Development and Empirical Study of an Evaluation Index System for Blue Book Impact: Postprint

Authors: Jiang Chunlin, XU Shiyue

Date: 2024-03-28T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Blue Book evaluation plays a key guiding role in the development of Blue Books and serves as an important measurement basis for tiered funding, awarding, and elimination. A scientific and rational Blue Book influence evaluation index system can provide safeguards for the orderly conduct of Blue Book evaluation, which is of great significance for ensuring fair and objective results and promoting the academic guiding role of Blue Book evaluation.

[Method/Process] Using literature survey, questionnaire survey, and Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) methods, and comprehensively considering relevant principles, this study establishes four first-level indicators (decision-making influence, academic influence, usage influence, and social influence), ten second-level indicators, and sixteen third-level indicators, determines their weights, and conducts an empirical study on 51 Blue Books from the 12th "Excellent Blue Book Award" .

[Results/Conclusion] The empirical results of this paper are correlated with the actual award outcomes, indicating that the constructed Blue Book influence evaluation index system possesses certain validity and rationality. This paper proposes recommendations for optimizing Blue Book evaluation.

Full Text

Preamble

Construction and Empirical Research of the Influence Evaluation Index System of the Pishu

Jiang Chunlin, Xu Shiyue

(WISE Lab, Institute of Science of Science and Technology and S&T Management, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, China)

Abstract: [Purpose/Significance] The evaluation of the Pishu plays a key leading role in its development and serves as an important measurement basis for the grading, funding, awarding, and elimination of Pishu publications. A scientific and reasonable influence evaluation index system can guarantee the orderly implementation of Pishu evaluation, which is of great significance for ensuring fair and objective evaluation results and promoting the academic leading role of Pishu evaluation. [Method/Process] This study adopts literature survey, questionnaire survey, and analytic hierarchy process methods, comprehensively considering various principles to establish four first-level indicators: decision-making influence, academic influence, use influence, and social influence, with 10 second-level indicators and 16 third-level indicators beneath them. Indicator weights were determined, and 51 Pishu volumes from the 12th "Excellent Pishu Award" were selected for empirical research. [Result/Conclusion] The empirical results of this study are correlated with the actual award outcomes, demonstrating that the constructed Pishu influence evaluation index system possesses certain validity and rationality. Finally, recommendations for optimizing Pishu evaluation are proposed.

Keywords: Pishu; Influence; Evaluation index system

Pishu are annual public publications of humanities and social science information, typically employing professional perspectives and empirical research methods to analyze and forecast development trends in specific fields or regions. They combine originality, empirical rigor, continuity, professionalism, and timeliness, comprising a collection of think tank reports unified by theme or institution. In November 1996, *Analysis and Forecast of China' s Economic Situation: 1997*, published by Social Sciences Academic Press, marked the inaugural work of the "Pishu Project." The 2000 National Pishu Work Seminar, convened under the auspices of Social Sciences Academic Press, signaled Pishu' s entry into the public discourse system as a distinct form of academic publication. In 2010, Social Sciences Academic Press established the "Pishu Academic Committee" to standardize and guide Pishu publishing work and improve its evaluation system. As of July 2022, China has cumulatively published over 1,000 types of Pishu, with total volumes exceeding 16,000, demonstrating flourishing development in both publication quantity and the breadth and depth of research scope.

As important academic achievements of think tanks, Pishu not only carry the perspectives of think tanks but also serve as a crucial platform for promoting the construction of new-type think tanks with Chinese characteristics, effectively introducing Chinese experiences and publicizing China' s development path. Their continuous publication enables Pishu to comprehensively present the developmental conditions of a field or region, providing intellectual support and decision-making references for government departments, enterprises, and social organizations. With strong support from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the State Administration of Press, Publication, Radio, Film

and Television, and other relevant departments, Pishu have gradually become a renowned academic brand of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, successively included in the national key publication development plans for the 12th, 13th, and 14th Five-Year Plan periods, emerging as an excellent vehicle for humanities and social science researchers to publish research findings and serve society.

