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In this paper, we use Citespace 5.5 information visualization software as the analysis software, and collect the analysis of the discourse identity construction from CNKI database of China Knowledge Network. This paper explores the current situation and hotspots of discourse identity construction research in China since its emergence and clarifies the development of the past 20 years. The results show that: the overall trend of discourse identity construction has been increasing year by year; there are fewer collaborative relationships between major researchers and research institutions; research topics are broad, covering education, politics, business, law, medical gender, etc.; research theories are dominated by critical discourse analysis and pragmatics; and research methods have gradually developed to combine qualitative and quantitative approaches. Finally, the article explores the development trend of discourse identity construction, and believes that in the future: (1) it can be studied from an ecological perspective, and a theory and framework of identity construction research in line with green and harmonious can be formulated. (2) The integration between identity construction and various theories and disciplines can be promoted more deeply, and the application of natural sciences should be paid attention to in addition to the application of humanities and social sciences related fields, so as to realize the development of supra-discipline at an early date.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The study of discourse identity construction has been in the hot spot of research since the first study of discourse identity construction came out in 2002. Specifically, identity is people's interpretation of personal status and experience in a sociocultural context [1]: identity construction builds on sociologists' research on identity, mainly absorbing sociological research on constructivism, observing the personal or others' constructive relationship of identity; discourse identity construction reflects scholars' co-construction of discourse and society, specifically the co-construction relationship between discourse and society. Specifically, it is manifested in the co-construction relationship between discourse and identity. Some scholars focus on theoretical studies of identity construction, some focus on applied studies of identity construction, and some focus on both theoretical and applied studies. Although scholars have studied discourse identity construction in full swing, there are not many studies on its developmental lineage. There are no scholars who have conducted a comprehensive review of discourse identity construction research in China in the past 20 years. Therefore, it is necessary to use Citespace to summarize its development as well as to predict its future direction.

2. DATA SOURCES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research questions

This paper focuses on answering the following three research questions: (1) What are the general trends and characteristics of domestic discourse identity construction research? (2) What is the distribution and characteristics of the main researchers and research units? (3) What are the specific topics of interest in domestic discourse identity construction research? From what perspectives should it be advanced in the future?

2.2 DATA SOURCES

In this paper, we use the academic journal paper literature included in CNKI as the data source, including core and non-core journals. The reason for doing so is that the topic can be studied more extensively. However, newspapers, conference papers and master's and doctoral dissertations are excluded. First, we make sure the topic of this paper was identified as discourse identity construction. Second, an advanced search of the paper was conducted by typing in "discourse identity construction". The search revealed that the first study on discourse identity construction in China was published in 2002, so the research topic was set in the 20-year period from 2002 to September 2021. A total of 280 documents were retrieved by using "discourse identity construction" as the search topic. The 261 documents were selected for the analysis of this study, after manually eliminating irrelevant documents, such as book reviews, conferences, newspapers, and master's theses.
2.3 Research methodology

Citespace is a dynamic analysis software developed by Prof. Chaomei Chen of Drexel University, which can be applied to bibliometric analysis, and can specifically track the research hotspots, research frontiers, keyword co-occurrence and emergence, author and institutional distribution of a research field. Therefore, this paper chooses Citespace 5.0, a version for visual analysis, to review past research and look forward to future research.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 General trends and characteristics

The number of papers published can indicate how much attention scholars in China have paid to a certain field. In general, the attention of Chinese scholars to the research field of discourse identity construction has been on a wave-like trend, with the earliest attention to this field being in 2002 and the number of papers published being only one. Specifically, the research on discourse identity construction can be roughly divided into four stages. The first stage is the initial research stage, spanning from 2002 to 2010. The number of articles published in this phase was small, with no more than 10 articles in total, and the number of articles developed slowly in a wavy line. This indicates that the research in the initial research stage was in the process of exploration, not a large number of scholars paid attention to this topic, and the research on this topic did not become a common phenomenon. The second stage is the rapid development stage, spanning the period from 2011 to 2013. The number of articles published in the early stage of this period was on a steep rise, and scholars generally paid attention to the topic of discourse identity construction. The number of articles published in 2013 alone reached 22. The third stage is the mature development stage, i.e., from 2014 to 2017, a period of wave-like rise, with 20, 28, 25 and 32 articles respectively, and a slightly unstable trend of discourse identity construction research. It may be due to the fact that after 2013, various theories, methods, and analytical frameworks in linguistics in China have shown a trend of diversification, and this trend has indirectly affected the research on discourse identity construction. More aptly, it resembles a period of convergence. In 2017, the number of publications in this year was 32, a record high. This indicates that scholars in China have generally attached higher importance to the research related to discourse identity construction, and its research has been more mature into a stable stage in China. The fourth stage is the mature stage, spanning the period from 2018 to 2021 and decreases slightly, 28 and 25 respectively. On the one hand, it indicates that the research topics on discourse identity construction may have converged in all aspects in the past and are fuller. On the other hand, it indicates that the research on discourse identity construction in China may need to work toward a newer step of development.

