EDITORIAL

In and Beyond This Issue

In recent years, the *JoEMLS* has regularly announced its rejection rates for each issue. It always shows the *JoEMLS* editor's attitude for the past few years: we do not intend to distinguish whether a journal is "good" or "bad" simply by its rejection rate high or low; on the contrary, we consider it our responsibility to tell the readers there exists the rejection percentages in our journal, that is all. It is a hard job to be an editor of an academic journal, who often teases himself as a match-maker, but not a bridegroom himself. She/he often worries about whether her/his devotion to the journal business is not transparent and open enough to the public. Based on this sort of concept, if we emphasize the "Trust-worthy operations", a kind of audit system for editorial works, other than rejection rate, there should be; for example, the namelists of all reviewers in the last volume issue as a whole, the publication lag (the average time span of delaying effect on publishing), the mean or median number or, the 75% percentile of publication lag, and even the revealing of reviewers' commentaries and the rebuttals from the authors as a method of scholarly communications and publicities, etc. The aforementioned methods are not newly invented or unprecedented, they are used by renowned international journals for years. We believe it takes much more sacrifice in achieving any active tasks with positive purpose. We hope in the future the editorial effectiveness and its managing system can be improved by means of fulfilling the purpose of "Trust-worthy Operations".

Owing to the creativity and perseverance in the past years, the *JoEMLS* has been considered as a benchmark for scholarly journal publishing in Taiwan. Encouraged and advised by many peers and counterparts in this academic field, the editors have strived to carry out the "double blind" review procedures for each article—going through both "review of article form" and "substantial review". The former comprises title, abstract, keywords, author's names, job position, affiliation of organization in Chinese and English, and e-mail address should be verified, and that the theme, length, citations, and referencing style of the article should meet the requirement in the academic scope of this Journal. After the article passed the "form review", the editorial staff will send it to the members of editorial board for their advice and suggestions on its theme. If accepted, it will be sent to the reviewers who were recommended by the editorial board. If there are no candidates suggested by the board members, the candidate of reviewers will be determined by the editors. Each article should be assessed at least by two reviewers for the "substantial review".

The editor and his team handled the basic and minimum "review of article form" only, they do not do any subjective assessment on the theme and substantial contents of any submissions. In this way, arbitrary editorial and blunders could be avoided, editorial efficiency could by reached, and author's rights could be guaranteed. The assessment on substantial contents should be conducted by our academic peers in this field so that objectiveness and practical suggestions can be achieved. In other words, except the form of an article does not meet our requirements, the editor of this journal will not capriciously reject it before sending it to the board and reviewers for suggestions and assessment. We will definitely respect the author's rights and the mechanism of peer-review.

The result of "substantial review", either its contents or detailed items, will be noted and recorded on the "Referee's Evaluation Form". The result will include: novelty, significance of the research, clarity of presentation, adequacy of citations, appropriate for *JoEMLS*, and of sufficient interest to publish, etc. The reviewers may offer some suggestions on the format of its citations. As to the questions about the format of citations for reference, the *JoEMLS* has devoted a lot of efforts, trained many staff for citation experts and set up systems related to the format. If the author's reference format of any article does not meet the standard (requirement), this *Journal* will help the author to improve it. Yet, it is certain that we are facing lots of challenges and hardships in keeping the standard in journal for referencing styles.

This issue (Volume 49, Issue 4) has dealt with 14 articles, including five accepted and nine rejected. The rejection rate is still around 64.3%. The first article is by Pao-Nuan Hsieh (謝寶煖), Ching-Yin Wang (王靜音), Fu-Hsuan Chuang (莊馥瑄) doing research on all articles in the *JoEMLS* in the past 40 years, analysing the characteristics of each one. Another article is about design and practice of journal OAIS by Sinn-Cheng Lin (林信成) and Wen-Yan Huang (黃文彥). Another is about a network analysis among online sociology journals, by Pei-Chun Ko (柯佩均), Ray-May Hsung (熊瑞梅), Ke-Wei Lu (盧科位). Still another is about university librarians' job satisfaction, job autonomy, and job performance by Yu-Ping Peng (彭于萍). The other is about college students' preference of environmental ambiance in libraries by Yi-Chu Lin (林詣筑) and Ming-Hsin Chiu (邱銘心). Namely, there are two brilliant and interesting main themes in this issue: the development of scholarly journal; the management of university libraries.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor

