

EASTERN REGIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

ASIAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

JOURNAL INFORMATION

ASIAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EDITORIAL POLICIES | 3 |
| <i>Focus and Scope</i> | 3 |
| <i>Peer Review Process</i> | 3 |
| AUTHOR GUIDELINES | 6 |
| SUBMISSION PREPARATION CHECKLIST | 11 |
| <i>Ensuring a Blind Peer Review</i> | 11 |
| EDITORIAL TEAM | 13 |
| SUBSCRIPTION RATES | 14 |

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.

AUTHOR GUIDELINES

Contributors are advised to adopt the following format and styles:

Headings: For A headings we use bold type, upper and lower case, flush with the left margin. For B headings we use italics, upper and lower case, flush with the left margin. It is best to avoid further subdivisions. Eg, Framework for Analysis: Sources of Continuity (A heading), Processes, Principles and Interests (B heading).

Note that the first line of text below headings is not indented. Subsequent paragraphs are indented.

Tables and Figures: refer to tables and figures in the text as follows: Table 1 not table 1, Figure 1 not figure 1. The heading Table or Figure, and the title below it, should be in bold type and centered over the content of the table or figure.

Quotations: (a) use double quotation marks for a simple quotation; (b) for a quotation within a quotation, use single quotation marks; (c) quotations which are five lines or longer when typeset (60 words is a reasonable guideline) should be indented from the left and right margins; (d) no quotation marks should be used either at the beginning or at the end of an indented quotation; (e) spelling, punctuation, capitalization and the use of italics in quotations should follow the original - however, translations should be changed to conform to our style.

Abbreviations: (a) avoid unnecessary abbreviations - a text full of acronyms and abbreviations is difficult to read; (b) it is usually unnecessary to abbreviate a short term; (c) ensure that all acronyms are spelt out when they first appear - eg, Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF); (d) omit the full stop after Dr, Mr, Ms, Mrs, St, ed, eds and in abbreviations consisting entirely of capitals, eg, OECD. For references (see also below), we omit stops after initials in author names.

Spelling: we use "z" rather than "s" in, eg, organization, corporatization, privatization, etc. Where the Concise Oxford Dictionary gives alternative spellings, the preferred spelling should be used.

Italics: italic script makes the italicized word conspicuous. It should therefore be used with restraint. Italic type is best reserved for (a) titles of books, journals and newspapers; (b) foreign words and phrases. In exceptional cases, words may be italicized for emphasis, but it is best to use this practice sparingly.

Capitalization: capitals should be used sparingly. If in doubt, use lower case.

Hyphens: We prefer to use hyphens for compound adjectives, ie where the adjective comprises two (or more) closely linked words, as in "a longer-term relationship". Not, however, in "a longer term", where only the "longer" is an adjective.

Numbers: (a) in a descriptive text, numbers under 10 should be spelt out; (b) numbers from 10 upwards should normally be written in figures; (c) avoid using a figure at the beginning of a sentence – there the number should be written in words; (d) figures should be used for all percentages (percent, not per cent), ratios, dates, degrees, dimensions, times of day, series of figures, weights and measures, and such obvious cases as page references.

Dates: (a) we use the form "30 June 2003"; (b) when month and year alone are mentioned, we use "July 2003"; (c) names of months may be abbreviated in tables as follows: Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, June, July, Aug, Sept, Oct, Nov, Dec - it is not necessary to abbreviate them in the text; (d) use 1990s, not 1990's; (e) abbreviate references to centuries and decades - eg, 19th century, 20th-century China, during the 1980s and 1990s; (f) use 1997-99, not 1997-1999; (g) a financial year may be referred to as 2000/01.

Notes: should be kept to a minimum, and are for important qualifications to what is said in the text, not for reference material (on which see next item).