Pishu influence evaluation serves three functions driven by practical needs. First, it identifies the scientific nature and universality of Pishu, analyzing and judging their social, academic, and decision-making values to serve Pishu audiences—this represents the instrumental value of Pishu evaluation. Second, it summarizes experiences, identifies deficiencies and problems, and advances the self-development of Pishu—this constitutes the target value of Pishu evaluation. Third, it guides and regulates the compilation of Pishu content, prompting Pishu research and creation teams to continuously improve and achieve high-quality content output to fulfill publication goals—this is the regulatory value of Pishu evaluation.

To achieve the objectives of Pishu influence evaluation, a scientific, reasonable, fair, and objective evaluation index system with both scientific rigor and operational feasibility must be constructed. For a long time, peer review has been widely used in the evaluation of humanities and social science research outcomes and think tank achievements. With the accelerating trend of integrated development between natural sciences and humanities and social sciences, mathematics has increasingly permeated the latter. Beyond qualitative evaluation, evaluators have gradually begun to conduct quantitative indicator-based analyses of academic achievements, effectively combining quantitative evaluation results with qualitative evaluation to derive value assessments. From the perspective of scientometrics, the evaluation index system occupies an important position in evaluation activities—without a complete index system, there can be no integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches. A scientific and reasonable influence evaluation index system not only facilitates the orderly evaluation process but also helps improve fairness and promotes the standardization of Pishu research and creation work, thereby advancing high-quality Pishu development. It is against this background that this study attempts to investigate the construction and application of a Pishu influence evaluation index system.

1. Current Research Status on Pishu Evaluation

As a typical form of applied research outcomes in humanities and social sciences, Pishu also represent a primary format of think tank reports. Research specifically addressing the construction of Pishu influence evaluation index systems is scarce, though studies on evaluation systems for applied humanities and social science research outcomes and think tank achievements are relatively abundant.

Regarding evaluation index systems for applied humanities and social science research outcomes, scholars have conducted research from several perspectives.

First, some focus on designing index systems based on the intrinsic characteristics of applied outcomes. Such systems fully utilize the professional knowledge and judgment of expert reviewers, leveraging the advantages of peer review and offering certain scientific reliability in judging outcome value. Sha Siyuan et al. proposed that the most distinctive feature of applied research outcomes lies in their "application," and thus their application value must be prioritized in evaluation. Second, some combine intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of applied outcomes, incorporating both subjective and objective indicators into the evaluation system. This approach compensates for the shortcomings of expert review while overcoming the defect of indirect indicator evaluation methods that overemphasize extrinsic features. Ye Peng suggested selecting eight indicators: topic source, difficulty level, social value, maturity level, adoption scope, social benefits, publication level, and award level. Deng Yi argued that evaluating applied research outcomes should not focus solely on academic value but should emphasize social value, proposing seven second-level indicators: project source, difficulty level, social value, maturity level, adoption scope, social benefits, and award grade. Third, some design corresponding index systems according to different evaluation subjects or purposes. While ensuring the evaluation system fully considers the characteristics of applied research outcomes, other factors in the evaluation process should also receive adequate attention. Xu Meihua proposed designing evaluation indicators from three perspectives—stakeholders, project leaders, and experts—fully considering the strong applicability of applied countermeasure outcomes.

With the development of think tanks, research on evaluation standards and indicators for think tank achievements has become increasingly diverse. Regarding evaluation standards, Li Mingliang and Wang Wenjing argued that general scientific research achievement assessment systems are unsuitable for evaluating policy recommendations and research reports from applied countermeasure research, and that think tank achievement evaluation standards should emphasize application contributions and achievement transformation rates. Cui Shuyi noted that if "academic nature" remains the primary standard for evaluating think tank achievements while neglecting social impact, the evaluation would deviate from the fundamental purpose of think tanks. Regarding evaluation indicators, Hu Yan, in examining representative think tank evaluation systems, pointed out that continuous publications could be evaluated using existing journal evaluation systems with increased weight given to social influence and decision-making influence indicators. Liao Bingyi highlighted the necessity of innovating think tank evaluation mechanisms, proposing increased weight for government-commissioned project quantity and level, government policy consultation recommendation adoption rates, and social impact in evaluation. Zhu Xufeng and Han Wanqu indicated that research consultation reports adopted by leaders and used by relevant government departments should serve as important evaluation indicators.

