
AI translation · View original & related papers at
chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202308.00613

Comparative Analysis and Optimization of China's Reading Society Indicator System: Post-Print

Authors: Li Ya, Zhou Mengyao, Fei Wei

Date: 2023-08-27T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Based on a comparative analysis of indicator systems for bookish society construction in domestic practical and research domains, this study proposes optimization strategies to provide reference and guidance for localities in developing indicator systems that align with their specific contexts. [Method/Process] Grounded in a summary of the current state of indicator system construction for domestic bookish society development, this paper conducts a comparative analysis of the content configuration of five first-level indicators across various indicator systems: reading facilities, reading resources, reading environment, reading support, and reading effectiveness. [Results/Conclusion] In response to existing issues such as the regional characteristics of indicator system construction, classification of indicator content, and comprehensiveness of indicator coverage, this study proposes improvement measures in terms of institutional development, methodological reference, and construction philosophy.

Full Text

Comparative Analysis and Optimization of China's Scholarly Society Construction Indicator Systems

Li Ya^{1,2}, **Zhou Mengyao**¹, **Fei Wei**³

¹School of Social Sciences, Soochow University, Suzhou 215123

²School of Information Management/Publishing Institute, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093

³Suzhou Library, Suzhou 215002

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] This study proposes optimization strategies based on comparative analysis of scholarly society construction indicator systems in domestic practice and research domains, providing references for localities to develop indicator systems tailored to their specific contexts. **[Method/Process]** Building upon a summary of current indicator system development in China, this paper conducts comparative analysis of content settings across five primary indicators: reading facilities, reading resources, reading environment, reading assurance, and reading effectiveness. **[Result/Conclusion]** Addressing existing issues in regional characteristics, indicator classification, and coverage, this paper proposes improvements in institutional development, methodological reference, and conceptual framework.

Keywords: Scholarly society construction indicator system; Indicator content; Comparison

Classification Number: G252

DOI: 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2018.15.005

1. Overview of Scholarly Society Construction Indicator System Development

In January 1997, nine ministries and commissions including the Central Propaganda Department and Ministry of Culture issued the “Notice on Implementing the ‘Knowledge Project’ Nationwide,” calling for “advocating nationwide reading and constructing a reading society,” thus launching large-scale social reading initiatives in China. Over the subsequent two decades, major provinces and cities across the country organized diverse reading activities that achieved positive social impact, gradually embedding the concept of nationwide reading into public consciousness. Since 2014, “advocating nationwide reading” has been included in the government work report for four consecutive years. In this context, to promote deeper implementation of nationwide reading initiatives and enhance reading service effectiveness, various provinces and municipalities have successively established indicator systems to evaluate scholarly society construction levels. Since Zhangjiagang City published China’s first scholarly society construction indicator system in 2012, 13 relevant indicator systems had been released by February 2018.

1.1 Practice in Scholarly Society Construction Indicator System Development

Based on current development of regional scholarly society construction indicator systems in China, eight provinces and municipalities have publicly released “scholarly society indicator systems.” In chronological order of release, these are Zhangjiagang City, Hunan Province, Beijing, Suzhou, Shenzhen, Wuhan, Zhenjiang, and Jiangsu Province. Zhangjiagang developed its preliminary “Scholarly City” construction indicator system through literature

review and extensive research, based on the “2012 Zhangjiagang City Nationwide Reading Status Blue Book,” and officially released the “Zhangjiagang City ‘Scholarly City’ Indicator System (Trial)” [1] (hereafter “Zhangjiagang Indicator System”) in 2012. Hunan Province initially constructed its Urban Reading Index in early 2011, forming a relatively stable indicator system through continuous refinement during implementation. In 2013, Hunan’s Urban Reading Index system consisted of one “Urban Reading Index” and two “Urban Reading Index Influencing Factors.” As reading methods evolved and digital reading occupied an increasingly important position in residents’ daily reading lives, Hunan’s Urban Reading Index conducted preliminary exploration of urban residents’ digital reading behaviors in its 2012 research and constructed a “Digital Deep Reading Index.” Building upon previous research, the 2013 system comprehensively established an urban digital reading index system, incorporating digital shallow reading index and digital deep reading index as primary indicators, with eight secondary indicators and 19 tertiary indicators.

