學術對談

網絡規管的新秩序：權力、控制與治理[*]

對談人：姬德強、黃楚新、郭中實、王丹、黃磊
統稿：郭中實、王丹、黃磊
翻譯：郭中實、王丹、黃磊

姬德強教授
（Prof. Deqiang Ji）

黃楚新教授
（Prof. Chuxin Huang）

郭中實教授
（Prof. Zhongshi Guo）

[*] 本文英文版請見學刊網頁 www.cschinese.com。

姬德強，中國傳媒大學教授、媒體融合與傳播國家重點實驗室研究員、國際媒介與傳播研究學會國際傳播分會副主席、《國際跨文化傳播學刊》特約副主編、《全球媒體與中國》編輯、《國際傳播學會年刊》編委。研究興趣：傳播政治經濟學、國際傳播、數字化與中國社會轉型。電郵：jideqiang@cuc.edu.cn

黃楚新，中國社會科學院新媒體研究中心副主任兼秘書長、研究員、中國社會科學院大學新聞傳播學院副院長及教授、中國記協新媒體專業委員會專家組組長、《中國新媒體發展報告》主編。研究興趣：新媒體傳播、媒體融合。電郵：huangchuxin@163.com

郭中實，香港浸會大學傳理學院新聞系教授。研究興趣：媒體效果、新聞生產、新聞轉型。電郵：guo@hkbu.edu.hk

王丹，香港浸會大學傳理學院新聞系研究助理教授。研究興趣：以宏觀政治經濟學和微觀媒體社會學視角研究媒體轉型。電郵：angelawd@hkbu.edu.hk

黃磊，香港浸會大學傳理學院互動媒體系研究助理教授。研究興趣：組織傳播、數字技術、網絡人際傳播、策略傳播。電郵：vincenthuang@hkbu.edu.hk

「目前我們可以看到兩種趨勢：一種是非政治的話語實踐，變得更加多元乃至極端多元，廣大用戶群體按照自身興趣和意願構建著屬於自己的話語世界，不同的世界之間甚至『老死不相往來』；另一種是政治化的話語實踐，正在走向兩個極端，其一是高度管控所塑造的話語同一性，儘管其中也存在著真假同一問題；其二是缺乏管控的話語極化或者說極端的話語表達乃至對立，以民粹主義為代表的更具表層傳播力和情感動員力的政治話語正在『摧城拔寨』，將冷靜的觀察、複雜的思考、慎重的表達推至公共輿論的邊緣地帶。」

——姬德強教授

「在傳統意義上的新聞生產消失的情況下：新聞生產方式根據算法採寫，套用一定的模板進行創作，內容形式單一，同質化問題嚴重，且缺少人文關懷，影響受眾多元信息的接收。傳統新聞生產通常有著嚴格的新聞倫理和新聞價值觀，確保新聞的真實性和公正性；如果傳統新聞生產消失，去『中心化』的信息生產方式易使受眾接觸到的網絡信息良莠不齊、真假難辨，嚴重影響受眾對新聞的信任度和滿意度。同時，通過算法推送的新聞信息被限制在一定範圍之內，用户的媒介接觸也因此不斷被固化，極易導致用户信息視野的狹窄和思維的僵化。」

——黃楚新教授

Dialogue

The New Order of Cyber Space Regulation: Power, Control, and Governance

Discussants: Deqiang JI, Chuxin HUANG, Zhongshi GUO, Dan WANG, Lei HUANG
Editors: Zhongshi GUO, Dan WANG, Lei HUANG
Translators: Zhongshi GUO, Dan WANG, Lei HUANG

Abstract

Depending on where one stands, the cyberspace can be thought of either as a site for discursive emancipation to be celebrated or as a threat to dominant

Deqiang JI (Professor). State Key Laboratory of Media Convergence, Communication University of China; Vice Chair of the International Communication Section for IAMCR; Chief Editor of *Journal of Transcultural Communication*; Editor of *Global Media and China*; Editorial Board Member of *Annals of the International Communication Association*. Research interests: political economy of communication, international communication, digitalization and social transformation in China.

Chuxin HUANG (Professor). Associate Director and Secretary General of the Chinese Academy of Social Science; Associate Dean of the School of Journalism and Communication at the Chinese Academy of Social Science; Team Leader of the New Media Committee of Professional Journalists in China; Chief Editor of *Annual Report on Development of New Media in China*. Research interests: new media communication and media convergence.

Zhongshi GUO (Professor). Department of Journalism, School of Communication, Hong Kong Baptist University. Research interests: media effects, news production and transition.

Dan WANG (Research Assistant Professor). Department of Journalism, School of Communication, Hong Kong Baptist University. Research interest: analysis of media transformation from the perspectives of macro-political economy and micro-media sociology.

Lei HUANG (Research Assistant Professor). Department of Interactive Media, School of Communication, Hong Kong Baptist University. Research interests: organizational communication and technology, mediated interpersonal communication, strategic communication.

discourse warranting containment. The former typically implies the latter, especially in societies where the press is granted limited measures of self-determination. While the power unleashed by new media technology is yet to be fully appraised, scholars agree that the time-cherished professionalism in newsmaking is being dethroned. Increasingly taking its place is a new set of routines and a platform-based business model that privilege click-rate, metrics, sensory stimulation, and audience balkanization over people and public interest. Enter media convergence. As a state-headed massive media digitalization campaign, convergence in China started with news organizations as the primary sites of reform and evolved into a co-opted integration of various actors in the realm of platforms and networks. In the process of this multi-role interplay, two major characteristics emerged in the country's internet ecology: one is a pluralistic space where exchange of ideas is limited; the other is discourse dominated by the state apparatus. This situation gives theoretical salience and historical urgency to discussions of cyberspace regulation and governance. Based on their decade-long emersion into the reality and research of the technology-information relationship as the State Key Laboratory of Media Convergence and Secretary General of Academy of Social Science, the two invited scholars offer valuable insights beyond the façade of change into the deeper meaning and implications of digital news production and the fate of journalism in China.

Citation of this article: Ji, D., Huang, C., Guo, Z., Wang, D., & Huang, L. (2024). The new order of cyber space regulation: Power, control, and governance. *Communication and Society, 70,* 1–21.

姬德強教授簡介

姬德強，中國傳媒大學教授、博士生導師、媒體融合與傳播國家重點實驗室研究員，主要研究興趣為傳播政治經濟學、國際傳播、數字平台等，是第五批國家「萬人計劃」青年拔尖人才，也是首批北京市社會科學基金青年學術帶頭人。姬教授擔任國際媒介與傳播研究學會（IAMCR）國際傳播分會副主席，同時亦為《國際跨文化傳播學刊》（*Journal of Transcultural Communication*）、《全球媒體與中國》（*Global Media and China*）、《國際傳播學會年刊》（*Annals of the International Communication Association*）等期刊編輯、編委，主持多項國家社科基金和教育部社科基金課題，獲得全國新聞學青年學者優秀學術成果、全國新聞傳播學優秀論文等獎項。出版專著有《數位化中國：有線電視數位化的政治經濟學》、《國際反腐敗傳播》等，以及編著《傳播與全球話語權力轉移》等，發表中英文論文150餘篇。學術研究分為兩個階段：2011至2015年，主要致力於傳播政治經濟學及其本土化，一方面立足廣播電視研究，推動數位化中國的理論構建，另一方面聚焦中國媒體走出去及其對中國文化軟實力的影響；2016年至今，轉向數字平台研究，關注其如何影響了媒體市場、治理政策、網路社群、地緣關係，並努力探求平台研究的國家理論。

黃楚新教授簡介

黃楚新，中國社會科學院新媒體研究中心副主任兼秘書長、研究員，同時為中國社會科學院大學新聞傳播學院副院長、教授、博士生導師，也是中國社會科學院領軍人才、國家廣播電視總局媒體融合發展專家庫專家、中國新聞獎評委、中國記協新媒體專業委員會專家組組長、《中國新媒體發展報告》主編。主要研究方向包括新媒體傳播、媒體融合等。

郭中實教授簡介

郭中實，香港浸會大學傳理學院新聞系教授。曾任《中國日報》記者、香港浸會大學傳理學院暫任院長，主要研究興趣是採用量化和質化方法對新聞生產、內容、受眾的認知和行為進行分析。曾在政治傳播學領域發表大量相關論文，主持或參與主持的研究課題達15項，並曾獲伊莉莎白・尼爾遜優秀論文獎（The Elizabeth Nelson Prize）等多個獎項。

DJ：姬德強
CH：黃楚新
CS：郭中實、王丹、黃磊

CS： 面對新媒體科技的衝擊，傳統新聞採編寫模式還能支撐多久在業界和學界都是頗具爭議的話題，請問您對這個問題的看法是甚麼？如果說傳統意義上的新聞生產將會逐漸消失，這會給受眾效果帶來甚麼影響？

DJ： 科技發展日新月異，新的媒體技術被大量運用到了新聞生產的各個環節，傳統新聞採編寫模式有兩個基礎：第一個是工業化、城市化引發的福特式經濟模式，即大規模的生產和消費。相應形成的是大眾媒體主導的大眾傳播，當然在不同的媒體制度中，支撐這一模式運行的經濟動能會有差異，比如市場體系、公共體系、國有體系，乃至社區體系；第二個是隨著新聞業崛起，特別是其負面社會效應所引發的意識形態自我合法化問題，也就是新聞專業主義，以及其內在的公共性或人民性導向。在上述基礎上，傳統的新聞採編寫模式注重現場和調查，聚焦報道真實與闡釋平衡；文本有結構，產品有類型，行業有規範，是一種以新聞人為中心的、面向大眾的、存在一定啟蒙色彩的故事講授和知識生產模式。