The evaluation of applied humanities and social science research outcomes initially relied primarily on single-method peer review. With the development

of bibliometrics, bibliometric analysis methods have enhanced evaluation scientificity and formed good complementarity with peer review. However, most current outcome evaluation work requires research teams to provide supporting materials in advance, which evaluators then assess according to evaluation standards, making the process vulnerable to adverse subjective influences. For different types of applied research outcomes, past studies have rarely made distinctions, and research on how to evaluate, what to use for evaluation, and how to conduct evaluation specifically for continuous publications like Pishu is even scarcer.

While considerable research exists on think tank evaluation, studies on think tank achievement evaluation are often merely mentioned in passing within broader think tank research. Both theoretical and practical research on think tank achievement evaluation needs strengthening, and improving and optimizing think tank achievement evaluation systems represents an urgent concern in current research. Moreover, specialized studies on evaluation of research report-type think tank achievements are rare, and Pishu, as a typical research report outcome, have seldom been the focus of think tank achievement evaluation research. Therefore, this study takes Pishu as an example to explore the construction of a Pishu influence evaluation index system, providing meaningful references for Pishu evaluation index system construction.

Addressing the scarcity of empirical research on research report-type think tank achievement evaluation, this study attempts to select appropriate Pishu samples, construct an influence evaluation index system for assessment, and verify its validity and rationality through comparative analysis.

2.1 Construction Principles

The construction of a Pishu influence evaluation index system should follow four key principles: (1) **Systematicity**. A qualified evaluation index system should treat the evaluation object as an organic whole, comprehensively considering various factors to reflect the complete picture of the outcome. Indicators should have inherent connections, and hierarchical levels should have logical relationships rather than being isolated. (2) **Purposefulness**. When constructing the system, key indicators should be selected based on the characteristics of the evaluation object and specific evaluation purposes, clearly reflecting evaluation objectives while accurately characterizing the object' s features. Evaluation indicators should also provide directions for improvement to achieve evaluation purposes. (3) **Operability**. When selecting indicators, stable and reliable data sources and acquisition channels must be ensured so that evaluators can process collected valid indicator data through standard calculations, maintaining appropriate indicator quantity and refined hierarchy to improve evaluation efficiency. Theoretical scientificity and completeness should be pursued while fully considering practical feasibility for evaluators, achieving perfect integration of theoretical and operational aspects. (4) **Comparability**. Both qualitative and quantitative indicators must ensure that evaluation results can be compared,

enabling evaluators to smoothly obtain value judgments. Only by establishing an index system under unified statistical calibers and comparable benchmarks can evaluation content be quantified and compared. For difficult-to-quantify indicators, descriptions should be sufficiently concrete to clearly and specifically define evaluation content.

2.2 Selection of Evaluation Indicators at All Levels

Based on existing research findings and considering Pishu' s roles in providing intellectual support and decision-making references for government departments, enterprises, and social organizations, offering a platform for think tanks to voice their perspectives, and supplying basic data resources for academic research, this study attempts to construct a Pishu influence evaluation index system from four dimensions: decision-making influence, academic influence, use influence, and social influence.

2.2.1 Decision-Making Influence

Think tanks convey knowledge achievements to government decision-makers through meetings, government-funded projects, and other channels in oral or written form. Decision-makers may adopt these recommendations after receiving them, demonstrating the think tank' s decision-making influence. As an important type of think tank achievement, Pishu analyze and forecast social hot issues or industry development trends from professional perspectives, serving as written carriers for expert opinions. They not only provide decision-making references for government departments but also constitute important reference materials for decision-makers in enterprises and social organizations. Therefore, when determining Pishu decision-making influence evaluation indicators, this study considers both influence on government departments and influence on industries/sectors, setting three third-level indicators: government website mention frequency, institutional official website mention frequency, and whether transformed into educational resources.

