

Thoughts on Constructing the Discourse System for the Information Resource Management Discipline: Postprint

Authors: Chu Jingli, Wang Jue

Date: 2024-05-04T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Against the backdrop of the state's advancement in constructing the discourse system of philosophy and social sciences and the renaming of the first-level discipline of Library, Information and Archives Management, further clarifying the impact of disciplinary renaming on its discourse system is conducive to promoting disciplinary development and adapting to the changes of the times. The article first employs the literature research method to review the current development status of the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline, deconstructs the disciplinary discourse and elaborates on the evolution process of core concepts and disciplinary context. Furthermore, utilizing journal papers from the two major databases of "Peking University Core" and "CSSCI" between 2012 and 2022 as corpora, it explores the status and development trends of academic discourse in the discipline of Library, Information and Archives Management over the past decade through methods such as constructing semantic networks, and subsequently discusses the fundamental structure and construction pathways for building the discourse system of the Information Resource Management discipline.

Full Text

Thoughts on Constructing the Discourse System for the Information Resource Management Discipline

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: Against the backdrop of national efforts to construct discourse systems for philosophy and social sciences and the renaming of the first-level dis-

cipline from “Library, Information and Archives Management” to “Information Resource Management,” clarifying the impact of this renaming on its discourse system is crucial for promoting disciplinary development and adapting to contemporary changes. This article first employs literature review methods to examine the current state of discourse system development in information resource management, deconstructing disciplinary discourse and explaining the evolution of core concepts and disciplinary contexts. Using journal articles from the “Peking University Core” and “CSSCI” databases between 2012 and 2022 as a corpus, the study explores the status and developmental trends of academic discourse in library, information, and archives management over the past decade through semantic network analysis and other methods, thereby discussing the basic structure and construction pathways for the information resource management discourse system.

Keywords: discourse system; information resource management; library, information and archives; discipline construction

On May 17, 2016, General Secretary Xi Jinping delivered an important speech at the Symposium on Philosophy and Social Sciences, explicitly outlining the coordinated advancement of discourse system, disciplinary system, and academic system construction as a critical task in accelerating the development of philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics. He pointed out that China’s philosophy and social sciences lag in the construction of disciplinary, academic, and discourse systems, and emphasized the need to build a Chinese-characteristic philosophy and social science system based on the principles of rooting in China while learning from abroad, exploring history while grasping the present, and caring for humanity while facing the future. This system should fully embody Chinese characteristics, style, and ethos in its guiding ideology, disciplinary framework, academic system, and discourse system. On December 7-8, 2021, at the National Conference on Ideological and Political Work in Higher Education, General Secretary Xi Jinping again stressed the importance of innovating academic discourse systems, noting that academic discourse systems represent important outcomes of scholarly research and concrete manifestations of research quality, style, and strength. Once produced, academic achievements deeply permeate scholarly activities, influencing reproduction within academic fields and becoming essential content in knowledge and value transmission, thereby shaping social subjects—people—on a broader scale. Building a culturally strong nation and cultivating talent for the country necessitates attention to academic discourse system construction.

On September 13, 2022, the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council and the Ministry of Education officially issued the *Graduate Education Discipline and Specialty Catalogue (2022 Edition)*, formally renaming the first-level discipline from “Library, Information and Archives Management” to “Information Resource Management,” with the new catalogue taking effect in 2023. This change will profoundly and enduringly impact the original discipline’s

disciplinary system, academic system, and discourse system. National policy guidance and the first-level discipline renaming compel us to reflect on the development of information resource management and the construction of its discourse system.

This article employs literature review and corpus analysis methods to clarify the fundamental meanings and transformational relationships of core concepts such as discourse system, examine the current state of information resource management discourse systems, analyze existing deficiencies, and focus on exploring the basic structure and construction pathways for the information resource management discourse system. It should be noted that “construction” does not mean restoration or rebuilding from scratch, but rather building an information resource management discourse system that meets the needs of the new first-level discipline based on existing achievements.

