

---

AI translation · View original & related papers at  
[chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202304.00861](https://chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202304.00861)

---

## Postprint: Reflections on Cultural Elements in the Discipline Construction of Library, Information and Archive Science in the New Era

**Authors:** Li Yuhai, Li Jiahui, Gong Lihua

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

### Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Discipline culture construction constitutes an essential component of library and information science (LIS) discipline construction, and the distillation of discipline cultural elements can provide direction and guidance for LIS discipline culture construction.

[Method/Process] By thoroughly analyzing the connotation of discipline culture, integrating the main contents of discipline cultural substrate and discipline cultural morphology, this study analyzes and extracts the cultural elements of LIS discipline, and subsequently derives reflections on discipline construction focused on these cultural elements.

[Results/Conclusion] The cultural construction of LIS discipline is a systematic and complex undertaking. On one hand, it is necessary to fully leverage the important roles of multiple stakeholders—including the Ministry of Education, universities, colleges, and eminent scholars—in discipline culture construction; on the other hand, it also requires attention to the LIS discipline itself, balancing the preservation of tradition and innovation in discipline culture.

### Full Text

### Editorial Preface

2021 marks the 65th anniversary of *Library and Information Service* and represents a pivotal year for the construction of the library, information, and archives (LIS) discipline. In this new era, LIS discipline construction must address theoretical and academic questions arising from practical innovation needs, while practice fronts must simultaneously tackle new challenges and develop new capabilities. Both dimensions require enhanced interaction and communication

to achieve resonant, coordinated development. To commemorate its 65th anniversary, *Library and Information Service* convened a high-level forum and young scholars' symposium on "Discipline Construction and Practical Innovation in LIS" in Yanji, Jilin Province, from June 24–27, 2021. The journal's editorial board members, academic and industry experts, and over 200 participants engaged in substantive exchanges on themes of discipline construction and practical innovation. This special issue collection reflects selected expert presentations and outcomes from these discussions.

Li Yuhai and colleagues examine disciplinary culture construction, proposing that it constitutes a vital component of LIS discipline building. Ke Ping explores the interactive integration between LIS discipline construction and industry practice under the new liberal arts initiative, suggesting that new liberal arts development requires both self-reform within LIS and active support from related industries. Shao Bo and co-authors propose a regional alliance platform for university libraries based on resource circulation, creating a "reader-library-publisher" alliance structure. Wei Lai analyzes LIS discipline development in normal universities from perspectives of professional accreditation, program development, and professional recognition, offering specific recommendations. Liu Wanguo and colleagues synthesize characteristics of professional master's education in LIS, proposing joint training base development and improved industry collaboration mechanisms. Huang Guobin and co-authors investigate registered research reports as a new scholarly communication medium in open science environments. Liu Yuenan and colleagues, aiming to enhance national governance capacity for scientific information resources, analyze coordination issues between scientific data and research archives management based on extensive domestic and international surveys, proposing advancement strategies. Pan Yanan reflects on development frameworks for scientific archives work under new conditions, drawing from theoretical research and practical exploration at the Chinese Academy of Sciences to provide references for institutional digital transformation. We hope these expert contributions will inform innovative development in LIS discipline construction and practice, and inspire integrated development of theory and practice.

---

## Reflections on Cultural Elements in the Discipline Construction of Library, Information and Archives Management in the New Era

Li Yuhai, Li Jiahui, Gong Lihua

School of Information Management, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079

## Abstract

**[Purpose/Significance]** Disciplinary culture construction constitutes an important component of LIS discipline building. Condensing the elements of disciplinary culture provides direction and guidance for LIS disciplinary culture construction. **[Method/Process]** Through in-depth analysis of disciplinary culture connotation, combined with the main contents of disciplinary culture matrix and forms, this paper analyzes and refines the general elements of LIS disciplinary culture, and on this basis, elicits discipline construction thinking focused on cultural elements. **[Result/Conclusion]** The disciplinary culture construction of LIS is a systematic and complex project. On the one hand, it is necessary to give full play to the important roles of multiple subjects including the Ministry of Education, universities, colleges, and academic masters in disciplinary culture construction. On the other hand, it is also necessary to pay attention to the discipline itself, balancing the integrity and innovation of disciplinary culture.

**Keywords:** Library, Information and Archives Management; Discipline Construction; Discipline Culture

---

## 1. Introduction

In his report at the 19th National Congress, General Secretary Xi Jinping emphasized: “Culture is the soul of a country and a nation. When culture thrives, the nation’s fortune thrives; when culture is strong, the nation is strong. Without a high degree of cultural confidence and without cultural prosperity, there can be no great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation” [1]. As an essential component of China’s “five-in-one” overall layout, cultural construction has always occupied a prominent position in socialist development. In March 2021, the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, and National Development and Reform Commission jointly issued the “Evaluation Measures for the Effectiveness of ‘Double First-Class’ Construction (Trial),” explicitly including cultural inheritance and innovation as a key element in the overall evaluation of university construction [2]. This demonstrates that disciplinary culture construction in the new era is an inevitable requirement for building “Double First-Class” disciplines, a concrete manifestation of developing socialist cultural confidence, and a genuine demand for building a strong socialist cultural nation.

