

## Research on the Current Development Status and Strategies for Enhancing the Influence of Think Tanks for Academic Journal Publishing in China

**Authors:** Lü Qing, high-strength, Zhao Suting, He Qin, Qiu Huabing, She Shigang

**Date:** 2024-04-02T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

**Purpose** This study investigates the overall development level of research institutions currently engaged in academic journal publishing in China, reflects current industry practices and cognitions regarding academic journal publishing think tanks, and reveals the development trends of China's academic journal publishing think tanks, aiming to promote research and consulting services in this field and provide references for policy formulation in academic journal publishing. **Methods** Through questionnaire surveys, this study investigated institutions conducting research in the journal publishing domain, including academic journal editorial departments, academic journal societies and associations, relevant university departments, research institutes related to academic journals, and enterprises in the academic journal sector. Statistical analysis and case analysis methods were employed to examine the current development status and existing problems of academic journal publishing think tanks, and strategies for enhancing their influence were proposed. **Results** Overall, think tank research output in the journal publishing field is limited, with few outputs adopted by decision-making bodies, small-scale practitioner teams, single-source funding for think tank research projects, and ineffective fulfillment of think tank functions. Nevertheless, China's academic journal publishing think tank construction possesses substantial development potential. **Conclusion** It is recommended that relevant management departments strengthen guidance for the development of the journal publishing think tank industry; research institutions in the journal publishing field should enhance achievement transformation and diversify funding sources, clarify their mission positioning for think tank research, establish benchmark institutions, strengthen the cultivation of think tank research literacy among journal practitioners, utilize intelligent journal data platform tools to conduct think tank research, and enhance exchanges and cooperation among publishing think tanks.

## Full Text

# Research on the Development Status and Influence Enhancement Strategies of Academic Journal Publishing Think Tanks in China

Lyu Qing<sup>1)†</sup>, Gao Qiang<sup>2)†</sup>, Zhao Suting<sup>3,4)</sup>, He Qin<sup>2)</sup>, Qiu Huabing<sup>3,4)</sup>, She Shigang<sup>2)</sup>\*

1) National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 33 Beisihuan West Road, Zhongguancun, Beijing 100190

2) Editorial Office of *Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*, Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 2 Xi-aohongshan, Wuchang District, Wuhan, Hubei 430071

3) National Science Library (Wuhan), Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 25 Xi-aohongshan West, Wuchang District, Wuhan, Hubei 430071

4) Hubei Key Laboratory of Big Data in Science and Technology, No. 25 Xiaohongshan West, Wuchang District, Wuhan, Hubei 430071

### Abstract:

[**Purpose**] This study investigates the overall development level of research institutions engaged in academic journal publishing in China, reflecting the industry's current practice and perception of academic journal publishing think tanks and revealing their development trends. The aim is to promote research and consulting services in this field and provide references for policy formulation related to academic journal publishing. [**Methods**] Through questionnaire surveys, we examined institutions conducting research in journal publishing, including academic journal editorial departments, academic journal associations, university departments, research institutes, and enterprises related to academic journals. Statistical analysis and case study methods were employed to analyze the current development status and existing problems, and strategies for enhancing the influence of academic journal publishing think tanks were proposed. [**Findings**] Overall, think tank research output in the journal publishing field remains limited, with few 研究成果被决策层采纳. The practitioner community is small in scale, funding sources for think tank research are singular, and think tank functions have not been effectively utilized. However, there remains significant room for development in China's academic journal publishing think tank construction. [**Conclusions**] We recommend that relevant management departments strengthen guidance for the journal think tank industry, that research institutions enhance achievement transformation and diversify funding sources, clarify their strategic positioning and establish benchmark institutions, cultivate think tank research literacy among journal practitioners, utilize intelligent journal data platform tools for think tank research, and strengthen communication and cooperation among publishing think tanks.

**Keywords:** Academic Journal; Research Institutions in the Publishing Field; Publishing Think Tank; Journal Publishing Think Tank; Think Tank Influence

**Author Contributions:**

Lyu Qing: Proposed research topic and framework, designed questionnaire, conducted literature review and field research, analyzed data, and wrote and revised the paper.

Gao Qiang: Organized project discussions, designed online questionnaire, distributed and collected data, participated in writing and revising the paper.

