingly.

Many new writers incorrectly cite their references. When citing another author's(s') work, use only his or her (their) last name(s). It is not necessary to refer to the title of the publication, except in the reference section of the paper. Also, writers need to cite only sources they have personally reviewed. If the writer refers to information cited in a secondary source, he or she should note the original work and identify that he or she reviewed the information in a secondary source (Szuchman, 2008). An example of this citation would be "Rogers, as cited in Corey (2004)." However, as noted earlier, citing secondary sources should be limited. Additionally, all cited works need to be appropriately referenced. A common problem found in manuscripts and student papers is inconsistencies between the works cited in the text of the paper and those listed in the reference section. Therefore, it is important for writers to review and confirm the congruence between their citations and references.

Structural Organization

Traditional scholarly writing usually adheres to a standard organizational configuration, although the components of a research report may vary depending on the journal. The typical model found in counseling journals includes (a) a title page, (b) an abstract page, (c) an introduction (rationale and a review of the literature), (d) a Method (research) section (Participants [Sample], Measures [Instrumentation or Variables], Procedure, and Design [Research Design and Data Analysis]), (e) a Results (Findings) section, (f) a Discussion (Conclusion, Limitations, and Implications) section, and (g) References. Reviewing the Method and Results sections of a scholarly manuscript is beyond the scope of this article. It is recommended that writers consult Choudhuri, Glauser, and Peregoy (2004); Creswell (2003, 2006); and Janesick (2004) on qualitative research designs and Heppner and Heppner (2003); Gay and Airasian (2005); Creswell (2003); and Heppner et al. (2008) on quantitative research designs. The following subsections provide an overview of the other five elements of a scholarly manuscript/paper.

Title Page

The title page contains (a) the title of the work, (b) the writer's(s') full name(s), (c) his or her (their) institutional affiliation, (d) the paper's page header, and (e) the running head. The title should provide a clear orientation to the central idea of the paper (identifying primary constructs and variables) and contain 10 to 12 words. The paper's page header should contain "the first two or three words of the title" (Szuchman, 2008, p. 123) followed by the page number. The running head is an abbreviated title that should not exceed 50 characters. For additional clarifications of the title page, writers should consult the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001, pp. 10–12).

Abstract

Following the title, the abstract is often the first and most frequently read section of a paper. It should be a clear and concise summary of the work that provides readers with a brief orientation to the paper. According to APA (2001), an abstract should not exceed 120 words, and "a well-prepared abstract can be the most important paragraph" of a scholarly work (p. 12). The word *Abstract* should be centered on the top of the page and followed by a nonindented, single paragraph (many peer-reviewed journals also require writers to include the paper's title on the abstract page). Suggestions for constructing an abstract include (a) describe clearly and concisely the paper's purpose, findings, and implications; (b) write in the active voice; (c) ensure that the abstract is clear and understandable and can stand alone; and (d) incorporate as many descriptive words as possible, to assist individuals conducting a keyword search to find the paper (Szuchman, 2008). Many writers find writing a strong abstract a challenging task (Heppner et al., 2008); additional clarifications of the abstract page can be found in the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001, pp. 12–15).

Introduction

The introduction should set the stage for the paper and clearly state a purpose. It should emphasize the writer's(s') views of

the topic and include citations from the literature to support his or her (their) claims. Necessary elements include (a) an orientation to the specific problem investigated or reviewed, (b) the purpose of the paper, (c) a summative review of the pertinent literature, (d) possible theoretical implications, (e) clarification and definition of central variables and concepts, and (f) the rationale for the paper (APA, 2001; Heppner et al., 2008; Pyrczak & Bruce, 2007; Szuchman, 2008). Also, the introduction may contain a brief orientation to the central objectives of the paper (e.g., purpose statement). The introduction section should not use *Introduction* as a heading or subheading (APA, 2001).

Rationale. The rationale establishes the importance of the problem investigated. Sufficient justification must be given for its importance or worth (either theoretical or practical). According to Heppner et al. (2008), "the framework for the rationale is built through the logical interconnectedness of empirical results and theory that lead to a critical, unanswered research question" (p. 521). Arguments supporting the rationale include data on the prevalence and severity of the problem, as well as its potential consequences (e.g., prevalence and severity of child abuse, potential consequences of abuse). It may be helpful for new writers to review journal articles on a given subject and evaluate if and how other authors clearly conveyed the importance of the research topic.