編者言

本期紀要與展望

　　近年來，教育資料與圖書館學季刊已例行地發佈每一卷期的退稿率，正如數年前即已表明的編輯立場：我們不鼓勵以退稿率做為期刊良窳之分辨；退稿率的存在目的在於盡一部分的徵信責任。學術期刊之編輯作業向來辛苦，既自嘲為「為人作嫁」，也擔心苦心經營的期刊園地不夠公開與透明。源於這種理念，如果有所謂的「徵信」作業，則當不僅只於退稿率一途，尚得有其他措施，譬如：已出版之合卷內之所有評閱者名單、出版時滯之平均數、出版時滯之中位數與75百分位數等，甚至將評閱意見與作者之答辯內容予以揭露，以昭公信與學術互動之積極手段。前述各種措施並非創見或史無前例，而是早見於若干國際知名期刊之作為。我們相信，任何的積極作為，都必須付出更多代價的。我們期待未來能藉由「徵信」之目的來達成期刊編輯效率與管理制度的提升，同樣也可經由管理制度的改善，進而達到期刊多元的「徵信」項目。

　　與上述「徵信」同等重要之觀念即是「無私」。

　　教育資料與圖書館學季刊是相當有指標性的學術刊物，多年來在許多編輯作業上的創新與堅持；以及在許多學術同儕的鼓勵與監督下而得以成長，每篇文章均採雙盲審查程序，來稿均需經過「形式審查」與「實質審查」。形式審查的內容包括：確認中英文題名、摘要、關鍵字、作者中英文之姓名、職銜、服務機關與所屬部門、電子郵址等，也確認篇幅與旨趣是否符合本刊要求與學域範疇，以及文章是否具足本刊所規範之引用文獻。來稿通過形式審查後，編輯小組會發函給編務諮詢委員會成員，就該文主題是否符合本刊旨趣，再次請委員會成員提出意見，若無異議，並由編輯委員建議審稿者。若無建議之審查者名單，便由編輯小組開會擬定審稿者名單，每篇文章至少由兩位審查者進行文章內容的實質審查。主編與編輯小組僅針對「形式審查」項目予以處理，並不涉及來稿的主題或實質內容之主觀評價，如此才能提高效率並保障作者之權益，避免主編獨斷專擅或人謀不臧。其餘的實質內容評閱作業，實則必須交由我們領域的學術同儕來衡斷，盡全力做到客觀公正與具體建議。換言之，本刊主編在未將稿件送出評閱前，除非形式條件不具備，否則不率爾否定任何作者之稿件，以示尊重作者與同儕評閱機制。

　　實質審查的內涵與項目詳列於「審查意見表」中，包括見解的創新性、研究重要性、觀點、方法、註釋、結構、文筆、學術與實用性等，當然審查者在此階段也可針對引文格式的問題提出意見。在稿件之參考引文格式問題上，本刊更是花了不少心思，培養了許多專業人才，以及相關制度的建立。引文格式若不規範（不符標準），本刊也努力協助作者改善。但不可諱言，對於引文格式的堅持也承受許多的挑戰與辛酸。

　　本卷期（49卷4期）與上卷期相同，總計處理稿件篇數14篇，退稿篇數為9篇；收錄篇數5篇，退稿率約略為64.3％。本卷期首篇為謝寶煖、王靜音、莊馥瑄三位作者以本刊40年收錄稿件為研究對象，進行論文特徵剖析；其他同樣必須感謝的研究論文作者，計有：林信成、黃文彥以OAIS開放取用期刊管理系統之設計與實作；柯佩均、熊瑞梅和盧科位針對台灣社會學門專業期刊間引用網絡之結構分析；彭于萍則探析了大學圖書館員工作滿意、工作自主性與工作績效之關係模式；林詣筑、邱銘心探討大學讀者對大學圖書館服務環境氛圍之偏好等議題。學術期刊發展與大學圖書館服務管理兩大議題，成為了本卷期精彩之論述主軸。

<div align="right">

邱　炯友

教育資料與圖書館學　**主編**

</div>