

Evaluation of three sports think tanks in Guizhou Province of China

Sun Zhubing^{1,2}

Abstract: *This study adopts the research method of descriptive narrative to evaluate three representative sports think tanks in Guizhou province, aiming to establish a strategic enhancement plan to improve the influence of think tanks. A sample of 69 staff members from three sports think tanks was used to evaluate the results through quantitative analysis. The study found that: The three sports think tanks have certain competitiveness in social influence and government influence, while academic influence, external cooperation and exchange, organization of think tanks have poor performance; Methods to enhance the competitiveness of sports think tank include :Improve the application of achievements and increase the academic influence of think tanks , Strengthen the building of talented personnel, Expand foreign exchanges and cooperation, Optimize organizational structure and improve system management. The ultimate purpose of the study is to provide useful theoretical reference for the development of Sports think tanks in China*

Key words: Think tank; Competitiveness; influence; evaluation.

1.Introduction

A think-tank refers to the various disciplines, decision makers to deal with economic, political, social, military, diplomatic and other fields to provide ideas, theories, methods and strategies of scientific consultancy, and sports think-tank, is a specialized service for sports public policy and public decision-making, to carry out sports public policy and public decision-making research and consulting organization or institution.[1]But at present, the research on the evaluation of university sports think tank has not been fully carried out, which will greatly affect the competitiveness of sports think tank and weaken the ability of sports think tank to serve the society and the government. As an important part of China's think tank system, university sports think tank plays an important role in the construction of new think tank with Chinese characteristics. Scientific and fair evaluation of university think tanks, which have 60% of the research manpower and resources of philosophy and social sciences in China, can explore the industry orientation of the development of university sports think tanks through the construction of the index system, optimize the allocation of resources of university sports think tanks in China, and promote healthy competition and overall improvement of sports think tanks.[2-3]

Based on the above reasons, this paper takes the university sports think tank in Guizhou province as the research object, and resorts its development orientation, academic mission, organization mode and research methods, so as to enhance the competitiveness of university sports think tank and promote it to better serve the government and society.

2.Research Design

2.1 Research Locale and Research Participants

¹ Adamson University, Philippines. ² Guizhou .University of Engineering Science,China. 2021 Guizhou Province Joint project of theoretical innovation Topic "Research on the Inheritance and Innovation of Bijie Minority Sports Culture assisted by University Sports Think Tank", Project number: GZLCLH-2021-84. Corresponding Author Email: 591284781@gmail.com

The study, the three samples involved in the interview and questionnaire survey are: Guizhou Northwest Nationality Traditional Sports Institute of Guizhou university of Engineering Science, Sports and Physical Health Research Centre of Guizhou Normal University, and High-level Sports Management Centre of Guizhou University.

2.2 Sampling Technique

The method of sample extraction is closely related to the regional distribution of the current university think tank. In order to comprehensively evaluate the competitiveness of sports think tanks in Guizhou Province. The study shall involve 69 respondents who will be randomly selected. Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents based on the total population which was determined using Slovin's formula.

Table1 Distribution of Respondents

Think tank name	Attached to the university	The total population	Sample size
Think 1:Guizhou Northwest Nationality Traditional Sports Institute	Guizhou University of Engineering Science	22	20
Think 2:Sports and Physical Health Research Centre	Guizhou Normal University	25	24
Think 3:High-level Sports Management Centre	Guizhou University	26	25

2.3 Research Instrument

In order to evaluate the three sports think tanks, the questionnaire on evaluation Index System of University Think Tanks independently developed by Dr.GuoRui (2020) [4]will be used in this study.

Under the guidance of governance theory and the fourth generation of evaluation theory, based on public management, combined with pedagogy evaluation theory and questionnaire survey, the author constructs the index evaluation system of think tank by combining demonstration and theory.The questionnaire included 39 quantitative index sets, which were measured by likert scale 1-5 to determine the importance, and 16 qualitative index sets were determined by questionnaire survey.

Through verification, Cronbach's salpha value of each part of the scale 0.776 <a< 0.955 has high reliability, and there is strong consistency among variables of each dimension. Correlation test was carried out on 39 variables, except that correlation coefficient between individual variables was less than 0.3, and correlation coefficient between multiple variables Greater than 0.6 and the Sig value is basically 0.000.It indicates that there is a significant correlation between variables and it is necessary to conduct factor analysis. In addition to five first-level indicators, factor analysis was performed on 34 indicators. According to the results, KM0 of the scale is 0.848, approximate Chi-square is 2285.054, and DF value is 561, indicating that the internal structure dimension of the scale is good. "Sig of Bartlett sphere city test statistic is < 0.01, which negates the null hypothesis that correlation matrix is the identity matrix,

and it can be considered that there is significant correlation between variables". The results indicate that the questionnaire has high reliability and is suitable for evaluating the competitiveness of sports think tanks in this study.[5-7]

