

The Social Mentality and Governance in the Intelligent Era: Taking the Mentality Crisis Caused by ChatGPT as an Example

Zeja Zhang¹, Huali Lin²

¹Shaanxi University of Chinese Medicine, Xi'an 712046, China

²Xi'an Mental Health Center, Xi'an 710061, China

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology is triggering changes in social structure and social mentality. With the networking, digitization and intelligence of human society, the boundaries between social mentality and social behavior in cyberspace are blurring day by day, and the subjects of cyber behavior are gradually embedded with various types of algorithm-driven non-human intelligences including ChatGPT in addition to real Internet users, and the relationship between human and machine has become a basic social relationship. The general generative artificial intelligence represented by ChatGPT has even broken through the monopoly of human language ability, aggravating the value concern of human beings about themselves as the only “intelligent body” on the earth, and thus triggering a crisis in the mentality of all human beings about their own sense of ontological existence. For this reason, the governance of social mentality and the design of social mechanisms in the age of intelligence should be aimed at guaranteeing the subjective value of human beings more adequately, so that a better life in the future will be able to accommodate the existence of human beings themselves. This also calls for the revival of a social psychology full of humanity.

Keywords: Intelligent society; Social psychology governance; ChatGPT; Intelligences.

1. Introduction

At present, the discussion on the possible impact of ChatGPT on human society and various disciplines is still in the ascendant, involving many disciplines, with a growing variety of topics and diverse perspectives. [1-2] It is the common mission of different disciplines to look cautiously at the social and psychological consequences of such technological changes, and to find ways to cope with the crises arising from them as far as possible. In this paper, from the standpoint of social psychology, which is a “hub science” connecting the two main disciplines of sociology and psychology, we discuss the crisis of mindset triggered by ChatGPT from the perspective of social mindset governance, with a view to shaping the future of social mindset. We will discuss the crisis of mindset caused by ChatGPT from the perspective of social mindset governance, with the aim of providing academic insights and intellectual support based on the perspective of social psychology for shaping the ideal vision of the future society.

2. Understanding the Impact of Artificial Intelligence from a Social Psychological Standpoint

Artificial intelligence, as a technology, has dramatically changed human society and will continue to influence the historical process of human development. As with the application and diffusion of all previous emerging technologies, it will bring about a change in productive forces while at the same time bringing about a change in the relations of production, thereby triggering a change in the social structure and a change in social mentality. Moreover, this process of change is not always positive, positive, moderate and satisfactory, but also may be hidden social unrest and

human confusion of the causative factors, so that the technological evolution of the period of mutation is often also the social order and mentality of the order of the period of disorder. This is not uncommon in human history. The European Enlightenment, for example, had the social consequences of total war worldwide: “Armed reason merged with popular passion to reorganize and destroy social structures in the name of 'scientific' conclusions about the direction of history. The innovations that the modern scientific method carries with it enhance the destructive power of weapons and ultimately usher in an era of total war characterized by mobilization at the social level and destruction at the industrial level.” [3] While the superficial social order may be temporarily restored through political or military force once social dislocation is experienced, the lifting of the crisis of the mentality and the bridging of the world, i.e., the full restoration of the society's own organic integration mechanism, often takes a long time to realize. How to give full play to the constructive power of social mentality, and how to help maintain social order in the era of rapid technological change through the cultivation and construction of social mentality, has become an important practical subject and theoretical call.

Over the past six months or so, there has been no more exciting or disturbing AI technology breakthrough than ChatGPT and its iteration, ChatGPT-4 (hereinafter referred to collectively as ChatGPT when no specific distinctions are made). To date, there is no clear evidence that ChatGPT, or any other big language modeling or other AI technology, has had the de facto effect of destabilizing and disrupting the social order, but concerns about this potential have been accompanied by the big language modeling race and technological frenzy it has created in every country and on every major online platform. Standing at the crossroads of the era when AI technology is constantly breaking through the boundaries, and then restructuring the society in depth,

thinking about the deep impact of such technology on human psychology and society has become an important opportunity to stimulate the academic imagination of different disciplines, and thus to highlight the value of our own disciplines.

