Asia Pacific Science Press

Critical Humanistic Social Theory
ISSN(O):3005-9291
ISSN(P):3005-9283
Vol. 3 No.4 (2026)

From Elders to Peers: Stance-Taking and the Interface Bias of Chinese Cultural Memory among Youth in Taiwan, China

Wenlu Huang*

Guangzhou University, 230 Waihuan West Road, Higher Education Mega Center, Panyu District, Guangzhou, Guangdong, 510006, China

Corresponding author: Wenlu Huang, huangwenlu3992@gmail.com

Copyright: 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY-NC 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, and explicitly prohibiting its use for commercial purposes.

Abstract: The generational continuity of Chinese cultural memory among youth in Taiwan, China runs largely through digital platforms, yet research has asked mainly how culture becomes easier to reach, not whether young people can take up what reaches them. This study asks what young people do with the cultural symbols handed down by elders and institutions once those symbols arrive on a platform, and how this rewriting reshapes generational transmission. Five public fragments from YouTube, Threads and Instagram (2024-2026) were analysed by reflexive thematic analysis, with Du Bois's stance triangle as the analytic tool and generational transliteration as the object. Three practices of stance-taking recur: re-narrating tradition as a verifiable, hands-on project; negotiating cultural genealogy through everyday taxonomy; and reworking a festival symbol into a reproducible, shootable recipe. They share one rule: symbols are kept while their use changes, and authority over memory is partly transferred from elders and institutions to platform visibility and peer feedback. The point where this rewriting happens is conceptualised as an interface, which is not a neutral conduit but carries a structural bias, amplifying what can be visualised and imitated while forms of memory dependent on bodily co-presence, oral ritual detail for instance, fall silent. Practice should therefore shift from supplying content toward keeping open interfaces that young people can take up themselves. The study is exploratory and awaits systematic sampling.

Keywords: Stance-Taking; Generational Transliteration; Interface Bias; Chinese Cultural Memory; Youth in Taiwan, China
Published: Oct 30, 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62177/chst.v3i4.1805

1. Introduction

Memory institutions have never been simple storehouses. They collect, order and authorise, and in doing so decide what a society should remember; after digitisation, the dispute turns on whose voices enter that collection [1]. Cultural memory research has followed the same turn, moving from institutional preservation to how platforms reorganise the accessibility of memory. Digital media do not simply add a technical shell to existing sites; through digital mapping, scene reconstruction and interactive participation they change how culture enters young people's lifeworlds [2], and visual media matter less for preserving craft than for prompting the reconstruction and contemporary expression of cultural memory [3]. These studies establish that platforms have become the main site where cultural memory circulates. They also tend to start from institutionally provided sites or images and ask how culture becomes easier to reach. This paper starts from young people's own acts of posting and asks whether they can take up what reaches them. Reach is not uptake: an interface available at any moment may off er nothing but a position for watching.

Following Assmann [4], communicative memory is carried by living bearers and circulates in everyday interaction, whereas cultural memory is fixed in texts, monuments and rituals; Halbwachs [5] established the prior point that memory is social before it is individual. Festival customs, family recipes and dress conventions reach young people first as communicative memory, and whether they enter cultural memory now depends largely on what happens on platforms. The question is not whether transmission occurs but what form it takes once rewritten there. Cheng and Sun [6] studied young people writing family memoirs for their grandparents, proposing material, narrative and interactive mechanisms of transliteration and arguing that digital media turn individual memory into public narrative through a mediated field. Their field is family memory and the two ends are family members; here the ends are what elders pass down and what peers read, with a platform-set interface between them.

Research on cultural identity among youth in Taiwan, China provides coordinates. Li [7], taking the game Black Myth: Wukong as a case, identifies four routes of transmission and observes that young people enjoy experiencing Chinese traditional culture while lacking systematic knowledge of it; Zhu [8] notes reactance and selective avoidance; Yin [9], studying Chinese migrants in New Zealand, shows that being Chinese is negotiated rather than given, since homeland media reinforces a sense of the authentic Chinese while ethnic media reconstructs it under the labels of the host society. These sketch a macro picture and say little about micro-level positioning in everyday practice. Xu and Huang [10] identify drifting and differentiation among contemporary youth and concede that quantitative data alone cannot capture the dynamics of generational change, calling for qualitative work on the semantic generation and internal identity construction of youth generations.