In November 2020, the Ministry of Education’s Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center published the “Work Plan for the Fifth Round of Discipline Evaluation” (hereinafter “the Plan”). The Plan examines certain aspects of disciplinary culture construction effectiveness, such as including “the effectiveness of teacher ethics and style construction” as a third-level indicator in faculty and resource evaluation, reflecting the Ministry’s emphasis on disciplinary culture. However, regarding overall disciplinary culture construction, the evaluation indicator system framework lacks cultural assessment indicators

[3]. This suggests that, on one hand, culture as an intangible spiritual force is difficult to measure with specific values; but on the other hand, it indicates that China's disciplinary culture construction is still in its infancy, with no strong "cultural levers" yet formed, making it urgent for disciplinary experts and scholars to fully exercise cultural consciousness and actively shoulder the responsibility and mission of disciplinary culture construction.

Currently, Chinese scholars pay limited attention to disciplinary culture elements. Searching the CNKI academic database reveals that since the proposal of "first-class discipline construction," research on discipline construction has increased annually, but most studies focus on organizational frameworks, resource input, and performance evaluation—external aspects—while paying insufficient attention to the spiritual core of discipline development, namely cultural elements [4]. Discussions on disciplinary culture construction in specific fields are also limited, scattered only across relatively mature disciplines such as English [5], mathematics [6], and physical education [7]. Although LIS scholars have interpreted the discipline's culture, their content mainly addresses specific sub-disciplines. For example, Liu Weigui elaborated on the connotation and characteristics of archival discipline culture from a historical perspective [8]; Fan Zhenjia analyzed the disciplinary mission and scholarship of library science by examining its logical architecture [9]. Overall, research revealing the cultural characteristics of LIS as an integrated discipline remains relatively scarce.

After decades of "natural" cultural accumulation, LIS disciplinary culture has become rich in connotation, yet few scholars have fully condensed its cultural elements and implications. At this historical juncture of the "Two Centenaries," LIS disciplinary culture construction bears important era missions under the guidance of the Chinese Dream of national rejuvenation. This paper attempts to analyze the structure of disciplinary culture, distill key elements of China's LIS disciplinary culture, and elicit discipline construction thinking focused on cultural elements, hoping to serve as a catalyst for LIS disciplinary culture construction in China.

---

## 2. Culture and Disciplinary Culture

**2.1 Culture** Culture is a concept with rich and complex connotations. Tracing its historical origins, the early Chinese compound "wenhua" appeared in the late Warring States period in the *Zhouyi · Bi Gua · Xiang Zhuan*: "Observe human patterns to transform the world," where "culture" implied "transforming through culture" and "governing through education." Later, Liu Xiang in the Han Dynasty explicitly used the term in *Shuoyuan · Zhiwu*: "Sages govern the world with culture and virtue before military force. Military force is used only when culture fails to transform." The Southern Dynasty's *Wenxuan · Buzhi Shi* further clarified: "Culture internalizes, military achievements externalize" [10]. Since then, culture has been used as an independent concept alongside economy

and politics as three components of human society.

With social development, culture's connotation and denotation have continuously expanded [11], and scholarly understanding has gradually deepened. In 1952, anthropologists A.L. Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn examined cultural concepts from 1871–1951 in their book *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, finding over 160 definitions in just 80 years [12]. Today, global definitions of culture number in the hundreds, with scholars offering various interpretations. Generally, definitions fall into broad and narrow categories. Broad culture, contrasted with nature, refers generally to human civilization, including all material and spiritual wealth created by humanity. For example, American scholar W.F. Ogburn stated: “Culture may be regarded as the accumulation of the products of human society, including the use of material objects, social institutions, and ways of behaving” [13]. British anthropologist E.B. Tylor defined culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” [14]. These definitions reflect a “large culture” perspective, encompassing both material and spiritual creative activities and their outcomes, with cultural levels including material, institutional, and spiritual dimensions. Narrow culture corresponds to a “small culture” perspective, generally referring to ideology-related literature, art, philosophy, religion, morality, belief, and customs. Chinese writer Liang Xiaosheng's classic interpretation—“Culture is cultivation rooted in the heart, consciousness without reminder, freedom based on restraint, and kindness for others”—embodies this narrow sense. Sometimes narrow culture also specifically refers to people's educational level, as in the term “cultured person.”

**2.2 Disciplinary Culture** Disciplinary culture belongs to the subculture system of culture but is rooted in disciplinary soil, thus exhibiting characteristics different from other cultural forms and phenomena [15]. Disciplinary culture is an important criterion for measuring whether a discipline is mature and represents its core competitiveness. Different disciplinary environments nurture different disciplinary cultures. According to Tony Becher's perspective, each discipline is a relatively independent “academic tribe” with recognized identity characteristics and cultural attributes, possessing distinct disciplinary cultures [16]. This culture comprises knowledge traditions and behavioral norms formed by disciplines according to their unique tasks, a lifestyle that every new disciplinary member must gradually cultivate, including specific theories, methodologies, professional techniques, unique symbolic systems, disciplinary beliefs, and academic spirit [17].

From the perspective of cultural definition, on one hand, disciplinary culture is the sum of disciplinary theoretical systems and ideas, methods, concepts, and laws created and formed during discipline development, including language symbols, value standards, scientific or humanistic spirit, cultural products, and working methods adopted by the discipline [18]. On the other hand, disci-

plinary culture can be summarized as all moral orders that discipline development needs to follow. These moral orders include both external constraints on individuals and internal values and beliefs, under which disciplinary members consciously abide by common disciplinary norms and present similar spiritual outlooks [19]. Disciplinary culture construction is a multi-point integration and co-development process, where spiritual and material construction should not be neglected. Therefore, this paper's condensation of LIS disciplinary culture elements is primarily based on a broad cultural perspective.

