

Research on Public Opinion Control in Online Public Opinion Events: A Case Study of the "Li Wenliang Incident"

Jiaying Li

Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing, China

jiayingli_0629@163.com

Abstract. Public opinion refers to the views and attitudes of the public toward certain public events within a specific period. Therefore, the study and management of public opinion are crucial. The incident involving Dr. Li Wenliang during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, where he was reprimanded for warning about the virus, sparked significant dissatisfaction among netizens toward government departments. His death further escalated public sentiment, leading to an unprecedented "national funeral" on social media, which placed immense pressure on the government. Although the public opinion surrounding this incident was eventually well-managed, it exposed shortcomings in the government's ability to control public opinion. This paper examines the Li Wenliang incident during the pandemic, analyzes the public opinion at each stage based on the lifecycle theory of online public opinion events, and provides suggestions and measures for handling similar events in the future.

Keywords: Online public opinion events, Public opinion control, Public administration.

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

With the development of information technology, the internet has become a crucial platform for people to access information and exchange views. It has also become an important source for the public to evaluate government credibility. In October 2013, the General Office of the State Council issued the "Opinions on Further Strengthening Government Information Disclosure and Responding to Social Concerns to Enhance Government Credibility,"[1] which mentioned Weibo and WeChat seven times. The dissemination of government information and image management must now be conducted on internet platforms. Online discussions can more candidly and accurately reflect societal opinions, avoiding the barriers imposed by the current system that prevent officials from hearing the public's true feelings.

As a new space for public opinion and social power, online public opinion is prone to emotional, complex, and amplified issues, posing significant challenges to social governance in China. The report of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China[2] emphasized the need to "strengthen and innovate social governance" and improve the "modernization level of the national governance system and governance capacity." In this context, improving the governance of online public opinion has become a major task in enhancing internet governance capabilities in the new era.

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic attracted widespread attention, and as the number of infections increased, topics related to the pandemic emerged one after another. On February 3, the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee held a meeting, emphasizing the importance of propaganda, education, and public opinion guidance. It called for better coordination of online and offline efforts, domestic and international perspectives, and major and minor issues to strengthen confidence, warm hearts, and unite the people[3]. Therefore, effectively managing public opinion is crucial in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic.

On December 30, 2019, Dr. Li Wenliang, who worked at a hospital with COVID-19 patients, identified the virus as similar to SARS and disclosed information about the unknown pneumonia in a group chat with his classmates. After his message was screenshotted and shared, he was reprimanded by the local police for "spreading false information online." Later, the novel coronavirus was confirmed, and Dr. Li Wenliang died after contracting the virus from a patient. This incident

drew significant attention from netizens and sparked intense dissatisfaction with the Wuhan municipal government and public security authorities. After Dr. Li's death, the National Supervisory Commission established an investigation team to look into the matter. Eventually, the Wuhan police revoked the reprimand issued to Dr. Li and apologized to his family, while also taking disciplinary action against the responsible officials. However, this incident revealed many shortcomings in the government's handling of public opinion, highlighting the importance of research on guiding public opinion and managing online sentiment.

1.2 Research Significance

In recent years, the governance and control of online public opinion have gained national attention, and research on online public opinion has become a hot topic in academia. However, most studies focus on the basic theories and legal regulations of public opinion control, with few offering specific measures or effective suggestions based on actual cases.

This paper takes the Li Wenliang incident as a case study, dividing the lifecycle of online public opinion and analyzing the development of public opinion at each stage, as well as the government's control measures. It identifies the shortcomings in the government's handling of public opinion during this incident and provides suggestions for guiding positive mainstream public opinion during the pandemic, creating a healthy and harmonious online environment for the public. This research is significant for the government in correctly guiding public opinion, controlling negative sentiment, and maintaining social harmony and stability.

1.3 Research Methods

This paper divides the Li Wenliang incident into different lifecycles based on the lifecycle theory of online public opinion. It examines the development of public opinion and the government's control measures at each stage, analyzing the evolution of public opinion and the government's methods in handling online public opinion events. The paper summarizes the government's shortcomings, analyzes the reasons, and provides constructive suggestions for future public opinion control in similar events.

This paper adopts case analysis and quantitative research methods. By combining domestic and international literature on online public opinion events and control measures, it provides a comprehensive analysis of the Li Wenliang incident. Through statistical analysis of data at each stage, it offers a more intuitive summary of the government's handling of public opinion and control measures during online public opinion events.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Online Public Opinion

Online public opinion refers to the sum of various emotions, attitudes, or opinions expressed and disseminated by netizens through the internet.[4] It is considered a branch and important carrier of social public opinion. Online public opinion events refer to crisis events triggered by online public opinion. [5] Academic research on online public opinion mainly focuses on its concept, themes, characteristics, evolution, and factors influencing its evolution.

Early research on online public opinion events originated in the West in the 1990s. Foreign studies primarily focus on public opinion elections and social surveys, with limited research on how governments control online public opinion. Chen et al. (2008) proposed a public opinion prediction scheme based on chaos theory and social network analysis[6]. Ampofo (2011) studied government credibility during the 2010 UK general election through Twitter surveys[7].