The analytic tool comes from Du Bois's stance triangle [11]: stance-taking is a public act in which a social actor, through overt communicative means, simultaneously evaluates a shared object, positions herself along some dimension of that object, and aligns or disaligns with other subjects. Here the object is a Chinese cultural symbol, a dragon boat, a bowl of zongzi, a set of festival dress; the other subjects are peers who may imitate, elders who transmit, institutions that claim authority, and cross-cultural interlocutors who demand explanation; the implicit claim of belonging is the assertion this is mine or this is not mine. Shifman [12] adds that sharing need not reveal a stance, but producing something necessarily discloses one's reading of the text. Building a boat, classifying a cuisine, remaking a lantern are productions, and each discloses how its maker reads tradition. Identity research asks whether you consider yourself part of Chinese culture; stance research asks what relation you claimed to this symbol, before whom, in this one expression. Platform texts almost never answer an identity scale, yet they almost always expose stance relations.

Using stance-taking to study youth and memory is not new. Oswald, Esborg and Pierroux [1] analysed a youth programme at a Norwegian folklore archive, in which participants aged sixteen to nineteen selected internet memes and wrote contextualising descriptions for them, and showed that they had to account for the perspectives of others: which memes were worth collecting, and what future users of the archive would need explained. This paper shares the tool but not the scene. There stance-taking occurs inside a framework the institution has invited, and the adjudicators are the archive and the researchers; here young people mostly post on their own, the institution is frequently absent, and the adjudicators are peers in the comment section.

What this paper calls the interface is the point of transposition between the elder end and the peer end. The elder end supplies practice, taste and embodied teaching, its authority resting on experience and seniority. The peer end receives projects, taxonomies and visual events, adjudicated by likes, saves and replies. The interface decides what from the former can appear in what form at the latter, and the title phrase from elders to peers names this path. Ji [13] uses the term differently: for him, when the body becomes a datafied interface-body in short-video practice, the notion of the cultural holder undergoes deconstruction. The sense here is narrower: not the body but the conditions under which generational memory is transposed, including format, visibility rules and feedback. Interface also differs from affordance. Affordance is what a platform offers for action, a property of the technology; interface is how those possibilities are combined for a task, here generational transmission. The same affordance works differently across tasks: saving preserves a recipe, endorses an opinion, and comes close to a shopping list for a festival handicraft. So the claim is not that affordance shapes memory but that the interface sets the rules of transposition, and the claim stops there: the platform does not decide what young people remember, only the form

in which memory can circulate. One implication is untested here: if the rules of transposition are shaped by affordance, one person handling one symbol across platforms should produce different forms, so a follow-up should take one set of posters across platforms as its object.

A methodological constraint comes from Li [14], who critiques the teleological reductionism of tying particular forms of memory construction to particular outcomes: the form of a memory text cannot determine the meaning it generates, since what matters is the articulation between memories. It converts into two limits. A mode of stance-taking cannot be equated with a level of identity, since an epistemic re-narration may spring from identification, curiosity or an expectation of traffic and a public text cannot tell them apart. Platform form cannot be used as an independent variable explaining identity, since platforms set the conditions of transliteration rather than its outcomes. Conclusions are thus confined to stance and interface mechanism.

Two research questions follow: what stance-taking do youth in Taiwan, China perform toward Chinese cultural memory in digital media practice, and how do these stances enable or reshape generational transliteration, with what role for the platform?

2. Materials and Methods

The corpus comes from an ongoing exploratory pilot: five public fragments from YouTube, Threads and Instagram, posted between 2024 and 2026.