References: we use the text style of, eg, (Anderson 2003), (OECD 2003:77), with a range of pages being 7-10, 11-17, 91-94, 100-106, etc. Page numbers or page-number runs should always be given when there are direct quotes, close paraphrases, or views or items of information relating particularly to the cited source. In text citations where there are more than two authors, use this form: (Martin et al 1999: 46); all will be named in the reference list. Use the ampersand ("&") in citations and reference list items except where "and" is part of a formal title.

In the list of references at the end of the article, the titles of books, journals, newspapers, reports, and theses/dissertations should be in italics. The references should be set out as follows:

Books (authored & edited):

Heidenheimer, Arnold J, Hecl, Hugh & Adams, Carolyn Teich 1990. *Comparative Public Policy: The Politics of Social Choice in America, Europe, and Japan*, 3rd ed, New York: St Martin's Press.
Baker, R (ed) 1992. *Public Administration in Small and Island States*, Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Baker, R (ed) 1992. *Public Administration in Small and Island States*, Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Chapters in Books:

Ito, Daiichi 1996. "Improving the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Public Service Systems: The Case of Japan", in Kurosawa, Susumu, Fujiwara, Toshihiro & Reforma, Mila A (eds), *New Trends*

in Public Administration for the Asia-Pacific Region: Decentralization, Tokyo: Local Autonomy College, Ministry of Home Affairs, pp.206-218.

Articles in Journals:

Thynne, Ian 1994. "The Incorporated Company as an Instrument of Government: A Quest for Comparative Understanding", *Governance*, 7(1), pp.59-82.

Newspaper Articles:

Walker, Robert 1995. "Reality Strikes Mission to Planet Earth", *Space News*, 28 August-3 September.

Reports:

Finance Branch 1989. *Public Sector Reform: A Sharper Focus*, Hong Kong: Finance Branch, Hong Kong Government.

Office of the Ombudsman 2003. *Annual Report*, Hong Kong: Office of the Ombudsman.

Theses/Dissertations:

Ko, Yuk Ying 1995. *An Analysis of Performance Pledges and Customer Service in the Hospital Authority*, unpublished Master of Public Administration dissertation, Hong Kong: Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Hong Kong.

Conferences/Symposia/Seminar Presentations and Addresses/Talks:

Peters, B Guy 2000. "The Future of Governing: Emerging Models", paper presented at a symposium on "Governance in the 21st century: Options, Issues and Challenges", University of Hong Kong, 10 April.

Sung, Yun-wing 1993. "China-Hong Kong Economic Relations: Trade Issues", talk at the University of Hong Kong, 1 June.

Electronic Media/Online References:

Li, J 2012. *Good Governance for Sustainable Development*, FutureGov [online], available from <http://www.futuregov.asia/articles/2012/jul/12/good-governance-sustainable-development/> [Accessed 2 August 2012].

[These notes have been adapted from those used for a kindred journal, *The Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, whose goodwill we acknowledge with gratitude.]

Reporting standards

Authors should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial “opinion” works should be clearly identified as such.

Data access and retention

Authors should be prepared to provide public access to raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, if practicable. In any event, they should also be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works and, if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism takes many forms, from “passing off” another’s paper as the author’s own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another’s paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable to ARPA.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

Authors should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. In general, authors should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper. Publication of some kinds of articles (e.g. translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justifiable, provided certain conditions are met. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

Acknowledgment of sources

Authors should always properly acknowledge the work of others. They should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as reviewing manuscripts, must not be used without explicit written permission of the authors of the work involved in these services.

Authorship of the paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Hazards and human or animal subjects

If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must clearly identify these in the manuscript. If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) have approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Authors should reveal in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, he/she should promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper. If the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, the author should promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the editor of the correctness of the original paper.

SUBMISSION PREPARATION CHECKLIST

As part of the submission process, authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items, and submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to these guidelines.