From the perspective of disciplinary culture components, disciplinary culture is the product of the dynamic interaction among disciplinary ontology, disciplinary community, and disciplinary knowledge [20] (see [Figure 1: see original paper]). Discipline is the carrier that nurtures disciplinary culture, the basic organization in the academic system that names each "academic tribe" and demarcates academic territory for the emergence and development of disciplinary culture. Disciplinary members within different geographical scopes produce disciplinary knowledge, conduct academic activities, disseminate disciplinary culture, and pursue common disciplinary goals centered on disciplinary fields. The disciplinary community is the subject of disciplinary culture, including producers, disseminators, and inheritors of disciplinary culture. Disciplinary culture producers are the leading forces promoting academic research, mainly scholars and experts in the discipline. Disciplinary culture disseminators are the main forces developing disciplinary education, such as teachers. Disciplinary culture inheritors are the core forces continuing disciplinary culture and the main audience, such as students. Members of the same discipline can have one or multiple identity roles simultaneously within the same period, with roles changing over time as the discipline develops. Disciplinary knowledge is the crystallization of disciplinary culture, concerning discipline classification. Specific theories, knowledge, methods, and symbols constitute the unique knowledge system of a disciplinary field. The cultural matrix is the basic "material" that nurtures, nourishes, and carries culture. Disciplinary ontology and community are the fundamental conditions for a discipline's emergence and development, while disciplinary knowledge is the result of a series of academic research activities conducted by the disciplinary community around disciplinary ontology. These run through the entire lifecycle of discipline development, continuously promoting discipline development while nurturing and nourishing disciplinary culture, collectively referred to as the disciplinary culture matrix.

From the perspective of cultural forms, disciplinary culture can be divided into disciplinary spiritual culture, disciplinary material culture, and disciplinary institutional culture (see [Figure 2: see original paper]). Disciplinary spiritual culture is the sum of value systems formed by disciplinary members based on specific disciplinary development goals during long-term knowledge production and organization, including unique disciplinary thinking modes, beliefs, responsibilities, missions, and spiritual outlooks. As the highest form of disciplinary culture, it is the soul of teaching, research, and social service. Different disciplines have different spiritual cultures. Good disciplinary spiritual culture

can enhance members' identity and group cohesion while expanding the discipline's social influence. Disciplinary material culture is the explicit disciplinary culture easily perceived by people, with rich manifestations including facilities, media, technologies, and products involved in disciplinary research or teaching, as well as displays of idols, authorities, symbols, and creeds with disciplinary attributes in disciplinary spatial environments. Material culture construction creates a unique cultural environment for disciplinary members, exerting subtle influences on their academic research and communication. Some material elements with obvious disciplinary attributes serve as important identifiers of disciplinary culture, such as the compass, hammer, and magnifying glass known as the "three treasures of geology" in geological disciplines. Disciplinary institutional culture comprises behavioral norms and work guidelines jointly observed by disciplinary groups, consisting of both flexible norms and rigid institutions [21]. Flexible norms are implicit disciplinary contracts, including "public ethics" based on various disciplinary morals and observed by all independent disciplines, as well as "private ethics" emerging from specific disciplinary fields and recognized by those groups. Rigid institutions generally appear as standards and guidelines covering talent cultivation, scientific research, academic evaluation, and organizational management. Disciplinary institutional culture plays important roles in motivating, guiding, and constraining disciplinary members, serving as the guarantee for discipline construction.

---

### 3. Cultural Matrix and Forms of LIS Discipline

LIS disciplinary culture manifests shared value orientations, thinking modes, behavioral norms, language systems, and psychological belonging developed by generations of LIS scholars since New China's founding during the discipline's creation, construction, expansion, and development. It possesses both general cultural functions and structures and characteristics unique to LIS. Based on 梳理 the development history of LIS disciplinary culture and understanding of its connotation and characteristics, this paper condenses general elements of LIS disciplinary culture from both the cultural matrix and cultural forms perspectives, while identifying specific cultural elements that deserve particular attention in LIS discipline construction under new era conditions.

#### 3.1 LIS Disciplinary Culture Matrix 3.1.1 LIS Disciplinary Ontology

LIS disciplinary ontology refers to the Library, Information and Archives Management first-level discipline itself, collectively describing basic elements such as discipline name, structure, and scope. It includes library science, information science, archival science, and related disciplines such as bibliography and documentation. LIS originated from and serves institutions like libraries and archives, which are susceptible to social environments and scientific technologies. Consequently, the discipline's theoretical systems, research methods, and tools

include both original creations and imported improvements, making disciplinary ontology innovative, open, integrated, and inclusive.

This “institution-named” discipline of Library, Information and Archives Management differs from cognitive disciplines like mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology. Although it appears somewhat unconventional, its long existence has accumulated rich disciplinary culture, forming unique influence and recognition. Within the discipline, peers understand its system, paradigm, and research scope. Outside the discipline, the existence of physical institutions like libraries, archives, and information centers enables the public to understand and respect the discipline’s academic value.

Therefore, LIS disciplinary culture construction must attend to ontological elements. Future discipline construction should both innovate and maintain integrity. Regardless of how the discipline name may change, we must document the complete history of the discipline, tell its stories well, continuously consolidate LIS disciplinary values, and promote the branded development of LIS disciplinary culture [24].

### 3.1.2 LIS Disciplinary Community

The LIS disciplinary community comprises groups with dedication to library, information, and archives causes, who observe LIS disciplinary norms, engage in LIS education and theoretical research, and are committed to promoting LIS discipline development. If disciplinary ontology is the stage, the disciplinary community consists of the performers and institutions on that stage, occupying the subject position in disciplinary culture. The LIS disciplinary community mainly includes discipline creators, inheritors, and industry practitioners.

