

## Instructions to the Authors

*Bhartiya Journal of Counselling Psychology* (BJCP) accepts Perspectives, Review Articles, Original Articles, Brief Reports, Practice Notes, Case Studies, Book or Video Reviews, and Brief Communications. The focus is on collecting manuscripts with meaningful, relevant, original and quality research problems investigated by using ‘clean and clear’ methodology (Calfee and Valencia, 2007). The paper must be able to reach a clear and meaningful conclusion with specific and future recommendations. The manuscripts are reviewed by skilled reviewers in a highly objective and conscientious manner. The authors must (strictly) adhere to the APA style of writing the research reports available on the APA website (APA Journals Manuscript Instructions for All Authors) and in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed., APA, 2010, pp. 228–231, <http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/instructions.aspx>). The specific ‘Instructions to the Authors’ of BJCP are given below.

For empirical papers the pattern of writing should follow a sequence of writing the Title, Name(s) of the Author(s), Abstract & Key Words and the authors’ affiliations on one separate page; further followed by Introduction (brief but highlighting the major variables along with relevance of the study), Objectives/ Problem, Hypotheses, Methods and Procedures (including design, sample, tools and process), Results and Discussion & the References in APA style as shown in the sample at the end.

**Title** should be clear and crispy reflecting upon the inside story. Abstracts have to be conclusion-oriented abstracts clearly stating the rationale, problem, hypotheses, methodology (design, sample and tools), analysis techniques, results stating research findings and their meaning. The abstract should be limited to 500- 600 words written in the paragraph form without mentioning the sub- titles in it. The title is to be followed by the name of the authors in italics and the abstract on one page. The affiliations of the authors should be written at the bottom after the key words.

**Introduction** should not exceed 2-3 pages including the rationale of the study. The posed research questions should not be ambiguous. It should be clearly conceptualized in the introduction section focusing on the rationale of the study supported by scientific and past evidences. Research question or the statement of problem should be followed by well stated and preferably directional hypotheses.

**Methodology** section should adequately and effectively describe the design, sample, tools or measures, methodology & process within the framework of the scientific and ethical considerations followed throughout. Regarding the research ethics to be followed, researchers can consult the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (APA, 2002).

**Results and Discussion** should include the descriptive statistics, appropriate statistical analysis, clear description and interpretation of results. The statement pertaining to each hypothesis having been accepted or rejected by the obtained results must be followed by discussion in the light of past evidences and the reflections or recommendations. Post hoc

explanation is expected when the hypothesis does not prove. Discussion should be relevant, not going beyond the data and results obtained in the present research. Implications, specific recommendations to researchers and society along with the limitations are undoubtedly important constituents of the discussion. The captions of the tables and figures should be clear and revealing, presented in APA style on the separate sheets.

Needless to say that, plagiarism has no place to rest in a quality work. The writing style should be simple, with non-ambiguous and bias free language. The length of the paper should not exceed 20 pages or 6000 words typed in double spacing in the format of 12 point text single font- Times New Romans and preferably in M.S. Word package in English. These should be mailed to the editor in chief at editor.bjcp@gmail.com

BJCP is a peer reviewed journal. Therefore, the title, abstract and the script would be given a 'quick read' by the journal editor and these scripts would be furthered for the peer review only if the editor deems fit. If the content is not relevant, or is not within the purview of the journal or not structured as per the stated format of the journal, the scripts would be returned to the authors in original. The journal would follow the 'masked review policy'. The identities of the authors' and reviewers' would never be revealed to each other. However, the scripts may be sent to two or three reviewers depending on the area of concern in the manuscript and the expertise of the reviewers.

The manuscripts may be accepted with or without modifications, may be subjected to second review after suggesting major revisions, or may be outrightly rejected by the reviewers. The reviewers will send a clear comment on whether the paper is being (a) accepted, (b) accepted with suggested revisions and modifications or (c) rejected. The reviewers will submit a detailed note on the decision taken by them. This will be the purview of the reviewer whether the paper is to be reviewed for the final decision after implementation of the suggested revisions. Of course this would depend upon the nature and amount of revisions warranted. The decision of the reviewers has to be clearly stated which would be communicated to the authors.

### **Note for the reviewers**

The evaluation criteria for the reviewers would be the same as quoted for APA journals and is reproduced below:

*'Reviewers are held to demanding standards: They must (a) present a clear decision regarding publication, considering the quality of the manuscript, its scientific contribution, and its appropriateness for the particular journal; (b) support the recommendation with a detailed, comprehensive analysis of the quality and coherence of the study's conceptual basis, methods, results, and interpretations; and (c) offer specific, constructive suggestions to authors.'* (Manual of the American Psychological Association, 2010).

The reviewers must keep an eye on the sense of the research question, methodology, findings, interpretations and the internal flaws, if any. Research question should be relevant, clearly defined, and followed by the appropriate methodology. Structure of the paper should be clear.

Language should be easy to understand. The research should be conducted ethically in a well organised manner and should be clearly presented in small paragraphs with small and unambiguous sentences. References have to be written in APA style as given in the sample below:

Everitt, B.S., Landau, S., & Leese, M. (2001). *Cluster analyses*. 4th Ed. London: Hodder Arnold.

Kuppens, S., Laurent, L., Heyvaert, M., & Onghena, P. (2013). Associations between parental psychological control and relational aggression in children and adolescents: A multilevel and sequential meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 1697–1712.

Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2010). Personality and Social Interaction. In: R. J., Larsen, & D. M., Buss (Eds). *Personality Psychology: Domains of Knowledge about Human Nature*. pp. 464–491, 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

### **Criteria of rejection**

The papers are liable to rejection if the research question is not relevant to the theme of the journal or is ambiguous, design is not in coherence with the stated problem, ethical considerations are not met, methodology (sample and design), procedures, analysis are not appropriate, results are not explained and discussed clearly or correctly or the study does not make any contributions. However, if the study is meritorious in findings and application, it may not be rejected only for ambiguous expression, style of presentation and other small drawbacks. The author may be given an opportunity to rewrite and present on the basis of specific comments and warranted modifications advised by the reviewer. However, it would be completely the decision of the reviewer whether the revised draft is to be reviewed again, depending upon the amount of correction recommended. In case of major revision the draft will be reviewed and can be rejected if the quality of paper is not upto the mark of satisfaction of the reviewer/s and the editors.