

## On Academic Discourse Power and Its Evaluation Postprint

**Authors:** Rongying Zhao, Liu Zhuozhuo, Zhang Zhaoyang, Li Xinlai, Chang Ruru

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

### Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Academic discourse power is the carrier of national spirit and culture, and an important manifestation of national soft power. Research on the connotation and formation mechanism of academic discourse power contributes to clarifying its connotation, formation process, constituent elements, and evaluation, holding significant implications for enhancing national soft power and promoting national spirit and culture. [Method/Process] By integrating Foucault's discourse power theory and Lasswell's 5W communication theory, this paper analyzes the mechanism of academic discourse power, focusing on its connotation, formation process, constituent elements, and evaluation. [Results/Conclusion] The constituent elements of academic discourse power are proposed to include academic discourse subject, academic discourse carrier, academic discourse transmission medium, academic discourse object, and academic discourse influence effect. An evaluation index system for the academic discourse power of research institutions is constructed by combining informetrics and scientific evaluation theories.

### Full Text

## On Academic Discourse Power and Its Evaluation

**Zhao Rongying**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Liu Zhuozhu**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Zhang Zhaoyang**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Li Xinlai**<sup>1,2</sup>,  
**Chang Ruru**<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] Academic discourse power serves as a carrier of national spirit and culture and constitutes an important manifestation of national soft

power. Research on the connotation and formation mechanism of academic discourse power helps clarify its meaning, formation process, constituent elements, and evaluation methods, which is of great significance for enhancing national soft power and promoting national spirit and culture. [Method/Process] This paper analyzes the mechanism of academic discourse power by integrating Foucault's discourse power theory and Lasswell's 5W communication theory, focusing on the connotation, formation process, constituent elements, and evaluation of academic discourse power. [Result/Conclusion] The paper proposes that the constituent elements of academic discourse power include the subject, carrier, communication medium, object, and influence effect of academic discourse. Based on informetrics and scientific evaluation theory, an evaluation index system for the academic discourse power of scientific research institutions is constructed.

**Keywords:** academic discourse power; connotation; formation mechanism; evaluation of academic discourse power

**Classification Number:** G250

**DOI:** 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2022.11.002

---

Following the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, international competition shifted from military strength to soft power foundations such as economy and culture. International discourse power, as a crucial indicator of national soft power, has become a focal point of attention and research for governments and academia worldwide [1]. Discourse power belongs to national soft power: domestically, it refers to the ability to guide public opinion and shape a healthy social ecology; internationally, it represents the capacity to defend national cultural sovereignty, safeguard core national interests, and shape international public opinion. International discourse power is a vital instrument of statecraft, and the rise of great powers is often accompanied by the ascent of discourse power [2].

As early as February 19, 2016, at the symposium on the Party's news and public opinion work, General Secretary Xi Jinping proposed "accelerating the enhancement of international influence of Chinese discourse so that the world can hear and clearly understand China's voice." On May 31, 2021, at the 30th collective study session of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee on strengthening China's international communication capacity, General Secretary Xi Jinping again emphasized "making great efforts to strengthen international communication capacity building, forming international discourse power that matches China's comprehensive national strength and international status, and creating a favorable external public opinion environment for China's reform, development, and stability" [3]. From "accelerating the enhancement of international influence of discourse" in 2016 to "forming national discourse power" in 2021, it is evident that with the rise of new communication technologies such as self-media and the evolution of media forms and communication patterns, the international discourse system and public opinion landscape have

undergone significant changes, and China faces new situations and tasks.

In the current context of globalization, China is experiencing unprecedented changes in a century. Enhancing China's international discourse power has been incorporated into China's top-level design and research agenda, representing an important national strategy for China's rise as a great power and national rejuvenation. Chinese academic discourse power constitutes a crucial component of China's overall discourse power, serving as a carrier of national spirit and culture. Clarifying the connotation, formation process, and constituent elements of academic discourse power facilitates the establishment of a sound evaluation system for academic discourse power, improves the construction of academic and discourse systems, and provides theoretical foundations and references for enhancing Chinese academic discourse power.

Research on international discourse power differs between domestic and foreign contexts in terms of starting time and orientation. Foreign research on international discourse power began relatively early, emerging from international political studies and closely linked to the concept of power, with extensive research fields. Marx and Engels first proposed the concept of "ideological discourse power" [4], arguing that the ruling class obtains political rights and achieves cultural and ideological discourse power by dominating the means of production and economic foundation of society. After the 1970s, "discourse" developed as an independent discipline. French philosopher Michel Foucault first combined the linguistic concept of "discourse" with the political concept of "power," proposing that "discourse is power" [5].

Domestic research on academic discourse power began in the early 21st century and is closely related to politics, publishing, education, and social sciences. Theoretically, it mainly concentrates on Chinese academic discourse power research, Chinese academic discourse system research, and research on the influence of academic discourse power on ideology. Chinese academic discourse power research primarily addresses the influence of various Chinese academic fields internationally and how to enhance China's academic discourse power in the global arena. The Chinese academic discourse system refers to China's unique academic terminology, concepts, categories, and discourse framework [6], with research focusing on how to improve Chinese academic discourse power through constructing this system. Xie Fuzhan argues that constructing China's academic discourse system should include building disciplinary systems, academic systems, and discourse systems [7], while Su Xinning believes that constructing these three systems is significant for building a Chinese characteristic information science discourse system [8]. Research on the influence of academic discourse power on ideology discusses how to position Marxist core discourse within humanities and academic discourse and enhance and consolidate Marxism's discourse power in ideology [9][10].