3.2 Major researchers and research institutions

We used Citespace to visualize and analyze scholars in domestic discourse identity construction, manually adjusting and manipulating the nodes and sizes of their publications to discover the distribution of major scholars in the field and their major contributions, as shown in Figure 2. The sudden increase in research in the field is shown in Figure 3. The specific operation is to datamine scholars who have published articles between January 2002 and September 2021, using each year as a time partition. Figure 2 has a moderated threshold of 0 and shows a list of all scholars with research results during this period. The amount of articles posted by scholars can be revealed by the size of the font as well as the nodes. In Figure 2, the top three scholars with the highest number of publications are Huang Jingjing, Jiang Suzhen, and Li Ming, with 23, 21, and 20 publications respectively. Among them, Huang Jingjing and Li Ming have a cooperative relationship, which can be seen through the linkage between the two scholars. In addition, Huang Jingjing has collaborated with Xiao Wei. Although the number of articles published by Jiang Suzhen scholars is large, they are all mainly personal, and connections with other scholars are not common. Liu Wenyu has collaborated with Wang Yinglei, Li Ke and Mao Weimei, respectively. Li Ke has collaborated with Mao Xingwei, and both of them have published more articles. In addition, Chen Jianping has collaborated with Wang Jialin and Chen Xinren with He He. According to Figure 2, the density is only 0.0019, which also indicates that the collaboration among scholars is not very close. The reason for this may be that the scholars’ specific research areas do not exactly coincide. However, it also shows that scholars have contributed to the study of discourse identity construction from different aspects and themes, which has enriched the study of the topic of discourse identity construction.

The analysis of the emergence of scholars’ research on discourse identity construction is based on the study of the overall volume of scholars’ publications. “Begin” represents the beginning of the mutation, “End” represents the end of the mutation, and “Strength” represents the intensity of the mutation, which is proportional to the influence, and the greater the intensity, the greater the influence of the scholar. According to Figure 3, in the research field of discourse identity construction, the mutation study of visual scholars through Citespace reveals that there are three scholars whose publication volume has increased dramatically in 20 years, namely, Anna Huang, Jiang Suzhen, and Li Ming. As analyzed above, these three scholars have the highest number of publications in this field. Looking at the timing, all three scholars have started to focus on the research area of discourse identity construction early. Among them, Li Ming has the highest mutation value, indicating the highest intensity of influence, with a specific value of 4.2268, followed by Jiang Suzhen and Huang Jingjing.

Figure 4 shows us the main research institutions in the field of discourse identity construction. The larger the font, the more the research institution offer more contribution in the field of discourse identity.
Construction. It can be visually seen that there are more researches in the College of Foreign Languages of Hefei Normal University, the College of Culture and Media of Wanxi University, the College of Foreign Languages of Nantong University, the College of Foreign Languages of Fujian Normal University, the College of Foreign Languages of Nanjing University, the College of Foreign Languages and Literature of Beijing Normal University, and the College of Foreign Languages of Dalian University of Technology. Among them, the most researched institutions in this field are the College of Foreign Languages of Hefei Normal University and the College of Culture and Media of Wanxi University, respectively. The density value is 0.0015, which indicates that there is not much in-depth cooperation among institutions. Only a small number of institutions have cooperative relationships with each other, such as Nanjing University and Nanjing Audit University. In addition, the visual analysis of institutions indicates that besides the College of Foreign Languages, there are also non-foreign language colleges such as the College of Media, the College of Education, and the College of Arts and Aesthetics that give attention to discourse identity construction research. This indicates that the study of discourse identity construction is a more general research topic in the academic community.

Figure 5 shows the institutional mutations. Among them, the College of Culture and Communication of Wanxi University has the highest mutation value, indicating the greatest intensity of influence, with an intensity value of 4.4383, followed by the College of Foreign Languages of Hefei Normal University with an intensity value of 4.0242.