新媒體科技是一種融合性力量，已經模糊了新聞業的邊界，並從內外部挑戰和重建著新聞業的合法性。我們常說的新媒體科技大多源自傳統媒體之外更廣闊的資訊傳播業，包括互聯網、大數據、雲計算、人工智慧等等。雖然常常伴隨著各種未來主義的

迷思，這些科技革命在社會層面應用的首要目標其實是解決更宏觀的經濟危機和政治問題，如尼克森時期的互聯網。對新聞業尤其是採編寫模式的影響，是這些技術力量影響社會全域的一個面向。只有跳出傳統的工業化的媒體視閾，才能反觀社會資訊系統重構對新聞業的複雜和深遠影響。當資訊產消關係從供給者為中心轉向消費者為中心，當受眾可以離開新聞媒體主導的、基於資訊稀缺而構建的縱向的供需等級關係，反而依託橫向的連接力和生產力來獲取更為豐富和多元的資訊，甚至可以與新聞媒體「斷連」來獲取日常的資訊供給，傳統新聞實踐及其採編寫模式所面臨的挑戰就不僅是如何捍衛「何為新聞」這一合法性問題，更是確證新聞業在這一技術增量所創造的社會資訊化過程中是否能保持韌性且長期存在的生存性問題。除此之外，由傳統新聞生產模式所參與構建的社會民主秩序也面臨著極化多元主體和深度後真相認知的雙重挑戰。

因此，傳統新聞採編寫仍然是一種重要的生產模式，會與新聞業本身一樣經歷沉浮式生存的命運，只是它的實踐場域在相對縮小。除此之外，我們需要看到，隨著平台經濟對新技術的捕獲速度不斷加快，資訊商品化所導致的真相危機正在引發廣泛的社會信任危機，包括牛津大學路透新聞學研究所的報告等均已證實，以廣播電視為代表的傳統新聞媒體的權威性和公信力成為社會公眾找尋重建資訊秩序路徑的重要支點。從辯證的角度來說，雖然新媒體科技引發了整個資訊生態的變革，導致了新聞業本身不得不按照資訊市場或者說流量經濟的方式來調整生存和發展方式，但是新聞本身的價值並沒有消弭，而是往往被遮蔽，傳統新聞採編寫的結構化模式仍然是生成可信資訊和可靠故事的重要基礎，只是需要更符合碎片化、移動化、即時性的流動不羈的消費場景，並在此基礎上重建信源和敘事的權威性，讓網路化的受眾或用戶在面對起伏不定的資訊海況時還能找到航標或燈塔。因此，傳統意義上的新聞生產模式確實在很大程度上將不復存在，但其所蘊含的結構化力量將會在資訊失序之後復生，從業者和研究者需要立足更長的歷史觀和更新的實踐觀來傳承。這不是一個行業問題，而是一個社會問題。

CH： 當今，傳統的採寫、傳播以及呈現方式都發生了深刻變化，傳統的新聞生產模式受到了一定程度的衝擊。但總的來看，新技術的來臨並不意味著傳統新聞採編寫模式的終結。傳統新聞生產通常依賴於專業的新聞機構和記者，他們有嚴格的採訪、報道和編輯流程，具備貼近性、專業價值觀等優勢，有利於保證內容生產的真實性、個性化以及新聞內容深度和廣度，在新的傳媒生態中仍保持其特有的價值。在傳統意義上的新聞生產消失的情況下，新聞生產方式根據算法採寫，套用一定的模板進行創作，內容形式單一、同質化問題嚴重，且缺少人文關懷，影響受眾多元信息的接收。傳統新聞生產通常有著嚴格的新聞倫理和新聞價值觀，確保新聞的真實性和公正性；如果傳統新聞生產消失，去「中心化」的信息生產方式易使受眾接觸到的網絡信息良莠不齊、真假難辨，嚴重影響受眾對新聞的信任度和滿意度。同時，通過算法推送的新聞信息被限制在一定範圍之內，用戶的媒介接觸也因此不斷被固化，極易導致用戶信息視野的狹窄和思維的僵化。

CS： 媒體融合在當下已成為不可逆轉的趨勢，多功能、一體化、多元化整合衍生出各種形式的資訊產品，通過互聯網、社交媒體和資訊平台散播給受眾。請問您認為這個發展方向如何影響著日常生活的話語實踐並改變當權者的話語管控？受眾又會採取何種策略應對？

DJ： 媒體融合已經從將來式變成現在式乃至過去式，因為融合本身已經不再是預言，而是日常生活實踐。對於資訊富足和媒介富裕社會來說，融合已經是過去，一體變為現實。普通人往往並不關心一個特定網站或社交應用的背後是如何整合或融合的，而是將其視為進入整個數字世界或虛擬世界的基礎設施般的入口。一種特定的「終端體驗」正在主導普通人的媒介化生活，而各個終端也是將每個個體數據化為這個融合世界的基礎要素的生產工具。換言之，普通人的日常生活已經深度媒介化——或者更準確地說——深度平台化，與社交媒體為代表的數字平台的深度綁定成為日常生活話語實踐的新常態。平台話語的重要特徵之一就是「我想即我說，我說即我聽」。平台以其強大的計算能力將用戶轉化為可控

數據，進而掌握了話語實踐的全鏈條，並有意或無意地將每一個用戶封閉在一個可以彈性擴張的資訊柵欄裏。在這個意義上，儘管每一個個體可以借助多應用和多模態表達自身觀點，進而實現聚集或串聯，但融合所引發的權力集中化效應會使得追蹤、分析、干預變得更加容易，這其中就包含著日益明顯的政商合作，也就是政治權力與平台權力的相互借力。從日常生活的話語實踐角度來説，目前我們可以看到兩種趨勢：一種是非政治的話語實踐，變得更加多元乃至極端多元，廣大用戶群體按照自身興趣和意願構建著屬於自己的話語世界，不同的世界之間甚至「老死不相往來」；另一種是政治化的話語實踐，正在走向兩個極端，其一是高度管控所塑造的話語同一性，儘管其中也存在著真假同一問題；其二是缺乏管控的話語極化或者説極端的話語表達乃至對立，以民粹主義為代表的更具表層傳播力和情感動員力的政治話語正在「摧城拔寨」，將冷靜的觀察、複雜的思考、慎重的表達推至公共輿論的邊緣地帶。

　　如上所述，在一個平台化時代，融合所帶來的權力集中更多是一種政商聯合體結構。政治管控的目的是表達順意以及大眾動員，而經濟管控的目的是維護用戶生態，而當前最大的問題是雙方均不能以一己之力實現管控目的。政商力量的相互嵌入導致了政治平台化和平台政治化。在這個權力金字塔中，受眾或用戶往往是弱勢的存在，主要是因為用戶的橫向連接力正在被資本加持的技術力量以及政治干預策略所切割，並逐漸蛻化為單一個體或群體的自治性乃至自律性行為，其政治象徵意義大於實踐變革意義。這裏的悲觀看法並不完全來自一種結構性分析，而更多是日常觀察的結果。當身邊的幾乎所有人都客觀沉浸在以計算為核心機制、無處不在的資訊產消場景之中時，所謂的主體性如何被喚回、所謂的抵抗性如何被激發，往往陷入意識形態宣稱與主體行動效果之間的巨大鴻溝。

CH：一方面媒體融合改變了信息的生產和傳播方式，各媒體平台通過多樣的信息產品突顯自身傳播優勢，呈現出不同的話語表達特徵，深刻影響了用戶日常生活的話語實踐。人們可以通過不同的

　　媒介平台接觸到不同的聲音和觀點，契合新時代用戶的多元價值訴求，促使公眾話語更加多元化。另一方面，媒體融合背景下催生了群體間圈層化表達，不同類型的信息產品促使用戶因趣緣發生連接進而形成話題共議，不斷分化出新的社會圈層，形成獨特的話語系統與思維方式。

CS： **習近平總書記在2014、2018年兩次分別提到了媒體融合和縣級媒體融合，之後還提出「互聯網思維」等媒介發展方針。從歷史的角度來看，各個媒體在這幾個時間點發生了甚麼樣的變化呢？媒體與社會的關係又有甚麼變化呢？**

DJ：　媒體融合是十幾年來中國傳媒行業變革的核心政策關鍵字，也是一個由上而下的系統再造的歷史進程。從媒體融合到媒體深度融合，從中央級媒體融合到縣級媒體融合，每一次政策話語的變化都是對融合實踐及其在整個國家發展和治理體系中所發揮作用的評估和安排。十八大之後的媒體融合概念，包括對互聯網思維的強調，實際上是對商業互聯網崛起所引發的傳統媒體經營危機，當然更重要的是國家資訊化治理能力不足的主動出擊，力圖通過對國有媒體體系的能力再造，或者説自我革命，維護互聯網時代的輿論引導力和傳播權威性。這一階段的重心是擁有更多政策和市場資源、更容易實現融合目標的中央級媒體以及部分省市級媒體，或者説頭部媒體。那麼，更普遍的基層媒體 —— 特別是縣級媒體 —— 如何存活於數字革命的巨浪之中並找尋到未來創新發展之路、如何融入國家治理體系與治理能力的現代化進程，成為媒體融合走入下一階段的關鍵命題。縣級融媒體建設具有經濟和政治層面的多重涵義，是媒體融合這一國家戰略的關鍵步驟。首先，媒體融合賦予縣級媒體更多的經濟活動可能性，使其超越傳統的業務範疇去找尋商業機遇，比如更多地承接政務服務、更好地融入地方經濟、更快速實現體制轉型；其次，媒體融合驅動著縣級媒體更好服務於「郡縣治，天下安」的基層治理目標，這一點特別表現在縣級融媒體中心與黨群服務中心、政務服務中心、新時代文明實踐中心等基層單位的聯動之中，輿論、黨務、政務、文化公共服務逐漸融合，形成了基層文化和社會治理的新格