1. The submission has not been previously published in any other journal or primary publication, nor is it with another journal – other than ARPA – for consideration.
2. The submission file is in OpenOffice, Microsoft Word, RTF, or WordPerfect document file format.
3. Where available, URLs for the references have been provided.
4. The text is double-spaced and must be 6000 to 8000 words long, inclusive of notes and references; uses a 12-point Times New Roman font; employs italics, rather than underlining (except with URL addresses); and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.
5. The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the *Author Guidelines*.
6. If submitting to a peer-reviewed section of the journal, the instructions in *Ensuring a Blind Review* have been followed.

Ensuring a Blind Peer Review

To ensure the integrity of the blind peer-review for submission to this journal, every effort should be made to prevent the identities of the authors and reviewers from being known to each other. This involves the authors, editors, and reviewers (who upload documents as part of their review) checking to see if the following steps have been taken with regard to the text and the file properties:

The authors of the document have deleted their names from the text, with "Author" and year used in the references and footnotes, instead of the authors' name, article title, etc. With Microsoft Office documents, author identification should also be removed from the properties for the file.

For **Microsoft 2003** and previous versions, and **Macintosh** versions of Word:

Under the File menu select: Save As > Tools (or Options with a Mac) > Security > Remove personal information from file properties on save > Save.

For **Macintosh Word 2008** (and future versions):

1. Under the File menu select "Properties."
2. Under the Summary tab remove all of the identifying information from all of the fields.
3. Save the File.

For **Microsoft 2007** (Windows):

1. Click on the office button in the upper-left hand corner of the office application.
2. Select "Prepare" from the menu options.
3. Select "Properties" for the "Prepare" menu options.
4. Delete all of the information in the document property fields that appear under the main menu options.
5. Save the document and close the document property field section.

For **Microsoft 2010** (Windows):

1. Under the File menu select "Prepare for sharing."
2. Click on the "Check for issues" icon.
3. Click on "inspect document" icon.
4. Uncheck all of the checkboxes except "Document Properties and Personal information".
5. Run the document inspector, which will then do a search of the document properties and indicated if any document property fields contain any information.
6. If the document inspector finds that some of the document properties contain information it will notify you and give you the option to "Remove all," which you will click to remove the document properties and personal information from the document.

For **PDF files**:

With PDFs, the authors' names should also be removed from Document Properties found under File on Adobe Acrobat's main menu.

EDITORIAL TEAM

(As of June 2019)

Editor-in-Chief

[VACANT]

Associate Editors

Dr. Maria Fe Villamejor-Mendoza, National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines, Philippines

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

Managing Editor

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

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. Ruixin Zhang, College of Administration, Jilin University, People's Republic of China

Dr. B.S. Ghuman, Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, India

Dr. Kamla Kant Pandey, Indian Institute of Public Administration, India

Prof. Dr. Eko Prasajo, Administrative Science Department, University of Indonesia, Indonesia

Dr. Jon S.T. Quah, Singapore

Dr. Supachai Yavaprabhas, Department of Public Administration, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Dr. Tran Anh Tuan, National Academy of Public Administration, Vietnam

Editorial Staff

Prof. Mila A. Reforma

Ms. Samantha R. Chan

Ms. Mercedita M. Miranda

Mr. Jose Angelito M. Aurelio

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Past and present issues of the ARPA journal can be viewed via <http://journals.sfu.ca/arpa/index.php/arpa/index>.

For hard copies of the journal, please refer to the rates specified below:

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Single Copy* | Non-Filipino Subscribers | US\$ 16.00/copy |
| | Filipino Subscribers | P 350.00/copy |
| Subscription (per year)* | Non-Filipino Subscribers | US\$ 30.00/year |
| | Filipino Subscribers | P 600.00/year |

* The rates are specified in consideration of shipping costs from Manila, Philippines (where the Office of the EROPA Secretariat-General is located) to anywhere in the world.

NOTE: Published contributors are entitled to receive two physical copies of the issue their work has been printed in.

For more information and inquiries, please contact the EROPA Secretariat via e-mail (publications@eropa.co; secretariat@eropa.co) or telefax (+632) 8 929 7789.