2.2.2 Academic Influence

The continuous publication characteristic enables Pishu to provide basic data resources for academic research, making academic influence evaluation a primary component of Pishu influence assessment. For academic books, academic influence evaluation mainly relies on citation analysis, altmetrics, and other tools, with evaluation indicators typically including book awards, book reviews, and utilization. This study sets two third-level indicators—total citation count and award quantity—to evaluate Pishu academic influence, primarily considering book citation frequency and award status.

2.2.3 Use Influence

Evaluating use influence means assessing the influence generated during Pishu usage, examining the utilization of evaluation objects. Libraries are primary venues for concentrated book usage, and early library collection evaluation methods assessed benefits demonstrated during book usage, with borrowing frequency and similar indicators still applicable to book use influence evaluation. Additionally, e-book download counts, search frequencies, and sales channels are commonly used to evaluate book usage. This study evaluates Pishu use influence by considering Pishu database usage depth, print book utilization scope, and publication circumstances, setting five third-level indicators: browsing count, download count, library holdings, number of stores selling on Kongfuzi Old Book Network, and whether foreign language editions exist/are distributed abroad.

2.2.4 Social Influence

In a media convergence environment, traditional news media and social media channels play important roles in expanding Pishu social influence. With altmetrics development, indicators such as online book reviews and forum data are frequently used in book influence evaluation research. This study evaluates Pishu social influence by considering online book reviews, official WeChat public platform usage, and news media coverage, setting six third-level indicators: Dangdang review count, Dangdang rating, intensive report reading volume, intensive report like/share count, media coverage frequency, and whether new book launch events were held.

The final Pishu influence evaluation indicators at all levels and their measurement/quantification methods are shown in Table 1 .

2.3 Determination of Indicator Weights

Determining indicator weights is a crucial step in Pishu influence evaluation. This study employed a questionnaire survey method, inviting experts engaged in long-term academic evaluation research, think tank research, and those working in publishing houses and government departments to score the relative importance of each evaluation indicator factor. Thirteen questionnaires were distributed, and 13 valid responses were collected. Using the analytic hierarchy process, the weighted arithmetic mean of each expert' s ranking vector was calculated to determine the weight coefficients of each indicator, yielding the final weights for indicators at all levels as shown in Table 2 .

2.4 Characteristics of This Evaluation Index System

The primary force engaged in Pishu evaluation research in China is Social Sciences Academic Press, which initiated Pishu evaluation work in 2008, conducting comprehensive evaluations of Pishu content quality and social influence. Their

social influence evaluation index system includes three first-level indicators: media influence, Pishu database download rate, and brand contribution, with only the media influence indicator having second-level indicators: public media influence, self-media influence, and academic influence. Beyond examining media coverage, this system also incorporates efforts made by research teams to enhance Pishu influence into the assessment scope, such as whether Weibo and WeChat public accounts related to Pishu content were established and whether revised Pishu reports were successfully submitted to journals. Such indicators can effectively stimulate research teams' promotional enthusiasm. Overall, this index system has limited scope for assessing Pishu influence, emphasizing public media exposure (weight set at 0.45) while paying insufficient attention to audience feedback and lacking indicators to examine Pishu decision-making influence.

This study comprehensively considers conceptual and indicator design principles, selecting four dimensions—decision-making influence, academic influence, use influence, and social influence—to construct a Pishu influence evaluation index system framework that basically covers all types of influence generated by Pishu. When assessing decision-making influence, this study uses website mention frequency to reflect Pishu influence on government agencies and industries/sectors, eliminating the need for research teams to proactively provide supporting materials and effectively excluding subjective interference to ensure evaluation objectivity. When assessing academic influence, this study utilizes Pishu award status to inform judgment, incorporating evaluation results from other index systems to enhance rationality. When assessing use influence, this index system selects indicators with contemporary characteristics such as Pishu database browsing counts and Kongfuzi Old Book Network store numbers, considering audience habits for e-book reading and print book purchasing. When assessing social influence, beyond traditional bibliometric evaluation indicators, this study also selects official WeChat public platform usage as an evaluation indicator to reflect Pishu influence on social media platforms, thereby promoting active Pishu dissemination on social media.