As far as the discipline of social psychology is concerned, it has a typical intermediate position or pivotal function, one of the most important manifestations of which lies in the fact that it inherently links the basic methodological positions of sociology and psychology. [Among them, sociology pays attention to the exploration of the social causes of psychological phenomena and rejects purely “psychological” explanations of behavior; psychology pays attention to the reductionist exploration of the basic mechanisms of human behavior, and pays more attention to outlining the basic motives of social behavior from the perspective of psychological processes and their physiological mechanisms. Social psychology, on the other hand, pays attention not only to the psychological reflection and behavioral tendencies at the individual level, but also to how these individualized reflections and tendencies converge to form specific social behaviors, thus making the “psychological problem” a “social problem”, i.e., how the individual psychology affects the social order; or conversely, how a specific psychological problem affects the social order; or, on the other hand, how a specific psychological problem affects the social order. Or, conversely, how specific social structures and processes drive and regulate different individuals to produce a generally consistent psychological experience, i.e., to form a certain shared psychological reality of social members, i.e., the social mindset. [6-8]

Exploring the social impact of ChatGPT from the perspective of social psychology and the level of analysis of social mentality, we can better demonstrate its dual impact on human society: First, at the factual level, it has already produced obvious and visible impacts on the practical work in certain areas of high repetitiveness, knowledge retrieval, and language comprehension and transformation (e.g., translation), etc., but the long-term impacts of such impacts on the occupational division of labor and the social structure need to be further observed. Secondly, at the conceptual level, it has produced different degrees and areas of psychological impact on governmental organizations, experts and scholars, and the general public, and has manifested itself in a variety of different types of social attitudes, but these attitudes have not formed a unified, shared social mentality, and the social attitudes towards ChatGPT itself, like the technology itself, are still in the “evolutionary period” of being observed and debated. The social attitudes towards ChatGPT itself, like the technology itself, are still in an observable and debatable “evolutionary period”. [9-10] It can even be asserted that many of the predictions about the development process of ChatGPT and its social consequences may ultimately fail, and that its ultimate impact may often take on other guises.

However, the failure of prophecies does not necessarily diminish the historical value of the various current discussions. This is because it is only in such timely (though not necessarily accurate) discussions and reactions that the unity of subjective initiative and objective necessity in the course of human history can be demonstrated: although the ultimate direction of history may not depend on the momentary thoughts and ideas of individuals or groups, these thoughts and ideas always determine the actions of the moment in reality, and thus drive or shape the direction of historical development. In the case of ChatGPT, the average

person, or even a non-AI expert or government administrator, often knows very little about the core areas of its technological development, and is therefore unable to influence its path on a purely technical level. However, ChatGPT and any application of AI cannot be separated from the real limitations of social context and social space. In fact, many of the principles of governance for ChatGPT and AI “are common to human societies, not just for the governance of AI societies, but are basic principles of social development” [11]. These fundamental principles do not change qualitatively as a result of short-term technological leaps. In fact, what determines the scope of application and role of AI is not only the “hard constraints” of hardware infrastructure such as arithmetic power, but also the “soft constraints” of social systems, social values, and new social trends and other social products. Therefore, how human beings in different countries and different groups of people in the same country perceive ChatGPT and AI is one of the “soft constraints” that will affect its further development in the near future.

During the past decades or even centuries of modernization, China has been in the position of catching up, imitating and being suppressed in many aspects of modernization and transformation, which has greatly limited the influence and academic discourse of Chinese experience and Chinese experience in the world. Nowadays, the Chinese government has been actively advocating the development of digital economy and the transformation of digital society, Chinese Internet enterprises have been devoting themselves to the development, application, and business model innovation of big language models, and Chinese people are relying more and more on all kinds of online platforms and intelligent algorithms to plan their daily lives and unfold their social lives [12-13], which are all developing facts that indicate that Chinese society is on the way to modernization and transformation in various aspects. These evolving facts have illustrated that Chinese society is at the forefront of global digital transformation, thus assuming the role of a frontrunner in exploring the transformation of human civilization on its own initiative, and that there is no ready-made example to learn from, and that it must show its own initiative and stance. In this sense, timely and adequate research on the impact of social mentality caused by AI and its governance is the perfect opportunity for Chinese social psychology to highlight the global value of China's governance.