局。如今，媒體融合進入深水區，建設和發展的不平衡性日益突出，經濟意義如何生存依然是眾多融媒體中心的核心問題。

反觀媒體融合十年，對各級媒體最大的影響至少有三個方面：第一，身分認知上突破了新舊之別，傳統媒體所附帶的身分優勢在快速增長的流量經濟面前顯得十分脆弱，如何與舊媒體視野中的新媒體競合共生成為重塑媒體身分的第一要務；第二，經濟收入上實現了對單一廣告模式依賴路徑的超越，説是「超越」，更多是無奈之舉，一則是廣告主本身的逃離，二則是融合本身就是媒體經濟參與數字經濟多邊市場的過程，只是大多數媒體人並不具備這一市場化能力，從而導致目前為止尚無成功的普遍融合模式，大多是地區性案例模式；第三，內容生產上實現了流程再造，這既是政策要求，也是現實所需。圍繞多終端尤其是移動端的多元消費需求，各級媒體都基本實現了生產資源的集約化和生產流程的鏈條化，產能和效率確實有了大幅提高，努力在流量新聞時代佔據一席之地。只是這個注意力競技場的演化規律往往與媒體行業的期待相距甚遠，導致了很多時候還是需要國家力量來進行干預，在保證資訊傳播不失序的同時，為媒體賦能。

十年融合，不管是技術驅動、市場變革，還是主動或被動的政策反應，均大幅改變了中國媒體的景觀。新舊媒介之別不再明顯，媒體平台化趨勢日益顯現，對中國社會平台化的推動也越加顯著。如果説曾經的媒體主要是社會輿論的設置者和引導者，那麼如今的媒體更多是社會資訊服務者，其中包含新聞資訊服務、政務資訊服務、商業資訊服務、民生資訊服務等多個方面。在這個意義上，媒體變革更加深入地嵌入到中國社會變革之中。雖然這個過程充滿矛盾與挑戰，特別是來自商業互聯網平台的壟斷式阻截，媒體仍然可以借助自身的制度優勢，獲取排他性資源，這就決定了國有媒體與商業平台之間的競合走向變得撲朔迷離。

CH：2014年8月18日，中央全面深化改革領導小組第四次會議審議通過《關於推動傳統媒體和新興媒體融合發展的指導意見》，提出「要著力打造一批形態多樣、手段先進、具有競爭力的新型主流媒體，建成幾家擁有強大實力和傳播力、公信力、影響力的新型

媒體集團，形成立體多樣、融合發展的現代傳播體系」以及「要強化互聯網思維，堅持傳統媒體和新興媒體優勢互補、一體發展」等要求。隨後，各地各部門以此為依據，出台相關政策。在這一時期頭部主流媒體迅速發力，形成集團化優勢，著手構建轉型範式；多家地方報業集團進行平台化轉型，推出特色客戶端，引發了現象級關注。2018 年 8 月，習近平總書記在全國宣傳思想工作會議上指出：「要扎實抓好縣級融媒體中心建設，更好引導群眾、服務群眾」。從國家戰略層面提出了縣級融媒體建設的發展方向。在此階段中，全國各地縣級融媒體中心建設有條不紊地推進，至 2020 年年底縣級融媒體中心已基本實現全國全覆蓋。2022 年 4 月，中宣部、財政部、國家廣電總局聯合下發《關於推進地市級媒體加快深度融合發展實施方案的通知》，在全國範圍內遴選 60 家市級融媒體中心建設試點單位，補齊媒體融合一體化規劃中的腰部地帶建設，地市級媒體加速轉型，中國媒體融合發展進入新的篇章。各級媒體積極投身媒體深度融合發展實踐，在體制機制、內容生產、渠道建設等方面不斷創新，媒體與社會的關係越來越緊密。首先，各級媒體推進平台化建設，公眾信息獲取途徑更加多元，信息傳播更加迅速和廣泛。同時媒體依靠平台建設提供本土政務服務和民生服務，打通了群眾向上反應的渠道，滿足受眾社會需求，促進了社會的和諧與穩定。其次，在互聯網思維的加持下，用戶不再是被動的信息接收者，成為內容的創作者和傳播者，公眾能夠更加主動地參與社會公共事務的討論和監督，有效提升了公眾的參與度與獲得感。

CS：媒體融合概念興起後，我們觀察到大陸各大媒體機構都進行了基礎設施和文化層面上的改革。包括所謂的「兩微一端」、「媒體矩陣」等，導致第三方平台的融入不可避免。麥克盧漢（Marshall McLuhan）提到過媒體即資訊，在您的觀察和研究中，中國平台在媒體融合中扮演了甚麼角色？

DJ：從去媒體中心主義的視角來說，媒體融合是媒體平台化和媒體基礎設施化的過程。十年融合，中國媒體不僅重構了生產流程，轉變了運行思路，增加了服務功能，也開始與曾經「看不上」的商業

互聯網平台求學取經，並在後者設定的技術和市場話語中不斷協商著新的身分認同。這一權力格局的轉移是中國社會平台化的結果，因為驅動中國社會平台化的核心力量就是生而具備全球基因和生在中國市場雙重優勢的各類商業數字平台。在這些快速崛起的平台企業背後，是一個發展型大國的國家發展主義決策模式和政策體系。平台企業不僅是推動中國經濟轉型破局的前沿力量，也是推動中國社會數字基礎設施建設和治理能力升級的關鍵仲介，更是助力中國參與全球數字博弈的重要支撐。在這個前提下反觀媒體與平台的關係，我們就可以看到，「平台圍城」使得中國社會的各個部門都不得不與其進行關聯。平台塑造的新的資訊產消和社會交往環境逼迫著媒體融合不得不從多個方面加以回應，包括快速提升新聞和娛樂等內容的生產能力與生產效率、對各類平台終端的積極嵌入乃至自建APP等自有平台的長遠打算，以及在內容生產、廣告行銷、輿論危機管理等方面的積極合作。因此，平台崛起對媒體融合的影響是全方位的。如果說曾經引領媒體融合的是「互聯網思維」，那麼如今更應該是「平台思維」。前者更多指向一種技術邏輯，而後者則是一種包含了技術、商業、治理、文化在內的系統化邏輯。從政策話語的角度來說，媒體融合進入深度發展階段，要處理的核心問題就不是媒體自身的內部結構調整，而是如何與外部商業平台生態的共生關係。構建這一良性共生關係，更具高維調節能力的國家權力就變得十分重要。

CH：平台建設是媒體融合發展的重要抓手，是推進媒體深度融合的關鍵所在，在媒體融合推向縱深發展的過程中，四級媒體機構積極進行平台化轉型，依靠自身搭建的信息發佈平台和內容採編平台，推進內容生產傳播，同時拓展「新聞＋政務服務商務」模式，不斷提高自身的傳播力、引導力、影響力、公信力。

一是作為信息傳播的樞紐。平台是媒體機構信息發佈的重要場所。各媒體機構以「信息價值」為出發點，將其為視為信息傳播有效手段，充分發揮和利用自身平台優勢，使其成為服務用戶的可用信息源。二是助力內容採編。媒體機構搭建統一技術平台，實現資源有效匯集、共享以及業務的聯動。如以浙江日報報業集

團「媒立方」融媒體技術平台、河南日報報業集團大河雲等為代表的省級媒體「中央廚房」，為媒體深度發展過程中媒體機構加強現代傳播能力提供了強有力的技術支撐體系。三是提供公共服務。媒體機構與教育、醫療、安全等相關公共服務本部門合作，通過平台與用戶形成有效連接，協同當地政府承擔著民生服務等功能。例如尤溪縣融媒體中心上線「智慧尤溪」客戶端平台，在發揮基層媒體信息傳播和新聞宣傳效力的基礎上，開通就業服務、城鄉醫保、食品安全、移動辦稅、人才服務、養老保險等服務功能。四是助推政務服務。媒體不斷加強與黨政部門的合作，通過自建平台，拓展公開問政、政務信息等方面政務服務功能，有效助力基層社會治理。五是提供商務服務。媒體機構通過媒體平台實現資本化運作，持續增強自身「造血」技能，為媒體融合發展提供資金的保障。例如安吉縣融媒體中心自主研發運營縣域公共品牌自主平台「安吉優品匯」，通過線上會員推廣和線下爆款單品銷售，將安吉優質產品推廣到全國各地，自 2022 年 7 月 9 日正式上線以來，截至目前發展會員已達六千餘名，銷售額近三億元人民幣。