1. Conceptual Clarification

1.1 Discourse and Discourse System The term “discourse” is widely used across numerous disciplines and intellectual schools. Due to differences in methods, theories, perspectives, and research purposes, “discourse” carries various orientations. Therefore, defining the concept of discourse and analyzing discourse itself constitutes a multidimensional understanding that has evolved from a singular linguistic dimension of text, words, and grammar to interdisciplinary research spanning society, history, politics, and philosophy. The formation mechanism from discourse to discourse system is complex. Discourse system construction builds upon discourse as its basic unit, establishing logical genealogies and ideological systems for discourse that become inherited as solidified texts and knowledge systems, presenting the relational states among different concepts and theories. From a macro perspective, when certain realities cannot be contained by modern structures and modes of thinking, it becomes necessary to deconstruct existing cognitive frameworks and core structures, reconstructing societal thinking and language systems to re-express them through different modes of thought and linguistic forms—this represents the philosophical-level explanation of discourse system. Discourse theorists argue that discourse systems are concealed beneath the subjective consciousness of discourse subjects while simultaneously governing people’ s thoughts, speech, and actions in a default manner, necessitating high attention and prudent treatment of discourse system issues. Zhang Weiwei and Wu Xinwen deconstruct discourse systems, arguing that they consist of core concepts, dominant ideas, knowledge frameworks, cultural symbols, discourse production mechanisms, discourse dissemination mechanisms, and discourse support mechanisms forming an integrated whole.

1.2 Academic Discourse System A discipline’ s development is inseparable from the construction and improvement of its academic, knowledge, and discourse systems. While the academic system reveals the essential laws of a

discipline' s research objects through systematic theoretical knowledge, the discourse system represents the expressive form of that theoretical knowledge—the external characteristics and linguistic carrier of the academic system. 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 comprises academic concepts, propositions, paradigms, and logical relationships that constitute systematic theoretical knowledge explaining the external world. Different disciplines form distinct academic discourse systems around different research objects or questions, and even within the same discipline, different discourse systems may emerge around common research objects or questions. In short, academic discourse systems present the relational states of concepts, categories, and theories within academic fields, undergoing continuous change while maintaining reflexivity and criticality. Their construction is not mere speculation but must ultimately reflect social realities and address social contradictions, building academic discourse systems on the foundation of social development.

1.3 Discourse Power Zhao Rongying et al. define power as a force of mutual influence among subjects that maintains social structure, with this interaction constituting a power network. Discourse power represents the ability of social subjects to use discourse forms to disseminate and guide the depth and breadth of their influence. Examining “discourse power” from four perspectives—conceptual analysis, characteristic classification, typology, and evaluation indicators—combined with explorations of discourse concepts in linguistics, sociology, philosophy, history, and informetrics, academic discourse power is defined as the ability of academic subjects possessing academic achievements or resources to disseminate their academic outcomes through various discourse expressions, thereby influencing and even guiding the cognition and actions of other actors. The subjects include scholars, disciplines, academic journals, conferences, media, and institutions. Influential discourse systems and their discourse power embody five core elements: political implications, theoretical support, philosophical thinking, general education expression, and effective dissemination. Therefore, macroscopically constructing Chinese philosophy and social science discourse systems, including information resource management, requires effort in these five core elements.

In summary, “discourse” is the conceptual foundation and premise, “discourse system” is the basis and support, and “discourse power” is the purpose and ultimate goal. “Discourse system” serves as a foundational concept linking “discourse” and “discourse power.” The purpose of studying academic discourse systems is to enhance disciplinary discourse power. This article focuses on the discourse system of information resource management without extensive discussion of disciplinary discourse power.

