**English for Counselor Education Purposes:
Research Article Length, Design, and Publishing Impact Elements of This Subdialect**

April B. LaGue¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5187-3253>

Abraham Cazares-Cervantes¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6785-4439>

Cass Dykeman¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7708-1409>

Arien K. Muzacz¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9688-5613>

Allison List¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7160-1394>

¹Oregon State University

Author Note

This authors' preprint contains an empirical study intended for submission to a peer reviewed journal.

All comments are welcome and can be directed to the third author at dykemanc@oregonstate.edu

Abstract

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) represents a specialized form of English found in academic journals. A subdialect of this form of English is English for Counselor Education Purposes (ECEP). Little is known on the relationship between ECEP and published counselor education journal articles. The aim of this study was to close this gap by detailing word count, research method, and journal impact factors in this subdialect. Differences were assessed using both Frequentist and Bayesian statistics so the strength of both the null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis outcomes became known. Very strong evidence for differences in word count were observed between research methods ($BF_{10} = 309.07$). Moderate evidence for no differences in word count was observed between the high and low impact factor categories ($BF_{01} = 4.90$). An absence of evidence was encountered with the examination of the relationship between design and impact factor registering at the anecdotal level ($BF_{10} = .69$ and its inverse $BF_{01} = 1.45$). This study represents a start at defining the nature of ECEP. It is hope that that information contained herewith can assist counselors seeking to write for publication within academic subdialect.

Keywords: English for Academic Purposes, EAP, English for Counselor Education Purposes, ECEP, Counselor Education, corpus linguistics, counseling, academic writing, Frequentist statistics, Bayesian statistics, JASP, Bayes Factor, BF, impact factor, research design

English for Counselor Education Purposes:

Research Article Length, Design, and Publishing Impact Elements of This Subdialect

Publish or perish! Counselor educators are not immune from this long-established reality in higher education. Despite this pressing reality and the abundance of academic journals that are published yearly, little is known about the *nature* of writing in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) subdialect known as English for Counselor Education Purposes (ECEP). As such, counselor educators and their students are adrift in a sea of words with no sextant or global positioning devices. Moreover, such isolation separates counselor educators from the broader academic community. Counselor educators need this direction to increase their chances of getting published.

The purpose of the present research effort is twofold. First, even though all formal communication about research in Counselor Education occurs via the specialized form of English, known as English for Counselor Education Purposes, no research exists on fundamental elements in counselor education publications such as article length, design, and impact. Second, gap spotting is a necessary but not sufficient part of a persuasive rationale for a research study. A study must also have the potential to disrupt current practice (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011; Sandberg & Alvesson, 2011). The present study was designed to produce results that could potentially disrupt how academic writing is conceived of and taught in Counselor Education by informing counselor educators how to strengthen their academic writing and to inform them on how academic writing is taught in counselor education programs.

In order to align the literature review to the variables contained in the research questions, six topics explored. These topics were: (1) what is corpus linguistics, (2) key definitions, (3) research using corpus linguistics in fields related to counselor education, (4) word count differences between qualitative and quantitative research articles, (5) article length differences between journal impact rankings, and (6) advantages of a Bayesian versus frequentist analysis. After these topics are discussed, the research questions that guided the present study will be detailed.

To gain insight on ECEP, the present study employs methods from the field of Corpus Linguistics. Corpus Linguistics is designed to study language based upon real-life usage in context (Baker et al., 2006). This method has been used before with counseling research. For example, Perez-Rosas et al. (2019) used Corpus Linguistics methods to examine differences between high-quality and low-quality counseling conversations. Of interest to counselor educators, corpus linguistics can be a way to study practices in academic writing which can assist writers to know norms in their field (e.g., Bajwa et al., 2019). In sum, Corpus Linguistics represent

There are key terms critical for counselor educators to understand when reading research using Corpus Linguistics methods. These terms are: *corpus*, *register*, *token*, and *type*. *Corpus* refers to “a collection of pieces of language text in electronic form, selected according to external criteria to represent, as far as possible, a language or language variety as a source of data for linguistic research” (Sinclair, 2005, p. 16). *Register* denotes any variety of textual or spoken communication associated with a configuration of situational characteristics and purposes (Biber & Conrad, 2005). In the present study, the register is *Academic Prose* and the subregister is *Research in Counselor Education Journals*. *Token* is the term assigned to each individual word in a corpus. *Type* indicates each unique word form. Take this part of Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address (1863) as an example:

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

This quote contains 73 tokens and 53 types. The most frequent type was “that” with a count of six.