CS： **媒體融合是科技和政治的必要結果。很多傳播學者爭論說例如「中央廚房」的興起、本地多元資訊變少、聚合和同質內容變多。您對此有甚麼評論？**

DJ： 縱觀全球，不管是經濟層面還是政治層面，媒體融合（convergence）確實是權力集中化的過程，當然也伴隨著媒體分化（divergence）的結果。隨著商業平台的介入，這一融合和分化的共存狀態變得更加複雜。以「中央廚房」為代表的集約化生產模式加速了資訊的收集、處理、分發能力，也更容易把握乃至干預資訊在不同節點之間流動所產生的接觸效果，使得即時且精準的效果監測從理想變成現實。隨著資訊聚合能力的增強，包括政治新聞在內的關鍵社會議題的內容生產和終端投送變得更具中心化，甚至在媒體融合之前，這都是無法想像的。但這並不代表整個社會議程的完全同質化。因為融合的另外一個結果是，其他社會議題變得更加分化，流動的本地性正在主導平台化的輿論環境。借助商業互聯網平台的賦能，本地資訊生產正在演算法的加持下變得更加活躍，

多元的內容正在多元的用戶群體中被挖掘、被生產、被展示、被消費、被傳遞，形成了更具圈層化乃至個人化的傳播生態。也許，唯一變得更具同質化的是這一強調暫態性與景觀性的資訊生產和消費模式，以及對於少數壟斷性平台及其應用的系統性依賴。因此，我們看到了媒體融合塑造的新的中心與邊緣關係：一方面是媒體主導的、以政治新聞為代表的主流內容生產的集中化，另一方面是其他內容生產的網路化。在商業互聯網平台的催化下，本地多元內容生產呈現出井噴式狀態，也客觀上進一步截流了公眾有限的媒體注意力，導致即便經歷了融合，提升了內容生產能力和傳播觸達能力，傳統媒體在整個社會資訊流量池中的佔比仍然是相對減少的。媒體對平台這一「管道霸權」的依賴仍然會是一個常態，這也將不斷反向侵蝕媒體自身的內容生產邏輯。融合遠未結束，也許更為激烈的變革即將到來。

CH：《關於推動傳統媒體和新興媒體融合發展的指導意見》曾提出：傳統媒體和新興媒體應在「『內容、渠道、平台、經營、管理』等多重方面深度融合。」在這一意見的指導下，「一次採集、多種生成、多元傳播」的採編傳理念在媒體深度融合過程中得以逐漸落實，並在不同媒體集團的生產實踐中得到了完善，以「中央廚房」為代表的生產方式變革取得了巨大成就。在新聞生產的理念上，「中央廚房」扮演著為各級媒體提供原材料或半成品信息的角色。各媒體平台的編輯會根據目標受眾的具體需求，挑選信息並構建敘事框架，創造並有效傳播新聞產品。從實際情況來看，「中央廚房」模式有效打通部門壁壘，最大限度節約人力成本，提升了採編效率和採編能力。但在內容生產層面，「中央廚房」的信息生產方式仍以「傳者為中心」，聚合化、同質化的信息尤為明顯，需要理性分析、科學應對：

首先，根據不同媒體的功能、特色實行差異化定位，選擇合適的語境進行內容表達。其次，培養用戶思維，強化媒體平台與用戶之間的深度互動，及時收集用戶反饋並掌握用戶信息需求，為用戶提供更具針對性的新聞產品。最後，提升從業者新聞專業素養，注重對從業者信息採集、整理分發以及創新能力的培養。

《傳播與社會學刊》,（總）第 70 期（2024）

CS： **在生成式人工智慧工具湧現的背景下，新聞與傳播研究出現了哪些新視角，還有哪些研究盲點？每當新技術、新工具出現的時候，我們都會看到大量關於它們的研究，有學者批評很多研究「新瓶裝舊酒」，您怎麼看？如何評價一項研究的理論貢獻？**

DJ： 對新聞與傳播研究而言，技術迷思往往是創新的催化劑，而技術話語是創新的合法性來源之一。這一點尤其表現在生成式人工智慧從迷思逐漸轉為實踐的當下。當然，更重要的背景還是對生成式人工智慧全面替代處於重重危機中的媒體行業的擔憂。目前，中文新聞與傳播學界進入這一領域的視角主要包括基於人機交互的傳播新範式（也有學者稱之為機器範式）、多模態（尤其是高質量視頻）內容生成、虛假資訊治理、媒體接入與變革、法律規制與倫理規範，以及與主權相綁定的地緣政治問題等。可以說，作為一個最具顛覆性的技術現象，生成式人工智慧對新聞與傳播學界的知識生產和人才培養帶來了空前的挑戰，也引發了有關研究如何做的廣泛討論，比如應如何處理知識生產和教學實踐中的人機分工和人機交互等問題。

儘管涉及了眾多面向，新聞與傳播學界對生成式人工智慧的研究依然受專業視野和理論想像力所限，未能深入觸及一些盲點性問題，比如：話語層面，生成式人工智慧的技術話語是如何構成的、主要的話語主體是誰、採用了怎樣的話語策略，以及對人工智慧的這一新形態存在怎樣不同的技術想像；影響層面，生成式人工智慧對新聞的影響與之前的技術形式在本質上有何不同、新聞的邊界又該如何界定、真與假的認知二元論是否會消弭；經濟層面，生成式人工智慧將演化出怎樣的商業模式和金融模式，並將如何參與重組之前的數字經濟；治理層面，生成式人工智慧本身是否存在不公平和不正義問題、對生成式人工智慧的法律規制和倫理規範該如何界定，還有是否存在地區、國家、文化差異；國際關係層面，如何理解生成式人工智慧所引發的國家競爭、地緣矛盾、數字鴻溝等等，不一而足。相關問題的延伸將取決於參與學者的學科背景的多元性，以及參與政策進程和產業進程的廣度和深度。至少有一點需要確認，學術界的研究進路需要

超越使用者的經驗主體視野，而是要看到更多的利益相關者，以及技術與社會互構關係的非線性特徵。

當然，「新瓶裝舊酒」，尤其是僅僅聚焦於修辭創新，也是任何前沿研究的通病，主要原因是研究對象在有限的時間內並未向所有觀察者展開其全部細節，何況類似生成式人工智慧技術這種核心技術的大眾認知本就受限於開發者和運營者的推廣策略。在有限的知識和經驗基礎上，疊加一些技術想像和理論修辭進行分析和闡釋，似乎也是比較合理的學術生產方式。但是，需要提醒的是，不管概念如何嫁接、修辭如何創新，每一種學術成果都應呈現點滴的學術增值。要麼是發現了未被發現的，要麼是補充了解讀的新面向，兩者都具有填補學術空白的價值。針對生成式人工智慧這一技術革命，學術界應在幫助社會大眾破除——而不是參與再生產——各種技術迷思和市場神話的前提下，聚焦其技術邏輯的內裏以及相應的政治、經濟、文化內含，同時開放搭建多學科對話和交流空間，以避免形成盲人摸象的局面。

CH：關於生成式人工智能工具，新聞傳播領域出現的研究視角有四：一是關於生成式人工智能自身的優勢與不足以及面臨的機遇與挑戰，二是生成式人工智能為對新聞業帶來的變革與創新、對行業帶來的影響以及挑戰，三是生成式人工智能對新聞從業者的影響，以及應對問題，四是生成式人工智能涉及到的法律、法規、倫理以及問責問題。

目前來看，國內基礎研究雖數量眾多，研究範圍覆蓋較廣，但同質化傾向嚴重，許多研究成果僅僅是在已有研究成果的基礎上進行再次梳理和總結，對於生成式人工智能的用戶問題、人才的技能培養問題以及未來發展趨勢的探討仍有欠缺，未來的研究可以針對這些領域進行拓展和深化。

在新技術、新工具出現的初期，學術界對其了解有限，許多研究將新技術應用套用於原有的理論和模型當中，出現「新瓶裝舊酒」的情況。隨著對新技術的理解加深，單純地應用原有的理論和模型已經無法滿足學術界探索的需求。此時，研究應注重創新與深度的拓展——即如何超越原有的理論應用，努力挖掘新

技術背後的深層次影響和原理，探索出新變化以及潛在的理論創新。

關於一項研究的理論貢獻，第一是理論創新性：研究是否提出了新的理論概念、模型或框架，或對現有理論進行了有意義的擴展和深化。第二是理論適用範圍：該研究的理論是否能夠跨越特定案例，具有普遍性和適用性。第三是解釋力和預測力：該研究提出的理論在多大程度上能夠解釋現實中的現象、是否具有預測未來趨勢的能力。第四是引發後續研究：是否為後續的研究提供了新的思路、方法或數據資源，又是否激發了學術界對相關議題的進一步探討。

CS：自媒體融合發生以來，傳媒從業者的職業角色認同發生了怎樣的變化？不同級別的傳媒從業者的工作實踐有何不同？一些學者認為，傳媒從業者現今處在一種「趕工」的新聞生產實踐中，身心俱疲，我們可以怎樣做以提升傳媒從業者的健康和福祉？

DJ：對從業者而言，媒體融合確實帶來了更加靈活但繁重的工作任務，以應對多樣化的平台、應用、用戶需求。以記者為例，長期以來，眼力、腳力、筆力、腦力是最為核心的四項能力，除此之外，還需要培養技術思維、產品思維、用戶思維，乃至流量思維，從而導致了曾經的「一專多能」演變成如今的「一專全能」。每個人都應是一個「自媒體」成為從業者乃至管理者的共識，這裏的「自」指的不是自己或自我，而是自成一體。在這個過程中，除了政治素養和管理能力，管理者的專業認知乃至實踐能力成為一個極為重要的衡量標準。因而，面對快速變化的傳播環境，面對無時無刻不在「趕工」的加速狀態，能力缺位反而內化為從業者的身分焦慮，進而引發了一系列勞工問題。其實，引發這一現象的根源並不是媒體自身的能力問題，而是外部世界的資訊增量狀態使得媒體系統不得不為了重新獲取公眾注意力並維護其專業合法性，按照商業互聯網平台所設定的生產效率標準來調整自身；與此同時，又不能完全放棄自身的行業標準和職業操守及其塑造的高昂生產成本，從而不得不將指數級膨脹的工作量轉化為從業者的工作壓力。換句話說，媒體從業者正在同時跳兩種舞蹈，舞步

