

**EASTERN REGIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

# **ASIAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**JOURNAL INFORMATION ON ARPA'S FOCUS, SCOPE, AND MANAGEMENT**

# ASIAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL POLICIES .....	3
Focus and Scope.....	3
Peer Review Process .....	3
EDITORIAL TEAM.....	6
Members of the Editorial Board .....	6

# ASIAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

## EDITORIAL POLICIES

### Focus and Scope

The Asian Review of Public Administration (ARPA) is the bi-annual journal of the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration (EROPA). It is an internationally-refereed journal in the field of public administration and governance in the Asia-Pacific region.

The first issue of ARPA came out in June 1989, taking off from the EROPA Review, initially published in Saigon. ARPA hopes to serve as a continuing forum through which views and positions of scholars and practitioners can be shared. It reinforces EROPA's commitment to good administration not only among members in the region, but with other regions as well. EROPA seeks to expand the forum, to improve EROPA's interactions, to further discover the organization's capabilities by way of exchanging ideas and perspectives.

Scholars and academicians, practitioners, students and researchers interested in the field of public administration and governance in the general Asia-Pacific region are the target audience of the journal.

The Journal aims to:

1. Disseminate ideas, issues, trends and problems impinging on public administration and related fields. It also aspires to promote study and research, as well as serve as a venue for exchange of ideas and experiences; and
2. Promote public administration and governance as a field of study and as an area of professional practice through the documenting of new ideas and to discuss emerging trends and problems and innovative solutions to the problems and to share organizational policies and experiences in the effort to improve the state of public administration and governance in the region and other parts of the world.

### Peer Review Process

ARPA is essentially a double-blind peer-reviewed journal. Each manuscript submitted will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- **Clarity.** The paper should clearly and concisely present its objectives, as well as the approaches and methods used to attain such objectives. Conclusions should be stated briefly and adequately supported.
- **Value-added quality.** The content of the paper should show the importance of the study findings, new concepts, knowledge and learning, and their value to the state of the art

in public administration. The paper must also illustrate how the results relate to the work of other scholars in the field.

- **Presentation.** Papers must adhere to the guidelines set by the ARPA Editorial Board (see Author Guidelines for more information). Tables, figures, as well as sub-section titles should be well-organized and used appropriately. In general, the paper must be able to effectively communicate its ideas to the readers.
- **Technical merit.** The paper should be able to demonstrate technical or scientific merit in the conduct of the study and presentation of results.

Reviewers are tapped from the existing database, maintained by the EROPA Secretariat with guidance from the ARPA Editorial Board, consisting of experts from different schools and universities around the world.

### *Contribution to editorial decisions*

Peer review is an essential element of the ARPA editorial process. Peer review assists the ARPA journal editors in making editorial decisions, and through the editorial communications with the author, may also assist the authors in improving their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. ARPA shares the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

### *Promptness*

Any chosen referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process without intentional delay.

Referees should contact the editors if they are not able to submit a timely review, and indicate an accurate estimate of the time they will need to finish the review if still asked to do so.

Reviewers should abide by the given time frame, and should not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author.

### *Confidentiality*

Manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents even post-review. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the Editor-in-Chief. In addition, review details should also be kept confidential.

### *Standards of objectivity*

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the authors is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. They should indicate good judgment, and give an honest and fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the research and the manuscript. Referees should ensure that their review is based on the merits of the work, and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual biases.

### *Acknowledgment of sources*

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement by a reviewer that an observation, derivation or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

### *Disclosure and conflict of interest*

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers. They should also notify the journal immediately and seek advice if they discover either a conflicting interest that wasn't apparent when they agreed to the review or anything that might prevent them providing a fair and unbiased review.

If any reviewer suspects they know the identity of the author/s, they should notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential conflict of interest.

Reviewers should also notify the journal immediately if they come across any irregularities, have concerns about ethical aspects of the research being reviewed, are aware of substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article, or suspect that misconduct may have occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript. However, they should keep their concerns confidential and not personally investigate further unless the journal asks for further information or advice.

## **EDITORIAL TEAM**

(As of July 2020)

### **Members of the Editorial Board**

#### **Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Edna A. Co, Director, University of the Philippines Diliman Extension Program; Director, UP  
CIFAL

#### **Associate Editors**

Prof. Mila Reforma; National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the  
Philippines

#### **Managing Editor**

**Prof. Dan A. Saguil**, National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the  
Philippines, Philippines & Deputy Secretary-General for Research and Publications, EROPA

#### **Editorial Board**

**Dr. Akira Nakamura**, School of Political Science and Economics, Meiji University, Japan

**Dr. Koichiro Agata**, Faculty of Political Science and Economics, Waseda University, Japan

**Mr. Hamidin Abd Hamid**, Razak School of Government, Malaysia

**Dr. Dwarika Nath Dungal**, Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration, Nepal

**Dr. Jon S.T. Quah**, Singapore

**Dr. Mark Richard Hayllar**, Department of Public Policy, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong  
SAR, China

**Dr. Masao Kikuchi**, Department of Public Management, School of Business Administration,  
Meiji University, Japan

#### **Editorial Staff**

Ms. Marjorie L. Iñigo

Ms. Mercedita M. Miranda

Mr. Jose Angelito M. Aurelio