3.Results of the evaluation

3.1Academic influence

Table 2Evaluation of academic influence of think tanks

Academic influence	Mean	Quantitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
A1 Number of publications	2.58	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
A2 Number of research Reports released	2.50	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	3
A3 Number of monograph	2.39	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	5
A4 Number and level of publications	2.56	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	2
A5 Number of projects undertaken	2.49	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	4
Composite Mean	2.50	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance;1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

Table 2 shows the self-evaluation results of the respondents of three think tanks on “social influence.”It shows "poor performance " in four secondary indicators of the think tank's academic influence: number of publications, number of research reports released, number of monograph and number of projects undertakenwith the mean values of 2.58, 2.50, 2.39,2,56 and 2.49 respectively. But the mean of indicator A1and A4 is as high as 2.58 and 2.56, shows “good performance”. This means that three think tanksisstrong competitive in this indicator.A compositemean value of 2.50 reveals that the evaluation results of academic influence means low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness.

The mean ranking also reveals the construction orientation of domestic sports think tanks. Zhang Sheng (2021) believes that the most important indicator to measure the effectiveness of think tanks is the quantity and quality of their publications. In this study, the number and level of publications rank first and second (A1, A4), while the mean value of other indicators is low, which is consistent with the assessment standards of domestic sports think tanks. At present, the assessment of many domestic sports think tanks takes the number of papers as the most important indicator. For example, the Research Center of Journalism and Social Development of Renmin University of China is characterized by high output, high citation volume and

many cited papers, and has obvious advantages in academic influence.(Zhang Li, Liang Nannan, 2021).

3.2 Social influence

Table 3 Evaluation of social influence of think tanks

Social influence	Mean	Quantitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
B1.1 Think tank website browsing and searching volume	2.47	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	6
B1.2 Number of think tank products released in society	2.71	Good Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	2
B1.3 Report and Reprint of think tank products by media and periodicals	2.41	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	7
B1.4 Comments cited by think tank experts on blogs	2.59	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	4
B1.5 Participation of think tanks or members in media talk shows	2.52	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	5
B2 Number of talents sent by think tanks to Enterprises and Institutions	2.81	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
B3 think tank product application practice conversion rate	2.62	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	3
Composite Mean	2.59	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance;;1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

The social influence of think tank is an important embodiment of its competitiveness. (Guo Lin,2020).Table3 presents evaluation result of social influence of three think tanks, it shows that among these evaluation indicators of social influence, B1.2,B1.4, B1.5,B2 and B3 have “good performance” due to the mean value of 2.71, 2.58, 2.52, 2.81and 2.62 respectively. B1.1and B1.3 have “poor performance” due to the mean value of 2.47and 2.41.According to the composite mean value of 2.59, it can be judged that the social influence of the three think tanks is highly recognized by respondents due to its high competitiveness.

Among all indicators, the highest mean value is Number of talents sent by think tanks to Enterprises and Institutions (2.81), indicating that the aim of Guizhou sports think tanks to cultivate talents to the society is highly recognized. Chen Xiangjian (2015) believes that talent in think tanks is the basis for the construction of local think tanks. The lowest mean value was Report and Reprint of Think Tank products by media and Chinese (2.41), which indicated that Guizhou sports think tanks did not value the propaganda power of the media, which greatly weakened the influence of think tanks.

3.3 Government influence

Table 4 presents the evaluation result of government influence in the three think tanks. As the table shows, all indicators of government influence performed well. These indicators include C1 (Level/number of times a report or policy product is approved by the leader), C2(report or policy product received government internal briefing), C3 (Level/number of symposiums and consulting meetings attended by government departments), C4 (Organize or participate in the research, drafting and evaluation of national and provincial development plans) , C5 (Proportion of employees in government departments) and C6 (Number of Government trained personnel). The composite mean is 2.81, which means that government influence of the three think tanks in Guizhou gets high degree of recognition.

This research is different from our understanding of the government influence of think tanks, because the government influence of think tanks has been very weak. However, the government influence of sports think tank in Guizhou province shows its strong competitiveness.[8]

The reasons are as follows: First, as a big tourism province, Guizhou established the country's first professional think tank on sports and tourism: Guizhou Sports Tourism Research Institute in 2019. This has greatly enhanced the government influence of Guizhou sports think tank.(Guizhou daily,2019). Second, the first National Sports Culture Think Tank Forum was held in Guizhou in 2020, which further enhanced the positive image of Guizhou think tanks. (Wang Xuefeng,2020).