The aforementioned research on academic discourse power lacks studies on its formation mechanism and evaluation. To deeply analyze the formation mechanism of academic discourse power, this paper examines its connotation, for-

mation process, and constituent elements. First, based on French philosopher Michel Foucault's discourse power theory, we elaborate on discourse power. Second, we summarize numerous scholars' interpretations of his theory and further study the connotation of academic discourse power. Then, combining Lasswell's 5W communication theory, we analyze the formation process and constituent elements of academic discourse power. Finally, taking scientific research institutions as an example and integrating informetrics and scientific evaluation theory, we construct an evaluation index system for academic discourse power.

---

## 2. Connotation of Academic Discourse Power

### 2.1 Discourse Power

After the 1970s, "discourse" developed as an independent discipline. French philosopher Michel Foucault first combined the linguistic concept of "discourse" with the political concept of "power," proposing that "discourse is power" [5]. In his 1970 inaugural lecture at the Collège de France, "The Order of Discourse," Foucault first introduced the concept of "discourse power" [11]. Foucault pointed out that the "will to truth" in modern Western society essentially relies on knowledge systems composed of education, books, publishing, and laboratories, while modern social institutions also seek support from this "will to truth" [12]. The power of discourse partly derives from truth, while the judgment of truth is influenced by invisible power, which in turn requires discourse to consolidate. Therefore, discourse itself is a form of power.

### 2.2 Academic Discourse Power

Yang Yunxia summarized various scholars' different understandings and definitions of "discourse power" proposed by Foucault, which mainly fall into five categories [13]: (1) the right to speak, the right to voice opinions, and the freedom to express one's views [14]; (2) a power that influences others, society, and policy decisions [15]; (3) the unity of right and power, where discourse right and discourse power represent the dual attributes of discourse power [16]; (4) discourse power as the actual and potential influence possessed by information dissemination subjects, while also having dual meanings: discourse right and discourse power [18]; (5) discourse power as a "trinity" combination of right, power, and competence [19].

This paper argues that academic discourse power represents the unity of academic discourse right, academic discourse power, and academic discourse ability. Right refers to the right to speak, and academic discourse right specifically means the qualification of scholars or academic groups to express opinions or ideas in a certain research field, including the rights to create and update, assign meaning, and maintain academic autonomy. Ability refers to the talent, strength, or conditions required to perform a job or accomplish a task [20], and

academic discourse ability specifically means that academic discourse subjects must possess certain qualities to exercise academic discourse right and thereby possess academic discourse power. For example, they must be able to express academic viewpoints in a normative form that enables audiences to fully understand their academic ideas, thus exercising academic discourse right. Power represents a special influence between people and the authority and strength to govern, rule, and dominate others [21], and academic discourse power specifically refers to the dominating effect on others' behavior after expressing opinions and ideas. This power includes guiding authority, appraisal and judgment authority, and action domination authority, representing the leading and controlling force generated after scholars or academic groups speak in a certain research field.

Zheng Hangsheng believes that academic discourse power consists of academic discourse right and academic discourse power, representing the unity of discourse qualification and discourse authority in the academic field [22]. In Zheng's description of the components of discourse power, an important component is implicitly included—academic discourse ability. Both academic discourse right and academic discourse ability are necessary conditions for ultimately forming academic discourse power. Only with academic discourse right and academic discourse ability can academic discourse power be formed. The relationship among the three is shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper], which illustrates the process from academic output to dissemination to influence, demonstrating how academic subjects move from possessing academic discourse right to using academic discourse ability to exercise academic discourse right and thereby obtain academic discourse power.

This paper uses a specific academic event to illustrate the relationship among the three: a scholar from a country participates in an international academic conference, presents a report, and his academic viewpoints or ideas are recognized by scholars from other countries. In this event, the scholar's qualification to participate in and speak at the conference represents academic discourse right, proving that the scholar has the right to voice opinions at academic conferences. The scholar's ability to complete the task of speaking at the conference represents academic discourse ability, proving that the scholar possesses the qualities to exercise academic discourse right and can disseminate academic ideas to the audience through normative academic expression at the venue. The recognition of the scholar's academic viewpoints by other participants after the presentation represents academic discourse power, proving that the scholar's academic ideas have gained emotional and value recognition from the audience.

The relationship among academic discourse right, academic discourse power, and academic discourse ability can also be reflected in the process of academic paper production, publication, dissemination, and academic impact generation. When scholars produce academic papers, the paper's topic selection, content quality, author's reputation, reputation of the author's institution, and collaboration status determine the paper's primary influence [23]. Topic selection and content quality reflect the scholar's academic discourse ability, while the au-

thor's reputation, institutional reputation, and collaboration status reflect the scholar's existing academic discourse power. These factors influence whether the paper can be accepted by reviewers and editors, directly determining whether the scholar has the academic discourse right to voice opinions. After publication, the paper's downloads and citations by other scholars represent its secondary influence [23], reflecting recognition of the scholar's academic viewpoints by others. The secondary influence of academic papers is manifested when they are recognized and adopted by other scholars, generating positive impact, which represents the embodiment of academic discourse power.

In summary, academic discourse power refers to the capacity of academic subjects possessing academic discourse right and academic discourse ability to disseminate their academic achievements through various discourse expression forms and generate sufficient influence to affect and even guide the cognition and actions of other actors in academic exchanges.