Zhao Suting: Organized project discussions, participated in questionnaire design and distribution, collected and organized data, participated in writing and revising the paper.

He Qin: Participated in project discussions, assisted in designing online questionnaire and collecting information on distribution targets, participated in paper revision.

Qiu Huabing: Participated in project discussions, assisted in field research and information organization, participated in paper revision.

She Shigang: Organized project discussions, coordinated research and implementation, provided revision suggestions, reviewed the paper.

**Project:** 2023 Open Project of the National Press and Publication Administration Key Laboratory of Smart Publishing and Knowledge Service (Project Approval No. ZHCB202322).

---

Think tanks are research and consulting institutions that conduct strategic and public policy research oriented toward real-world problems to serve decision-making purposes. As components of modern society's decision-making consultation system, think tanks constitute important support for scientific, democratic, and law-based decision-making. In November 2013, the "Decision on Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Deepening Reforms" adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the 18th CPC Central Committee marked the first time "think tanks" were written into a central Party document. In 2015, the General Office of the CPC Central Committee and the State Council issued the "Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of New-Type Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics," which clarified the overall goals and development pathways for such think tanks, reflecting that enhancing think tank construction has become a major practical issue facing China's development.

In recent years, the construction of new-type think tanks with Chinese characteristics has been actively promoted across various industries. The National Press and Publication Administration's "14th Five-Year Plan for the Publishing Industry" (2021) stated in its section on "Improving Guarantee Measures for High-Quality Development of the Publishing Industry" that high-end publishing think tank construction should be advanced and standardized development of various publishing think tanks should be promoted in a coordinated manner. In 2022, 16 institutions with a solid foundation for building high-quality publishing think tanks—from publishing research institutions, universities, and publishing units—were selected for the Publishing Think Tank High-Quality Construction Plan. By 2023, the number of cultivated publishing think tanks in China

had reached 27. In terms of affiliation, publishing think tanks include research institute-type think tanks, university-affiliated think tanks, and internal think tanks within publishing enterprises (including online publishing). In terms of research fields, they cover book publishing, digital publishing, and journal publishing. The institutions currently selected for the national publishing think tank high-quality construction plan constitute a diversified system of publishing think tanks with Chinese characteristics, providing a good demonstration effect for establishing diverse and multi-level development models and coordinated development mechanisms for publishing think tanks. Among them, a typical academic journal publishing think tank is the Science and Technology Publishing Research Center of the National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences. This center publishes more than ten academic journals, possesses a think tank research team for academic journal development, and has developed a series of think tank products including publishing dynamic monitoring bulletins, a science and technology publishing think tank platform, and branded academic conference activities, playing a think tank role in academic journal evaluation, open science policy systems, and the development of the journal publishing ecosystem.

Currently, academic journal publishing faces multiple challenges and opportunities. Academic journal publishing think tanks can provide recommendations and solutions on how academic journals should adapt to hot and difficult issues such as open access, digital publishing, artificial intelligence, all-media integration, and preprints. In recent years, the China Association for Science and Technology has issued project topics related to journal publishing think tanks, such as the 2024 “Think Tank Consultation for First-Class Journal Construction” and the 2022 and 2021 “Think Tank Research for World-Class Science and Technology Journal Construction,” all aimed at promoting research and think tank consulting services in the academic journal publishing field to provide scientific basis for formulating policies and measures related to science and technology journal construction. Research institutions engaged in academic journal publishing play an irreplaceable role in decision-making consultation by grasping the development direction and priorities of academic journals, guiding their sustainable and high-quality development, and promoting the construction of a publishing powerhouse.