2.1 Literature Review

A mature and stable discourse character, style, and system represent important standards for disciplinary strength and theoretical confidence, as well as signs of a maturing disciplinary system. In research on constructing Chinese-characteristic sports science discourse systems, Wang Lei and Xu Tao point out that current construction faces challenges including Western academic hegemony, lack of original theories, and inadequate translation norms for sports academic terminology, proposing five measures including bidirectional interpretation of sports academic discourse and active external promotion. In research on constructing China's external discourse on marine governance, Han Shuqin and Jiao Lin argue that China needs to provide Chinese solutions and wisdom for global marine governance through its external discourse, proposing three practical pathways—internal-to-external transformation, equivalent standardization, and integrating Chinese and foreign elements—based on clarifying the connotation and extension of China's marine governance discourse. In research on Chinese-characteristic education discourse system construction, Zhao Menglei points out that Chinese education researchers' ideological understanding has become disconnected from China's belief discourse, resulting in aphasia in Chinese educational academic discourse under Western-dominated contexts and imbalance between educational practice and theoretical discourse, proposing solutions such as rooting in traditional Chinese cultural spirit, pursuing consensus-seeking discourse thinking, and building diversified dissemination pathways. Tan Weizhi, examining the evolution and reconstruction of education's core concepts, argues that constructing Chinese-characteristic education discourse systems must be based on Chinese educational academic traditions and contemporary educational practice, proposing that expanded educational spacetime requires redefining schools and that new teaching organizational forms require redefining classes while enhancing interpretations of information equity, information justice, and information democracy.

Under the first-level discipline renaming, attention to constructing the three major systems of information resource management has gradually increased. However, existing problems and shortcomings within the original “library, information, and archives” discipline will not disappear due to renaming but will instead generate more issues requiring consideration and response. Therefore, it remains necessary to return to the state of “three independent disciplines” to explore inherent problems in discourse system construction. This article reviews existing research, organizing mentioned perspectives according to dimensions such as “domain concepts” and “research theories” to summarize weaknesses in the original discipline's development (see Table 1). As shown in the table, library science, information science, and archival science carry rich historical national heritage and wisdom in China. However, modern disciplinary development has been challenging, with weak academic continuity, leaving many excellent historical achievements yet to be effectively excavated and utilized. Different research perspectives and subjects have led to different paradigm divisions within disci-

plines, and as research questions become increasingly complex, interdisciplinary integration has intensified, causing chaotic development, unclear positioning, and uncertain futures. To break original constraints and stimulate disciplinary vitality, information resource management has become the new first-level discipline name, presenting both opportunities and challenges for future disciplinary construction.

2.3 Evolution of Core Concepts

All disciplinary research begins with concepts. Core concepts form the foundation of disciplinary discourse systems, serving as channels and media for academic thought. Their evolution and reconstruction often signify the opening of new research fields requiring new methods and perspectives, as well as new solutions to existing problems or creative explanations of new problems. In knowledge production, concepts are not given facts or dogmas but tools for empirical research that explain and clarify relevance and applicability. Concepts are not merely terminology but concrete means of providing understanding of 事物的 value and meaning, becoming tools for practical exploration and constructing theory through exploration. Ren Dongsheng and Han Shuqin note in their research on constructing Chinese-characteristic marine discourse systems that successful discourse system construction invariably begins with the standardization, popularization, and theorization of concepts.

In early research, scholars exploring the construction of bibliography's core concept system noted that a disciplinary core concept system's key characteristics include systematicity and intuitiveness, ensuring internal logical connections to prevent conceptual ambiguity midway or overall. As disciplines develop in increasingly complex internal and external environments, understanding and research of different concepts transform due to varying external environments and internal perspectives. For instance, the core disciplinary concept of "information resources" has undergone three major shifts between 1994 and 2019, with Wang Zhongyi et al. analyzing these shifts using semantic cloud models and attributing them to database technology, internet technology, and big data application technology, which have continuously changed information carriers and communication media, enriching and expanding the concept's connotation and extension. After the first-level discipline renaming, Ma Feicheng explained the disciplinary connotation of information resource management, noting that our core content involves information resource management and utilization, with all basic theories, research paradigms, and professional development revolving around this process and lifecycle. From the perspective of inheriting and innovating the "library, information, and archives" discipline, Yu Liangzhi also reflected on the library concept, pointing out that its essential characteristic is not institutional, locational, or public welfare nature, but functional characteristics ensuring effective information access and retrieval. The unchanging foundation of library science lies in its concern for and guarantee of human information needs, with its innovation space encompassing all related thoughts,

theories, and technologies, including but not limited to those of libraries as functional entities. In disciplinary development, new entities can be used to modify and update concepts, merging new members' attributes into conceptual representations, with different concept combinations helping people understand and communicate across contexts—this is central to discourse system research.