3.1 Data Sources and Processing

Given the continuous and timely nature of Pishu publication, samples from the same publication year were prioritized. Academic influence requires sufficient time after publication to be fully manifested, so publication dates should not be too recent. This study selected 51 Pishu volumes awarded in the 12th "Excellent Pishu Award" co-hosted by the Bureau of Scientific Research Management of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Social Sciences Academic Press as evaluation objects. All were published in 2020, with awards covering first to third prize. By applying the constructed influence evaluation index system to predict awards and analyze these samples, then comparing predictions with actual expert-review-based award results, this study verifies the operability and rationality of the constructed Pishu influence evaluation index system.

Additionally, by statistically analyzing the profiles of award-winning Pishu, this study objectively reveals their influence across various dimensions, helping to comprehensively and scientifically assess China' s Pishu research and publishing needs, optimize resource allocation in Pishu research and creation, and identify targeted measures for further Pishu development.

Original data for sample indicators were collected item by item according to the third-level indicator data sources described in Table 3 (statistics collected March 3-23, 2023), quantified and standardized using the Min-Max normalization method.

3.2 Empirical Verification

The standardized data for samples were weighted and averaged to obtain final influence scores for the 51 samples. The 12th "Excellent Pishu Award" included 12 first-prize, 20 second-prize, and 19 third-prize winners. The final influence scores calculated using this study' s evaluation index system were ranked, with the top 12 predicted as first-prize winners, ranks 13-32 as second-prize winners, and ranks 33-51 as third-prize winners. Predicted award lists were compared with actual award lists to verify the rationality and feasibility of this evaluation index system.

3.2.1 First-Prize Prediction Results

Among the 12 Pishu predicted to win first prize, 4 matched the actual award level. The predicted first-prize Pishu based on the evaluation index system show certain correlation with actual award results, demonstrating rationality. The four Pishu with consistent predicted and actual award levels ranked first, third, fourth, and fifth in final influence scores, indicating that within the high-influence-score range, results from this evaluation index system align well with those from expert-review-based systems. *Annual Report on Rule of Law in Sichuan No.6 (2020)* actually won third prize but ranked second in influence score under this system, with its primary advantage being "government website mention frequency." While other Pishu typically had 1 or fewer mentions, this volume received 28 mentions, creating a clear advantage in decision-making influence assessment. Specific predicted award-winning Pishu and their actual award levels are shown in Table 4 .

3.2.2 Second-Prize Prediction Results

Among the 20 Pishu predicted to win second prize, 7 matched the actual award level. The predicted second-prize Pishu based on the evaluation index system show certain correlation with actual award results, demonstrating rationality. *Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Development Report (2020)* actually won first prize but scored only 0.0704 in final influence score, ranking 30th, because its two evaluation indicators scored 0 due to absence from the "Duxiu Academic Search"

database, and only 7 stores sold this Pishu on Kongfuzi Old Book Network, creating a large gap in use influence assessment compared to other Pishu. *China Mobile Internet Development Report (2020)* actually won third prize but scored 0.1250 in final influence score, ranking 13th. Despite scoring 0 on "official WeChat public platform usage," its other indicators showed clear advantages, with final weighted score only 0.0013 points behind the previous rank, making it the highest-scoring among predicted second-prize Pishu. Specific predicted award-winning Pishu and their actual award levels are shown in Table 5 .