However, no specialized research on think tanks in the academic journal publishing field currently exists domestically. Existing research on publishing think tanks mainly explains the concept based on the theory of new-type think tanks with Chinese characteristics, provides brief descriptions of typical publishing think tanks, and points out the necessity of building publishing think tanks and reflections on their future development. For example, Xu Jie et al. attempted to construct an indicator system for new-type publishing think tanks with Chinese characteristics; Fan Junheng pointed out the practical dilemmas and optimization paths of publishing think tank construction; Liang Yan et al. elaborated on the current status and construction pathways of publishing think tanks in China; Cui Jiabin analyzed the necessity of publishing think tank construction and

proposed future development trends; Zhang Zhiqiang et al. explained the core characteristics of new-type publishing think tanks with Chinese characteristics from four dimensions— “specialization, innovation, expertise, and intelligence” —and identified existing problems; Fan Jun et al. analyzed the connotation and functions of new-type publishing think tanks with Chinese characteristics and prospects for their construction. While these studies provide theoretical discussions on how representative publishing think tanks can better fulfill their functions, they do not present a panoramic view of the current development status of publishing think tanks nor comprehensively reflect the industry’ s cognition and practice regarding publishing think tank construction. This paper specifically studies academic journal publishing think tanks to fill the current research gap, align with national policy orientation, and reflect industry practice and cognition regarding academic journal publishing think tank construction through a substantial number of questionnaire surveys.

This study employs questionnaire surveys to conduct broad research among personnel in institutions engaged in academic journal publishing research, aiming to reveal and discuss the current development status and trends of publishing think tanks in the academic journal field, and propose strategies for enhancing their influence, thereby providing practical and actionable policy recommendations and references for industry development and related policy formulation.

## 2.1 Connotation of Academic Journal Publishing Think Tanks

Think tanks are research and consulting institutions that conduct strategic and public policy research oriented toward real-world problems to serve decision-making purposes. Their basic characteristics include: being based on academic research, possessing relative independence, and aiming to influence decision-making. As research and consulting institutions that pursue both academic excellence and policy participation, the main difference between think tanks and ordinary academic research is that think tanks serve decision-making as their purpose and starting point, focusing on policy influence, academic influence, social influence, and international influence, whereas academic research aims to pursue objective truth. Think tanks typically conduct planned forward-looking and reserve research, while academic research can be scattered, occasional, and unsystematic.

The “publishing think tanks” referred to in the current National Press and Publication Administration’s Publishing Think Tank High-Quality Construction Plan mean “excellent institutions engaged in publishing field research” that possess a solid foundation for building high-quality publishing think tanks. This definition captures the core capability of think tanks: academic research is the foundation of think tanks, and policy consultation without high-level academic research would be like a tree without roots or a castle in the air. Excellent institutions engaged in publishing field research possess the most important foundation for cultivating excellent think tanks and can therefore be called “publishing think tanks.”

In this paper, “academic journal publishing think tanks” refer to research and consulting institutions that provide professional opinions and suggestions for the development of China’s academic journal industry and offer theoretical support and decision-making basis for the sustainable development of academic journals. Academic journal publishing think tanks are important components of publishing think tanks and represent the concrete manifestation of new-type think tank construction with Chinese characteristics in the field of academic journal development research, possessing functions such as policy consultation, theoretical innovation, policy interpretation, management evaluation, and training and exchange.

It should be noted that “academic journal publishing think tanks” research the industry field of “publishing,” which differs from “think tank academic journals” and should be distinguished. Regarding the latter, many scholars in the industry have provided insightful analyses and reflections on the transformation and development of academic journals toward think tank media. For example, Yang Liuchun et al. studied the mechanism of science and technology journals as think tank communication; Cui Shanggong et al. elaborated on the pathways for academic journals to participate in think tank decision-making services; Chen Xingtong et al. explored the internal connections and expansion pathways between academic journals and think tank function construction. The research object of this paper is not what think tank functions academic journals have played, but rather how research institutions in the academic journal publishing field exert decision-support functions.

In addition to the Science and Technology Publishing Research Center of the National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences—a typical academic journal publishing think tank selected for the National Press and Publication Administration’s Publishing Think Tank High-Quality Construction Plan—many other institutions in academic journal associations, university departments, research institutes related to academic journals, enterprises related to academic journals, and journal editorial departments have continuously conducted research in the academic journal publishing field and played think tank roles in supporting decision-making. These institutions collectively constitute China’s extensive and diverse system of academic journal publishing think tanks.