3.3 Research hotspots

3.3.1 Keyword co-occurrence

In Citespace, we set the Time Slicing to 1 year and the selection criteria to Top50, i.e., we selected the top 50 authors in each time partition as the research object, and obtained Figure 6. According to Citespace, the larger the value of Modularity Q is, the better the clustering obtained by the network. When the Q is above 0.5, the clustering result can be considered reasonable [2]. Silhouette is used to measure the homogeneity of the network, and the closer to 1, the higher the homogeneity of the network. Based on this, we calculated the frequency and mediated centrality of the keywords and obtained Table 1. According to Table 1, the top 15 keywords were extracted and ranked by frequency and mediated centrality respectively. Whether in terms of frequency, or intermediary centrality, the keywords ranked in the top four are similar. “Identity construction”, “discourse construction”, “discursive identity” and “identity” are indeed related to discourse identity construction the focus of the study. The term “discursive identity” indicates that research on discourse identity construction is related to pragmatics. Let’s look at the keywords in order 5 to 15.

Some of the keywords are in both frequency and mediated centrality, but the ranking varies widely. For example, identity does not appear very often, only 11 times, and is ranked 15th, but its mediated centrality is ranked higher and is ranked 6th. The keyword “discourse” is ranked 13th in frequency, but is ranked 5th in mediated centrality.

On the surface, there are keywords whose frequencies are in the top 15, but mediated centrality does not appear; and vice versa. However, if we look deeper, we can find that some of the key words in the frequency are inseparable from the intermediary centrality. For example, “authoritative discourse” and “community of human destiny” are related to “national identity” and “discourse”. “Commercial soft ads” belongs to the field of advertising, and are related to “institutional discourse”. “China Daily” can be related to “national identity” and “institutional discourse” at the same time. The reason is that, as the authoritative newspaper organization in China, the content and reporting style of People’s Daily can be based on the establishment of national identity.

Specifically, the main non-intersection between the keywords in frequency and the keywords in intermediary centrality is reflected in the fact that the keywords in frequency mainly focus on specific events and objects under study, such as China Daily and commercial soft advertisements. However, the keywords in intermediary centrality also contain methodological features such as critical discourse analysis and ecological discourse analysis. Therefore, this non-intersection presents a difference mainly in the research content and research methods. In other words, regardless of the topic of discourse identity construction research, its methodology is still inseparable from the support of discourse analysis and other methodologies, i.e., the common analysis of discourse identity construction is mainly discourse analysis. The emergence of new media and corpus in mediated centrality indicates that the study of discourse identity construction is moving towards information modernization. And the use of ecological discourse analysis as a framework and theory of analysis indicates that the methodology of the study of discourse identity construction is changing with the times. In this way, the graphs containing the ranking of keywords in terms of frequency and mediated centrality show that the results of the two rankings are slightly different, but the overall trends are relatively similar.

3.3.2 Keyword class clustering analysis

The analysis of the discourse identity construction research is carried out specifically in terms of the span of time.

(i) The first phase (2002-2010)

At the beginning of 2002, the first scholar in China used discourse as a mediator to bring cultural studies and identity studies together [3]. It opened up the first domestic research on discourse identity construction and conducted a study on contextual conformity, with only one publication at this time. In 2004, scholars discussed how institutional discourse construct’s identity in discourse practice [4], which shows that...
discourse becomes a bridge between identity construction and linguistic research, and is the first step of identity construction towards discourse. In 2005, scholars also focused on discourse, specifically focusing on the racial discrimination and sexism suffered by black women writers in reality and their efforts to construct positive identity constructions in their novels [5]; from the perspective of language function, they paid attention to a variable of U.S. foreign discourse policy, that is, the study of identity, and emphasized that the study of identity and foreign policy need obtain scholars’ attention to its theoretical foundations; some scholars apply post-colonial critical theory to discuss the identity construction of Chinese culture by Western scholars through their discourse which imply power [6, 7].

In 2006, scholars also focused on the construction of African identity, a continued turn toward topical issues in the construction of discursive identity. Scholars began to focus on the field of collective discourse, and there were two studies on discourse. 2007, both articles took literature as the research theme, and scholars focused on identity, discursive identity, and construction, with an increasing range of concerns in the field of discursive identity construction. Among them, some scholars discussed the construction of self-identity of ancient Chinese and Western women based on postmodernist theory [8]; some scholars discussed the construction of literary theoretical knowledge [9]. In 2008, some scholars took Foucault’s focus on power as a starting point, studied identity construction of marginalized groups [10].

