EDITORIAL

The Opportunity and Status of the *JoEMLS* Open Peer Review System

In recent years, many controversial issues around publishing of predatory journals have been unresolved, mainly because not enough facts are served as substantial evidence to support or deny the innovative management models, which are supposed to be within the range of normal journal publishing. In another words, so-called predatory publishing behaviors are often turned out to be wrongly accused, sometimes because the accusers are unconsciously over-subjective, and in some cases it is because of stereotypes towards the publishers' images, credibility or history. Such prejudices certainly become hindrances for new journal publishers who make efforts to promote innovative publishing modes, and it is also easy for the REAL predatory journal publishers to pass off fake products as genuine, and to gain improper advantages in chaotic accusations. How to solve the dilemma of the chaotic scholarly publishing? Many scholars and institutions have developed various journal evaluation standards, trying to identify the genuine ones; however, these standards might still be developed from others' past experiences, which tend to be over-subjective. The expedient solution to this problem might be the so-called Open Peer Review (OPR) system, which makes review records of submitted manuscripts open to the public, that is, readers can read all the referees' review opinions and authors' responses. It is for the publishing process of a scholarly journal to be more transparent and just, in order to dismiss all doubt concerning whether it is a decent journal publisher, with authentic review records. Even though OPR might not be the cure-all that solves the problem of predatory journals, it may help present partial truth and decency, and seems to be the most adequate procedural check.

The *JoEMLS* has implemented the OPR system since Issue 2, Volume 56 of 2019. So far 17 articles of four issues have been published in the *JoEMLS*. Based on manuscript categorical features and special factors, we prudentially asked the authors and referees of 14 articles about their willingness of participating in the OPR system, and authors of 11 articles agreed. Among the 30 referees of these 14 articles, 10 referees agreed to make their review opinions open with their names disclosed, 13 agreed to make open in anonymous, and the rest declared they were unwilling to make open or did not respond to the requests. Eventually we have produced 10 general reports and three individual reports, for the readers. From our one-year experience of implementing the OPR system, we found that the

key to the success of OPR, is the consensus and corporation among the major beneficial interests of OPR (e.g., authors, referees) and the secondary beneficial interests (e.g., readers, editors). In terms of OPR, this not only involves rights and obligations of both authors and referees, but also concerns a deeper meaning regarding design of the OPR system, journals' brand images, and readers' privileges. It has not been too long since the OPR system was implemented and promoted, thus although some authors or referees may support the concept of OPR, they still tend to reserve their opinions and declared they were unwilling to make the record open for the time being. They might have concerns about academic peer pressure, or they still had not perceived the positive effects that OPR might bring. To sum up, since the OPR is a kind of diverse and innovative mechanisms without a universal operation mode, we will keep observing and improving implementations of the OPR.

We would like to remind you that in this issue of the *JoEMLS* (Volume 57, Issue 2), we have uploaded to the official website the examples of referencing styles in Chinese and English, following the guidelines of the latest 7th version of APA and the 9th version of Chicago (Turabian). This demonstrates our high regard for these two style manuals of academic papers. Readers are welcome to use this reference.

Many manuscripts submitted for this issue did not properly follow our editorial guidelines, and thus were rejected at the beginning. Nine manuscripts have gone through the whole review process, and four were accepted, with a rejection rate of 55.6%. Manuscripts published in this issue include "A Preliminary Investigation of Taiwanese Researchers' (Mis)understandings of Academic Ethics: Taking the Reported Cases Relating to Plagiarism, Improper Citations, and Self-Plagiarism by the Ministry of Science and Technology as Examples" by Mei-Lien Hsueh, Sophia Jui-An Pan, and Chien Chou; "Tracking the Scholarly Influence of Dervin's First Paper on Sense-Making Methodology" by Yu-Wei Chang and I-Jen Li; "Exploring the Patients' Mental Model of the Sunshine Social Welfare Foundation's Support Group on Facebook: A ZMET Approach" by Yi-Chiao Vicky Tseng and Ming-Hsin Phoebe Chiu; and "An Application of Inquiry-Based Quality Talk to the Flipped Design and Teaching of 'Reading & Writing' Courses" by Tina Pingting Tsai, Chingsheng Hsu, and Jyhjong Lin.