## 2.2 Research Methods and Objects

To conduct a general survey of the overall level and capacity of institutions currently engaged in academic journal publishing research and understand the status quo and development trends of academic journal publishing think tanks in China, the “Research on the Planning and Roadmap of New-Type Academic Journal Publishing Think Tanks” project team conducted extensive research in the journal community through questionnaires supplemented by interviews. The survey targets included journal associations, university departments, research institutes related to journals, journal evaluation institutions, journal editorial departments, and enterprises related to journals. The

project team distributed questionnaires through an online survey platform (<https://www.wjx.cn/vm/QIdIaCM.aspx#>) in relevant WeChat groups for journal industry peers, including groups for journal associations, important journal conferences, and journal peer exchange groups, basically covering different types of institutions and journal practitioners from different regions in the journal industry, thus possessing relatively broad representativeness.

The questionnaire contained 26 questions, including single-choice, multiple-choice, and open-ended questions. The content covered: general institutional overview, research directions of academic journal publishing think tanks, forms of research output, output scale, funding and project sources, personnel situation, talent cultivation mechanisms, organizational structure, future development directions, development dilemmas, and benchmark think tank institutions.

The questionnaire survey received broad responses from academic journal associations, university departments, research institutes related to academic journals, enterprises related to academic journals, and journal editorial departments. The questionnaire was distributed on January 28, 2024, and after about half a month, no more responses were received. By February 9, 2024, a total of 175 valid questionnaires had been collected. The response rate for this survey also reflects, from one perspective, insufficient attention to the topic of academic journal publishing think tanks within the industry.

Among the respondents, approximately 60% reported having senior professional titles, and 47% reported being responsible persons in their institutions, who are relatively familiar with the overall structure and operation of publishing think tanks, indicating high credibility of the questionnaire. In terms of institutional types, journal editorial departments accounted for approximately 72.6% of respondents; the remaining were 9.7% from academic journal associations, 6.9% from university departments, 4.5% from research institutes related to academic journals, and 4.0% from enterprises related to academic journals.

The purpose of this survey was to understand, based on the overall investigation of institutions engaged in academic journal publishing research, whether these institutions possess the characteristics of academic journal publishing think tanks and whether they have actually carried out relevant research and consulting work and fulfilled think tank functions. Among the returned questionnaires, only about 23% of respondents indicated that their institutions had fulfilled academic journal-related think tank functions or conducted consulting projects related to academic journal development research, while 77% of institutions responded that they had not played a think tank role in journal research. This indicates the small number of institutions engaged in journal publishing research and that academic journal publishing think tanks in China are still in the initial stage of development.

Specifically, among university departments, 8% of respondents indicated that they had fulfilled academic journal-related think tank functions or conducted

consulting projects related to academic journal development research; approximately 20% of journal editorial departments responded that they had fulfilled think tank functions or conducted journal publishing research; the proportions for academic journal associations and research institutes related to academic journals were roughly similar, at 29% and 25% respectively; approximately 57% of respondents from enterprises related to academic journals reported that they had conducted think tank-related research. In terms of proportions, journal-related enterprises conducted relatively more think tank research, followed by associations and research institutes. The proportion of journal editorial departments engaged in think tank research was relatively small, mainly because most academic journal editorial departments are small in scale and their research is scattered and lacks systematicity, making it difficult to systematically conduct research in the academic journal publishing field and exert influence on industry and national decision-making. However, due to the large number of journal editorial departments, they constitute an important potential force for conducting journal publishing research in terms of quantity.

The following sections focus on the analysis and summary of questionnaires that responded “their institutions have fulfilled academic journal-related think tank functions and conducted consulting projects related to academic journal development research.”

### 3.1 Adoption of Research Outcomes

Overall, the think tank role in the academic journal publishing field needs improvement. Regarding the question “Since the establishment of your institution, what is the average annual number of policy suggestions related to academic journal publishing submitted to higher-level management departments?” 20% of the 40 institutions had never submitted policy suggestions, 67.5% submitted 1-5 suggestions annually, 7.5% submitted 6-10 suggestions annually, and 5% submitted 11 or more suggestions annually.

Regarding “Since the establishment of your institution, what is the average annual number of policy suggestions related to academic journal publishing development that have been instructed or adopted?” 32.5% of institutions had zero adopted suggestions, 50% had 1-3 items, and only a few institutions had more than four items instructed or adopted.