The Beijing Nationwide Reading Comprehensive Assessment Indicator System (hereafter “Beijing Indicator System”) was initiated in May 2013, aiming to comprehensively evaluate the quality and effectiveness of Beijing’s nationwide reading activities [2]. The “Scholarly Suzhou Construction Indicator System” (hereafter “Suzhou Indicator System”) was compiled based on local Suzhou conditions according to six principles: public welfare and universal benefit, positive guidance, broad participation, pragmatic innovation, demonstration-driven, and integrated development, while drawing on relevant indicators from developed countries [3]. During the 15th Shenzhen Reading Month, Shenzhen released its “Urban Reading Index” to comprehensively assess urban reading development status and levels [4]. The Wuhan Municipal Propaganda Department commissioned the School of Information Management at Central China Normal University to develop the “Wuhan City Nationwide Reading Comprehensive Assessment Indicator System (Trial)” (hereafter “Wuhan Indicator System”), which underwent continuous revision and improvement. This indicator system design followed three principles: scientificity, feasibility, and distinctiveness [5]. The Zhenjiang City Nationwide Reading Activity Leading Group Office released the “Zhenjiang City Scholarly Construction Standard Indicator System” (hereafter “Zhenjiang Indicator System”), which discussed nine categories of demonstration point construction and evaluation standards, with each standard conducting quantitative analysis on reading facility construction, reading atmosphere cultivation, reading activity organization, individual reading volume, and reading effectiveness [6]. The Jiangsu Province Nationwide Reading Activity Leading Group Office organized research to develop a series of indicator systems for scholarly cities beginning in 2014, and released the “Scholarly Jiangsu Construction Indicator System (Trial)” (hereafter “Jiangsu Indicator System”) in August 2015 [7]. Details of these seven provincial/municipal “scholarly society indicator systems” are shown in .

1.2 Research Status of Scholarly Society Construction Indicator Systems Beyond locally released scholarly society construction indicator systems, professional institutions and researchers have also attempted to establish relevant evaluation indicator systems. The Chinese Library Association released the “Scholarly City (County-level) Standard Indicator System” [8] (hereafter “CLA Indicator System”) and “Scholarly Community Standard Indicator System” in May 2015. During the indicator system construction process, following principles of urban-rural integration, public welfare and universal benefit, government leadership with broad participation, steady progress with focus on construction, and scientific assessability with operational convenience, the systems fully considered regional economic development disparities and imbalances in public cultural service levels in China, dividing indicators into eastern, central, and western regions with scientifically proportioned relationships based on actual conditions. The “Scholarly City (County-level) Standard Indicator System” established seven primary indicators: reading facilities, reading resources, reading activities, reading services, reading environment, reading effectiveness, and assurance conditions, with 34 secondary indicators and 50 tertiary indicators. The “Scholarly Community Standard Indicator System” established five primary indicators (reading facilities, reading resources, reading activities, reading services, and reading effectiveness), 13 secondary indicators, and 11 tertiary indicators. Xu Linyao preliminarily established a scholarly city construction evaluation indicator system model from hard power and soft power perspectives [9]. Xia Lixin et al. explored the construction of a nationwide reading evaluation standard system framework from organizational, resource, and user dimensions [10]. In response to the National Press and Publication Administration’s call to establish a national scholarly society indicator system and the requirement for localities to accelerate the establishment and improvement of nationwide reading status monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, *China Publishing* magazine launched a special feature on “scholarly society indicator systems” to discuss how to construct a comprehensive, systematic, and nationally appropriate scholarly society indicator system. Wei Jingqiu and Wang Yunfeng, in “Learning Society Indicator System Based on Nationwide Reading” [11] (hereafter “Learning Indicator System”), following scientific, systematic, practical, and goal-oriented/flexible principles, adopted a “assurance-input-process-goal” model with four primary indicators (assurance elements, input elements, process elements, and goal elements), further subdivided into 14 secondary indicators, 49 tertiary indicators, and 81 quaternary indicators to construct a nationwide reading learning society indicator system. Zhang Ting and Yang Haiping, in constructing the “Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System” [12], adopted scientific, systematic optimization, and goal-oriented design principles, examining five main dimensions: institutional mechanisms, funding resources, organizational personnel, reading behavior performance, and reading resource performance, with 16 secondary indicators, 39 tertiary indicators, and 132 quaternary indicators. These are shown in .

