2026 文化的軌跡：

文化與共享治理的交織 國際學術研討會

2026 International Symposium on Cultural Trajectories: Interweaving Culture and Shared Governance

徵稿啟事

＊主辦單位：國立臺灣藝術大學人文學院藝術管理與文化政策研究所
＊合辦單位：台灣藝術史研究學會、臺灣文化政策研究學會
＊會議日期：2026 年 9 月 19 日（六）
＊會議地點：國立臺灣藝術大學教研大樓 10 樓國際會議廳
＊Organizer: Graduate School of Arts Management and Cultural Policy, College of Humanities, National Taiwan University of Arts
＊Co-organizers: Taiwan Art History Association, Taiwan Association of Cultural Policy Studies
＊Dates: September 19 (Saturday), 2026.
＊Venue: International Conference Hall, 10th Floor, Teaching and Research Building, National Taiwan University of Arts

年度主題介紹

「文化的軌跡」國際學術研討會自 2008 年開辦迄今，已連續辦理二十屆。近 3 年來以「2025 文化的軌跡：文化 MBTI」、「2024 文化的軌跡–文化價值的辯證：對話與實踐」與「2023 文化的軌跡：藝術．管理．人工．智慧」為主題，敏銳關注不同藝文趨勢發展，致力搭建文化學術研究與實務工作的溝通平台，也思索國內外藝術管理與文化政策治理的多元取徑。

今年會議主題為「文化與共享治理的交織」，立意援引「文化生態系」(cultural ecosystem)作為一種研究的思路觀點，提醒我們看待藝文生態，或可理解為一個由不同參與角色、不同組織機構等所共同構築的網絡關係，藉由穿梭彼此的能動作用，也形成「互為主體」的依存對應。而「共享治理(shared governance)」是指一種調和與平衡不同行動者可及參與的過程，內涵應超越片面權力與掌控資源之分配，故本次研討會希望彰顯，文化與共享治理在藝文生態脈動中，所能扮演積極、殊異與引領性的角色價值。

我們深入探問，如何將可支配的權力資源、包括所期待或所獲得的價值利益，體現在多方行動者之間以達到共享治理？當涉及公、私部門與中介組織協力運作

來導控、調節有關政治、社會與經濟爭議問題時，如何橋接官僚理性與公共參與的鴻溝，促使鼓勵更具創意之夥伴形式，幫助克服政府與市場同時失靈的可能窘境？又或如何更加開放給生態網絡中參與角色的行動投入，從而實踐分歧社會的各種價值調和，提增相互影響與共融願景？綜合上述，呼應文化生態系動態交織的視角，延伸接合「數位、空間、群體、個體」豐厚層面的論述形構與實踐敘事。

本屆盼從研究案例中尋找以文化為主體，開展共享治理的借鏡，廣泛連結官僚機構、市場機制、民間組織、社區自治及學術智庫等有機能量，反映透過參與、互助、賦權、合夥乃至抵抗等不同行動的聚合成果，論證生態網絡中相互依存之肯認意義，同步也詮釋藝術工作者、藝文團體、政府機構、民間產業、中介組織及學術單位等，如何「現在進行式」地一起刻劃這條文化途徑。爰此，「2026 文化的軌跡：文化與共享治理的交織」國際學術研討會，徵求以下子題論文，期待激盪出更多理論與實踐的交會啟發，也讓以文化為核心的共享治理，更加在臺灣盛開綻放。

徵稿子題 Call for Papers

子題一：數位環境衝擊與網絡關係重組

科技快速迸發的時代，數位早已超越「工具」的指稱，其不只是創作運用的技術，更已轉化為某種意義上的存在現實，並與人類世界、社交生活相互滲透、交融，迫使重新定義有關權利、可及性與治理的邊際。當 AI 演算與數位平台深度嵌入日常，文化公共領域的運作邏輯勢必也被波及，因此不難發現，數位時代固然消弭物理空間距離、降低參與門檻，突破技術限制與刺激蓬勃的文化態樣，卻也引發關於勞動成果、剩餘價值與權利分配等爭議。

從生成式 AI 的創作倫理到大數據的演算橫行，伴隨衍生的資訊霸權與資訊偏差，值得我們沉澱反省對文化多樣性與相關權利造成的威脅與衝擊，甚或是否因此加劇了政治激化等問題，而在數位平台經濟與演算法霸權的夾縫中，如何透過共享治理重建公平的倫理框架，將是當代社會必須正視的課題。