Research in corpus linguistics from fields related to counselor education (i.e., education, social work, counseling psychology, psychiatry) has shown the benefits of Corpus Linguistics in preparing teacher educators to train preservice teachers in language education (Ebrahimi & Faghih, 2017) and in

helping counselor trainees examine their own use of language in counseling sessions (Perez-Rosas et al., 2019). Ebrahimi and Faghih (2017) cited earlier research where training in Corpus Linguistics was offered to student teachers and inservice teachers, as well as graduate students in fields like language and English, prompting creative applications of Corpus Linguistics tools and the creation of corpuses by students as part of their final projects. In their own qualitative study of the experiences of 32 preservice teachers in two introductory-level online courses in Corpus Linguistics, Ebrahimi and Faghih (2017) found that the preservice teachers employed tools like Lextutor and AntConc with publicly available Corpus Linguistics databases like the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA; Davies 2008). Participants touted the ability of these tools to create graphical maps more effective for visual learners and the insight into their students' writing that they gained.

There is limited information on article word count differences between qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative research methods are known for "thick description" and thus, in theory, the word count of such manuscripts should exceed quantitative research manuscripts. However, this emphasis on thick description runs against the page length/word length guidelines held by most journals. The scant research on article length for qualitative research suggests authors work within journal guidelines (Weiner et al., 2011). Most author guidelines for counselor education journals do not distinguish word/page limitations between methods (e.g., *Career Development Quarter*, 2020; *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 2020). An exception encountered was found in *Professional School Counseling* (2020). The APA's Publications and Communications Board Task Force Report on qualitative manuscripts urged an additional 10 pages beyond current page limitations for qualitative research (Levitt et al., 2019). This page addition calculates out to approximately 2,500 additional words. We discovered no research in counselor education documenting page length differences between qualitative and quantitative research. Therefore, word count differences between qualitative and quantitative research articles remains an open question.

Like qualitative research article length, no research on the relationship between research methods and journal impact can be found in ECEP. Given the linkages between journal impact scores and professional advance in higher education, the absence of such research is problematic. As such, counselor education faculty and doctoral students have no guidance on the critical publishing choices they face.

Two statistical approaches to assess for differences exist in the academic literature — Frequentist and Bayesian. Because each approach provides distinct answers, we employ both in this study. Of the two approaches, the Bayesian is the less well known in Counselor Education. As such, we offer a brief look at Bayesian concepts and nomenclature. With the Bayesian analysis, a key outcome metric is the Bayes factor (BF). The BF can be defined as a ratio contrasting the likelihood (i.e., predictive probability) of the data under the null hypothesis with the likelihood of under the alternative hypothesis (Jarosz & Wiley, 2014). The Bayes factor in favor of the null hypothesis is denoted as BF_{01} (pronounced as “BF zero one”) and the Bayes factor in favor of the alternative hypothesis as BF_{10} (“BF one zero”). Schönbrodt and Wagenmakers (2018) detailed the relationship between these two factors:

Depending on the order of numerator and denominator in the ratio, the Bayes factor is either denoted as BF_{01} (“ H_0 over H_1 ”) . . . or as its inverse BF_{10} (“ H_1 over H_0 ”). When the Bayes factor BF_{01} equals 5, this indicates that the data are five times more likely under H_0 than under H_1 , meaning that H_0 has issued a better probabilistic prediction for the observed data than did H_1 . In contrast, when BF_{01} equals 0.25 the data support H_1 over H_0 . Specifically, the data are $1/BF_{01} = BF_{10} = 4$ times more likely under H_1 than under H_0 . (p.2)

Thus, BF grades the decisiveness of the evidence for the hypotheses under consideration (Wagenmakers et al., 2016a, 2016b).

Now let us return to the three advantages we wish to highlight. The first concerns the richer nature of results with Bayesian analyses. With Frequentist analyses, the only information that can be

ascertained is the probability of obtaining results at least as extreme as those observed, given that the null hypothesis is true (Wagenmakers et al., 2018). In contrast, the Bayesian approach compares the predictive adequacy of two competing statistical models (H_1 & H_0), grading the evidence provided by the data on a continuous scale, and quantifying the change in belief that the data bring about for the two models under consideration (Wagenmakers et al., 2018). The second advantage is that BF is arguably easier to understand than the traditional p -value. Keyzers et al. (2020) point out that a $p < 0.01$ is not 5 times as convincing as $p < 0.05$ but a $BF_{10} = 6$ really means twice the evidence compared to $BF_{10} = 3$. The third advantage is that NHBT can make outcome distinctions impossible with NHST. Wagenmakers et al. (2018) noted that BF outcomes can be assigned to three discrete categories: (1) evidence in favour of H_1 (evidence in favour of the presence of an effect); (2) evidence in favor of H_0 (evidence of an absence of an effect); (3) evidence that favors neither H_1 nor H_0 (absence of evidence of an effect). Rosenfeld and Olson (2020) clearly captured the advances that come with the Bayesian inferential paradigm:

One of the first things one learns in a basic psychology or statistics course is that you cannot prove the null hypothesis that there is no difference between two conditions such as a patient group and a normal control group. This remains true. However now, . . . even when the result of an inferential test is $p > 0.05$ —the test result was insignificant—it is now possible to rigorously and quantitatively conclude that (a) the null hypothesis is actually unlikely, and (b) the alternative hypothesis of an actual difference between treatment and control is more probable than the null. Alternatively, it is also possible to conclude quantitatively that the null hypothesis is much more likely than the alternative. Without Bayesian statistics, *we couldn't say anything* if a simple inferential analysis like a t-test yielded $p > 0.05$. Moreover, again, with Bayesian statistics, it is also now possible to support the alternative hypothesis with far more confidence

than the mere statement: " $p < 0.05$ ". One may now state rigorously that the alternative is (for example) 100 times more likely than the null! (p. 1)

We believe these stated advantages express more than esoteric points of statistics. This study is concerned with key parameters of academic writing in counselor education. Understanding and working within these parameters represent high-stakes career choices. Thus, we think our fellow counselor educators deserve more guidance than solely p values.

Given the aforementioned, five research questions regarding published counseling research articles were developed to guide this study. The two exploratory research questions were:

RQ1: What is the average number of words for articles in the corpus?

RQ2: What were the most common content words in the corpus?

The three confirmatory research questions were:

RQ3: Does the number of words per article differ by research method?

H_0 : The number of words per article does not differ by research method.

H_1 : The number of words per article does differ by research method.

RQ4: Does the number of words in articles in the corpus differ by journal ranking?

H_0 : The number of words per article does not differ by journal ranking.

H_1 : The number of words per article does differ by journal ranking.

RQ5: Is there a relationship between research method and journal impact factor?

H_0 : There is no relationship between research method and journal impact factor.

H_1 : There is a relationship between research method and journal impact factor.

Method

Design

A synchronic corpus linguistic design was employed for this study (Weisser, 2016). The corpus was composed of research articles that appeared in counseling research journals. The variables were:

token (i.e., individual words), type (i.e., type of word), research method, and journal ranking. The level of measurement for token and type was continuous and for research method and level of journal impact was binomial. The unit of analysis for the RQs 1-2 were single words. For RQs 3-5, the unit of analysis was research article. Sample size determination (SSD) followed the procedures set for in Schönbrodt and Wagenmakers (2018). The population effect size δ was estimated from the obtained effect size in a study examining academic writing ($d = 0.733$; Lindstromberg et al., 2016). The SSD was calculated using a Bayes Factor Design Analysis Fixed N Design ShinyApp (Schönbrodt, 2020). The input was as follows: (a) Expected effect size: $\delta = 0.7$; (b) Prior distribution for effect sizes under alternative hypothesis = Default: Cauchy ($\mu = 0, r = \sqrt{2}/2$), (c) Probability: $\eta = 0.80$, and (d) Strength of Evidence = $BF_{10} > 3$. The output was: (a) For H_1 at least 35 observations per group to obtain a Bayes factor larger than 3 with a probability of $p = 0.80$, and (b) For H_0 at least 104 observations per group to obtain a Bayes factor smaller than $1/3$ with a probability of $p = 0.80$.

Corpus

Scope and Size

The corpus was developed by employing stratified random sampling of research articles from counselor education journals published in 2018. With one exception, the scope was national level journals sponsored by professional associations in counseling. Also, when this study was conducted, one journal had not published its 2018 volume so a 2017 issue was used as a proxy. A list of the 35 journals included in the corpus can be found on this study's research project webpage (<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>). This process resulted in 222 articles for potential inclusion in the corpus. Articles were eliminated from the corpus for the following reasons: (a) non-research articles ($n = 83$), corrupted pdf ($n = 1$), length of article made it an extreme outlier ($n = 1$). After this culling 137 remained. These articles were subdivided into research method categories (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, and mixed). The number of mixed method articles was too low for analysis and thus this category was eliminated ($n = 3$). The resultant

corpus contained 134 articles, 717,455 tokens, and 21,754 types. This corpus was named the Lorem Ipsum Dolor Sit Amet (LIDSA) [name and acronym blinded for peer review]. For copyright reasons, the text of the corpus cannot be distributed. However, a list of the constituent articles in the corpus is available on the research project webpage (<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>).

