

Good Research Writing Practices for Emerging Scholars: A Study in Education and Humanities

Dr. Pradeep Kumar Tiwari¹, Mr. Hemanta Kumar Dash²

¹Associate Professor, School of Education, G. M. University, Sambalpur Odisha.

²Assistant Professor, School of Education Gangadhar Meher University Sambalpur

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1308000277>

Received: 06 September 2026; Accepted: 11 September 2026; Published: 21 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Research writing is a fundamental component of scholarly development, yet emerging researchers frequently encounter challenges related to organizing ideas, sustaining writing practices, articulating original contributions, meeting disciplinary conventions, and navigating publication processes. This study systematically reviews literature on effective research writing practices for emerging scholars, with particular attention to the disciplines of education and the humanities. Using a systematic review approach, relevant peer-reviewed literature, scholarly books, and practitioner-oriented sources were examined and thematically synthesized. The findings identify four interconnected domains of effective research writing: planning and workflow; argumentation, structure and clarity; scholarly conventions and research ethics; and communication and dissemination. The review further demonstrates that disciplinary contexts influence writing expectations: education emphasizes empirical grounding, methodological transparency, and implications for educational practice and policy, whereas humanities scholarship places greater emphasis on interpretive originality, theoretical engagement, primary sources, and argumentative nuance. Based on these findings, the study proposes a four-stage scaffolded model of research writing development, progressing from foundational literacy and applied practice to autonomous scholarly production and leadership. The study argues that research writing competence should be developed through sustained practice, structured mentoring, peer feedback, writing communities, and institutional support rather than treated as an isolated technical skill. The paper contributes a discipline-sensitive framework for strengthening research writing pedagogy and offers practical implications for emerging scholars, supervisors, and higher education institutions seeking to enhance scholarly productivity, research quality, and academic communication.

Keywords: Research writing; academic writing; emerging scholars; writing pedagogy; education; humanities; scholarly communication; research writing competence; academic publishing

INTRODUCTION

Research writing is the principal medium through which scholars contribute to knowledge, shape debates, and position themselves professionally. For emerging scholars—graduate students, early-career researchers, and adjunct faculty—mastering the conventions of research writing is crucial for career progression, securing publication, and engaging in scholarly communities (Belcher, 2009; Silva, 1997). In education and humanities, where interpretive nuance, rigorous argumentation, and extended expository prose are central, writing competences intersect with epistemological and methodological choices in discipline-specific ways (Coffin et al., 2003; Hyland, 2016). Despite its importance, many emerging scholars report persistent challenges: organizing ideas, developing a publishable voice, conforming to genre expectations, managing time and revision, and navigating ethical and citation norms (Sword, 2012; Murray, 2013). Universities and supervisors provide varied levels of support, and pedagogical interventions—writing workshops, mentoring, and structured feedback—differ widely in effectiveness (Thompson & Lee, 2012; Aitchison & Lee, 2006).

This paper synthesizes the literature on good research writing practices for emerging scholars in education and the humanities. The aims are to: (1) identify core writing practices and skills emphasized across the

literature; (2) examine disciplinary particularities that shape writing expectations; (3) propose a scaffolded model for developing writing competence; and (4) offer actionable recommendations for scholars and institutions. The study uses a systematic review methodology to map the field and derive evidence-based guidance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining “Good” Research Writing

“Good” research writing is multidimensional. It involves clarity and coherence of argument, methodological transparency, ethical rigor, genre-appropriate structure and engagement with scholarly debates (Hart, 1998; Booth, Colomb, & Williams, 2008). In the humanities, emphasis often lies on interpretive sophistication, originality of perspective, and stylistic subtlety; in education, clarity in linking empirical evidence to educational practice and policy tends to be prized (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Graham, 2006). Across disciplines, however, readers—peer reviewers and editors—value logical structure, clear claims, evidence-based reasoning, and readability (Day & Gastel, 2012).

Common Challenges for Emerging Scholars

Empirical and reflective studies highlight recurring problems. These include procrastination and poor time management, limited familiarity with scholarly genres, difficulty in articulating contribution, problems with literature synthesis, and anxiety about rejection (Menter et al., 2011; Murray, 2013). Socialization into scholarly discourse—learning appropriate vocabulary, citation practices, and rhetorical moves—takes time and guided exposure (Swales & Feak, 2012).

