

Towards the Construction of a Discourse System for Information Resource Management: A Post-print

Authors: Chu Jingli, Wang Jue, Wang Jue

Date: 2023-05-12T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

This paper takes the national initiative to construct the discourse system of philosophy and social sciences as its primary research background, exploring the impact of renaming the first-level discipline of Library, Information and Archives Management to Information Resource Management on the construction of disciplinary discourse systems. Through methods such as literature review and corpus analysis, it clarifies the fundamental meanings and transformational relationships of core concepts including discourse systems, reviews the current status of the discourse system in the Information Resource Management discipline, analyzes existing deficiencies, and further explores the basic structure and construction pathways for establishing the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline.

Full Text

Preamble

Title: Thoughts on the Construction of Discourse System for the Information Resource Management Discipline

Authors: Chu Jingli¹, Wang Jue²

¹ National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190

² Department of Information Resource Management, School of Economics and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190

Abstract

Taking the country's promotion of constructing a discourse system for philosophy and social sciences as the main research background, this paper explores

the impact of renaming the first-level discipline of Library, Information and Archives Management to Information Resource Management on the construction of the discipline's discourse system. Through methods such as literature research and corpus analysis, this paper clarifies the basic meanings and transformational relationships of core concepts such as discourse system, sorts out the current status of the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline, analyzes existing deficiencies, and further discusses the basic structure and construction path for building the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline.

Keywords: Discourse system; Information resource management; Library information and archives; Discipline construction

Introduction

On May 17, 2016, General Secretary Xi Jinping delivered an important speech at the Symposium on Philosophy and Social Sciences [1], explicitly summarizing the coordinated advancement of discourse system, disciplinary system, and academic system construction as a crucial task for accelerating the development of philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics [2]. He pointed out that the overall level of China's philosophy and social sciences in terms of disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system is not high, and that we must follow the approach of being based in China while drawing on foreign experience, excavating history while grasping the contemporary, caring for humanity while facing the future, and strive to build philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics, fully embodying Chinese characteristics, Chinese style, and Chinese ethos in guiding ideology, disciplinary system, academic system, discourse system, and other aspects. On December 7-8, 2021, at the National Conference on Ideological and Political Work in Higher Education [3], General Secretary Xi Jinping once again emphasized the issue of innovating the academic discourse system, noting that the academic discourse system is an important outcome formed by academic research activities and a concrete manifestation of academic research quality, style, and strength. Once academic achievements are produced, they deeply permeate academic activities, influence the reproduction of academic fields, become important content in knowledge and value transmission, and shape social subjects—namely, people—within a broader scope. Building a culturally strong nation and cultivating talent for the country cannot ignore the construction of the academic discourse system [4].

On September 13, 2022, the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council and the Ministry of Education issued the *Catalogue of Disciplines and Majors for Graduate Education (2022 Edition)* [5], officially establishing the renaming of the original first-level discipline “Library, Information and Archives Management” to “Information Resource Management,” with the new catalogue taking effect from 2023. This will inevitably have profound and long-term impacts on the disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system of the original library, information, and archives disciplines. National policy orientation and

the renaming of the first-level discipline prompt us to reflect on the development of the Information Resource Management discipline and the construction of its discourse system.

This paper employs literature research and corpus analysis methods to clarify the basic meanings and transformational relationships of core concepts such as discourse system, sort out the current status of the Information Resource Management discipline's discourse system, analyze existing deficiencies, and focus on discussing the basic structure and construction path for building the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline. It should first be noted that “construction” does not mean restoration or rebuilding from scratch, but rather building an Information Resource Management discipline discourse system that meets the needs of the new first-level discipline based on existing achievements.

