



EDITORIAL

In and Beyond This Issue

In the past few months, three significant factors have played an important role in affecting the scholarly journal publishing in Taiwan, of which that is the most relevant to *JoEMLS* is, according to the new guide on journal rankings in library and information science field, *JoEMLS* has as usual been rated as the first grade journal and indexed into the TSSCI database. Quite intriguingly, Research Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences (RIHSS), Ministry of Science and Technology, has issued an official letter to universities for expressing concerns and clarification about the dispute that some universities have limited the core journals to the first grade journals and rejected the second grade journals.

The truth is, the Ministry of Science and Technologies has from the beginning committed an error by mistaking the uses and terminologies of “Citation Index” and “journal ranking”. No wonder some universities would have doubts and concerns right now. It is not surprising that these universities would only acknowledge those “first-grade core journals”. Since the lists of TSSCI and THCI Core have being extended, universities naturally have to re-evaluate these journals and adjust their money distributions for encouragement. In Taiwan, the regulations and policies on scholarly journal publishing are often quite ambiguous and confusing, thus resulting in the continuing and implementation of wrong policies. This is a worrying issue.

The second factor affecting scholarly journal publishing in Taiwan is that, since it is not easy for journals of humanities and social sciences from non-English-speaking countries to be indexed into SSCI or A&HCI databases, it is reasonable that we have citation databases exclusively for humanities and social sciences in Taiwan. In the past years, the Ministry of Science and Technologies (National Science Council) has provided subsidy for commissioning Western publishers, such as Springer, to publish journals of Taiwan, with the hope that journals of Taiwan can be indexed into the international citation databases soon. However, if we take a close look at the past years’ records of expenditures, budget and performances (commitments) of these commissions, we can see that the outcomes of these efforts are actually not as expected. The truth might be quite embarrassing. In terms of databases or the meaning of scholarly publishing, these journals of “Taiwan” that are subsidized by the government are actually publications of Western companies. However, those scholars are quite enjoying the fake honor of staging on journals of overseas well-known publishing companies.

The third factor regarding academic publishing in Taiwan is that, the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Science and Technologies on one hand have always advocated “academic ethics”, but on the other hand have ambiguous attitudes toward the issue of the order of authors on a paper. According to the Academic Ethics Guidelines by the Ministry of Science and Social Sciences, in

the guideline 9 it is mentioned that “based on the for-better-for-worse principle, co-authors are responsible for the paper content within a reasonable range, that is, once an author has gain the co-authorship on a paper, he or she should be responsible for the contributed part...” This is obviously a degradation of academic ethics. When a “co-author” has to be responsible for only “the contributed part”, it is not possible to prevent greedy and cheating misconducts of inappropriate co-authorship. Some scholars might form specific authorship rings to list each other as co-authors, no matter how much each contributes, just for mutual benefits or power and influence. Once there are controversies on the paper, each author is only responsible for “the contributed part”. These people can always harvest the benefits of co-authorship on papers and get away from troubles, because their contributed parts tend to be not so important theories or paragraphs. In addition, some senior scholars or young scholars looking for faculty positions in universities tend to have a long list of publications on their resumes; they might be proud of their abilities of publishing six to ten papers of SSCI/SCI level every year, but they are unaware of the fact that they might be violating academic ethics. However, university principals or presidents are exerting their power to recruit these new faculty member with “many works to his or her credit”, for hoping to assist the school to squeeze into the QS World University Rankings, in order to gain the title and budget of “top universities”. The guideline 9 of Academic Ethics Guidelines of the Ministry of Science and Technologies is literally a scandalous one manipulated by a group of scholar tyrants in the Ministry. Officials, well-known scholars, junior assistant professors, and graduate students, are all indifferent toward this phenomenon, either for mutual benefits or under threats. If the new guidelines of Taiwan’s “academic ethics” are such abnormal and embarrassing, it is nonsense to expect a future of really normal academic ethics.