2.4 Transformation of Disciplinary Context

Discourse system transformation is a historical process fundamentally determined by the accumulation of social practice, era progress, and knowledge system updates. However, different knowledge systems have different presuppositions, and cross-cultural knowledge systems face natural barriers. As Bourdieu's field theory states: "Very similar events occurring in different historical environments produce completely different results." Over-relying on external environmental changes and technological evolution for disciplinary development, always immersing oneself in answers provided by other contexts or disciplines without considering one's own questions, constitutes a form of discourse deficiency. Therefore, discourse systems must emphasize rooting in Chinese traditions, drawing from Chinese contexts, and reconstructing discourse systems based on Chinese cultural characteristics. Many scholars have made efforts to break these barriers, such as Peng Zhihui's proposal for the translation, adaptation, and reinterpretation of the concept of Disinformation in the Chinese context, and Qi Chenhang's exploration of the EU's information fog governance system under digital sovereignty discourse and its implications for China's international political environment and technology enterprises' overseas layout, suggesting embedding Chinese political concepts into information fog governance systems.

Based on these research findings and analysis of discourse describing research contexts in the corpus, language use changes between 2012 and 2022 were not significant, with "big data technology," "information technology," and "digital transformation" becoming almost mandatory phrases in describing academic backgrounds and natural starting points for thinking. However, logical fallacies and omissions may exist herein. At the contextual level, these technologies are not native to the library, information, and archives fields; researchers need to investigate how these technologies affect society, information, and media in relation to specific problems, examining the real impact on domain research rather than using them as mere backdrops for empirical studies. At the technical level, we must consider how these technological developments affect LIS's own technologies, such as cataloging, knowledge organization, and ancient book restoration, allowing external technological developments to genuinely advance the LIS field. At the academic logic level, we must clearly recognize that each discipline has its own mission and responsibilities—for instance, the commonality among four information science perspectives is that library science's mission is information organization and equitable access, information science's mission is information processing and retrieval efficiency, and archival science is dedi-

cated to information preservation and flow control. While such summaries may seem concise today, future second-level discipline expansion will bring more disciplinary missions and broader visions, but committing to disciplinary missions remains our original logical starting point for academic research rather than passively chasing scientific frontiers driven by era and technology. Therefore, emphasizing cross-cultural and interdisciplinary contexts, tracing discourse origins, and truly doing “translation” work between contextual barriers constitutes an important part of building disciplinary discourse systems.

3. Constructing the Discourse System of Information Resource Management

3.1 Basic Structure of the Disciplinary Discourse System

3.1.1 Historical View and Methodology All discourse systems have their values, with historical views and methodologies playing dominant roles. Discourse systems cannot exist independently of present history. In contemporary China, Marxist guidance is an inevitable requirement for discourse system construction. The Marxist historical view represents the concrete implementation and scientific application of dialectical materialism in the social-historical domain, providing discourse system understanding with distinct historical materialist characteristics and emphasizing analysis of discourse systems’ semantic connotations and value orientations from social-historical and class standpoint attributes. Discourse is the garment of thought; ideological transformation signifies discourse transformation. As a discourse form under specific disciplinary systems, terminology constitutes that discipline’s unique discourse system, with its discourse field and content determined by specific disciplinary attributes and characteristics. At the methodological level, we similarly adhere to social science methodology from a Marxist perspective, using practice and dialectical-historical materialism as fundamental methods to form a scientific, open methodological system that studies and explores major relationships in social development—including subjects and objects, systems and elements, contradictions and processes, individuals and groups, cognition and evaluation—applying materialist historical views and scientific methodology throughout the entire process of constructing China’s information resource management discipline to provide answers to domain problems that align with China’s social development process, thereby forming a complete information resource management discourse system.