---

### 3. Formation Mechanism of Academic Discourse Power

Formation mechanism refers to the internal working methods of various constituent elements during the formation process of something to achieve a specific function, as well as the operating rules and principles of their interconnections and interactions under certain environmental conditions [24]. The formation mechanism of academic discourse power refers to the operating rules and principles of interconnections and interactions among constituent elements in the information dissemination environment to achieve the guiding, disseminating, and influencing functions of academic discourse power.

#### 3.1 Formation Process of Academic Discourse Power

Wu Junxian elaborates in his book *The Construction of China's International Discourse Power: Theory, Status Quo, and Path*: "International discourse power is the result of transforming knowledge concepts into power in international relations through discourse as an external means" [25]. Therefore, the formation process of academic discourse power is essentially the process of knowledge transforming from production to dissemination to influencing others' cognition and behavior.

Combining Foucault's discussion on the relationship among knowledge, discourse, and power in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [11] and Harold Lasswell's "5W" communication model proposed by the American communication scholar and political scientist [26], this paper divides the formation process of academic discourse power into three stages corresponding to Foucault's analysis of discourse power: the knowledge production stage (corresponding to knowledge), the knowledge dissemination stage (corresponding to discourse), and the knowledge influence stage (corresponding to power). The specific process is shown in Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper].

**(1) Knowledge Production Stage.** In response to the traditional view of power as “repressive,” Foucault proposed that “power is productive” regarding the relationship between power and knowledge. He examined not only the effect of power on knowledge but also the effect of knowledge on power: “Knowledge acts on power, giving people power; without the dissemination and preservation of knowledge, power cannot function” [27]. Therefore, the knowledge generation stage also marks the beginning of academic discourse power formation.

**(2) Knowledge Dissemination Stage.** After knowledge production is completed, knowledge resource owners must exercise academic discourse right and disseminate their academic ideas to audiences through certain carriers and communication media to form their academic discourse influence. In this stage, the carriers and communication media of academic ideas play crucial roles. What kind of carriers are used for dissemination and what media are used to voice opinions are vital to the formation of academic discourse power.

**(3) Knowledge Influence Stage.** When knowledge influences audiences’ cognition and behavior after dissemination, academic discourse power is formed. Academic discourse influence is not achieved through the coercive and submissive nature of public power but through interactivity and equality, generating emotional and value recognition when the audience enjoys complete freedom of thought. The audience and effect are two important factors in the knowledge influence stage. The audience of academic discourse represents the target to whom academic discourse subjects disseminate their academic ideas, and selecting the appropriate audience can help achieve the expected discourse effect [28].

In summary, the formation process of academic discourse power is essentially the process of knowledge moving from generation to dissemination to influencing audiences’ cognition and behavior. During this process, academic discourse subjects use academic achievements as carriers and transmit their academic ideas to audiences through certain communication media, enabling them to receive and accept the ideas.

### 3.2 Constituent Elements of Academic Discourse Power

Foucault explained the relationship among knowledge, discourse, and power in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [5], demonstrating the transformation between knowledge and power. He argued that knowledge disciplines constructed through language impose a discipline on the world and people, and knowledge provides necessary support for power operations through language, even forming a knowledge politics. In Foucault’s discourse theory, discourse power is mainly classified into three categories [28]: (1) knowledge-based discourse systems, which primarily form discourse power through the dissemination of “truth” or “objectivity” in society; (2) political public power discourse systems, which mainly rely on political power or institutional support to legitimize and rationalize discourse; and (3) various discourses in people’s daily lives. Among these, Foucault considered the knowledge-based discourse system the most important,

where “power” represents recognized knowledge forms, scientific understanding, and “truth.” The external manifestation of discourse power is knowledge, and the amount of knowledge possessed is an important determinant of discourse influence [13].

The constituent elements of academic discourse power are reflected in the process from knowledge production to dissemination to influence. In Harold Lasswell’s 5W communication model, the five Ws represent knowledge producer (Who), knowledge content (What), communication channel (In Which Channel), audience (Whom), and effect (What Effect). Combining Foucault’s theory of knowledge-to-power transformation and Lasswell’s 5W communication model, this paper identifies the constituent elements of academic discourse power (see Figure 2) as: academic discourse subject, academic discourse carrier, academic discourse communication medium, academic discourse object, and academic discourse influence effect.

### 3.2.1 Academic Discourse Subject

Academic discourse subjects include scholars, research institutions, and nations. These three levels of academic discourse power actually reflect the progression from individual-level to group-level academic discourse power, which ultimately traces back to the academic discourse power of “people.” Both research institutions and nations are composed of people, merely representing different levels. Although the subjects of academic discourse power are all human, individuals, research institutions, and nations constitute three completely different levels, with different mechanisms of action for academic discourse power at each level. The size of discourse power at the institutional or national level cannot be simply obtained by adding up individual academic discourse power, and strategies for improving academic discourse power differ accordingly. Current domestic research on enhancing Chinese academic discourse power mostly fails to distinguish among these three levels. Therefore, classifying academic discourse power types according to academic discourse subjects is important for improving Chinese academic discourse power from different levels.

