EDITORIAL

In This Issue: TSSCI Lost

This issue, volume 46(1), includes five research papers. Abdullah and Zainab explore the "Collaborative Digital Library" and use it to serve as a user-constructed systems to empower students in information literacy practices. Findings regarding teachers' reception of the digital library are encouraging as they feel the relevance of the digital library to the current requirement of the students' project and its potential to entrench information and resource study skills through project-based learning. Huang proposes the patent curriculum planning and design in Library and Information Science (LIS) schools. She investigates and analyzes the existing courses related to patent knowledge. This article, which contains both academic and practical views, will benefit librarians who are patent retrieval experts and the LIS education for potential patent retrieval professionals. Yu probes the solution for long-term preservation of web resources by adopting the standardized method and analyzing composition components and characteristics of web resources according to the perspective of the data structure. This study has offered web resources integrity, management and application effectively with the whole information content. The team organized by Liang, Chen and Hsu examine the participation motivations and work styles of administrators of Chinese Wikipedia among Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland China. Findings and suggestions are given to Wiki administrators for a better understanding and significant view.

In this issue, we especially invite Ye and Gu from Nanjing University to present academic journal databases, supplier, such as Wanfang, TsingHua Tong Fang, Vip, etc., and its related evaluation mechanism. This article compares respective similarities and differences, analyses the progress of academic journal evaluation, the existing problems, and those corresponding measures and trends. It is a worthwhile reading for those readers who would like to explore the academic publishing market in the Mainland.

Combining already received as well as new manuscripts there are 19 in total that we have processed in the past several months. Among these manuscripts, seven needed to be substantially revised, thus the review committee has not yet come to the consensus as for whether they should be accepted or not. Another four manuscripts are in the first round reviewing process. As a result, only eight manuscripts, including accepted and rejected ones, are processed in this issue, which brought the rejection rate to 40% for this issue. The journal frequency of quarterly and its publication lag have unsettled the rejection rate to some extent.

We tried the fourth time in filing for Taiwan Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI) inclusion; unfortunately, we failed again. As reflecting upon the Journal's

needed improvement, we are also aware that there are some issues, including politics, in Taiwan's academic environment that are essentially difficult for the field of LIS, which cannot be reasonably resolved. Here I would like to name a few episodes that we have experienced in the past: one is related to citation style, and another is regarding Chinese translation.

LIS is a multidisciplinary field; therefore, the differences in the nature of humanities and social science should be respected. The choice of citation styles is not an absolute decision; rather, it is usually based on the tradition of the field as well as the scholar's training. This is also why the Journal has been offering two options — APA and Chicago (Turabian) styles. By examining internationally well-known journals that are listed in the SSCI and A&HCI, we found that many of the journals also have two options in terms of citation styles. Thus, we can be certain that merely accepting one citation style is not the norm for international journals. By accepting both APA and Chicago styles, we require that scholars use the preferred style and be consistent throughout the manuscript. It is therefore beyond our understanding that our practice has been identified as problematic in TSSCI reviews for the past applications.

The second episode concerns with TSSCI's policy of translating article title and abstract that is originally written in English into Chinese. This is not an impossible request; the translation work could be easily done by editorial staff or even graduate students. However, this is unnecessary and unrelated to anything scholarly. We have not been conforming to this request because we do not believe this is the right way to go. For one thing, most international authors are unable to check with us whether our Chinese translations are correct. For another, even if we obtain the authorization from international authors to translate their works, we are concerned whether we can faithfully translate the article title and abstract without the author's confirmation. Since we have been pushing forward be international in many aspects academically, TSSCI does not have strong argument for insisting on the Chinese translation. Compared with this controversy, English Summary for Chinese articles that we started to include in the Journal since last year, we now have another newly added feature — the Romanization of Chinese references. The reason for this rather time consuming task is to meet the inclusion requirement of foreign citation databases, such as SSCI. And this is a task of realism that *JoEMLS* can afford to make it.

With its many shortcomings, we believe TSSCI still has a lot of room for improvement. We expect TSSCI to become a responsible platform that is trustworthy for the scholarly community in Taiwan. The *JoEMLS* lost TSSCI again, but TSSCI has lost itself for quite a long time.