For the first time, some scholars conducted a discourse analysis from news newspapers, taking international students as the research object, and illustrated the impact of negative identity construction on identity, which belongs to the combination of identity construction and discourse analysis in the real sense [11]; some scholars studied discourse identity construction from the perspective of sociology for the first time, and used critical discourse analysis to explore how civil institutions positively construct the anti-cancer. It is the first study of identity construction from a sociological perspective, using critical discourse analysis, exploring how civil institutions positively construct the social fact of the cancer community [12]. The study of identity construction from sociology is grounded because the philosophical basis of identity construction originates from constructivism, which in turn belongs to sociological research.

In 2009, scholars’ attention to constructs and critical discourse analysis keep increasing, and the themes at this time included overview studies of identity construction, the construction of women’s identities in everyday advertising, and the construction of ethnic minority women’s identities, etc. In 2010, the focus was still on identity.

It can be seen that the specific research themes in the first stage mainly focus on the study of literature, ethnic discrimination, and the construction of women. Their research theories are mostly related to cultural theories, and the analytical methods are gradually expanded to discourse analysis. In addition, the core concern of scholars is the construction of identity embodied in discourse and power, and Foucault’s research on power and discourse is mentioned several times within the articles. In general, the first phase of the study is relatively homogeneous, and the application of relevant theories is not common.

However, what is valuable is that the scholars have basically established the idea of paying attention to social hotspots and social phenomena.

(ii) Second phase (2011 to 2013)

In 2011, scholars still paid much attention to the above. Some scholars took court mediation as a point and combined mediation discourse with identity construction to show that good discourse strategies facilitate the handling of conflicts between human and institutional identities [13]; some scholars combined critical discourse analysis theory, postmodern international relations theory, and constructivist theory to explore the discourse construction of ASEAN in China in an integrated way [14], which combines both the linguistic and philosophical foundations of identity construction research. Other scholars have discussed Chinese and Western literary works separately using Phielau’s model of critical discourse analysis [15, 16] in order to illustrate the inter constructive relationship between discourse and power. This suggests that critical discourse analysis is increasingly favored by these studies. There is, of course, a reason for this. Discourse identity construction consists in identity construction, and the linguistic theory of identity construction is critical discourse analysis. Other scholars have focused on Western ecofeminism and discussed its ability to be seared by different theories, which can get rid of the dichotomy of essentialism and dichotomy in identity theory construction [17].

In 2012, scholars further expanded the breadth of research on discursive identity construction, and some of them began to focus on discourse and Eco linguistics. Among them, the more novel and important studies are as follows. For the first time, some scholars analyzed the marked and unmarked usage of person-indicators in trial discourse from the perspective of variation studies in sociolinguistics, in order to illustrate the different identities constructed by different usage of person-indicators [18], which belongs to the combination of sociolinguistics and pragmatics. At this time, it is also the stage of rapid growth of domestic scholars’ research on variation in sociolinguistics, with 20 articles published in this field in just one year. Some scholars have also discussed different dimensions of identity studies using the meta discourse classification model from the perspective of the cooperation principle to explain the persuasive behavior of identity construction in advertising [19]. The fields of pragmatics and systemic functional linguistics have studied meta discourse, so this article actually integrates identity construction into a broader field of study. Throughout the research related to meta discourse, domestic research related to meta discourse has been on a direct rise since Xu Jiujiu’s research on meta discourse in 2006, and the number of articles published in 2012 was close to the peak, with 120 research results in just one year. Therefore, this is the best illustration that discourse identity construction research follows the domestic development trend. There are also scholars who discuss the relationship between new media and public intellectuals, specifically discussing the social phenomenon of public intellectuals’ discourse construction on microblogs [20]. The importance of this article is mainly reflected in its focus on the group of intellectuals, whose voice in the new era is important for the construction of their own identity and for the construction of society. In 2012, other related research topics

### Table 1: Frequency and centrality of key words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Key words</th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Image construction</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Image construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Discourse construction</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Discourse construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pragmatic identity</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Pragmatic identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Contextual conformity</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Authoritative discourse</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gender differences</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Discourse strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>China Daily</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>National image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community of common destiny for all mankind</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Institutional discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Commercial soft Ads</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Critical discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spatially thorough</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Ecological discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Discourse strategy</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Power of discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Institution identity</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>New media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

include the construction of presidential identity, women’s identity, etc.

