Impact Evaluation of Chinese Academic Books in Humanities and Social Sciences: A Case Study of Library, Information and Documentation Science (Postprint)

Authors: Peng Qiuru, He Bei, Huang Shuiqing

Date: 2023-04-01T16:02:58+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Academic books serve as crucial instruments for presenting the outcomes of scientific research activities and constitute significant information resources in human societal information activities. Conducting impact evaluation of academic books facilitates their full utilization.

[Method/Process] Building upon previous research findings, this study designs a complete and comprehensive impact evaluation system for Chinese humanities and social sciences academic books. From the two dimensions of academic impact and social impact of books, multi-level evaluation indicators are established. The study selects 103 academic books in the field of library and information science from CBKCI as research samples, collects corresponding indicator data, and employs the CRITIC weighting method and TOPSIS method to conduct empirical impact evaluation on the 103 sample books.

[Results/Conclusion] Research results indicate that the evaluation indicators and methods for Chinese humanities and social sciences academic book impact proposed in this paper, which consider factors such as research scholars, readers, and the books themselves, relatively comprehensively reflect various aspects of academic book impact and possess certain usability and feasibility.

Full Text

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Academic books are important tools for presenting the results of scientific research activities and constitute significant information resources in human social information activities. Conducting impact evaluations of academic books facilitates their full utilization. [Method/Process] Based on

previous research findings, this paper designs a complete and comprehensive impact evaluation system for Chinese academic books in the humanities and social sciences. The system establishes multi-level evaluation indicators from two perspectives: academic impact and social impact. We selected 103 academic books in the field of library, information, and documentation science from the CBKCI as research samples, collected corresponding indicator data, and conducted an empirical impact evaluation of these 103 sample books using the CRITIC weighting method and the TOPSIS method. [Result/Conclusion] The research results demonstrate that the evaluation indicators and methods proposed in this paper for Chinese academic books in the humanities and social sciences consider factors such as researchers, readers, and the books themselves, comprehensively reflecting various aspects of academic book impact with certain ease of use and feasibility.

Keywords

Chinese academic books; impact evaluation; book evaluation; humanities and social sciences; library and information science

Introduction

Academic books serve as crucial carriers of knowledge and information in human social information activities, characterized by systematic and comprehensive content as well as mature and reliable knowledge. Particularly in the humanities and social sciences, academic books not only provide more systematic and integrated high-density, long-form knowledge compared to journal articles or other formats, but also greatly facilitate knowledge dissemination and academic exchange. Impact evaluation has become a current research hotspot, generating numerous research outcomes. However, existing impact evaluation research both domestically and internationally has primarily focused on journal articles, with relatively few studies on academic book impact evaluation. Peer review and citation analysis represent more traditional methods for evaluating academic book impact. Although these two approaches started early and have continuously developed and improved, their shortcomings cannot be ignored.

Peer review processes are time-consuming and labor-intensive, and are susceptible to the personal preferences of evaluation experts, potentially leading to biased results. Citation analysis methods primarily evaluate academic books based on citation data, yielding relatively one-sided results. According to statistics, in 2020, China published 10.1 billion books, with per capita book ownership reaching 7.24 volumes[1], making the total existing book stock considerable. As the number of published books continues to grow, improving the book evaluation system and conducting effective book evaluation has become imperative.

An accurate and effective academic book impact evaluation system helps promote the healthy development of the book publishing industry: First, it assists publishers in accurately grasping market conditions and trends in book publish-

ing, providing a basis for book publishing and management, thereby enhancing market competitiveness. Second, it can be used to evaluate library collections and optimize collection resources to provide quality books. Third, it helps expand the scope of research evaluation objects, breaks the limitations of the "paper-only" evaluation approach, and optimizes the evaluation system for academic achievements in the humanities and social sciences. Therefore, this paper aims to develop a quantifiable and operational impact evaluation system for Chinese academic books based on domestic and international research findings on book impact evaluation, and to conduct an empirical evaluation of academic books in the field of library, information, and documentation science.

