Editorial

Vision of a new journal: *Administrative Sciences Research*

Bowon Kim[†]

KAIST College of Business, Seoul 02455, Korea; bwkim@kaist.ac.kr

[†] Editor-in-Chief of *Administrative Sciences Research*

I accepted the invitation to serve as the Founding Editor-in-Chief of *Administrative Sciences Research (ASR)* in March 2025. As I had a profound sense of responsibility and tempered optimism, this decision did not come lightly. Starting a new academic journal may seem unwise since the publishing ecosystem is already saturated with established publishers and disciplinary gatekeepers [1]. People can legitimately ask reasonable and essential questions like "Why should another journal be dedicated to administration? What new and necessary purposes can ASR serve?"

These questions speak to the heart of what it means to create, curate, and sustain a new intellectual venture. I engaged deeply with these questions before committing to this role, precisely because I recognize both the risks and responsibilities of founding a journal. The stakes are high. The workload is significant. Yet, I believe the potential impact of ASR can be transformative, if and only if executed with integrity, clarity, and vision.

The journal we are building is not designed to replicate existing models. Nor is it an attempt to secure prestige through imitation. Instead, ASR aspires to challenge prevailing boundaries, expand the domain of administrative sciences, and amplify voices that remain underrepresented or marginalized in traditional academic venues [2]. We are motivated by a simple yet compelling question: What kind of scholarly platform does the world need today to better understand and guide the implementation of administration in all its forms?

In this inaugural statement, I set out the vision to guide ASR as it takes its first steps into the world. This vision is founded on three core principles. They are a global, contextual, and interdisciplinary orientation, a deliberate embrace of methodological and theoretical pluralism, and a structural integration of scholarly and practical dialogue, including unconventional perspectives. These are not merely aspirational commitments. They are necessary to respond meaningfully to our time's complex, multi-dimensional administrative challenges.

1. Reimagining administrative science: Global, contextual, and interdisciplinary

ASR begins with a recognition that administration is everywhere. From governments and corporations to NGOs, schools, hospitals, start-ups, and informal organizations, administrative practices and institutions shape human life across regions, sectors, and cultures. Yet, paradoxically, much of what we call "administrative science" remains anchored in narrow paradigms.

Theories conceived in specific institutional contexts in the West and generalized prematurely to others often dominated the academic field. Of course, they have offered important and instrumental ideas. But they have increasingly failed to explain the cultural, political, and historical diversity of administrative applications in the 21st century. For instance, management practices in Scandinavian public agencies, South Korean conglomerates, or African social enterprises may differ not just in degree, but in kind, from those in North American firms [3]. Institutional logics, regulatory environments, and historical legacies matter [4].

ASR, therefore, positions itself as a journal that foregrounds contextual richness. We are especially interested in contributions that emerge from the Global South, post-colonial states, hybrid governance systems, and transitional economies [5,6]. This does not mean relegating such work to a special issue or marginal position. Instead, we aim to place such perspectives at the center of our editorial scope. We believe that grounded, context-sensitive research from across the globe will diversify the field and refine and expand its theoretical boundaries [7].

Second, ASR advocates for an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral understanding of administration [8]. The boundaries that separate public from private, corporate from nonprofit, or formal from informal administration are increasingly porous. Problems such as climate governance, AI regulation, public health, and infrastructure financing demand integrated responses from multiple domains. Insights gained from one sector can illuminate actions in another.

We want authors to draw from diverse disciplines like public administration, organizational studies, sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, information systems, and beyond [9]. We equally seek studies that compare, connect, or traverse sectors [10]. For example, what might nonprofit resource mobilization strategies teach us about resilience in public finance? How might observations from military logistics inform civilian disaster response? ASR will provide a home for such intellectually cross-pollinating work [11].

