

## A Study on the Evaluation of Discourse Power in Academic Conferences (Postprint)

**Authors:** Zhao Rongying, Lu Lan, Chang Ruru, Zhu Weijie

**Date:** 2023-04-01T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] As one of the primary means of disseminating academic achievements, academic conferences can guide academic directions, influence academic decision-making, establish academic norms, and identify outstanding academic achievements. From this perspective, academic conferences, as entities, possess a certain degree of discourse power in the academic community. Conducting evaluation research on the discourse power of academic conferences holds theoretical and practical significance for the development of academia in China. [Method/Process] From an organizational structure perspective, this study clarifies the definition and connotation of academic conference discourse power through reviewing and summarizing existing research. Subsequently, combining informetrics and evaluation theory, it analyzes the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power evaluation. [Results/Conclusions] The study identifies the evaluation elements of academic conference discourse power as academic conference leadership, academic conference dissemination capacity, and academic conference influence. Based on these evaluation elements, it constructs an evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power and summarizes the evaluation research approach, aiming to provide new insights for constructing an evaluation system for academic discourse power in China.

### Full Text

Vol. 66 No. 11, June 2022: Research on the Evaluation of Discourse Power in Academic Conferences

Zhao Rongying<sup>1, 2</sup>, Lu Lan<sup>1, 2</sup>, Chang Ruru<sup>1, 2</sup>, Zhu Weijie<sup>1, 2</sup> <sup>1</sup> Research Center for Chinese Science Evaluation, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072 <sup>2</sup> School of Information Management, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072

**Abstract:** [Purpose/Significance] As one of the primary means of disseminating academic achievements, academic conferences can guide academic directions,

influence academic decision-making, establish academic rules, and identify outstanding academic accomplishments. From this perspective, academic conferences, as a subject, possess certain discourse power within the academic community. Research on evaluating the discourse power of academic conferences holds both theoretical and practical significance for China's academic development. [Method/Process] Based on an organizational structure perspective, this paper clarifies the definition and connotation of academic conference discourse power through reviewing and summarizing existing research. It then analyzes the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power evaluation by integrating informetrics and evaluation theory. [Result/Conclusion] The study identifies the evaluation elements of academic conference discourse power as academic conference leading power, academic conference communication power, and academic conference influence power. Based on these evaluation elements, it constructs an evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power and summarizes the research approach, aiming to provide new ideas for constructing China's academic discourse power evaluation system.

**Keywords:** academic discourse power; academic conference; academic conference discourse power; discourse power evaluation **Classification Number:** G250 **DOI:** 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2022.11.005

## Introduction

In recent years, with the enhancement of China's comprehensive national strength, its international discourse power and influence have also increased significantly, while simultaneously facing new tasks and challenges. On May 31, 2021, General Secretary Xi Jinping emphasized during the 30th collective study session on strengthening China's international communication capacity that telling China's stories well and disseminating China's voice requires vigorous efforts to enhance international communication capacity and develop international discourse power commensurate with China's comprehensive national strength and international status. Academic discourse power constitutes an important component of international discourse power, representing the outcome of knowledge production and dissemination [1], and embodying the articulation and expression of academic issues [2]. As a primary mode of academic exchange and dissemination, academic conferences can spread academic achievements and exchange academic ideas. From an organizational structure perspective, academic conferences, as academic organizations, can also guide academic directions, influence academic decision-making, establish academic rules, and identify outstanding academic achievements, thereby possessing certain academic discourse power.

With the continuous improvement of research evaluation theories and indicator systems, using evaluation to promote academic development has become an inevitable trend. How to evaluate the discourse power of academic conferences, enhance the international status and influence of Chinese academic conferences, and enable conferences to better fulfill their academic functions are issues ur-

gently requiring attention in the academic community and represent one of the developmental goals for improving international discourse power. Therefore, this paper combines informetrics and evaluation theory to study academic conference discourse power evaluation, taking academic conferences as the discourse subject. Through reviewing and summarizing existing research, it clarifies the definition and connotation of academic conference discourse power, analyzes the constituent elements and evaluation index system of academic conference discourse power evaluation, and summarizes the research approach, aiming to provide new ideas for constructing China's academic discourse power evaluation system.