Literature review. The literature review is foundational to a scholarly production. According to Choudhuri et al. (2004), "review of the literature creates an organizing component for your manuscript and provides the reader with a focal point" (p. 444). However, APA (2001) stipulates that a writer should present the pertinent literature but not incorporate an "exhaustive historical review" (p. 16). The comprehensiveness and depth of the literature review may vary depending on the type of scholarly production (e.g., a thesis and dissertation will often have an extensive review of the literature). Still, the choice of the studies to include in a review of the literature should always be purposeful.

When reviewing the literature, writers should examine the most relevant and current studies on their topic. Studies that are closely related to the new author's writing (same principal variables) should be described in greater depth and detail than the other studies reviewed. Thus, one paragraph in the review of the literature may describe three or four studies (generally related to the topic), whereas another paragraph may detail the qualities of a single study (closely related to the topic). It is recommended that writers present significant aspects of the studies reviewed, not every detail. Typically, the relevant information from another study should include its findings and conclusions; however, in some cases, its methodology and design features also need to be included.

There are some general guidelines for constructing a review of the literature. First, it is important that literature reviews remain opinion free. Second, the research reviewed has already been conducted, and, thus, the review should be written in the past tense (e.g., "suggested") or present perfect (e.g., "have suggested"). Third, research supports or challenges a theory or hypothesis; it never "proves" one. Suggested language for delineating the findings or conclusions of other studies includes such terms as *found, reported, demonstrated, concluded, suggested,* and *indicated.* Finally, a well-developed review of the literature clearly and logically supports the purpose of the paper.

Discussion

APA (2001) provides less standardized structural guides for the Discussion section, offering writers some flexibility in the development of their manuscript. The following are suggested guidelines for writers, not standardized actions. (We suggest that those writing for publication should review journal submission requirements and that students constructing a dissertation or thesis should consult with their chair to receive additional clarification.) Generally, the Discussion should summarize the findings and bring closure to the purpose stated in the introduction section. In this section of the paper, the writer evaluates, qualifies, offers interpretations, and draws inferences from the research findings or literature reviewed (APA, 2001). Additionally, the Discussion should include (a) a discussion of whether the results of the study or the literature reviewed answer the research questions and/or support the hypotheses, (b) a logical explanation of the study's or reviewed literature's findings, (c) a statement of potential limitations to the study, and (d) possible implications for the field.

The beginning of the Discussion section indicates specifically which research questions were answered or which hypotheses were supported by the data (APA, 2001; Heppner et al., 2008; Szuchman, 2008). Generally, research questions and hypotheses are based on theoretical constructs; therefore, once the writer has discussed the findings in relation to the research questions or hypotheses, the writer should draw logical inferences relating the findings to theory.

Conclusion. According to Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold (1999), in the Conclusion component of the Discussion, the writer answers the question, "What conclusions can be reached from the results?" (p. 526). In this section, the writer is able to be more "independent" and "creative." The writer reflects on possible explanations for the findings and ties the interpretations to the literature reviewed in the introduction (plausible relationship). However, if findings are unexpected, the writer may introduce new literature in the Conclusion to support his or her interpretation of the findings. It might be useful for writers to speculate on reasonable postulations for the findings based on research design, sampling, psychometric limitations, or other aspects of the study.

Limitations. Szuchman (2008) referred to the Limitations section of the paper as the "confessional" (p. 87). It is important to recognize that there are no perfect studies; all studies have limitations. However, this is not to imply that writers should focus on the faults or weaknesses of a study;

rather, they need to acknowledge both the study's limitations and contributions. It is suggested that writers be direct about possible limitations and offer ways in which the findings may be interpreted despite the limitations (Heppner et al., 2008).

Implications. Most scholarly journals require an "implications for the field" component in manuscripts submitted for publication. The final section of the Discussion should explain and clarify the significance of the findings (APA, 2001), describing the "logical consequences and the larger significance of the outcome" (Szuchman, 2008, p. 92) of the findings. More specifically, the writer should say what the findings practically and pragmatically mean to readers. It is important that writers logically infer their implications for the field from the study's findings. The Implications section should be written in the present tense (what the reader should "do" based on the findings), and writers may want to include suggestions for future research.