### 3.2.2 Academic Discourse Carrier

Academic discourse carriers are academic achievements, including academic monographs, academic papers, dissertations, academic reports, and invention patents. Knowledge is the external manifestation of power, and knowledge needs to be presented through specific carriers. Therefore, in the formation process of academic discourse power, knowledge is presented to the audience by scholars or academic groups in specific spaces through academic achievements as carriers. Scholars or academic groups are the subjects of academic discourse power and also the producers of academic achievements. Spaces are divided into virtual and real: virtual spaces mainly refer to cyberspace supported by information technology, such as academic paper databases, electronic libraries, online conferences, or academic salons; real spaces mainly refer to venues for academic activities, such as academic conference venues and newspaper offices.

### 3.2.3 Academic Discourse Communication Medium

Academic discourse communication media are divided into online and offline. Offline communication media include school podiums, seminars, and academic salons. With the development of information technology, online communication media, in addition to traditional media such as radio and television, have become very important discourse platforms, including databases and various social media and online communities on the internet, such as CNKI, Web of Science, Baidu Wenku, Zhihu, and blogs.

### **3.2.4 Academic Discourse Object**

Academic discourse objects are the audiences of academic discourse. The number of audience members can reflect the breadth of academic discourse influence. Different audience identities (scholars, government officials, ordinary people) should also be assigned different weights when evaluating academic discourse influence. For example, when a scholar presents at an academic conference, the audience consists of scholars; when speaking as a think tank expert at a government work meeting, the audience consists of government officials; and when giving public science lectures online or offline, the audience consists of ordinary people. The academic discourse influence generated in these three situations should be distinguished according to these different audience identities.

### **3.2.5 Academic Discourse Influence Effect**

Academic discourse influence effect is reflected in whether the audience accepts and identifies with the academic discourse after receiving it. According to different audience identities, the influence effect is manifested in specific audience behaviors: scholars' acceptance and identification are reflected through academic citations; ordinary people's acceptance and identification are reflected through social media comments, retweets, and likes; and government officials' acceptance and identification are reflected through mentions in policy documents.

---

## **4. Evaluation of Academic Discourse Power**

### **4.1 Connotation of Academic Discourse Power Evaluation**

As the most direct manifestation of knowledge power, academic discourse power occupies an important position in a nation's discourse power. To enhance academic discourse power, we must first clarify how to measure its magnitude and where to start improving it. Answering this question requires constructing a scientific theory, method, and application system for evaluating discourse power. Zhao Rongying et al. systematically reviewed and summarized domestic and international research literature on discourse power evaluation science and found a lack of specialized theoretical research on discourse power evaluation [29]. In subsequent research, they clarified that one of the basic theoretical issues in Chinese discourse power evaluation science is the study of evaluation objects, evaluation criteria, index systems, and evaluation models [30]. Constructing the evaluation science theory of academic discourse power requires clarifying the evaluation object. Since academic discourse power is an abstract concept,

its scientific evaluation must start from the formation process of academic discourse power, clearly identifying the evaluation object (i.e., evaluation target) and conducting in-depth analysis. Evaluating academic discourse power first requires quantifying it. Informetrics is a discipline that uses quantitative methods to describe and study information phenomena, processes, and laws [31]. Quantitative evaluation of academic discourse power needs to be based on informetrics and scientific evaluation theory.

## 4.2 Analysis of Academic Discourse Power Evaluation Elements

This paper analyzes the elements of academic discourse power evaluation by examining its formation process. Based on the formation stages and constituent elements of academic discourse power, this paper summarizes its characteristics as: subjectivity, leading nature, dissemination, and influence. Figure 2 specifically shows the correspondence between constituent elements and characteristics of academic discourse power: academic discourse subject corresponds to subjectivity and leading nature; academic discourse carrier and communication medium correspond to dissemination; and academic discourse audience and influence effect correspond to influence. The four characteristics of academic discourse power correspond to three evaluation elements: subjectivity and leading nature correspond to the leading power of academic discourse subjects; dissemination corresponds to the dissemination power of academic discourse carriers and communication media; and influence corresponds to the influence on audiences.

### 4.2.1 Leading Power of Academic Discourse Subjects

Discourse power follows three principles: the principle of strength, the principle of truth, and the principle of morality. These three principles are not equivalent or symmetrical but have primary and secondary importance, with the principle of strength being the most important [28]. Without strength, there is no discourse power, as hard power determines discourse power. The “authority effect” (also known as authority suggestion effect) positively suggests to academic discourse audiences, making them more likely to identify with academic discourse. Audience recognition of academic discourse can be specifically manifested as paper citations and journal acceptance. The authority effect is a famous law in management science, stating that a person with high status, prestige, and respect can easily attract attention to their words and actions and make others believe in their correctness [32]. Therefore, academic leading power refers to the guiding effect of academic discourse subjects’ academic strength and authority on academic discourse audiences during the formation process of academic discourse power.

### 4.2.2 Dissemination Power of Academic Discourse Carriers and Communication Media

Academic discourse carriers and communication media are necessary conditions for forming academic discourse power. The influence and diversity of academic discourse platforms determine the media dissemination power of academic dis-

course, which further affects how many audiences can “receive” academic discourse. “Receiving” is a prerequisite for “accepting.” Without receiving the information of academic discourse, subsequent identification and acceptance are impossible. The dissemination power of academic discourse carriers and the dissemination power of academic discourse communication media together constitute the dissemination power evaluated in academic discourse power.

#### **4.2.3 Influence of Academic Discourse Audiences**

The influence of academic discourse audiences is also a manifestation of academic discourse influence effect. The breadth and number of audiences affect the magnitude of academic discourse power, while audience identity directly affects discourse effect. Audiences of academic discourse can be governments and intergovernmental international organizations (such as the United Nations and its affiliated scientific research institutions), non-governmental organizations (including international NGOs and domestic NGOs), scholars and their academic groups or research institutions, and the public (such as netizens and people from various industries not engaged in academic or government work). When evaluating the identification or behavior of different audiences with academic discourse, proxy variables must be found for quantification, and different weights should be assigned according to their different identities and different effects on the external world.