In recent years, with China's social and economic progress and development, indigenous Chinese scholarship has shown vigorous growth. However, China's current "voiceless" state in international academic discourse power has not been substantially improved. To help contemporary Chinese scholarship "go global," China must construct its own academic discourse system and enhance its international academic discourse power. Some scholars believe that academic discourse power emerges from the process of knowledge production and dissemination, and that the enhancement of academic discourse power can only be achieved through the quality of knowledge production, the distinctiveness of knowledge expression, and the breadth of knowledge dissemination [3].

## 2 Research Status

Currently, academic research on discourse power primarily involves theoretical studies, discourse power evaluation, and discourse system construction. In the theoretical research on discourse power, Z.S. Harris first proposed the concept of "discourse analysis" [4], which French postmodernist thinker Michel Foucault later applied to the study of ideology, politics, and economics, introducing the concept of "discourse power" [5]. In Foucault's theory, discourse power is essentially a form of power, not a right, epitomized by "discourse is power" [6-7]. Subsequent scholars have largely drawn upon Foucault's theory in their research [8-9], discussing the "power" and "right" dimensions of discourse power. Additionally, Antonio Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony also provides a theoretical foundation for discourse power. Gramsci interpreted the "power" in discourse as both "power" and "authority," where power corresponds to a coercive force that constrains individuals or society, typically associated with politics, while authority emphasizes using non-coercive means to alter the ideology of individuals or groups to achieve recognition or voluntary compliance.

In discourse power evaluation, existing research reveals almost no relevant studies abroad, while domestic research remains limited, focusing primarily on theoretical studies, evaluation system construction, and evaluation criteria. For instance, Xie Qun argues that constructing a Chinese academic discourse system represents one of the main pathways to enhancing China's academic discourse power [10], while other scholars have constructed a scientific research framework for Chinese discourse power evaluation based on five essential elements

[11]. Overall, research on discourse power evaluation remains in its infancy, with existing studies concentrating on theoretical aspects and virtually no empirical research on discourse power evaluation.

Research on academic conferences predominantly addresses conference organization, current status, processes, effects and satisfaction, participant motivations, development recommendations, and quality assessment systems [12]. For example, studies have examined academic conferences from perspectives including main content, overall paper quality, discussion level, and participant response [13]. Regarding participant motivation, grounded theory analysis has identified six types of motivations from a tripartite perspective: personal needs, social needs, information collection, promotion, external stimuli, and leisure entertainment [14]. In academic conference evaluation, research has primarily focused on single-dimensional assessments such as conference influence evaluation, conference quality evaluation, and conference effect and satisfaction evaluation. For instance, evaluation indicators for academic conference quality have been proposed from aspects including conference topic selection, paper quality, comprehensive benefits, academic atmosphere, and conference logistics [15]; the improved Peer Reputation value (PR value), H-index, and impact factor have been used to evaluate academic conference quality [16]; conference effects have been evaluated based on the degree of goal achievement for organizers and sponsors from target, user, process, and resource/capability layers [17]; cross-sectional surveys have been introduced to evaluate satisfaction at orthopedic conferences, providing data support for improving satisfaction in this field [18]; and conference performance has been analyzed and evaluated from an organizational structure perspective combined with structural characteristics [19].

Through reviewing the research status, we find that theoretical and indicator system studies on discourse power abound, yet panoramic analyses based on theoretical construction—that is, empirical research—remain scarce, lacking a unified research and evaluation system for discourse power. Regarding academic conference research, most studies adopt a management perspective, with conference evaluation limited to single-dimensional assessments such as conference quality, satisfaction, and effects, lacking multi-dimensional evaluation of academic conferences and virtually no research examining academic conferences from perspectives of leading power, influence, or dissemination effects of conference outcomes. In summary, existing research exhibits several shortcomings: lack of theoretical systems and empirical research on academic conference discourse power evaluation; lack of studies on the connotation, generation process, and influencing factors of academic conference discourse power; and lack of research evaluating discourse power by treating academic conferences as discourse subjects. Therefore, how to overcome the limitations of single-dimensional evaluation and measure the magnitude of academic conference discourse power constitutes a noteworthy issue for the academic community, making it particularly urgent to combine scientific evaluation theories and methods for academic conferences with discourse power theory to evaluate their discourse power. Given the vast differences among academic conferences involving various purposes, re-

quirements, fields, disciplines, methods, and scales, to avoid the influence of inherent characteristic factors of different conference types on research results, this paper sets aside specific conference characteristics and treats academic conferences as academic organizations from an organizational structure perspective to study academic conference discourse power evaluation.