References

Often, the References section of student papers and manuscripts submitted for publication has inaccuracies (K. Hughey, personal communication, December 8, 2004; McGowan & Scholl, 2004). In the References, the writer should provide references for all sources cited in the paper. With the information presented in the References, readers should be able to retrieve each source cited by the author. It is suggested that writers review their papers to ensure congruence between works cited in the text and those found in the References section (agreement in spelling and dates). To appropriately construct text citations and the References, it is strongly suggested that writers consistently refer to the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001, pp. 207–281).

Prevalent Writing Errors

In developing one's scholarly writing skills, it is important to learn to avoid common technical writing errors. We have solicited feedback from editors and counselor educators from several universities on common writing inaccuracies found in counseling students' research papers and manuscripts submitted for publication. The four most common writing errors identified were (a) poor organization and continuity; (b) lack of sufficient support for statements and claims made with appropriate citations and references; (c) syntax, grammar, and punctuation problems; and (d) lack of connection between the implications for the field and the research and theory reviewed or research results.

Poor Organization and Continuity

Often, new writers find it difficult to structure and sequence their papers. According to Kline and Farrell (2005), writers who do not "use effective transitional language do not lead readers understandably from one idea to another. Thus, the ideas presented appear to lack logical connections" (p. 169). Transitional terms and phrases serve to link one paragraph and section of the paper to another and provide a logical sequence (Szuchman, 2008). Generally, transitional phrases are used at the beginning and end of a paragraph. The beginning transitional language introduces the content of the new paragraph, whereas the ending transitional wording brings the paragraph to a conclusion, linking the content of the paragraph to the whole paper. Transitional terms that help connect paragraphs and sentences (thoughts) include *consequently; furthermore; nevertheless; first, . . . , second, . . . ,* and *third, . . . ; therefore; thus; similarly; however;* and *additionally.*

Lack of Sufficient Support for Claims Made With Appropriate Citations and References

Just as transitional terms and phases improve the readability of a paper, so does the integration of information from a number of sources. New writers often struggle to organize and integrate supportive information and citations into their papers. Writings that analyze and effectively incorporate information from multiple sources are more interesting than papers that simply paraphrase or quote information and place citations at the end of each paragraph (Polnac, Grant, & Cameron, 1999). The writer's task is to include both personal observations and views and sources that support these observations and views. Sources may be included within the sentence structure, for example, "According to Smith (2005), reading improves one's writing skills" or at the end of a sentence, for example, "Reading improves one's writing skills (Smith, 2005)." In either case, the writer is responsible for accurately quoting or paraphrasing the work of others.

Direct quotations are the exact copying of another's work (Joseph, 1999). As stated earlier, it is best to use direct quotations in moderation. Ruszkiewicz, Walker, and Pemberton (2006) listed seven reasons for using quotations:

1. To focus on a particularly well stated key idea in a source
2. To show what others think about a subject—either experts, people involved with the issue, or the general public
3. To give credence to important facts or concepts
4. To add color, power or character to your argument or report
5. To clarify a difficult or contested point
6. To demonstrate the complexity of an issue
7. To emphasize a point. (p. 138)

When incorporating past research, paraphrasing is preferred. Paraphrasing is the restating, in one's own words, the research findings or views of others. Lester and Lester (1999) suggested the following guidelines for paraphrasing:

> (a) Rewrite the original in about the same number of words, (b) provide an in-text citation to the source, (c) retain exceptional words or phases from the original by enclosing them within quotation marks, and (d) preserve the tone of the original by suggesting moods of satire, humor, doubt and so on. (p. 69)

New writers often believe that simply changing or rearranging the order of a few words or key phases is paraphrasing. If the passage closely resembles the original work in wording or phrasing or fails to cite the original source, it is actually plagiarism. Polnac et al. (1999) defined plagiarism as "taking the words of another writer and presenting them as your own" (p. 298). The best way for new writers to avoid plagiarism is to learn appropriate citation and to practice paraphrasing the writings of others. Counselor educators can assist in this process by reviewing with students the APA (2001) guidelines for citing sources and by developing classroom activities in which students paraphrase a short passage and receive feedback from the professor concerning the appropriateness of the restatement and citation.

Syntax, Grammar, and Punctuation Problems

Poor grammar and usage errors are common in both student papers and manuscripts submitted for publication. Although there are some hard-and-fast rules, it is worth noting that clarity of expression is the key to strong writing. Errors commonly found in new authors' writing include (a) use of the passive rather than the active voice, (b) lack of subject–verb agreement, (c) punctuation inaccuracies, and (d) unnecessary wordiness. The following highlights some of these errors.