Table 1. Composition of the corpus

Fragment	Platform	Content	Visible engagement
F1	YouTube	An individual creator builds and tests a homemade dragon boat during the Dragon Boat Festival holiday	Description and multiple comments
F2	YouTube	A news organisation's channel reports a hanfu festival parade with over a thousand participants	Approx. 15,000 views
F3	Threads	Whether Taiwanese cuisine counts as Chinese cuisine, prompted by a Japanese friend's question	2,031 views
F4	Threads	A family exchange about whether the household makes northern- or southern-style zongzi	Multiple replies
F5	Instagram	A Lantern Festival clip turning a dried tangerine peel into a lantern; posted in Taichung, Taiwan, China	Approx. 68,000 likes, 2,412 saves

The three platforms sustain different genres of public exchange: long video encourages project narrative, short threads encourage taxonomy and dialogic negotiation, savability encourages aestheticisation and imitation. If transposition rules are shaped by the platform, putting contrasting platforms side by side makes that shaping visible at least cost. Sampling required a Chinese cultural symbol and visible interaction, not platform usage rates. Identifying information has been anonymised and no interviews were conducted. Quotations in this paper were originally posted in Chinese and are rendered in English following the original sense; terms such as Taiwanese cuisine and across the strait are users' own words, retained for the authenticity of the corpus and not representing the author's position, whose own reference to the region is Taiwan, China throughout.

Analysis followed reflexive thematic analysis [15] in three steps: open coding, axial grouping by platform and type of practice, thematic synthesis to extract the mechanism of transliteration. Coding attended to what the poster did with the symbol, to whom the utterance was addressed, and what resource made the stance credible. The third proved decisive: credibility here comes less from citing authority than from showing the work, built it, classified it, filmed it.

Stance analysis was chosen because the material justifies it. All five fragments share one feature: the poster is doing something rather than stating an attitude, building, classifying, remaking. Content analysis counts how often a symbol appears but struggles to say what it was used for; discourse analysis handles argumentative structure, whereas the arguments here are

often one step long. Stance analysis works with extremely short texts: one comment, awesome, I really want to try paddling it, already configures speaker, object and audience, and a thread of such comments constitutes peer adjudication in progress. The tool has a cost, since a platform text may carry stance relations, emotion and traffic strategy at once and stance analysis handles only the first, and since intensity cannot be measured, which is why the conclusion presents the three practices as an analytic framework rather than a typology.

The researcher's position needs stating: an early-career scholar from the Chinese mainland, a position that may bring sensitivity as well as bias, risking over-reading expressions of Chinese roots as signals of belonging. Any code involving a judgement of belonging therefore had to find verifiable textual evidence within the fragment, and the addressee of each claim was recorded, so that an utterance addressed to an outsider would not be read as internal identification.

3. Results

Three fragments from three platforms show three recurrent practices: tradition is remade as a project one can build and test, as a genealogy one can argue over, and as a recipe one can copy and film. In each the symbol survives, the boat, the zongzi, the lantern, while what is done with it changes, and in each the authority to say which version counts sits in the comment section. One rule runs through all three, set out at the end.

The first fragment is a video titled Building a Luxury Dragon Boat over the Dragon Boat Festival Holiday: Tested, Insanely Cool. Its description reads: to mark the Dragon Boat Festival we built a dragon boat under the blazing sun; it was really special, really happy, really grounding. Under it sits not one approving comment but a thread answering one another: awesome, I really want to try paddling it; I want to climb on and try it; I want to play too. Others tease the filming: why were you spanking him the whole time, and the bit with the phone had me dying. One commenter looks past the boat, notices the food in frame, and remarks that the meat zongzi looks delicious.

The second fragment, posted by a news organisation's channel, reports a hanfu festival in Taiwan, China. Commenter 2 writes that hanfu is part of Chinese culture like the traditional characters we write and the Han festivals of New Year, Dragon Boat and Mid-Autumn, adding that many garments are historically researched. Commenter 3 recalls founding a hanfu society at university in 2007 and finds it deeply gratifying to see Chinese culture revived. Commenter 5 quotes Su Shi, a hound at the left hand, a falcon on the right, to praise the costume, and Commenter 4 offers a comparative judgement: much better looking than the kimono.

Both show the same practice: young people no longer receive tradition as pupils but rewrite it as something verifiable and hands-on. The boat is built and tested rather than watched; hanfu must be researched rather than put on as instructed. Credibility is earned through demonstration, and the comment section catches that demonstration rather than the poster's status: nobody appeals to elders' authority, nobody checks with elders. Adjudication sits with peers and is exercised on the spot. Wanting to paddle and wanting to play are verdicts of approval; teasing about the spanking and the phone is banter that treats the creator as one of their own and declares the video belongs to the frame of play, not ritual.