### 3 Connotation and Generation Process of Academic Conference Discourse Power

#### 3.1 Definition of Academic Discourse Power

M. Foucault first proposed the concept of “discourse power” and introduced “discourse is power” in his inaugural lecture [6]. Later scholars’ definitions of discourse power have largely involved concepts of “power,” “right,” and “authority.” In the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “power” carries meanings of domination, influence, authority, jurisdiction, or influential individuals/groups; “right” primarily refers to legal, moral, or natural rights; and “authority” generally denotes experts in a field, administrative departments, or influence. Literally understood, “discourse” means speaking and expression, while “power” encompasses both rights and power, making discourse power the unity of the right and power to speak. Discourse power can be categorized from macro, meso, and micro perspectives into international discourse power, institutional discourse power, and individual discourse power; according to different fields, it can be divided into economic discourse power, academic discourse power, political discourse power, media discourse power, etc. [20]; in academia, based on the scope and size of research subjects, academic discourse power can be further divided into scholar discourse power, institutional discourse power, and international academic discourse power.

In current research involving academic discourse power, most scholars cite Zheng Hangsheng’s definition: discourse power in the academic field signifies the unity of the right and power to speak [21]. Everyone possesses the “right,” manifested as citizens’ freedom of expression, while “power” represents the full embodiment of “right” based on “capability and strength,” manifested as the influence of the discourse subject’s actions and statements on the discourse object. The discourse subject, or the issuer of discourse, can specifically be a discipline, university, journal, country, or organization. For example, Zhang Zhengtang has conducted theoretical research on the construction of discourse power in management science as a discourse subject [22]; Zhang Jing et al. have evaluated the international academic discourse power of scientific journals [23]. Academic discourse objects primarily refer to individuals, groups, or organizations affected by the discourse subject. In summary, this paper defines academic discourse power as the unity of discourse rights and discourse power possessed by academic subjects, emphasizing that a particular academic subject, relying on a powerful discourse platform (such as academic conferences or journals), disseminates its discourse content to exert influence or guidance on academic objects

(individuals, disciplines, fields, etc.).

### 3.2 Connotation of Academic Conference Discourse Power

Academic conferences are premised on academia, centering on academic issues with purposes typically including solving academic problems, acquiring academic knowledge, exploring academic frontiers, and establishing academic rules. If academic conferences are merely regarded as a form of academic activity, their discourse power essentially belongs to the conference organizers. However, from an organizational structure perspective, academic conferences operate with clear objectives and management mechanisms, and most are periodic, making them long-term organizations [24] composed of multiple elements including organizers, participants, conference platforms, and conference outcomes. The generation of academic conference discourse power results from the interaction of these multiple elements within the academic field. Therefore, this paper treats academic conferences as academic organizations for discourse power research. Based on an organizational structure perspective and through reviewing existing research, this paper defines academic conferences as: academic organizations spontaneously formed by experts and scholars with certain disciplinary backgrounds under management mechanisms to achieve their academic purposes, with specific activities including presenting academic papers, delivering keynote speeches, group presentations, and exchange discussions.

Academic conference discourse power manifests as the power to guide academic directions, determine academic rules, and influence academic decisions, emphasizing the leading power, influence, and communication power demonstrated by academic conferences as authoritative discourse subjects in the academic community, as shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper].

### 3.3 Generation of Academic Conference Discourse Power

Since the Western Enlightenment, Western intellectuals have established the foundation for Western discourse power, resulting in a West-strong, East-weak pattern in international academic discourse power. The formation and enhancement of academic discourse power depend on knowledge dissemination and acceptance. Only by maintaining an international perspective, allowing China's academic achievements, concepts, and ideas to collide, exchange, and learn from academic achievements of different countries and cultural backgrounds, and continuously improving them to gain recognition from the international academic community, can China truly obtain and enhance its academic discourse power. Therefore, "going out" with China's academic achievements and ideas represents the necessary path to enhancing China's international academic discourse power. As a primary channel for academic achievement exchange and dissemination, academic conferences play an irreplaceable role in building Chinese academic discourse. Academic conference discourse power emerges precisely against this background.

