

Editorial

Welcome to the third edition of the Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling. You may have noticed already a difference between this year's edition and last year's – a new section entitled 'Field reports'. This section has been included to widen the range of papers published in the journal, and to encourage colleagues to consider submitting articles which may be less research-oriented than articles in previous years. This serves the purpose of trying to meet the expressed needs of many of our readers who say they want a practical professional journal, not just one that looks good and satisfies rigid academic criteria.

Although we receive many positive comments about the contents and appearance of the journal, I don't think we have reached anywhere near the potential we could, given the talent of our members. There still seems to be a reluctance to submit papers for consideration, so it is hoped that commencing this new section will entice more field reports, so that innovative practices in guidance and counselling can be shared without having to go through the traumas of preparing and submitting a formal paper. Next year we will be including a book review section, so keep your eyes open in the newsletter for further details.

The range of issues covered in this edition is again very broad. Ashman et al. look at the correlation between training provided for guidance personnel and on-the-job needs of newly-graduated professionals. Frydenberg provides very helpful comments on the coping skills of capable adolescents, while Burnett investigates the relationship between self-concept and self-esteem. Raciti and Waltisbuhl, in separate papers, consider different aspects of the continuing issue of 'inclusion', and offer practical strategies which may assist others. Ross investigates aspects of the career decision-making strategies of secondary students considering careers in the hospitality industry. Wragg provides a timely essay on the need to consider internalising disorders (e.g. excessive quietness and shyness), as well as externalising disorders (e.g. conduct disorders), when implementing guidance programs in schools. Sherrington reports on the shortening of a maths anxiety rating scale which may be useful for working with certain types of students, and Heinecke provides a cogent discussion of issues which need to be considered when developing policies on critical incident management in organisations such as schools.

Once again, I must sincerely thank my co-editor, Robyn Gillies, and my editorial panel – Gabrielle Elich, Greg Field and Robynne Moore, for meeting my deadlines and providing invaluable critiques.

John Carroll