Notably, among the different institutions surveyed, enterprises related to journal publishing performed relatively prominently, with higher numbers of submitted policy suggestions and adoptions in journal publishing research. Among journal-related enterprises, 14% responded that their average annual number of instructed or adopted policy suggestions related to academic journal publishing development was more than seven items, while for journal editorial departments, university departments, research institutes related to academic journals, and academic journal associations, the average annual number of instructed or adopted suggestions was basically 0-3 items.

### 3.2 Personnel Composition

The effective functioning of publishing think tanks is positively correlated with the scale of personnel engaged in think tank research. In the feedback questionnaires, enterprises reported that the number of full-time personnel engaged in journal development research was basically 6-15 people, in sharp contrast to other types of institutions: responses from academic journal associations, research institutes related to journals, university departments, and journal editorial departments were basically 1-5 people. Considering that compared with full-time personnel, part-time personnel in institutions may have more industry experience and their policy suggestions may be more “grounded” and targeted and operable, we also investigated the number of part-time and externally hired personnel engaged in academic journal development research. This data was also not optimistic: 27.5% of institutions had “0” part-time or externally hired personnel for journal think tank research, and 57.5% had “1-10” such personnel. Overall, associations had more part-time personnel, which is related to their institutional nature. Talent is the most critical factor for think tank research, and insufficient personnel will limit think tank output.

Excellent think tanks first require excellent talent. Personnel in institutions engaged in journal publishing research generally have high educational levels and professional titles. The survey showed that in 42.5% of institutions, the proportion of personnel with graduate degrees was above 50%, with even higher proportions in university departments and research institutes related to academic journals. In 20% of institutions, the proportion of personnel with senior professional titles was above 50%. High educational levels and senior titles reflect a good talent foundation for current journal publishing research.

The survey revealed that among full-time personnel engaged in academic journal development research, 62.5% had backgrounds in editing and publishing, 55% in natural sciences, 17.5% in journalism and communication, 12.5% in library and information science, and 25% in other disciplines. This structure can form relatively good research teams and facilitate the conduct of decision-making consultation research.

### 3.3 Research Directions and Hot Topics

Survey results indicate that research in the journal publishing field has received considerable attention in the industry. When asked about their research fields in journal development, “academic journal publishing” was the most selected direction, accounting for 70%; “academic journal evaluation,” “digital distribution and communication,” and “journal brand promotion” accounted for 27.5%, 37.5%, and 37.5% respectively; the “other” option accounted for 10%. Among them, journal editorial departments mainly focused on academic journal publishing, while associations, research institutes related to academic journals, and enterprises related to academic journals engaged in relatively broader research fields, involving other research areas in addition to academic journal publishing.

Evidently, the vast number of academic journal practitioners not only manage journals but also pay attention to industry development policies and invest considerable energy in research in the journal publishing field.

When asked “What research fields or trends should academic journal development focus on in the future?” only some respondents provided answers to this open-ended question, mainly involving three aspects: (1) Challenges of the big data era to traditional media. There is widespread concern about digital communication, digital publishing, new media integration development, academic journal development in the context of artificial intelligence, construction of digital journal platforms, and the PubScholar public academic platform. (2) Construction of the journal academic ecosystem. This includes journal evaluation systems, review mechanisms for think tank articles, academic ethics, and legal and policy environments. (3) Business innovation in academic journals. This includes multidisciplinary integration development and internationalization of academic journals.

These responses basically reveal the current hot topics of concern in the academic journal publishing community.

#### 4.1 Ineffective Think Tank Function

The purpose of think tanks is to support and influence decision-making. Regarding the survey results on the forms of think tank research outcomes, 75% of institutions listed academic papers as the form of output for their think tank research on academic journals, while forms more characteristic of think tank output accounted for smaller proportions: internal reports (37.5%), monographs (20%), hosting think tank journals (12.5%), organizing forums and conference activities (52.5%), and others (10%). Strictly speaking, academic papers and other academic research outcomes usually need to be transformed into policy consultation materials before they can become think tank outcomes that support decision-making.

When asked about their institutions’ outstanding contributions or representative achievements in academic journal-related research and consulting, most returned questionnaires did not list specific examples. Only a few journal editorial departments and enterprises listed important published papers, project reports, reprints by important abstracts, or influential forums they had organized. However, these reflected more academic and social influence rather than policy influence, and the responses failed to demonstrate what specific decision-making influence the institutions had generated.