3. The all-round Challenge to Social Mentality Governance in The Intelligent Era

Governance of social mentality (referred to as “governance of mentality”) is the whole process of governance of the content of social mentality that hinders or promotes the realization of the will of the state and the conclusion of the social order by a particular state at a particular stage of history based on its dominant value concept. [Although this name is not necessarily adopted, the substantive governance content embodied in this definition has always existed in different countries at different stages of history as an inherent requirement of national governance. In China, there is a tradition of political discourse that “the people's heart cannot be violated”, and nowadays it is also common to see the political expression that “the people's heart is the biggest politics”, which reflects the great importance that those who govern pay to the issue of social mentality. This also makes

the concept of social mentality in the Chinese context itself has the dual nature of academic concept and policy concept, and also has a deep connection with national governance. [15] The evolution from “doctrine” to “governance” has also been the basic trend in the research process of social mentality since the early 1980s. [16-17]

In recent years, with the accelerated pace of networked, digitalized, and intelligent transformation of Chinese society, cybersocial mentality (referred to as “cybermind”) and its governance have received increasing attention. [At the same time, government authorities are keenly aware that cyberspace has become the source, conductor and amplifier of various social risks, and there is a clear trend that social risks are converging in cyberspace, which in turn misleads social emotions and public psychology [20], and cybermindset has been emphasized as an emerging category of social risk factors and governance topics. The reason for this trend, in addition to the general political and social causes, is also related to the unique “physical-psychological” attributes of cyberspace. With the enhancement of digitization and intelligence, the physical and psychological characteristics of cyberspace have been deeply integrated, and cyberspace is highly permeable to real space in both directions, which makes cyberspace not a unidimensional information exchange space, but also a comprehensive social space with a full range of socio-psychological functions, such as mobilizing emotions, shaping perceptions, transmitting values, fostering personalities, and stimulating behaviors, which has fundamentally reshaped human psychology and behavior. It has fundamentally reshaped human psychology and behavior.

For example, the anonymous communication, asynchronous interaction and other technical characteristics of cyberspace, as well as the information dissemination effect caused by digital technology such as the “information cocoon” and “echo chamber” effect formed by platform algorithms, objectively strengthen the “disinhibiting effect” of netizens' psychology and behavior, i.e., weaken individuals' public awareness and concern for others' feelings, making it easier for people to be verbally abusive and bullying and other negative behaviors when online. disinhibiting effect” (disinhibiting effect), i.e., weakening individual's public awareness and concern for other people's feelings, which makes it easier for people to engage in negative behaviors such as verbal abuse and bullying when surfing the Internet [21-22]; the interface design and algorithmic mechanism of many smart devices and applications, and the “information cocoon” and “echo chamber” effects of digital technology have objectively strengthened the psychology and behavior of netizens. The interface design and algorithmic mechanism of many smart devices and applications are designed to capture the attention of individuals to the greatest extent possible, and individuals are easy to get addicted to these well-designed interfaces and programs and not easy to get away from them; language is an important representation and shaping power of the psyche, and the “language communication” in cyberspace has developed from pure text communication in the early days to the present-day “language communication”, which includes Emoji symbols, pictures and other symbols. Nowadays, from Emoji symbols, pictures, short videos to the mixed use of deepfake technology, this mode of discourse interaction has a subtle influence on individual's self-identity, emotional expression, cognitive style, personality traits, and way of thinking, which reflects the mutual embeddedness and

symbiosis between technology and human nature [23-25], and this relationship is more or less the same as the relationship between technology and human nature [24], and this relationship is more or less the same as the relationship between technology and human nature. -25], and this relationship is deepening with the evolution of intelligent technology. These new changes also make the governance of mind, social governance and national governance encounter new challenges at the same time. This is related to the fusion of boundaries and dissolution of subjects between mindset and behavior brought about by the networking, digitization, and intelligence of human societies.