2. Conceptual Clarification

2.1 Discourse and Discourse System

The term “discourse” is widely used across many disciplines and intellectual schools. Due to differences in methods, theories, perspectives, and research purposes, “discourse” carries different orientations. Therefore, defining the concept of discourse and analyzing discourse involves multidirectional understanding and grasping [6]. The formation mechanism from discourse to discourse system is also complex. A discourse system is built upon discourse, using “discourse” as the basic unit to construct logical genealogies and ideological systems for discourse, becoming solidified texts and knowledge systems that can be inherited [7]. From a Chinese perspective, when certain realities cannot be contained by modern structures and modes of thinking, it becomes necessary to deconstruct the original thinking system and core framework, reconstruct social thinking and language systems, and re-express them with different modes of thinking and linguistic forms—this is the philosophical-level explanation of discourse system [8]. In the view of discourse theorists, discourse systems are hidden beneath the subjective consciousness of discourse subjects while simultaneously dominating people's thoughts, speech, and behaviors in a default manner, making issues related to discourse systems require high attention and prudent treatment [9]. Zhang Weiwei deconstructs the discourse system, pointing out that it is a whole composed of core concepts, dominant ideas, knowledge frameworks, cultural symbols, discourse production mechanisms, discourse dissemination mechanisms, and discourse support mechanisms [10]. Currently, constructing an Information Resource Management discourse system that conforms to China's characteristics and reflects the features of our era, and promoting the innovation and development of China's Information Resource Management discipline, is an important task facing the Information Resource Management community. This requires in-depth research on the Information Resource Management discipline discourse system, proposing basic concepts, relevant categories, logical frameworks, and main viewpoints concerning the Information Resource Management

discipline discourse system, and further constructing a theoretical system of Information Resource Management that takes discourse system as its research object, providing an academic foundation for the development of China's Information Resource Management discipline [7].

2.2 Academic Discourse System

A discipline's development is inseparable from the construction and improvement of its academic system, knowledge system, and discourse system. The academic system is the systematic theoretical knowledge that reveals the essential laws of a discipline's research objects, while the discourse system is the expression form of theoretical knowledge, the external characteristic and linguistic carrier of the academic system [11]. The goal of academic discourse system construction is to form categories with subjectivity and originality in the process of understanding the world, exploring truth, and serving development. The core of an academic discourse system consists of systematic theoretical knowledge that explains the external world, composed of academic concepts, academic propositions, paradigms, and logical relationships.

Different disciplines form different academic discourse systems around different research objects or disciplinary questions, and the same discipline may also form different academic discourse systems around common research objects or questions [12]. In short, the academic discourse system presents the relational state between different concepts and theories within the academic field.

2.3 Discourse Power

Professor Zhao Rongying defines power as a force of mutual influence between subjects that maintains social structure, with such interactions constituting a power network, while discourse power is the ability of social subjects to use discourse to disseminate and guide the depth and breadth of their influence [13]. She explores "discourse power" from four perspectives: conceptual analysis, characteristic classification, type division, and evaluation indicators, discussing the connotation of discourse concepts in combination with linguistics, sociology, philosophy, history, informetrics, and other fields. She defines academic discourse power as the ability of academic subjects with academic achievements or resources in academic exchanges to disseminate their academic achievements through various forms of discourse expression, generating sufficient influence to affect and even guide the cognition and actions of other actors, with subjects including scholars, disciplines, academic journals, academic conferences, academic media, academic institutions, etc. [14]. Influential discourse systems and discourse power both possess five core elements: political implication, theoretical support, philosophical thinking, general education expression, and effective dissemination. Therefore, from a macro perspective, constructing China's philosophy and social science discourse system, including Information Resource Management, requires efforts in these five core elements [15].

In summary, “discourse” is the conceptual foundation and premise, “discourse system” is the foundation and support, and “discourse power” is the purpose and ultimate goal. The “discourse system,” as a foundational concept, links the two core concepts of “discourse” and “discourse power” [16]. The purpose of studying academic discourse systems is to enhance disciplinary discourse power. This paper focuses on the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline and does not discuss disciplinary discourse power in depth.

