



EDITORIAL

Integrity and Vigilance of a Journal Editor

The most shocking news in recent international academic publishing field would be the unexpectedly closing of Scholarly Open Access website in the mid-January of 2017. Although Jeffrey Beall, the key figure of the website, somehow disclosed the academic misconduct and set an example of running journals, he made some unsolved problems for the journal administrators and himself. No matter whether the website is closed forever or not, a scandal has been witnessed by the whole world—the so-called “predatory journal” and a contemporary legendary figure.

In the early January of 2017, Beall issued a black list of 2017 international publishing, including predatory publishers, predatory standalone journals, misleading metrics companies and hijacked journals. Among these, scholars of India are the majority, and unfortunately some scholars of Taiwan are among these too. However, the notorious event and the black list lasting less than a month disappear all together with the closing of Scholarly Open Access website.

Another ironic news of this year drew attention again. On March 22, *Nature.com* published an article titled as “Predatory Journals Recruit Fake Editor”, mentioning some international journals received a job application from a fake figure Dr. Szust and hired her as the editor. The disclosing of this scandal raised a hot debate in the academic field, and most people blame the awful quality of these predatory journals. However, the whole issue is more complicated than this. We should take an objective and rational viewpoint to look at this issue.

Don't easily believe or have a myth in titles of editor-in-chief of so-called “international journals”. It is not supposed to and appropriate to fool or taunt those predatory journals all the time. Some journals are labeled as the notorious “predatory journals”, with an essentially unfair standing point. Now they are treated as baits, becoming so-called “academic papers” that scholars study and publish related articles. This research design is with flaws and against academic ethics. Taking a first look at the resume of Dr. Szust, “she” is truly qualified for journal editors. After the first contact and gaining trust, the candidates' backgrounds should be investigated and verified by the journal before the final decision is made. However, the researcher of the report was eager to make a conclusion and disclose his fake identity afterwards. Isn't this also a fraud in academic ethics? We should be glad that we are not in the list of being set up and taunted. It's highly possible that when this seduction comes to us, we may

not be able to escape this fraud since we are so fascinated with so-called journal “internalization”.

Some academics serve as editors-in-chief or editorial board members in so-called predatory journals. These are usually in-experienced young scholars, but some are sophisticated greedy experienced scholars. So many scholars of Taiwan are fascinated with titles of editorial committee members of “international journals”. Are they ignorant, innocent or with purposes? From another viewpoint, how many new and young journals are wrongly labeled as “predatory journals” because of their creative publishing strategies? Jeffrey Beall casted some shadow. Since the foreign media treated the issue that way, we as their academic peers in Asia should be cautious. The true issue is: between co-authorship and co-editorship without any actual intellectual contributions, which one is worse in terms of academic ethics? If we would like to discuss this issue, we have to treat it as a case and judge it accordingly. When a group of scholars form an academic crime ring, they are as vicious, because these people know it’s hard to sort out the truth, and would keep denying their misconducts. This is unforgivable.

In this issue (Volume 54, Issue 1), five articles are collected; three are research articles, one is a brief communication, and one is an observation report. In the research article part, eleven are rejected, with a rejection rate of 78.5%. Manuscripts published in this issue include “Design and Implementation of a Library and Information Science Open Access Journal Union Catalogue System” by Sinn-Cheng Lin and Ting-Yu Chou, “A Study on Volunteers of the Storytelling of Training in Public Libraries: A Case Study on Volunteer Storytellers of Taipei Public Library” by Yu-Ping Peng and Po-Han Chuang, “Analyses of the Standard Classification of Fields Based on the Directory of Faculty Expertise Open Data” by Sung-Chien Lin. In this issue, in reaction to the well-known Leiden Manifesto, we publish two articles focusing on basic introduction and observation analysis, as well as actual examples of application. We hope to offer a more rational, appropriate and correct viewpoint and value judgment for researchers, academic publishers and academic institutions in an academic climate that emphasizes influence factor (IF) of performance in bibliometrics.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor



編者言

期刊經營者的誠信及警惕

最近國際學術期刊出版界的大事恐怕首推 Scholarly OpenAccess 網站於 2017 年 1 月中旬的無預警關閉，網站首席人物 Jeffrey Beall 雖然某種程度糾舉了學術不端行為，並且樹立期刊經營典範；但自己卻也給一些期刊經營者穿小鞋戴大帽子，反將自己膨脹成麻煩。該網站不論是否無限期關閉，它（他）都已留下了歷史見證——所謂的「Predatory Journal」（詐騙斂財期刊）以及傳奇人物的時代案例。

