WHilst at this year’s Division of Counselling Psychology Conference in Leicester, I (Terry) was asked numerous questions about the process of publishing in *Counselling Psychology Review*. In fact throughout the year I regularly field questions about the publishing process more generally. In being transparent I should acknowledge that I myself am relatively new to the publishing game and in becoming Editor of this publication I found myself splashing in the deep end of rather choppy waters. In this editorial, therefore, I hope to share some of my experiences of getting into print with the hope that doing so proves useful to others. To harness this discussion I adopt a relatively standard chronological presentation, outlining some of the considerations/thoughts I have had at different stages of getting into print. I also present 10 tips to help you along the way. I am then accompanied on the final leg of the journey by Edith Steffen, who has kindly agreed to act as a case example and thus providing a vehicle to bring some of my more turgid presentation alive. Following this, an overview of the rest of this edition of *Counselling Psychology Review* is given.

Choosing an outlet

There are so many publishing options these days that you will have to sit down and ponder what fits with your hopes for the work you are thinking about creating. You may want to write something relatively informal for a professional audience or you might want to write something for a hard nosed research journal. Such a decision may be led by your personal interests or professional roles – for instance, those embedded in practice may see practitioner journals and books as being a more natural home for their work, whilst those with roles in academia may see research journals as a necessary part of their job. It is publishing within the latter type of publication that the rest of this paper will discuss (with the process of publishing within *Counselling Psychology Review* being an unashamed focal point).

**Tip 1:** Consider submitting your work to *Counselling Psychology Review* – please.

Writing the paper

There is obviously a lot to think about when sitting down to write a paper for publication. First things first, however, you do not want to fall at the first hurdle and you must write your paper with the publication’s ‘house style’ in mind. For instance, numerous papers are submitted to *Counselling Psychology Review* that are either referenced using a different format or do not have an abstract. I like to think that we, involved in editing *Counselling Psychology Review*, are responsive to the developmental process that such errors indicate but others are not and will send the paper straight back to you without looking beyond such surface issues. For information, although publications often provide an overview of their expectations on a website, the best way to get a grasp of a house style is to read a few papers from the publication itself.

In relation to the house styles that publications have, it is also useful to consider the topic that you are presenting. Particularly publications often have their own scope and interests. For example, many publications do not publish theory papers, and solely look to publish empirical research. As is evident from the pages in this particular edition, *Counselling Psychology Review* aims to straddle...
both worlds. Likewise, publications often focus upon particular topics or expect certain content. Once again, in considering publication in Counselling Psychology Review, small things can be essential and we expect that research papers should provide a statement about the ethical review that a project has received (including case studies). Likewise, we expect that the presentation of work is in keeping with the ethos of the general discipline of counselling psychologists (e.g. see Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2010). Thus, if we use quantitative research as a case and point, such research is very much welcomed, but it would be anticipated that the findings of such work would be presented in a way that conveys the notion of it being ‘a’ truth, rather than ‘the’ truth.

One positive move within the assessment of trainee counselling psychologist’s academic work in the UK is the active encouragement of individuals to present their work in a way suitable for an academic publication. In focusing work in this way, institutions support trainees in creating papers that they can be automatically sent off to publications for consideration. It also acts as a very positive bridge between course work and professional dissemination. Do be mindful, however, that the orchestration of such a process by course tutors might warrant a discussion about whether they should be a co-author of the paper or not (for more information about this consideration see Hanley, Cutts & Scott, 2012).

Tip 2: Do your research and consider your audience thoroughly.

Tip 3: Look for a synergy between presentation styles and the work you might be submitting elsewhere (e.g. as a trainee for a qualification).

Submitting a paper

‘How long did that take!?’

‘Agh – if I could throttle a computer I would!’

Counselling Psychology Review has a very lo-fi submissions process. Essentially you email your work to me and I send you an acknowledgement in a day or so (be warned, however, I am fallible and checking up on a silence is no bad thing). Many larger scale publishing companies have automated online submission sites. These are obviously great when it comes to managing large numbers of publications, they do, however, have their own personalities and the comments starting this section are not uncommon from those using them for the first time. The good news is that you do get used to them. The bad news is you do have to suffer them a few times before this happens.

Tip 4: Be prepared for difficulties to arise in the submission process. Set aside some extra time and remember those deep breathing techniques that you undertook as part of your training.