3. Current Status of Information Resource Management Discourse System

3.1 Literature Review

Possessing mature and stable discourse characteristics, styles, and systems is an important criterion for a discipline’s strength and theoretical confidence, as well as a sign of a mature disciplinary system [17]. In research on constructing China’s sports science discourse system, Wang Lei et al. point out that the current construction of a discourse system with Chinese characteristics faces dilemmas such as Western academic discourse hegemony, lack of original sports theories, and improper translation of sports academic terms, and propose five measures including focusing on bidirectional interpretation of sports academic discourse and actively carrying out external publicity [18]. In research on constructing China’s external discourse system for ocean governance, Han Shuqin points out that China needs to provide Chinese solutions and wisdom for global ocean governance through its external discourse on ocean governance, and proposes three practical paths—internal-to-external transformation, equivalent standardization, and Chinese-foreign integration—based on clarifying the connotation and extension of China’s external ocean governance discourse [19]. In research on the logic of constructing a Chinese-characteristic pedagogy discourse system, Zhao Menglei [20] points out that Chinese educational researchers’ ideological understanding has become disconnected from China’s belief discourse, that Chinese educational academic discourse is aphasic under Western-dominated contexts, and that educational practice is imbalanced with China’s pedagogy theoretical discourse, proposing countermeasures such as rooting in traditional Chinese cultural spirit, pursuing a discourse thinking of seeking common ground while reserving differences, and building diversified communication channels. Tan Weizhi [21], from the perspective of the evolution and reconstruction of pedagogy’s core concepts, points out that the construction of core concepts for a Chinese-characteristic pedagogy discourse system must be based on Chinese educational academic tradition and contemporary Chinese educational practice, and in analyzing concepts, further proposes that the expansion of educational spacetime requires redefining schools, that new forms of teaching organization require redefining classes, and that interpretations of information equity, information justice, and information democracy should be strengthened.

Against the backdrop of first-level discipline renaming, attention to the construction of the three systems for the Information Resource Management discipline has gradually increased. However, existing problems and drawbacks within the original “Library, Information and Archives” discipline will not disappear because of the renaming, but will instead generate more new issues that require consideration and response. Therefore, it is still necessary to return to the state of “three independent disciplines” to explore inherent problems in discourse system construction within the field. This paper sorts out existing research and organizes the mentioned viewpoints according to dimensions such as “domain concepts” and “research theories,” thereby summarizing the weaknesses in the development of the original “Library, Information and Archives” discipline. As shown in the table, the core ideas and cultural essence carried in library science, information science, and archival science have a long history in China, containing national heritage and ethnic wisdom. However, modern disciplinary development has been bumpy, with weak academic inheritance, and many historical achievements have not been effectively excavated and utilized. Different research perspectives and subjects have led to different paradigm divergences within the discipline, yet as research questions become increasingly complex, they have intensified inter-disciplinary integration, resulting in chaotic development, unclear positioning, and uncertain future directions. To break through original constraints and stimulate disciplinary vitality, Information Resource Management has become the new first-level discipline name, with opportunities and challenges coexisting in future disciplinary construction and development.

Many scholars have proposed countermeasures for discourse system construction issues in disciplinary development. Zhang Yu evaluates the library science discourse system using dual logic of credibility and data chain evaluation, pointing out how to reconstruct library science and strengthen the conscious awareness of discourse system construction within the library science field, clarifying new trends in discourse system construction research [22], and subsequently discusses how to construct discourse systems from two dimensions of academic logic and social logic, pointing out the need to enhance subject consciousness and actively connect political discourse with academic discourse to form policy discourse [26]. Su Xinning explores the relationship between the establishment of a broad information science disciplinary system, book systems, and disciplinary discourse, proposing to perfect disciplinary theory and build an information science discourse system with an open vision [33]. Yang Wen et al. propose that constructing a discourse system for archival science with Chinese characteristics in the new era should balance history and reality, adhere to the unity of localization and internationalization, academic and practical orientation, inheritance and innovation, and promote theoretical innovation and Chinese-foreign integrated discourse expression [34].

Facing the current more complex social environment, technological environment, and disciplinary environment, this paper intends to deconstruct the discourse system from the level of textual language to explore the construction path for the Information Resource Management first-level discipline.

3.2 Deconstruction of Disciplinary Discourse

Building a disciplinary discourse system involves, on the one hand, refining the thinking system behind the discourse system, and on the other hand, striving to break through the narrowness and inadequacies of traditional discourse systems, seeking open, intuitive, accurate, understandable, and richly associative linguistic methods to improve communication efficiency and pursue high-level philosophical cognition that focuses on essence rather than form. To understand the current status of the Information Resource Management discipline's (formerly "Library, Information and Archives") discourse system, this paper takes journal articles from the "Peking University Core" and "CSSCI" databases over the 11-year period from 2012 to 2022 as corpus material to explore the state and development trends of academic discourse in Library, Information and Archives Management over the past decade. To collect as comprehensively as possible representative articles within the discipline, this paper combined library science and information science for searching, then separately searched archival science literature for two reasons: first, from the perspective of disciplinary integration, library science and information science have more active exchanges [35] and stronger research relevance, and separate searching would produce many duplicate results; second, if all three were combined, archival science literature would be easily overlooked in correlation and co-occurrence analyses due to its relatively independent system. Therefore, separate search strategies were formulated, and after retrieving the literature, the data were cleaned and deduplicated, removing non-research papers such as research news and conference announcements, resulting in 2,682 papers in the "Library and Information" field and 3,313 papers in the "Archives" field. The specific search strategies and literature quantities are shown in the table below.