Table 4 Evaluation of government influence of think tanks

Government influence	Mean	Quantitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
C1 Level/number of times a report or policy product is approved by the leader	2.77	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	4
C2 report or policy product received government internal briefing	2.89	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
C3 Level/number of symposiums and consulting meetings attended by government departments	2.81	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	3
C4 Organize or participate in the research, drafting and	2.88	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong	2

evaluation of national and provincial development plans			competitiveness	
C5 Proportion of employees in government departments	2.75	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	6
C6 Number of Government trained personnel	2.76	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	5
Composite Mean	2.81	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance; 1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

3.4 External cooperation and exchange of think tanks

Table 5 presents the evaluation result of external cooperation and exchange of three think tanks. As the table shows, indicators of poor performance identified by the respondents included D1, D2, D4 and D6 with the mean values of 2.36, 2.43, 2.26 and 2.36 respectively. Indicators of good performance identified by the respondents included D3, D5 with the mean values of 2.61, 2.53 respectively. According to composite mean of 2.43 in the three think tanks, we can judge that the three think tanks own weak competitiveness in external cooperation and exchange. From the order of the mean value, it is D3, D5, D2, D1, D6 and D4. Disciplinary coordination platform between university think tanks gets worst performance. This reflects the serious lack of cooperation between university think tanks and the lack of resource sharing, which seriously affects the competitiveness of think tanks. According to You Chuanbao (2020), there is no lack of scientific research resources in the discipline of physical education in universities, due to different research paradigms and research habits, the disciplines are in a serious state of isolation, and the integration between disciplines is not ideal, which is exactly the challenge and difficulty faced by the development of think tanks.[9]

External cooperation and exchange of education adhere to the principles of independence, equality and mutual benefit. Research institutions in larger cities have more frequent external exchanges, while those in smaller cities have less external exchanges. (Zhang Fang, 2020) The findings support this conclusion. The three think tanks are located in the southwest of China, far away from the country's political, economic and cultural centers. The geographical location is relatively remote, which results in poor performance in external cooperation and exchange. However, Liu Lei (2022) believes that the communication and cooperation between think tanks should not reduce the frequency of cooperation because of geographical distance, which is positive and effective cooperation.

Table 5 Evaluation of external cooperation and exchange of think tanks

External cooperation and	Mean	Quantitative	Interpretation	Rank
--------------------------	------	--------------	----------------	------

exchange		Description		
D1 Number and level of academic exchanges	2.36	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	4
D2 Number and level of academic conferences	2.43	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	3
D3 Cooperation platform between university think tanks	2.61	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
D4 Disciplinary coordination platform between university think tanks	2.26	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	6
D5.Project collaboration between DS university think tanks	2.53	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	2
D6 Cooperation platform between university think tanks	2.36	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	4
Composite Mean	2.43	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance;;1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

3.5 Organization of think tanks

Table 6 presents the evaluation result of organization of three sports think tanks. As shown in the table, indicators of poor performance identified by the respondents included E1, E2, E3.2, E4 and E5.1 with the mean values of 2.38, 2.27, 2.49, 2.25 and 2.46 respectively. However, indicators of good performance identified by the respondents included E3.1, E5.2 with the mean values of 2.52 and 2.52 respectively. Composition mean value is 2.45, which reflects the weak competitiveness of the organizational evaluation of the three think tanks. This point is consistent with the research results of Liu Hai. She believes think tank construction in the western China should learn advanced organizational structure and operation mode from developed coastal areas of China (Liu hai,2021).Wang Yishan(2021) also expressed the same view that the organization, management and operation mode of think tanks in western universities should be similar to those in developed areas in China.

Table 6 Evaluation of organization of think tanks

External cooperation and exchange	Mean	Quantitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
E1 Personnel or proportion of core	2.38	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	5

experts				
E2 Funding channels or proportion of research funds to government	2.28	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	6
E3.1 Think tank information collection and sharing channels	2.52	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	2
E3.2 Think tank database construction	2.49	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	3
E4 think tank survey and research platform	2.25	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	7
E5.1 Think tank Operation management	2.46	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	4
E5.2. Management guarantee of think tanks	2.68	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
Composite Mean	2.45	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance;;1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

Table 7 presents summary of evaluation of three think tanks, the three sports think tanks differ from each other due to their different geographical location, personnel composition and operation mode, so the respondents have different evaluations on sports think tanks, which reflect the current operation status of sports think tanks in Guizhou Province. By evaluating the mean value, it can be seen that the performance level of sports think tanks in Guizhou province is Government influence, Social influence, Academic influence, Organization of think tanks, External cooperation and exchange of think tanks in order.