The inevitable delayed response

Now delayed responses do not apply to all publications but it is not uncommon and thus it does seem appropriate to raise it as a possible expectation. The reliance on voluntary contributions from others means that reviews can be de-prioritised at times.

In editing Counselling Psychology Review (a publication which for information relies 100 per cent on voluntary contributions – except the process of actually getting it into print) it is very apparent that we have fantastic support from reviewers. There are, however, times when reviews get delayed, with reasons for these delays ranging from life circumstances getting in the way to just forgetting. We attempt to turn around papers in a three-month period but sometimes this occurs faster and unfortunately this sometimes takes longer (for information, other publications have longer/shorter review periods and some do not state a timescale).

Tip 5: Try not to get too grumpy if you don’t hear back from the Editor within the expected timescale. Do, however, follow-up delays with a friendly enquiring email.

Receiving the comments from peer review

This is always a key moment in the process. It often provides an indication of whether all of your hard work has paid off (or not).
Although do be mindful that it is unlikely that you will get a final verdict at this stage (Editors are not keen on being definite until they have the piece of work they want). At this stage, it can be helpful for those submitting research for the first time to look towards a research supervisor/course tutor for support in interpreting reviewers’ comments. It seems particularly necessary to highlight that peer reviews rarely focus in upon the strengths of the paper and often they are presented in a way that can be perceived as overly critical. With this in mind, do put on your thick skin before clicking open to the email you have just received.

Reviews are often presented as documents separate to the paper you submitted – increasingly, however, reviewers accompany their comments with additional narration on the paper that has been submitted. In Counselling Psychology Review we ask for reviewers to present their comments in a standard format to aid consistency, however, many publications are more ad hoc in their expectation (an information sheet about how reviewers are asked to respond to papers in Counselling Psychology Review was published in 2010 (see Hanley, 2010)). As noted above, the comments within peer reviews are not always easy to read. It is also important to remember that reviewer’s comments are just one opinion of many, a fact that is evident in multiple reviews that do not concur. For example, personally I had a single paper that has been reviewed by three individuals each of whom have come to different conclusions (no corrections, minor corrections, major corrections). However much you may want to, it is important not to dismiss comments that reviewers put forward as they often have numerous elements that can help to strengthen the work (or put you in a helpful position of justifying your decisions).

Tip 6: Put on your best thick skin before reading the feedback you have received.
Tip 7: Consider working with a tutor (or if you are not a trainee, someone experienced at submitting research for publication) during this phase of the review.

Responding to a positive peer review
This is a process that all publications do differently. For instance, you may be asked to respond to the reviewers comments in a separate document, or to track the changes that you have made from the original piece of work. At this point it is useful to remember that you do not need to respond to all of the requests that reviewers put forward. It is, however, necessary to be aware of why points have been left unaddressed and for a rational to be provided. Once this work has been received either: (a) the Editor will take things forward; or (b) this could go back to the reviewers again for comment.
Tip 8: Once again you may find yourself playing a waiting game – see Tip 5.

The final verdict
Once the back and forth of peer review has finished the final verdict comes from the Editor of the publication. Although it is hoped that the Editor will see that you have studiously responded to the comments of the reviewers it is not uncommon for papers to be rejected at this stage. In the case of a rejection, the author may then attempt to publish the paper in an alternative publication. In the case of an acceptance, you only have a few small hurdles to go.
Tip 9: In the case of success, it’s time to celebrate! In the case of rejection, if you truly believe in the quality of your work, do your research once again and try to find another home for the piece.

Publication and beyond
Once the celebration has died down, the nuances of the publishing process need to be worked with. Often this involves supporting the piece through the final editorial with answers to questions from the Editor or copy editors being requested (often this is completed using the same confusing system that you submitted the work – or, in the case of Counselling Psychology Review, responding to comments on a word processed document). At this stage you might find that you realise that you forgot to note down the page number or date for that
important reference! It can be worth having this in your mind when you start writing as chasing a reference, or completing a minor task of a similar ilk, can be incredibly time consuming and annoying. At this stage it is also common for you to complete a copyright form for the piece of work. Once again these are often badly designed forms that are required to be signed, printed off and returned to the publisher. They often confirm that you give the rights to the work to the publisher who then ensures that people don’t steal your work. Only on receipt of the form can your work be published.