Academic discourse power is not inherent to academic conferences themselves but is generated over time through the influence of conference discourse subjects on objects, representing the result of multiple factors working together. Drawing on Harold D. Lasswell's [26] "5W" communication model, this paper divides the generation process of academic conference discourse power into production, communication, and regeneration (strengthening) stages. The production stage corresponds to discourse subjects and their generated discourse content, the communication stage corresponds to discourse carriers, and the regeneration stage corresponds to discourse objects and the discourse influence/effects on them. The generation process of academic conference discourse power is essentially the process through which discourse subjects produce discourse effects/influence, which can be subdivided into "discourse subject  $\rightarrow$  discourse content  $\rightarrow$  discourse carrier  $\rightarrow$  discourse object  $\rightarrow$  discourse effect/influence," corresponding to the "5W" communication model of "communicator (Who)  $\rightarrow$  information (Say What)  $\rightarrow$  medium (In Which Channel)  $\rightarrow$  audience (To Whom)  $\rightarrow$  effects (With What Effects)," as shown in Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper].

In the production stage of academic conference discourse power, conference organizers leverage their institutional advantages, academic reputation, and status to lead conference development and release conference information (including conference topic setting, paper evaluation rules, and communication scope), convening participants. The information provided by organizers and the academic achievements contributed by participants collectively form a shareable information source. Through refinement and expression during exchange and sharing, this information gains recognition, understanding, and acceptance from the academic community, initially generating academic conference discourse power. Subsequently, conference outcomes are disseminated through conference reports, publications, and online platforms, expanding communication scope and enhancing academic conference influence. When these outcomes gain recognition from objects, who interpret, absorb, and carry them forward, new knowledge evolves, achieving regeneration of conference outcomes and further evolving into academic conference influence, which in turn continues to affect academic conference subjects, thereby strengthening academic conference discourse power.

In short, the generation, strengthening, and enhancement of academic conference discourse power constitute a cyclical process. In this process, the magnitude of leading power of conference subjects (organizers, chairs, etc.), the intensity of academic idea dissemination by conference carriers, and the degree of influence on objects in later stages can be described respectively as academic conference leading power, academic conference communication power, and academic conference influence power—three elements that collectively constitute the three major components of academic conference discourse power.

## 4 Evaluation of Academic Conference Discourse Power

### 4.1 Constituent Elements of Academic Conference Discourse Power Evaluation

**4.1.1 Academic Conference Leading Power** “Leading” emphasizes guidance and direction. Academic conferences typically focus on domestic and international research hotspots, frontiers, and latest achievements. Through participation, experts and scholars can discuss challenging issues in academic research and form theoretical consensus. From this perspective, academic conferences can grasp academic development trends and trajectories, driving academic research in certain directions or movements. Therefore, this paper defines academic conference leading power as the capacity to drive academic research development in specific directions.

Strength and authority are prerequisites for exerting leading power, and the formation of academic conference leading power requires time accumulation. In the initial stage of academic conferences, leading power is primarily determined by the strength and authority of the organizing institutions and conference chairs—the stronger their academic status and positions, the more authoritative the conference and the more prominent its leading power. Academic conferences leverage this leading power to determine evaluation criteria, solicit conference papers, and attract participants, initially exerting guiding influence in the academic community. Subsequently, as participating experts and scholars have long been engaged in relevant research with rich experience and strength, they may also play leading roles in specific academic fields and possess certain discourse power. Their participation can increase conference visibility and authority. From this perspective, participants’ academic leading power also influences academic conference leading power to some extent. As conferences continuously improve and develop, the magnitude of academic conference leading power changes dynamically with the academic leading power of organizers, chairs, and participants.

In summary, the academic leading power of organizing institutions, conference chairs, and participants collectively determines academic conference leading power. Considering data availability and building on previous research, this paper uses the improved Peer Reputation (PR) value to measure academic leading power, assessing its magnitude through rankings of organizing institutions, institutions affiliated with conference chairs, institutions of first authors for each paper, and the H-index of conference chairs [27]. Leading power is associated with “strength” and “status,” which can be reflected through institutional/university rankings in academia, while scholars’ leading power can be demonstrated through their affiliated institution’s ranking and their personal H-index.