The ineffective functioning of publishing think tanks is also reflected in the singular source of research projects. According to questionnaire feedback, research institutions’ decision-making consultation activities mainly rely on top-down assigned projects. Among the main sources of consulting projects, “undertaking government-commissioned projects” and “applying for competitive projects” accounted for 37.5% and 32.5% respectively, totaling 70%. Inter-institutional

horizontal cooperation with enterprises and public institutions accounted for 15%, and other sources accounted for 10%. Without government commissions or successful applications for competitive projects, the think tank function is inevitably limited. Notably, approximately 40% of institutions also selected “self-established projects,” which represent valuable forces for future journal think tank research. Journal publishing think tanks should be encouraged to proactively conduct forward-looking and reserve research based on their research interests and expertise, transform these into think tank outcomes submitted to support decision-making, and gradually form and enhance their influence.

#### **4.2 Incomplete Talent Cultivation Mechanism**

First-class talent is the foundation for high-level think tanks to conduct research. Without cultivating and gathering a group of outstanding professionals, high-end think tank construction becomes a tree without roots. Although the proportions of graduate students and senior professionals engaged in journal research are relatively high, the mechanism for cultivating journal publishing research talent has not been well established. The survey found that the vast majority of institutions have not established graduate courses or postdoctoral stations related to journal development research, and even the proportion of positive responses from universities and research institutes was very low. This indicates, to some extent, that the current sustainable development capacity of journal think tank research forces is insufficient.

Think tank research is closely related to decision-making, so think tanks need to pay special attention to establishing smooth connections with relevant decision-making departments. However, according to questionnaire responses, only 25% of institutions have ever sent personnel to work in government departments, while most institutions engaged in journal publishing research have not proactively established talent exchange mechanisms between think tanks and the government, which is not conducive to providing targeted and practical policy recommendations and solutions.

#### **4.3 Lack of Resource Sharing and Collaboration**

The problems faced by think tanks are usually comprehensive and complex, requiring complementary advantages and collaborative cooperation among research institutions with different research directions and levels. Although China’s journal publishing think tank construction has begun to take shape, current publishing think tanks are basically in a relatively dispersed development state. Survey results show that project tasks undertaken by publishing think tanks are mostly completed independently by individual institutions, operating in isolation without synergy effects, which is not conducive to forming major and key achievements for the industry.

When asked “What are the difficulties faced by research and consulting work related to academic journal development, and how can they be overcome?” re-

spondents generally mentioned not only the lack of specialized talent and insufficient technological updates but also particularly pointed out issues such as administrative barriers. How to improve resource sharing capabilities among different think tanks, break through inter-departmental restrictions, and promote cooperation among different professional fields through innovative research techniques are current challenges and problems that need to be solved in think tank research.

## 5 Influence Enhancement Strategies

Currently, there is a serious mismatch between national policy consultation needs and the development level of journal publishing think tanks. Therefore, this paper attempts to propose strategies for enhancing the influence of journal publishing think tanks.

### 5.1 Strengthen Guidance for the Journal Think Tank Industry

Academic journal publishing think tanks, oriented toward policy needs and addressing key issues in academic journal development from a national perspective, play an irreplaceable role in building a publishing powerhouse. Compared with ordinary research institutions, academic journal publishing think tanks have higher thresholds in terms of operation models, research capacity, and level.

The development of the journal publishing think tank industry should receive more guidance, with professional think tank theories guiding the specialized development of academic journal think tanks, improving their theoretical and disciplinary levels, and enriching their theoretical research systems. It is recommended that journals in editing and publishing disciplines organize special issues to attract broader industry attention. In addition to national think tank selection programs, third parties could also be mobilized to organize selection of journal think tank institutions to promote sustainable and high-quality development of the publishing industry.

### 5.2 Clarify Strategic Positioning and Establish Benchmark Institutions

Incorporating think tank functions explicitly into institutional development goals and strategies is the first step for journal think tanks to establish clear development directions. Currently, among institutions engaged in journal publishing research, some treat research and consulting in the journal publishing field as part of their business, while others only engage in it occasionally. Almost none of these institutions explicitly describe their engagement in journal publishing research and consulting or their fulfillment of journal think tank functions in their development vision or positioning statements.