2 Related Research

Currently, domestic and international research on book impact evaluation primarily proceeds from two perspectives: quantity and content. Similar to the evaluation of other publication types, book impact evaluation is largely based on quantitative indicators, mining quantifiable evaluation data to obtain numerical evaluation metrics such as citation counts and collection quantities. He Mingxing[2] used bibliographic data from OCLC's WorldCat database to study the collection status of books published by Zhonghua Book Company in libraries worldwide, thereby determining its international impact. H.D. White et al.[3] proposed a new book evaluation indicator—the Libcitation Index—which calculates the number of libraries holding a particular book and used OCLC's WorldCat bibliographic database to analyze the Libcitation Index across different disciplines, arguing that it can reflect book impact.

In addition to collection status, book borrowing patterns can also reflect book popularity. Zhang Haiying[4] redefined the marketing RFM model for library use as: Recency (R) of last borrowing, Frequency (F) of borrowing, and Monetary (M) total borrowing time, integrating these three indicators into a book evaluation factor to construct a book evaluation indicator system, where higher scores indicate greater reader popularity. Experimental results demonstrated that this book evaluation model possesses strong feasibility and high accuracy. Li Hang[5] also utilized this model as the foundation for book quality evaluation, proposing hypothetical conditions for introducing the RFM model into book evaluation systems.

Citation metrics are frequently used to evaluate the academic impact of books. Yang Siluo et al.[6] used citation data from the CSSCI database to comparatively analyze book citation patterns and selected high-impact books in the fields of information science and archival science. Su Xinning et al.[7] used citation data from the CSSCI database (2000-2007) as their data source and analyzed high-impact academic works in over 20 disciplines including library and information science based on average citations per work and total citation counts.

With the advent of the Web 2.0 era, many researchers have begun incorporating web data as sources for book impact evaluation indicators. The emergence of Alt-

metrics, in particular, has attracted the attention of scholars studying book impact evaluation. Researchers have demonstrated the value of Altmetrics-related web-based media indicators for evaluating books, particularly humanities and social sciences books, proposed some evaluation indicators, and analyzed the relationships between certain indicators and citation metrics. They have also collected partial indicator data from existing Altmetrics tools to conduct impact analyses of academic books in specific disciplines. A. A. Zuccala et al.[8] obtained book titles from references in over 600 history journals indexed in Scopus (2007-2011) and analyzed the relationship between book citation counts and reader ratings. R. Snijder[9] obtained citation data and Twitter data for books to investigate whether open access could affect book impact, finding a certain positive correlation that was not statistically significant. Ma Ning et al.[10] acquired Bookmetrix indicator data for over 10,000 e-books from the Springer database platform for research and analysis.

Book review content has been used by many scholars to assess book impact. For example, J. Gorräiz et al.[11] believed that the simplest and most direct method for book impact evaluation is book reviews, arguing that they can intuitively reflect book content quality, particularly in humanities, social sciences, and arts, where book reviews can serve as a basis for screening academic works included in the Book Citation Index (BKCI). Zhang Fengyu[12] designed an algorithm for calculating semantic positive review ratings based on book review data from online bookstores, using the review content from online bookstores as a corpus to validate the algorithm. Tong Tiantian[13] used Douban book online reviews as a data source, employed unsupervised sentiment analysis techniques to observe the emotional attitudes in book reviews, and utilized multi-document automatic summarization technology to conduct mining research on book reviews from a semantic perspective. K. Kousha et al.[14] used Amazon online book reviews as a data source to analyze 2,739 academic monographs and 1,305 bestsellers, with results showing that Amazon online reviews reflect book popularity. Zhang Chengzhi et al.[15] selected five Chinese academic books from different disciplines on Amazon, analyzing citation behavior from citation location, length, and sentiment perspectives, finding that citation content analysis can improve upon the limitations of traditional evaluation methods based on citation counts and expert review.

Although scholars both domestically and internationally have attempted to use book reviews or citation content to explore book impact evaluation, significant challenges remain in how to mine and analyze book reviews or citation content to achieve truly large-scale operational book impact evaluation practice.

Currently, the more feasible approach to book impact evaluation is multi-dimensional quantitative evaluation. Li Yanling et al.[16] constructed a five-dimensional book evaluation system encompassing libraries, publishers, web impact, book sales data, and author information, theoretically covering all factors that could be included in book impact evaluation. Zhang Yu et al.[17] selected 27 indicators across four dimensions—citations, funding and

awards, online book reviews, and book utilization—to conduct empirical analysis of several books in the medical field. Zhou Qingqing[18] conducted comprehensive book evaluations based on four dimensions: book reviews, book content, book citations, and book utilization. Xiao Aoxia and Yang Siluo[19] used Bookmetrix platform data to establish an evaluation system including five indicators—citation count, reader marks, online mentions, review count, and downloads—to comprehensively evaluate academic book impact.