Preprocessing

The html or pdf version of each randomly selected article was obtained. Each article was then converted to txt format. Then the following elements were de-identified from the article to leave only the body of the text: (1) article title, (2) author name and affiliation, (3) author's note, (4) running head and page numbers, (5) footnotes, (6) tables and table titles, (7) figures and figure captions, (8) conflict of interest statements, (9) acknowledgements, (10) non-ascii characters, (11) hyphens within words that wrap at the end of a line, (12) numbers, and (13) references. If present, the abstract header as well as the standard Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion headers and subheaders were retained. If contained in the body of the text, the following were also retained: (1) citations, (2) quotes, (3) urls, (4) words in languages other than English, and (5) statistical symbols.

Measures

Quantitative Design

Articles that used inferential statistics were classified as Quantitative. If the article also contained some form of qualitative analysis the classification was changed to "Mixed."

Qualitative Design

If the article noted the use of one of the following methods it was classified as Qualitative: Ethnography, Grounded Theory, Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology, Case Study, and Action Research (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). The exception was articles where the use of inferential statistics was also present; in such cases the article was coded as "Mixed."

Level of Impact

Few counseling journals possess an impact factor score from Journal Citation Reports (Clarivate Analytics, 2019). This being the case, the Scimago H-index was used (Scimago Labs, 2019). A coding of “High” was operationalized as a journal possessing a Scimago H Index score. A coding of “Low” was operationalized as a journal without such a score.

Content Words

In this paper, the frequency and dispersion of the 25 most common content words will be reported. This list will be augmented by the frequency and dispersion of the following words: (a) UK spelling of counseling, (b) UK spelling of Counselor, and (c) UK spelling of Counselors. Before calculation of the content word list, common function words such as “and” and “of” were removed (i.e., stopword filtering). The list of stopwords used was one of the most widely cited (Natural Language Toolkit [NLTK], 2020). This list was augmented with words common across articles IMRD/IMRaD (Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion format (e.g., Song et al., 2020). The complete list used for this study can be found on the study’s project webpage (<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>). This webpage also contains spreadsheets containing a complete listing of words with stopwords removed (<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>).

Apparatus

Linguistic analyses were conducted using Wordsmith Tools 8.0 (Scott, 2020).

Data Analysis

For RQ1, the descriptive statistics reported will be mean, standard deviation, skewness, minimum, and maximum. In terms of RQ2, reported on each word will be: (1) absolute frequency, (2) normalized frequency (percent of the words), (3) number of texts the word appeared in, (4) that number as a percentage of the whole corpus of texts, and (5) the word's dispersion. The dispersion metric can range from 0 to 1 with 1 suggesting very uniform dispersion and 0 suggesting "burstiness" (Oakes, 1998: Scott, 2020).

The inferential analyses (RQs 3-5) will be completed using JASP, an open-source software program that includes both frequentist and Bayesian analysis options and is widely cited in the academic literature (JASP Team, 2020). These analyses follow the JASP Bayesian guidelines outlined by van Doorn et al. (2020). RQs 3-4 will be addressed via an independent sample t-test using both Frequentist and Bayesian analyses. For the Frequentist analyses, the alpha level was pre-set at $p < .05$. An effect size will be provided with descriptors drawn from Cohen (1988). For the Bayesian analysis, the prior employed was the standard default: a two-sided Cauchy distribution centered at zero with scale parameter of .707 (van Ravenzwaaij & Wagenmakers, 2019). The specific JASP settings were: Module = T-tests, Test: Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test, Alternative Hypothesis = Group 1 $\neq$ Group 2, Bayes Factor = Bayes Factor = BF_{10} , Tests = Student, and Prior = Default Cauchy = .707.

RQ5 involves the analysis of a 2 X 2 contingency table. In terms of the Frequentist analysis, a chi square test with the ϕ effect size statistic will be employed. The pre-set alpha level was $p < .05$. For the Bayesian analysis, the default prior of $\alpha = 1$ was used. As such, the following JASP settings were used: Module = Frequencies, Test = Contingency Tables, Sample = Poisson, Alternative Hypothesis = Group 1 $\neq$ Group 2, Bayes Factor = BF_{10} , and Prior Concentration = 1. The accepted standard of a less than 10% error percentage will be followed (Goss-Sampson et al., 2020). Descriptive classification of the obtained Bayes factors used Lee and Wagenmakers' (2013) adaptation of the Jefferys' (1961) classic scheme. BF_{10} and BF_{01} as well as probability wheels will be provided.