3.2.3 Third-Prize Prediction Results

Among the 19 Pishu predicted to win third prize, 7 matched the actual award level. *Report on Climate Change (2020)* and *China Industrial Competitiveness Report (2020) No.9* both actually won first prize but, under this evaluation index system, lacked competitiveness despite obtaining valid scores across all indicators, with final scores significantly lower than predicted first-prize Pishu, ranking 36th and 45th respectively. *Gansu County and Rural Development Report (2020)* was not included in the "Duxiu Academic Search" database, and its content was never intensively recommended on the official WeChat public platform, resulting in zero scores for four indicators due to missing data and unremarkable scores for remaining indicators, thus ranking low and diverging significantly from actual award results. Specific predicted award-winning Pishu and their actual award levels are shown in Table 6 .

3.3 Empirical Summary

Overall, except for the top five Pishu, final influence scores for remaining Pishu are relatively evenly and reasonably distributed within the [0.01, 0.16] interval. This indicates that selected samples have roughly similar influence levels and reflects that this Pishu influence evaluation index system possesses good discriminatory power and evaluation effectiveness. The five Pishu scoring above 0.2 not only exceeded average scores across multiple indicators but also had notably outstanding individual items—for example, *China New Media Development Report No.11 (2020)* had the highest total citation count of 81 among sample Pishu. Within the >0.2 score range, predicted award levels show high consistency with actual award results. However, within the [0.01, 0.16] range, consistency is lower due to multiple factors.

In the award activities co-hosted by the Bureau of Scientific Research Management of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Social Sciences Academic Press, Pishu content quality evaluation carries slightly more weight than social influence evaluation, with review conducted by experts from various industries/fields. This study constructs a comprehensive influence evaluation index system covering four dimensions—decision-making influence, academic influence, use influence, and social influence—objectively evaluating Pishu through quantitative data. While compensating for subjective factors in expert review, this may render evaluation results overly absolute. In practice, subjective and objective

evaluation index systems could be combined to ensure fairness and scientificity. Without a unified Pishu data collection platform, some indicators in this index system require data obtained through search engines, and data collection may involve missed detections that affect evaluation results. Therefore, this index system requires continuous practical testing and, based on increasingly perfected evaluation mechanisms, can fulfill its intended utility, saving substantial human and time costs while improving objectivity and systematicity in Pishu evaluation.

3.4 Optimization Suggestions for Pishu Influence Evaluation Index System Construction

(1) **Provide Professional Technical Support and Improve Pishu Evaluation Mechanisms.** In 2016, the Ministry of Science and Technology announced the abolition of regulations including the *Scientific and Technological Achievement Appraisal Measures*, gradually replacing science and technology administrative departments at all levels with third-party evaluation institutions as the main force in scientific and technological achievement evaluation. Third-party evaluation institutions, independent from government departments, enterprises, or think tanks, can make impartial judgments about Pishu value without potential pressure. Multiple indicators in this constructed influence evaluation index system require relevant data information about evaluated Pishu. Establishing a unified Pishu data collection platform can facilitate standardized indicator data calculation, enabling smooth quantitative Pishu evaluation activities under effective technical support and achieving the integration of subjective and objective evaluation. The composition mechanism of evaluation subjects also requires improvement—authoritative experts from different Pishu research fields or regions could be invited to conduct evaluations. Measures should be taken to ensure full transparency of the evaluation index system and process, strengthen integrity assessment mechanisms for evaluation subjects, and make assessment results public to enable social supervision.

(2) **Strengthen Institutional Guarantees and Optimize Evaluation Atmosphere.** According to Pishu' s characteristics as applied research outcomes, relevant normative documents for promotion and application should be improved to encourage Pishu research teams to actively disseminate and utilize Pishu knowledge. Simultaneously, by improving evaluation subject assessment mechanisms, evaluators can be urged to fully understand Pishu influence evaluation requirements, prompting research teams to make targeted improvements based on evaluation results to expand Pishu influence and fulfill Pishu' s purpose as applied research outcomes. Additionally, as previously mentioned, establishing a unified Pishu data collection platform is necessary for standardized and convenient data collection. Currently, policies and regulations regarding data openness and sharing are relatively incomplete, resulting in high data acquisition

costs and difficulty in sharing multi-source data for Pishu influence evaluation. Accelerating the construction of policies and regulations for various data openness, sharing, or integration can help resolve difficulties in obtaining evaluation indicator data and facilitate achieving Pishu influence evaluation objectives.