The zongzi comment deserves a pause. The central symbol of a boat-building video is the boat, yet this commenter steps past it to the food in frame, as if the thread completed the festival by itself: the festival is never explained, and in the responses it is lived as eating and playing. Nobody recounts the origin of the boat race; the festival's legitimacy is taken for granted, and what remains discussable is whether one can paddle it, play with it, find it good to eat. Memory in the mode of instruction has no place here, while memory in the mode of participation fills the space. One detail: several comments carry a platform translation tag, which means the video reached audiences needing machine translation, and what survives translation is still wanting to play. The willingness to imitate crosses language boundaries; the machine of transposition does not ask whether a commenter knows the festival, it only carries wanting to play to the next screen.

The addressees are not uniform. Toward peers, wanting to paddle and wanting to play signal imitation, treating tradition as something to go and do. Toward cultural genealogy, Commenter 2 places hanfu in a series with characters and festivals, and Commenter 3 claims belonging by presenting himself as a transmitter. Toward outside interlocutors, the kimono comparison produces a ranking, and the quotation from Su Shi shows classical literacy has become a resource for stance-taking. Li's observation [7] is a useful footnote: young people enjoy experiencing Chinese traditional culture while lacking systematic

knowledge of it. The corpus shows the lack produces not estrangement but a compensating move of knowing, filling the missing context through research, testing and juxtaposition. This re-narration is a posture of self-teaching rather than judging.

Self-teaching carries a risk. Research and testing are fallible, and adopting verifiability as the source of credibility means accepting a falsifiable standard, so in principle what elders say can also be checked. Tradition turns from an unquestionable premise into something discussable, and discussable means rejectable. The second video was posted by a news organisation: the institution supplies visibility and legitimacy, young people supply the material, and stance-taking happens in the comments rather than the report. At this point the first practice is clear: tradition is rewritten as something one can do. In the next two fragments it becomes something one can argue about.

On Threads, User A opens: a Japanese friend asked me, is Taiwanese cuisine Chinese cuisine? User B replies: they are all Chinese-style cuisine but the taste is different; Chinese cuisine is what Japanese people understand as Chinese food, Taiwanese cuisine is Taiwanese, and a large part evolved from across the strait, since the roots came from there, Minnan, Hakka, Sichuan, Hunan, Guangdong, Jiangsu and Zhejiang, and these are comparatively light. A second exchange was posted on the Dragon Boat Festival. User C asks her mother whether the family makes northern zongzi; the mother answers, huh? No! Our family has always made southern zongzi. User C replies with a string of punctuation and jokes that this is what misplaced devotion means. Others join in: look at whether it is boiled or steamed, only the boiled one is a southern zongzi. One replier admits he learned that northern zongzi exists only through the north-south debate of recent years.

Same root, different taste is the clearest instance of boundary work: it acknowledges genealogical roots while establishing local flavour. Chinese cuisine is further distinguished as what Japanese people understand as Chinese food, showing that the taxonomy varies with the interlocutor: to a Japanese friend it unfolds in a triangle of Chinese, Japanese and Taiwanese cooking; to strangers on a platform it collapses into an argument about boiling versus steaming. Classification is not a statement of belief but practical reasoning directed at someone, changing shape with the addressee. Hence a methodological point: expressions of belonging are not fixed attitudes but a capacity deployed by scene, and a single scale cannot capture that. Taxonomy is not a substitute for identity but the way identity is worked out.

Boundary work also exposes an asymmetry in transliteration. Elders transmit practice, young people produce classification. The mother says our family has always made southern zongzi, a statement about her own household; the repliers say look at whether it is boiled or steamed, a rule of general application. From practice to rule is an abstraction: it lets memory circulate beyond the concrete family and drops the part that holds only in that family. The second thread therefore captures the micro-site of generational transliteration. Zongzi on the family table begins as bodily memory of how to make and eat it, the kind of knowledge Halbwachs would locate in the family group, and the mother's remark exposes a loosening: the flavour the children believed had been passed down does not match what the parents make. What is new is what young people do with it. They turn the mismatch into a performable story, and repliers arrive with classificatory knowledge and supply a standard of adjudication. They do not correct the mother; they build a taxonomy in which her answer can be placed. Transmission continues, but as material for classification rather than as instruction.