In summary, the common characteristic of domestic and international research is the emphasis on studying book impact evaluation indicators and data sources. Foreign research leads domestic research, with many specialized database tools and platforms such as BKCI and Bookmetrix already available, enabling foreign scholars to complete book impact evaluation work based on these mature platforms. Domestic research, however, still focuses on studying book impact evaluation methods, emphasizing indicator selection and framework construction. Future accurate evaluations reflecting both the academic value and dissemination effectiveness of books must simultaneously consider scholars, readers, and the books themselves.

3 Construction of an Impact Evaluation System for Chinese Humanities and Social Sciences Academic Books

3.1 Evaluation Dimension Considerations

To conduct impact evaluation of academic books, we must first identify the domains in which academic books can exert influence, investigate influencing factors at different levels across various domains, determine evaluation dimensions, and thereby construct the overall framework of the evaluation system. For setting indicators at all levels, we must investigate whether data sources are available, whether quality meets standards, and what data types reflect the indicators, and based on this foundation, determine specific indicators for each dimension. Synthesizing these factors in sequence, incorporating characteristics of the internet era, and balancing factors related to scholars, readers, and books themselves, this paper proposes a comprehensive evaluation of Chinese humanities and social sciences academic books from two aspects: academic impact and social impact.

3.1.1 Academic Impact Academic books involve different professional fields with strong novelty and specificity, serving as high-value guiding tools for professional learning and academic research. Therefore, academic impact can serve as an important dimension for evaluating academic books. When selecting specific evaluation indicators, due to the academic and professional characteristics of academic books, indicators should primarily reflect the academic community's utilization of books and the influence of the book authors themselves. Therefore, indicators under academic impact are proposed to include citations from various publicly published papers or books to the target book, library collection

status, book reprint counts, and the author's own academic influence.

3.1.2 Social Impact Currently, the internet has become an important link connecting people across different industries and regions, with real-time online academic exchange activities emerging on major web platforms. Members of the public from different fields and industries can publicly express their evaluations of academic books on these platforms. Therefore, social impact based on web media platforms can serve as another important dimension for evaluating academic books. However, given the numerous web media platforms, indicator selection must identify representative indicators and websites from various types of sites as data sources. After research, social impact indicators are proposed to include evaluation information of academic books on commonly used book websites and online mentions on the social platform Weibo.

3.2 Evaluation Indicator Settings

According to a 2020 paper by Zhou Qingqing and Zhang Chengzhi[20] published in the *Journal of Academic Libraries* titled "Research Progress and Prospects of Book Impact Evaluation," citation, collection, and review data are frequently used as sources for book impact evaluation indicators, and these indicator data can comprehensively reflect the degree of book impact in different domains. Therefore, based on previous research and comprehensively considering influencing factors across the two dimensions of academic and social impact of Chinese humanities and social sciences academic books, this paper constructs an impact evaluation indicator system for Chinese humanities and social sciences academic books involving multiple indicators including book citations, collection status, reprint counts, author influence, reader reviews, and social media mentions, as shown in Table 1 .

The indicator system includes: - Book citation counts (Journal Citations JC, Dissertation Citations DC, Conference Citations CC, Book Citations BC) - Library collection quantity (Number of Libraries LN, University Library Collections SC, Public Library Collections PC) - Reprint count (RN) - Author influence (Author h-index HI, Author g-index GI) - Online bookstore reviews (Douban review participants DBP, Douban review count DBN, Douban review quality DBQ, Douban rating DBF, Dangdang review participants DDP, Dangdang review count DDN, Dangdang review quality DDQ, Dangdang rating DDF) - Social media mentions (Weibo mentions WN)

3.2.1 Book Citation Counts Book citation counts reflect the citation status of academic books in various publicly published materials. Secondary indicators include journal paper citation counts, master's and doctoral dissertation citation counts, conference paper citation counts, and book citation counts. This paper will collect total citation counts of target books by various types of papers from CNKI's Chinese Book Citation Statistics Database and Duxiu Database, as well

as total citation counts of target books by other books. Higher total citation counts indicate greater academic impact of the book.