**4.1.2 Academic Conference Communication Power** President Xi Jinping explicitly stated in the 30th collective study session on advancing China’s in-

ternational communication capacity that China should conduct various forms of domestic and international humanities exchange activities, utilize important international conference forums and foreign mainstream media platforms to make its voice heard, accelerate the construction of Chinese discourse and narrative systems, and build a strategic communication system with distinct Chinese characteristics to enhance international communication influence, persuasiveness of Chinese discourse, and guidance of international public opinion [28]. In building the international discourse system, constructing a strategic communication system with distinct Chinese characteristics and developing international discourse power matching China's comprehensive national strength and international status are prerequisites for promoting the global expression of Chinese stories and voices and advancing Chinese culture worldwide [28].

As an important platform for academic exchange, academic conferences inherently prioritize peer communication as their core mission [29]. Scholars use academic conferences to focus on industry frontiers, research hotspots, and latest achievements to exchange ideas and disseminate academic viewpoints, quickly seizing “academic opportunities” to gain “academic recognition” and thereby enhance their academic influence. Conference outcome dissemination relies on carriers such as conference proceedings, publications, social media, and online platforms. Scholars have noted that academic achievement dissemination has evolved from traditional print-document-centered stages to network communication stages [30]. Drawing on previous research, this paper divides academic conference communication media into traditional and network communication media, exploring academic conference communication power from both aspects.

From the perspective of traditional media, the diversity of conference outcome forms, overall conference publication volume, and conference scale (number of parallel sessions, participants, institutions, countries, and conference continuity) affect academic conference communication power [31]. Evaluation indicators can be selected from these three angles to assess communication power through traditional media. Second, from the perspective of network media, evaluation indicators can be selected from three angles: websites (web page quantity [32], web page link count, network centrality), online conferences (ZOOM, Tencent Meeting), and official WeChat accounts.

**4.1.3 Academic Conference Influence Power** Academic conferences promote the dissemination of academic achievements and advancement of knowledge. Academic conference influence power refers to the impact of conference outcomes during communication on academic and non-academic subjects/objects, involving thought and behavioral domains—essentially, the influence of conference outcomes. Research has found that bibliometric indicators are the most important determinants in conference evaluation [33]. Traditional citation indicators have been used to evaluate academic conferences both domestically and internationally, such as O.S. Loizides et al. [16] using H-index and impact factor to evaluate academic conference quality, and Wang

Qian [34] using H-index and its derivative indicators for academic conference evaluation.

Using traditional citation indicators for academic evaluation represents an important approach that can measure academic influence to some extent. However, in the network era, after academic achievements are disseminated in the online field, they not only influence the knowledge systems of academic subjects but also trigger behaviors such as likes, comments, reposts, and social media mentions from network users, forming social influence. At this point, evaluating only academic influence clearly appears one-sided and cannot comprehensively measure the influence of academic achievements. The emergence of Altmetrics makes it possible to simultaneously evaluate both academic and social influence of academic achievements. Altmetrics is an evaluation method for measuring academic influence in social networks by collecting attention received by research achievements online [35]. Altmetrics indicators offer advantages including timeliness, diversity, and precision [36], effectively avoiding limitations of traditional citation indicators such as long time lags and ambiguous citation motivations. Although Altmetrics was proposed relatively recently and some scholars may question its credibility, relevant studies have proven that Altmetrics indicators not only demonstrate good credibility but also avoid risks of large-scale manipulation, simultaneously reflecting both academic and social influence of academic achievements [37].

Therefore, to obtain more scientific, objective, and comprehensive evaluation results, this paper breaks through the limitations of traditional influence indicators used solely for academic influence evaluation and comprehensively employs both traditional influence indicators (SCI/EI indexing, highly-cited papers, H5-index) and Altmetrics indicators (social media, news, policy, patent mentions, etc.) to evaluate academic conference influence power.

In summary, based on the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power, a preliminary evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power is obtained, as shown in Table 1 .

## 4.2 Research Approach for Scientific Evaluation of Academic Conference Discourse Power

Before evaluating academic conference discourse power, several key questions should be considered: What is academic conference discourse power? How to construct an evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power? How to conduct such evaluation? Centering on these key questions and based on informetrics and scientific evaluation theory, this paper proposes that research on academic conference discourse power evaluation should follow the logical sequence of “demand analysis → theoretical research → evaluation model construction → empirical research.”

**4.2.1 Demand Analysis for Academic Conference Discourse Power Evaluation** Demand analysis constitutes an essential step before scientific research. Before evaluating academic conference discourse power, this paper first clarifies the necessity of such evaluation based on the strategic demand for constructing China's discourse system. Second, it employs relevant methods to summarize, synthesize, and conduct comparative analysis of existing research, and develops this study based on identified problems and deficiencies in current research.