是否可以協調還是一個未知數，但是跟蹤的狀態卻是顯而易見。因此，如何保護媒體從業者群體性的身心健康也成為一個非常棘手的問題。也許可以通過三種方式加以影響：一是更多鼓勵媒體機構內部的協同工作，發揮不同主體優勢，減少工作疊加；二是發揮行業組織作用，推動形成平台和智能時代的勞動規範；三是發揮研究型大學和職業學校作用，為從業者能力提升提供再培訓機會。

回到職業角色認同這個關鍵問題。由於融合本身就是媒體邊界的重塑，那麼從業者的職業角色自然也處於變動之中。從面對互聯網興起而呈現的角色傲慢，到自媒體蓬勃發展而引發的角色焦慮，再到從業者出走引發的角色危機，以及如今平台時代的角色彷徨，媒體從業者的角色認同一直處在一種否定之否定的狀態之中。為甚麼是否定之否定，而不是簡單的危機與生存？我這裏想強調的是，媒體融合本身是一個非線性過程，針對不同的融合和分化場域，從業者的角色認知是不一樣的。比如，針對技術場域，媒體人的外行人感受和能力焦慮是明顯的，這也是身分危機的重要來源；針對市場場域，媒體人自然也是焦慮且彷徨的，更帶有對作為過往注意力市場壟斷者輝煌的懷舊和對平台新壟斷者的質疑與抵抗；針對新聞或政治場域，媒體人大多是自信的，且具有較強的職業認同，這不僅源自傳統和依然保留的權威，更在於商業互聯網平台出於政策和身分等各種原因與此類實踐的絕緣。當然，針對上述職業角色認同的分析更多還是立足於中國媒體環境，雖然共用了一些普遍性問題，但其本土色彩依然非常濃厚。

CH：媒體融合的背景下，受體制機制、媒介技術、傳播主體、傳播渠道等多重力量衝擊，傳統的採寫編評技能以及拍攝剪輯技能已不能滿足新聞傳播的整體需求，融媒體編輯部開始對從業者提出了「一專多能」的複合型新聞人才的要求，個體的職業認同危機問題日漸突顯。

在推進媒體深度融合發展過程中，各媒體機構摒棄傳統生產和傳播模式，不斷優化體制機制和生產流程，形成「一次採集、

多元生成、多端發佈」的全新採編播發體系，不同級別的傳媒工作者分別負責指揮調度、素材蒐集、信息的整合、覈實、推送共享等不同分工實踐，以生成不同風格、不同類型的節目，滿足受眾多層次需求。

媒介融合加劇了媒體外部以及同行之間以「速度」和「流量」為目標的競爭較量，致使一些採編人員深陷高速而低質的「趕工」實踐當中。應加強統籌謀劃，合理調配人力資源，將從業者從重複而低質的勞動中解放出來，使其在合適的崗位上發揮才幹；推進內容產品供給側改革，發揮傳媒從業者的專業性與主體性，著力生產「有品質，有價值」的優質內容。其次，多元的傳播形式和多樣的傳播內容推動傳媒工作者功能和職責邊界的拓展，應不斷完善從業者人才培訓機制，培養從業人員智媒應用能力以及新媒體內容生產與運營、新營銷模式等能力，使從業者更好地適應媒體轉型發展。最後，優化傳統的薪酬體系、出台科學的績效考核辦法和完善的人員工資管理辦法，在調動新聞從業者的工作積極性的同時，保證其「物質回報」，進一步提高從業者的歸屬感和獲得感。

姬德強教授著作選

姬德強（2020）。〈深度造假：人工智能時代的視覺政治〉。《新聞大學》，第 7 期，頁 1–16。

姬德強、鄒宇（2023）。〈國際傳播的情感結構與干預路徑〉。《現代傳播（中國傳媒大學學報）》，第 10 期，頁 52–59。

姬德強、李喆（2024）。〈平台研究的進化及其中國框架〉。《浙江學刊》，第 3 期，頁 90–101。

Hu, Z., & Ji, D. (2012). Ambiguities in communicating with the world: The "Going-Out" policy of China's media and its multilayered contexts. *Chinese Journal of Communication, 5*(1), 32–37.

Ji, D., Jiang, X., & Wang, L. (2024). Domesticating international news: China's media coverage of the Russia-Ukraine conflict. *International Communication Gazette, 86*(1), 55–72.

黃楚新教授著作選

黃楚新 (2021)。〈全面轉型與深度融合：2020年中國媒體融合發展〉。《現代傳播 (中國傳媒大學學報)》，第8期，頁9–14。

黃楚新 (2023)。〈全方位融合與系統化佈局：中國媒體融合發展進路〉。《現代傳播 (中國傳媒大學學報)》，第7期，頁1–7。

黃楚新、彭韻佳 (2017)。〈透過資本看媒體權力化 —— 境外資本集團對中國網絡新媒體的影響〉。《新聞與傳播研究》，第10期，頁68–78、128。

黃楚新、彭韻佳 (2018)。〈2017年中國媒體融合發展報告〉。《現代傳播 (中國傳媒大學學報)》，第4期，頁9–15。

黃楚新、郭海威 (2018)。〈論資本影響與媒體輿論的博弈〉。《國際新聞界》，第11期，頁82–97。

郭中實教授著作選

Guo, Z. (2018). Media credibility in the public mind: A critique. *Communication & Society, 46*, 121–182.

Guo, S., & Wang, D. (2020). News production and construal level: A comparative analysis of the press coverage of China's Belt and Road Initiative. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, *14*(2), 211–230.

Guo, S. Z., & Wang, D. (2022). Classroom vs. newsroom: Journalism education and practice in the digital age. In S. I. Zhang (Ed.), *Digital journalism in China* (pp. 99–112). London: Routledge.

Wang, D., & Guo, S. Z. (2023). Aggregation and the new news order: A practice theory approach. *Digital Journalism,* 1–23.

Wang, D., & Guo, S. Z. (2023). Making "un-news": News aggregation in Chinese press. *Journalism, 24*(8), 1715–1732.

本文引用格式

Academic Dialogue with **Deqiang JI** and **Chuxin HUANG**

The New Order of Cyber Space Regulation: Power, Control, and Governance

DJ: Deqiang JI
CH: Chuxin HUANG
CS: Zhongshi GUO, Dan WANG, Lei HUANG

CS: **Facing the impact of new media technology, the question of how long traditional news production and editing modes can be sustained is a topic of considerable controversy in both the industry and academia. What is your opinion on this issue? If traditional modes of news production were to gradually disappear, what impact would it have on the audience?**

DJ: The rapid development of technology has led to the extensive utilization of new media technologies in various aspects of news production. Traditional news production and editing models are based on two foundations: First is the Fordist economic model triggered by industrialization and urbanization, which entails mass production and consumption, correspondingly leading to mass communication dominated by mass media. Of course, the economic dynamics supporting this model's operation may vary in different media systems, including market systems, public systems, state-owned systems, and even community systems. The second foundation lies in the rise of the news industry, especially the issue of ideological self-legitimization triggered by its negative social effects, namely, journalistic professionalism, and its inherent public or people-oriented nature. Based on these foundations, traditional news production and editing models emphasize fieldwork and investigation, focusing on reporting the truth and maintaining balance in interpretation. Texts have structure, products have types, and industries have standards. It is a storytelling and knowledge production model centered around journalists, oriented towards the masses, and possessing a certain enlightenment character.

New media technology is a convergent force that has blurred the boundaries of the news industry and challenges and reconstructs its legitimacy from both internal and external perspectives. The new media technologies we often refer to mostly originate from a broader spectrum of information dissemination industries outside traditional media, including the internet, big data, cloud computing, artificial intelligence, and so on. Although often accompanied by various futuristic myths, the primary goal of these technological revolutions in social applications is actually to address more macroeconomic crises and political issues, such as the internet during the Nixon era.

The impact on the news industry, especially on its production and editing modes, is one aspect of these technological forces affecting society as a whole. Only by transcending the traditional industrial media perspective can we observe the complex and far-reaching effects of the reconstruction of the social information system on the news industry. When the information production-consumption relationship shifts from being supply-centered to consumer-centered, when audiences can depart from the vertically structured supply-demand relationship based on information scarcity constructed by news media, and instead rely on horizontal connectivity and productivity to access richer and more diverse information, even to "disconnect" from news media for daily information supply, the challenges faced by traditional news practices and their production and editing models are not just about defending the legitimacy of "what is news," but also about confirming whether the news industry can maintain resilience and long-term existence in the process of social informatization created by this technological increment.

Furthermore, the social democratic order constructed by the traditional news production model faces the dual challenges of polarized diverse subjects and deep post-truth cognition.