1. 當生成式 AI 與賽博格(Cyborg)人機混種技術介入文化生產，我們應如何重新界定「創作者」的主體性與藝術倫理？面對數位複製與機器學習的衝擊，現行智慧財產權框架，又該如何重新釐清以捍衛原創價值？
2. 數位平台經濟與大數據演算法如何重構資源分配？在數位化技術廣泛運用的夾縫中，我們該如何透過共享治理來重塑生活型態與建構社會網絡，重新找到對話與協商共處的可能性？
3. 面對演算法導致的 AI 資訊偏差與資訊霸權，從文化的治理角度可如何修補被激化撕裂的公共領域？同時，在數位社群的推波助瀾下，新興的次文化群體（如夢女夢男、粉文化）又是如何展現新的認同與建構集體文化行動？

子題二：城市空間轉型與文化資源創生

人文理性擁抱調和社會既存的分歧價值，當都市發展需求、文化資產保存與社會群體權益交疊時，涉及不同利害關係者的相互理解與開放協商，無疑成為至關重要的議題。從當代臺灣文化資產活化與地方創生再造的眾多證明，包括背後所展現出的文化行動與所扮演的溝通媒介，正可提供我們重新理解與深化詮釋關於文化治理的多重內涵。

藉由城市空間與文化資源的理論及案例對照，反思當前都更邏輯下對居住權、歷史記憶與地方空間所造成的影響，並強調跨領域的合作與開放的對話機制，文化資源才更有機會在社會中被公平地分享，真正成為維繫公眾的公共財。故我們關注不同的行動者，如何經由文化生產與參與，勾勒人與環境共處的永續藍圖，從而保障不同社群之權益，形塑具公共價值與韌性的治理政策。

1. 在都市更新與文化資源轉型過程中，資本邏輯發展如何衝擊在地居民的居住權益與空間正義？我們應如何強化共享治理及參與機制，抵抗空間的排他性，如仕紳化（gentrification），確實保障在地社群的生存權力與歷史記憶？
2. 面對地方再造創生與歷史街區活化，文化基礎設施如何超越單一的經濟導向，轉變為促進社會溝通的媒介？不同行動者如何善用跨領域能量，將空間中的文化資源重塑為符合社會公平共享、共同維繫的公共財？
3. 跨城市空間政策的比較視野，不同城市在面對都市高密度開發與文化資源保存的價值衝突時，展現出哪些殊異的協商與治理機制？我們又能從這些豐富的具體案例中，淬鍊出何種更可契合永續價值的都市文化政策？

子題三：群體價值調和與跨域政策實踐

如何辨證檢視現行文化法規的落實與文化施政之制定，促進擴大參與共享治理的可行性？當代文化政策不只限於產業扶植範疇，也致力銜接社會福利面向，如推動社會處方箋介入醫療與個人健康、訂定社會包容之措施以調節不同族群、性別、階級等群體，共同維護文化權利與社會正義等。此外，相關藝文單位（如博物館、美術館、表演藝術場館、文化機構、民間組織）運作亦需超越內部管理的單向思維，強化連結社會互動參與，催生公眾導向的共享治理。

另外，透過創新型態的專業匯聚與文化群體的行動投入，也有助我們重新思考臺灣接軌國際的文化關係，開拓更多的交流管道以突破情勢侷限與意識形態之阻礙，共同建立一個支持集體價值、保障多元內涵、思考創新策略以應對未來挑戰的文化體質。

1. 當代文化相關法規與施政應如何跳脫單一的產業扶植思維，跨出與社會福利政策的銜接？我們該如何鼓勵制度創新、落實社會包容，以實質捍衛不同族群、性別與階級的文化權與社會正義？
2. 藝文館所與民間文化組織運作應如何突破傳統僵化的桎梏，促進並擴大整體社會參與的公共性？特別在導入「社會處方箋」等跨域機制的過程中，文化機構如何與醫療、社福體系協作，實踐價值共享與邊緣弱勢照顧？
3. 面對國際地緣政治與意識形態的阻力，臺灣該如何有效思考轉換策略或參與途徑，促成實踐共享的網絡治理來提升與其他國家的國際文化關係？

子題四：個體權益保障與產業環境永續

藝文工作者的勞動權益，是近年全球文化政策關注的重點對象，綜觀整體文化勞動環境，長期存在著保障不穩定、專業邊界模糊，普遍薪酬偏低的經濟壓力，使得許多工作者的真實生存困境被資本社會中少數成功故事所掩蓋，更形成政策制定上的盲點。在當前快速轉型且政治動盪的陣痛期，機構內外的藝文工作者，其勞動處境經常有著高度零碎化的特徵，迫使個體在追求創作自由的過程中，同時也承擔缺乏工作權保障的制度風險。