3.1.2 Research Paradigms and Theory The concept of paradigm, proposed by renowned American philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn, refers to the consensus and fundamental views reached by scientists in specific disciplines, representing shared agreements in research criteria and conceptual systems within a disciplinary community. It is the foundation and soul of insights, theories, and viewpoints—the essence and law of academic, disciplinary, and discourse innovation. Discourse systems are constructed on specific paradigms

and in fact represent these research paradigms; discourse system transformation must connect to corresponding research paradigms. Grasping research paradigms means grasping the main qualitative determinations that distinguish one disciplinary, academic, and discourse community from other groups and research paths. For instance, Chinese information science research has divided into two major paradigms—information management and intelligence research—due to different logical starting points, forming different research objects and discourse systems. Different research paradigms are mutually exclusive and cannot be combined; forced integration only causes disciplinary boundary confusion and research chaos. A discipline should be based on a stable theoretical core; once a disciplinary standpoint is determined, it should not chase trends and hotspots but “respond to all changes with constancy.”

Against interdisciplinary integration backgrounds, many disciplines are constructing pluralistic paradigms from macro perspectives. In archival science, for example, the Association for Archives Education and Research advocates new paradigms under pluralistic perspectives: applying postmodernism, post-colonialism, and post-custodialism to archival education and research against globalization and internationalization backgrounds, with core concepts focusing on marginalized communities, emphasizing diverse backgrounds, participating in social governance, promoting equity and justice, exploring historical truth, and calling for challenge response. In information science research, Yang Jianlin established a generalized intelligence 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 directions for constructing information science basic theoretical systems. Using paradigms as entry points allows accurate grasp of disciplinary innovation points, revealing disciplinary development laws and guiding accelerated discourse system construction.

3.1.3 Basic Categories Discourse systems are constructed through relevant categories. To interpret and construct value, we must fully employ categories. Basic categories in discourse systems refer to core, critical, and fundamental categories—for instance, aesthetics uses “imagery” as its core category to integrate Chinese traditional aesthetics and Western modern aesthetics. The renaming of the first-level discipline from “Library, Information and Archives Management” to “Information Resource Management” reflects breakthroughs and expansions at the categorical level. This concept selection solves the problem that the original three disciplines lacked a common 上位概念 or had unclear 上位概念 s. Under the “coordination” of the “Information Resource Management” name, second-level disciplines have a common logical starting point, forming a disciplinary architecture with clear connotation, definite direction, and reasonable relationships, breaking the limitation of the original discipline name’s excessive focus on specific institutions. Just as education research should not be confined to “schools” as physical institutions, library science, information science,

and archival science should also deepen basic theoretical research beyond practice and exploration of institutions like libraries, information institutes, and archives, allowing knowledge accumulation to come from theoretical iteration rather than merely experiential 叠加, and continuously endowing disciplinary conceptual frameworks and core categories with new meanings that reflect the times.

3.2 Paths for Constructing the Disciplinary Discourse System The core essence of academic discourse system construction lies in, under shared worldviews, historical views, and methodologies, clarifying disciplinary missions and visions, addressing problems arising in social development, grasping principal contradictions, and from disciplinary perspectives, using scientific theories and methods with reasonable techniques and means to provide answers within the disciplinary domain. Through continuous accumulation, a unique and stable academic discourse system is formed, primarily through: (1) Theory as the soil for discourse construction and main driving force—constructing disciplinary discourse systems must first consolidate theoretical foundations, strengthen discourse guidance and explanatory power, and promote innovative discourse development; (2) Continuously outputting influential expressions that both highly summarize disciplinary achievements and strengthen disciplinary characteristics and advantages; (3) Optimizing dissemination channels, promoting effective integration of various media resources with disciplinary professional achievements, leveraging disciplinary strengths, and building discipline-specific content platforms and institutions; (4) Continuously enhancing the virtuous cycle between theory and practice, fundamentally improving disciplinary influence, establishing 完善的 discourse feedback mechanisms, and promoting interactive communication with researchers and the public both within and outside the discipline.