The zongzi in this exchange answers the meat zongzi recognised in the boat video's comment section: in both, what peers take over first is festival food, which can be eaten, compared and sided with and is therefore the cheapest form of memory to transcribe. The easier a content is to transcribe, the more likely it survives on the interface, a point developed in the discussion.

The third fragment, a Lantern Festival video from a two-person creative account, shows a sparkler pushed into a dried tangerine peel so that it glows like a lantern. The creator adds: this tangerine was going to be cleared away, and I thought I would use its remaining value before throwing it out; dried tangerine transmits light extremely well, and if you try it remember not to use a fresh one. A commenter marvels: so it was a dried tangerine, it really does look like a lantern.

The lantern, the core symbol of the festival, is not displayed directly. It is disassembled into material, light effect and camera language, then reassembled through a vocabulary of frugality. Tradition is aestheticised and moralised at once: by stipulating that a fresh tangerine must not be used, the creator grounds festive making in not wasting. The moral frame makes the clip shareable, which is why saves are high; what is saved is a recipe, not an image.

Saves and likes form a structure worth recording. A like responds to something finished and expires with viewing; a save points to a future action, presupposing that the viewer intends to take the recipe out again at some festival. The number of saves measures reproducibility rather than affection, and on a visual platform what is transmitted is often not the most liked image but the most saved recipe. Memory here turns from an object of appreciation into a task one collects.

The elder end is absent from this fragment. The creator cites no family recipe, and no moment arises in which an elder needs to be consulted; the Lantern Festival is presupposed as shared background. This contrasts with the zongzi exchange, where an elder is present and says something that fails to match the daughter's expectation. The difference is not whether tradition appears but whether transmission passes through the family. When tradition can circulate entirely without elders, the version held by elders is no longer the only source, and the reproducible recipe in peers' hands takes its place. This fragment is the strongest evidence in the paper: from elders to peers is not a necessary route but one being bypassed. The comments move in two directions, recognising the object back into tradition and rearranging festive consumption: viewers reconnect the novelty to the festival it comes from and reorganise their own festive practice around it. Continuity here does not depend on accurate transmission of knowledge but on an imitable object. A young person does not need to know the lore of lanterns, only that tangerine peel transmits light, and the second thing is transmitted by a single save.

The three differ in ways their platforms mark. Beneath them they share one rule. Symbols are kept while their use changes: the boat is still in the water, hanfu still on the street, zongzi still on the table, the peel still glowing. Authority is partly transferred from elders and institutions to platform visibility and peer feedback: which zongzi is authentic, which lantern worth imitating, which comment rises to the top are decided by likes, saves and replies, and in none of the three scenes does an elder have a seat. What elders hand down is rewritten on the three platforms as a testable project, an arguable classification and a reproducible recipe, and the rules of that rewriting are set by platform affordance.

4. Discussion

Hu and Zheng [16], studying online searches for missing persons, distinguish connection from disconnection and show that algorithms together with old photographs trigger memory connection. The interface connects with theirs but looks elsewhere: disconnection here is not a failure to find someone but a failure of transposition. Memories requiring bodily presence that cannot be filmed as a reproducible recipe, ritual detail transmitted orally for instance, have no corresponding format, and what survives is disproportionately what can be filmed.

The bias is built from three filters, each identifiable in the corpus. The format filter is plainest: a tangerine peel disassembles into material, steps and a finished object, so it enters; oral ritual detail does not, so it stays out. The feedback filter follows: comment sections under the boat and hanfu videos answered within seconds in jokes and likes, whereas what takes years of immersion to appreciate, a household flavour that exists only between boiling and steaming, gets no such response. The temporal filter ties content to the festival cycle: synchronised content gains periodic visibility, while content bound to everyday rhythm surfaces only by accident, as the north-south zongzi exchange did on the Dragon Boat Festival itself.