When asked “What domestic or foreign journal development research and consulting institutions does your institution benchmark against?” only a few respon-

dents listed their benchmark institutions as the China Periodicals Association, international renowned publishing groups, and other well-known domestic and foreign journal associations and publishers. This indicates that most institutions currently engaged in journal publishing research have not clarified their target positioning as publishing think tanks and lack awareness of analyzing their own strengths and weaknesses and finding benchmarks to promote institutional development, which should be the primary consideration for guiding and motivating the long-term sustainable development of think tanks.

### **5.3 Emphasize Achievement Transformation and Diversify Funding Sources**

To fully exert think tank functions, research institutions in the journal publishing field need to expand the scale of think tank practitioners, proactively conduct forward-looking reserve research, improve the transformation rate of achievements, and effectively support journal development decision-making.

Survey results on main funding sources showed that for university departments, research institutes related to academic journals, and journal editorial departments engaged in journal publishing research, funding basically relies on fiscal appropriations, institutional budgets, and sponsor support. Singular funding sources are not conducive to expanding research and consulting business and affect the independence of think tank research.

### **5.4 Cultivate Think Tank Research Literacy Among Journal Practitioners**

Journal practitioners are the main force engaged in journal publishing research. Currently, China's academic journal practitioners are large in number, have high educational levels, and possess a good theoretical innovation foundation required for think tank research. At the same time, journal practitioners have long been engaged in frontline journal editing, publishing, and communication work, making them more sensitive to development trends and existing problems in the journal publishing field, thus having a practical foundation for conducting journal publishing think tank research.

However, the thinking and methods of think tank research differ significantly from academic research. Academic journal practitioners should focus on developing think tank research awareness, thinking from the perspective of decision-makers, and transforming academic research outcomes into think tank outcomes that can influence decision-making and the industry. Relevant journal management departments should not limit their training systems to topics such as improving journal impact factors and sharing editorial experience but could supplement them with training on think tank research theories and methods, lectures on journal development policy research, and provide exchange platforms for peer-to-peer intellectual 碰撞.

### 5.5 Utilize Intelligent Journal Data Platform Tools

In the context of rapid big data and artificial intelligence development, academic journals can conduct think tank research and provide high-quality research outcomes by introducing artificial intelligence technology and enhancing data mining and analysis capabilities. By building intelligent digital journal platforms, industry information exchange platforms can be effectively established to achieve data connectivity in the journal publishing industry, including data linkage among journal publishing think tanks, between think tanks and the government, and between think tanks and enterprises, breaking down current development barriers where publishing think tanks operate in isolation, promoting full resource utilization, achieving win-win cooperation, and constructing a new development model for journal publishing think tanks.

### 5.6 Strengthen Cooperation Among Different Publishing Think Tanks

First, establish policy dialogue and information sharing mechanisms. Journal industry development policies often have far-reaching impacts. Different journal think tanks have different research directions, fields, positioning, development goals, and operation models, with each institution having its unique advantages. Collaborative research among publishing think tanks facilitates multi-dimensional and multi-faceted thinking on policy issues, and accommodating various opinions and voices during policy formulation helps make policies more scientific and targeted.

Second, jointly conduct research and publish research outcomes. By jointly applying for funded projects and cooperatively publishing journals, monographs, and reports, publishing think tanks can complement each other's advantages to expand the influence of research outcomes. For example, the Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP) and the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) are internationally renowned academic publishing associations that jointly founded the peer-reviewed journal *Learned Publishing*, mainly covering the academic publishing field. Through cooperation and resource complementarity, the two associations have promoted the development of the academic publishing industry and enhanced their respective influence.

Third, establish long-term cooperation mechanisms. Long-term stable cooperative relationships can be established through signing strategic cooperation agreements and forming research alliances. For example, the joint establishment of the "Phoenix-Nanjing University" Key Laboratory of Publishing Integration Development of the State Administration of Press, Publication, Radio, Film and Television by Phoenix Publishing & Media Group and Nanjing University is a typical case of cooperation between different types of publishing think tanks. The two parties formed a shared vision of "building the laboratory into a first-class innovative research institution in the domestic publishing field with strong international influence," promoting the sharing of professional knowledge among think tanks, enhancing the depth and breadth of think tank research, and im-

proving research efficiency through collaboration.