(3) **Deepen Application of Evaluation Results and Improve Pishu Research Quality.** Evaluation results should be released in a timely, accurate, and standardized manner. With advances in digital platform technology and expanded data collection scope, evaluation result release timing can achieve multiple intervals, and evaluation outcome types can become more diverse, such as releasing "Pishu Academic Influence Monthly Reports" or "Pishu Use Influence Quarterly Reports." Published evaluation results should include more detailed substantive textual content rather than merely data and rankings. Summarizing and describing potential problems in Pishu research processes and the significance of Pishu topic selection in evaluations enables research teams to fully understand their strengths and weaknesses. On this basis, combining two temporally adjacent evaluation results for the same Pishu could allow deficiencies and suggestions from previous evaluations to be examined as improved content in new evaluations, forming a dynamic connection between Pishu evaluation and research teams to improve Pishu research quality and better fulfill the role of Pishu influence evaluation.

Conclusion

Based on systematic review of existing research and following the characteristics of Pishu knowledge production, dissemination, and application, this study constructed a Pishu influence evaluation index system framework from four dimensions—decision-making influence, academic influence, use influence, and social influence—adhering to systematicity, purposefulness, operability, and comparability principles. Comparative empirical analysis with actually awarded Pishu demonstrated the constructed evaluation index system' s rationality and operability to a certain extent. However, this index system remains in a preliminary exploratory stage with certain limitations. First, it primarily selects quantitative indicators with stable data sources. For indicators without specific numerical values in evaluation content, such as "whether new book launch events were held," the quantification method of scoring "yes" as "1" and "no" as "0" was applied for standardized processing, using Min-Max normalization. If extreme values in data are unstable, maximum and minimum values in the formula require redefinition, potentially causing unstable standardization results that affect evaluation effectiveness. When using this index system in practice, if indicator data collection meets certain standardization and scientific requirements, empirical constant values could replace maximum and minimum values. Second, during indicator selection, it is difficult to avoid using single indicator data to explain a criterion layer and reflect a concept. Considering indicator

operability and other factors, indicators have certain limitations in covering criterion layers. However, with updated technical tools and establishment of a unified Pishu data collection platform, indicator content and weights can be dynamically adjusted with policy or demand changes, further improving indicator coverage.

Current academic evaluation faces problems of incomplete multi-dimensional classification evaluation systems. Different types of research outcomes exhibit significant differences in formal specification, content expression style, and functional value orientation. Overly uniform evaluation systems cannot accurately reflect outcome value connotations, let alone achieve the goal of promoting outcome development. Applied research outcomes in humanities and social sciences demonstrate diversity, including survey reports, research reports, Pishu, and consultation reports. Currently, academic understanding of Pishu attributes and functions remains insufficient, and Pishu have not received due attention in outcome evaluation systems. In performance evaluation, professional promotion, and other assessment activities, Pishu importance is often considered lower than academic monographs or core journal papers, affecting scholars' motivation for Pishu research and creation. Advancing and improving Pishu evaluation system construction based on different evaluation purposes not only helps stimulate scholars' enthusiasm for participating in Pishu research and creation and expand Pishu influence but also holds significant meaning for optimizing the academic evaluation environment and improving humanities and social science outcome evaluation methodology systems.