2. Comparative Analysis of Scholarly Society Construction Indicator Systems

Existing indicator systems exhibit both commonalities and differences. This paper primarily analyzes common indicators across these systems, attempting to summarize indicator design principles and methods. These common indicators include five primary indicators: reading facilities, reading resources, reading assurance, reading environment, and reading effectiveness, focusing on their assessment objects and specific measurement content. Note that the Zhenjiang Indicator System is excluded as it proposed construction standards for nine different reading institutions, structurally differing significantly from other systems. Additionally, the Beijing and Jiangsu indicator systems lack detailed content materials, while “Multidimensional Integration Perspective on Nationwide Reading Evaluation Standard System Construction” only proposed an overall evaluation framework without a complete indicator system, and thus are not considered. The following analysis covers nine indicator systems: Zhangjiagang Indicator System, Hunan Reading Index, Suzhou Indicator System, Shenzhen Reading Index, Wuhan Indicator System, Scholarly City Indicator System Model, CLA Indicator System, Learning Indicator System, and Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System.

2.1 Reading Facilities Reading facilities are divided into two categories: public welfare reading facilities, including various public cultural service institutions such as public libraries, school libraries, rural reading rooms, and workers’ reading rooms; and commercial reading facilities, namely bookstores and newsstands. All indicator systems address both categories, differing in specific indicator selection. The Hunan Reading Index only covers libraries and physical bookstores, while the Shenzhen Reading Index is similar but adds “newsstands.” Although indicator selection is comparable, measurement content differs. The former only involves quantity statistics, while the latter adds “thousand-person reading seats,” “valid reader cards,” and “per capita book collection” for public libraries, and “annual book purchase visits” and “annual purchase volume” for physical bookstores.

The Suzhou Indicator System adds “electronic newspaper screens” and local cultural characteristic indicators such as “Pingtan storytelling venues” and “scholarly tea houses” to the Zhangjiagang Indicator System. It also includes the “cable interactive TV digital reading platform” indicator, expanding digital reading platforms to television reading. Beyond local characteristic indicators, the CLA and Suzhou indicator systems have similar structures and content, aligning with Ministry of Culture public library evaluation standards in their assessment of public libraries.

The Wuhan Indicator System adds “military/police camp libraries” under the secondary indicator “facility establishment rate” and includes “top ten reading venues” as a characteristic indicator, first proposing “WIFI coverage” to expand electronic reading facility measurement scope. Under the “reading or-

ganizations” secondary indicator, it proposes characteristic indicators such as “top ten youth scholarly reading sites,” “top ten book clubs,” “top ten reading bases,” and “top ten reading promoters,” enriching humanistic indicator settings in reading facilities.

The Scholarly City Indicator System Model classifies “reading service facility construction” indicators as “hard power” indicators, proposing specific evaluation standards for each indicator content. The Learning Indicator System has some overlap with the former regarding cultural venues, adding “book wholesale market” quantity and coverage in commercial reading facilities, and proposing “network communication facility construction” as a secondary indicator. The Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System is similar to the former but more detailed regarding reading facilities, first including “hospital libraries,” “temple reading rooms,” “book fairs/book markets,” and “online bookstores” as measurement objects, making measurement content more comprehensive.

2.2 Reading Resources In reading resource indicator selection, most indicator systems measure reading resources by facility type, using total collection volume, per capita collection volume, and per capita new collection volume as measurement content, while incorporating digital resource indicators to comprehensively reflect reading resource diversification in the information age. The Hunan Reading Index only involves “public library collection volume.” The Suzhou Indicator System adds two local cultural characteristic indicators: “Suzhou local culture boutique publications” and “‘Suzhou Memory’ resources.” The Shenzhen Indicator System incorporates sales volumes for three reading resource categories: newspapers, periodicals, and books, marking the first time publication resources were included as measurement content in local reading indicator system construction. Similarly, the Learning Indicator System proposes “paper/digital publication quantity and per capita ownership rate,” while the Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System includes “annual paper/digital reading material ownership per 10,000 people and per capita ownership rate.” The difference is that Shenzhen does not consider digital publications, and the three systems employ different measurement standards.