Effective Practices Identified in the Literature

The literature clusters recommended practices into several overlapping areas:

1. **Planning and Workflow:** Incremental drafting, setting measurable writing goals, micro-scheduling, and using writing routines (Boice, 1990; Murray, 2013). Tools such as writing logs, project plans, and reference managers are frequently recommended (Belcher, 2009).
2. **Argumentation and Structure:** Use of clear thesis statements, thematic organization of sections, signposting for readers, and coherent paragraphing (Booth et al., 2008). The IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion) structure is common in empirical education research; humanities scholarship often follows more flexible narrative-analytic structures but still benefits from transparent argument maps (Coffin et al., 2003).
3. **Revision and Feedback:** Iterative revision cycles, multi-level editing (content, organization, sentence-level), and seeking diverse feedback—peers, mentors, and professional editors. Structured peer review groups and writing retreats show positive effects on productivity and quality (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014).
4. **Ethical Scholarship and Referencing:** Accurate citation, transparent methodology, data availability where appropriate, and ethical treatment of participants and sources are foundational (APA, 2020; Resnik, 2015).
5. **Discipline-Specific Writing Moves:** Attention to rhetorical moves appropriate to each field—close textual analysis and theoretical engagement in humanities; linkage of empirical evidence to practice and policy in education (Hyland, 2016; Lea & Street, 1998).
6. **Professional Communication:** Preparing cover letters, responding to reviewers, adapting manuscripts for different venues, and presenting research effectively in talks and posters (Belcher, 2009; Sword, 2012).

Pedagogical Approaches to Writing Development

Writing instruction for scholars ranges from transferable workshops to embedded writing in disciplinary courses. Mentoring and apprenticeship models, where early-career researchers’ co-author papers with

supervisors, are effective but depend heavily on supervisor time and skill (Aitchison et al., 2010). Course-based approaches that couple writing instruction with discipline-specific content show promise for sustained improvement (Wingate, 2012).

METHODOLOGY

Review Goal and Questions

This study sought to synthesize research and practitioner guidance on effective research writing practices for emerging scholars in education and humanities. The review addressed three questions:

1. What practices are consistently recommended for improving research writing among emerging scholars?
2. How do disciplinary features of education and the humanities shape those practices?
3. What pedagogical or institutional strategies support writing development effectively?

Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

A systematic search was conducted across multidisciplinary academic databases (e.g., ERIC, Scopus, Web of Science) and major publisher platforms (e.g., Routledge, Wiley) using combinations of keywords: “academic writing,” “research writing,” “graduate writing,” “early career researchers,” “writing pedagogy,” “education,” and “humanities.” Inclusion criteria were: English-language sources (peer-reviewed articles, books, and influential practitioner guides), published primarily in the last three decades, and directly addressing writing practices or interventions for graduate or early-career scholars in education or humanities contexts. Classic, foundational texts (e.g., Booth et al., 2008; Belcher, 2009) were also included for their enduring relevance.

Synthesis Approach

Documents meeting criteria were thematically coded using an iterative qualitative synthesis approach (Thomas & Harden, 2008). Codes reflected practices (e.g., “goal setting,” “literature synthesis”), pedagogical methods (e.g., “writing groups,” “course-embedded writing”), and discipline-specific features. Themes were aggregated into the four-domain framework used in this paper: Planning & Workflow; Argument & Structure; Scholarly Conventions & Ethics; Communication & Dissemination.

FINDINGS

Core Practices and Themes

Planning and Workflow:

Set structured, achievable goals: Consistent across sources is the advice to break writing tasks into manageable units—daily word counts, chapter milestones, or submission targets (Boice, 1990; Murray, 2013). This reduces overwhelm and builds momentum.

Adopt a regular writing routine: Habitual writing—daily or scheduled sessions—correlates with higher productivity. Routine need not be long; many scholars find that short, focused sessions (e.g., 30–60 minutes) add up productively (Aitchison & Lee, 2006).

Use project management tools and reference managers: Software (e.g., Zotero, Mendeley, EndNote) and simple project boards (e.g., Trello) help track sources, deadlines, and tasks (Belcher, 2009).