---

## **5. Construction of Academic Discourse Power Evaluation Index System**

Constructing an evaluation index system for academic discourse power is one of the basic theoretical issues in academic discourse power evaluation science. The selection and design of evaluation indicators should reflect the characteristics of academic discourse power. This paper takes scientific research institutions as an example and constructs an evaluation index system for institutional academic discourse power based on the characteristics of subjectivity, dissemination, influence, and leading nature. This paper first determines three first-level indicators for academic discourse power evaluation according to its characteristics: leading power (corresponding to subjectivity and leading nature), dissemination power (corresponding to dissemination), and influence power (corresponding to influence). Then, it analyzes and designs second-level evaluation indicators for leading power, dissemination power, and influence power. Finally, it designs corresponding third-level evaluation indicators (see Table 1 ) to provide theoretical support for evaluating and enhancing academic discourse power.

### **5.1 Leading Power**

The first first-level indicator in the academic discourse power evaluation system is leading power. According to the analysis of academic discourse power evaluation elements, leading power includes two second-level indicators: aca-

democratic authority and academic strength. Before academic achievements undergo communication, the original authority and academic strength of the academic achievement authors or their institutions have already laid the foundation for academic discourse power. Therefore, in the first stage of academic discourse power formation, the academic strength and authority of academic discourse subjects already have primary influence on academic discourse power [23], playing a leading role for the audience. This paper considers the academic strength and authority of academic discourse subjects in the first stage of the formation process as the embodiment of academic discourse leading power.

### 5.1.1 Academic Authority

The academic authority of research institutions includes three third-level indicators: academic ranking, academic reputation, and faculty strength. This paper evaluates the academic authority of research institutions by referencing four major world university ranking reports: QS World University Rankings, U.S. News Best Global Universities Rankings, Times Higher Education World University Rankings, and the Academic Ranking of World Universities published by Shanghai Jiao Tong University. These rankings reflect the international authority of universities, and their evaluation indicators include academic reputation, faculty strength, academic productivity, and international cooperation [34]. Chen Qunfang et al. found through empirical research that university academic reputation and citations show a significant strong positive correlation; universities with higher academic reputation have higher percentages of highly cited papers [35]. Whether there are academic masters in a research institution's faculty significantly impacts the institution's overall academic authority. Cases where a few authoritative scholars drive the development of an entire institution's academic discourse power are common, and the construction of talent teams including discipline leaders and academic backbones is also important for enhancing academic discourse power [36].

For individual scholars, academic authority is manifested in academic positions, academic titles, and academic ranks. Scholars' academic positions, titles, and ranks represent their academic authority. Academic positions differ from administrative positions: leadership positions at various levels in research institutions and universities are administrative positions, while positions in academic committees at various levels of the State Council and provincial academic evaluation groups and professional degree graduate education guidance committees are academic positions [37]. Academic titles represent recognition of scholars' past academic abilities and guarantee research output [38], specifically referring to national-level talents (such as academicians) designated by the state, provincial-level talents designated by provinces, and university-level talents designated by institutions. Academic titles represent academic reputation and status, enabling academic subjects to more easily obtain or control academic resources [39], thus possessing greater academic discourse power. Academic ranks refer to senior professional titles (including professor, chief physician, senior editor, researcher, etc.), associate senior professional titles (including associate professor, associate chief physician, associate senior editor, associate researcher, etc.), intermediate

professional titles (including lecturer, attending physician, assistant researcher, editor, etc.), and junior professional titles (including resident physician, teaching assistant, etc.) [40] held by researchers working in research institutions or universities. Wei Yahui et al. studied CSSCI journals in information science and found that author identity has a significant impact on research output; authors with higher titles produce more research, possibly because journals are more likely to accept papers from high-title authors [41]. Wu Fengzhi et al. studied the relationship between author identity and citation/download counts, finding that differences in author titles and degrees lead to significant differences in paper downloads and citations; authors with higher titles and degrees have more downloads and citations [40].

### 5.1.2 Academic Strength

Academic strength includes two third-level indicators: the quantity and quality of academic achievements already possessed by academic subjects. The quantity and quality of academic achievements are important factors determining academic discourse power [42]. The quantity of scholars' academic achievements reflects their individual academic productivity, while the quality of academic achievements determines whether they can "convince people with reason," reflecting the "principle of truth" of discourse power. Therefore, this paper uses the quantity and quality of scholars' existing academic achievements as evaluation indicators for academic strength, specifically using the number of published research papers and the impact factor of publishing journals for evaluation. The academic strength of research institutions is mainly aggregated from the academic strength of numerous scholars working there, so its evaluation indicators are the same as those for scholars' academic strength: the quantity and quality of institutional academic achievements.

In summary, existing research shows that the academic authority and academic strength already possessed by academic subjects directly affect academic discourse influence, generating primary influence on the implementation effect of academic discourse power and playing a leading role for audiences. This paper considers the academic strength and authority of academic discourse subjects in the first stage of the academic discourse power formation process as the embodiment of academic discourse leading power.