2. Pluralism in methods and theories: Welcoming rigorous diversity

A journal dedicated to openness must also be rigorous. We do not conflate pluralism with permissiveness. Instead, we believe that thorough scholarship can take many forms. ASR is devoted to methodological and theoretical pluralism, not as a default stance but as a philosophical choice [12]. We understand that the complexity of administrative phenomena cannot be captured by a single method or theory [13].

We expect submissions built upon quantitative models, statistical analyses, ethnographic fieldwork, comparative case studies, design science, simulation modeling, and conceptual argumentation [14,15]. When executed thoughtfully and transparently, each approach brings unique strengths. Similarly, we welcome theoretical papers ranging from institutional theory, systems thinking, pragmatic realism, complexity theory, Global South perspectives, and practice theory, to emergent frameworks yet to be named [16].

But we ask one thing in return: clarity of purpose. We expect authors to clearly define their research questions, position their articles in the proper context of relevant literature, and offer insights based on administrative realities. ASR's reviewers and

editorial board will uphold the highest coherence, relevance, and influence standards, without enforcing unjustifiable conformity.

In addition, we strongly support pluralism for language and form [17]. Although we value academic precision, we do not overvalue jargon. Articles should be readable, accessible, and thought-provoking, with lessons that stimulate dialogue beyond disciplinary compartments. We want ASR to be a journal where readers can learn from unfamiliar methods and perspectives, not be excluded by them.

3. Administrative reflections: Honoring experience, bridging practice and theory

I've often contemplated the paradox of conventional academic publishing: citation is too frequently prioritized over insight, form over substance, and conformity over curiosity [18]. Yet, transformative thinking rarely emerges from conformity. Many of the *truly* foundational papers among the most groundbreaking in modern sciences were remarkably light on references. Not because they lacked rigor, but because the ideas were so unprecedented that existing literature could hardly contain them [19].

With ASR, we aspire to create a space where insight precedes orthodoxy [8]. Our ambition includes welcoming voices that may not speak in academic jargon, e.g., veteran administrators, policymakers, and managers whose lived engagement with institutions reveals truths that theory alone cannot capture [20].

To this end, one of the defining features of ASR will be its special section, *Administrative Reflections*. This section is designed to host manuscripts from practitioners, e.g., public servants, civil society leaders, corporate executives, social entrepreneurs, policy designers, and institutional reformers [21]. These people may not speak in the technical language of academia, but they often possess wisdom born of experience that can profoundly enrich our understanding of administration.

Many journals exclude such narratives because they fall outside standard "peer-reviewed" scholarship criteria. We take a different approach. While *Administrative Reflections* essays will be editorially reviewed and supplemented by peer review if necessary, they will be held to a high standard of thoughtfulness, coherence, and storytelling power. These essays can take many forms: personal accounts of leadership, behind-the-scenes stories of reform initiatives, critical thoughts on institutional failure, or thought pieces on emerging administrative dilemmas [22].

We hope to build bridges between rarely conversing communities by including such work in ASR [6,23]. Theory needs practice. Practice needs reflection. Neither should exist in isolation. The inclusion of practitioner-authored content does not lower the standards of ASR: it broadens them. We envision a journal in which a research article on regulatory design in emerging markets can sit alongside a probing piece by a regulator in a real emerging market, where a simulation model of disaster response logistics is enriched by an essay from a first responder on the street in another emerging country, and where, above all, ideas meet action.

4. Fostering scholarly and practical dialogue

ASR should be a forum, a meeting ground, and a living dialogue [9]. It has to be more than a journal. This vision is not just rhetorical: it has structural implications. We need to foster a culture of dialogue within and beyond our pages.

To this end, we will initiate features such as [24]:

- Special issues curated around grand challenges that cut across contexts and fields (e.g., climate adaptation, digital bureaucracy, administrative ethics in AI governance);

- Editorial essays that synthesize trends in recent submissions and suggest future directions.

We also adhere to inclusive editorial policies. Our editorial board is diverse and open geographically, institutionally, and intellectually. We will proactively mentor early-career scholars and encourage authors for whom English is not a first language [25]. We believe that a journal's reputation should not rest on the citations it garners, but on the communities it cultivates [26].