<div align="right">

Jeong-Yeou Chiu

JoEMLS Editor

</div>

編者言

本期紀要：失落的TSSCI

　　本期46卷1期收錄5篇論文。Abdullah與Zainab透過所謂「合作式數位圖書館」模式來活化學生資訊素養之能力，對於網路資訊時代下的圖書館或教師而言，咸信相當具有啟發作用。黃元鶴提出圖書資訊系所專利相關課程的規劃與設計，並分析一系列相關課程規劃，在其學術與實務性兩相觀點下，將明顯有助於專利檢索種子人才之培育工作。余顯強探討了網站資源長期保存之解決方案，採用標準化的方式，依據資料結構的角度分析網站資源的組成模式與特性，以提供網頁內涵描述與整體資訊內容的有效管理與應用。梁朝雲、陳佳珩和許育齡就兩岸三地中文維基百科的管理員為對象，探討其參與動機與工作型態，研究群最後根據研究結果，提出對中文維基百科及其管理員制度之系列建議。這項實調對於維基百科建置者提供了許多有意義的觀察點。

　　本期特別刊登了由南京大學葉繼元和顧燁青兩位先生之中國學術期刊評價現狀評述，這篇論述詳細分析了中國大陸學術期刊評價的進展和困境，並提出了相應措施和趨勢。對於許多想瞭解中國大陸學術期刊資料庫與相關評鑑機制之學者而言，是一篇不可多得的寶貴資料。

　　本季共處理新舊稿件合計19篇，其中尚待「修訂重審」之未決稿件高達7篇，另4篇處於初審過程中，致使本期可資結案稿件（含接受與退稿）僅為8篇，雖仍維持近四成之退稿率，但季刊刊期（frequency）密集與出版時滯（publication lag）現象，顯然影響每季退稿率之分析。

　　在新年度TSSCI收錄申請中，本刊四度叩關再度敗北，除了本刊必須深切自我檢討外，原因亦在於圖資學門所處之劣勢並未得到合理之紓解，以及遭受顢頇的學術官僚與政策所掣肘。過去經驗與所曾抗議事項，試舉其一二：

　　一、圖資學一向為科際整合之學門，理應尊重人文與社會科學之本質差異；況且引文格式之採用涉及理論與師承關係。教育資料與圖書館學 季刊規定APA或Chicago（Turabian）二擇一，便是稟承理念之作法。我們針對知名的國際期刊（SSCI與A&HCI）進行調查，發現有多本國際期刊（如：*Government Information Quarterly*、*Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, …等）亦同時採用二種格式，因此僅採用單一格式並非國際期刊的慣例，亦不足取。我們要求任何個別文章必須謹守單一規範，不可混用。教育資料與圖書館學季刊在這項「問題」上，過去卻屢在TSSCI審查意見書上列入「缺失」！

　　二、TSSCI要求國外英文稿題名及摘要等須翻譯成中文。然而此要求既不關學術亦不關引文計量。卻有支持者認為：此舉係要對抗「英文霸權」保有「中

文自尊」？當然，將英文題名與摘要譯成中文並非什麼大困難，或許編輯助理或研究生可以指使差遣，毋庸勞駕主編傷神，但 教育資料與圖書館學 季刊始終力拒此要求，為什麼要抵抗？因為這是「是非」的問題。若國外作者不諳中文，則我們如何讓國外作者確認譯稿，即使要求國外作者同意授權中譯，避開了侵犯著作人格權之疑慮，則試問中文譯名、譯詞、譯句等是否正確貼切表達了原意？最重要的問題還是在於：中譯的目的、效益何在？如果是法德俄等第二外語，或有可能須中譯（或英譯），但已經成為學界通用的「英文」，還有必要中譯嗎？我們學術界講求重視「本土研究」之餘，更為學術國際化努力多年（盲目追求SCI、SSCI等標的，可為明證），但矛盾的是，曾幾何時，卻如此堅持「中文翻譯」？我們必須清清楚楚的瞭解：此「中文翻譯」舉措，無關編目、引文計量、學術品質、中文自尊等等，卻是多此一舉、庸人自擾。然而，我們為何多費工夫將中文稿件增列「英文作者名、題名、摘要、關鍵詞」？原因很簡單：因為我們要國際化、要讓國外資料庫收錄、國外學者可基本辨識、要增加學術交流機會、要…等等。換言之，學術無國界的理想促使我們向英語妥協；而我們又無法以全英文表達、出版。因此，將中文稿件部分英譯是必要的手段，無關「民族自尊」。有朝一日，「華文霸權世界」果真到耶，我們再來將英文稿中譯吧？！屆時那怕是翻成中文摘要而已，全文中譯或拒收英文稿，都行。

　　TSSCI仍有許多設計上之盲點與缺點，但已非新手上路，如何做個良善、負責的學術平台，應該是許多人的期待。

　　基於經營永續學術期刊，善盡保障作者權益之理念，本刊復於此卷期起，繼去年中文稿件增設英文摘錄之外，再新增中文註釋（或參考文獻）羅馬化拼音方案，此作業耗費許多編輯人力與精力，其目的在於滿足國外西文引文資料庫（如：SSCI）收錄之形式要求。至此，道理相當清楚可辨。因為在有限的籌碼中，或許我們並沒有太多的勝算，但我們仍應該堅持道理，有所為與有所不為。我們失去了TSSCI；但TSSCI卻失落了自己。

<div style="text-align: right">

邱　炯友

教育資料與圖書館學　**主編**

</div>