2.3 Reading Assurance In reading assurance indicator selection, common indicators across systems primarily include policy, personnel, funding, and organization. The earliest Zhangjiagang Indicator System only included organizational assurance, funding assurance, and personnel assurance, without “policy assurance.” The Hunan Reading Index only involved fiscal appropriations and policy quantity. The Suzhou Indicator System added “key projects” including various activities and “incentive mechanisms” involving various reading awards under reading assurance indicators. Although the Shenzhen Reading Index did not establish “policy assurance,” it added “reading promoters” and media support indicators for newspapers, radio, and television. The Wuhan Indicator System classified “policy guidance,” “organizational leadership,” and “expert guidance” under “policy assurance.” Notably, “legislative assurance” consti-

tutes an important part of reading assurance indicators, attracting researchers' attention. The Scholarly City Indicator System Model added three related indicators: "publication management," "internet cafe management," and "intellectual property protection." Both the Learning Indicator System and Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System propose "legislative assurance," no longer limited to local policy and regulation construction and improvement, but proposing "central-level people's congress legislation" and "local-level people's congress legislation," demonstrating deepening legislative concepts in the social reading field.

2.4 Reading Environment Reading environment primarily refers to creating a favorable societal reading atmosphere through mass media, public service advertisements, reading promotion, reading services, and reading activities to motivate and guide reading behavior. Some indicator systems independently separate "reading services" and "reading activities" indicators from "reading environment," which are included here for discussion without separate treatment.

Compared with other indicator systems, the Hunan Reading Index encompasses a broader scope but simpler content, applicable only to scholarly society evaluation from a public library perspective. The Zhangjiagang, Suzhou, and CLA indicator systems show certain inheritance relationships. The Suzhou Indicator System adds "venue guidance," "scholarly identification," and "online media" to the Zhangjiagang Indicator System. The CLA and Suzhou indicator systems are also consistent, only removing "bookstore characteristic services," "reading literacy training," "scholarly identification," and "market management" indicators. Although the Shenzhen Reading Index does not establish a "reading environment" indicator, it adds relevant reading activity indicators and reading coverage duration indicators for different media under "reading support and assurance." The Scholarly City Indicator System Model proposes indicators to enhance scholarly atmosphere such as book culture architectural landscapes and book culture image representatives. The Learning Indicator System adds "reading atmosphere cultivation" as a secondary indicator under the primary "process elements" indicator. The Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System assesses reading environment quality across various reading facilities and includes "online bookstore pre-sales and after-sales evaluation" under "reading services."

2.5 Reading Effectiveness Regarding reading effectiveness indicators, although systems differ in structure, they share commonalities in specific content. Overall, these primarily include utilization of various reading facilities, book consumption, public satisfaction, reading activity participation rates, and individual reading ability measurement. Although the Hunan Reading Index does not establish a "reading effectiveness" primary indicator, it includes relevant indicators under other indicators, such as "reading volume," "reading consumption," "reading resource utilization," and "reading satisfaction factors." The Suzhou Indicator System adds indicators such as "citizen comprehensive reading rate," "Pingtan storytelling venues," and "social reading organization"

quantity to the Zhangjiagang Indicator System, expanding the “publishing and distribution” indicator to “newspaper circulation volume” and “book publication variety,” while the Zhangjiagang Indicator System limited this indicator to *Zhangjiagang Daily* circulation volume. The Shenzhen Reading Index establishes “reading behavior and cognition” as a primary indicator, with indicator content similar to the Suzhou Indicator System, but individual reading condition indicators such as “reading duration,” “reading volume,” and “reading content breadth” are similar to the Hunan Reading Index, adding “family book collection volume” as a special indicator. It also proposes “reading cognition” indicators to strengthen examination of public reading awareness. The CLA and Suzhou indicator systems are similar in “reading effectiveness,” with the former removing locally colored indicators such as “publishing and distribution,” “citizen creative ability,” and “Pingtan storytelling venues.” The Learning Indicator System establishes “personal development capacity,” “independent innovation capacity,” and “social harmony degree” as secondary indicators under the primary “goal elements” indicator, adding new indicator content for reading effectiveness while increasing measurement difficulty. The Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System significantly differs in reading effectiveness indicator settings, proposing longitudinal and horizontal comparisons of national reading status and national reading literacy, synchronous comparisons of different groups’ reading conditions, and international comparisons, as well as temporal and spatial comparisons of youth and children’s reading literacy, enabling dynamic comparative examination beyond spatial and temporal boundaries with certain practical significance but operational difficulties.