Discipline creation is significant, often with clear era characteristics and distinct social backgrounds, making its figures and events easily remembered by later generations. We need not delve into the orderly arrangement of collections in ancient Babylonian temple ruins that nurtured the embryonic library science, nor deeply examine Chinese archival thought history featuring Confucius and Liu Zhiji, nor overemphasize information science’s origins in the International Institute of Bibliography founded by Belgian scholars Otlet and La Fontaine. Focusing just on the past century, influential figures in China’s LIS development include Shen Zurong, Hu Qingsheng, and Liu Guojun in library science; Gan Naiguang and Teng Gu in archival science [25]; people habitually call them pioneers of discipline creation. These names and deeds are mentioned in relevant discipline introductions to trace disciplinary history and remember academic thought.

Compared with traditional disciplines like physics, mathematics, and biology, LIS has a shorter development history and less stable disciplinary ontology. Although China has merged library science, information science, and archival science into a first-level discipline for over 20 years, considerable controversy and disagreement persist both within and outside academia regarding “Library, Information and Archives Management” as the first-level discipline name. Es-

pecially after some renowned Chinese universities' LIS first-level discipline authorization points were revoked [22], calls for adjusting the discipline name and structure have grown louder: Should more discipline-specific names like "Information Management" or "Information Resource Management" replace the current first-level discipline name? Should information science be separated to align with national intelligence strategy systems? Should information resource management, editing and publishing, ancient book preservation, and information analysis be incorporated into the second-level discipline system? [23] These debates essentially question LIS disciplinary positioning and cultural belonging. The uncertainty and inconsistency of LIS disciplinary ontology not only leave the discipline lacking clear positioning, reduce internal identity, and affect value system shaping, but also cause generational disconnects and contemporary fragmentation in LIS disciplinary culture, increasing self-consumption and hindering cultural inheritance and continuity.

Besides library science's early origins in the Boone Library School founded by Mary Elizabeth Wood and Shen Zurong in 1920, China's LIS discipline development has been closely linked to New China's birth, giving LIS a red cultural gene. After 1949, in 1953, Boone Library School was transferred to Wuhan University by the national education commission, where Peng Feizhang, a Boone graduate, inherited and developed it to this day. Wang Chongmin and Liu Guojun created the library science program at Peking University; proletarian revolutionaries Zeng San, Pei Tong, and Wu Baokang established the archival science program at Renmin University; Chinese Communist Party member Lian Zhen, who joined the revolution early, created the library science program at Sun Yat-sen University; later, Professors Xu Zhusheng, Shi Tingyong, and Qian Yaxin at Nanjing University, and Director Sun Gongwang at Central China Normal University successively created or restored library science programs. As military intelligence transformed into scientific and technological intelligence for New China during peacetime, Wuhan University's Huang Zongzhong founded the information science program after returning from overseas investigation, followed by Jing Jipeng establishing information science at Jilin University. This generation of scholars endured war hardships, witnessed New China's birth, shouldered responsibilities, and dared to innovate. Some started from scratch to explore and establish disciplinary systems; others inherited and developed disciplinary essence, making important contributions to discipline development.

As LIS discipline construction developed, like other disciplines, academic leaders began to emerge, evoking disciplinary cultural identity among members, strengthening their commitment to discipline construction as a lifelong career, and cultivating talent for discipline development. For example, Professors Wu Weici at Peking University, Yan Yimin, Ma Feicheng, and Chen Guangzuo at Wuhan University, Feng Huiling at Renmin University, and Tan Xiangjin at Sun Yat-sen University have inherited and promoted disciplinary spirit, innovated disciplinary theories, expanded disciplinary directions, and enhanced academic influence with outstanding achievements and contributions, recognized as academic leaders. Additionally, many long-established disciplines exhibit clear

academic lineage phenomena, and China's LIS discipline is no exception. Research shows that mentor-student relationships existed among China's first and second generations of librarians, and this mentorship culture remains strong in LIS today [26-27].

In summary, the LIS disciplinary community is not only a symbol of LIS disciplinary culture but also crucial for its development and continuity.

### 3.1.3 LIS Disciplinary Knowledge

LIS disciplinary knowledge is the crystallization of LIS disciplinary culture, including specific theories, methods, and symbols in the LIS field. Among these, the discourse system is the condensation of core disciplinary knowledge and the symbolic system of LIS disciplinary culture. Therefore, LIS disciplinary discourse system construction is also an important element of LIS disciplinary culture construction.

On one hand, LIS disciplinary discourse exhibits distinct LIS academic styles and characteristics [28]. As LIS disciplinary knowledge evolves and updates, the LIS disciplinary discourse system gradually enriches and reveals clear disciplinary features. Terms like collection, literature, digital library, reading promotion, and cultural poverty alleviation frequently appear in library science research; oral history, cultural heritage, social memory, and archival resources concentrate in archival science research; information resources, information organization, information retrieval, and knowledge management mainly appear in information science research. Each discipline has its unique discourse system, and constructing disciplinary discourse systems can better reflect LIS research orientations and disciplinary cultural characteristics.