An abstract condenses the connotation of an article and serves as an epitome of a discipline's research content. After screening the literature, this paper decided to focus on analyzing the abstract sections, extracting and merging them into a corpus. Hereinafter, the abstract corpus of "Library and Information Science" papers is referred to as "LIS," and the abstract corpus of "Archival Science" papers is referred to as "Archives." To provide a brief overview of discourse flow between 2012 and 2022, both corpora were divided into two parts: 2012-2017 (a) and 2018-2022 (b), undergoing word segmentation and feature word extraction. Network graphs were used to clarify semantic associations and preferences between concepts, with the top 1,000 feature words extracted to construct semantic networks, as shown below.

(a)

(b)

[Figure 1: see original paper] LIS Corpus Semantic Network Comparison

Overall, the semantic network of the "Library and Information Science" discipline is relatively stable, with no particularly obvious transformation in the expression methods and statement approaches of disciplinary knowledge. Nodes in the semantic network show a trend of becoming tighter, with increased cen-

trality of terms related to disciplinary development and education. In detail, the weight of words related to “library” or “books” shows a weakening trend; for example, the weight between “books-analysis” nodes decreased from 542 to 439, and the weight between “library-research” nodes decreased from 461 to 375. In contrast, the weight of nodes such as “intelligence-research” and “intelligence-development” shows an upward trend, and the proportion of discourse related to “discipline,” “talent,” and “system” has increased.

(a)

(b)

[Figure 2: see original paper] Archives Corpus Semantic Network Comparison

Macroscopically, discourse in the archival science field centers on “archives,” with a more explicit subject than the “LIS” discipline. The core discourse cluster within the field has become tighter, while the association with the periphery is weaker and discourse repulsion has increased. In detail, the weights of “theory-archives,” “digital-archives,” and “archives-value” have significantly increased, while the weights of “archives-archival repository,” “archival repository-construction,” and “archival repository-development” have slightly decreased.

After the overview analysis of the two corpora, an n-gram grammatical model was used for deeper observation, aiming to analyze changes in the discipline over the past decade from the discourse level. Since the post-renaming discipline emphasizes the term “information,” and its weight in the LIS corpus is significantly higher than in the Archives corpus, it was used as a keyword for bigram analysis of the LIS corpus to explore linguistic collocations and semantic compositions of the term “information” in the “LIS” discipline over the past decade, as shown in the table below.

LIS Corpus n-gram Model Processing Results

Over the past decade, the collocation “information-resources” has been a commonly used approach in the “LIS” discipline, with research mainly focusing on the development, utilization, co-construction, and management of information resources. The term “information resources” has been habitually used as a general designation for research objects. Additionally, the frequency of human-related terms such as “information literacy” and “information behavior” has increased, reflecting the discipline’s gradual emphasis on human-centered thinking in research. “Information science” as a new term entering the top ten indicates the growing integration between the field of information science and the “LIS” profession.

3.3 Evolution of Core Concepts

All disciplinary research begins with concepts. Core concepts constitute the foundation of a disciplinary discourse system, serving as channels and media for expressing academic ideas. Their evolution and reconstruction often signify the opening of a new research field, requiring new research methods and perspectives to conduct new research, and also mean providing new answers to existing

problems or creative explanations for new problems using new methodologies [36]. In knowledge production, concepts are not established facts or dogmas but key issues that need to be applied in empirical research to explain and clarify relevance and applicability. Concepts are not merely terminology but concrete tools that provide us with understanding of the value and meaning of things, becoming instruments for practical exploration and constructing theory through exploration [37]. Ren Dongsheng points out in research on constructing a Chinese-characteristic ocean discourse system that successful discourse system construction invariably begins with the fixation, popularization, and theorization of concepts [38].

