



EDITORIAL

The Blind Spots of “Publicness” of Scholarly Publishing Under the Open Access Policy

During the development of scholarly publishing industry, it requires efforts from experts of various fields to build a progressive atmosphere and create substantial growth. In Taiwan, in addition to efforts of scholars and academic institutions, the scholarly publishers in private sectors have also cultivated for a long time, occasionally along with the supervision and guidance of government. In other words, this is an academic environment and market created together by a scholarly publishing community.

In Taiwan, the governmental institution, Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST), has played an influential and often decisive role on a journal evaluation system. It is the administrative unit, and also the ultimate decision maker. However, being influential suggests that any subtle actions of the public sector would be watched closely by the public, thus the institution should have its self-knowledge, knowing if its own conditions, such as influence, authority, executive power, and policy making, etc., could meet the needs for development. The public sector should also appreciate the efforts and contributions of each participant in this industry. Furthermore, since it is the national administrative unit and policy maker of the scholarly publishing environment, it should exercise the due care of a good administrator, and take the full responsibility for the development of the environment.

For many years, the MOST (the former National Science Council), has supervised and managed the scholarly journals through the means of journal ranking systems, such as Taiwan Humanities Citation Index (THCI Core) and Taiwan Social Science Index (TSSCI). This system has developed into a considerate scale and had certain achievements. Several regulations regarding the conditions of ranking have been partially improved, such as the new regulation addressing that the rejection rate should count in the numbers of rejected manuscripts in the internal editorial review process. It is believed that this new regulation could enhance the editorial and review efficiencies of journals and deal with the problems of publication ethics. This is a progress, but limited. However, recently we are surprised to find out that the MOST, along with the National Central Library (NCL), has boldly advocated the so-called “publicness” of scholarly publishing, without comprehensive policy debates and planning among scholars and government.

“Publicness” here could mean the quality or state of being public or being owned by the public, however, the real meaning of this term proclaimed by the MOST or NCL remains somewhat of an ambiguity. As a chief-editor and publishing science scholar, I have no choice but to express my concerns and opinions.

1. The phrase “publicness of scholarly publishing” claimed by the MOST and NCL covers a wide range, including scholarly journals, professional books, theses and dissertations, conference papers, and research reports, etc. It also involves the publications of various public and private sectors. It is thus a phrase with latent, numerous and jumbled meanings. It is nothing but a vague slogan.

2. The government advocates the “publicness” of scholarly publishing, without considering if the administrator, such as the NCL, would commit to or be capable of undertaking the tasks of promoting academic resources overseas (including the Mainland China), budgeting, managing and providing services? Whether the government is capable of achieving what the scholars look forward, that is, scholarly communication dynamics?

3. With the so-called “publicness of scholarly publishing”, it is wondered whether the government has ever set national policies regarding Open Access to academic resources? This is an issue involving national academic development, scholarly publishing industry development (i.e. the Knowledge Industry), as well as those controversial issues regarding scholars’ copyright and scholarly communication effects.

4. When public affairs involve rights and interests of public and private sectors, the government should be more cautious to respect and understand the needs and expectations of “stakeholders” relevant to the scholarly community, including authors, scholars (peers and readers), publishers, institutions and sponsors in scholarly publishing.

5. The concept of “publicness of scholarly publishing”, in general, equals “publicness of academic resources”, requiring comprehensive planning, consulting, sustainable government budgeting, and determination and executive power for sustainable management. The MOST, and the NCL, should have got prepared before they announced and advocated the concept; otherwise, this kind of scattered, one-shot, short-term, parochial policy manipulation is nothing but despicable and irresponsible bureaucratic monopoly.

6. Any country promoting so-called “Open Access to academic resources” policy should deal with the two major issues — publishing and archiving, and prudentially and comprehensively assess various situations and conditions, including relevant development strategies, market distributions, potential threats,

budgets and manpower. It also requires detailed reports of impact assessment.