First, in cyberspace, the boundary between social mentality and social behavior is becoming increasingly blurred. The basic difference between external behavior and internal mindset is that behavior is more observable in the physical sense, which is an important reason why behavior is regarded as an objective variable while mindset is only regarded as a subjective variable. Mindset can of course be observed objectively to some extent, but it is more implicit, has a higher observational error, and is not as intuitive and easy to identify uniformly and accurately as behavior. In traditional, offline life situations, only behaviors can be observed, while mindsets can only be “guessed” or “experienced”, which always means that there are errors. As a result, human behaviors always show a game-like, i.e., strategic character based on a specific cultural context [26], which makes it impossible to establish a simple functional correlation between attitudes and behaviors, e.g., superficial behavioral compliance does not imply internal attitudinal agreement. Because of this, at the level of conceptual definition, it can be argued that “public opinion, public opinion and so on are the expression and manifestation of social mentality, not social mentality itself”, and people can learn about social mentality from street talk, rumors, hearsay, and other speech “behavior”, but also through rallies, riots, hearsay, and so on. People can learn about social mentality from verbal “behaviors” such as street talk, rumors, and hearsay, and also through specific behaviors such as rallies, riots, commotions, strikes, and petitions. [This actually shows that social mentality is more of a conceptual construction based on external behavior. Social mentality has both cognitive and ontological features, it cannot be separated from the cognitive processing of social reality by the observer, and this cognitive processing (i.e., how the observer of social mentality observes and understands the social mentality) constitutes an organic component of social mentality itself.

In cyberspace, however, the distinction between mindfulness and behavior is fading. If social behavior is the behavior of individuals meaningfully directed to others (whether familiar or unfamiliar) in the sense of Max Weber [28], and can be divided into different “ideal types” for theoretical analysis due to the influence of factors such as the rationality of purpose, the rationality of value, emotions, and customs, etc., then in cyberspace, the production of content (such as verbal comments, text distribution, image sharing, video uploading, etc.) and the resulting behaviors such as liking, commenting, and forwarding are undoubtedly different from the behaviors of others. If content production in cyberspace (e.g., verbal commenting, text distribution, image sharing, video uploading, etc.) and the resulting behavior of liking, commenting, forwarding, etc., undoubtedly have the same conceptual connotation, and can be classified into similar ideal types as well. However, these

online behaviors are distinctly different from those in traditional, offline spaces, in that they are only presented in cyberspace and do not have a direct, face-to-face impact on individuals who do not use the Internet; however, in many cases, their real-world effects may spill over into offline spaces. For example, “cyberviolence” usually takes the form of indiscriminate posting of abusive insults, rumors and slander, and invasion of privacy against individuals on the Internet, and is essentially just a form of cyber-speech rather than “real” behavior. However, this kind of online violence does cause individuals to “social death” [29-30] and depression and other depressed state of mind, and in serious cases, it may even lead to individuals to commit suicide and other real consequences. In addition, this kind of language violence also destroys the ecological environment of cyberspace, and destroys the safety and experience of other Internet users. In terms of the motives and consequences of cyber violence, it is social behavior, which is no different from verbal behavior in the offline world. However, unlike language in the offline space, online speech is recorded and observed all the time, i.e., cyberspace creates the “visibility” of a social mindset to be observed by others, and thus considered as a social behavior. For example, without the corroboration of Internet browsing traces, merchants would not be able to infer whether someone has specific consumption preferences, and would not be able to conduct all kinds of so-called “user profiles”; without the pictures and videos that have been secretly filmed or uploaded by others unintentionally, the “social death” or “being killed” of the person concerned might not have been caused. Without the pictures or videos that are secretly taken or inadvertently uploaded by others, it may not result in the “social death” or “being reported” of the person concerned, which in turn may not lead to the relevant discussions and subsequent mentality.