The final element to this overview of the process is publication. This can occur relatively quickly with some publications, and take an exceedingly long time with others (potentially be prepared to wait over a year to see a paper copy of your work). Increasingly publications are developing online portals for work to be published prior to making it into a paper copy of a publication. This helps considerably and probably indicates something of the future of publishing. Only time will tell on this one. After passing this threshold, it is now too late to pull out of the publication and the work develops a life of its own. People might critique the work openly, or reference it widely. Once again that thick skin can come in handy.

Tip 10: Don’t forget to champion your work, but in doing so be prepared for positive and negative feedback.

Now over to Edith…

…I’m afraid I need to go back a few steps to put my ‘case example’ into context, but I’ll try to be brief:

Getting published – a case of self-belief or a matter of course?

When I started training, I became so used to being assessed, examined and evaluated, always having to prove to someone that I was ‘good enough’, it did not even occur to me that producing publishable research could be a feasible goal from the very outset. I was all intent on throwing myself into the research and giving my best, but to think of the product of this as one day being ‘out there’ in the glittering world of academic journals alongside ‘the real thing’ would have caused me significant cognitive dissonance. Perhaps others have more realistic expectations, which in this case would mean expecting that, yes, we can produce really decent work that not only could be published but should be published. And this is actually not just a question of personal choice but forms part of what we are committed to, that is, making a contribution to the discipline. As Elaine Kasket (2012) put it in the last issue of Counselling Psychology Review, if you don’t disseminate your work, ‘you will essentially have failed to fulfil the doctoral remit’ (p.72). Some training institutions may make getting published easier than others. As Terry has indicated, there is a move of some institutions to ask for work to be submitted in the form of publishable articles, and I think that is an excellent way of getting this process on the road.

But now cutting to the chase of my ‘case’…

Publish, or else…

I did my doctorate at an institution that promoted the publication of work not only with encouraging words (although these helped considerably); the research portion of the course required us to submit three papers in manuscript format – one literature review and two empirical studies, usually all located within one larger topic. From the start of writing the actual reports, we had to think about which journals we wanted to submit them to eventually and already observe the instructions for authors (to be submitted with the paper/report) of the journal in question in the very writing. This was actually an examinable component of the work – a form of coercive encouragement perhaps, but very effective. It meant that at the end of each year, we had a manuscript in our hands (with more or less revision work still to be done) and there was nothing to stop us from getting our work...
We are not alone
I found that, generally, the help from my supervisor was instrumental, from the first conception of the research idea to completion, revision, submission and so on. Coming from an arts/languages background, what I love about the social sciences is that they are so ‘social’: collaboration and co-authoring are the rule rather than the exception, and it’s a great acknowledgement of a good supervisory relationship to have both your names (or more, depending) on the title page. While not every supervisory relationship is a happy one and while there are ups and downs in every such relationship, I found it paid off to be persistent and to take difficult comments on the chin (not easy if you are hypersensitive like a lot of us are). It helps to remember, though, that supervisors are naturally interested in having the work published too (Research Excellence Framework [REF] and all that, amongst other reasons, of course), so once the supervisor is convinced that the work is publishable, even more help should be at hand. However, if such help is hard to come by, there are peers, books on how to get work published and editors too who may be happy to make suggestions to aspiring authors.

Facing the boxy void of the submission system
Still, the actual process of submitting can be rather anxiety-provoking, especially when it is the first time. Being reassured of the support of my supervisor (and co-author) I was all gung-ho about the process and I still remember sitting down at my computer one fine September day, and having already gone through a gruesome process of creating an author log-in and reading about the should’s and should not’s of submitting a manuscript on the publisher’s website, I finally had to confront the intricacies of the electronic submissions system that Terry mentioned. I found myself trembling and shaking with anxiety and breaking out in sweats at every point, firing off panicky emails to my supervisor in my fear of ‘getting it wrong’. I should perhaps add that the process probably touched a number of core issues for me, so others might not find themselves worrying about this tick in that box or contemplate the thought that if you enter the name of the reviewer you’d rather not have (there is sometimes an option for this!), this is probably going to be the reviewer you’ll be given. Having gone through the submission system a few times now, I find it less scary, perhaps because I have seen my work come out the other side in one piece and have developed a certain amount of trust that the system won’t just gobble up my precious little text. I guess if you’ve spent many hours, weeks, months (years?) over this ‘baby’ of yours, you can get a bit protective over it and you’d probably prefer to hand it to a person rather than enter it into a box (an advantage when you submit to Counselling Psychology Review is that you are dealing with real people at all stages!).