Results

Concerning RQ1, the descriptive statistics for the average number of words per article can be found in Table 1. With regards to RQ2, the most common content words encountered in published articles can be reviewed in Table 2. The obtained results for the inferential analyses can be inspected in Table 3. In sum, there was *Extreme* evidence for the alternative hypothesis for RQ3 (design- quantitative v. qualitative), *Moderate* evidence for the null hypothesis for RQ4 (impact- high v. low), and *Anecdotal*

evidence for the null hypothesis for RQ5 (design by impact). Readers can review the .jasp file containing these analyses on the study's research project webpage (<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>).

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to inform present and future counseling researchers as to the nature of ECEP. To that end, various linguistic aspects of this subform of academic writing were examined. What follows is an explanation of the reasons for the obtained results.

In terms of the first research question (overall word count), two likely reasons for the obtained results exist. First, the average number of words for articles in the corpus was slightly over 5,600, which translates into 20 double-spaced pages. This is likely due to journal submission guidelines for articles in the counseling field. The *Journal of Counseling Development* (2020) author guidelines state, "Research section submissions must not exceed 30 pages, including references. For submissions to the Practice, Theory, or Assessment & Diagnosis sections, manuscripts must not exceed 25 pages, including references." (p. 347). An alternative reason may be such counts have developed in this subform independent of journal page length restrictions. There is evidence that rhetorical device use varies by academic discipline (Hyland & Tse, 2004). The former explanation is more likely, as journal submission guidelines have common parameters in academic writing within the counseling field.

Regarding the second research question (word frequency and dispersion), a clear preference in nomenclature emerged. The preferred terms used for professional and clinical activities are counselor and counseling. The word stem "counsel*" occurred 5,276 times in the corpus. In an article on clinical supervision, Thériault and Gazzola (2018) asserted that the terms counseling and psychotherapy can be used interchangeably, yet this linguistic interchange rarely occurs. The word stem "psychotherap*" occurred 274 times in the corpus. One reason for this preference might be the strong emphasis the profession places on counselor identity formation (cf., 2016 CACREP standards Section 2: Professional counseling identity). Another reason for this preference could be that authors privilege counseling

nomenclature when submitting manuscripts to journals sponsored by counseling professional associations to enhance the chance of publication. The most likely explanation for the almost exclusive use of counseling nomenclature is an interaction between professional training standards and professional association advocacy.

In addition to the preference for profession-specific nomenclature, the use of metadiscourse markers should be noted. Hyland (1998) specified that authors statements don't just communicate ideas but also the writer's attitude to these ideas and to the readers. According to Hyland, authors communicate their level of certainty using boosters (e.g., always) and hedges (e.g., might). An inspection of Table 2 reveals the hedge "may" ranked 8th in frequency with an appearance across 93% of the articles in the corpus. No boosters appeared amongst the 25 most frequent words. Such a finding is consistent with research showing that authors in the social sciences use hedges to a greater degree than boosters (Hyland, 1998, Hyland & Tse, 2004). The reader interested in a detailed examination of metadiscourse markers present in the LIDSA corpus are referred to Lorem and Ipsum (2021) [authors blinded for peer review].

With the third research question (quantitative v. qualitative design), two credible reasons for the results encountered can be posited. First, one core element of qualitative research is "thick description" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This element produces rich linguistic data not easily condensed and hence a greater word count. An alternative explanation is that journal reviewers are less familiar with qualitative methods and thus greater explanations in the methods section pushes up word count. Of the two, the former explanation is the more probable, as thick description is essential to this design family, whereas editorial board expertise in research design varies across journals.

In terms of the fourth research question (high v. low impact), the result revealed moderate evidence for the null hypothesis. One possibility for this finding is that, regardless of the journal's impact factor, word count is constrained by the standard IMRD format (de Araújo, 2014). The other possibility is

the economic forces in the publishing industry influence all journals equally. However, Siler and Frenken (2020) found the journal impact factor significantly associated with profit-oriented publishing. We examined the major publishers' (SAGE, Elsevier, Wiley, APA, Taylor & Francis) article publishing charge for open access and found that word count was not a fee variable. Therefore, it appears that the moderate evidence for the null hypothesis was the result of the IMRD format.

Regarding the fifth research question (design by impact), the obtained results push forward whether we are dealing with evidence of absence or absence of evidence? If the obtained result emerged from the evidence of absence, it would stand in contrast to known publishing preferences. Note an excerpt from a widely published rejection letter sent by the *British Medical Journal*:

Thank you for sending us your paper. We read it with interest but I am sorry to say that qualitative studies are an extremely low priority for The BMJ. Our research shows that they are not as widely accessed, downloaded, or cited as other research. (Greenhalgh et al., 2016, p. i563)

If the obtained result emerged from an absence of evidence, it would be because the actual sample size fell below the minimum sample size determination for the H_0 . Between the evidence of absence or absence of evidence explanations, the absence of evidence one is most probable given the failure to reach the minimum sample size determination. Further research on this topic with larger sample size should be pursued to settle the question between these two explanations.