On the other hand, disciplinary discourse power derived from discourse systems symbolizes disciplinary cultural soft power. Although LIS research has developed obvious disciplinary characteristics, rapid information technology development has infinitely expanded LIS research boundaries, causing serious academic generalization and gradual marginalization. To improve LIS development circumstances requires further perfecting the disciplinary discourse system and enhancing LIS discourse power in major national, governmental, and social institutional decisions, as some government policies, documents, and speeches on library development have cited LIS terminology. Moreover, under the dual influence of building socialism with Chinese characteristics and the overall national security concept, cultural memory institutions like libraries and archives have gained new development, and intelligence research and work have gradually manifested their role in major national decision-making, bringing new opportunities for LIS discipline construction. In this context, constructing LIS theories with Chinese character and style and forming a Chinese LIS discourse system [29] can further enhance the social influence of LIS disciplinary culture.

## 3.2 LIS Disciplinary Culture Forms

### 3.2.1 LIS Disciplinary Spiritual Culture

LIS disciplinary spiritual culture is the essence of LIS disciplinary culture. Its elements mainly include two aspects:

- (1) **LIS Disciplinary Values.** The sub-disciplines under LIS have different missions that collectively constitute the LIS value system, guiding LIS theoretical research and professional education. China's library science aims to inherit human cultural heritage, conduct social education, and promote information exchange and sharing, striving to eliminate information inequality. Information science is responsible for building scientific decision-making mechanisms, social information evolution mechanisms, and social information competition mechanisms [30], serving national intelligence development strategies and outputting “eyes, vanguard, staff, and leader” type intelligence research talent. Archival science aims to preserve traditional memory, promote excellent culture, and build human spiritual civilization, committed to achieving archival information resource sharing [31]. Disciplinary missions reflect value orientations, and LIS missions have obvious humanistic colors, with a “people-centered” service concept running through all LIS practice. As a comprehensive discipline integrating humanities and technology, LIS has both humanistic and technological characteristics. However, with rapid IT development, pure technicism strongly impacts the LIS value system, temporarily causing value deviation or even dislocation. If “technology” replaces “humanities” as the main orientation of LIS research and practice, LIS core competitiveness and value will be difficult to manifest [32]. Therefore, LIS discipline construction should adhere to the “people-centered” original aspiration and lead scientific development with correct value orientation.
- (2) **LIS Disciplinary Spirit.** LIS disciplinary spirit represents the historical sedimentation of LIS knowledge and values, embodying the discipline's character and ethos, and serving as the soul for LIS scholars' research, teaching, and social service. Although no scholar has yet systematically condensed LIS disciplinary spirit, different LIS subjects interpret it differently. For example, Wuhan University School of Information Management takes “pioneering innovation, pragmatic entrepreneurship, and leading innovation” as its tradition, while Jilin University School of Management adopts “humanism, harmony, truth-seeking, and innovation” as its philosophy. However, different educational objectives contain common expectations for disciplinary culture: the pursuit of humanism, truth-seeking, pragmatism, and innovation. Humanism is the core of LIS value, truth-seeking is the foundation of LIS research, pragmatism is the criterion for LIS education, and innovation is the driving force for LIS development. Additionally, scholars note that LIS innovative development requires strengthening research on interdisciplinary projects and introducing interdisciplinary talent [33], so LIS disciplinary culture construction also needs to cultivate an inclusive and free-exploration spirit.

### 3.2.2 LIS Disciplinary Institutional Culture

Disciplinary culture construction is not just a term written on paper but measures internalized in members' hearts and practiced within institutions. Disciplinary institutions are the criteria for disciplinary research and construction and necessary conditions for ensuring healthy disciplinary growth. LIS disciplinary institutions and norms originate from different levels. First, directional constraints from the national level, such as the February 2020 document "Several Measures for Breaking the 'Paper-Only' Orientation in Science and Technology Evaluation (Trial)" issued by the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Science and Technology [34], which stipulates that LIS and other disciplines should break the "paper-only" evaluation, providing correct value orientation for LIS academic evaluation. Second, guiding opinions from the industry level, such as the 2019 "Action Initiative for Library Science Education in the New Era" issued by the Library Society of China Education Committee, which proposes suggestions for LIS talent cultivation in the new era. Third, self-discipline from within LIS, namely institutions and rules spontaneously established by LIS groups applicable only to LIS fields or specific LIS institutions to regulate member behavior. Overall, China's LIS institutional culture construction concentrates at macro levels of state and industry, while internal institutional culture remains underdeveloped.

### 3.2.3 LIS Disciplinary Material Culture

LIS disciplinary material culture carries the spiritual traits and values of LIS, embodying its ethos and characteristics as concrete cultural elements. On one hand, LIS disciplinary material is an important carrier for disseminating and inheriting LIS disciplinary culture. All intangible spiritual elements must be presented through material carriers. In this regard, domestic LIS performance is generally suboptimal—mention of library science or archival science still evokes physical institutions like libraries and archives. However, with in-depth discipline development, China's LIS institutions, organizations, and scholars have consciously begun building LIS material culture. For example, the "Intelligence Science and Intelligence Work Development Forum," held for four consecutive years as a major academic conference in intelligence science, has designed its own logo and banner to continue its cultural tradition. Some LIS academic journals have also begun using exclusive logos to promote their academic culture. These unique material cultural elements have become "brand symbols" of China's LIS disciplinary culture. On the other hand, disciplinary material culture construction occurs within specific cultural fields. Disciplinary groups' cultural consciousness is generally weak, with limited attention to material cultural elements. Even when some organizations emphasize material construction, it mostly remains at university or college levels, failing to highlight LIS characteristics. Therefore, creating LIS material culture is an important aspect of LIS discipline construction.

#### 4. Reflections on Discipline Construction Focusing on Cultural Elements

As an endogenous element rooted in disciplines, disciplinary culture will exert lasting and profound influence on discipline construction and development. In the “Double First-Class” discipline construction process, sustained attention to and emphasis on disciplinary culture element construction and development are essential.