7. The “publicness” of scholarly publishing is not absolutely equal to Open Access policy. To some extent, I am afraid that the premise of “publicness”, similar to “nationalization”, is (forced) releases of rights, implying demands from higher-level administrators. On the other hand, the Open Access policy emphasizes respecting copyright owners’ willingness of making resources public for free. With the “publicness” of scholarly publishing, governments are powerful hegemonies, and they have to bear the overall responsibility of budgeting, advising, supervising relevant to academic resources, as well as the success or failure. With the Open Access policy, governments select policies after steps of prudential considerations among groups of policies, balancing between open access policy and appropriate development of the scholarly publishing industry. It also requires a balanced reciprocity between academic resources owned by private enterprises and public sectors.

8. If the Open Access policy is encouraged in the TSSCI, then journal publishers and chief-editors should be clearly informed with all the possible options and compliance practices. The government (i.e. MOST and NCL) should not advocate its policies biased toward any specific journal platform as the priority criterial of evaluation, should not pass off the sham as the genuine, and should not try to carry out partial “publicness” policies nationwide.

In short, problems need to be solved, doubts need to be clarified, and policies should be effective and well-intended. It is wished that the MOST and NCL should be more prudential, mature and stable in making decisions.

In this issue (Number 1, Volume 58), 14 manuscripts have gone through the review process. According to the new regulation, the rejection rate of this issue is 71.4% (10 out of 14). The calculation of rejection rate is presented below.

$$\frac{[\text{number of rejected manuscripts (4)} + \text{number of rejected manuscripts during the internal review process (6)}]}{[\text{number of rejected (4)} + \text{number of rejected during the internal review process (6)} + \text{number of accepted and published manuscripts (4)}]}$$

The four manuscripts published in this issue include “The Effectiveness of School Libraries on Students’ Reading Engagement and Learning Achievement: A Case of Rural Schools in Hunan, China” by Tsung-Yeh Lee, Chao-Chen Chen, Wai-Ming Leung, and Hong-Shiu Liang, “Exploring Government Officials’ Data Collection Process in Open Data Initiatives” by Chung-Cheh Ma and Tung-Mou Yang, “Exploring Fact-Checking Behavior: A Case Study on Food Safety Message” by Ho-Chin Xiao, Chaoyun Liang, Jung-Hung Yen, and Yuting Sun,

and the “Transformative Agreement: An Exploratory Study of Journal License Agreements” by Chia-Ning Li and Meng-Ling Lin.

These four excellent papers are with profound insights and long-term observations. It is expected that they can motivate future researchers to generate more insights and have various applications in practices.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor





編者言

開放取用 (OA) 政策下的「學術出版公共化」盲點

學術出版產業之發展過程中，每每需要各方人士的努力，才能營造出進步的氛圍，以及創造實質上的成長。在台灣，除了學者、學術機構的付出外，也有著民間學術出版社的長期耕耘，偶爾同時也伴隨著政府機構的管理與輔導。換言之，這是一個由「學術出版共同體」(Scholarly publishing community)所一起開創的學術環境與市場。

多年來，科技部(先前的國科會)利用期刊評比制度、台灣社會科學引文索引資料庫(TSSCI)等手段來管理台灣的期刊出版單位，這制度已更有規模和些許成就，它在一些評比規範的條件設定上，有了部分的改善。例如：退稿率計算涵蓋「內審退稿數」新規。咸信此新規可以提高期刊出版單位的編審效率和改善出版倫理問題。然而，在有限的進步之餘，近日卻又發現科技部與國家圖書館，在毫無整體政策思辯與規劃的情形下，大膽倡議所謂「學術出版公共化」。所謂「公共化」一詞十分曖昧混沌，身為主編與出版學者，不得不提出若干質疑：