Post-partum
Nevertheless, the moment of pressing the final ‘submit’ or ‘send’ button eventually comes, and it can take weeks and months before anything comes back (apart from acknowledgement of receipt). Anxieties can ride high, especially when this is the first attempt at publication. I found it helped to submit something relatively early on in training, as a rejection then may be easier to take. When my first reviews came through, though, I was surprised how pleasing it can be to get feedback (someone actually bothered to read this!). However, I have to admit I found it not always a smooth process. In my case, it seemed that the reviews fell into two extreme categories: cheerfully positive or
pretty oppositional. Getting into a conversation with reviewers and editors can help clarify things or prepare for a compromise. I learned that I can stand up for some points that are really important to me (‘the topic may be controversial but that doesn’t mean you can’t research it’) while giving in on other points (‘ok, that pet hypothesis can go; it’s not really borne out of the evidence…’). Another thing I learnt was that when the ‘accept’ has finally been achieved and the celebration has come and gone, the waiting starts all over again. I remember how I waited for months for a publication before I finally had the courage to ask what had happened to it, and it turned out that the manuscript had gone missing somewhere in the system. Generally, though, once an ‘accept’ has been issued, the rest is just a technical process, and the happy ending is getting ever closer.

Afterlife
The joy of publishing one’s work is that the publication is not the end, though, but can be a beginning. Yes, it may please our narcissistic side (which, as a rumour goes, is more pronounced in our profession), and it looks good on our CV and can lead to other interesting work, but the greatest pleasure is to see the work take its place as an equal among other people’s work within one’s chosen field. When I recently saw an article that I had written quoted in the introduction to someone else’s study, forming part of that investigation’s rationale, I was amazed. The work had, indeed, not gathered dust in the drawer. However small, it was actually making a contribution somewhere. It was alive and doing its job, and somehow that made it all worth the trouble.

This seems an appropriate moment to turn attention from this one case as an example of what it can be like to get work published to the very real example of this very alive new issue of Counselling Psychology Review and the feast of contributions we are about to present.

An overview of this edition
Having spoken at length about getting one’s (doctoral) research published, I (Edith) will now move on to the current issue and first of all to a case in point. We are delighted that this issue kicks off with the winning contribution of this year’s Trainee Prize, ‘Practice-based research and counselling psychology: A critical review and proposal’ by Isabel Henton, who makes a strong case for pushing a much more integrated research-practice agenda for the profession as a whole. I would urge readers to take note of this article. Firstly, it contains an excellent review of the literature and (current) debate around practice-based research. Secondly, the author approaches her topic with great zest as well as clarity and maturity, which makes for a truly refreshing read, and thirdly, the author spells out a vision for the discipline and its research training that is well-grounded and thought-out, while its somewhat anti-pluralistic flavour should trigger further lively debate across the discipline.

This winning contribution is followed by two qualitative research papers, the only research articles in this issue (and we hope this will reinforce our call for the submission of further good-quality research papers for which there is an unwavering demand). While these two studies coincidentally show some commonality in terms of their chosen methodology, that is, Grounded Theory, they cover very diverse ground, setting the scene for the remainder of this issue which could also be read as a celebration of the diversity within our discipline. The first research paper, by Dzintra Stalmeisters, invokes early maladaptive schemas to examine Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, developing a promising theory about how, in a ‘subtle cycle’, schema-related behaviours that are seen to fulfil an individual’s desire for acceptance and continuity of pre-illness patterns are engaged in, obscuring illness-related needs and exacerbating symptoms or hindering a re-negotiation of such patterns as a result. Conceptualised as the ‘surrender to the
schema’ coping style, such an understanding, as the author suggests, may call for an incorporation of schema-focused, compassion-focused or mindfulness-based therapeutic interventions into current NICE-endorsed cognitive-behavioural ways of working with this presentation. It should be interesting to see how such a practice-relevant theory is further developed and taken up on a larger scale.