## 5.2 Dissemination Power

The second first-level indicator in the academic discourse power evaluation system is dissemination power. According to the analysis of academic discourse power evaluation elements, dissemination power includes two second-level indicators: discourse carrier dissemination power and communication medium dissemination power. Dissemination power refers to the dissemination effect of academic discourse carriers and communication media. From the generation process of academic discourse power, whether academic discourse can be disseminated through certain carriers and communication media is a necessary condition for generating academic discourse power. The dissemination capacity

of academic discourse power ensures that audiences can “receive” discourse information from academic discourse subjects. Therefore, evaluating academic discourse power dissemination power involves evaluating the dissemination power of academic discourse carriers and communication media.

### 5.2.1 Academic Discourse Carrier Dissemination Power

Analysis of the academic discourse power production process reveals that academic discourse carriers are generally academic achievements. Academic discourse carrier dissemination power includes two third-level indicators: academic achievement dissemination breadth and academic achievement dissemination depth. Academic discourse power is realized during the dissemination process after knowledge production. Therefore, an important way to enhance academic discourse power is to increase the breadth and depth of knowledge dissemination [13]. With the arrival of the new media era, knowledge dissemination methods have undergone fundamental changes, and the depth and breadth of knowledge dissemination have been affected [43]. This paper defines academic achievement dissemination breadth as how many different types of communication media are used to disseminate academic achievements. In addition to being included in traditional databases, whether multiple social media platforms are utilized for dissemination matters—for example, many Chinese academic journals not only have their own WeChat official accounts but also establish accounts on influential social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, increasing the breadth of academic achievement dissemination. Academic achievement dissemination depth refers to the sum of dissemination depth across various communication media, such as the read count and retweet count obtained when an academic journal publishes its latest achievements on its social media accounts. When evaluating academic achievement dissemination depth, different weights should be set according to the influence of different communication media rather than simply adding them up.

### 5.2.2 Communication Medium Dissemination Power

Li Xingchen divides online information platforms for academic communication into three categories: academic websites, social platforms, and institutional websites [44]. This paper uses these three types of information exchange platforms as the main media for academic discourse communication and evaluates the dissemination power of research institutions on these platforms. When evaluating research institutions’ academic discourse power, communication medium dissemination power includes three third-level indicators: official website dissemination power, dissemination power on various academic exchange websites, and dissemination power on various social media platforms.

Official website dissemination power can be evaluated using website dissemination power evaluation index systems, such as total page count, number of links, total visits, retweet count, and comment count [45]. Dissemination power on various academic websites refers to the dissemination power of institutional homepages on mainstream academic websites (domestic mainstream academic exchange websites include ScienceNet Blog, Zhihu, etc.; foreign mainstream aca-

dem exchange websites include GitHub, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, etc.). The evaluation first assesses whether the research institution has created institutional accounts on mainstream academic exchange websites and then evaluates the dissemination power of its homepage, using specific indicators such as follower count and attention count. Similarly, dissemination power on various social media platforms refers to the dissemination power of institutional homepages on mainstream social media platforms at home and abroad, with domestic mainstream social media platforms including WeChat Official Accounts and Weibo, and foreign mainstream social media platforms including Twitter and Facebook.

Since research institutions are composed of numerous scholars, evaluating institutional academic influence often involves counting the academic influence of the institution's scholar group. Therefore, when evaluating scholars' academic discourse power, the third-level indicators for communication medium dissemination power are basically the same as those for evaluating institutions: personal homepage dissemination power, dissemination power of scholars' personal homepages on various academic exchange websites, and dissemination power on various social media platforms. Official personal homepage dissemination power specifically refers to the click count or read count obtained by scholars' personal homepages or profile pages on their work units. For example, searching "Zhao Rongying" on Baidu can retrieve her profile page from Wuhan University School of Information Management, and entering this page can obtain click counts. The evaluation of the other two third-level indicators is the same as for research institutions.

### 5.3 Influence Power

The third first-level indicator in the academic discourse power evaluation system is influence power. Different audience identities lead to significant differences in their acceptance of academic discourse and the impact of audience behavior on the external world. For example, scholars can understand academic discourse faster and more effectively than government officials and other citizens, while the behavioral effects of government officials and decision-makers influenced by academic discourse have greater impact on society than those of scholars and citizens, thereby increasing the academic discourse power of discourse subjects. Therefore, this paper divides academic discourse influence effects into academic influence, social influence, and policy influence according to different audience identities. The same indicators are used to evaluate scholars' and institutions' academic influence, social influence, and policy influence, with the difference being whether individual scholars' academic achievements or institutional academic achievements are counted.

Academic influence is reflected through academic citation indicators, including traditional citation indicators and online citation indicators. Traditional citation indicators are improved or expanded based on citation frequency, such as the h-index, AuthorRank, and normalized impact factor. Online citation indica-

tors refer to citation counts in databases such as CrossRef, PMC, Web of Science, Scopus, and Microsoft Academic Search. Social influence is reflected through social media indicators. The important evaluation indicator in current academic influence evaluation—Altmetrics—includes numerous social media evaluation indicators [46], which can be used to evaluate the social influence of academic discourse. Policy influence is reflected through policy document mention indicators, specifically the frequency of academic achievements being mentioned in policy documents [47].