**4.2.2 Mastering Theories and Methods for Academic Conference Discourse Power Evaluation** Based on reviewing informetrics, evaluation theory, and discourse power-related theories, this paper proposes the concept of academic conference discourse power, analyzes its generation process around subjects, carriers, and objects, and identifies its constituent elements as academic leading power, academic communication power, and academic influence power based on this process. Currently, no evaluation methods specifically target academic conference discourse power. In scientific evaluation, methods can be categorized as single-indicator or multi-indicator evaluation according to the number of indicators. This paper argues that for a more comprehensive evaluation of academic conference discourse power, integration and innovation based on discourse power evaluation methods and conference evaluation methods should be employed, selecting multiple indicators to construct an evaluation index system for comprehensive assessment.

**4.2.3 Constructing the Evaluation Model** In evaluation, the first step is to identify the evaluation subject and indicators. Currently, virtually no evaluation specifically targets academic conference discourse power. Therefore, combining relevant theories of discourse power and conference evaluation and based on the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power and scientific evaluation principles, appropriate evaluation indicators should be selected from three dimensions: academic leading power, academic communication power, and academic influence power. First, correlation analysis should be conducted on indicators under each dimension to eliminate indicators with high substitutability. Then, influence, communication, and leading power indicators should be integrated, using correlation analysis, principal component analysis, and other methods to determine indicator weights and further construct the academic conference discourse power evaluation model.

**4.2.4 Empirical Research on Academic Conference Discourse Power Evaluation** Theoretical research on academic conference discourse power evaluation holds theoretical significance, while empirical research possesses practical significance. At the empirical level, this paper plans to select 40 top-tier international conferences in artificial intelligence from the "China Computer Federation Recommended International Academic Conferences and Journals Directory" published in 2019 as research samples, including 7 Class A conferences, 12

Class B conferences, and 21 Class C conferences. First, collected indicator data will be standardized, then the academic conference discourse power evaluation model will be applied for comprehensive evaluation and analysis, calculating component scores and relative rankings of sample conferences. The evaluation results will be comparatively analyzed to verify the feasibility of the index system. Based on the evaluation results, recommendations for academic conference discourse power evaluation will be proposed to lay the foundation for applying the evaluation model to conferences in more fields.

Academic conferences serve as weather vanes and barometers of academic development, providing a platform for communication and exchange in the academic community and guiding academic research directions through mutual discussion. This paper first reviews and summarizes relevant research, proposes the concept of academic conference discourse power, and briefly elaborates on its generation process. Second, from the perspectives of subjects, carriers, and objects in the generation process, it identifies the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power as academic leading power, academic communication power, and academic influence power, briefly explaining each element's concept and components, and preliminarily proposes an evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power. Finally, based on informetrics and scientific evaluation theory combined with the concept of academic conference discourse power, it summarizes the research approach for scientific evaluation. This paper 首次 integrates discourse power evaluation theories and concepts with academic conferences, studying conferences from a discourse power perspective and broadening research perspectives in both discourse power and academic conference fields. It should be noted that this paper focuses on theoretical research regarding academic conference discourse power, with subsequent empirical research on academic conference discourse power using sample conferences to continuously improve the index system based on research conclusions, aiming to provide new perspectives and ideas for constructing China's discourse system.

## References

- [1] Dai Guangrong. From “Going Out” to “Going In” [N]. *China Social Sciences Daily*, 2020-01-10(4).
- [2] Han Pugeng. Academic Journals and Chinese Academic Discourse Construction from the Perspective of Public Rationality [J]. *Fujian Tribune (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2009(11): 82-85.
- [3] Zhang Lianhai. The Transformation of Development Paths for Chinese Academic Discourse Power from the Perspective of Community [J]. *Journal of Hubei Minzu University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2017, 35(5): 142-146.
- [4] Harris ZS. Discourse Analysis [J]. *Language*, 1952, 28(1): 1-30.
- [5] Zhuang Qinfang. Foucault's Postmodern Discourse View and Chinese Discourse Construction [J]. *Foreign Language Research*, 2007(5): 94-96.
- [6] Foucault M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* [M]. New York: Knopf Doubleday, 1982.
- [7] Mao Yue. On the International Discourse Power of Socialist Core Values [J]. *Zhejiang Social Sciences*, 2013(7): 27-32, 26, 155-156.