Therefore, traditional news production and editing remain an important mode of operation, undergoing a fate of survival akin to that of the news industry itself, albeit with a relatively diminished scope of practice. Furthermore, we need to recognize that as platform economy continues to rapidly capture new technologies, the truth crisis resulting from the commodification of information is triggering a widespread crisis of social trust. Reports such as those from the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at the University of Oxford have

confirmed that the authority and credibility of traditional news media, represented by broadcast television, have become crucial pivot points for the public to seek paths to reconstruct the information order.

From a dialectical perspective, although new media technologies have sparked a transformation in the entire information ecosystem, forcing the news industry itself to adjust its survival and development modes according to the ways of the information market or the traffic economy, the intrinsic value of news has not been eradicated but often obscured. The structured mode of traditional news production and editing remains an essential foundation for generating credible information and reliable stories. However, it needs to be more aligned with fragmented, mobile, and real-time consumption scenarios and, based on this foundation, reconstruct the authority of sources and narratives. This allows the networked audience or users to find beacons or lighthouses when facing unpredictable information seas.

Hence, while the traditional notion of news production may largely cease to exist, the structured power it embodies will resurface after the disorder of information. Practitioners and researchers need to rely on a longer historical perspective and updated practical views for inheritance. This is not merely an industry problem but a societal one.

CH: The advent of technology has profoundly transformed the traditional methods of news gathering, broadcasting, and presentation, impacting the conventional model of news production to a certain extent. However, overall, the arrival of new technologies does not signify the end of traditional news gathering and writing processes. Traditional news production typically relies on professional journalism organizations and reporters, characterized by strict procedures for reporting, broadcasting, and editing. These practices offer advantages such as relevance and professional values and ensure the authenticity, personalization, depth, and breadth of news content, maintaining their unique value in the new media ecosystem. In the absence of traditional news production, news is produced algorithmically, utilizing certain templates, which leads to homogeneity in content, a lack of human interest, and affects the audience's access to diverse information. Traditional news production is often governed by stringent journalistic ethics and values, ensuring the truthfulness and fairness of the news. Without it, decentralized modes of information production could expose audiences to a mix of

good and bad online information, making it hard to distinguish truth from falsehood and severely affecting their trust and satisfaction with the news. Moreover, algorithm-driven news limits users to certain types of information, which perpetuates media exposure and potentially leads to narrow perspectives and rigid thinking.

CS: **Media convergence has become an irreversible trend in today's world, giving rise to multifunctional, integrated, and diversified forms of information products that are disseminated to audiences through the internet, social media, and information platforms. How do you think this development direction is impacting discourse practices in daily life and altering the discourse control of those in power? What strategies might audiences adopt in response?**

DJ: Media convergence has transitioned from a future concept to a present and even a past reality, as it is no longer just a prediction but a part of everyday life. In societies rich with information and media resources, convergence is a thing of the past, and integration into reality is evident. Ordinary people typically do not concern themselves with the backend integration of websites or social apps; instead, they view these platforms as gateways to the digital or virtual world. A specific "end-user experience" is dominating their media-engaged lives, with various devices acting as tools to digitize individuals into this integrated world.

In essence, everyday life for many has become deeply media-driven, or more precisely, platform-driven. The binding with digital platforms, such as social media, has become a new norm in daily discourse. One key feature of platform discourse is the notion of "I think, therefore I speak; I speak, therefore I listen." Platforms transform users into controllable data with their computational power, dominating the entire discourse process and, intentionally or unintentionally, enclosing users within a flexible informational corral.

This convergence leads to a centralization of power, making it easier to track, analyze, and intervene in user activities, including the increasingly apparent political and commercial collaborations. From a daily discourse perspective, there are two trends: one is a non-political discourse, which becomes more diverse or even extremely diverse, with user groups creating their own worlds of discourse, often completely

disconnected from others. The other trend is politicized discourse, moving towards extremes: one is a highly controlled uniform discourse, though it also involves issues of truth and falsehood; the other is uncontrolled discourse polarization or extreme expressions, often represented by populism, which sidelines calm observation, complex thinking, and cautious expression in public opinion.

In this era of platformization, convergence has led to a structure of political and commercial unions. The goal of political control is compliant expression and mass mobilization, while economic control aims to maintain a user ecosystem. However, neither can achieve their goals independently. The interweaving of political and commercial forces has led to the politicization of platforms and the platformization of politics. In this pyramid of power, audiences or users are often disadvantaged, mainly because their horizontal connectivity is being dissected by capital-boosted technological forces and political intervention strategies, reducing their autonomy and self-regulatory behavior, which often holds more symbolic than practical significance.

This somewhat pessimistic view is not solely based on structural analysis but also on everyday observations. When almost everyone is deeply immersed in an information consumption and production environment centered around computation, questions arise about how subjectivity can be reclaimed and resistance ignited, often falling into a large gap between ideological claims and the effectiveness of individual actions.

CH: On the one hand, media convergence has altered the ways information is produced and disseminated. Various media platforms, through a range of information products, highlight their communicative strengths and exhibit distinct characteristics in their discourse. This profoundly impacts the everyday discourse practices of users. People can access diverse voices and viewpoints through different media platforms, catering to the multifaceted value demands of users in the new era, thereby making public discourse more diversified.

On the other hand, in the context of media convergence, a stratification of group expressions has emerged. Different types of information products lead users to connect based on interests, fostering communal discussions around shared topics. This ongoing

differentiation gives rise to new social strata, forming unique discourse systems and modes of thinking.

CS: **President Xi Jinping mentioned media convergence and county-level media convergence in 2014 and 2018 respectively, and later proposed media development policies such as "Internet Way of Thinking." From a historical perspective, what changes have occurred in various media at these time points? What changes have occurred in the relationship between the media and society?**

DJ: Media convergence has been a core policy keyword and a systematic transformation process in China's media industry over the past decade or more. It represents a shift initiated top-down from traditional independent media operations to a unified, integrated system. This transition to media convergence, and eventually to deep media convergence, affects all levels of media, from central to county-level, with each policy shift reflecting an assessment and arrangement of the role of convergence in national development and governance.

After the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the concept of media convergence, including the emphasis on internet thinking, was largely a response to the crisis traditional media faced due to the rise of commercial internet. It was also a proactive measure to address the shortcomings in national information governance capabilities. The focus was on restructuring or self-revolutionizing state-owned media systems to maintain guidance and authoritative dissemination in the age of the internet. The primary focus during this phase was on central and some provincial-level media, or the leading media entities.

The key question for more widespread grassroots media, especially county-level media, is how to survive and innovate in the digital revolution and integrate into the modernization of national governance systems. County-level integrated media construction has multiple economic and political implications and is a crucial step in the national strategy of media convergence. Firstly, it opens economic possibilities for county-level media, enabling them to venture beyond traditional operations and seek commercial opportunities, such as more involvement in government services, integrating better with local economies, and achieving institutional transformation faster. Secondly,

it drives county-level media to better serve grassroots governance goals, particularly in aligning county-level media centers with party and community service centers, government service centers, and new-era civilization practice centers. This alignment gradually integrates public opinion, party affairs, governmental affairs, and cultural public services, forming a new pattern of grassroots culture and social governance.

As media convergence enters a more complex phase, the imbalances in construction and development become more pronounced, with economic viability remaining a core challenge for many integrated media centers.

Reflecting on a decade of media convergence, the most significant impacts on media at all levels include:

Identity recognition: Breaking the old vs. new dichotomy, traditional media's identity advantage appears fragile against the rapidly growing economy of web traffic. Reshaping media identity to coexist and co-create with new media within the old media's perspective becomes crucial.

Economic income: Surpassing reliance on a single advertising model became a necessity, partly due to advertisers shifting away and partly due to convergence being a process of media economic participation in the digital economy. However, most media personnel lack the marketization skills required for successful convergence, which leads to predominantly regional case model successes rather than a universal successful model.

Content production: The transformation in production processes was both a policy requirement and a practical necessity. Focused on multi-terminal consumption, especially on mobile devices, media at all levels have generally achieved the intensification of production resources and streamlined production processes, significantly improving capacity and efficiency to claim a place in the age of traffic journalism.

Despite these advances, the evolution of this attention-based competitive field often diverges from the media industry's expectations, necessitating state intervention to ensure orderly information dissemination and to empower the media.

In conclusion, the past decade of convergence, whether driven by technology, market changes, or proactive or reactive policy responses, has dramatically altered the landscape of Chinese media. The distinction between old and new media is fading, and the trend of media platformization is increasingly evident, further propelling the platformization of Chinese society. Media, which once mainly set and guided public opinion, now serves a broader role as an information service provider, encompassing news, government, business, and public welfare information services. This transformation embeds media changes more deeply into the broader social transformation of China. Despite contradictions and challenges, especially from the monopolistic practices of commercial internet platforms, the media can still leverage institutional advantages to access exclusive resources, leading to a complex and unpredictable competitive and cooperative dynamic between state-owned media and commercial platforms.

CH: The guidelines issued by the Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reforms on August 18, 2014, mark a significant turning point in the media landscape of China. These guidelines aimed to foster the development of new, competitive mainstream media entities with diverse formats and advanced methods, which leads to the establishment of powerful new media groups with strong dissemination, credibility, and influence. The strategy envisioned creating a modern, multi-dimensional, and integrated communication system. It emphasized strengthening internet thinking and promoting the complementary and integrated development of traditional and emerging media. Following these directives, regional departments and localities introduced relevant policies that led to a dynamic period of transformation and innovation in the media sector.