---

## References

- [1] Chen Jiawen. A review of research on China's international discourse power and its construction logic [J]. *Contemporary China Political Research Report*, 2018(1): 91-108.
- [2] Chen Shuguang. On the logic of discourse power on the international stage [J]. *Marxism and Reality*, 2021(1): 35-40.
- [3] Xi Jinping presided over the 31st collective study session of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee and delivered an important speech [EB/OL]. [2021-01-29]. <http://cpc.people.com.cn/n1/2021/0627/c435113-32141625.html>.
- [4] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels (Vol. 3)* [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2012: 52.
- [5] Foucault. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [M]. Translated by Xie Qiang and Ma Yue. Beijing: Life • Reading • New Knowledge Sanlian Bookstore, 1998: 136.
- [6] Gao Yu. The historical process and current construction of modern Chinese academic discourse [J]. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2011, 41(2): 140-151.
- [7] Xie Fuzhan. Accelerating the construction of the disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system of philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics [J]. *Chinese Social Sciences*, 2019(5): 4-22, 204.
- [8] Su Xinning. An outline of the disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system of information science with Chinese characteristics [J]. *Chinese Journal of Library and Information Science*, 2021, 47(4): 16-27.
- [9] Hou Huiqin. Ideological transformation and discourse power—re-discussing the discourse power of Marxism in contemporary times [J]. *Marxism Studies*, 2006(1): 45-51.
- [10] Wu Rongsheng. Popular discourse: a new dimension for enhancing the discourse power of Marxism [J]. *Theory Journal*, 2016(3): 29-34.
- [11] Michel F. *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language* [M]. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- [12] Zhang Yibing. From ordering to disordering: deconstructing the violent structure in discourse—an interpretation of Foucault's *The Order of Discourse* [J]. *Jianghai Academic Journal*, 2015(4): 50-59.

- [13] Yang Yunxia. Discourse “right” or “power”: analysis and re-understanding [J]. *People’s Tribune • Academic Frontier*, 2021(6): 94-102.
- [14] Zhang Guozuo. Some thoughts on “discourse power” [J]. *Qiushi*, 2009(9): 43-44.
- [15] Chen Shuguang. What kind of power is discourse power [N]. *Guangming Daily*, 2015-01-15(16).
- [16] Du Min. Research on ideological and political education discourse power [D]. Lanzhou: Lanzhou University, 2018.
- [17] Huang Dongxia. Research on internet ideological discourse power [D]. Chengdu: University of Electronic Science and Technology, 2017.
- [18] Xu Xuqi. The connotation of the world discourse power of socialism with Chinese characteristics [J]. *World Socialism Studies*, 2019, 4(4): 85-86.
- [19] Shi Shanshan. Research on ideological and political education discourse power [D]. Wuhan: Wuhan University, 2014.
- [20] He Guowei, Li Lin, Gu Ying. *Modern Chinese Synonym Dictionary* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Lexicographical Publishing House, 2009.
- [21] He Guowei. *Modern Chinese Synonym Dictionary* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Lexicographical Publishing House, 2009.
- [22] Zheng Hangsheng. Grasping academic discourse power is the key to constructing an academic discourse system [N]. *Chinese Social Sciences Today*, 2014-01-17(B02).
- [23] Guo Fengjiao, Zhao Rongying, Sun Shaomin. Research on academic paper influence evaluation based on the scientific communication process—taking international academic papers in Chinese social sciences as an example [J]. *Journal of Intelligence*, 2020, 39(4): 357-366.
- [24] Wang Ting. Research on the formation mechanism of characteristic landscapes [D]. Wuhan: Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 2006.
- [25] Wu Xianjun. The construction of China’s international discourse power—theory, status quo, and path [M]. Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2017: 21.
- [26] Gao Haibo. Exploring the origin of Lasswell’s 5W model [J]. *International Press*, 2008(10): 37-40.
- [27] Dictionary Editorial Office, Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. *Modern Chinese Dictionary* [M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1996: 582.
- [28] Shi Yibin, Wang Yong. An analysis of Foucault’s discourse theory [J]. *Journalism & Communication Review*, 2010: 26-33.
- [29] Zhao Rongying, Wang Xu, Qi Yongkang, et al. A review of evaluation science research from the perspective of Chinese discourse power [J]. *Modern Intelligence*, 2019, 39(10): 145-153, 176.
- [30] Zhao Rongying, Wang Xu, Yu Bo, et al. Construction of a scientific research framework for Chinese discourse power evaluation [J]. *Library and Information*, 2019(4): 122-131.
- [31] Qiu Junping, Zhao Rongying, Hou Jingchuan. *Informetrics* [M]. Wuhan: Wuhan University Press, 2007.
- [32] Management Science Famous Laws Serial No. 46: Authority Effect [J]. *Construction Enterprise Management*, 2010(6): 81.