From this an absence list can be drawn. None of the five fragments contains the complete procedure of a rite, a knack a master would correct in person, or oral narrative from inside a family, precisely the parts of communicative memory most dependent on bodily co-presence. Their absence cannot be explained by corpus size: even with expanded sampling, as long as the unit is public platform text, such content will appear at a similarly low rate. Absence is a product of the interface, not a gap in sampling, and the list maps back onto the two ends: what falls silent belongs almost entirely to the forms the elder end is good at, what is amplified almost entirely to the forms the peer end can consume at once. The bias of the interface is thus a bias of generation as well as of format. Zhou and Chen [17] corroborate from another side: integrated memory, formed by artificial intelligence aggregating individual memories, now permeates multiple scenes, and in this corpus the structure in which saves exceed likes reads as accommodation to that discourse, since a clip packaged as an executable tutorial is exactly what algorithms reward.

On youth and memory institutions, Oswald, Esborg and Pierroux [1] complement this account. In their study the archive invites young people to select and contextualise memes, so participants must account for others' perspectives, judging which memes are worth collecting and what future users would need explained. That capacity appears here too, with a different adjudicator.

The cuisine thread distinguishes Chinese cuisine as what Japanese people understand as Chinese food because the questioner was Japanese; the hanfu section produces genealogical argument because the platform makes comparison easy. The difference is that in an archive explanations are handed to the institution and become collected knowledge, whereas on a platform an explanation is handed to competition for visibility and survives only if likes and replies allow. Their conclusion can be extended: participatory design does let institutions collect new expressions, and the addition here is that what can be collected remains mostly what disassembles, explains and rewrites as a recipe.

The interface sits in the same problem space as the public cultural interface in Kang [2] and the reconstruction of visual memory in Wang [3], with three differences. Their starting point is institutionally provided sites or image texts, and what is transposed is space and artefacts; here it is young people's posting, and what is transposed is memory handed down by elders. They ask about accessibility, how culture becomes easier to reach; this paper asks about adoptability, whether one can take up what has been reached, since greater accessibility need not bring greater adoptability. They place consequences on identity construction; this paper stops at stance, because public texts cannot separate posture from belonging. Those studies also take well-functioning cases and lean toward the enabling side; these fragments are likewise highly visible content, yet the analysis of bias suggests that high visibility is itself the result of a filter, so any study using public platform text should make what has not entered the platform an explicit dimension. That also explains the insistence that the interface carries a bias: if digital media merely increased accessibility, bias would be repairable after the fact, but if the interface stipulates which positions are available, bias is structural, screening out certain forms of memory before content is even considered.

The findings contrast rather than repeat Cheng and Sun [6]. Their transliteration happens inside the family, points to social adaptation, is driven by anxiety about rootlessness, and is received first by family members; here it happens on platforms, received by peers and intercultural interlocutors, driven by occasions for explanation and competition for visibility. Their interactivity is other users sharing family stories, a distributed memory network; here it is peers adjudicating classificatory standards, a competitive order of visibility. Within research on youth in Taiwan, China, this supplies everyday evidence for Li [7]: enjoying experience while lacking systematic knowledge appears as epistemic re-narration and classificatory boundary work. It also echoes Xu and Huang [10]: perhaps shared generational media experience provides a narrative core for identity integration precisely because it offers classificatory and performative practices one can join.

If transmission must now pass through an interface young people operate themselves, practice organised around supplying content needs to rethink its weight. Content answers what tradition is; the interface answers what a person can do with it. No case in the corpus shows a young person refusing content, while several show them working intensively with what they were given; what decides participation is whether tradition arrives as something to build, classify and film or only as something to accept. The failure point is therefore usually usability, not credibility.

Institutions need repositioning too. On platforms preservation and transmission come apart: platforms keep memory visible and rewritable, while what travels poorly and needs long immersion stays with institutions and families. Continuity is guaranteed by no single agent and depends on whether a passage remains between the two ends. The cross-cultural moment deserves mention: young people state belonging most plainly when they must explain it to an outsider, so practice that creates occasions for explanation rather than only reception would place belonging in the capacity to answer. Yin [9] observed the same mechanism across media realms: the meaning of being Chinese shifts with the interlocutor and the labels in circulation.

Cultivating interfaces needs an operational criterion. Symbols young people take up generally have three features: something definite to make, a classificatory question to argue over, a finished state to display, with the boat, zongzi and lantern corresponding. This gives a more concrete test than increasing delivery: not how many saw the content, but how many can make something from it afterwards. It binds both ends: what elders pass down cannot enter the interface if it cannot be disassembled into operable steps, and peers who receive nothing they can handle will like but not take up.