The enhancement of “visibility” is manifested in two aspects: firstly, it enhances the visibility of individual's mindset, which is expressed in cyberspace through text feedback, emoticons, forwarding, liking and other forms of text or behavior, so that individual experience can be conveniently displayed in cyberspace, accelerating the conversion cycle from private experience to public experience. Second, the text (e.g., text, emoticons) and behavior (e.g., likes) used by individuals to express their preferences, emotions, and perceptions are used to express their personal experiences in cyberspace.

Second, the text (e.g., text, emoticons) and behavior (e.g., likes, retweets) that individuals use to express their preferences, emotions, and perceptions provide the most realistic materials for grasping the mentality of netizens and the overall social mentality, and the emergence of big data technology facilitates the processing of these materials for researchers. [31] If the first kind of visibility still belongs to the scope of individual control, the latter kind of visibility is almost beyond the control of individuals. Compared to platforms and algorithms, individuals have actually become “semi-transparent”, and users can neither prevent platforms from collecting traces of their own network behavior, nor prevent algorithms from deducing their own “state of mind” based on these traces of behavior. In addition to handheld terminal devices such as smartphones, and with the expansion of the Internet of Things, various types of smart terminals and their application scenarios, the subjective emotions and psychological feelings of individuals are constantly captured by the intelligent wearable devices that they carry, or

collected and analyzed by the devices that are installed in urban spaces (e.g., public roads, commercial buildings, and parks) or the relevant mobile smart carriers (e.g., smart cars). In addition, the information collected by such devices may further converge in the hands of relevant companies and platforms, providing information for them to adapt relevant products, improve relevant designs, as well as carry out accurate marketing and customized services; and the various types of “city brain” plans that are now in the ascendant may also make use of the legal authorization of the public authority to collaborate with various types of sensors and mobile devices. In addition, the “city brain” program, which is now on the rise, may also use the legal authorization of public authority to collaborate with information from various sensors and mobile devices, as well as other information about the physical space of the city and individual residents, to provide planning guidelines for city managers or references for municipal reforms.

In the face of this trend, is the individual still the subject of his or her own state of mind? Is the “social mindset” collected, summarized and processed by intelligent technology in an uninvolved and unperceived way the sum of real individual mindsets? Can the “user personality profile” provided by platforms and algorithms represent the real individual personality? Traditional social psychology emphasizes the distinction between the ideal self and the real self, which is in fact the individual's own perception of the scene. In the age of intelligence, individuals may also need to learn to adapt to the existence of the “algorithmic self” - it is independent of individual control, but to a large extent represents the “system” of the individual. The “system's” view of the individual. In this way, the subject of self-construction changes from a human being to a “machine”, i.e., an artificial intelligence system centered on an intelligent algorithm and its physical carrier. At this point, then, the subject of mindfulness governance should also include not only human beings in the biological sense, but also the algorithms that process mindfulness and their providers - often platform companies or state agencies. In this way, the associated subjects of mindfulness governance would naturally be infinitely enlarged. This will undoubtedly further increase the complexity of online mindfulness governance.

Second, there is a derivative problem. In terms of physical attributes, cyber behavior is generally defined as the collection of Internet users' action trajectories in cyberspace [32], and issues/events in the form of online public opinion, online speech, and behaviors such as likes and retweets are all specific manifestations of this. However, there is an important qualification in this definition, that is, all the “traces” of online traces should be left by netizens as natural persons, excluding non-human intelligences, such as social robots, avatars, and various kinds of big language models represented by GhatGPT, etc. Based on the definition of “traces”, it is not possible to define the “traces” of online traces as a collection of traces of actions in cyberspace. models, etc. However, only in terms of external manifestations, ordinary Internet users may not be able to accurately recognize which network traces are left by natural persons and which ones are generated by intelligents. In this way, some virtual intelligences can manipulate the mindset of netizens, while netizens as real individuals are unable to influence the “mindset” of these “fake accounts” and their manipulators. When the corpus of the online world is more and more generated and filled by some robotic accounts, is the cyberspace perceived by people