**4.1 Disciplinary Culture and Construction Institutions** Disciplinary culture construction institutions include government departments, universities, colleges, and other relevant groups and organizations that conduct disciplinary culture construction or provide conditions for it. Their attitudes and policies are crucial for creating favorable academic ecological environments and providing institutional and material foundations for disciplinary culture accumulation and development.

##### 4.1.1 Government Attention and Guidance

As the national authority overseeing education, the Ministry of Education plays a guiding role in promoting education system reform and strengthening discipline construction. Disciplinary culture construction is an important indicator in discipline evaluation. The Ministry and relevant departments should adopt a holistic perspective, formulate strategies, plan rationally, coordinate overall arrangements, and strengthen disciplinary culture construction at the institutional level. In policy guidance, central and local education departments should adhere to relevant policies and strategies such as “Double First-Class” and “high-quality education system” construction to ensure scientific, democratic, and law-based decision-making in disciplinary culture construction. In platform construction, the Ministry and relevant departments should support innovation, establish models, and encourage the construction and selection of exemplary LIS disciplinary culture cooperation platforms and bases. In policy formulation, relevant departments under Ministry leadership should establish discipline evaluation systems incorporating disciplinary culture construction indicators, improve discipline construction management and supervision systems, clearly define responsibilities of various subjects involved in disciplinary culture construction, and actively create free, democratic, open, and harmonious disciplinary culture construction atmospheres [35].

##### 4.1.2 University Consciousness and Action

Good teaching and research conditions provide the foundation and prerequisite for disciplinary material culture construction. Universities offering LIS programs should set ambitious goals toward building first-class LIS disciplines and strengthen and improve infrastructure accordingly. On one hand, universities should provide adequate hardware equipment for LIS disciplinary culture construction, such as modern information devices (eye trackers, VR equipment) and information laboratories, ensuring smooth teaching and research activities

while providing material prerequisites for disciplinary culture accumulation [4]. On the other hand, universities should strengthen software facilities supporting LIS hardware, such as building LIS information portals that enable users to access LIS journal articles, obtain academic conference information, retrieve research projects and publications, and access advisor information and quality courses. Software facilities can interpret discipline development from different perspectives and constitute important components of LIS material culture.

Moreover, as the main arena for disciplinary culture construction, universities need to provide a free, equal, and open academic environment for cultivating healthy and sustainable disciplinary culture. LIS is a multi-attribute discipline with strong social science characteristics, associated with computer science, sociology, management, and other disciplines, possessing strong interdisciplinary integration features. Therefore, universities should encourage inclusive, tolerant, and rigorous academic climates, support and strengthen exchanges and integration between LIS and related disciplines, provide rich nourishment for strengthening LIS ontology construction and enriching and expanding LIS knowledge systems, and thereby promote diversified accumulation and innovative development of LIS disciplinary culture.

#### 4.1.3 College Cohesion

Colleges are the basic units for cultivating disciplinary professionals. Under the “Double First-Class” construction background, all college members including deans, professors, and students should emphasize disciplinary culture construction. Through rich disciplinary teaching activities and cultural education activities, they should consolidate internal strength, strengthen learning and inheritance of different cultural forms, and enhance college disciplinary competitiveness and influence.

First, integrate the learning, dissemination, and development of disciplinary spiritual and institutional culture into teaching and research processes. LIS college teachers and students should jointly cultivate mission and responsibility for disciplinary culture construction in teaching and research activities. Teachers should incorporate disciplinary culture connotation and values into courses to subtly influence students, such as offering electives introducing LIS history and presenting fruitful LIS achievements (important conferences, high-impact journals) in class. LIS professors should, on one hand, place traditional LIS theories and methods in new research contexts for new verification and application, reassessing the applicability of relevant theories and methods to provide basis for reconstructing LIS systems. On the other hand, they should adapt to era changes, maintain LIS characteristics in multidisciplinary integration contexts, selectively absorb knowledge and methods from computer science, sociology, and related disciplines, break through bottlenecks in LIS system construction, and improve and expand LIS theories and methods. Additionally, LIS has advantages in information collection, organization, and management. Faculty and students should leverage these advantages in information organization, data analysis, and processing, value archives and intelligence roles, and create quality

courses with LIS characteristics and college features.

Second, colleges should organize various disciplinary culture education activities to strengthen beliefs and goals. Academic elites, especially deans, should play leading exemplary roles by actively participating in, hosting, or undertaking important LIS academic conferences and forums to showcase research and disciplinary culture construction achievements. For example, Central China Normal University's School of Information Management hosted the 5th Smart Library Development Forum 2021 and the 2021 National Symposium on Digital Resource Guarantee System Reconstruction, gaining widespread attention and praise. This cultivates and strengthens disciplinary cultural belonging and identity while disseminating excellent disciplinary culture to other universities and organizations. Colleges should also actively organize and widely carry out various disciplinary culture education activities to cultivate new disciplinary members with contemporary qualities, strong mission, responsibility, and identity, promoting internal disciplinary culture inheritance [35], such as compiling manuals and books with disciplinary culture inheritance significance—Wuhan University School of Information Management compiled and published the *Centennial Journey: Centennial History of Wuhan University School of Information Management (1920–2020)* series for its centennial celebration.

**4.2 Disciplinary Culture and Academic Masters** Academic masters are academic pioneers who have made outstanding contributions to a discipline's construction and development, driving innovative breakthroughs and leapfrog development in the field [36]. On one hand, academic masters themselves and their thoughts belong to disciplinary culture components, playing foundational and leading roles. On the other hand, as disciplinary “idols,” academic masters can stimulate members' disciplinary identity and academic enthusiasm, promoting disciplinary culture inheritance and sustainable development.