In early research, some scholars explored and reflected on the construction of bibliographic core concept systems, pointing out that an important characteristic of a disciplinary core concept system is its serial nature and intuitiveness, ensuring internal logical connections within the core concept system to prevent conceptual ambiguity midway or overall [39]. However, disciplinary development has become more complex in both internal and external environments, and understanding and research of different concepts transform due to different external environments and internal perspectives. For example, the core disciplinary concept “information resources” has undergone three major drifts between 1994 and 2019 based on semantic cloud model analysis by Wang Zhongyi et al., who point out that these three conceptual drifts were caused by the development of database technology, internet technology, and big data application technology, which continuously changed information carriers and transmission media, constantly enriching and expanding the connotation and extension of the “information resources” concept [40]. After the first-level discipline renaming, Ma Feicheng explained the disciplinary connotation of Information Resource Management, pointing out that our core content is the management and utilization of information resources, and that all our basic theories, research paradigms, and career development revolve around and derive from such processes and life cycles [41]. From the perspective of upholding tradition while innovating in the “Library, Information and Archives” discipline, Yu Liangzhi also reflected on the concept of libraries, pointing out that their essential characteristic is not their institutional, physical, or public welfare nature, but their functional characteristic of ensuring effective information query and acquisition. The unchanging foundation of library science is its concern for and guarantee of human needs for information query and acquisition, and its innovation space includes all thoughts, theories, and technologies related to this, including but not limited to theories and technologies of libraries as functional entities [42]. In disciplinary development, new entities can be used to modify and update concepts, merging new attributes of new members into conceptual representations, and different concept combinations help people understand and communicate with each other in different contexts—this is a core aspect of discourse system research.

3.4 Transformation of Disciplinary Context

The transformation of discourse systems is a historical process. Its fundamental shift depends on the accumulation of social practice, the progress of the times, and the renewal of social knowledge systems. However, different knowledge systems have different presuppositions, and cross-cultural knowledge systems have natural barriers. As Bourdieu's field theory [43] states: "Extremely similar events occurring in different historical environments produce completely different results." If disciplinary development relies too heavily on changes in the external environment and technological evolution, always immersing itself in answers provided by other contexts or disciplines without thinking about its own questions, this is also a form of discourse deficiency. Therefore, discourse systems must pay greater attention to being rooted in Chinese tradition, drawing from Chinese contexts, and reconstructing discourse systems on the basis of Chinese cultural characteristics. In existing research, many scholars have made efforts to break through these barriers. Peng Zhihui [44] proposed the transformation, connection, and reinterpretation of the concept of Disinformation in the Chinese context. Qi Chenhang [45] explored the impact of the EU's information fog governance system under digital sovereignty context on China's international political environment and the external layout of technology enterprises, proposing suggestions such as embedding China's political concepts into the information fog governance system.

Based on the above research findings and combined with analysis of discourse describing research backgrounds in the corpus, it was found that linguistic usage changes between 2012 and 2022 were not significant. Almost inevitably, discussions mention "big data technology," "information technology," and "digital transformation," which have almost become idioms for describing academic backgrounds and naturally serve as starting points for thinking. However, there may be some logical fallacies and omissions in this process. At the level of historical context, these technologies themselves are not technical terms from the library, information, and archives fields. Researchers need to investigate the impact of these technologies on society, information, and media regarding specific issues, examining the 脉络 that truly affects research within the field, rather than using them as background cloth for certain empirical studies. At the technical level, it is necessary to consider the impact of these technological developments on the field's own technologies, such as library cataloging technology, knowledge organization technology, and ancient book restoration technology, allowing external technological development to truly drive the library and information field. At the academic logic level, we must clearly recognize that each discipline has its own mission and responsibility. For example, the commonality among four information science perspectives is the belief that the mission of library science is information organization and equitable access, the mission of information science is information processing, analysis, and access efficiency, and archival science is dedicated to information preservation, evidence, and flow control [46]. While such summaries may seem somewhat concise today, and fu-

ture expansion of second-level disciplines will bring more disciplinary missions and broader disciplinary visions, committing to fulfilling disciplinary missions remains our original logical starting point for academic research, rather than passively accepting the development of the times and technology and blindly chasing scientific frontiers. Therefore, paying attention to cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary contexts, tracing the origins of discourse, and truly doing a good job of “translation” between contextual barriers constitute an important part of building a disciplinary discourse system.

