EDITORIAL

In and Beyond This Issue

This issue (Volume 49, Issue 3) deals with 14 articles wherein 9 are rejected and 5 are accepted in print. Its rejection rate is 64.3%. In recent years, after being informed by the reviewers who dealt with the manuscripts in proper procedure, we have found that sometimes a few authors enriched their articles with citations from their own works. In some cases, some forms of self-citation can be committed or better described as "self-plagiarism". In fact, it is difficult to have a clear cut between self-citation and self-plagiarism from the rules of referencing styles and citation analysis study. The quality of an article might be determined by the amount of self-citations which are often considered as bad and disadvantageous for an article. On the other hand, self-plagiarism can mean that one article is submitted to two or more than two journals and can be accused even more severely by criticism with academic sense of moral.

Because it is hard to know their motivation for self-citation and to assess how severe situation the citations may cause, it is bothersome that we constantly ask ourselves the following resolutions and questions: In the age of internet publishing world, how can we define that the work being self-cited has been "officially published"? If a work is self-cited, can we establish it as one of the criteria that we judge whether an article is committed with self-citation or a self-plagiarism, fundamentally according to the reality of its source work being officially published?

If the statement of already being "officially published" can be mandated in the system of legal deposit in national libraries, and become one of the prerequisites for the definition. The aforementioned doubts of self-citation or "(work) official published" can be solved accordingly. It will be a mutual beneficial result, firstly the legal deposit system can be put into effect thoroughly and secondly there will be a positive effect exerted on avoiding the ambiguity of the terms and practices.

In addition, after the last issue with *The Influence of the Journal of Educational Media & Library Sciences on Theses in Taiwan* by Yu-Wei Chang (張郁蔚), this issue continues to present a bibliometric analysis on 1,500 articles from the 1970's initial issue of *JoEMLS* to 2010. The analyzed items of the report includes the total numbers of articles, length of each one, character numbers of each title, languages, co-authorship, range of prolific authors' subject matter, and analysis on literature citation.

Next issue (Volume 49, issue 4) will have another article analyzing the characteristics of research articles in *JoEMLS* during the past 40 years. The series of articles and observation reports have proved that *JoEMLS* enjoys an important status in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) in Taiwan. The series are also helpful for observing the past research momentum in the fields related. They will follow and look forward to the future subject matters and trends, enlarge the range of full observation and in-depth academic studies, and broaden the LIS and its related scholarly fields.

Finally, we are thankful to those contributors in this Issue, contains the following research articles: *The Development of Digital Learning Objects for a "Research Methods" Course in Library and Information Science* by Shan-Ju L. Chang (林珊如) and Ya-Hong Siao (蕭雅鴻); *Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Library Electronic Databases* by Ming-Jiu Hwang (黃明居), Jiann-Cherng Shieh (謝建成), Chih-Chia Hsieh (謝志佳); *A Study on User Perceptions and User Behavior of an Online Federated Search System* by Ching-Yi Lee (李靜宜), Hao-Ren Ke (柯皓仁); *A User Study of the Effectiveness of MAP (Multiple-Access to PubMed): A MeSH Based Query Suggestion Tool* by Muh-Chyun Tang (唐牧群), Cheng-Li Hung (洪承理); and *Integrating Information Literacy into Second-Grade Inquiry Learning Using the Super3 Model: An Example of Our Community in Social Studies* by Lin Ching Chen (林菁). Each article with high value of research theory and practice really deserves our attention to read them thoroughly.

<div align="right">

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor

</div>

編者言

本期紀要與展望

　　本卷期（49卷3期）總計處理稿件篇數14篇，退稿篇數為9篇；收錄篇數5篇，本期退稿率約為64.3%。近年來，在本刊處理評閱稿件程序中，經由評閱者的提醒，我們發現偶爾有少數稿件出現了不當的「自我引用」現象而造成有所謂的「自我抄襲」之虞，事實上，在學術論文引用文獻以及引文計量研究上，所謂的「自我抄襲」總是與「自我引用」現象糾結不清，「自我引用」或許只是引用程度之多寡而產生文章良莠之別與瑕疵；但「自我抄襲」卻涉及「一稿兩投」或可能遭致更嚴厲的學術倫理批判。在難以釐清引用動機與所涉輕重程度之差異下，若以被自我引用之文獻是否為「已正式出版」文獻？而據此作為「自我引用」或「自我抄襲」之論斷標準之一，是否可行？而我們又該如何在網路多元出版的時代中，認定文獻「已正式出版」？這些疑問在在困擾著我們。如果未來能將國家圖書館的法定送存制度與此「已正式出版」課題相結合，利用國家圖書館送存制度之「公開典藏陳閱」特性，視作判定文獻「已正式出版」與否之形式要件，一來既可落實法定送存制度；二來亦可對於所謂「正式出版」等衍生議題之釐清形成積極的作用。

　　此外，繼上一卷期刊出張郁蔚教授針對本刊對台灣相關學位論文之影響力之研究分析後，本卷期亦特別整理出教育資料與圖書館學季刊從創刊年至2010年間近四十年來1,500多篇文章之書目計量分析，此報告之分析項目包括了出版篇數、文章篇幅、題名字數、寫作語言等議題，以及作者合著狀況及高生產力作者之文章內容主題分佈及引用文獻分析。在此我們也同時預告本刊下一卷期（49卷4期）也將另有一篇文章針對教育資料與圖書館學四十年來論文特徵剖析研究。這一系列的研究論文或觀察報告，不僅證明了本刊在台灣圖書資訊學領域之重要學術地位，同時也有助於了解過去圖書資訊學相關學門的研究脈動，足以展望和掌握未來研究趨勢課題，開創更全面與深入之學術觀察，豐富圖書資訊學等相關學術領域之發展。

　　最後，必須感謝本卷期所收錄的研究論文作者，計有：林珊如與蕭雅鴻對於圖書資訊學「研究方法」數位學習教材進行實例探討；黃明居等學者利用「資料包絡分析法」應用於圖書館電子資料庫使用績效研究；李靜宜和柯皓仁針對電子資源整合查詢系統，進行使用者接受度與使用行為之研究；唐牧群與洪承理「評估以MeSH做為PubMed資料庫搜尋之建議詞彙的有效性及檢索行為研究」；以及林菁以Super3模式為例，針對「資訊素養融入國小二年級社會學習領域『我們的社區』主題探究」等五篇。篇篇深具研究理論與實務價值，相當值得大家細讀。

<div align="right">

邱炯友

教育資料與圖書館學　**主編**

</div>