During this period, top mainstream media rapidly strengthened themselves, forming conglomerates and developing transformation paradigms. Many local newspaper groups underwent platform-based transformations, launching unique client applications that attracted widespread attention. In August 2018, Xi Jinping, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, underscored the importance of developing county-level integrated media centers to better guide and serve the public, marking a strategic direction for media development at the national level.

Consequently, the construction of county-level integrated media centers across the country was methodically advanced, achieving nationwide coverage by the end of 2020. In April 2022, the Propaganda Department, the Ministry of Finance, and the National Radio and Television Administration jointly issued a notice to accelerate the deep integration of city-level media. This involved selecting 60 city-level integrated media centers as pilot units, addressing a crucial gap in the integration and planning of media at the regional level. This marked a new chapter in China's media convergence, emphasizing a holistic approach to media transformation at various levels.

Media entities at all levels actively engaged in the practice of deep media integration innovate in system mechanisms, content production, and channel construction. This drew the relationship between media and society closer, with two key outcomes:

Platformization: Media entities at various levels advanced their platform-based construction, diversifying public information access and enabling faster, wider information dissemination. Media platforms also began to offer local government and public services, opening channels for public feedback and meeting social needs, thereby contributing to social harmony and stability.

Internet Way of Thinking: Users transitioned from passive recipients of information to active content creators and disseminators. This shift allowed the public to more actively participate in discussions and oversight of social and public affairs, significantly enhancing public engagement and satisfaction.

Overall, the evolution of media in China underlines the shifting role of media in society, from a traditional disseminator of information to a more interactive, service-oriented entity. This transformation reflects the broader social and technological changes shaping media practices worldwide.

CS: **After the concept of media convergence emerged, we observed that major media organizations in Mainland China underwent reforms at both the infrastructure and cultural levels. This includes the so-called "Two Weis and One App," "Media Matrix," etc., which leads to the inevitable integration of third-party platforms. Marshall McLuhan mentioned that "the medium is the message."**

In your observations and research, what role do Chinese platforms play in media convergence?

DJ: From a de-mediacentric perspective, media convergence is a process of media platformization and infrastructure development. Over a decade of convergence, Chinese media have not only reconstructed their production processes and changed their operational thinking but also enhanced their service functions. They have also started to learn from commercial internet platforms that they once looked down upon, and are continuously negotiating new identities within the technological and market discourses set by these platforms. This shift in the power structure is a result of the platformization of Chinese society, driven by various commercial digital platforms that have the dual advantage of being globally-oriented and rooted in the Chinese market. Behind these rapidly emerging platform companies lies a developmental state's decision-making model and policy system. Platform companies are not only the vanguard forces driving China's economic transformation but also key intermediaries in upgrading China's digital infrastructure and governance capabilities and significant supporters of China's participation in the global digital game.

Looking back at the relationship between media and platforms from this standpoint, it is evident that the "siege of platforms" compels all sectors of Chinese society to establish connections with them. The new information consumption and social interaction environments shaped by platforms force media convergence to respond in multiple ways. This includes rapidly enhancing the production capabilities and efficiency of news and entertainment content, actively embedding it in various platform terminals, and planning for proprietary platforms like self-built apps. It also fosters active collaboration in content production, advertising marketing, and public opinion crisis management. Thus, the rise of platforms has a comprehensive impact on media convergence. If the earlier driver of media convergence was "internet thinking," it is now more aptly "platform thinking." The former mainly refers to a technological logic, while the latter encompasses a systemic logic that includes technology, business, governance, and culture.

From a policy discourse perspective, as media convergence enters a deeper development phase, the core issue is no longer the internal

structural adjustment of the media but how to coexist symbiotically with external commercial platform ecosystems. Establishing this beneficial symbiotic relationship makes highly adaptive national power extremely important.

CH: Platform construction is a key lever in the development of media convergence and is crucial in advancing deep media integration. Throughout the process of advancing media convergence, media institutions at all four levels have actively undergone platform transformation. They rely on their own platforms for information dissemination and content editing to advance content production and distribution. They are also expanding the "News + Government and Business Services" model to continuously enhance their communicative power, influence, credibility, and guidance. The transformation includes:

Becoming a hub for information dissemination: Platforms are vital venues for media organizations to release information. Media institutions use their platforms as effective tools for information dissemination, starting with "information value," and fully leveraging their platform advantages to serve as a viable source of information for users.

Aiding content acquisition and editing: Media institutions have established unified technological platforms to effectively gather and share resources and interlink their operations. Examples like the Zhejiang Daily Newspaper Group's "Media Cube" integrated media technology platform and the Henan Daily Newspaper Group's Dahe Cloud are representative of provincial media's "Central Kitchens," providing robust technical support systems to enhance modern communication capabilities in the depth development process of media institutions.

Providing public services: Media institutions collaborate with public service departments like education, healthcare, and security. Through platforms, they effectively connect with users and, in coordination with local governments, take on functions like public service. For example, the Youxi County Integrated Media Center's "Smart Youxi" client platform offers employment services, urban and rural medical insurance, food safety, mobile tax processing, talent

services, pension insurance, etc., on top of its basic functions in information dissemination and news promotion.

Promoting government services: The media continually strengthen cooperation with the party and government departments. Through their platforms, they expand functions in public political inquiries and government information services, effectively aiding grassroots social governance.

Providing business services: Media institutions capitalize their operations through media platforms, continuously enhancing their "self-sustaining" skills to provide financial guarantees for the development of media convergence. For instance, the Anji County Integrated Media Center independently developed and operates the regional public brand platform "Anji Youpinhui." Through online member promotion and offline sales of popular products, it promotes Anji's quality products nationwide. Since its official launch on July 9, 2022, it has gained over 6,000 members and nearly 300 million yuan in sales.

CS: **Media convergence is an inevitable outcome of technology and politics. Many communication scholars argue that the emergence of platforms like "Central Kitchen" leads to a reduction in diverse local information and an increase in aggregated and homogeneous content. What are your comments on this?**

DJ: Looking globally, whether it is from an economic or political perspective, media convergence is indeed a process of power centralization, accompanied by media divergence as a result. With the involvement of commercial platforms, this coexistence of convergence and divergence becomes even more complex. Models like "Central Kitchen" that represent centralized production accelerate the collection, processing, and distribution of information, making it easier to grasp and intervene in the contact effects generated by the flow of information between different nodes, turning real-time and precise effect monitoring from an ideal into a reality.

With the strengthening of information aggregation capabilities, the production and terminal delivery of key social issues, such as political news, have become more centralized. This would have been unimaginable before media convergence. However, this does not mean the complete homogenization of the entire social agenda.

Another result of convergence is that other social issues become more diversified, and the mobility of localism is dominating the platform-based opinion environment.

Empowered by commercial internet platforms, local information production is becoming more active with the blessing of algorithms. Diverse content is being explored, produced, displayed, consumed, and transmitted among diverse user groups, forming a more segmented and personalized communication ecosystem. Perhaps the only thing becoming more homogenized is the transient and spectacular information production and consumption patterns, as well as the systematic dependence on a few monopolistic platforms and their applications.

Therefore, we see the new center-periphery relationship shaped by media convergence: on the one hand, the centralization of mainstream content production dominated by media that is represented by political news; on the other hand, the networkization of other content production. With the catalysis of commercial internet platforms, diverse and local content production is experiencing explosive growth, objectively further diverting the limited media attention of the public. This means that despite experiencing convergence and enhancing content production and dissemination capabilities, the proportion of traditional media in the entire societal information flow pool is still relatively decreasing.

The media's dependence on platforms' "pipeline dominance" will continue to be a norm, which will constantly erode the media's own content production logic. Convergence is far from over, and perhaps even more intense changes are on the horizon.

CH: The "Guiding Opinions on Promoting the Integrated Development of Traditional Media and Emerging Media" proposed: "Traditional media and emerging media should deeply integrate in multiple aspects such as content, channels, platforms, operation, and management." Under this guidance, the concept of "one-time collection, multi-generation, and diversified dissemination" has gradually been implemented in the process of media convergence and has been perfected in the production practices of different media groups. The transformation of production methods, represented by the "Central Kitchen," has achieved remarkable success.

In terms of news production philosophy, the "Central Kitchen" plays a role in providing raw materials or semi-finished information to media at all levels. Editors from various media platforms select information and construct narrative frameworks based on the specific needs of target audiences, thereby creating and effectively disseminating news products. In practical terms, the "Central Kitchen" model effectively breaks down departmental barriers, maximizes labor cost savings, and enhances editorial efficiency and capabilities. However, at the content production level, the information production mode of the "Central Kitchen" still tends to be "sender-centric," with aggregation and homogenization of information being particularly evident, requiring rational analysis and scientific responses:

Firstly, according to the functions and characteristics of different media, differential positioning should be implemented to select appropriate contexts for content expression. Secondly, cultivating user thinking, strengthening deep interaction between media platforms and users, timely collecting user feedback, and grasping user information needs are required to provide users with more targeted news products. Finally, improving the professional literacy of practitioners and focusing on the cultivation of practitioners' skills in information collection, organization, distribution, and innovation are much needed.

CS: With the rise of generative AI-powered tools, what new insights have emerged in the fields of journalism and communication studies? Are there any areas of research that have been overlooked? When new technologies and tools are introduced, there is usually a surge of research related to them. However, some argue that much of this research is simply repackaged ideas. What is your opinion on this? How do you evaluate the theoretical value of a research study?