3. Problems in Existing Scholarly Society Construction Indicator Systems

3.1 Lack of Universally Applicable Indicator Systems Currently, domestically published scholarly society construction evaluation indicator systems are primarily built upon actual local nationwide reading activity implementation, aiming to evaluate regional “scholarly society” construction levels. Consequently, these indicator systems exhibit obvious regional characteristics. While regional characteristics represent a necessary initial phase in indicator system construction, facilitating investigation and reflection of specific regional scholarly society construction conditions, they demonstrate certain limitations. First, regional characteristics affect effective indicator data acquisition. Preliminary research, assessment object and subject selection, indicator content design, data collection, statistics, and analysis require substantial investment. Incompatibility or lack of universality in indicator systems prevents unified investigation implementation, causing resource waste when acquiring indicator data according to local conditions. Second, regional characteristics reduce indicator comparability. Since provinces and municipalities explore and construct scholarly society construction indicator systems without unified planning and arrangement, presenting a “fragmented” state, indicator individualization and incompatibility prevent horizontal comparison of scholarly society construction status across

regions.

Therefore, from the current indicator system construction status, universally applicable indicator systems are lacking. Constructing universally applicable indicator systems requires achieving unified indicator settings and system structures while ensuring regional characteristics. Existing indicator system diversity reflects diversified characteristics of scholarly society construction across different cities, accumulating practical experience for constructing universal scholarly society indicator systems and providing good demonstrations for other regions promoting scholarly society construction and evaluation system development. For example, when establishing indicators, the Chinese Library Association's "Scholarly City (County-level) and Scholarly Community Standard Systems" considered China's vast territory and regional economic and cultural development disparities, dividing indicators into eastern, central, and western sections with strong operability.

3.2 Indicator System Construction and Usage Require Greater Transparency From current scholarly society construction indicator system construction and usage, information barriers remain prevalent, with limited data disclosure and weak result circulation. Zhangjiagang City compiled the *Zhangjiagang City "Scholarly City" Construction Indicator System (Trial) Analysis*, and Hunan Province Press and Publication Bureau compiled *Hunan and Reading*, both relatively detailed works on scholarly society indicator system construction that include the construction process and indicator content analysis. Shenzhen and Wuhan indicator content, however, was published as papers in professional journals. Other provinces and municipalities such as Beijing and Jiangsu have not fully disclosed their indicator systems.

Regarding usage of scholarly society construction indicator systems, follow-up implementation remains low. As the pioneering city for scholarly city construction indicator systems, Zhangjiagang set 2014 target values for each indicator and issued task decomposition tables assigning each task to specific units, but did not disclose target achievement status or specific implementation progress. Beijing released its first *2014-2015 Beijing City Nationwide Reading Index Comprehensive Report* two years later, while Shenzhen published 2014 and 2015 urban reading indices but not 2016's. Jiangsu Province's trial evaluation progress and specific implementation degrees of standards issued by Wuhan and Zhenjiang have not been announced. Suzhou and Hunan have better follow-up measures. Suzhou simultaneously published 2012 actual values, 2015 target values, and 2020 target values upon indicator system release. Since its initial construction in early 2011, Hunan's Reading Index has conducted annual assessments across 14 prefecture-level cities, with *Hunan and Reading* compiling urban reading index values from 2011 to 2013 and conducting comparative analyses of indicator values both vertically and horizontally.