回顧 2017 年 1 月初，Beall 甫公佈了 2017 新年度國際期刊出版黑名單，包括了 Predatory publishers、Predatory standalone journals、Misleading metrics companies、Hijacked journals 四項，名單中似乎仍以印度學者居多；但不幸地卻也出現了台灣學者入榜。然而維持不到一個月的榜單，也因 Scholarly OA 網站的終結，不名譽事件盡消失無蹤。

今年另一件極為諷刺的報導再度引起許多人側目。Nature.com 於 3 月 22 日刊出了一篇名為「Predatory journals recruit fake editor」的報導，提及某些國際期刊輕易受到一位假造人物「Dr. Szust」應徵函，進而禮聘且受騙之事。此事一經揭露，亦引起學界一片譁然，紛紛矛頭轉向指責「詐騙斂財期刊」品質之不堪。然而，事實不然，我們應該要以另一種客觀冷靜的角度來審視此事件：

不要輕易相信或迷信「國際期刊」的主編／編委頭銜；若始終找這些新創期刊者的麻煩（或嘲弄）是不應該且不恰當的。它們有些已率然被冠上「predatory journal」的惡名，既存有先天的不公平條件，如今卻又被以「釣魚」方式上鉤，成為他人研究發表的「學術文獻」，這種研究設計是有瑕疵，且違學術倫理！以「Dr. Szust」的「履歷資料」來看，「她」的確有潛力被選上期刊編輯成員，第一次的接觸取信之後，通常仍有待期刊後續接洽、確認、核實，並非如此簡單真正成案。該報導文章之研究者急於第一階段即定論且公開報導，再於事後始公開真假身份，這於學術倫理上不也是詐欺？！該慶幸的是，我們不在被設計的名單內，因為，在台灣常常聲稱追求期刊的「國際化」之同時，若這樣的誘惑臨到，我們恐怕也難以脫身與抵擋。

或許，在這個學術圈子，有許多人於所謂的「predatory journal」擔任主編或編委職務，這些人通常是資淺「涉世未深」的青年學者；卻也有一些人是貪念下「老謀深算」的壯年學者。這類迷戀「國際期刊」編輯委員頭銜的台灣學者幾希？他們的過錯是無知、蓄意抑或無辜？再從另一角度而言，又有多少曾被戴上（被指涉）為「詐騙斂財期刊」，本身僅僅是草創初期的創新策略而被誣陷？Jeffrey Beall 的陰影依舊。國外媒體（報導）如此看待問題，身為亞洲學術同儕

的我們，怎可不慎辨、不警惕？真正核心問題是：在未曾有真正實質智識貢獻 (intellectual contributions) 情形下之「期刊發表掛名」與「期刊編輯掛名」，何者事涉學術倫理較嚴重？欲論此就必須依個案按情節論處。當一群人儼然形成學術「犯罪集團」(Ring) 時，便一樣可惡。因為這些人自恃事件原委常無法查證，而往往不認罪。如此便難被饒恕。

本刊新卷期 (54 卷 1 期) 共收錄 5 篇文章，其中三篇為研究論文，一篇為短文論述，一篇為觀察報告。若單以研究論文計算本期退稿率，退稿篇數為 11 篇，則本期退稿率高達 78.5%。本卷期刊載研究論文計有林信成與周庭郁的「圖書資訊學開放取用期刊聯合目錄系統之設計與實作」、彭于萍與莊博涵的「公共圖書館故事志工教育訓練之研究：以臺北市立圖書館林老師說故事團隊為例」，以及林頌堅的「以開放資料的教師學術專長彙整表為基礎之學科標準分類分析」。此外，本刊期特別對於近年著名的「萊登宣言」(Leiden Manifesto) 刊出兩篇分別著重基本介紹與觀察分析，及實際應用範例的文章，這在講求書目計量學項下有關影響係數 (IF) 績效的學術社群環境中，可望能為研究者、學術出版者、學術機構等社群，帶來更理性、合宜、正確的觀念與價值判斷。

邱 炯友

教育資料與圖書館學 主編