still an ontologically real world, or is it just a cognitive world? When all online behaviors are triggered by real individuals, this kind of worry can still be understood as a kind of philosophical reflection, but when all kinds of artificial intelligence technologies can conveniently and autonomously create accounts, forward information, initiate comments, and even generate speech and images through deep synthesis, this kind of worry is not a kind of “contemplation on an easy chair”, but becomes a kind of “contemplation on the Internet”, which is not a kind of “contemplation on the easy chair”. “Instead, it becomes a “question of authenticity” that must be faced when surfing the Internet. If an individual is guided by the words of a virtual account or a virtual person and develops a deviant state of mind and wrong behavior, is it only the person himself who needs to be governed? How should the attribution and accountability of social behavior be defined at this point? Obviously, human beings do not yet have a completely clear answer to these questions, and need to continuously grope and even trial and error.

4. Conclusion

The emergence of an intelligent society will require a new design of governance mechanisms, but we may still lack some imagination in this regard. Or rather, the design of order and the conception of institutions for a smart society are still in their infancy, with multiple, competing possibilities. However, for this paper, it is clear that we should make sure that the conception and practice of this mechanism should be aimed at guaranteeing the subjective value of human beings, demonstrating the goodness of human nature more comprehensively, and pursuing the goodness of the governance mode more proactively. The realization of a good life requires, first of all, a good desire for a good life - without this most basic psychological need and value-driven, any technology may fall into the application of the wrong way, and any society may be close to the nightmare of destruction. Therefore, adopting a posture of early action and saving for a rainy day is a common task in front of all social sciences and humanities, including social psychology. From this point of view, it can even be argued that there has never been an era that calls for a psychological view of humanity, a social view and a social psychology full of humanity as the present one. For only in this way can one be assured that the society in which one lives in the future will be one that accommodates, rather than banishes, human beings themselves.