1. 科技部與國家圖書館所標榜的「學術出版公共化」一詞，其範圍包括甚廣：學術期刊、專書、學位論文、會議論文集、研究報告等。更涉及不同公私部門的產出，因此是個潛在而龐雜的語意；一個陳義過高的口號！

2. 政府一味倡議「學術出版公共化」，主其事者(例如：國家圖書館)可願承諾或有能力承擔做好學術資源的海外(含中國大陸與國外)推廣、預算編列、管理、服務？學者所企盼的「學術傳播能量」，政府有充分能力滿足否？

3. 就所謂「學術出版公共化」政策下，試問：我國政府曾有過國家級的「學術資源開放取用(Open Access)」政策？此等議題涉及國家學術發展、學術出版產業(知識產業)發展；以及攸關學者著作權益、學術傳播效益的爭議話題。

4. 當公共事務又事涉公私部門權益時，政府對所有學術資源出版相關的「利害關係人」(學術著作者、學術研究者、學術出版業者、研究機構、研究贊助者等)可曾尊重、調查、瞭解以及掌握必要程序、意願與期待？

5. 「學術出版公共化」的思維，亦即等於「學術資源公共化」，必需有絕對的擊劃、諮詢、永續預算，以及永續經營之決心和執行能力，試問我國科技部或國家圖書館皆已充分具備否？任何零散、單點、短線、本位的政策操弄，乃是惡劣且不負責任的「官僚式壟斷」行為。

6. 任何國家即使推動所謂「學術資源開放取用(Open Access)」政策，不論在出版或典藏兩大類手段中，絕對必須雙雙因應，並衡量自身「國情」，對於

相關發展策略、市場分佈、潛在威脅，以及預算與人力執行等面向，通盤檢討，甚至必須有詳實的影響評估報告。

7. 「學術出版公共化」絕對不完全等於「開放取用(OA)」政策。因為所謂公共化的前提是(強迫)權利的釋出，有著更高的位階含義；而OA是(尊重)資源的免費開任意願。但兩者存在的前提是：學術出版「公共化」下，語意恐類似「國有化」，政府是強勢的霸主，且必須概括承受所有學術資源產生的經費、輔導與管制，及成敗之責；而「開放取用(OA)」則是政府有步驟、分類分群的政策選擇，在講求OA的同時，亦兼顧學術出版產業的合宜發展；並在民間產業與公部門學術資訊之間，取得良好平衡與互惠。

8. 若台灣之學術期刊評比(TSSCI)鼓勵「開放取用(OA)」政策，那便應該明白做好政府說帖，告知期刊出版單位與主編們，所有可能的選項、達標做法，不單偏任何期刊發表平台，不魚目混珠，只圖遂行偏頗的「公共化」政策。

總之，問題需要解決，疑問必須釐清，而政策也必須有為與良善。真心期待台灣有不躁進與成熟穩定的管理者。

本卷期(58卷1期)審查作業總共處理完成14篇稿件。按新規計算，本期退稿率則為10/14，即為71.4%，退稿率計算方式：

$$[\text{退稿數}(4) + \text{內審退稿數}(6)] / [\text{退稿數}(4) + \text{內審退稿數}(6) + \text{決定刊登數}(4)]$$

本卷期所收錄的四篇大作：李宗曄、陳昭珍、梁偉明與梁鴻翔共同發表「學校圖書館對學生閱讀投入及學科成績影響之研究：以湖南雙峰縣偏鄉小學為例」，此外，馬中哲與楊東謀亦發表了「政府開放資料承辦人員之資料準備流程初探」；蕭禾秦、梁朝雲、顏榮宏與孫宇婷則探討「解析事實查核行為：以食安訊息為例」，以及李家寧與林孟玲以觀察報告呈現「轉型中的圖書館期刊合約：訂閱及投稿計價項目初探」，皆為一時之選，有深刻的見地與長期觀察，希望這些大作能激起後續研究者更多的洞見，並在實務上也有豐富的應用。

邱 炯友

教育資料與圖書館學 主編