There exist three limitations to the present study the reader should keep in mind. First, as discussed in the previous paragraph, the obtained sample fell below the sample size determination for the H_0 . Second, the stratified random sampling was of a single year of research article in peer-reviewed counselor education journals. As such, there was the potential that a period effect interacted with the results. The potential of this threat was somewhat mitigated by (1) the wide dispersion of journals, and (2) variations in submission to publication lengths (both inter-journal and intra-journal). The third

limitation concerns the scope of the journals being restricted to those published in English. For this reason, the nature of the academic discourse in counseling beyond English remains unknown.

The findings of this study suggest implications for both educational and research practices. In terms of educational practices, the results present current counseling doctoral students and faculty with information on actual journal practices (e.g., average manuscript word count by design). Less obfuscation concerning counseling journal expectations can help emerging researchers to develop more effective academic writing. Regarding research, corpuses like LIDSA present opportunities to research multiple aspects of writing in the counseling subform. Some examples include topics such as (1) rhetorical device usages rates and preferences, (2) how words such as “counseling” and “multicultural” are used together, (3) wording shifts over time, and (4) semantic practices in counseling academic writing. For example, faculty teaching new counseling researchers can have their students use corpus linguistic tools to examine their own writing to see if their use of hedges and boosters matches conventions in the field. Charles (2018) contains excellent guidance for counselor educators on how to use Corpus Linguistics to teach students how to write in English for Academic Purposes.

Regarding research practices, the present study displayed how both the corpus linguistic tools and Bayesian analysis can be used by counseling researchers. For example, a school counseling researcher examining pro-anorexia websites read by adolescents or the nature and frequency of diversity language in college recruiting websites. Examples for mental health counseling researchers include comparing grieving styles present in counseling transcripts or the nature of the discourses on LGBT+ issues in influential treatment manuals. The corpus linguistic tools can not only give insight into the unique worldviews of clients, authors, or social media participants but provide objective data about effective interventions that can contribute to skill development in counselors-in-training as well. As illustrated by this study, we feel that the clarity, accuracy, utility, and flexibility of Bayesian analysis commends its further use by counseling researchers. As such, we encourage our fellow counselor

educators to consider switching from NHST to NHBT approaches. Our students and colleagues deserve the most informative data we can provide for the further development of the profession.

In sum, knowing more about the characteristics of and expectations within the subfield of English for Counselor Education Purposes can benefit counseling scholars, educators, and students. This exploratory study utilized corpus linguistics, a set of research tools infrequently employed by counseling researchers yet widely used across other disciplines in tandem with Bayesian analytic methods, which offer advantages over traditional frequentist analysis. Findings primarily support known conventions in academic publication requirements and trends (e.g., recommended word counts). Results also indicate opportunities for further exploration of the interaction of research design (i.e., quantitative or qualitative) with impact factor, using a larger sample size, and for investigation of ECEP in the context of larger corpuses, spanning multiple years, created from articles published in American and international counseling journals.

References

- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 247-271. <http://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0188>
- Bajwa, N. U. H., Langer, M., König, C. J., & Honecker, H. (2019). What might get published in management and applied psychology? Experimentally manipulating implicit expectations of reviewers regarding hedges. *Scientometrics*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03164-2>
- Baker, P., Hardie, A., & McEnery, T. (2006). *Glossary of corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2005). Register variation: A corpus approach. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 175-196). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470753460.ch10>
- CACREP. (2016). *Section 2: Professional counseling identity*. Author. <https://www.cacrep.org/section-2-professional-counseling-identity/>
- Career Development Quarterly. (2020). *The Career Development Quarterly guidelines for authors*. https://www.ncda.org/aws/NCDA/pt/sp/cdquarterly_submissions
- Charles, M. (2018). Corpus-assisted editing for doctoral students: More than just concordancing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 36, 15-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.08.003>
- Clarivate Analytics. (2019). *Journal Citation Reports*. Author. <https://clarivate.com/products/journal-citation-reports/>
- Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project*. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. <http://www.qualres.org/HomeSemi-3629.html>
- Davies, M. (2008). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
- de Araújo, C. G. S. (2014). Detailing the writing of scientific manuscripts: 25-30 paragraphs. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Cardiologia*, 102(2), e21. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5935/2164-3802.20140019>