This paper conducts pioneering research on academic journal publishing think tanks, enriching the theoretical research on academic journals. It preliminarily analyzes the current development status and existing problems of academic journal publishing think tanks, and proposes strategies for enhancing their influence in China, aiming to provide references for industry development. Overall, China's academic journal publishing think tanks have great development potential and broad prospects.

This study still has limitations. For example, in the questionnaire design regarding analysis dimensions of academic journals, it failed to distinguish and reflect the characteristics and differences in research content between science and technology journal think tanks and social science journal think tanks in the field of journal publishing. The survey questionnaire did not collect more detailed information such as respondents' institutional names, which may have resulted in multiple respondents from the same institution. The limited number of questionnaires distributed and collected also means the research data may not be comprehensive or accurate enough. Future research needs to combine more field investigations and interviews to verify the theories related to academic journal publishing think tanks proposed in this paper and further enhance the practicality and relevance of the research results.

## References

- [1] General Office of the CPC Central Committee and the State Council. *Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of New-Type Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics* [EB/OL]. [2024-02-27]. [https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2015-01/20/content\\_{2807126}](https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2015-01/20/content_{2807126}.).
- [2] *14th Five-Year Plan for the Publishing Industry* [J]. *China Publishing Journal*, 2022(3): 8-20.
- [3] National Press and Publication Administration. *Notice on Announcing the 2022 Selected Institutions for the Publishing Think Tank High-Quality Construction Plan* [EB/OL]. [2024-03-07]. [https://www.nppa.gov.cn/xxfb/tzgs/202206/t20220610\\_{666338}.html](https://www.nppa.gov.cn/xxfb/tzgs/202206/t20220610_{666338}.html).
- [4] Xu Jie, Liu Mengqi. Construction of an Evaluation Index System for New-Type Publishing Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics [J]. *Chinese Editors*, 2023(8): 22-28.
- [5] Fan Junheng. Practical Dilemmas and Optimization Paths of Publishing Think Tank Construction [J]. *Chinese Editors*, 2023(8): 34-38.
- [6] Liang Yan, Li Jing. Research on the Current Status and Development of New-Type Publishing Think Tank Construction in China [J]. *Chinese Editors*, 2023(8): 29-33.
- [7] Cui Jiabin. The Necessity, Complexity, and Foresight of Publishing Think Tank Construction in China [J]. *Publishing Wide Angle*, 2021(16): 34-36.

- [8] Zhang Zhiqiang, Yin Zhaokai. Construction of New-Type Publishing Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics: Experience Coordinates and Core Essentials [J]. *Modern Publishing*, 2020(1): 41-46+84.
- [9] Fan Jun, Ouyang Min. On the Connotation, Function, and Prospects of New-Type Publishing Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics [J]. *Modern Publishing*, 2018(4): 5-9.
- [10] National Press and Publication Administration. *Notice on Implementing the 2024 Publishing Think Tank High-Quality Construction Plan* [EB/OL]. [2024-03-26]. [https://www.nppa.gov.cn/xxfb/tzgs/202402/t20240221\\_{833019}.html](https://www.nppa.gov.cn/xxfb/tzgs/202402/t20240221_{833019}.html).
- [11] Yang Liuchun, Wen Yanjie. The Mechanism of Science and Technology Journals as the Core of Think Tank Communication [J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2020, 31(10): 1238-1243.
- [12] Cui Shangong, Li Xue, Wang Shaopeng, et al. Feasible Pathways for Academic Journals to Participate in Think Tank Decision-Making Service Function Construction—Taking Oceanography Journals as an Example [J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2022, 33(8): 1013-1018.
- [13] Chen Xingtong. Innovative Pathways for Expanding the Think Tank Functions of English Academic Journals—Taking the Practical Strategies of *Financial Innovation* as an Example [J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2023, 34(11): 1543-1547.
- [14] Lyu Qing. Leading the Building of a National Team for Policy Analysis with Theoretical Innovation: The Experience of the Center for Forecasting Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, in Building a National High-End Think Tank—An Exclusive Interview with Director Wang Shouyang [J]. *Think Tank: Theory & Practice*, 2023, 8(1).

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

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