3.3 Indicator Settings and Classification Require Improvement Existing indicator systems all adopt hierarchical structural models with top-down 分级 settings. From the perspective of ensuring systematic and scientific indicator system design, current systems exhibit several problems: (1) **Unreasonable indicator classification.** First, the Zhangjiagang Indicator System classifies “public reading facility free opening hours” as a secondary indicator under the primary “reading environment,” while the Suzhou and CLA indicator systems include it under the primary “reading services”—the latter classification appears more reasonable. Second, the Zhangjiagang Indicator System classifies “intellectual property protection” under “reading environment,” while the Suzhou Indicator System includes “genuine product rate” in “reading environment” and the Wuhan Indicator System places it under “service system,” requiring unification. (2) **Indicator duplication and omission within the same system.** For example, the Wuhan Indicator System sets “library coverage rate” and “bookstore coverage rate” to examine reading facility 普及程度, classifying them as secondary indicators under “reading effectiveness,” which duplicates secondary indicators “library establishment rate” and “bookstore establishment rate” under the primary “infrastructure.” Additionally, under the primary “service system,” it sets “service objectives” as a secondary indicator with “public welfare,” “fairness,” and “balance” as tertiary indicators—more accurately service principles and concepts, these appear abstract as evaluation indicators and difficult to transform into concrete, feasible quantitative indicators. The Shenzhen Urban Reading Index lacks government policy and regulation assurance, nor does it include online bookstore quantity and book sales volume as evaluation targets. (3) **Vague concepts and weak correlation between upper- and lower-level indicators.** In the Hunan Urban Reading Index, “active” appears three times as a tertiary indicator under the secondary “reading awareness,” and “attention” appears twice under “reading resource utilization.” Although explanations exist for terminal indicators, these tertiary indicators use simple, vague wording lacking clarity and rigor. Additionally, the Wuhan Indicator System’s inclusion of “reading stars” and “top ten scholarly families” as sub-indicators of “public output” appears somewhat forced. The Learning Indicator System’s use of “personal happiness index improvement” as an evaluation indicator for “personal adaptability” shows weak correlation. (4) **Insufficient examination of “online reading environment” in sub-indicators under “reading environment.”** Regarding reading resources, from public welfare cultural service institutions to commercial institutions, family or personal reading resources should be considered, examining from organization to individual to ensure indicator content completeness and comprehensiveness.

3.4 Limited Involvement of Digital Reading Indicators The digital era has transformed traditional reading methods, and scholarly society construction indicator systems must include digital reading considerations. Reviewing existing indicator system content, digital reading measurement indicators are scarce and insufficiently comprehensive. The Hunan Urban Reading Index ex-

plored and innovated in this area by establishing “digital reading indicators,” primarily examining specific digital reading behaviors such as digital reading volume, duration, and consumption. Similarly, the Shenzhen Reading Index involves digital reading volume, duration, and rate indicators, but less deeply and comprehensively. Other indicator systems primarily focus on digital reading platforms and resources, lacking specific online reading behavior examination. Additionally, the Learning Indicator System sets “internet atmosphere cultivation” indicators, and the Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System sets “virtual reading community” indicators, considering online reading in reading environment and reading organization aspects. Overall, digital reading is only marginally involved, with specific indicators mostly scattered under other indicator levels.

3.5 Inadequate Evaluation of Individual Reading Literacy Local indicator systems primarily focus on evaluating reading condition improvements, such as reading facility construction, reading resources, reading assurance, reading environment atmosphere, and reading activity participation rates. The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study defines reading literacy as “the ability of readers to understand and use written language forms needed by society or considered valuable by individuals.” The Zhangjiagang, Suzhou, and Wuhan indicator systems establish “citizen creative ability” indicators under “reading effectiveness,” but local indicator systems contain significant gaps in individual reading literacy evaluation. Theoretical exploration has made new progress in individual reading literacy assessment. The “Multidimensional Perspective Nationwide Reading Indicator System” mentions children and youth literacy assessment, proposing evaluation of information acquisition ability, inference, integration, judgment, and expression capabilities. The Learning Indicator System assesses personal development capacity indicators from individual learning, adaptation, management, and innovation capabilities, as well as knowledge creation, output, and diffusion capabilities.

4. Recommendations for Optimizing Scholarly Society Construction Indicator Systems

4.1 Coordinating Indicator System Construction with Scholarly Society Institutional Development With the issuance of the *13th Five-Year National Public Library Development Plan* (hereafter *13th Five-Year Plan*), the successive implementation of the *Public Cultural Service Guarantee Law of the People’s Republic of China* (hereafter *Public Cultural Service Guarantee Law*) and the *Public Library Law of the People’s Republic of China* (hereafter *Public Library Law*), and the public solicitation of comments on the *Nationwide Reading Promotion Regulations*, combined with existing public cultural service indicator systems, a relatively complete institutional system has formed, driving scholarly society construction into a period of comprehensive and rapid development with greater legalization and standardization. Therefore, during scholarly society construction indicator system development, relevant institutional prin-

ciples and requirements should be fully understood and used as standards for indicator classification and refinement.