4. Construction of Information Resource Management Discourse System

4.1.1 Methodology and Historical View

All discourse systems have their values, with the most core being the dominant role of historical view and methodology. Taking Marxism as guidance is an inevitable requirement for discourse system construction, with the Marxist historical view being the concrete implementation and scientific application of dialectical materialism in the social and historical field [7]. At the methodological level, we also adhere to social science methodology from the Marxist perspective, taking practical, dialectical, and historical materialism as fundamental methods to form a scientific and open methodological system. This system researches and explores a series of major relationships in social development within information resources, including subject and object, system and element, contradiction and process, individual and group, cognition and evaluation, thereby constituting a complete Information Resource Management discipline discourse system [47].

4.1.2 Research Paradigms and Theory

Paradigm is a concept proposed by Thomas Kuhn, referring to the consensus and basic viewpoints reached by scientists in specific disciplinary fields, representing some common agreements on research criteria and conceptual systems within a disciplinary community [48]. Discourse systems are constructed on the basis of specific paradigms and in fact represent such research paradigms; the transformation of discourse systems must be connected to their corresponding research paradigms [7]. For example, due to different logical starting points, Chinese information science research has divided into two paradigms—information management and intelligence research—forming different research objects and discourse systems [49]. Different research paradigms are mutually exclusive and cannot be combined; forced integration only leads to blurred disciplinary boundaries and research confusion. A discipline should be based on a stable theoretical core. Once the disciplinary position is determined, it will not chase trends and hot topics, allowing the discipline to “respond to all changes with constancy” [49].

Against the backdrop of disciplinary integration, many disciplines are making efforts to build pluralistic disciplinary paradigms from macro perspectives. For

example, in archival science, the new paradigm advocated by the Archival Education and Research Institute under a pluralistic vision gradually reveals its core: taking globalization and internationalization as the background, applying theories such as postmodernism, post-colonialism, and post-custodialism to archival education and research, with core concepts focusing on marginalized communities, emphasizing pluralistic backgrounds, participating in social governance, promoting fairness and justice, exploring historical truth, and calling for addressing challenges [25]. In information science research, Yang Jianlin established a generalized information system model, unifying management science paradigms based on information management and knowledge management frameworks, soft science paradigms based on intelligence, and library and information science paradigms based on information within one model, pointing the direction for constructing the basic theoretical system of information science [30]. This “integration” thinking is indispensable for interdisciplinary research and new theory formation.

4.1.3 Basic Categories

Discourse systems are constructed by relevant categories to conduct ideological interpretation and value construction, which requires full utilization of categories. Basic categories in discourse systems refer to core, critical, and fundamental categories. For example, aesthetics takes the concept of “imagery” as its core category, becoming the meeting point between traditional Chinese aesthetics and modern Western aesthetics [50]. The renaming of the first-level discipline from “Library, Information and Archives Management” to “Information Resource Management” reflects a breakthrough and expansion at the disciplinary category level. The selection of this concept solves the problem of the original three disciplines lacking a common superordinate concept or having an unclear superordinate concept. Under the “coordination” of the name “Information Resource Management,” the construction of subordinate second-level disciplines has a common logical starting point, forming a disciplinary system architecture with clear connotation, definite direction, and reasonable relationships [51], while also breaking through the limitation of the original discipline name’s excessive focus on specific institutions. Just as pedagogy research should not be confined to the physical institution of “school,” the original library science, information science, and archival science should also deepen basic theoretical research beyond the practices and explorations of institutions such as libraries, information institutes, and archives, allowing knowledge accumulation to come from theoretical iteration rather than just empirical accumulation, and endowing the discipline’s conceptual framework and core categories with new meanings that conform to the times, continuously advancing disciplinary construction.

4.2 Construction Path of Discourse System

The preceding sections deconstructed and analyzed the current status of the Information Resource Management discipline's discourse system and discussed the basic structure of the academic discourse system. It is clear that the core essence of academic discourse system construction is, under a common worldview, historical view, and methodology, to clarify disciplinary missions and visions, address problems arising in social development, grasp principal contradictions, and from a disciplinary perspective, use scientific theories and methods and reasonable techniques and means to provide answers within the disciplinary field. Through continuous accumulation, a set of academic and knowledge systems is formed, and on this basis, a unique and stable discourse system is established.