- [33] Qu Yinghe, Zhou Tongmei. Investigation and analysis of “doctor authority” under the orientation of “relationship-based medical treatment” [J]. *Medicine and Philosophy (Humanistic & Social Medicine Edition)*, 2010, 31(11): 34-36.
- [34] Sohu. Detailed analysis of the “four most influential world university rankings”! The most comprehensive! [EB/OL]. [2022-01-29]. [https://www.sohu.com/a/312877487\\_{120077463}](https://www.sohu.com/a/312877487_{120077463}).
- [35] Chen Qunfang, Wang Yuan, Zhao Chuanxian. Research on the correlation characteristics between academic reputation and academic influence of world-class universities [J]. *Science & Education Wenhui (Mid-term)*, 2019(11): 1-5.
- [36] Tao Wenzhao. On the basic factors for enhancing China’s academic discourse power [J]. *Social Science Abstracts*, 2016(12): 29-31.
- [37] Yu Haiyan. Research on the “double-shouldered” problem in university positions [J]. *Asia-Pacific Education*, 2016(1): 204.
- [38] Shang Huping, Zhao Panpan. Which characteristics of project applicants affect research performance improvement?—a reverse evaluation oriented towards National Natural Science Foundation output [J]. *Science Research Management*, 2014, 32(9): 1378-1389.
- [39] Chang Chengming, Xiong Heping. Symbol, control, and academic order: reflection on scholars’ titles [J]. *University Education Science*, 2020(6): 31-37.
- [40] Wu Fengzhi, Zhang Wen, Yang Yidian, et al. The relationship between author identity and research productivity and academic influence [J]. *Modern Chinese Clinical Medicine*, 2018, 25(6): 57-60.
- [41] Wei Yahui, Liu Xueli, Liu Ruiyuan. Analysis of research productivity and academic influence of authors with different identities—taking CSSCI journals in information science as an example [J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2018, 29(2): 159-164.
- [42] Pan Hong, Tang Li. Think tank experts and international academic discourse power: an exploratory study based on a moderated mediation model [J]. *Science of Science and Management of Science and Technology*, 2020, 41(10): 3-16.
- [43] Han Pugeng. Academic journals, academic originality, and the formation of Chinese schools [J]. *Exploration and Free Views*, 2021(7): 5-7.
- [44] Li Xingchen. Research on citation display analysis based on scholars’ personal homepages and its influencing factors [D]. Hefei: University of Science and Technology of China, 2019.
- [45] Zhang Yu, Ren Fubing. Research on think tank network communication power evaluation based on AHP-entropy weight method [J]. *Information Science*, 2017, 35(3): 110-116.
- [46] Wang Xu. Research on the construction of a theoretical framework for evaluating the discourse power of Chinese academic journals [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2021, 65(12): 83-92.
- [47] Wang Feifei, Jia Chenran, Han Wenfei, et al. Analysis of the distribution trend of academic achievement utilization efficiency from the perspective of alternative metrics in policy documents [J]. *Journal of Beijing University of Technology (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2018, 18(4): 55-66.

---

**Author Contributions:**

Zhao Rongying: Topic selection, framework design, paper guidance, revision;  
Liu Zhuozhu: Framework design, paper writing, revision;  
Zhang Zhaoyang: Literature research, revision;  
Li Xinlai: Literature research, revision;  
Chang Ruru: Literature research, revision.

---

**Research on Academic Discourse Power and Its Evaluation**

Zhao Rongying<sup>1, 2</sup>, Liu Zhuozhu<sup>1, 2</sup>, Zhang Zhaoyang<sup>1, 2</sup>, Li Xinlai<sup>1, 2</sup>,  
Chang Ruru<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] Academic discourse power is a carrier of national spirit and culture and an important embodiment of national soft power. Research on the connotation, formation mechanism, constituent elements, and evaluation of academic discourse power is of great significance for improving national soft power and promoting national spirit and culture. [Method/Process] This paper analyzes the mechanism of academic discourse power based on Foucault's discourse power theory and Lasswell's 5W communication theory, focusing on the connotation, formation process, constituent elements, and evaluation of academic discourse power. [Result/Conclusion] This paper holds that the constituent elements of academic discourse power are the subjects, carriers, communication media, objects, and implementation effect of academic discourse power. According to informetrics and scientific evaluation theory, this study constructs an evaluation index system for the academic discourse power of scientific research institutions.

**Keywords:** academic discourse power; connotation; formation mechanism; evaluation of academic discourse power

---

**Notice from the Office of Research Integrity, Chinese Academy of Sciences on Issuing the Negative List of Issues Concerning Standardizing Authorship in Academic Publications**

In February 2022, the Office of Research Integrity of the Chinese Academy of Sciences issued the *Notice on Issuing the Negative List of Issues Concerning Standardizing Authorship in Academic Publications* (Document No. [2022] 1 of the Science Development Supervision and Audit Letter), which standardized requirements for authorship issues in academic publications by Chinese Academy of Sciences researchers and listed negative behaviors regarding authorship.

The notice points out that research integrity is the cornerstone of scientific and technological innovation. Upholding research integrity and conducting responsible innovation are not only the basic principles for Chinese Academy of Sciences researchers to engage in scientific research and promote scientific and technological innovation but also the basic requirements for their positioning as the main force of the national strategic scientific and technological strength. Authorship norms in academic publications are generally determined by long-standing conventions in the academic community, and different disciplines, fields, and even different scientific journals may have different normative requirements. It is difficult to formulate unified authorship norms applicable to different scenarios. The notice lists some negative behaviors regarding authorship in academic publications, such as misusing author attribution, fabricating author attribution; including persons without substantial contributions as authors; determining author order without the consent of all authors; violating the necessity principle when listing first authors or corresponding authors; arbitrarily changing the primary completion institution of the publication due to changes in the author's affiliation; fabricating or forging author affiliations; listing non-completing institutions as affiliated units; using informal contact information as author contact information; deliberately excluding research workers with important contributions from authorship; and infringing upon the basic authorship rights of graduate students who directly conduct scientific experiments.

The Chinese Academy of Sciences implements a “zero tolerance” policy for the behaviors listed. Any Chinese Academy of Sciences researcher who exhibits the listed behaviors will be investigated by the corresponding primary responsible unit according to the notice's provisions, and will be identified and dealt with based on specific facts and relevant circumstances, with lifelong accountability for serious violations of research integrity requirements.

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

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