References

- [1] Wang Xingfu, Qiu Xipeng, Chen Yunsong, et al. Pandora's Magic Box or Civilization Weapon - Reflection on ChatGPT in the Perspective of Great Civilization [J]. Exploration and Contention, 2023 (5): 4-38.
- [2] Tong Shijun, Wang Min'an, Ren Jiantao, et al. How will ChatGPT affect the future of humanity Journal of Guangzhou University (Social Sciences Edition), 2023 (4): 73-82
- [3] Henry Kissinger, Eric Schmidt, Daniel Huttenlohr. The Age of Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humanity [M]. Translated by Hu Liping and Feng Jun Beijing: CITIC Publishing House, 2023:52, 7
- [4] Fang Wen. The Evolution of Social Psychology: A Discipline Institutional Perspective [J]. Chinese Social Sciences, 2001 (6): 126-136
- [5] Liu Chunxue. Integrated Study of Two Orientations of Social Psychology [J]. Journal of Nankai (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2007 (5): 135-140
- [6] Wang Junxiu. Social Psychology: A Study of Social Psychology in Transitional Societies [J]. Sociological Research, 2014, 29 (1): 104-124
- [7] Zhou Xiaohong. Social Psychology in the Era of Transformation and China's Experience: A Discussion with "Social Psychology: A Study of Social Psychology in Transitional Societies" [J]. Sociological Research, 2014, 29 (4): 1-23
- [8] Yang Yiyin. The Psychological Relationship between Individuals and Macro Society: Defining the Concept of Social Psychology [J]. Sociological Research, 2006 (4): 117-131
- [9] Wang Xingfu, Qiu Xipeng, Chen Yunsong, et al. Pandora's Magic Box or Civilization Weapon - Reflection on ChatGPT in the Perspective of Great Civilization [J]. Exploration and Contention, 2023 (5): 4-38.
- [10] Tong Shijun, Wang Min'an, Ren Jiantao, et al. How will ChatGPT affect the future of humanity Journal of Guangzhou University (Social Sciences Edition), 2023 (4): 73-82
- [11] Wang Junxiu. ChatGPT and the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Breakthrough, Risk, and Governance [J]. Journal of Northeast Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2023 (4): 19-28
- [12] Jiang Xiaojuan. Technology and Culture in the Digital Era [J]. Chinese Social Sciences, 2021 (8): 4-34
- [13] Wang Tianfu. Social Changes and Research in the Digital Era [J]. Chinese Social Sciences, 2021 (12): 73-88
- [14] Lv Xiaokang, Fu Chunye. Meta theoretical thinking on social mentality governance [J]. Journal of Suzhou University (Education Science Edition), 2022, 10 (2): 73-82
- [15] Lv Xiaokang. Social Psychology: The Generative History of a Policy Concept and Its Disciplinary Value [J]. Social Science Research, 2023 (4): 11-20
- [16] Wang Xinjian, Jiang He. Academic Genealogy and Main Issues of Social Psychology Research [J]. Journal of Northwest Normal University (Social Sciences Edition), 2021, 58 (2): 69-76
- [17] Wang Xinjian, Chai Peixing. From "Academic Theory" to "Governance": Academic Evolution of Research on Social Psychology of Chinese Doctors and Patients (1980-2021) [J]. Journal of Northwest Normal University (Social Science) Science Edition, 2022, 59 (2): 48-54
- [18] Huang Ronggui, Wu Jinfeng, Gui Yong. Network Social Psychology: Core Characteristics, Analytical Perspectives, and Research Topics [J]. Sociological Review, 2022, 10 (3): 102-120
- [19] Zheng Wen. The Evolution of Cyberspace: A Study of Network Social Psychology (Part 2) [M]. Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2022:3-7
- [20] Sheng Ronghua. Accelerating the establishment of a comprehensive network governance system to comprehensively improve the level of network governance capacity [J/OL]. China NetEase, 2022 (3). <http://www.cac.gov.cn/2022-06/08/c1656303130339484.htm>
- [21] Suler. Cyber People: How We Think, Act, and Socialize in the Digital Age [M]. Translated by Liu Shuhua and Zhang Haihui. Beijing: CITIC Press, 2018:119-140
- [22] Zhou Zongkui. Network Psychology [M]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 2018:5
- [23] Liu Xiaoqian, Zhu Tingshao. Big Data Boosts Social Governance: Psychological Perception and Event Detection in

- the Online Society [M]. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press, 2022: 25-59
- [24] Aiken. Network Psychology: The Truth of Behavioral Design Hidden Behind Phenomena [M]. Men Qun, translated. Beijing: CITIC Press, 2018: XI-XV
- [25] Etelier, Fulwood. Network Psychology: Exploring the Psychological Motivation of Online Behavior [M]. Translated by Yang Haibo and Liu Bing. Beijing: People's Posts and Telecommunications Press, 2017: 81-92
- [26] YamashishiT, HashimotoH. Socialnicheconstruction [J]. Current Opinion Psychology, 2016, 8:119-124
- [27] Yang Yiyin. The Psychological Relationship between Individuals and Macro Society: Defining the Concept of Social Psychology [J]. Sociological Research, 2006 (4): 117-131
- [28] Max Weber. Basic Concepts of Sociology [M]. Translated by Gu Zhonghua. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press, 2005: 29-34
- [29] Liu Neng, Zhou Hang. Social Death: Social Control and Moral Remodeling in the Internet Era [J]. Journal of Jiangsu University of Administration, 2021 (6): 53-60
- [30] Zhang Guoqing, Ali Mujiang, Yu Shan. "Social Death" and Its Criticism [J]. Social Science, 2022 (8): 156-166
- [31] Lv Xiaokang, Fu Chunye. Governance of online doctor-patient mentality: concepts, logic, and issues [J]. Journal of Northwest Normal University (Social Science Edition), 2022, 59 (2): 55-61
- [32] Yan, Z. Analyzing human behavior in cyberspace [M]. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2019: xvi xvii