3.2.2 Library Collection Quantity Secondary indicators for library collection quantity include the number of domestic libraries holding the target book, university library collection quantities, and public library collection quantities. Data on the number of collecting libraries comes from the Duxiu Database, which statistics the number of domestic libraries holding paper copies of target books. More collecting libraries indicate higher academic value and greater impact of the book. Collection quantities in university and public libraries can reflect the book's use value and audience size.

For university library collection quantity, based on the fourth-round discipline evaluation results for library, information, and archival management[21], we selected the libraries of the top four universities representing the discipline's highest level: Nanjing University, Wuhan University, Renmin University of China, and Peking University. The mean collection quantity of these four university libraries serves as the indicator data for university library collection quantity. For public library collection quantity, according to 2020 provincial GDP ranking data from the China Statistical Yearbook[22], Guangdong, Jiangsu, Shandong, and Zhejiang provinces rank at the top of the list. Therefore, collection data from provincial public libraries in these four economically developed provinces—Sun Yat-sen Library of Guangdong Province, Nanjing Library, Shandong Library, and Zhejiang Library—were obtained and averaged to represent public library collection quantity.

3.2.3 Book Reprint Counts Book reprint count indicator data comes from CNKI's Chinese Book Citation Statistics Database. Reprint count refers to the number of editions a book has been reprinted from its initial publication to the present. More reprint editions indicate higher popularity and greater impact of the book.

3.2.4 Book Author Influence This paper sets secondary indicators for book author influence as the author's h-index and g-index. An author's h-index refers to the number h such that the author has published h papers that have each been cited at least h times[23]. The g-index refers to ranking papers in descending order by citation count, squaring the rank numbers, and cumulatively adding citation counts; when the square of the rank number equals the cumulative citation count, that rank number is the author's g-index[24]. This paper uses Baidu Academic as the data source to obtain the h-index and g-index of the first author of target books. Higher h-index and g-index values indicate greater academic achievements of the author and greater academic impact of their books.

3.2.5 Online Bookstore Reviews Secondary indicators for online bookstore reviews are set as reader review data for academic books, including review

participants, review count, review quality, and book ratings. Data sources are Douban Reading, the largest book review website in China, and Dangdang, a major online bookstore. Both platforms have active users, high-quality book review data, and easy data accessibility. Review participants and review count can reflect the breadth of a book's audience, while ratings can reflect content quality.

Additionally, this paper attempts to combine the sentiment polarity of review content with user ratings to propose a review quality indicator. Before calculating this indicator, review content polarity is first classified into three types: positive, neutral, and negative, assigned scores of 2, 1, and -1 respectively. Notably, reviews on online bookstores like Dangdang include evaluations of external aspects such as delivery and packaging, which are treated as neutral evaluations, focusing instead on sentiment polarity judgments of book content evaluations. Users are then categorized based on their platform usage level. For example, Dangdang users are divided into four levels: regular, silver, gold, and diamond, assigned level scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Douban Reading users have no explicit user levels; based on actual data distribution, user historical review counts serve as the basis for user level classification, with historical review counts of [1,10], [11,20], [21,30], and [31,+∞] assigned user level scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. The sentiment polarity score of each review is multiplied by the user level score, and the average value is taken to obtain the final book review quality indicator.

3.2.6 Social Media Online Mentions User attention to academic books on social media platforms is primarily reflected in the mention count indicator. Sina Weibo is currently the most influential open social networking platform in China, where any user can post information, with a broad user base, fast information release, and wide coverage. Blogs are also a significant platform for users to share academic books; however, as the three major domestic blog platforms—Sina Blog, NetEase Blog, and Tencent Blog—have all ceased service, data collection is difficult. Therefore, this paper only selects online mention counts from the Sina Weibo platform as an evaluation indicator.

4 Empirical Study on the Impact Evaluation of Chinese Humanities and Social Sciences Academic Books

4.1 Experimental Data Collection and Calculation

The Chinese Book Citation Index (CBKCI) is a database platform led by Nanjing University. Based on book citation data, award status, funding support, library collections, and other factors, the CBKCI database selects over 4,000 academic books in more than 20 humanities and social sciences disciplines published since 1992 through strict standards and procedures, possessing high scientific authority. Therefore, this paper selected 103 academic books in the "library, information, and documentation science" discipline from the CBKCI database

as empirical research objects.