Often, students and new writers struggle to understand one of the "trickier" grammatical concepts: active versus passive voice. Generally speaking, writing in the active voice means putting the subject of the sentence (the actor) first, then a verb phrase to describe the action, followed by the object of the verb (the person or object being acted on). Active voice clearly identifies who acted, what the action was, and who received the action. The passive voice, in contrast, generally puts the object first and often leaves the subject out completely, as in the well-known example of the passive voice, "Mistakes were made." When the actor does not appear until later in the sentence, or the actor is absent, the reader must make assumptions about "who did what." Clues to the appearance of the passive voice include the preposition *by*, a verb clause that ends in *n* or *en*, and the word *being* as part of the verb clause ("The cake was *being* eaten by the professor"). There are times when the passive voice is acceptable or even preferred; however, in scholarly writing, where clarity is paramount, the passive voice should be avoided when possible. For additional clarification of the active and passive voice, it is suggested that writers consult the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001, pp. 41–44).

A second common problem for many writers is subject–verb agreement. Singular nouns require singular verbs, and plural nouns require plural verbs. Most often, this is straightforward, but there are situations where it can be complicated. Some collective nouns (e.g., *faculty, clergy, team,* or *family*) refer to a group of people but can be singular or plural based on the context. When the context of the sentence refers to the members of the group as individuals, treat the noun as plural. However, if the action of the sentence involves the group as a collective whole, treat it as singular. Also, remember that in scholarly writing, the noun *data* is almost always plural. Another area that may be unclear for writers is the use of the conjunctions between one plural and one singular noun. In this case, the verb should match the noun closest to it.

There are many rules for punctuation, but following some basic guidelines will go a long way toward avoiding inaccuracies. Periods end sentences or signify an abbreviated word. They also serve a specific function in references and numerical expressions. Commas are most often used to suggest a pause in the flow of a sentence, to separate elements in a list or series (of three or more elements), to set off dates within a sentence, and to set a nonessential phrase apart from the rest of a sentence. Semicolons act as a "hard" comma or a "soft" period. Semicolons can connect two related clauses that do not have a conjunction (*and, but, or, etc.*), and they are also used to separate elements of a list that contains internal commas in subgroups ("The switches were sequentially placed in positions 1, 1, 1; 1, 1, 2; 1, 1, 3; 1, 2, 1; . . ."). Finally, the colon is used (a) to separate and introduce an expansion of a certain idea, (b) to indicate a ratio, and (c) between place of publication and publisher in the reference section. When the writer introduces an issue with a complete sentence, a colon is used to expand the thought or give an example (e.g., "This format allows for multiple responses: Participants can rate their experience along a scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*"). It is important to note that there is only one space after most punctuation (APA, 2001).

Clarity of expression is a final area of writing style that requires a few comments. The *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001) suggests that writers work from an outline and ask colleagues to review their work. Having colleagues review a writer's work is beneficial due to the more objective perspective on the writing. Writers are also encouraged to set a first draft aside for a few days before coming back to revise it. This allows for some distance and a new perspective on the writing. Following grammatical guidelines helps to keep writing clear, but writers must also remember that in scholarly writing, more is not always better. More words, more syllables, more punctuation often mean more work for the reader. It is easy for readers to get bogged down in writing that is heavy with technical or specialized jargon. Writers should strive to be succinct and precise and to say what is intended clearly, directly, and economically. The rules and guidelines for good writing cannot be covered here fully, but the problem areas highlighted earlier are common and are relatively easy to address.

Lack of Connection Between Implications for the Field, Research, and Theory Reviewed

According to Davis and Sink (2001), a common deficit in scholarly writing is the lack of clear implications for the daily practice of counselors and/or counselor education preparation. Research findings that contribute to the profession should provide theoretical direction for future researchers and practitioners. For example, even with statistically nonsignificant

findings or a small effect size, writers should provide implications for new lines of research, potential moderating variables, or research design considerations for future studies.

Often, the Implications section is the last chance for writers to emphasize the importance and practicality of their findings. Pyrczak and Bruce (2007) suggested that the Implications section is the place to state what action needs to be taken as a result of the research findings. Clear examples of how findings can affect practice should be given. Thus, a counselor or counselor educator should understand how to operationalize and apply each finding in his or her practice or preparation program.

Suggestions for Counselor Educators and Students

Becoming a strong scholarly writer is a purposeful and developmental process requiring a supportive and nurturing environment. The following suggestions are offered to counselor educators to support the development of their students' scholarly writing.