本子題盼一同思考藝文勞動的脆弱性，正視當前藝文產業價值分配之失衡現象，除深描各層級工作者所面臨的困境，亦剖析當中的機會與挑戰。我們期待更多的研究來證明藝文工作者勞動所創造的價值意義，惟有落實工作權利保障，加速關鍵轉型，也才能真正讓產業環境朝向永續的發展前進。

1. 在高度零碎化與專業邊界模糊的藝文產業中，創作者面臨著何種真實的勞動脆弱性與生存壓力？應如何揭開資本社會中機構內外藝文工作者承擔風險的現實處境？
2. 當前文化產業的價值鏈中，存在著哪些分配失衡與政策關注的盲點？面對資本社會的經濟壓力，我們該如何彰顯文化價值為主體，打造文化生態的健康永續？
3. 面對個體難以獨自抵禦的制度風險，藝文工作者如何透過藝文工會組織與社群互助等集體行動，由下而上地爭取勞動權益？在政府層面，政策又可以如何具體落實藝文工作者的權利保障？

在本次「文化與共享治理的交織」主題框架下，除既列子題外，亦歡迎凡涉及藝術管理與文化政策之重要議題，且能拓展本主題內涵之研究投稿。

Introduction to the Annual Theme

The "Cultural Trajectories" International Symposium has been held for 20 consecutive sessions since 2008. Over the past three years, with themes such as 2025 "Cultural MBTI: Culture as an Entangled Ecosystem," 2024 "Dialectics of Cultural Values: Dialogue and Practice," and 2023 "Arts｜Management｜Artificial｜Intelligence," the symposium has keenly observed various trends in the arts and cultural sectors, dedicating itself to building a communication platform between academic research and practical work, while exploring diverse perspectives to arts management and cultural policy governance both domestically and internationally.

The theme of 2026 would be "Interweaving Culture and Shared Governance." This theme draws upon the "cultural ecosystem" as a research perspective, in which arts and cultural ecology can be understood as a network constructed jointly by different actors. Through their dynamic interactions with one another, a relationship of interdependence and intersubjectivity is formed. "Shared governance" refers to the process of harmonizing and balancing the accessible participation of different actors, the connotations of which should transcend the unilateral exercise of power and the control over resource distribution. Therefore, this symposium hopes to highlight the proactive, distinctive, and leading values that culture and shared governance can play within the pulse of the arts and cultural ecosystem.

We deeply inquire, how can the power and resources available for distribution, including anticipated or acquired values and interests, be manifested among multiple actors to achieve shared governance? When public sectors, private sectors, and intermediary organizations collaborate to guide and regulate controversial political, social, and economic issues, how can the gap between bureaucratic rationality and public participation be bridged? How can we encourage more creative forms of partnership to help overcome the potential dilemmas of simultaneous government and market failures? How can we open up further to the active involvement of participants within the ecological network, thereby practicing the harmonization of diverse values in a divided society and enhancing mutual influence and a vision of inclusivity? Synthesizing the above, and echoing the dynamic interweaving perspective of the cultural ecosystem, this theme extends to articulate discourses and practical narratives across the rich dimensions of the "Digital", “Spatial”, “Collective”, and “Individual”.

This year’s symposium aims to draw lessons from research cases that position culture as the primary subject in developing shared governance, broadly connecting the organic energies of bureaucracies, market mechanisms, civil organizations, community autonomy, and academic think tanks. We aim to reflect on the aggregated outcomes of

different actions—such as participation, reciprocity, empowerment, partnership, and even resistance—demonstrating the recognized significance of interdependence within the ecological network. Simultaneously, we seek to interpret how arts workers, cultural groups, government agencies, private industries, intermediary organizations, and academic institutions are collectively carving out this cultural trajectory. Therefore, the "2026 International Symposium on Cultural Trajectories: Interweaving Culture and Shared Governance" invites paper submissions on the following sub-themes, anticipating the sparking of further inspiration at the intersection of theory and practice, and allowing shared governance centered on culture to bloom even more vibrantly in Taiwan.

Sub-theme 1: Addressing Digital Impacts and Restructuring Network Relations

In an era of rapid technological explosion, the digital has long transcended the designation of a mere "tool." It is no longer just a technique applied in creation, but has transformed into an existential reality, penetrating and blending with the human world and social life, forcing a redefinition of the boundaries of rights, accessibility, and governance. As AI algorithms and digital platforms become deeply embedded in daily life, the operational logic of the cultural public sphere is inevitably affected. Thus, it is not difficult to see that while the digital age eliminates physical spatial distances, lowers participation thresholds, breaks through technical limitations, and stimulates flourishing cultural forms, it also triggers controversies regarding labor outcomes, surplus value, and the distribution of rights.