#### 4.2.1 Strengthening Academic Masters' Cultural Leadership

Famous educator Mei Yiqi profoundly understood academic masters' role, stating in his inaugural speech as Tsinghua University president: “A university is not defined by its buildings but by its masters,” emphasizing the importance of “masters” for institutional construction. As outstanding figures in disciplinary fields, academic masters themselves serve as spiritual symbols representing disciplinary spiritual culture. Therefore, strengthening LIS disciplinary culture construction requires, on one hand, expanding the influence of disciplinary spiritual culture by introducing and employing LIS academic masters, emphasizing the exemplary and innovative leadership role of masters like Ma Feicheng and Feng Huiling, utilizing their “celebrity effect” to enhance disciplinary pride within the field and attract more people to LIS learning and construction. On the other hand, it requires attention to the continuation and inheritance of disciplinary spiritual culture, supporting and cultivating outstanding scholars with potential to become future academic masters. For outstanding young LIS scholars, more opportunities and platforms should be provided to fully display their creativity,

with policy and funding support to facilitate their development.

#### 4.2.2 Maintaining Necessary Inheritance Rituals

Disciplinary material culture often concretizes abstract cultural elements through tangible resources, enabling members to more vividly and intuitively understand their discipline's culture in academic activities [37]. In addition to serving as spiritual symbols, academic masters' academic thoughts, spirits, and attitudes constitute important elements of disciplinary spiritual and material culture. Therefore, strengthening LIS disciplinary culture construction requires attention to various inheritance rituals for disciplinary figures and spirits, including: organizing exhibitions related to LIS representative figures, such as the Boone Library 110th Anniversary Exhibition held by Central China Normal University in May 2020, which introduced Mary Elizabeth Wood and Shen Zurong's important roles in modern library science development; watching documentaries on LIS outstanding figures, such as the premiere of the documentary *Mary Elizabeth Wood* held by Wuhan University School of Information Management in October 2020; visiting sites where disciplinary pioneers studied, conducted research, and worked to experience disciplinary spiritual culture. Through various "idol" spirit and culture inheritance rituals, LIS members can subtly understand disciplinary characteristics and development history in historical and contemporary contexts, feel the guidance of disciplinary models and cultural atmosphere, continuously stimulate learning enthusiasm, and enhance internal motivation for disciplinary research [37].

**4.3 Disciplinary Culture and Academic Exchange** Disciplinary culture disseminates, integrates, and innovates through academic exchange. Whether domestic or international, internal or interdisciplinary, academic exchange provides pathways and bridges for disciplinary culture diffusion and development, enriching and inheriting disciplinary culture based on disciplinary ontology, community, and knowledge.

#### 4.3.1 Accelerating Disciplinary Culture Opening

First-class cultural concepts support first-class discipline construction. In the new era of cultural confidence and "Double First-Class" construction requirements, China's disciplinary culture construction must align with international standards, moving from domestic to international, from closed to open.

At the practical level, we must continuously strengthen and consolidate LIS disciplinary ontology and community construction: First, China's LIS discipline should actively promote its own paradigms, methods, and theories to international platforms, striving for and enhancing discourse power in international LIS. Second, strengthen exchanges and cooperation between Chinese LIS universities and world-class universities to promote collision and integration between Chinese and world-class disciplinary cultures, such as information schools striving to become members of the global iSchools alliance, and relevant universities strengthening cooperative education with foreign institutions to export

outstanding talent and promote LIS disciplinary culture exchange.

At the theoretical level, foreign LIS disciplines are forward-looking in theory, technology, and methods. Chinese LIS scholars should emphasize 梳理 and summarizing foreign LIS disciplinary culture construction experiences, combining them with Chinese realities to construct LIS disciplinary culture ontology with Chinese characteristics that meets world standards.

#### **4.3.2 Perfecting the Disciplinary Culture Discourse System**

Disciplinary culture maintains academic order and consensus, playing important functions and mechanisms for constructing discipline-based academic community consciousness, enhancing members' identity and self-discipline. Therefore, strengthening LIS disciplinary culture construction requires leveraging outstanding LIS figures under information and big data contexts, achieving consensus on building excellent disciplinary culture through coordination among relevant universities and LIS associations, creating an LIS disciplinary community “centered on information and data, driven by technology, and aimed at disciplinary innovation and integration,” multi-dimensionally perfecting an LIS disciplinary discourse system that reflects evolution and development and meets era requirements, continuously enriching and updating LIS knowledge and content, promoting disciplinary culture dissemination and exchange through continuous learning and integration, and enhancing disciplinary competitiveness, influence, and overall status [38].

#### **4.3.3 Emphasizing Disciplinary Culture Exchange**

To improve disciplinary culture construction levels, open, equal, and diverse platforms and channels for disciplinary culture exchange and dissemination should be provided for disciplinary members or groups.

In activity implementation, online and offline methods should be combined to fully utilize modern information technology, actively conducting multi-level, multi-type disciplinary culture exchange activities such as seminars, online conferences, academic forums, and salons. These activities enhance disciplinary culture dialogue and intellectual collision, creating rich disciplinary culture construction and research atmospheres that provide fertile soil for LIS disciplinary culture inheritance and innovation.