Focusing on the present, the construction of new liberal arts provides the historical context for Information Resource Management discipline discourse system construction, while the renaming of the first-level discipline to Information Resource Management provides the disciplinary field for discourse system reconstruction. In disciplinary development, we must achieve both integration and independence, both tradition-upholding and innovation. "Integration" refers to emphasizing the enhancement of interdisciplinary capabilities, including borrowing disciplinary theories, transplanting concepts or terminology, and crossing disciplinary methods [52], striving to reach consensus on insights from different disciplinary perspectives and categories, creating new concepts and theories, triggering methodological revolutions, opening new research fields, and thereby advancing disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system construction. "Independence" refers to emphasizing deeper understanding and reinterpretation of one's own discipline in the process of integrated development, while simultaneously updating practical and educational systems. Yang Wen et al. analyzed the digital transformation path for archival discipline construction and talent training after the first-level discipline renaming, pointing out the need to highlight the differences between information resource management and information management, and to maintain the traditional characteristics of an independent discipline while distinguishing it from other disciplines based on disciplinary integration [53]. "Tradition-upholding" does not mean preserving an unchanging discourse or disciplinary system but rather maintaining the core ideas and kernel of disciplinary development, based on historical development and national culture, and adhering to domain propositions and standardized discourse. "Innovation" requires critical reflection on the discipline from a macro perspective, using deeper practical innovation and theoretical speculation to expand disciplinary boundaries, eliminating limitations and biases through interdisciplinary perspectives, providing new interpretations for existing problems, and offering disciplinary solutions for new problems.

The Information Resource Management discipline stands at a new historical node. Under the trend of interdisciplinary integration, competition for disciplinary discourse power is becoming increasingly fierce, and development controversies have never ceased. Perhaps the only thing predictable is that the future

will be complex and ever-changing. At the same time, data and information generation will not stop, information resources are a tremendous driving force for social development, people's dependence on information and demand for information resource services will not disappear, the importance of information literacy is increasingly enhanced, and the inheritance and dissemination of culture are missions endowed by the times. Endowing information with meaning, excavating knowledge from data, tracing origins, and searching up and down—although the path ahead for Information Resource Management is challenging, it has great potential.

Author Contributions:

Chu Jingli: Topic selection, article revision

Wang Jue: Article writing

References

1. Wang Yu. Xi Jinping: Speech at the Symposium on Philosophy and Social Sciences[EB/OL]. (2016-05-18)[2022-11-12]. <http://www.wenming.cn/specials/zxdj/2016zxshkx/jhqw/2016051801.htm>.
2. China Social Science Network. Promoting the Construction of the “Three Systems” of Philosophy and Social Sciences with Chinese Characteristics[EB/OL]. (2020-01-19)[2022-10-07]. http://www.qstheory.cn/zhuanqu/bkxj/2020-01/19/c_1125481699.htm.
3. Jiang Chen. National Conference on Ideological and Political Work in Higher Education Held in Beijing on December 7-8[EB/OL]. (2016-12-09)[2023-01-18]. http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-12/08/content_5145253.htm#1.
4. Guangming Network. The Theory and Path of Academic Discourse System Construction[EB/OL]. (2017-01-06)[2022-10-07]. https://epaper.gmw.cn/gmrb/html/2017-01/06/nw.D110000gmrb_20170106_2-11.htm.
5. Li Pei. Catalogue of Disciplines and Majors for Graduate Education (2022 Edition)[EB/OL]. (2022-09-14)[2023-01-18]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/moe_833/202209/t20220914_611111.htm.
6. Teun A. van Dijk. Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk[M]. Translated by Tang Bin, Fu Tianjue. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2021.
7. Fan Fengchun. Reconstruction of Social Governance Discourse System in the Field of National Governance Modernization—Based on the Basic Framework of Discourse Analysis[J]. Administrative Tribune, 2018, 25(06): 109-115.
8. Bao Changhuo, Jin Xuehui, Zhang Jing, Zhao Fang, Jin Xiaohong, Liu Yanjun. On the Construction of Chinese Information Science Disciplinary System[J]. Journal of Intelligence, 2018, 37(10): 1-11+41.