- [8] Hu Weiguang, Zhou Quanhua. On Discourse Power and Ideological Leadership [J]. *Journal of the Fujian Provincial Committee Party School of the CPC*, 2019(3): 160-168. [9] Zhang Zhizhou. Discourse Quality: The Key to Enhancing International Discourse Power [J]. *Red Flag Manuscript*, 2010(10): 17-19. [10] Xie Qun. Academic Journal Internationalization and Competition for International Discourse Power [J]. *Theory*, 2014(18): 111-113. [11] Zhao Rongying, Wang Xu, Yu Bo, et al. Construction of a Scientific Research Framework for Chinese Discourse Power Evaluation [J]. *Library and Information Studies*, 2019(4): 122-131. [12] Zhou Jinping, Yan Min, Mu Guangyu. Research on Constructing an Evaluation Index System for Conference Proceedings' Academic Influence [J]. *Research on Library Science*, 2018(22): 97-101, 96. [13] Liu Guowei. Discussion on Academic Conference Quality Evaluation [J]. *Science of Science and Management of Science and Technology*, 1991(4): 24-26. [14] Wang Siyi, Zheng Shaoli, Chen Peng. Research on Participant Motivations from a Tripartite Perspective—Taking the 2020 China Tumor Prevention and Treatment Alliance Annual Meeting as an Example [J]. *Business and Exhibition Economics*, 2021(18): 8-11. [15] Yang Min, Bi Xiaojing. Feasibility of Academic Conference Quality Assessment Methods [J]. *China Modern Medical Journal*, 1994(4): 74-75. [16] Loizides OS, Koutsakis. On Evaluating the Quality of a Computer Science/Computer Engineering Conference [J]. *Journal of Informetrics*, 2017, 11(2): 541-552. [17] Xiao Jianhua, Huo Guoqing, Dong Shuai, et al. Research on Academic Conference Effect Evaluation Index System Based on Balanced Scorecard [J]. *Science of Science and Management of Science and Technology*, 2009, 30(12): 48-54. [18] Li Shuang, Lü Yanwei. Evaluation of Effect and Satisfaction at Orthopedic Academic Conferences [J]. *Beijing Medicine*, 2013, 35(7): 570-571. [19] Zheng Yi, Liu Wenbin, Song Zening. Research on Performance Evaluation and Management of Academic Conferences in China from an Organizational Structure Perspective [J]. *Science Research Management*, 2020, 41(3): 194-204. [20] Zheng Hua, Guo Yali. Path Exploration for Enhancing China's International Discourse Power [J]. *Foreign Theoretical Trends*, 2018(9): 119-127. [21] Zheng Hangsheng. Academic Discourse Power and the Development of Chinese Sociology [J]. *Social Sciences in China*, 2011(2): 27-34, 4, 220. [22] Zhang Zhengtang. Construction of Chinese Management Science Academic Discourse Power and Guidance of University Research Behavior [J]. *Nanjing Social Sciences*, 2016(11): 10-16. [23] Zhang Jing, Zheng Xiaonan. Construction of International Academic Discourse Power of Chinese English-Language Scientific Journals [J]. *Science-Technology and Publication*, 2017(6): 111-115. [24] Bittner E. The Concept of Organization [J]. *Social Research*, 1965, 32(3): 239-255. [25] Zhang Falin. Global Financial Governance Agenda-Setting and China's International Discourse Power [J]. *World Economics and Politics*, 2020(6): 106-131, 159. [26] Gao Haibo. Tracing the Origin of Lasswell's 5W Model [J]. *International Press*, 2008(10): 37-40. [27] Nelakuditi S, Gray C, Choudhury RR. Snap Judgment of Publication Quality: How to Convince a Dean That You Are a Good Researcher [J]. *Mobile Computing and Communications Review*, 2011, 15(2): 20-23. [28] Zhang Yusheng, Pang Min. China's International Communication in the New Era: New Basis, New Logic, and New Path [J]. *Modern*