Boundaries should be stated plainly. The corpus is exploratory and uneven, one Instagram fragment and no anonymous forums, so the three practices are a framework awaiting testing. Only the youth end was analysed: elders appear in a single quotation, the mother's answer about southern zongzi, and are elsewhere mentioned rather than speaking. No generational interviews were conducted, so the account of the elder end involves inference. Public texts cannot reveal algorithmic

distribution, and social stratum was not examined.

5. Conclusions

Where mediatisation and platformisation operate together, the generational continuity of Chinese cultural memory depends less on whether young people identify with it than on whether interfaces exist where they can take a position of their own. Three modes of stance-taking and their shared rule have been described, and that they hold outside family memory as well indicates that transliteration has moved onto an interface set by platforms.

This reframes continuity. The risk is not that young people reject tradition, since the corpus shows them engaging with it closely, but that tradition will remain available only in the forms platforms reward. Continuity depends on two things pulling against each other: giving young people something to do with what is handed to them, and keeping a passage open for forms of memory that do not transpose easily. The first is what platforms already do well; the second is why memory institutions exist, and why the turn to participation still needs institutions and not only platforms. The path from elders to peers will not disappear, but it is no longer the only one.

Funding

No

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Reference

[1] Oswald, E. C., Esborg, L., & Pierroux, P. (2023). Memes, youth and memory institutions. Information, Communication & Society, 26(15), 2999-3016. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2022.2131363

[2] Kang, Y. (2026). Research on the spatial reproduction of Guangdong revolutionary sites and the construction of youth identity empowered by digital media. Critical Humanistic Social Theory, 3(2), Article 1260. https://doi.org/10.62177/chst.v3i2.1260

[3] Wang, B. (2026). Constructing visual memory of local traditional material culture: A case study of the documentary The Green Endures. Critical Humanistic Social Theory, 3(2), Article 1234. https://doi.org/10.62177/chst.v3i2.1234

[4] Assmann, J. (2011). Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination. Cambridge University Press.

[5] Halbwachs, M. (1992). On collective memory (L. A. Coser, Trans. & Ed.). University of Chicago Press.

[6] Cheng, L., & Sun, S. (2025). Digital root-seeking: Generational transliteration and identity reconstruction in youth writing of family memoirs [In Chinese]. Media Observer, (11), 35-45.

[7] Li, X. (2025). Pathways of cultural identity construction among youth in Taiwan, China in the digital era: Observations on the video game Black Myth: Wukong [In Chinese]. Taiwan Studies, (2), 99-110.

[8] Zhu, X. (2024). The construction of cultural identity among youth in Taiwan, China in a polymedia environment [Master's thesis, In Chinese].

[9] Yin, H. (2015). Chinese-language cyberspace, homeland media and ethnic media: A contested space for being Chinese. New Media & Society, 17(4), 556-572. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813505363

[10] Xu, J., & Huang, Y. (2024). Drifting and differentiating: The internet, cultural values and generational identity of Chinese urban youth [In Chinese]. Journalism & Communication, (1), 51-66.

[11] Li, A. (2025). The articulation of memory and possible commonality: Mutual understanding oriented to hope [In Chinese]. Media Observer, (11), 23-34.

[12] Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), Stancetaking in discourse (pp. 139-182). John Benjamins.

[13] Shifman, L. (2013). Memes in a digital world: Reconciling with a conceptual troublemaker. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 18(3), 362-377. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12013

[14] Ji, G. (2025). Crisis of presence and displacement of identity: Methodological reconstruction of visual ethnography based on short-video practice of Liangshan Yi youth [In Chinese]. Media Observer, (5), 38-47.

[15] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE.

[16] Hu, K., & Zheng, Y. (2025). Remembering strangers: Connection and disconnection in digital memory practices [In Chinese]. Chinese Journal of Journalism & Communication, 47(6), 119-136.

[17] Zhou, L., & Chen, M. (2024). Encountering the algorithmic time machine: Technological embeddedness of AI-mediated memory and the escape of the subject [In Chinese]. Journalism & Communication, (1), 67-82.