From the creative ethics of Generative AI to the rampant use of big data algorithms, accompanied by derived information hegemony and biases, it is worth our calm reflection on the threats and impacts posed to cultural diversity and related rights, and whether these issues exacerbate problems like political polarization. In the crevices between the digital platform economy and algorithmic hegemony, how to rebuild a fair ethical framework through shared governance will be a critical issue contemporary society must face.

1. When Generative AI and Cyborg human-machine hybrid technologies intervene in cultural production, how should we redefine the subjectivity of the "creator" and artistic ethics? In the face of the impact of digital reproduction and machine learning, how should the current intellectual property rights framework be redefined to defend original value?
2. How do the digital platform economy and big data algorithms reconstruct resource allocation? In the interstices of the widespread application of digital

technology, how can we reshape lifestyles and construct social networks through shared governance, rediscovering the possibilities of dialogue and negotiated coexistence?

3. Facing AI information bias and information hegemony caused by algorithms, how can the exacerbated and torn public sphere be repaired from a cultural governance perspective? Simultaneously, fueled by digital communities, how do emerging subcultural groups (e.g., fandom cultures) demonstrate new identities and construct collective cultural actions?

Sub-theme 2: Transforming Urban Spaces and Regenerating Cultural Resources

Humanistic rationality embraces and harmonizes the divergent values existing in society. When urban development needs, cultural heritage preservation, and the rights of social groups overlap, mutual understanding and open negotiation involving different stakeholders undoubtedly become crucial issues. The numerous testaments to contemporary Taiwan's cultural heritage revitalization and placemaking practices, including the cultural actions demonstrated and the communicative mediums they serve as, provide us with possibilities to newly understand and deeply interpret the multiple connotations of cultural governance.

Through the theoretical and case-study comparisons of urban space and cultural resources, we reflect on the impacts of current urban renewal logics on residential rights, historical memory, and local spaces, emphasizing cross-disciplinary cooperation and open dialogue mechanisms so that cultural resources have a better chance of being equitably shared in society, truly becoming public goods maintained by the public. Therefore, we focus on how different actors, through cultural production and participation, outline sustainable blueprints for the coexistence of people and the environment, thereby safeguarding the rights of different communities and shaping governance policies with public value and resilience.

1. In the process of urban renewal and cultural resource transformation, how does capital-driven development impact the residential rights and spatial justice of local residents? How should we strengthen shared governance and participation mechanisms to resist spatial exclusivity, such as gentrification, and genuinely safeguard the right to survival and historical memory of local communities?
2. Facing local placemaking and historical district revitalization, how can cultural infrastructure transcend a singular economic orientation and transform into a medium that promotes social communication? How can different actors utilize

cross-disciplinary energy to reshape cultural resources within spaces into public goods that conform to social equity and are jointly maintained?

3. From a comparative perspective of cross-city spatial policies, what distinct negotiation and governance mechanisms do different cities exhibit when facing value conflicts between high-density urban development and cultural resource conservation? And what urban cultural policies, more aligned with sustainable values, can we distill from these rich and concrete cases?

Sub-theme 3: Harmonizing Collective Values and Implementing Cross-domain Policies

How can we dialectically examine the implementation of current cultural regulations and the formulation of cultural administration to promote and expand the feasibility of participation in shared governance? Contemporary cultural policy is not limited to the scope of industry support but also strives to connect with social welfare dimensions, such as promoting social prescribing interventions in healthcare and personal well-being, and formulating social inclusion measures to accommodate different ethnic groups, genders, and classes, jointly safeguarding cultural rights and social justice. In addition, the operations of relevant arts and cultural entities (such as museums, art galleries, performing arts venues, cultural institutions, and civil organizations) must also transcend the unidirectional mindset of internal management, strengthening their connection to social interaction and participation to catalyze public-oriented shared governance.

Furthermore, through innovative forms of professional convergence and the active engagement of cultural groups, it helps us rethink Taiwan's cultural relations in connecting internationally, opening up more communication channels to break through situational limitations and ideological obstacles, and collaboratively building a cultural constitution that supports collective values, safeguards diverse content, and considers innovative strategies to respond to future challenges.