In this issue (Vol. 54, Issue 3), three of 13 manuscripts are accepted, with a high rejection rate of 76.9%. The problem of scarce manuscripts has reappeared. It is a warning sign to both our journal and the relevant academic field. We would like to thank the contributed authors for making this issue to be able to be published. The manuscripts published in this issue include, “The Impact of Camera Shot and Background Design for MOOC Videos on Student Recall and Flow Experience” by Pei-Yu Wang, “Exploring Collaborative Health Promotion Services between Public Health Centers and Public Libraries” by Tung-Chi Hu and Yu-Wei Chang, and “An Analysis of the Questions of Online Medication Consultation Service” by Kai-Ying Chu and Ming-Hsin Phoebe Chiu. With these authors’ hard works and reviewers’ efforts, *JoEMLS* is honored to have its present academic significance.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor



編者言

本期紀要與展望

這幾個月來，有三件重大意義事件影響著台灣學術期刊出版環境。其中與本刊 教育資料與圖書館學 (*JoEMLS*) 最密切相關的就是：圖資學門期刊評比新制新一波榜單公布，*JoEMLS* 仍持續被收錄為 TSSCI 資料庫一級期刊。有趣的是科技部人社中心發出一份公函予各所大學，函中擔心並澄清期刊評比新制實施後，已有部分大學將「核心期刊」限於一級類別而摒棄二級類別。

事實上，科技部自始就犯了錯誤，不應該將「引文索引資料庫 (Citation Index)」與期刊評比排序 (ranking) 混用及混稱！如今有了部分大學的質疑，本來就相當正常，即使這些大學只願意採認「一級的核心期刊」也不令人意外，畢竟當所謂的「TSSCI」與「THCI Core」名單擴充，大學對這些期刊的評估或獎勵自然得重新衡量，以擲節獎勵經費規模。在台灣，學術期刊出版與其政策之制定，常出現矛盾現象，也造成錯誤政策的延續或繁增，令人擔心。

其二，非英語系國家的人文社會科學期刊被收錄於 SSCI 或 A&HCI 資料庫誠屬不易，如今，台灣有了人文社會學領域專門的引文索引資料庫可算是合理的做法。然而，若清查台灣科技部 (國科會) 曾出資委由國外出版社 (如：Springer 等) 發行的台灣期刊其歷年來之開支、預算及績效 (承諾) 等，就可發現原本寄望能因此快速擠進國際引文資料庫收錄之列，但是往往成效不如預期，事實恐怕十分令人不堪。就資料庫或出版意義而言，這些政府出資的「台灣」期刊都成了外國廠商出版品，但身在其中的學者卻也甘之如飴，因為他們披上了國外知名出版社期刊的假光環，而沾沾自喜。

其三，教育部與科技部談「學術倫理」卻老是對論文掛名排序問題放水。最近修訂的「科技部對研究人員學術倫理規範」第 9 條提到「基於榮譽與共的原則，共同作者在合理範圍內應對論文內容負責，共同作者一旦在論文中列名，即須對其所貢獻之部分負責，……。」顯然就是學術倫理的沈淪。因為當一個「共同作者」只需對「其所貢獻之部分負責」時，就完全無法抑止不當掛名的貪婪作假行為，基於相互利益或權勢因素，小小貢獻的小咖或大咖都可掛上名，形成特定的「掛名集團 (Authorship Ring)」，但當發生紕漏時，便只要扛「其所貢獻之部分負責」，如此，有些人便可常坐享「文章發表」之利益；卻永遠「禍不及身」，因這些人貢獻的永遠是不會出紕漏的不關痛癢之論或段落，但卻收至大之掛名利益。

再者，常有資深學者，或初應徵大學教職的新師，看其洋洋灑灑的著作清單，自豪其一年出個 6 至 10 數篇 SSCI/SCI 論文沒問題，卻對自己可能犯下的學術倫理疏失不自知，而各校校長們卻是大力「指定」用這種「著作等身」的新進

教師，以便協助衝學校QS國際大學排名指數，以爭取頂尖大學頭銜與補助經費。「科技部對研究人員學術倫理規範」第9條早已是被一群部內學閥把持下的醜陋法條。官員、大咖學者、小助理教授、研究生不論是交相賊或受脅迫，上下皆無知無感，如此一來，台灣的「學術倫理」連新的制度都如此不堪，怎麼會有真正正常的「學術倫理」？

本刊期(54卷3期)在總計13篇稿件中，只順利刊出三篇論文，使得退稿率攀升到76.9%。稿源的困頓再次出現，不論對本刊旨趣下的相關學域，以及本刊而言，這也可能都是一種警訊。很高興也很感謝此刊期得以順利出刊的重要貢獻者：王佩瑜發表「磨課師教學影片之鏡頭角度與背景設計對學習成效與心流經驗之影響」，胡彤琦、張郁蔚兩位作者提出了「衛生所與公共圖書館合作提供健康促進服務之探討」，以及另兩位作者朱凱纓、邱銘心的大作「網路藥物諮詢問題內容分析研究」。沒有所有作者們的辛勤研究與審稿者們的努力付出，*JoEMLS*就無法有今日的學術價值。

邱 炯友
教育資料與圖書館學 主編

