



EDITORIAL

In and Beyond This Issue

JoEMLS has been having strict regulations on referencing styles of academic papers, especially the Romanization of referencing required by Scopus and Web of Science (WoS), and has been implemented and proofread cautiously for guaranteeing the quality of papers for authors and readers. For the Romanization of referencing, we took the lead to set standards and regulations, published relevant professional books, and actively conducted investigations and reviews of relevant applications in journals. We indeed have been taking proud in the achievements mentioned above.

However, since the spectrum of the Library and Information Science (LIS) is so broad, covering from the traditional bibliography to contemporary hot research topics, such as big data and artificial intelligence; between these two, there have also been application issues in Social science, Educational technologies and Communication science. Therefore, the regulations and selections for referencing styles of papers should be appropriate for the needs of scholars in various fields. The APA and Chicago (Turabian) styles have been adopted in our journal as the referencing standards, for respecting the literature differences of various subjects, and for providing authors the freedom to choose, but only to choose from these two styles. Several years ago, this requirement of choosing from the two styles had been misunderstood and challenged by committee members of TSSCI; thank to our striving for keeping this appropriate policy, the crisis had been solved. Several years later, we now once again have to face similar challenges. Although we have already adopted dual referencing standards of different features, we who have regarded us as the best professional team in referencing styles of academic papers in Taiwan, still have to succumb to the practical situations of interdisciplinary integration happening in the LIS field. We have been having serious considerations in adopting the third referencing style.

This third referencing style to be adopted by *JoEMLS* should meet the needs of scholars in certain subject fields and with special writing habits, for accommodating the complete sub-fields in the LIS. With our strict requirements for regulations, this third referencing style should also be appropriately connected with the current two existing and mature referencing styles. This third referencing style should be a set of special regulations that apply to the writing of those subject fields that can't fit in APA and Chicago (Turabian) styles, such as academic papers in fields of Chinese philology, or bibliography and emendation studies, since in these papers the quoted ancient and historical materials might

have notations not following contemporary publication formats. The third new regulations of referencing style are expected to be announced in our next volume of 2019 (Volume 56).

We also received requests for changing authorship. It is worth reminding that if there are needs for adding or subtracting authors or changing the order of co-authors, it should be notified and verified at the first revision of manuscripts. If there are several co-authors, the first author will be regarded as the principal author. However, the author team should name one person as the corresponding author for communicating about manuscripts and academic communication. After the revised files have been uploaded, any requests for changes of author identities will not be acceptable, for following the standards of academic ethics. In addition, if manuscripts are adapted from degree papers or conference papers, it should be noted on the first page of papers when being published in our journal. We thank for your cooperation and support.

In this issue (Volume 55, Issue 3), 11 manuscripts have been reviewed and four been accepted, with a rejection rate of 63.6%. The papers published in this issue include: “Who Was the Key Figure? A Social Network Analysis of Suzhou Book Collector Groups in Ming Dynasty through a Digital Humanities Approach” by Kuan-chih Chen, Bo-Yi Chen and Ching-Cheng Huang, “A Content Analysis and Comparison of Typhoon News in Early and Recent Periods Based on the Text-Mining Approach” by Ji-Lung Hsieh and Bi-Chun Yang, “Exploring the Effect of Film Forms on Learning for MOOC Learners” by Pei-Yu Wang, and “Challenges Facing the DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) as a Reliable Source of Open Access Publishing Venues” by Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva, Judit Dobránszki, Aceil Al-Khatib, and Peter Tsigaris.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor





編者言

本期紀要與展望

本刊教育資料與圖書館學(*JoEMLS*)向來對於學術論文引文格式(referencing style),乃至為因應Scopus與WoS要求的「引文羅馬化」規定,都非常嚴格執行與校對,協助作者與讀者做最好的把關;所謂的「引文羅馬化」更是率先制定標準規範,除了配合此議題出版專書介紹之外,也積極進行相關期刊調查與應用檢討。這是本刊很值得引以為傲之事。

然而,由於圖書資訊學門的領域光譜跨距極大,它幾乎可從極為傳統的「文獻目錄學」跨距到時興科技下的「大數據」、「人工智慧」研究議題,其間尚有許多社會科學、教育科學、傳播科學的應用議題。因此就論文引文格式的規範與選定,就必須合宜適切。本刊向來以APA、Chicago(Turabian)此兩種引文格式作為採用範例,尊重學科主題的文獻差異性,也多了一份對作者自由選擇權的尊重,但嚴格要求作者必須擇一選定。多年前這種「二擇一」的引文格式要求曾遭到TSSCI評委的誤解及挑戰,所幸本刊力爭並化解了危機,而得以保存此合宜政策。多年後的今日,我們也不得不再面臨類似的挑戰:縱使本刊早已兼具採納兩種不同特性的引文格式標準,但自詡具備「台灣最佳學術論文引文格式專業團隊」的本刊,也不得不再臣服在圖書資訊學門的跨科際(interdisciplinary)整合的實務情境中,我們必須嚴肅與認真思考而採納「第三種」引文格式的必要性。

這「第三種」被本刊所採納的引文格式,在圖書資訊學門的完整領域與旨趣下,必須相當程度能滿足某種相關學科文獻與特殊寫作習慣之需求,以及由本刊縝密規範後,亦能適切聯結既存且成熟的引文格式。本刊「第三種」引文格式也必須是一種「難以融於APA、Chicago(Turabian)的學科寫作領域之特別規範」,例如:中國文獻學、目錄校讎學等類型文章,因為它們可能應用到中國各朝各代標註、不符現代出版形制的古籍資料等。本刊期待可於2019年的下一新卷期(56卷)制定新規範。

除上述事項外,本刊亦曾遇到作者團隊變動之要求,故在此另外提醒:如需新增或減少作者、變更作者序,請在回覆第一次修改版本時確認;賜稿若為多人共同著作時,本刊必定以排序第一作者為「最主要作者」,但請作者團隊自行指定同一人或另一人為稿件聯繫與學術交流之「通訊作者」,我們也必將嚴格執行:上傳修訂檔後本刊不再接受作者身份之任何更動,以維護學術倫理之一般規範。此外,若為學位論文或會議論文改寫,刊登時需於文章首頁附註說明。期待作者諸君之配合與支持。

本刊期(55卷3期)共計11篇論文完備評閱程序,僅收錄其中4篇文章,

故本期退稿率落在63.6%。這些大作包括：陳冠至等三位作者的「孰執牛耳？明代蘇州藏書家社群的數位人文解析」，謝吉隆與楊苾淳兩位發表「從『應變自然』到『社會應變』：以文字探勘方法檢視國內風災新聞的報導演變」，以及王佩瑜「磨課師課程影片形式對學習之影響」等研究論文。而Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva等四位作者提出的“Challenges Facing the DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) as a Reliable Source of Open Access Publishing Venues”為壓軸。

邱 炯友

教育資料與圖書館學 主編