According to the evaluation system established above, various indicator data for the 103 academic books were collected from different platforms in mid-April 2021. After manual cleaning and organization, the book evaluation data were obtained. Tables 2 and 3 show the specific evaluation indicator data for the top 10 books ranked by cumulative citation data across four categories.

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, *An Introduction to Network Public Opinion Research* has the highest total citation count among target books, particularly with 1,417 master's and doctoral dissertation citations, indicating substantial academic impact. Among the top 10 books by total citation count, *Outline of Bibliography* has relatively strong social impact, ranking first in Douban Reading and Dangdang review participants, review count and quality, and Weibo mention count, with Dangdang review participants reaching 3,644, demonstrating that in the current internet era, academic books also possess considerable social media impact.

Descriptive statistics were conducted on the collected 19 indicator data points, with results shown in Table 4 . Table 4 reveals large fluctuations across different indicators, with standard deviations for journal paper citations (JC), dissertation citations (DC), number of collecting libraries (LN), and Dangdang review participants (DDP) reaching 183.58, 166.41, 176.67, and 366.19 respectively, while the standard deviation for reprint count (RN) is only 0.79. This indicates that different books vary significantly in impact across different dimensions, with large absolute numerical differences, suggesting that the selected indicators can evaluate books from multiple perspectives.

To explore differences in indicator values between the two dimensions, this paper used SPSS to conduct Spearman correlation tests on the 19 indicators. As shown in Table 5 , at the $p<0.01$ level, book reprint count (RN) shows the highest correlation with Douban rating (DBF) at 0.495, which nonetheless represents only moderate correlation. Examining correlation coefficients between other indicators reveals mostly weak correlations or non-correlations, indicating that evaluation indicators under the two dimensions measure book impact from different aspects and can complement each other.

4.2 Indicator Weight Calculation

To conduct comprehensive impact evaluation of academic books, weights must first be assigned to each evaluation indicator. Considering that commonly used comprehensive evaluation methods such as the AHP analytic hierarchy process and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation require expert scoring for weight assignment—a time-consuming process susceptible to subjective influences—this paper adopts the CRITIC weighting method[25] to calculate indicator weights.

The CRITIC weighting method multiplies the contrast intensity and conflict of indicators, then normalizes the results to obtain final indicator weights. Con-

trast intensity is represented by standard deviation—larger standard deviations yield higher weights. Conflict is represented by correlation coefficients—larger correlation values between indicators indicate smaller conflict and thus lower weights. The CRITIC weighting method calculation steps are as follows:

(1) After dimensionless processing of data, the data matrix X is obtained. The calculation formula for evaluation indicator Xij is:

$$(x_{ij} - X_{min})/(X_{max} - X_{min})$$

(2) Calculate contrast intensity, where $\bar{x}_j$ represents the mean of indicator j and S_j is the standard deviation:

$$S_j = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j)^2}$$

(3) Calculate conflict between indicators, where C_j represents conflict and r_{jk} represents the Pearson correlation coefficient between indicators j and k:

$$C_j = \sum_{k=1}^{m}(1 - r_{kj})$$

(4) Calculate the information quantity I_j of indicators:

$$I_j = S_j \times C_j$$

(5) Calculate indicator weights W_j:

$$W_j = I_j / \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j$$

Following formulas (1)-(5), the weights for the 19 indicators in this paper were calculated as: $W = (0.0508, 0.0348, 0.0642, 0.0633, 0.0841, 0.0517, 0.0514, 0.0561, 0.0832, 0.0796, 0.0221, 0.0229, 0$

4.3 Comprehensive Evaluation Ranking

The TOPSIS method refers to the Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution, also known as the ideal solution method or the distance-based method[26]. The fundamental concept of TOPSIS is to rank evaluation objects by comparing their proximity to the positive-ideal solution (best solution) and negative-ideal solution (worst solution). Since this method has no specific requirements for the number of evaluation objects or indicators, can conduct comprehensive evaluation based on objective quantitative data, produce ranking results, and possesses strong operability, this paper selects the TOPSIS method for comprehensive impact evaluation and ranking of academic books.