- Ebrahimi, A., & Faghih, E. (2017). Integrating corpus linguistics into online language teacher education programmes. *ReCALL*, 29(1), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344016000070>
- Goss-Sampson, M. A., van Doorn, J., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2020). *Bayesian inference in JASP: A guide for students*. JASP Team. http://static.jasp-stats.org/Manuals/Bayesian_Guide_v0.12.2.pdf
- Gruman, D. H., & Purgason, L. L. (2019). A brief experiential school counseling site supervisor training approach. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2019.1635061>
- Greenhalgh, T., Annandale, E., Ashcroft, R., Barlow, J., Black, N., Bleakley, A., Boaden, R., Braithwaite, J., Britten, N., Carnevale, F., Checkland, K., Cheek, J., Clark, A., Cohn, S., Coulehan, J., Crabtree, B., Cummins, S., Davidoff, F., Davies, H., . . . Ziebland, S. (2016). An open letter to The BMJ editors on qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 352, i563. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i563>
- Hyland, K. (1998). Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 18(3), 349-382. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1998.18.3.349>
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- JASP Team. (2020). *JASP* (Version 0.12) [Computer software]. <https://jasp-stats.org>
- Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of probability*. Oxford University Press.
- Journal of Counseling & Development. (2020). Guidelines for authors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 98, 346-347. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12258>
- Jarosz, A. F., & Wiley, J. (2014). What are the odds? A practical guide to computing and reporting Bayes factors. *The Journal of Problem Solving*, 7(1), 2-9. <http://doi.org/10.7771/1932-6246.1167>
- Juilland, A. G., Brodin, D. R. & Davidovitch C. (1970). *Frequency dictionary of French words*. Mouton de Gruyter.

- Keyesers, C., Gazzola, V., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2020). Using Bayes factor hypothesis testing in neuroscience to establish evidence of absence. *Nature Neuroscience*, 23(7), 788-799.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0660-4>
- Lee, M. D., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2013). *Bayesian modeling for cognitive science: A practical course*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73, 26-46. <http://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151>
- Lindstromberg, S., Eyckmans, J., & Connabeer, R. (2016). A modified dictogloss for helping learners remember L2 academic English formulaic sequences for use in later writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 41, 12-21. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.08.002>
- Lincoln, A. (1863). *The White House Copy of the Gettysburg Address*. Smithsonian.
https://americanhistory.si.edu/documentsgallery/exhibitions/gettysburg_address_2.html
- Lorem, X., & Ipsum, X. (2021). *In eos nihil iudico, vel graeco eimod ei*. [article blinded for peer review].
<https://osf.io/xxxxx/>
- Natural Language Toolkit. (2020). *Stopwords corpus*.
https://raw.githubusercontent.com/nltk/nltk_data/gh-pages/packages/corpora/stopwords.zip
- Oakes, M. P. (1998). *Statistics for Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Pérez-Rosas, V., Wu, X., Resnicow, K., & Mihalcea, R. (2019, July). What makes a good counselor? Learning to distinguish between high-quality and low-quality counseling conversations. In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 926-935). <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P19-1088>

Professional School Counseling. (2020) *Journal author guidelines*.

<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors/publications-position-statements/professional-school-counseling-journal/journal-author-guidelines>

Quintana, D. S., & Williams, D. R. (2018). Bayesian alternatives for common null-hypothesis significance tests in psychiatry: a non-technical guide using JASP. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18(1), 178.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1761-4>

Rosenfeld, J. P., & Olson, J. M. (2020). Bayesian data analysis: A fresh approach to power issues and null hypothesis interpretation. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 1-6.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10484-020-09502-y>

Ryder, N. B. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 843-861. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2090964>

Sandberg, J., & Alvesson, M. (2011). Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or problematization?. *Organization*, 18(1), 23-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1350508410372151>

Scott, M. (2020). *WordSmith tools version 8.0* [software]. Lexical Analysis Software.

Scimago Labs. (2019). *Scimago journal rankings*. <https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php>

Schönbrodt, F. D., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2018). Bayes factor design analysis: Planning for compelling evidence. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(1), 128-142. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1230-y>

Schönbrodt, F. D. (2020). *Bayes Factor Design Analysis ShinyApp*. <http://shinyapps.org/apps/BFDA/>

Sinclair, J. (2005). Corpus and text - basic principles. In M. Wynne (Ed.), *Developing linguistic corpora: A guide to good practise* (pp. 1-16). Oxbow Books.

<http://ota.ox.ac.uk/documents/creating/dlc/chapter1.htm>

Song, H., Eberl, J. M., & Eisele, O. (2020). Online appendix for: Less fragmented than we thought?

Toward clarification of a subdisciplinary linkage in communication science, 2010–2019. *Journal*

of Communication, 70(3), 310-334.