In platform construction, awareness of disciplinary material culture construction should be enhanced. For stable, long-running academic conferences such as the Smart Library Development Forum and Intelligence Science Doctoral Student Forum, cultural identifiers like flags and emblems should be established, and valuable data and materials generated by conferences should be documented and preserved to form complete cultural preservation and inheritance systems. Journals within the same discipline should break through barriers, overcome professional limitations, focus on creating professional characteristics while absorbing excellent ideas from the same discipline, strengthen disciplinary culture exchange, continuously improve and perfect the LIS knowledge and content

system, and promote disciplinary culture integration.

---

## References

- [1] Xi Jinping: Secure a Decisive Victory in Building a Moderately Prosperous Society in All Respects and Strive for the Great Success of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era—Report at the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China [EB/OL]. [2021-07-01]. [http://www.gov.cn/zhuanli/2017-10/27/content\\_{5234876}.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zhuanli/2017-10/27/content_{5234876}.htm).
- [2] Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, National Development and Reform Commission. Notice on Issuing the “Evaluation Measures for the Effectiveness of ‘Double First-Class’ Construction (Trial)” [EB/OL]. [2021-07-01]. [http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-03/23/content\\_{5595085}.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-03/23/content_{5595085}.htm).
- [3] Ministry of Education. “Work Plan for the Fifth Round of Discipline Evaluation” [EB/OL]. [2021-07-01]. [http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2020-11/03/content\\_{5556900}.htm](http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2020-11/03/content_{5556900}.htm).
- [4] Lu Genshu, Hu Wenjing. First-Class Discipline Construction Should Emphasize Cultivating Disciplinary Culture [J]. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 2017(3): 5-9.
- [5] Chen Caihong. Research on Cultural Character as an English Subject Literacy [J]. *Theory and Practice of Education*, 2018, 38(8): 47-49.
- [6] Yan Biyou. Excavating Mathematical Culture and Practicing Subject Education [J]. *Mathematics Bulletin*, 2019, 58(11): 19-22, 27.
- [7] Huang Zhuhang, Yang Xueqin. Rationally Understanding Physical Education Disciplinary Culture to Promote Discipline Construction [J]. *Journal of Beijing Sport University*, 2009, 32(2): 8-11.
- [8] Liu Weigui. Research on Archival Disciplinary Culture [J]. *Lantai World*, 2014(2): 19-21.
- [9] Fan Zhenjia. LIS Discipline Construction in the Context of “New Liberal Arts”: Discourse, Logic, and Path [J]. *Information and Documentation Services*, 2021, 42(1): 28-36.
- [10] Tang Zhilong. The Triple Implications of Culture and Innovative Perspectives [J]. *Marxism Studies*, 2012(9): 100-107, 160.
- [11] Min Jiayin. Aspects of Western Cultural Concepts [J]. *Social Sciences Abroad*, 1995(2): 64-69.
- [12] Huang Lizhi. On the Humanistic Significance of the Narrow Definition of Culture [J]. *Philosophical Research*, 1998(3): 32-36.

- [13] Ogburn W F. *Social Change: With Respect to Culture and Original Nature* [M]. Translated by Wang Xiaoyi, et al. Hangzhou: Hangzhou University Press, 1989.
- [14] Tylor E B. *Primitive Culture* [M]. Translated by Lian Shusheng. Guangxi: Guangxi Normal University Press, 1871.
- [15] Wu Yelin, Cui Yanqiang. Path Exploration of First-Class Discipline Construction Based on Disciplinary Culture Innovation [J]. *Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 2017, 38(5): 89-97.
- [16] Becher T, Trowler P. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines* [M]. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press, 2001.
- [17] Burton R C. *Higher Education Systems: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective* [M]. Translated by Wang Chengxu, et al. Hangzhou: Hangzhou University Press, 1994: 87.
- [18] Xiang Dongchun, Tang Yuguang. Resistance and Countermeasures of Interdisciplinarity in “985 Project” Platforms—From the Perspective of Disciplinary Culture [J]. *Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 2006(6): 30-34.
- [19] Ylijoki O H. Disciplinary Cultures and the Moral Order of Studying—A Case-Study of Four Finnish University Departments [J]. *Higher Education*, 2000, 39(3): 339-362.
- [20] Jiang Hongchi. Analysis of the Connotation of University Disciplinary Culture [J]. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 2007(3): 26-28.
- [21] Xiao Nan, Yang Liansheng. The Knowledge Production Function of University Disciplinary Culture and Its Manifestations and Obstacles [J]. *Academic Degrees & Graduate Education*, 2012(1): 29-33.
- [22] Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council. Notice on the 2016 Dynamic Adjustment List of Revoked and Added Degree Authorization Points [EB/OL]. [2021-08-01]. [http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A22/xwb\\_{left}/zcywlm\\_{xwgl}/moe\\_{818}/201610/t](http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A22/xwb_{left}/zcywlm_{xwgl}/moe_{818}/201610/t)
- [23] Ke Ping. New Situations in LIS Discipline Development and First-Level Discipline Construction [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2021, 65(1): 12-15.
- [24] Qian Minghui, Xu Zhixuan. Reflections on Branding the Library, Information and Archives Management Discipline [J]. *Library & Information*, 2019(6): 35-40.
- [25] Wang Xiaofei. Four Generations of Chinese Archival Scholars [J]. *Archives*, 1989(4): 34-37.
- [26] Cheng Huanwen. On the Characteristics of Library Talent—Exploring the “Four Generations of Librarians” [J]. *Guangdong Library Journal*, 1988(3): 22-29.



**Li Jiahui:** Conducted literature review, wrote and revised the paper.

**Gong Lihua:** Conducted literature review, wrote and revised the paper.

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

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