Specific calculation steps are as follows:

(1) Construct the weighted data matrix X', where W_j is the indicator weight and indicator X'_{ij} in the weighted data matrix is calculated as:

$$X'_{ij} = W_j \times X_{ij}$$

(2) Calculate the positive-ideal solution X_j^+ and negative-ideal solution X_j^- of the weighted matrix. The positive-ideal solution is the optimal solution, with values being the maximum of each indicator in the weighted data matrix; the negative-ideal solution is the worst solution, with values being the minimum of each indicator. Calculation formulas are:

$$X_j^+ = \max_i(X'_{ij})$$

$$X_j^- = \min_i(X'_{ij})$$

(3) Calculate the distance D_i^+ and D_i^- from each evaluation object to the positive-ideal and negative-ideal solutions:

$$D_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}(X'_{ij} - X_j^+)^2}$$

$$D_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}(X'_{ij} - X_j^-)^2}$$

(4) Calculate the relative closeness R_i of each evaluation object to the ideal solutions. The closer the relative closeness is to 1, the higher the evaluation object's score and the higher its ranking. The calculation formula is:

$$R_i = D_i^- / (D_i^+ + D_i^-)$$

Substituting the 19 indicator data points of the empirical objects, the distances to the positive-ideal and negative-ideal solutions and the relative closeness were calculated for each evaluation object, yielding impact rankings for 103 academic books in the field of library, information, and documentation science. The top 10 books are shown in Table 6 .

A comprehensive ranking diagram of academic book impact was drawn based on the relative closeness scores obtained through the TOPSIS method (see Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]). Figure 1 shows that the relative closeness of empirical books ranges from [0.0460, 0.6387], with a large gap between the highest and lowest scores, indicating significant differences in impact among different academic books.

Among them, *New Perspectives on 21st Century Libraries* published by Shanghai Scientific and Technological Literature Press ranks first with the highest

relative closeness. Its journal paper citation count, conference paper citation count, and reprint count all rank first, particularly with journal paper citations reaching 1,047 times, exceeding the second-ranked book by 209 times and far surpassing other books. This book discusses the development blueprint for library careers in the new century and has undergone multiple reprints since its 1998 publication, thus exerting considerable impact, especially in academic impact.

The second most impactful book is *Outline of Bibliography* authored by Du Zexun, which primarily covers the characteristics and uses of bibliography and document organization methods. Its content is broad, covering virtually all aspects of bibliography, making it suitable as an introductory guiding tool and thus highly influential. *Outline of Bibliography* has relatively greater social impact compared to other books, ranking first in Douban Reading and Dangdang review participants, review count and quality, and Weibo mention count, with Dangdang review participants reaching 3,644, demonstrating that academic books also possess significant social media impact in the current internet era.

Information Service and Users ranks third in impact. Authored by Hu Changping, this book systematically expounds on the theories and applications of information service and user research. Although no single indicator for this book ranks first, most other indicators perform well, representing a type with both high academic and social impact, thus achieving a high comprehensive impact ranking.

Additionally, comparing the top 10 books in the library and information science field ranked by the CRITIC and TOPSIS methods in Table 6 with the top 10 books ranked by total citation count (cumulative citations from journal papers, dissertations, conference papers, and books) in Table 2 reveals significant differences between the two ranking methods. Highly cited academic books may have lower scores on other indicators and consequently lower comprehensive evaluation rankings. Two possible reasons explain this discrepancy: First, academic books in the library, information, and documentation science field are highly specialized with novel content and considerable depth, resulting in high citation counts in academia. However, library collection development must consider not only academic readers but also other audience scopes and quantities, potentially leading to relatively weaker performance in collection library count and collection quantity indicators for some highly cited books. Second, this paper's indicator system also includes social impact indicators from web media platforms, not solely considering academic impact. Incorporating current internet era characteristics by including online bookstore reviews and social media mention counts naturally produces results that differ from rankings based only on citation counts.

5 Discussion and Recommendations

The purpose of conducting impact evaluation of academic books is to better promote knowledge exchange and dissemination and facilitate disciplinary development. In today's internet era, everyone can share information and communicate through web platforms. If academic books continue to rely solely on traditional dissemination methods, it becomes difficult to maximize their value. Therefore, regarding the exchange and dissemination of academic books, this paper offers the following recommendations for industry reference:

(1) Increase promotional efforts for academic books to expand their audience. The empirical evaluation in this paper shows that over half of academic books are not mentioned on online bookstores or social media, indicating limited dissemination scope. However, there are outstanding examples, such as Du Zexun's *Outline of Bibliography*, which has generated considerable online enthusiasm. Review content reveals that Professor Du's online courses have attracted many students and readers interested in bibliography, who subsequently sought out *Outline of Bibliography*. Therefore, combining industry contexts, academic books can be promoted through platforms such as online courses, Weibo, and WeChat official accounts to increase visibility. Furthermore, review content indicates that readers rate cumbersome and heavy books lower, preferring concise and readable academic books, possibly because information fragmentation trends and fast-paced lifestyles make it difficult for people to quietly read entire paper books, with most only able to utilize fragmented time for online reading. Therefore, paper academic books can be digitized and further personalized, enabling readers to access high-level, high-quality academic books through digital reading methods.