Front-load planning: Developing an outline and mapping argument flows before drafting saves revision time and clarifies contribution early (Booth et al., 2008).

Argumentation, Structure, and Clarity

State clear contribution early: Effective introductions frame the research question, gap, and significance succinctly. In education research, linking to practice/policy strengthens relevance; in humanities, situating the interpretive move within debates is essential (Hyland, 2016).

Adopt reader-centered organization: Signposting (explicit statements of intent and transitions) assists readers in following complex arguments. Paragraphs with topic sentences and evidence-driven development improve coherence (Coffin et al., 2003).

Balance description and interpretation: Especially in humanities, reflective narrative must be paired with rigorous evidence and theoretical grounding. In education, empirical description should lead to analytic interpretation tied to implications (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009).

Revise for argument integrity: Higher-order editing (reorganizing sections, clarifying claims) should precede sentence-level proofreading (Sword, 2012).

Scholarly Conventions and Ethics

Master citation conventions and avoid plagiarism: Accurate, consistent referencing (e.g., APA 7th edition for many education journals) is non-negotiable. Understanding paraphrase, quotation, and attribution practices is crucial (APA, 2020).

Ensure methodological transparency: Clear description of methods, sampling, and analytic procedures allows others to assess validity and builds trust. Data ethics—consent, anonymization, and data stewardship—are integral (Resnik, 2015).

Engage with diverse literatures responsibly: Humanities scholarship requires careful engagement with primary sources and scholarship; education researchers should incorporate both theoretical and empirical literatures to situate findings (Lea & Street, 1998).

Communication and Dissemination

Target the right venue- Matching manuscript length, scope, and style to journal or publisher expectations increases acceptance likelihood. Scholars should study author guidelines and recent issues of target outlets (Belcher, 2009).

Prepare professional submission materials- Effective cover letters, clear abstracts, and responsive reviewer replies are part of scholarly skillsets (Day & Gastel, 2012).

Develop alternative dissemination pathways- Conference presentations, preprints, policy briefs, and public-facing writing (blogs, op-eds) broaden impact and provide feedback loops (Hyland, 2018).

Discipline-Specific Considerations: Education vs. Humanities

While many practices are transferable, disciplinary norms shape expectations.

Education

Empirical grounding: Many education journals expect empirical studies with clear methods and implications for practice. Thus, scholars must articulate research design, data collection, and analytic rigor.

Policy relevance: Framing contributions in terms of implications for educators, administrators, or policymakers enhances perceived value.

Mixed-methods literacy: Familiarity with both quantitative and qualitative reporting conventions is valuable.

Humanities

Argumentative nuance: Humanities scholarship privileges close reading, theoretical engagement, and originality of interpretation over methodological standardization.

Citation of primary sources: Mastery in handling archival materials, textual citations, and critical apparatus is required.

Stylistic flexibility: While clarity remains essential, stylistic voice and theoretical eloquence are often expected and valued.

Understanding these differences helps emerging scholars tailor their writing and select appropriate mentors and outlets.

A Scaffolded Model for Developing Research Writing Competence

Drawing on the findings, the paper proposes a four-stage scaffold for writing development tailored to emerging scholars:

1. **Foundational Literacy (Year 0–1):** Focus on genre awareness—reading widely in target journals, learning citation practice, and building basic writing routines. Workshops on academic argumentation and referencing are appropriate.
2. **Applied Practice (Year 1–2):** Engage in short writing tasks (conference abstracts, short notes), co-author with mentors, and participate in writing groups. Begin drafting thesis chapters or empirical articles.
3. **Autonomous Production (Year 2–4):** Lead manuscript preparation, manage submission processes, and respond to peer review. Emphasize revision strategies and dissemination beyond journals.
4. **Scholarly Leadership (Year 4+):** Mentor junior scholars, develop discipline-specific writing courses, and contribute to editorial/review processes.

Each stage combines technical instruction with apprenticeship experiences (co-authorship, mentor feedback). Institutions can support progress by providing sustained writing programs, access to editors, and workload recognition for mentor supervision.