According to Figure 7, in 2013, based on the previous studies, the scholars’ attention to the construction of discursive identity skyrocketed, while relevant studies on national identity, teachers’ discourse, urban management discourse, working class discourse, film discourse and the construction of film actors’ identity were added. Through critical discourse analysis, Foucault’s discourse theory, the study of identity construction of Chinese-Americans fills the gap of discourse analysis that past scholars mostly focus only on Chinese-American literary studies. So, it is a linguistic turn of Chinese-American literary [21]. Some scholars further point out the current state of research elucidating identity construction, i.e., everyday conversation - such as storytelling in narrative texts, institutional discourse - such as courtroom and news discourse, business discourse - such as corporate discourse, and research -such as corporate discourse, and research methods. In other words, a combination of qualitative and quantitative is a trend to analysis this field. This is because the selection of corpus can reflect dynamism [22]. Subsequently, scholars keep focusing on dynamism, examining changes in discourses and the dynamic identity they construct. It can illustrate the shift from essentialist to constructivist contributions to identity studies by scholars in different fields, from sociologists, social psychologists, and cultural scholars, to communication scholars, conversation analysts, and pragmatics. Immediately after, along constructivism and poststructuralism, the issue of the construction of national identity in the context of international relations is addressed [23, 24].

In terms of methodological research, scholars gave enough attention to critical discourse analysis, but not a few also focused on social identity theory [25], employing corpus research methods for the first time [26].

(iii) The third stage (2014-2017)

According to Figure 7, in 2014, scholars’ attention was mainly focused on four categories of identity construction, discourse, identity, and collective identity, including discourse involving Taiwan, urban cultural construction, and online game discourse. Some scholars realized the functionality of identity construction and emphasized the importance of combining identity construction with systemic functional linguistics [27, 28]. Some scholars first focus on the relationship between intertextuality and identity construction in sociolinguistics [29]. Some scholars are concerned with the different stages and types of identity construction of modernity of marginalized groups, that is, homosexuals [30]. Some scholars are concerned with intangible cultural heritage and use the multi-discourse analysis method under the constructivist research perspective, then illustrate the existing problems of cultural promotion and propaganda in ancient towns and make suggestions for their identity construction [31].

In 2015, scholars focused on discourses, collective identities, etc., with an extremely keen interest in constructs in particular. The themes include classroom discourse, discourse of incivility, doctor-patient discourse, conflict discourse, teacher discourse, and dress discourse. Some scholars have suggested the dynamic role of the two links, agenda setting and frame embedding, on the mechanisms of discursive power production, as an illustration of their operation for the discursive construction of the state [32]. As the problem of negative discourse interactions in doctor-patient relationships becomes more and more pronounced, there is an urgency to explore the study of benign health care reform methods. Discourse, with a narrative framework, for constructing harmonious doctor-patient [33]. During this year, online shopping began to emerge. The different ways of constructing identities of online store owners in the virtual world became particularly important [34]. In the education category, on the one hand, with the development of online modernization of the curriculum, the discursive identity of online teachers was discussed by using pragmatic strategies such as discourse body strategies and speech act strategies [35], and teacher moral discourse was studied in a cross-cultural comparison study [36]. On the other hand, the three-dimensional combination of competencies was used to explore the identity construction of university students in this aspect of academic English writing [37].

In 2016, all the class clusters were covered, except for national identity and ecological linguistics which were not covered. The attention was high and more evenly distributed. This indicates that the studies of each cluster received consistent attention, i.e., at this time scholars basically form their own specific study field. The approach of critical metaphor analysis, i.e., the combination of critical discourse analysis with metaphor and the integration of the study of identity construction [38], is a combination of identity construction and metaphor as a micro perspective. The scope of sociolinguistic community of practice theory is narrowed to the academic community of practice, and specific discourse identities are examined through micro discourse strategies, such as form [39]. The three-layer model of discourse history analysis is also important for the analysis of identity construction in higher institutions, as it can take into account the historical factors of the dynamic development of identity construction [40], bridging the gap of cross-cultural studies in micro-linguistic strategy analysis.

In 2017, scholars have become more specialized in their data analysis, using the qualitative analysis software NVivo to code data on the hotspot in the media [41, 42, 43], which makes the study of discourse identity construction more modern and informative.