(2) Standardize academic book writing styles to enhance readability. Review content from the empirical study reveals that many readers encounter obscure and difficult-to-understand content when reading academic books. One reason is the lack of reference sources in books, preventing readers from expanding their reading. Therefore, we recommend that academic book compilation emphasize scientific writing standards with proper citation and annotation. Additionally, operational content descriptions can include appropriate illustrations to help readers more intuitively understand described knowledge points.

(3) Accelerate the construction of specialized academic book evaluation data platforms. Compared to specialized book database tools and platforms such as BKCI and Bookmetrix abroad, China currently only has Nanjing University's CBKCI database and CNKI's Chinese Book Citation Statistics Database. The Chinese Book Citation Statistics Database focuses only on academic impact, emphasizing book citation data, while CBKCI has not yet opened specific book evaluation indicator data to the public. In today's internet era, web-sourced indicators such as online reviews are

also important for book impact evaluation research, yet China still lacks corresponding data integration platforms. The indicator data sources selected in this paper are reliable and easily accessible, and can serve as references for future data integration platform construction. Evaluation data is crucial for evaluation research; accelerating the construction of comprehensive academic book evaluation databases will facilitate better development and innovation in book evaluation research.

This paper also has certain limitations: First, the empirical study only selected 103 book samples within the library, information, and documentation science field for impact ranking, with limited research objects and no involvement in book evaluation in other disciplinary fields, requiring further validation of results. Second, this paper only discusses universal academic book impact evaluation issues from the perspective of more operational quantitative indicators. In reality, different types of academic books generate different impacts. More readable "popular" academic books receive greater attention, while professionally difficult "niche" academic books have relatively smaller audiences but may contribute no less value to disciplinary development than "popular" academic books. Therefore, evaluation practice activities must consider disciplinary differences, taking into account the scale and uniqueness of disciplines or research directions when conducting cross-disciplinary research evaluation.

References

[1] National Bureau of Statistics. 2020 National Economic and Social Development Statistical Bulletin of the People's Republic of China [EB/OL]. (2021-02-28) [2021-06-16]. http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/zxfb/202102/t20210227_{1814154}.html.

[2] He Mingxing. Examining the Global Impact of Chinese Academic Books from the Overseas Collections of Zhonghua Book Company [J]. Publishing Research, 2012(12): 14-18.

[3] White H D, Boell S K, Yu H, et al. Libcitations: a measure for comparative assessment of book publications in the humanities and social sciences[J]. Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology, 2014, 60(6): 1083-1096.

[4] Zhang Haiying. Research on Library Book Evaluation System Based on RFM Model[J]. Library Work, 2012(3): 60-62.

[5] Li Hang. Application of RFM Model in Book Quality Evaluation System[J]. Agricultural Library and Information Science Journal, 2014, 26(2): 54-57.

[6] Yang Siluo, Wang Hao, Wen Tingxiao. Research on Book Impact Based on Citation Analysis—Taking Library and Information Science as an Example[J]. Information and Documentation Services, 2010(1): 89-92.

[7] Su Xinning. Analysis of Book Citation Situation in China's Humanities and Social Sciences—Based on CSSCI Database[J]. Dongyue Tribune, 2009, 30(7):

5-13.

[8] Zuccala A A, Verleysen F T, Cornacchia R, et al. Altmetrics for the humanities: comparing Goodreads reader ratings with citations to history books[J]. Aslib Proceedings, 2015, 67(3): 320-336.

[9] Snijder R. Revisiting an open access monograph experiment: measuring citations and Tweets 5 years later[J]. Scientometrics, 2016, 109(3): 1855-1875.

[10] Ma Ning, Song Zhenshi. Evaluation of Mathematics E-book Impact Based on Bookmetrix[J]. Library and Information Service, 2019, 38(3): 72-79.