References

[1] Xie Shuguang. *Pishu Handbook: A Guide to Writing, Editing, Publishing, and Evaluation (4th Edition)* [M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2020.
[2] Pishu Network. Pishu Chronicle [EB/OL]. [2024-01-05]. https://www.pishu.cn/gyps/psdsj/448563.shtml.
[3] Xu Shiyue, Jiang Chunlin. Development Trends and Countermeasures of China' s Pishu from a Bibliometric Perspective [R] // Xie Shuguang, Cai Jihui, Wu Dan. *Blue Book of Think Tank Achievements: China Pishu Development Report (2022)* [M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2023.
[4] National Press and Publication Administration. Notice on Issuing the *Press and Publication Industry "14th Five-Year" Development Plan* [EB/OL]. [2021-12-30]. https://www.nppa.gov.cn/xxfb/tzgs/202112/t20211230_{666304}.html.
[5] Liu Jinyang, Liu Yongmou. Summary of the Academic Symposium on "Evaluation Issues in Humanities and Social Sciences" [J]. *Journal of Renmin University of China*, 2004(2).
[6] Sha Siyuan, Zheng Li, Guo Caibo, et al. Preliminary Exploration of Evaluation Index Systems for Humanities and Social Science Research Achievements [J]. *Shanghai Higher Education Research*, 1994(1): 74-78.
[7] Ye Peng. Analysis of Evaluation Index Systems for Humanities and Social Science Research Achievements [J]. *Exploration*, 2001(1): 60-67.
[8] Deng Yi. Analysis of Social Science Achievement Evaluation Index Systems

[J]. *Modern Education Forum*, 2004(6): 21-26.
[9] Xu Meihua. Research on Evaluation Index Systems for China' s Humanities and Social Science Achievements [D]. Shanghai: East China Normal University, 2012.
[10] Li Mingliang, Wang Wenjing. Construction of New-Type University Think Tanks in Tianjin: Current Status, Problems, and Countermeasures [J]. *Journal of Tianjin Radio and Television University*, 2014, 18(3): 63-68.
[11] Cui Shuyi. On Three Major Relationships in Local Academy of Social Sciences Think Tank Construction [J]. *Social Science Management and Review*, 2013(2): 98-103.
[12] Hu Yan. How to Evaluate Think Tank Achievements—Research Based on Four Think Tank Evaluation Systems [J]. *Think Tank: Theory & Practice*, 2018, 3(5).
[13] Liao Bingyi. Discussion on University National Advertising Think Tank Construction [J]. *Advertising Panorama (Theory Edition)*, 2014(5): 83-88.
[14] Zhu Xufeng, Han Wanqu. Rise, Dilemmas, and Exploration of New-Type University Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics—Taking Renmin University Think Tank Construction as an Example [J]. *Higher Education Review*, 2015, 3(1): 32-44.
[15] Jiang Xiaofei. Research on Think Tank Achievement Evaluation from a Synergy Theory Perspective [D]. Nanning: Guangxi University, 2017.
[16] Peng Zhanglin, Zhang Aiping, Wang Sufeng, et al. Design Principles and Construction Process of Comprehensive Evaluation Index Systems [J]. *Science Research Management*, 2017, 38(S1): 209-215.
[17] Wang Jia. Research on Scientific and Technological Achievement Evaluation Methods and Index Systems [D]. Beijing: China University of Mining and Technology, 2010.
[18] Zhu Xufeng, Su Yu. Influence of Western Think Tanks on Public Policy—Constructing an Influence Analysis Framework Based on Social Structure [J]. *World Economics and Politics*, 2004(12): 21-26, 4-5.
[19] Jiang Chunlin, Guo Qiqin, Zhang Guangyao. Construction and Empirical Research of Evaluation Index Systems for Humanities and Social Science Academic Works [J]. *Journal of Intelligence*, 2022, 41(2): 198-207.
[20] He Jun, Cai Ronghua. Research on Chinese Book Evaluation Systems [J]. *Journal of Academic Libraries*, 2016, 34(3): 51-58, 15.
[21] Jiang Chunlin. Research Progress on Foreign Humanities and Social Science Academic Book Evaluation [J]. *Journal of Southwest Minzu University (Humanities and Social Science Edition)*, 2019, 40(2): 228-235.
[22] Yao Li. Research on China' s Academic Book Influence Evaluation System Based on Altmetrics [D]. Nanjing: Nanjing University, 2017.

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