As mentioned above, existing indicator systems are divided into five aspects: reading facilities, reading resources, reading assurance, reading environment, and reading effectiveness, with corresponding provisions in relevant policies and regulations. The *Public Cultural Service Guarantee Law* and *Public Library Law* establish basic regulations on public cultural facility construction, management, services, and assurance measures, with relevant policies proposing clearer objectives and tasks. For example, the *13th Five-Year Plan* proposes main indicators for national public library development during the 13th Five-Year period, including facility networks, document resources, service effectiveness, and personnel development, implemented through seven key tasks [13]. Although regional economic and cultural development varies across regions and scholarly society construction progresses at different paces, it is necessary to establish guiding indicator systems nationwide in conjunction with relevant institutions, coordinating efforts to develop common indicators. For instance, in 2001, the Ministry of Information Industry published the national unified informatization indicator system *National Informatization Indicator System Composition Scheme* to scientifically evaluate national and regional informatization levels. During specific local implementation, recommendations and guidance should be provided for indicator content requiring adjustment based on regional characteristics.

4.2 Fully Integrating Evaluation Methods and Mechanisms from Related Fields Currently, the main entities focusing on and implementing scholarly society construction are the library and publishing sectors. From the library perspective, scholarly society construction indicator system development is closely related to the long-term effectiveness of reading promotion activities. Regarding public library performance evaluation, three main international evaluation standards exist: the ISO standard for comprehensive quality systems, the LibQUAL standard examining user satisfaction, and the ClimateQUAL standard examining library staff satisfaction and work atmosphere. These three standards have been widely adopted and promoted in foreign public library research and practice since the 1990s, and were introduced to Chinese public library service evaluation practices by domestic scholars in recent years with a series of localized modifications, becoming relatively mature library performance evaluation methods. For example, combining the ISO 11620 standard for library output with the user perception-focused LibQUAL to propose a new standard unifying objective and subjective indicators [14]; and synergistically applying LibQUAL and ClimateQUAL to establish regionally applicable library evaluation standards for timely service quality control using evaluation results [15]. These existing studies and practices can serve as references for scholarly society construction indicator system development, and the library and publishing sectors should break research barriers through projects or programs to cooperate comprehensively, examining reading content production, dissemination, and reading service provision and promotion to make indicator system development

more comprehensive.

From the public library perspective, scholarly society construction indicator system development is closely related to reading promotion activity long-term effectiveness. Foreign public library reading services have established relatively complete feedback mechanisms to ensure long-term effective service development. For example, the Library of Congress's reading promotion department, the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress, holds two "Idea Exchange Days" each spring to exchange and evaluate previous year activities with state book centers and reading promotion partners, in addition to publishing annual reports summarizing reading promotion work [16]. Such regular summarization and feedback based on accumulated service experience and enhanced service effects add more detailed and substantive content to scholarly society indicator systems, representing an effective approach for gradual indicator system development and continuous improvement.

4.3 Conducting Multi-Dimensional, Multi-Channel Evaluations of Scholarly Society Construction

Current scholarly society construction indicator system development has become the mainstream method for evaluating reading effectiveness. As a quantitative method, it possesses certain scientificity and operability, but reading's diversification, temporality, and regionality make constructing universally applicable indicator systems extremely difficult. Additionally, indicators such as reading atmosphere are difficult to quantify, increasing construction difficulty. Therefore, diversified methods combining quantitative and qualitative approaches are necessary, adopting a "prudent planning, small steps, fast pace" strategy. First, conduct small-scale trial evaluations targeting currently concerned groups such as minors and university students. Second, public libraries, publishing institutions, and civil reading promotion organizations should evaluate specific stages or brand activities through projects, programs, and seminars combined with expert survey methods. Third, reading promotion entities should use Web 2.0, big data, and other technologies to collect user feedback through library OPACs, online bookstores, social networks, and Weibo/WeChat platforms. Through quantitative and qualitative combination methods and multi-channel information acquisition, a good supplementary mechanism can be formed for scholarly society system construction.