Focusing on the present, new liberal arts construction provides an era backdrop for information resource management discourse system construction, while first-level discipline renaming provides a disciplinary field for discourse system reconstruction. In disciplinary development, we must achieve both integration and independence, both inheritance and innovation. (1) Integration means emphasizing enhanced interdisciplinary capabilities, including borrowing disciplinary theories, transplanting concepts or terminology, and crossing disciplinary methods, striving to reach consensus from different disciplinary perspectives and categories, creating new concepts and theories, triggering methodological revolutions, opening new research fields, and thereby advancing disciplinary, academic, and discourse system construction. (2) Independence means emphasizing deepened understanding and reinterpretation of one's own discipline during integrated development, simultaneously updating practical and educational systems. As Yang Wen and Yao Jing analyzed regarding archival discipline construction and talent cultivation paths after first-level discipline renaming, we must highlight differences between information resource management and information management while distinguishing from other disciplines on the basis of integration, maintaining traditional disciplinary characteristics. (3) Inheritance

means preserving not unchanging discourse or disciplinary systems but core ideas and kernels, rooting in historical development and national culture, and adhering to domain propositions and standardized discourse. (4) Innovation requires critical reflection on disciplines from macro perspectives, 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 disciplinary solutions for new problems.

The information resource management discipline stands at a new historical node. Amid intensifying interdisciplinary integration, competition for disciplinary discourse power is increasingly fierce, and development controversies never cease. Perhaps the only predictable aspect is that the future will be complex and ever-changing. Meanwhile, data and information generation will not stop; information resources are tremendous drivers of social development, people's dependence on information and demand for information resource services will not disappear, information literacy's importance is growing daily, and cultural inheritance and transmission constitute missions entrusted by the times. Endowing information with meaning, excavating knowledge from data, seeking origins, and exploring thoroughly—we believe the information resource management discipline has a promising future.

-
- References:** [1] Xi Jinping: Speech at the Symposium on Philosophy and Social Sciences Work [EB/OL]. [2023-10-12]. http://www.wenming.cn/specials/zxdj/2016zxshkx/jhqw/201605/t20160505_1125481699.htm
- [2] Chinese Social Sciences Net. Promoting the Construction of the “Three Systems” of Chinese-Characteristic Philosophy and Social Sciences [EB/OL]. [2023-10-07]. http://www.qsttheory.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]. [2023-10-18]. http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-12/08/content_5145253.htm#1
- [4] Guangming Net. The Theory and Path of Academic Discourse System Construction [EB/OL]. [2023-10-07]. https://epaper.gmw.cn/gmrb/html/2017-01/06/nw.D110000gmrb_20170106_2-11.htm
- [5] Li Pei. Graduate Education Discipline and Specialty Catalogue (2022 Edition) [EB/OL]. [2023-10-18]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/moe_833/202209/t20220914_660828.htm
- [6] Wang Xuedian. New Liberal Arts and New Era [J]. *New Liberal Arts Theory and Practice*, 2022(1): 38-47, 124-125.
- [7] Wu Hanquan. Preliminary Discussion on Discourse System [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2020.
- [8] [Netherlands] Teun A. van Dijk. *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk* [M]. Translated by Tang Bin and Fu Tianjue. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2021.
- [9] Fan Fengchun. Reconstructing the Social Governance Discourse System in the Context of Modernizing National Governance—Based on the Basic