[11] Gorräiz J, Gumpenberger C, Purnell P J. The power of book reviews: a simple and transparent enhancement approach for Book Citation Indexes[J]. Scientometrics, 2014, 98(2): 841-852.

[12] Zhang Fengyu. Research on Semantic Positive Rating Calculation Method Based on Big Data of Book Reviews[D]. Changchun: Northeast Normal University, 2018.

[13] Tong Tiantian. Research on Automatic Summarization of Book Reviews Based on Multi-source Heterogeneous Data[D]. Nanjing: Nanjing University of Science and Technology, 2019.

[14] Kousha K, Thelwall M. Can Amazon.com reviews help to assess the wider impacts of books?[J]. Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology, 2016, 67(3): 524-530.

[15] Zhang Chengzhi, Li Zhuo, Zhao Mengyuan. Research on Chinese Book Citation Behavior Based on Citation Content[J]. Journal of Library Science in China, 2019, 45(3): 96-109.

[16] Li Yanling, Sun Xiaohui, Chen Jiubing. Construction of Five-dimensional Book Evaluation System and Analysis Model[J]. Information Science, 2013(8): 80-83, 143.

[17] Zhang Yu, Pan Yuntao, Yuan Junpeng. On the Construction of Chinese Scientific Book Academic Impact Evaluation System from a Multi-dimensional Perspective[J]. Library and Information Service, 2015, 59(7): 69-76.

[18] Zhou Qingqing. Research on Book Impact Evaluation Based on Multi-source Heterogeneous Data[D]. Nanjing: Nanjing University of Science and Technology, 2018.

[19] Xiao Aoxia, Yang Siluo. Application of Bookmetrix Indicators in Academic Book Impact Evaluation[J]. Library Forum, 2020, 40(9): 79-85.

[20] Zhou Qingqing, Zhang Chengzhi. Research Progress and Prospects of Book Impact Evaluation[J]. Journal of Academic Libraries, 2020(3): 24-33.

[21] China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Information Network. Announcement of National Fourth-round Discipline Evaluation Results[EB/OL]. [2021-06-17]. http://www.cdgdc.edu.cn/xwy yjsjyxx/xkpgjg/.

[22] National Bureau of Statistics. China Statistical Yearbook 2020[EB/OL]. [2021-06-17]. http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2020/indexch.htm.

[23] Hirsch J E. An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output[J]. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2005, 102(46): 16569-16572.

[24] Egghe L. Theory and practice of the g-index[J]. Scientometrics, 2006, 69(1): 131-152.

[25] Diakoulaki D, Mavrotas G, Papayannakis L. Determining objective weights in multiple criteria problems: the critic method[J]. Computers and Operations Research, 1995, 22(7): 763-770.

[26] Hwang C L, Yoon K. Multiple attribute decision making methods and applications[M]. Berlin: Springer, 1981.

Author Contributions

Peng Qiuru: Research design and paper writing; He Bei: Data collection and processing; Huang Shuiqing: Paper revision.

Impact Evaluation of Chinese Academic Books in Humanities and Social Sciences: Taking Library & Information Science as an Example

Peng Qiuru[1,2], He Bei[1,2], Huang Shuiqing[1,2]
[1]College of Information Management, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing 210095
[2]Research Center for Humanities and Social Computing, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing 210095

Abstract: [Purpose/Significance] Academic books are not only important tools for presenting the results of scientific research activities, but also important information resources in human social information activities. The impact evaluation of academic books is conducive to their full utilization. [Method/Process] On the basis of previous research results, this paper designed a complete and comprehensive impact evaluation system for Chinese academic books in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and established multi-level evaluation indicators from both academic impact and social impact perspectives. This paper selected 103 academic books in the field of Library & Information Science from CBKCI as research samples, collected the corresponding indicator data, and used CRITIC and TOPSIS to evaluate the impact of the 103 sample books. [Result/Conclusion] The research results show that the indicators and methods for impact evaluation of Chinese academic books in the Humanities and Social Sciences proposed in this paper consider factors such as research scholars, readers, and the books themselves, comprehensively reflecting all aspects of academic book impact, and demonstrating certain ease of use and feasibility.

Keywords: Chinese academic books; impact evaluation; book evaluation; humanities and social sciences; library and information science

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.