With the second research paper, by Mhairi Selkirk, Ethel Quayle and Neil Rothwell, the reader is invited to travel from the intra-psychic minutiae of schema-level understandings to the opposite end of our diverse spectrum of concerns to look at influences on psychological help-seeking in a significant minority, namely Polish migrants in Scotland. The authors illuminatingly trace variability within cultural influences on migrants’ identity as well as previous experience of services and how these can be seen to impact on people’s readiness to become involved with state-run psychological services and/or seek out private community-based provisions. This well-informed and truly ‘grounded’ investigation raises awareness of the complexity of contextual factors that individual professionals and services at large need to consider if they are to adequately engage with the psychological needs of Polish migrants.

Staying with the wider theme of diversity and context relevance, this issue’s theory paper section is then spearheaded by Patrick Larsson, Onel Brooks and Del Loewenthal’s intriguing literature review of counselling psychology’s relationship with diagnostic categories on a meta-theoretical level. Taking up the theme of the oft-lamented clash between an empiricist knowledge base and a humanistic value base within our discipline, the authors approach the topic of diagnostic categorisation from a number of angles, offering, for example, a thorough and much-needed examination of the relevance of different epistemologies, situating the topic historically and politically and working up the dilemmatic position of counselling psychologists within this field of tension in terms of a moral-political choice. Reviewing a number of key publications against this background, the authors follow up the different threads of the debate with a well-substantiated and thought-provoking critical narrative, of which one (at least to me – Edith) particularly resonating idea suggests that we may ‘need to expand the definition of ‘scientist-practitioner’ and rethink what constitutes the ‘scientific’ aspect of our professional identity’.

Following on from this critical psychopathology perspective, the theoretical review paper section then continues with an emphasis on ‘salutogenesis’ as opposed to ‘pathogenesis’ in an article by Andreas Vossler, who presents a highly useful and well-researched introduction to the construct of the sense of coherence (SOC), a core concept in Antonovsky’s salutogenic model of health and resilience and explores its relevance for counselling psychology. Grounding his balanced discussion in a thorough overview of the wider positive psychology literature and the more specific salutogenesis literature, the author explores the possibilities of fostering the SOC as a global orientation in a therapeutic setting, which, he proposes, can put salutogenic resources, actualisation of potential and empowerment processes – core concerns of counselling psychology – at the centre of therapeutic attention. The author discusses the relevance of the construct for different forms of therapy including systemic family therapy and narrative therapy and draws attention to the construct’s potential to serve as an outcome measure in therapy, although some methodological limitations as pointed out by the author may yet need to be overcome.

The theory paper section then concludes with two papers that explore the theoretical and practical commensurability of aspects from different theoretical models and origins, providing some new insights into existing models and possibilities for further development. The first paper by Miltiades Hadjiosif explores the presence of person-
centred core conditions in psychodynamic therapy. This highly original, well-researched, often surprising and sometimes entertaining paper is well-worth a closer examination. Not only is it illuminating to consider how certain core conditions, for example congruence, may be mind-bogglingly represented in psychoanalytic work, but transplanting the core conditions mentally into a psychodynamic encounter also provides those conditions with a new hue, which will be interesting to those with a more purely person-centred orientation. The very nature of this article could also be inspiring in a wider sense: the author’s mastery of very diverse therapeutic models at the level of theory as well as practice which is required for this kind of examination may well be unique to counselling psychologists and could suggest further areas of fruitful engagement to all of us.

The second contribution that draws on counselling-psychology-specific multi-model expertise is a paper by Panagiotis Parpottas, which presents an insightful and rounded discussion of how attachment theory can offer counselling psychologists who work with CBT a theoretical framework and approach for working with the therapeutic relationship. Drawing on relevant literatures around the therapeutic relationship in CBT, attachment theory and transference-countertransference understandings of the therapeutic relationship, the author suggests exploring the transference in an exploratory and collaborative way using, for example, Socratic questioning or guided discovery. This suggestion is well-illustrated with a case example from the author’s own practice, and a particularly interesting touch here is how the author reflects on his own attachment style and how this understanding has usefully informed the work with his client.

This concludes the diverse range of this issue’s theory papers. Following this section, the ‘Dialogues and Debates’ section will be introduced by Denis O’Hara.

From Terry’s invitation to readers to consider ‘writing for publication’ and my experiential account of submitting work for publication to the above overview of this publication, this editorial has covered quite a distance, and it is now time for the actual publications to speak for themselves. We hope you will enjoy what they have to say and that they will inspire you to take part in the debates yourselves.
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