- Framework of Discourse Analysis [J]. *Administrative Tribune*, 2018, 25(6).
- [10] Zhang Weiwei, Wu Xinwen. *Chinese Discourse: Construction and Deconstruction* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2021.
- [11] Bao Changhuo, Jin Xuehui, Zhang Jing, et al. On the Construction of Chinese Information Science Disciplinary System [J]. *Journal of Intelligence*, 2018, 37(10): 1-11, 41.
- [12] Cai He. Discourse System and Discourse Power in Sociology [J]. *Sociological Review*, 2017, 5(2): 28-32.
- [13] Zhao Rongying, Zhu Weijie, Chang Ruru, et al. Visual Analysis of Discourse Power Research: Tracing, Reviewing, and Evolving [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2022, 66(11): 4-13.
- [14] Zhao Rongying, Zhang Xiaoxi, Liu Zhuozhu, et al. Analysis of Discourse Power and Discourse Power Evaluation [J]. *Information Studies: Theory & Application*, 2021, 44(11): 15-22.
- [15] Shen Wangyi. The Core Meaning and Internal Logic of Discourse System Construction [EB/OL]. [2023-09-23]. <http://theory.people.com.cn/n1/2016/1031/c376186-28821620.html>.
- [16] Zhang Yanyan. *Research on the Construction of Chinese-Modernization Discourse System* [D]. Lanzhou: Lanzhou University, 2022.
- [17] Zhao Fuxue, Yang Hua. Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Sports Science Discourse System in the New Era [J]. *China Sport Science*, 2022, 42(4): 3-13.
- [18] Wang Lei, Xu Tao. Connotation Analysis, Realistic Dilemmas, and Implementation Paths for Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Sports Science Discourse System [J]. *Journal of Beijing Sport University*, 2022, 45(4).
- [19] Han Shuqin, Jiao Lin. Research on the Construction of China's External Discourse System on Marine Governance [J]. *Journal of Ocean University of China (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2022(4): 32-39.
- [20] Zhao Menglei. On the Logic of Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Education Discourse System [J]. *Contemporary Education Science*, 2020(6): 3-8.
- [21] Tan Weizhi. Evolution and Reconstruction of Education's Core Concepts—Thoughts on Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Education Discourse System in the New Era [J]. *Educational Research*, 2018, 39(11): 25-33, 60.
- [22] Zhang Yu. Research on the Construction of Library Science Discourse System—A New Topic in Library Science Development [J]. *Library Theory and Practice*, 2018(8): 1-6, 25.
- [23] Wang Yanqing. Research on Issues in China's Information Science Development [J]. *Library and Information Studies*, 2020, 13(1): 29-34, 39.
- [24] Zhang Bin, Yang Wen. On the Construction of Chinese-Characteristic Archival Science Discourse System in the New Era [J]. *Archives Science Bulletin*, 2019(5): 4-12.
- [25] Qi Tianjiao, Li Zilin, Sun Jiarui. Exploring New Paradigms in Archival Education and Research under Pluralistic Perspectives: Based on AERI's Ten-Year Review and Implications [J]. *Archives Science Bulletin*, 2019(3): 90-98.

- [26] Zhang Yu. Academic Logic and Social Logic: Two Dimensions of Library Science Discourse System Construction [J]. *Library*, 2020(1): 1-6.
- [27] Liu Yajing, Wang Lin. Dynamic Analysis of Basic Theory Research in Information Science in the Past Decade [J]. *Information Studies: Theory & Application*, 2021, 44(4): 50-59.
- [28] Tang Qi. Chinese Standpoint, International Expression—The Theory and Path for Independent Construction of Chinese Archival Academic Discourse System [J]. *Archives Science Study*, 2021(1): 12-17.
- [29] Geng Zhijie, Cao Jianchuan, Lin Shan, et al. On Research Methods and the Transformation of Chinese Library Science Research Paradigms [J]. *Library Forum*, 2021, 41(10): 28-37.
- [30] Yang Jianlin. Thoughts on Reconstructing the Basic Theoretical System of Information Science [J]. *Journal of the China Society for Scientific and Technical Information*, 2020, 39(2): 125-134.
- [31] Lian Zhiying. Crisis and Development of Contemporary Chinese Archival Science [J]. *Archives Science Study*, 2019(2): 31-35.
- [32] Gong Jiaoteng, Wang Lu, Yi Ling. Opportunities, Dilemmas, and Solutions for Library Science Development under First-Level Discipline Renaming [J]. *Journal of the National Library of China*, 2022, 31(6): 3-12.
- [33] Su Xinning. Outline of Chinese-Characteristic Information Science Disciplinary System, Academic System, and Discourse System [J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2021, 47(4): 16-27.
- [34] Yang Wen, Zhang Bin. Further Discussion on Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Archival Science Discourse System in the New Era [J]. *Library and Information Knowledge*, 2022, 39(4): 30-42.
- [35] Huang Ying, Yu Yifei, Chen Jinghan, et al. Interdisciplinary Integration and Internal Knowledge Flow of Library, Information, and Archives from an Interdisciplinary Perspective [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2023, 67(1): 117-130.
- [36] Tan Weizhi. Evolution and Reconstruction of Education's Core Concepts—Thoughts on Constructing Chinese-Characteristic Education Discourse System in the New Era [J]. *Educational Research*, 2018, 39(11): 25-3360.
- [37] Ding Gang, Hou Huaiyin, Tan Weizhi, et al. Construction of Chinese Discourse System in Education: Issues and Paths [J]. *Basic Education*, 2021, 18(1): 13-39.
- [38] Ren Dongsheng, Han Shuqin. Construction and Dissemination of Chinese-Characteristic Marine Governance Discourse [N]. *Chinese Social Sciences Today*, 2022-03-04(4).
- [39] Liu Guohua. Preliminary Exploration of Bibliography's Core Concept System [J]. *Shandong Library Quarterly*, 1997(1): 8-11.
- [40] Wang Zhongyi, Tu Yue, Xia Lixin. Research on Disciplinary Knowledge Drift in Scientific Literature Resources [J]. *Information Studies: Theory & Application*, 2021, 44(6): 118-124.
- [41] Ma Feicheng. Inheriting and Innovating to Continue Advancing Information Resource Management Discipline Development [J]. *Information and Documentation Services*, 2023, 44(1): 13-14.