The Four Cs for Writing Assignments

Developmentally, individuals beginning a new task require explicit and concrete guidance to support their acquisition of new skills and abilities. Therefore, the first suggestion is for counselor educators to use the four Cs (*concreteness, clarity, consistency,* and *continuity*) in their writing assignments. Concreteness refers to new writers' need for specific and tangible directions related to assigned scholarly writing activities. Clarity refers to counselor educators providing students with detailed directions that delineate the required components of a given assignment. For example, to support new writers' need for concreteness and clarity, counselor educators should construct clear writing guidelines (or a writing rubric) for students' scholarly writing assignments (an example of scholarly writing guidelines is presented in the Appendix). Consistency refers to faculty remaining firm to the guidelines (writing rubric) they establish. Finally, continuity is a programmatic and/or departmental issue: All departmental faculty members should adhere to similar writing guidelines to provide stability for their students. Then, students will receive a consistent departmental "message" in the development of their scholarly writing rather than mixed messages, where one faculty member expresses one opinion on scholarly productions and another instructor requires different structural and technical guidelines for writing assignments. This is not to suggest that faculty give up their academic freedom, but simply to recommend that when working with students on the development of their scholarly writing, they should adhere to APA (2001) structural and technical guidelines.

Allocating Class Time

Scholarship is a significant aspect of counselor education training, and it requires a purposeful effort and supportive climate. Consequently, counselor educators should allocate class time to supporting their students' improvement in writing. Often, faculty members talk of the importance of writing and allocate a significant portion of a student's grade to a written assignment, but they do not designate class time for supporting the writing process. If counselor educators believe writing is an essential component of their course, they should devote time and energy to supporting their students' writing by offering writing workshops, requiring rough drafts, and providing samples of well-constructed work. For example, prior to writing a research paper, students may be given a "practice passage" to read and paraphrase. Review and discussion of such assignments will strengthen student writing and decrease the likelihood of plagiarism. Additionally, most universities have a writing center available to students that can be used to supplement the instructor's scholarly writing endeavors.

Supporting the Process Approach to Scholarly Writing

Scholarly writing is a developmental process that needs to be supported and nurtured. Scott (2001) presented an approach to support writers' scholarly work that attempts to "balance both the process and the production of writing" (p. 57). Writers typically follow these general steps: (a) thinking and planning ("brainstorming" and predrafting), (b) constructing or composing the writing, and (c) revising and editing their work. According to Scott, a common mistake for many writers is to not allocate enough time to the planning and revising stages, while allotting too much time and energy to the construction phrase. This approach suggests that successful writers attribute close to 50% of their time and energy to editing and revising and contribute only approximately 20% of their writing time to the construction. Thus, counselor educators should structure their writing assignments to support and reinforce the importance of editing.

Scholarly writing is a personal process within a structured framework. Writers approach the writing process differently (often based on their cognitive style, aptitudes, and training). Thus, there is no one "correct" approach to scholarly writing; rather, it is a process through which new writers learn to develop their unique and personal style within general structures. It is recommended that counselor educators be flexible in supporting students' personal writing styles and appreciate the various approaches they may take to achieve their goal. Additionally, scholarly writing requires a great amount of time and energy, and writers should have a "passion" for the subject they are writing about. Hence, counselor educators should offer students a choice of research and/or writing topics. Then, students can choose to write on issues they have an intrinsic motivation ("a passion") to learn more about, making the process more personal; pleasant; and, ideally, more productive.

Conclusion

Scholarly writing is a central component of the work of counselor educators and students in counselor preparation programs, and we

have proposed some guidelines for the preparation, development, and construction of scholarly works. Specifically, we have outlined the basic components of a scholarly paper or manuscript, identified prevalent writing errors, and offered suggestions to both counselor educators and their students to help improve their scholarly endeavors. Scholarly writing involves a complex interaction of multiple variables, that is, continuity of thought, appropriate support of challengeable claims, articulation of the logical relationships between all sections of the writing, adherence to APA (2001) structural and technical guidelines, and readability and practicality. To develop their writing, students and new professionals require support and tangible direction. As they develop their scholarly writing abilities, they will also be developing both their cognition and their ability to support professional practice and advocate for the profession based on empirical research.