Thanks the authors of accepted manuscripts in this issue, for their outstanding contribution to the academic knowledge. Our deep gratitude is also sent to the authors and referees who are willing to support our OPR system.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor

編者言

學術期刊「開放同儕評閱」制度的機遇與問題

　　近年來，許多掠奪性期刊出版的爭議話題往往都陷入羅生門，究其主要原因即在於難以充分舉證相關事實，來支持或否定那些原本該屬於正規（正常）期刊出版發行範疇內的創新經營模式；換言之，所謂的掠奪性出版行為的認定，常落於質疑者過分主觀而不自知，其中也常流於出版者本身的形象、信譽、歷史等刻板印象。這種偏見自然也就容易造成有心推展創新出版模式的新興期刊出版者的困窘，同時也就反而讓「真正的」掠奪性出版者魚目混珠，夾雜在一片好壞難分的指責聲浪之中，牟取不當利益。然而，又該如何解決這種混沌的學術出版市場的窘境呢？有許多的研究者與機構設想了許多的評鑑標準，想方設法為分辨黑白名單而努力，但卻無意間也同樣再陷入過去他人主觀的窠臼。釜底抽薪之計，紛紛指向所謂的「開放同儕評閱」（Open Peer Review，簡稱OPR）制度，期待藉由公開投稿的評閱紀錄，將審查者（referee）與作者之間的答辯回應意見公諸讀者群，讓期刊更透明公正，有記錄有真相，以解外界對於期刊是否正派經營的疑惑。姑且不論OPR是否就是解決掠奪性出版的萬靈丹，但至少能確實呈現部分的真實與坦蕩，且是最為自然的「程序備查」。

　　教育資料與圖書館學（本刊）自2019年的56卷2期實施OPR制度以來，截至本卷期（2020年的57卷2期）共四個卷期計刊登17篇文章，依稿件類別屬性及特殊因素，我們謹慎主動徵詢了其中14篇文章之作者與審查者的開放意願，總共獲得了11篇作者回應公開；以及從所有該14篇文章的30位審查者中，徵得了10位願意具名且完全公開評閱意見，13位表達願意匿名公開意見，餘則表明不願意或未回覆徵詢。因此最終本刊共製作了10份綜合報告、三份個人報告以饗讀者。從本刊一年的OPR經驗中，發現相關OPR權益人的主要權益人作者、審查者；以及次要權益人讀者、編輯，彼此間的共識合作將是制度成功的關鍵，就OPR制度而言，這不僅牽涉到作者暨審查者兩造的權利義務，尚有制度面設計、期刊品牌形象、讀者權益等更深層的意義。由於OPR制度的創始與推動不多時，就本刊的實際運作狀況下，目前即使支持此OPR精神，卻仍採保留態度而靜觀其變，他們或許顧慮學術同儕壓力，或者尚無法體會OPR帶來的可能正面效應等。總之，基於OPR運作模式同樣是一種多元及創新的機制，並沒有一致的運作模式，我們仍將繼續觀察並改善OPR的應用。

　　最後容再提醒：本卷期57卷2期上傳了目前最新的APA第七版及Chicago（Turabian）第九版的參考文獻中英範例於官網中，也凸顯了本刊對於學術論文引文格式的高度重視，歡迎讀者多加參考使用。本卷期期間有相當多的稿件未符合本刊編輯規範，因此逕予退稿，有9篇稿件順利完成整個評閱流程，僅接受其中4篇文章，故退稿率為55.6%。感謝薛美蓮、潘璿安、周倩三位學者共

同發表「台灣研究人員學術倫理概念調查研究之初探：以科技部公布之學術抄襲、未適當引註及自我抄襲概念為例」，此外，張郁蔚、李宜珍的「Dervin意義建構論起源文獻之研究影響力探討」；曾翊喬、邱銘心則探討「應用隱喻抽取技術（ZMET）探討陽光基金會病友參與臉書支持團體之心智模式」，以及蔡娉婷、許慶昇、林至中三位發表「應用探究式深度討論於閱讀與寫作翻轉學習課程設計與教學實務」。我們也對於所有這些願意支持與接受本刊OPR制度的作者群與評閱者，謹致上滿滿與誠摯謝意。

邱　炯友

教育資料與圖書館學 主編