<https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/70/3/310/5828491#supplementary-data>

Stefan, A. M., Gronau, Q. F., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2019). A tutorial on Bayes Factor Design Analysis using an informed prior. *Behavioral Research*, 51, 1042–1058

<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01189-8>

Thériault, A., & Gazzola, N. (2018). Dilemmas that undermine supervisor confidence. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 18(1), 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12153>

van Doorn, J., van den Bergh, D., Böhm, U., Dablander, F., Derks, K., Draws, T., Etz, A., Evans, N. J., Gronau, Q. F., Haaf, J. M., Hinne, M., Kucharský, Š., Ly, A., Marsman, M., Matzke, D., Komarlu, A. R., Gupta, N., Sarafoglou, A., Stefan, A., Voelkel, J. G., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2020). The JASP guidelines for conducting and reporting a Bayesian analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-020-01798-5>

van Ravenzwaaij, D., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2019). Advantages masquerading as ‘Issues’ in Bayesian hypothesis testing: A commentary on Tendeiro and Kiers (2019). *PsyArXiv*.

<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/nf7rp>

Wagenmakers, E.-J., Morey, R. D., & Lee, M. D. (2016a). Bayesian benefits for the pragmatic researcher. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(3), 169–176.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416643289>

Wagenmakers, E.-J., Verhagen, J., & Ly, A. (2016b). How to quantify the evidence for the absence of a correlation. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(2), 413-426. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0593-0>

Wagenmakers, E.-J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., Love, J., Selker, R., Gronau, Q. F., Šmíra, M., Epskamp, S., & Matzke, D., Rouder, J. D., & Morey, R. D. (2018). Bayesian inference for

psychology. Part I: Theoretical advantages and practical ramifications. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(1), 35-57. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1343-3>

Weiner, B. J., Amick, H. R., Lund, J. L., Lee, S. Y. D., & Hoff, T. J. (2011). Use of qualitative methods in published health services and management research: a 10-year review. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 68(1), 3-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558710372810>

Weisser, M. (2016). *Practical Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction to Corpus-Based language analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics of Article Word Counts*

Variable	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Min.	Max.
Overall	134	5354	1501	.35	2146	9650
<i>Research Method:</i>						
Quantitative	75	4906	1335	.38	2213	8875
Qualitative	59	5923	1519	.17	2146	9650
<i>Journal Ranking:</i>						
High	77	5305	1332	.18	2213	8875
Low	57	5421	1713	.40	2146	9650

Table 2*Most Frequent Words with Stopwords Removed*

Rank	Word	Freq.	%	Texts	%	Dispersion
1	Participants	3614	0.50	123	91.79	0.92
2	Students	2633	0.37	95	70.90	0.83
3	Research	2414	0.34	133	99.25	0.92
4	School	1932	0.27	87	64.93	0.71
5	Self	1738	0.24	123	91.79	0.88
6	Also	1727	0.24	133	99.25	0.96
7	Counseling	1718	0.24	91	67.91	0.82
8	May	1695	0.24	124	92.54	0.90
9	Social	1663	0.23	122	91.04	0.78
10	One	1631	0.23	133	99.25	0.96
11	Data	1501	0.21	131	97.76	0.89
12	Group	1450	0.20	103	76.87	0.86
13	Counselors	1410	0.20	85	63.43	0.76
14	Relationship	1402	0.20	113	84.33	0.83
15	Experiences	1241	0.17	106	79.10	0.88
16	Counselor	1187	0.17	70	52.24	0.75
17	Experience	1099	0.15	115	85.82	0.88
18	Career	1071	0.15	52	38.81	0.51
19	Support	1053	0.15	121	90.30	0.88
20	Model	1048	0.15	88	65.67	0.87
21	Professional	1030	0.14	83	61.94	0.73
22	Reported	1019	0.14	119	88.81	0.84
23	Time	1011	0.14	126	94.03	0.91
24	Based	1009	0.14	125	93.28	0.82
25	Used	1005	0.14	128	95.52	0.94
126	Counselling	454	0.06	30	22.39	0.55
311	Counsellors	255	0.04	24	17.91	0.58
388	Counsellor	213	0.03	16	11.94	0.43

Table 3*Results from Inferential Analyses (RQs 3-5)*

RQ	Var. 1	Var. 2	Statistic	<i>p</i>	Effect Size	ES Descr.	BF ₁₀	BF Descr.
3	Token	Design	4.119	< .001	0.717	Medium	309.17	Extreme
4	Token	Impact	-0.439	0.661	-0.077	Trivial	0.204	Moderate
5	Design	Impact	1.044	0.307	-0.088	Negligible	0.691	Anecdotal

Note. RQs 3-4, Statistic = *t* and effect size = *d*; RQ 5, Statistic = χ^2 and effect size = ϕ .