We view scholarly writing as an opportunity for new writers (i.e., students and newer junior faculty) to work collaboratively with more experienced and published authors as part of a purposeful and developmental mentoring process. Through such mentoring, less-experienced writers not only learn the central elements of scholarly writing, as outlined by the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001), but, more important, may begin to contribute valuable research findings to the profession and support the mission of professional organizations and accrediting bodies within the counseling profession.

References

American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA code of ethics.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2004). *Ethical standards for school counselors.* Alexandra, VA: Author.

Choudhuri, D., Glauser, A., & Peregoy, J. (2004). Guidelines for writing a qualitative manuscript for the *Journal of Counseling & Development. Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 443–446.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2001). *The CACREP accreditation manual.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, K. M., & Sink, C. A. (2001). Navigating the publication process: II. Further recommendations for prospective contributors. *Professional School Counseling, 5,* 56–62.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2005). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Joyner, R. L. (2005). *Writing the winning dissertation: A step-by-step guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heppner, P. P., & Heppner, M. J. (2003). *Writing and publishing your thesis, dissertation, and research: A guide for students in the helping professions.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Heppner, P. P., Kivlighan, D. M., Jr., & Wampold, B. E. (1999). *Research design in counseling* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Heppner, P. P., Kivlighan, D. M., Jr., & Wampold, B. E. (2008). *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenge experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 4,* 135–146.

Janesick, V. J. (2004). "*Stretching" exercises for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Joseph, N. (1999). *Research writing: Using traditional and electronic sources.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lester, J. D., & Lester, J. D., Jr. (1999). *The essential guide to writing research papers.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Kline, W. B., & Farrell, C. A. (2005). Recurring manuscript problems: Recommendations for writing, training, and research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44,* 166–174.

Magnuson, S., Davis, K. M., Christensen, T. M., Duy, D. Y., Glass, J. S., Portman, T., et al. (2003). How entry-level assistant professors master the art and science of successful scholarship. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 42,* 209–222.

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Haberstroh, S. (2001). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their preparation and their induction. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40,* 220–229.

McGowan, A. S., & Scholl, M. B. (2004). Counsel from a former editor and the current editor: Successful research and writing for publication in *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development. Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 43,* 4–15.

Polnac, L., Grant, L., & Cameron, T. (1999). *Common sense: A handbook and guide for writers.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pyrczak, F., & Bruce, R. R. (2007). *Writing empirical research reports: A basic guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

Ramsey, M., Cavallaro, M., Kiselica, M., & Zila, L. (2002). Scholarly productivity redefined in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42,* 40–58.

Ruszkiewicz, J., Walker, J. R., & Pemberton, M. A. (2006). *Bookmarks: A guide to research and writing* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Scott, J. C. (2001). Using the process approach to improve scholarly writing. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 43,* 57–66.

Seipel, M. M. O. (2003). Assessing publication for tenure. *Journal of Social Work Education, 39,* 79–88.

Smaby, M. H. (1998). Publishing in scholarly journals: Part I. Is it an attitude or technique? It's an attitude. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37,* 218–223.

Szuchman, L. T. (2008). *Writing with style: APA style made easy* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomas Learning.

Thompson, B. (1995). Publishing your research results: Some suggestions and counsel. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73,* 342–345.

APPENDIX

Example of Scholarly Writing Guidelines

Title page and Abstract
It is suggested that students consult the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA; 2001, pp. 10–15).

Introduction
The introduction should provide the following: (a) orientation to research "issue," (b) clear statement of the purpose of the paper, (c) succinct presentation to the central objective of the paper, (d) a summative review of current pertinent literature, (e) possible theoretical implications, (f) clarification and definition of central variables and concepts, and (g) a rationale supporting the importance and need for the paper.

Discussion
The Discussion should provide the following: (a) a summarization of the research or reviewed research studies' findings, (b) a review bringing closure to objectives stated in the introduction, (c) a presentation of the results of the study (reviewed literature) supporting the research questions and/or hypotheses, (d) a logical explanation for the study's (reviewed literature's) findings, (e) a statement of potential limitations, and (f) implications for the field.

References
It is suggested that students consult the *Publication Manual* (APA, 2001, pp. 215–281).

Overall flow and continuity of the paper
Does the paper transition smoothly, and is there a logical connection between the reviewed literature, research findings, and author's conclusion?

Overall clarity and readability of the paper
Are there syntax, grammar, and punctuation errors impeding the readability of the paper?

Overall adherence to the Publication Manual *(APA, 2001) formatting and technical guidelines*