Practical Recommendations

For Emerging Scholars

- Start small and be consistent. Set daily or weekly writing goals and celebrate incremental progress.
- Read strategically. Analyze the rhetorical moves of published articles in your target journals.
- Use tools wisely. Employ reference managers, writing templates, and version control.
- Form or join a writing community. Regular peer feedback and accountability improve both productivity and manuscript quality.
- Prioritize revision. Separate drafting and editing phases; seek higher-order feedback before line editing.
- Learn to respond to reviewers. Treat reviews as developmental; craft respectful, point-by-point responses.

For Supervisors and Institutions

Embed writing in curricula. Integrate disciplined writing practice into graduate programs rather than treating writing as an add-on.

Provide structured mentorship- Train supervisors in giving constructive writing feedback and in co-authoring practices.

Offer accessible supports- Writing centers, editor-in-residence programs, and funded writing retreats reduce barriers.

Recognize mentoring labor- Formal recognition for supervision and writing support incentivizes quality mentoring.

CONCLUSION

The findings demonstrate that effective research writing is a sustained and developmental scholarly practice that requires systematic planning, regular writing, clear argumentation, critical engagement with literature, ethical scholarship, rigorous revision, and appropriate dissemination. While these core practices are broadly applicable, disciplinary expectations—particularly between education and humanities—require researchers to adapt their writing to specific methodological, theoretical, and communicative conventions. The proposed four-stage scaffold further emphasizes that research writing competence develops progressively through foundational literacy, guided practice, increasing autonomy, and scholarly leadership, supported by mentoring, peer feedback, and institutional resources. Therefore, research writing should not be viewed merely as a technical requirement for publication or degree completion, but as an essential component of scholarly identity and knowledge creation. A sustained culture of writing, mentoring, ethical practice, and continuous improvement can empower emerging scholars to produce credible, impactful, and academically meaningful research.

LIMITATIONS

This review synthesizes existing literature and practitioner guidance but does not report new empirical data from a targeted sample of emerging scholars. The inclusion of primarily English-language and widely accessible sources may bias findings toward Western publishing norms. Future empirical work, especially cross-cultural studies within non-Western education and humanities contexts, would deepen understanding of locally situated writing practices and challenges.

REFERENCES

1. Aitchison, C., Catterall, J., Ross, P., & Burgin, S. (2010). *Postgraduate writing: Identity, learning and scholarly practice*. Higher Education Research & Development, 29(2), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903552416>.
2. Aitchison, C., & Guerin, C. (2014). *Writing groups for doctoral education and beyond: Innovations in practice and theory*. Springer.
3. Aitchison, C., & Lee, A. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680513>.
4. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). American Psychological Association.
5. Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. University of Chicago Press.
6. Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
7. Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
8. Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. Routledge.
9. Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
10. Day, R. A., & Gastel, B. (2012). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (7th ed.). Greenwood.

11. Graham, P. (2006). **The academic's guide to publishing: A practical handbook**. Open University Press.
12. Hart, C. (1998). **Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination**. SAGE Publications.
13. Hyland, K. (2016). **Teaching and researching writing** (3rd ed.). Routledge.
14. Hyland, K. (2018). **Language and identity in academic contexts**. In **Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics**. Oxford University Press.
15. Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. **Studies in Higher Education**, 23(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364>.
16. Menter, I., Elliot, D., Hulme, M., Lewin, J., & Lowden, K. (2011). **A guide to practitioner research in education**. SAGE.
17. Murray, R. (2013). **Writing for academic journals** (3rd ed.). Open University Press.
18. Resnik, D. B. (2015). **What is ethics in research & why is it important?** National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. (Note: For conceptual framing on research ethics, see Resnik's publications and institutional guidance.)
19. Silva, T. (1997). **Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications**. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4), 657–677.
20. Sword, H. (2012). **Stylish academic writing**. Harvard University Press.
21. Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). **Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills** (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
22. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. **BMC Medical Research Methodology**, 8, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>.
23. Thompson, P., & Lee, P. (2012). A research-based approach to the teaching of academic writing in higher education. **Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice**, 9(3), Article 2.
24. Wingate, U. (2012). **Using academic literacies and genre-based models for academic writing instruction: A 'fusion' approach**. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 17(1), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.590426>.