5. The road ahead: Substance, engagement, and relevance

As we prepare to launch the first issue of *Administrative Sciences Research* in June 2025, I am under no illusion that vision alone will carry us forward. We must earn credibility. That credibility will come from substance, inclusiveness, and intellectual honesty.

We ask our contributors to help shape ASR by submitting work that pushes boundaries while remaining grounded in meaningful questions, reviewers to provide generous, rigorous, and constructive feedback, and readers to engage with curiosity and openness.

ASR does not aim to become the most prominent journal in the field. We strive to become one of the most thoughtful [16]. We hope to serve as a destination for those whose work falls between disciplinary cracks, whose intuitions challenge conventional perception, or whose discourses have not yet found a scholarly home [2].

I offer my gratitude to the authors, readers, reviewers, and editors who will help build this journal. We are at the beginning of a long and challenging adventure [9]. I hope we can work together to build something that is true and meaningful.

I sincerely appreciate your thoughts, reflections, and participation as we embark on this journey.

Conflict of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Rafols I, Leydesdorff L, O'Hare A, et al. How journal rankings can suppress interdisciplinary research: A comparison between Innovation Studies and Business & Management. Research Policy. 2012; 41(7): 1262-1282. doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.015
2. Bevir M, Rhodes R. Interpreting British Governance. Routledge; 2003. doi: 10.4324/9780203135914
3. Ostrom E. Governing the Commons. Published online November 30, 1990. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511807763
4. March JG, Olsen JP. The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life. American Political Science Review. 1983; 78(3): 734-749. doi: 10.2307/1961840

5. Dreze J, Sen A. India: Development and participation. Oxford University Press; 2002.

6. Schmidt VA. Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. Annual Review of Political Science. 2008; 11(1): 303-326. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.060606.135342

7. Escobar A. Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World. Princeton University Press; 1995.

8. Flyvbjerg B. Making Social Science Matter. Published online January 15, 2001. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511810503

9. Feyerabend P. Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge. New Left Books; 1975.

10. Šiljak DD. Decentralized control of complex systems. Academic Press; 1991.

11. Helbing D. Pluralistic Modeling of Complex Systems. Models, Simulations, and the Reduction of Complexity. Published online November 14, 2013: 53-80. doi: 10.1515/9783110313680.53

12. Lamont M. In praise of methodological pluralism. Harvard University; 2012.

13. Rosen R. Anticipatory systems: Philosophical, mathematical, and methodological foundations. Pergamon Press; 1985.

14. Cartwright N. Hunting Causes and Using Them. Published online May 31, 2007. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511618758

15. Collier D, Brady HE, Seawright J. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards, 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield; 2010.

16. Shields PM. The Community of Inquiry. Administration & Society. 2003; 35(5): 510-538. doi: 10.1177/0095399703256160

17. Bevir M. Democratic Governance. Published online December 31, 2010. doi: 10.1515/9781400836857

18. Bourdieu P. Homo Academicus. In: Collier P (translator). Stanford University Press; 1988.

19. Geertz C. The Interpretation of Cultures. Basic Books; 1973.

20. Schön DA. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. Basic Books; 1983.

21. Shields PM, Soeters J. Peaceweaving. The American Review of Public Administration. 2016; 47(3): 323-339. doi: 10.1177/0275074015589629

22. Bevir M, Rhodes R. Governance Stories. Published online April 19, 2006. doi: 10.4324/9780203969090

23. Sandel M. Michael Sandel: What's the right thing to do? PsycEXTRA Dataset. Published online 2009. doi: 10.1037/e597132010-001

24. Dryzek JS. Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford University Press; 2006.

25. Hicks D, Wouters P, Waltman L, et al. Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. Nature. 2015; 520(7548): 429-431. doi: 10.1038/520429a

26. Mintzberg H. Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development. Berrett-Koehler; 2004.