DJ: Technological myths often serve as catalysts for innovation in journalism and communication studies. Discourse about technologies is a source of legitimacy for innovation, especially as generative AI shifts from myth to practice. However, there are concerns over the potential replacement of the media industry, which is already in crisis, by generative AI. Currently, the Chinese journalism and communication academic community is exploring new paradigms based on human-computer interaction (also known as the "machine paradigm"), multimodal content generation (especially high-quality

video), misinformation governance, media access and transformation, legal regulation and ethical norms, as well as geopolitical issues tied to sovereignty. Generative AI is considered one of the most disruptive technological phenomena, posing unprecedented challenges to knowledge production and talent cultivation in the academic community of journalism and communication. It has sparked discussions about how research should be conducted, such as addressing the division of labor and interaction between humans and machines in knowledge production and teaching practices.

Research in journalism and communication on generative AI covers many aspects but still has some blind spots due to limited professional vision and theoretical imagination. For instance, from the discourse perspective, it is essential to explore how the technological discourse of generative AI is constructed, who are the main discursive subjects, what discourse strategies are employed, and what different technological imaginations exist for this new form of AI. Similarly, it is important to understand the impact of generative AI on journalism, how it differs from previous technological forms, and how the boundaries of journalism should be defined. Additionally, it is critical to consider the economic level and understand the kind of business and financial models that will emerge with the help of generative AI and how they will reshape the existing digital economy. The governance level needs to be examined as well, including issues of unfairness and injustice in generative AI, and how legal regulation and ethical norms for generative AI should be defined. Finally, the international relations level should be considered to understand the state competition, geopolitical contradictions, and digital divides triggered by generative AI, among other issues.

To delve deeper into these problems, it is crucial for scholars to have diverse disciplinary backgrounds and participate in policy and industry processes. Academic research needs to go beyond everyday practices and experiences and take more stakeholders, as well as the nonlinear characteristics of the mutual construction between technology and society, into account.

Certainly, the issue of "old wine in new bottles," particularly focusing only on rhetorical innovation, is a common problem in cutting-edge research. The main reason is that the research subjects

do not reveal all their details to all observers within a limited time frame. Moreover, the public's understanding of core technologies like generative AI is inherently limited by the promotion strategies of developers and business organizations. Building on a limited foundation of knowledge and experience, layering some technical imagination and theoretical rhetoric for analysis and interpretation seems to be a reasonable academic production method. However, it must be reminded that regardless of how concepts are grafted or rhetoric is innovated, every academic output should present incremental academic values. It should either discover what has not been discovered or supplement new aspects of interpretation, both of which are invaluable in filling academic voids. In response to the technological revolution of generative AI, the academic community should focus on unraveling—rather than participating in the reproduction of—various technological myths and market myths, concentrating on the logic of the technology and its corresponding political, economic, and cultural implications. At the same time, it should foster an open environment for multidisciplinary dialogue and exchange to avoid a situation akin to the parable of the blind men and an elephant, that is, the inability to have a complete understanding of a larger situation or truth.

CH: In the field of journalism and communication, research perspectives regarding generative AI tools that have emerged include: (1) the strengths and weaknesses of generative AI itself, as well as the opportunities and challenges it faces; (2) the transformation and innovation that generative AI brings to the news industry, its impact on the industry, and the challenges it poses; (3) the effect of generative AI on news practitioners, as well as issues they need to address; and (4) legal, regulatory, ethical, and accountability issues related to generative AI.

In China, there is currently a significant amount of basic research that covers a wide range of topics. However, there is a concerning trend of homogenization, where many studies are just reorganizing and summarizing existing research findings. Unfortunately, there is a lack of discussion regarding user issues related to generative AI, skill development, and future development. It would benefit future research to expand and have a deeper understanding of these areas.

With the emergence of new technologies and tools, the academic community's understanding is limited, and many studies refer to existing theories and models to understand the technologies, leading to a "new wine in old bottles" situation. As the understanding of new technologies deepens, the simple application of existing theories and models no longer meets the exploratory needs of the academic community. At this point, research should focus on innovation and depth—that is, how to go beyond applying existing theories, strive to uncover the impacts and principles behind new technologies, and explore new changes and potential theoretical innovations.

Regarding the theoretical contribution of a study, the first is theoretical innovation, referring to whether the study proposes new theoretical concepts, models, and frameworks or meaningfully expands and deepens existing theories. The second is the scope of theoretical application, referring to whether the theory proposed by the study can transcend specific cases and has universality and applicability. The third is explanatory and predictive power, that is, to what extent the theory proposed by the study can explain real-world phenomena and whether it can predict future trends. The fourth is stimulating subsequent research: whether it provides new ideas, methods, or data resources for subsequent research, and whether it has stimulated further discussion on related issues in the academic community.

CS: **How has the professional identity of media practitioners changed in the context of media convergence? How do the work practices of media practitioners at different levels differ? Some scholars believe that media practitioners are now in a "rush job" practice of news production, which is exhausting both mentally and physically. What can we do to improve the health and well-being of media practitioners?**

DJ: For practitioners, media convergence has indeed brought about more flexible yet demanding tasks so that they can meet the diversified needs of platforms, applications, and users. Taking journalists as an example, the long-standing core competencies have been vision, energy, writing skills, and mental agility. Beyond these, there is now a need for journalists to develop a technological mindset, product thinking, user perspectives, and even "traffic thinking" (i.e., how to attract more traffic for their digital products). The consensus among practitioners

and managers is that everyone should be a "self-media," where "self" does not refer to oneself but to being an all-around specialist. In this process, in addition to political literacy and management skills, a manager's professional understanding and practical abilities become a very important measure of their competence.

Therefore, facing the rapidly changing communication environment and the constant state of "rush work," the lack of skills is internalized as identity anxiety among practitioners, which leads to labor issues. The root cause of this phenomenon is not the media's own capabilities but the increase in information in the world that forces the media system to adjust itself according to the standards of production efficiency set by digital platforms and businesses to regain public attention and maintain its professional legitimacy. At the same time, the media cannot completely abandon industry standards and professional ethics, and the consequent high production costs of maintaining them impel the media to translate the exponentially increasing workload into work pressure for practitioners. In other words, media practitioners are trying to dance two dances simultaneously, and whether these dances can be coordinated is unknown, but they are clearly stumbling. Therefore, how to protect the collective physical and mental health of media practitioners has become a very tricky issue. Perhaps this can be altered in three ways: first, by encouraging more collaborative work within media organizations to leverage different strengths and reduce overlapping work; second, by leveraging the role of professional communities to promote the formation of labor norms for the platform and AI era; and third, by leveraging the role of research universities and vocational schools to provide retraining opportunities to enhance the capabilities of practitioners.

The professional identity of media practitioners is an important issue that needs to be addressed, especially in the face of media convergence, which is constantly reshaping media boundaries. The roles of media professionals are constantly changing and evolving due to various factors such as the rise of the internet, the development of self-media, practitioners leaving the occupation, and the emergence of new platforms. This constant flux in roles has resulted in a negation of negation rather than just a simple crisis and survival.

Media convergence is a non-linear process, and practitioners' role cognition varies across different fields. For example, in the technical field, media professionals feel like outsiders and experience anxiety due to their lack of capabilities, which can lead to an identity crisis. In the market field, media professionals are naturally anxious and hesitant, with a sense of nostalgia for the time when media organizations were monopolists of the attention market. They may also question and resist new platform monopolists. In the journalistic profession or political field, media professionals are mostly confident and have a strong professional identity stemming from tradition and the authority that still remains. Additionally, commercial internet platforms may insulate them from certain practices due to policy and role identity reasons.

It is important to note that this analysis of professional role identity is based on the Chinese media environment, but it shares some universal issues. However, local characteristics play a significant role, too.

CH: Against the backdrop of media convergence, impacted by multiple forces such as institutional mechanisms, media technology, media users, and distribution channels, traditional skills in reporting, writing, editing, and commenting, as well as photography and video editing, can no longer meet the overall needs of news production. Editorial departments have begun to demand "multi-skilled specialist" journalists, and the individual professional identity crisis is increasingly prominent.

In the process of deepening media convergence, various media institutions are discarding traditional production and distribution models, continuously optimizing institutional mechanisms and production processes to form a new system of "once collected, diversely produced, and multi-platform distributed." Media workers at different levels are responsible for different tasks such as directing, material collection, information integration, verification, and shared distribution to create programs of different styles and types, meeting the multi-level needs of the audience.

The intensification of media convergence has increased the external competition among media and peers, leading to a focus on "speed" and "traffic." This has caused some editors and reporters

to compromise quality and resort to quick and low-quality work practices. To address this, it is essential to strengthen overall planning, rationally allocate human resources, free practitioners from repetitive and low-quality work, and enable them to utilize their talents in suitable positions. This will promote supply-side reform in content products, leverage the professionalism and subjectivity of media practitioners, and focus on producing high-quality content that has value.

The diversity of communication formats and content is driving the expansion of the functions and responsibilities of media workers. Therefore, it is necessary to continually improve the training of practitioners and cultivate their abilities in leveraging AI tools, new media content production and operation, and marketing. This will enable practitioners to better adapt to the transformation and development of media.

Finally, optimizing the traditional remuneration system, introducing scientific performance assessment methods, and perfecting wage management for personnel can motivate journalists' work enthusiasm while ensuring their "material rewards." This will further enhance practitioners' sense of belonging and fulfillment.

Selected Works by Deqiang Ji and Chuxin Huang

Please refer to the end of the Chinese version of the dialogue for Deqiang Ji and Chuxin Huang's selected works.