*Communication (Journal of Communication University of China)*, 2021, 43(7): 40-49. [29] Tan Yihong, Jia Hepeng, Yan Wenyu, et al. Science Communication as Culture—Taking Four Major International Science Conferences as Examples [J]. *Science and Society*, 2021, 11(1): 152-168. [30] Wan Hongyu, Zhao Jidong, Liu Wenhao. Research on Academic Information Dissemination Models from a Social Media Perspective [J]. *Library Theory and Practice*, 2020(3): 85-90, 123. [31] Tang Jiahui, Li Xiaoxuan, Zheng Yi, et al. Research and Practice on Comprehensive Academic Conference Quality Evaluation [J]. *Science and Technology Review*, 2021, 39(17): 106-114. [32] Ingwersen P. The Calculation of Web Impact Factors [J]. *Journal of Documentation*, 1998, 54(2): 236-243. [33] Kungsas P, Karus S, Vakulenko S, et al. Reverse-Engineering Conference Rankings: What Does It Take to Make a Reputable Conference? [J]. *Scientometrics*, 2013(96): 651-665. [34] Wang Qian. Research on Application of h-index and Its Derivatives in Evaluating Academic Conferences [J]. *Sci-Tech Information Development and Economy*, 2015(15): 135-139. [35] Wang Rui, Hu Wenjing, Guo Wei. Comparison of Common Altmetrics Tools [J]. *New Technology of Library and Information Service*, 2014(12): 18-26. [36] Liu Entao, Li Guojun, Qiu Xiaohua, et al. Comparative Study on Altmetrics Tools [J]. *Library Journal*, 2015, 34(8): 85-92. [37] Qiu Junping, Yu Houqiang. On Several Fundamental Issues Promoting the Development of Altmetrics [J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2015, 41(1): 4-15.

**Author Contributions:** Zhao Rongying: Topic selection, framework design, paper guidance, revision; Lu Lan: Paper writing, revision; Chang Ruru: Literature research, revision; Zhu Weijie: Literature research, revision.

**Statement on Academic Integrity:** *Library and Information Service* has consistently upheld the mission of publishing excellent academic paper achievements and promoting industry academic exchange, while committing to purifying the academic publishing environment and creating a sound academic ecosystem. In 2013, it took the lead in formulating, releasing, and implementing the “Joint Statement on Upholding Academic Ethics and Purifying the Academic Environment by Library and Information Science Journals” (referred to as the “Statement”) (see: <http://www.lis.ac.cn/CN/column/item202.shtml>), and subsequently led the formulation and release of the “Joint Action Plan for Library and Information Science Journals to Resist Academic Misconduct” (referred to as the “Joint Action Plan”) (see: <http://www.lis.ac.cn/CN/column/item247.shtml>). To implement and enforce this concept, this journal hereby declares that from now on, all submitting authors must 承诺: papers submitted to this journal must comply with the above “Statement” and “Joint Action Plan,” consciously uphold academic ethics, and resolutely resist academic misconduct. *Library and Information Service* maintains a zero-tolerance policy toward all papers suspected of plagiarism, piracy, and other forms of academic misconduct, and will implement corresponding punitive measures.

*Library and Information Service Magazine*

---

**Research on the Evaluation of Discourse Power in Academic Conferences**

Zhao Rongying<sup>1, 2</sup>, Lu Lan<sup>1, 2</sup>, Chang Ruru<sup>1, 2</sup>, Zhu Weijie<sup>1, 2</sup> <sup>1</sup> Research Center for Chinese Science Evaluation, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China <sup>2</sup> School of Information Management, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

**Abstract:** [Purpose/Significance] As one of the main means of disseminating academic achievements, academic conferences can lead academic directions, influence academic decision-making, determine academic rules, and identify excellent academic achievements. From this perspective, academic conferences, as a subject, have certain discourse power in the academic community. Research on the evaluation of academic conference discourse power has certain theoretical and practical significance for the academic development of our country. [Method/Process] Based on the perspective of organizational structure, this paper clarifies the definition and connotation of academic conference discourse power by reviewing and summarizing existing research, and then analyzes the constituent elements of academic conference discourse power evaluation by combining informetrics and evaluation theory. [Result/Conclusion] This study summarizes the evaluation elements of academic conference discourse power into academic conference leading power, academic conference communication power, and academic conference influence power, and constructs an evaluation index system for academic conference discourse power based on these elements, and summarizes the research ideas for evaluation, in order to provide new ideas for constructing an evaluation system for academic discourse power in our country.

**Keywords:** academic discourse power; academic conference; academic conference discourse power; evaluation of discourse power

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

*Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.*