Table 7 shows that the three sports think tanks have good performance in social influence and government influence due to mean of 2.59 and 2.81.while academic influence, external cooperation and exchange, organization of think tanks have poor performance due to mean of 2.50 ,2.43 and 2.45 respectively. The over-all mean of 2.56 reveals that the overall competitiveness of sports think tanks in Guizhou is strong, but there is still a lot of room for improvement in academic influence, external cooperation and exchange, and organizational management, which is also the significance and value of this paper. This research result is basically consistent with the research of Sun Yongqi(2019). and Li Mengyuan (2019). They all believe that Guizhou province is located in the southwest of China, and think tank organizations lack clear objectives and specific functional attributes. Long-term self-isolation leads

to the lack of academic communication, and these problems are bottlenecks for the development of think tanks in the west.[10]

Table 7 Summary of Evaluation of Sports Think Tanks

	Mean	Quantitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
Academic influence	2.50	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	3
Social influence	2.59	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	2
Government influence	2.81	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	1
External cooperation and exchange of think tanks	2.43	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	5
Organization of think tanks	2.45	Poor Performance	Low level of recognition, or weak competitiveness	4
Over- all Mean	2.56	Good Performance	High degree of recognition, or strong competitiveness	

Legend: 3.51 -5.00 Excellent Performance; 2.51 -3.50 Good Performance;;1.51-2.50 Poor Performance; 1.00-1.50 Extremely Poor Performance.

4.Conclusion

Based on the findings presented in the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1.This study investigated 69 samples, including 50 male and 19 female There are 13 professors, 29 associate professors and 27 lecturers &below in term of position. In term of education level, the total number of doctor is 17,the number of master is 32,the number of bachelor is 20.In term of length of service,23 of the respondents are 10 years &below, 19 of the respondents are 11-20 years, 17 of the respondents are 21-30 years, 10 of the respondents are 31 years & above.

2.According to the evaluation results of sports think tanks in Guizhou Province, the three sports think tanks have good performance in social influence and government influence. while academic influence, external cooperation and exchange, organization of think tanks have poor performance. The over-all mean of 2.56 reveals that the overall competitiveness of sports think tanks in Guizhou is strong, but there is still a lot of room for improvement in academic influence, external cooperation and exchange, and organizational management.

3.According to the results of face-to-face interviews with think tank personnel, the challenges and difficulties faced by sports think tanks in Guizhou province are basically consistent with the problems reflected in the questionnaire statistics, that is, academic influence, organizational management and external communication need to be improved.

4.Methods to enhance the competitiveness of Guizhou sports think tank include :Improve the application of achievements and increase the academic influence

of think tanks , Strengthen the building of talented personnel, Expand foreign exchanges and cooperation, Optimize organizational structure and improve system management.

5.Recommendations

Based on the conclusions generated in the study, the following recommendations are given:

1. There are some problems in sports think tank staff of Guizhou province, such as the imbalance between male and female, the number of people with high professional title and high education is too small. It is supposed to increase the proportion of female think tank staff and personnel with high education.

2. It's supposed to focus on their academic influence, organizational management and external exchanges to enhance the influence of sports think tanks in Guizhou Province.

3. It is suggested to form an alliance between sports think tanks to jointly face and solve the challenges and difficulties encountered by think tanks.

REFERENCES

1. Gao Xiang.(2016).*Construction of new think tank and research of philosophy and social Science*.Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.
2. James G. McGann.(2018).*American think tank and policy recommendations*.(Xiao Hongyu& Li Nan, Trans.).Beijing:Peking University Press.
3. Kulaiti.(2021).Research on the construction of sports think tank. *Stationery and technology*, (6):28-30.
4. Guo Rui.(2020). *Evaluation of Chinese University think tank*. Central China Normal University press.
5. Liu Wen-fang(2021) A Review of the Development of Professional Sports and sports Industry in China from the Disbandment of Sunning Football Club -- A summary of the academic workshop of "Sports Think Tank serving the Development of Jiangsu Sports" published by "Sport and Science". *Sports and Science*,42(6):111-117.
6. Wang Xuebin.et al.(2020).International Experience in Construction of Sports Think Tanks and China's Road..*Journal of Wuhan Institute of Physical Education*.54(1):47-53.
7. Wu Yao,&ZhengJiakun.(2017).Research on development status, trend and countermeasures of sports think tank in China .*Shandong sports science and technology*, 39 (5) : 5-10.
8. Yang Hua.(2015).Concept system of modernization of sports governance system and governance capacity in China..*Journal of Beijing Sport University*, 38(8) :
9. Liu Lei.(2022).Think tank exchanges should break down geographical barriers, *Journal of Wuhan Sport University*.56 (1) :3-9.
10. Dai Fangmei et al.(2016).Research on the types of sports think tank..*Hubei Sports Science and Technology*.35(2) : 95—97.