- [42] Yu Liangzhi. How to Inherit and Innovate? Reflecting on the Library Concept to View Chinese Library Science' s Inheritance and Innovation [J]. Library and Information, 2022(5): 63-70.
- [43] Bourdieu' s Field Theory. MBA 智库百科 [EB/OL]. [2023-09-22]. <https://wiki.mbalib.com/wiki/%E5%9C%BA%E5%9F%9F%E7%90%86%E8%AE%BA>.
- [44] Peng Zihui. On the Adaptation, Transformation, and Reinterpretation of the Disinformation Concept in Chinese Context [J]. Information Studies: Theory & Application, 2022, 45(1): 1-10.
- [45] Qi Chenhang. Research on EU Information Fog Governance under Digital Sovereignty Context [J]. Information Studies: Theory & Application, 2021, 44(9): 74-81, 96.
- [46] Yan Hui, Han Leiqian, Wu Meng, et al. Research on Development Prospects of Library Science, Information Science, and Archival Science by 2029 [J]. Library and Information, 2019(6): 2-17, 153.
- [47] Marxism and Social Science Methodology Writing Group. Marxism and Social Science Methodology [M]. Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2012.
- [48] KUHN T S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions [M]. England: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- [49] Ren Ping. Paradigm Innovation: Methodological Consciousness for Accelerating the Construction of “Three Systems” of Chinese-Characteristic Philosophy and Social Sciences [J]. Nanjing Social Sciences, 2023(9): 1-9.
- [50] Gao Jinhui. Inheritance or Innovation: Thoughts on Chinese Information Science Development Path [J]. Science and Technology Intelligence Research, 2023, 5(1): 1-11.
- [51] Hu Youfeng. On the Construction of Zeng Fanren' s Ecological Aesthetics Discourse System [J]. New Liberal Arts Theory and Practice, 2022(4): 26-39, 120.
- [52] Feng Huiling. Redrawing the Disciplinary Blueprint in the Name of Information Resource Management [J]. Journal of Information Resource Management, 2022, 12(6): 4-10.
- [53] Wang Zizhou. Fieldwork: Application of Anthropological Methods in Library Science [J]. Journal of Library Science in China, 2014, 40(6): 12-21.
- [54] Yang Wen, Yao Jing. Digital Transformation of Archival Discipline Construction and Talent Cultivation—Thoughts on Renaming Library, Information and Archives Management to Information Resource Management [J]. Library and Information Service, 2023, 67(1): 99-107.

Author Introduction: Chu Jingli, male, researcher at the National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, professor and doctoral supervisor at the Department of Information Resource Management, School of Economics and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences; Wang Jue, female, doctoral student at the Department of Information Resource Management, School of Economics and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, and the National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

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

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.