9. Zhao Rongying, Zhu Weijie, Chang Ruru, Liu Zhuozhu. Visual Analysis of Discourse Power Research: Tracing, Reviewing, and Evolution[J]. Library and Information Service, 2022, 66(11): 4-13.
10. Shen Wangyi. The Core Essence and Internal Logic of Discourse System Construction[EB/OL]. (2016-10-31)[2023-02-23]. <http://theory.people.com.cn/n1/2016/1031/c376186-28821620.html>.
11. Wang Lei, Xu Tao. Connotation Analysis, Realistic Dilemmas, and Implementation Paths of Constructing a Chinese-Characteristic Sports Science Discourse System[J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2022, 45(04): 12-22.
12. Tan Weizhi. Evolution and Reconstruction of Core Concepts in Pedagogy—Thoughts on Constructing a Chinese-Characteristic Pedagogy Discourse System in the New Era[J]. Educational Research, 2018, 39(11): 25-33+60.
13. Zhang Yu. Research on the Construction of Library Science Discourse System—A New Topic for Library Science Development[J]. Library Theory and Practice, 2018(08): 1-6+25.
14. Qi Tianjiao, Li Zilin, Sun Jiarui. Discussion on New Paradigms of Archival Science Education and Research under Pluralistic Perspectives: Based on AERI's Ten-Year Review and Implications[J]. Archives Science Bulletin, 2019(03): 90-98.
15. Liu Yajing, Wang Lin. Dynamic Analysis of Basic Theoretical Research in Information Science in the Past Decade[J]. Information Studies: Theory & Application, 2021, 44(04): 50-59. DOI:10.16353/j.cnki.1000-7490.2021.04.008.
16. Gong Jiaoteng, Wang Lu, Yi Ling. Opportunities, Dilemmas, and Solutions for Library Science Development under the Background of First-Level Discipline Renaming[J]. Journal of the National Library of China, 2022, 31(06): 3-12.
17. Huang Ying, Yu Yifei, Chen Jinghan, et al. External Disciplinary Integration and Internal Knowledge Flow of Library, Information and Archives from an Interdisciplinary Perspective[J/OL]. Library and Information Service: 1-14[2023-03-13]. <https://doi.org/10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2023.01.015>.
18. Tan Weizhi. Evolution and Reconstruction of Core Concepts in Pedagogy—Thoughts on Constructing a Chinese-Characteristic Pedagogy Discourse System in the New Era[J]. Educational Research, 2018, 39(11): 25-33+60.
19. Ding Gang, Hou Huaiyin, Tan Weizhi, Wu Gang, Huang Zhongjing, Wang Baoxing, Long Baoxin, Kang Yongjiu, Xiao Shaoming, Ding Shulin, Li

- Zhengtao. Construction of Chinese Pedagogy Discourse System: Issues and Paths[J]. Basic Education, 2021, 18(1): 13-39.
20. Yu Liangzhi. How to Uphold Tradition? How to Innovate? Reflections on Upholding Tradition and Innovating in Chinese Library Science through Reconsidering the Concept of Libraries[J]. Library and Information, 2022(05): 63-70.
 21. Bourdieu's Field Theory. MBA Library Wiki[EB/OL]. (2018-10-16)[2023-03-22]. <https://wiki.mbalib.com/wiki/%E5%9C%BA%E5%9F%9F%E7%90%86%E8%AE%BA>.
 22. Yan Hui, Han Leiqian, Wu Meng, Han Yanfang. Research on the Development Prospects of Library Science, Information Science, and Archival Science by 2029[J]. Library and Information, 2019(06): 2-17+153.
 23. Marxism and Social Science Methodology Writing Group. Marxism and Social Science Methodology[M]. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
 24. KUHN T S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions[M]. 2nd ed. England: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
 25. Yang Wen, Yao Jing. Digital Transformation of Archival Discipline Construction and Talent Training—Reflections on Renaming the First-Level Discipline from Library, Information and Archives Management to Information Resource Management[J/OL]. Library and Information Service: 1-9[2023-03-19]. <https://doi.org/10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2023.01.015>.

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

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.