1. How should contemporary cultural regulations and administration break away from a singular industry-support mindset and step out to connect with social welfare policies? How should we encourage institutional innovation and implement social inclusion to substantially defend the cultural rights and social justice of different ethnic groups, genders, and classes?
2. How should arts venues and civil cultural organizations break through traditional rigid constraints to promote and expand the publicness of overall

social participation? Particularly in the process of introducing cross-domain mechanisms like "social prescribing," how can cultural institutions collaborate with medical and social welfare systems to practice value sharing and care for marginalized groups?

3. Facing the resistance of international geopolitics and ideologies, how should Taiwan effectively consider transition strategies or participation pathways to facilitate networked governance through shared practice, thereby elevating its international cultural relations with other countries?

Sub-theme 4: Safeguarding Individual Rights and Sustaining Industrial Environments

The labor rights of arts and cultural workers have become a focal point of global cultural policy in recent years. Looking at the overall cultural labor environment, there is chronic instability in protections, blurred professional boundaries, and prevalent economic pressure from low compensation. This causes the true survival dilemmas of many workers to be overshadowed by the success stories of a few in a capitalist society, creating blind spots in policy formulation. During this current painful period of rapid transition and political turbulence, arts and cultural workers inside and outside of institutions often face highly fragmented labor conditions, forcing individuals to individually bear the institutional risks of lacking right-to-work protections in their pursuit of creative freedom.

We hope to collectively reflect on the precarity of arts and cultural labor, confronting the current imbalance in value distribution within the arts and cultural industry. In addition to depicting the difficulties and dilemmas faced by workers at all levels, it also analyzes the opportunities and challenges therein. We anticipate more research to prove the value and meaning created by the labor of arts and cultural workers; only by implementing the protection of the right to work and accelerating a critical transformation can the industrial environment truly move toward sustainable development.

1. In a highly fragmented arts and cultural industry with blurred professional boundaries, what genuine labor precarities and survival pressures do creators face? How should we uncover the reality of the risks borne by institutional and non-institutional arts workers hidden within a capitalist society?
2. In the value chain of the current cultural industry, what imbalances in distribution and blind spots in policy attention exist? Facing the economic

pressures of a capitalist society, how should we highlight cultural value as the primary subject to build a healthy and sustainable cultural ecology?

3. Facing institutional risks that are difficult for individuals to fend off alone, how can arts and cultural workers fight for labor rights from the bottom up through collective actions like arts unionization and community mutual aid? At the government level, how can policies concretely implement the protection of the rights of arts and cultural workers?

Under the overarching theme of "Interweaving Culture and Shared Governance" for this conference, in addition to the listed sub-themes, we also welcome paper submissions concerning important issues in arts management and cultural policy that can expand the connotations of this theme.

投稿說明

1. 本研討會接受中文及英文稿件，並統一採線上投稿方式，投稿網址為：https://forms.gle/jFvkVur13sDLfnVCA。
2. 論文摘要建議包括：問題意識或重要性、研究方法或設計、研究發現、預期結論或建議之說明、關鍵詞（不超過五個）。中文摘要以 300-500 字為原則，英文摘要以 300 字為原則。
3. 審查方式：
   （1） 由本籌備小組送請相關學者專家進行論文摘要審查。
   （2） 為鼓勵國內外博、碩士研究生踴躍參與發表，本研討會將獨立進行研究生摘要審查，保留一定比例之博、碩士研究生論文發表篇數。
   （3） 審查結果將於 2026 年 5 月 25 日下午 17:00 前於「國立臺灣藝術大學藝術管理與文化政策研究所」網站，並以電子郵件通知投稿者。
4. 論文摘要截止日：即日起至 2026 年 4 月 30 日晚上 23:59 止。
5. 論文全文截止日：
   （1） 論文摘要通過審查者，應於 2026 年 7 月 31 日晚上 23:59 前繳交論文全文電子檔，否則不排入議程。
   （2） 與會論文得以中文或英文撰寫，論文字數中文以 8,000 至 15,000 字為原則，英文以 6,000 至 10,000 字為原則。論文格式參考 APA 格式。
   （3） 論文全文不得為已出版者，文責自負。本會不額外提供稿酬。
6. 論文公開及出版：錄取之論文摘要電子檔將置於本研討會議程網站。本會印製之會議論文集，紙本僅提供主持人及評論人索取，惟該論文集不對外出版發行。論文全文電子檔，將依發表人意願上載至會議網站。
7. 聯絡電子信箱：amcpntua@gmail.com
   關於投稿相關問題，請以電子郵件聯絡會議籌備小組。
8. 相關網址：

藝術管理與文化政策研究所官網 https://acpm.ntua.edu.tw/web/index/index.jsp
藝術管理與文化政策研究所臉書粉絲 https://www.facebook.com/ACPMForum/