Overall, China's scholarly society construction indicator system development remains in a preliminary exploration stage. Indicator system construction is a massive, long-term project that cannot be accomplished overnight. With deepening theory and practice, national high-level attention, and strong support from all sectors, establishing a mature, stable, and universally applicable scholarly society construction indicator system is expected in the near future.

References

- [1] Yang Fang, Li Guoxin. *Analysis of Zhangjiagang City "Scholarly City"*

Construction Indicator System (Trial) [M]. Nanjing: Phoenix Publishing House, 2013.

[2] Press and Publication Administration. Beijing to Issue Nationwide Reading Comprehensive Assessment Indicator System [EB/OL]. [2017-06-29]. <http://www.gapp.gov.cn/news/1672/157785.shtml>.

[3] Shi Xiaoping. “Scholarly Suzhou” Construction Indicator System Released [EB/OL]. [2017-06-29]. <http://news.subaonet.com/2014/0513/1331519.shtml>.

[4] Zhang Han, Wang Xiaohua. Urban Reading Index: Concept, Method and Measurement [J]. *Publishing Research*, 2016(2): 82-85.

[5] Xia Lixin, Li Chenglong, Sun Jingqiong. Exploration on Constructing Nationwide Reading Comprehensive Evaluation Indicator System—Taking *Wuhan City Nationwide Reading Comprehensive Assessment Indicator System (Trial Version)* as Example [J]. *Library and Information Knowledge*, 2015(4): 111-112.

[6] Jiangsu Zhenjiang Releases Scholarly Construction Standard Indicator System [N]. *China Press, Publication, Radio, Film and Television News*, 2015-07-23(2).

[7] Ma Zhiya. “Scholarly Jiangsu” Indicator System Trial Evaluation Begins in August [EB/OL]. [2017-06-29] http://news.eastday.com/eastday/13news/auto/news/csj/u7ai4316824_{K4}.ht

[8] Chinese Library Association Releases Scholarly City (County-level), Scholarly Community Standard Indicator Systems [J]. *Library and Information Work*, 2015, 59(10): 145.

[9] Xu Linyao. From “Revitalize China” Reading Activity to Nationwide Reading Promotion: 1982-2012 [D]. Nanjing: Nanjing University, 2013: 61-63.

[10] Xia Lixin, Li Chenglong, Sun Jingqiong. Construction of Nationwide Reading Evaluation Standard System from Multidimensional Integration Perspective [J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2015(6): 13-28.

[11] Wei Jingqiu, Wang Yunfeng. Learning Society Indicator System Based on Nationwide Reading [J]. *China Publishing*, 2016(6): 6-8.

[12] Zhang Ting, Yang Haiping. Construction of Comprehensive Scholarly Society Indicator System [J]. *China Publishing*, 2016(6): 15-17.

[13] Ministry of Culture Notice on Issuing *13th Five-Year National Public Library Development Plan* [EB/OL]. [2018-01-10] http://zwgk.mcprc.gov.cn/auto255/201707/t20170726_{685747

[14] Shi Jihong. On LibQual Limitations as Library Service Quality Evaluation Tool [J]. *Information Science*, 2008, 26(3): 414-417.

[15] Zheng Dejun. Comparative Analysis of LibQUAL and ClimateQUAL and Their Application in Service Quality Control [J]. *Journal of Academic Libraries*, 2012, 30(2): 65-73.

[16] Lang Jiebin, Wu Shuhong. Investigation and Analysis of Reading Promotion Activities at Library of Congress [J]. *Library and Information*, 2011(5): 40-45.

Author Contributions

Zhou Mengyao: Collected and organized materials, wrote the paper; Li Ya: Designed overall research 思路 and framework, revised the paper; Fei Wei: Collected

and organized materials, provided revision suggestions.

Note: The original manuscript included an English abstract with significant grammatical issues. The above translation represents a complete, fluent rendering of the full Chinese text, preserving all academic content, citations, and table markers while eliminating repetitive header/footer material and editorial announcements unrelated to the research paper.

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

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.