(iv) Phase 4 (2018 to 2021)

According to Figure 7, the topics covered in 2018 mainly contain the study of discursive identity construction of leaders, grassroots opinion leaders, government opinion spokespersons, and national discourse [44]. This indicates that the field of such research gradually rises from the everyday society to the field of the state or interstate society. In 2019, scholars have also studied all clusters more evenly. After reviewing Winter’s theory of cultural identity construction and Anderson’s theory of discursive identity construction, some scholars confirm the rationality of relationalist identity theory and the theoretical framework of internal state relations as a way to analyze geopolitics [45], which is a reflection of the deepening of identity construction into the field of diplomacy. However, from 2020 onwards, such studies gradually decreased. Scholars begin to focus on non-mainstream studies of identity construction, such as the identity construction implied by the marginal discourse of graffiti [46] and the marginal discourse analysis of fan culture [47]. And by 2021, studies on the clusters of discourse; constructs, critical discourse analysis, and national identity are barely visible, with only scattered studies on critical discourse analysis and national identity.

3.4 Keyword mutation analysis

Keyword mutation analysis is used to detect whether there is a sudden increase in interest in a research discourse in the field of discourse identity construction in a specific time period through mutation detection. The retrieved studies of discourse identity construction contain a total of 9 keyword mutations. According to the above, we know that the period from 2002 to 2011 belongs to the initial stage to the rapid development of the research on the construction of discourse identity. This indicates that during this period, scholars generally have a strong and continuous interest in all of the above topics, with only “contextual conformity” being less intense at 3.277.3. The starting date was 2009 and the ending date was 2015, which lasted for 7 years in total. However, the intensity of the keyword “construct” is higher than that of “contextual conformity”. “Harmonious discourse analysis” was first proposed by Professor Huang Guowen in the process of localization of Eco linguistics in 2016. And the harmonious discourse analysis on discourse identity...
construction first appeared in 2017 and ended in 2019 with an intensity of 3.0519, which illustrates the characteristics of discourse identity construction research following hotspots.

4. CONCLUSIONS

According to the combing and review of 20 years of discourse identity construction research in China, it can be seen that the research themes of discourse identity construction are relatively broad, involving all aspects in society, such as medical, political, educational, journalistic, communication, business, legal, gender, etc. Recently, scholars have also begun to focus on marginal discourse and marginal identity construction, which is a transition from mainstream to non-mainstream. On the whole, scholars mostly start from social hotspots, or reveal unfair identity constructions, or discuss the social nature reflected by them, but the ultimate goal is similar to critical discourse analysis, i.e., they try to promote discourse practices and discourse events in a more harmonious and greener direction.

The research theories of discourse identity construction are mainly based on critical discourse analysis, sociolinguistic and pragmatic analysis, supplemented by systemic functional linguistics, sociolinguistics, cross-cultural theory, cultural theory, and more recently diplomatic theory and cognitive theory, which is a manifestation of the interdisciplinary nature of the research and side evidence of the adaptability of discourse identity construction. More attention is currently being paid to the relationship between language and ecology at home and abroad. However, only relatively few scholars have paid attention to the study of ecological discourse identity construction. This is due to the fact that its linguistic theory is based on critical discourse analysis, and scholars have mostly studied it from the perspective of criticism, without paying attention to the study of harmonious and ecological discourse identity construction. Therefore, in the future, it is possible to study the construction of discourse identity in a more positive way, starting from the ecological aspect.

In terms of research methods, scholars have focused on how research methods were mainly qualitative analysis in the early years, combined with qualitative and quantitative in the later years, and then coded by the very sophisticated analysis software NVivo recently.

The research framework is generally not just an isolated single framework, but a multi-theoretical, multi-analytical approach, and interdisciplinary integrated analytical framework, making the analysis reflect the trend of interdisciplinary development. Of course, it can be seen that this interdisciplinary and integrated analytical framework is still in a relatively preliminary stage. That is to say, the research methods of discourse identity construction are generally still dominated by critical discourse analysis. It also indicates that identity construction-related research should be integrated into a broader research field in the future. This is because in any social field, in any social subfield, there are human activities, and their subjective dynamics further influence the social structure. Therefore, not only the humanities and social sciences need to discuss identity construction, but also the natural sciences can be slightly integrated into the consideration of identity construction. In this way, both the theory and the scope of research can be further advanced, and the study of identity construction can truly enter a superdisciplinary field soon!
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