

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory

Stephan Grimmelikhuijsen, associate editor

Associate professor at the Utrecht University School of Governance

Twitter: @JPART1991

Ownership & Mission

Public Management Research Association: Improves public governance by advancing research on public organizations, strengthening links among interdisciplinary scholars, and furthering professional and academic opportunities in public management.

JPART: Seeks to advance public administration scholarship by publishing the highest quality theoretical and empirical work in the field. The journal is multidisciplinary and includes within its scope organizational, administrative, managerial, and policy-based research that improves our understanding of the public sector. ***JPART* is committed to developing diverse and rigorous research that extends and builds public administration theory.**

Goals

1. Publish high quality, rigorous research that advances public administration research and theory
2. Serve to develop research in the field

Impact

2021 Impact Factor: 7.000

5-year Impact Factor: 8.662

JPART Team

1. Editor & Co-Editor
2. Associate Editors
3. Board of Editors

Editor

1. Manages 1/2 of submissions
2. Oversees all reviewer assignments
3. Responsible for all decisions
4. Responsible for editorial strategy
5. Manages relationships with publisher & PMRA
6. Manages marketing and social media efforts

Associate Editors

1. Blind review to make desk reject decisions
2. Manage assigned manuscripts
 1. Select reviewers
 2. Correspond with authors, reviewers, & editor
 3. Recommend decisions
3. Consult on editorial strategy
4. Co-editor is a “*super*” associate editor

Publishing in JPART

Publishing in JPART, 2021 stats

- Received 573 manuscripts in 2021
- Goal: Publish 45-50 articles a year
 - Empirical (quantitative & qualitative) work that advances theory
 - Nonempirical work that advances public administration theory
- 9% acceptance rate
 - 58% of 2021 submissions desk rejected

Reviewing for JPART (and others)

1. Reviewing is **blind**, not secret
 1. It's OK if you know the author, have seen the paper before
 2. It's not OK if you cannot be objective
2. If you **cannot do the review**:
 1. Say no quickly
 2. Recommend someone else
3. Make a **clear recommendation** to the editor
 1. Why do you think this is a reject, R&R, or accept?
 1. Clearly articulate your logic in the letter to the author
 2. Don't put your recommendation to the editor in the letter to the author
 3. Do ensure your review aligns with your recommendation
4. Provide **developmental feedback** to the author(s)
5. Be consistent, timely & fair

Common themes for rejection

1. Fit

2. Framing & Theoretical Contribution

3. Practice

4. Readability

5. Methodological Rigor / Method

Common themes for rejection

- Does not make it clear how the study builds on and advances current public administration theory (significant theoretical contribution)
- Too narrow, would not be of interest to a broad range of scholars
- Describes a specific case or example rather than develops/tests a theory with broad application across settings/populations
- Data Driven (descriptive) versus Theory Driven (using theory to develop and test hypotheses)
- Validates previous findings in new context (no theoretical contribution)

What we'd like to see more of

- New methods
- Appropriate methods
 - Don't do an experiment because it is popular, do it b/c it is appropriate
- Consistent measurement use
 - No need to reinvent the wheel
- Qualitative methods
 - Rigorously applied and reported
- Applying new methods to old questions
- Field experiments
- Multi-method studies using multiple data sources

What we'd like to see more of

- Transparent data, method, and analytical reporting
- Willingness to share data and code with reviewers and readers
 - Upon request is fine
- Research addressing pressing questions
- Replication
 - varying method, measurement, setting, population
- Meta-analysis and systematic reviews that advance theory