Some scholars combine online public opinion with lifecycle theory, dividing it into stages for research. Generally, the lifecycle is divided into three, four, or five stages. For example, Sun (2019) divided the "Changchun Changsheng Vaccine Fraud Incident" into formation, outbreak, and decline stages, providing suggestions for government responses to public health events[8]. Song (2010)

pointed out that online public opinion generally goes through formation, escalation, fluctuation, and fading stages, and must follow the laws of public opinion evolution for guidance and control[9]. She(2011) combined lifecycle theory with government management theory, dividing online public opinion into five stages: gestation, outbreak, spread, turning point, and dormancy, to assess the risk of online emergencies[10].

In summary, with the development of the internet, the evolution of online public opinion has gained widespread attention in academia. Research on online public opinion events has gradually taken shape, but most studies focus on the events themselves, lacking a public management perspective on guiding online public opinion.

2.2 Public Opinion Control

Online public opinion reflects the public's social and political attitudes and is an important channel for national managers to understand public sentiment. Currently, there is no specific definition of public opinion control. Early foreign research combined communication theory with the relationship between government and media. Later, with the emergence of platforms like Twitter, research focused on using Twitter for crisis management. Amanda et al. (2009) studied Twitter's content, new user numbers, and user attitudes, finding that information dissemination and public opinion control through Twitter help achieve crisis management in online public opinion events[11]. Marcelo et al. (2010) found that rumors are one of the reasons for the intensification of online public opinion events on Twitter[12]. Sudha (2011) used natural language processing technology to classify Twitter information and calculate word frequency to assess the development of online public opinion crises[13].

Domestic research on public opinion control mainly focuses on three aspects. The first is early warning for online public opinion events. For example, Li (2008) analyzed the characteristics, functions, and causes of online public opinion, proposing the timely establishment of an early warning mechanism[14]. Wu and Li (2008) used the Delphi method to determine indicator weights and design an early warning knowledge system for timely preventive measures[15]. Zeng (2013) constructed a model for online public opinion information dissemination, using MATLAB for simulation to study the early warning mechanism for online public opinion[16].

The second aspect is emergency response to online public opinion events. Tao (2007) argued that when online public opinion events escalate into crises, the government should use a public opinion linkage mechanism to take specific actions, resolve public opinion crises, and eliminate negative impacts[17]. Lan (2012) built an evaluation system from the perspectives of public opinion responsiveness, guidance, and control, providing suggestions for local government early warning of online public opinion[18].

The third aspect is the guidance and control of online public opinion events. Guo (2005) focused on online media, combining communication theories like the spiral of silence, and proposed three suggestions: strengthening government guidance, improving the credibility of professional media, and enhancing the quality of mass media[19]. Wang (2006) proposed four strategies for public opinion control: cultivating "opinion leaders," strengthening gatekeeper awareness, connecting traditional media, and macro-level internet legislation[20]. Si (2008) suggested five aspects for establishing a public opinion monitoring mechanism: regulations, technology, online control, traditional media, and online coordination[21].

In summary, current research on public opinion control is based on sudden public events and online mass incidents, mostly using qualitative descriptions and lacking quantitative analysis. Therefore, starting with specific cases and combining data analysis can help clarify the basic development of online public opinion events and the government's control measures at each stage, summarizing the government's shortcomings and contributing to improving its ability to handle online public opinion events.

3. Case Introduction and Analysis

3.1 Case Introduction

In December 2019, Dr. Li's hospital admitted patients with an unknown viral pneumonia. On December 30, Dr. Li posted a message in a Wuhan University clinical class group chat, stating that "7 cases of SARS have been confirmed at the Huanan Seafood Market," warning his classmates to take precautions. Dr. Li became one of the first to warn the public about the virus. Shortly after, he was reprimanded by the local police for "spreading false information online." On January 10, 2020, Dr. Li developed symptoms related to the novel coronavirus, and his condition worsened, leading to his admission to the intensive care unit. On February 7, 2020, at 2:58 AM, Dr. Li Wenliang passed away.

Dr. Li's reprimand as a "whistleblower" drew significant attention from netizens and sparked intense dissatisfaction with the Wuhan municipal government and public security authorities. This dissatisfaction reached its peak after Dr. Li's death, leading to an unprecedented "national funeral" on social media. On February 7, the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection and the National Supervisory Commission announced that, with the approval of the Central Committee, an investigation team would be sent to Wuhan to investigate the issues related to Dr. Li [22].

3.2 Analysis of Public Opinion and Control in the Li Wenliang Incident

Based on the development process of the Li Wenliang incident and the volume of information released, and drawing on the lifecycle division of online public opinion events proposed by R.E. Crable et al. [23] and She Lian [24], the evolution of online public opinion in this incident can be divided into the following five stages: (1) gestation period (December 30, 2019, to February 5, 2020); (2) outbreak period (February 6 to February 7, 2020); (3) spread period (February 8 to March 18, 2020); (4) turning point period (March 19 to March 23, 2020); and (5) dormancy period (March 24 to April 18, 2020).

3.2.1 Gestation Period (December 30, 2019, to February 5, 2020)

The gestation period is the initial stage of an online public opinion event, where certain social events or phenomena are noticed by netizens or media, leading to discussions or reports. During this stage, the main characteristic is the gradual emergence of topics and information on online platforms, but due to the lack of clarity, netizens' opinions are scattered and diverse. The development of public opinion depends on the sensitivity of the topic and the media's guidance. The more sensitive the topic and the more media coverage, the higher the netizens' attention, and the more likely the public opinion will escalate. During the gestation period, the government's main task is to prevent the occurrence of negative events or control them within a specific discussion range.

Although the Li Wenliang incident began on December 30, 2019, it was only circulated within a small circle on WeChat at the time. Due to the sensitivity of the topic, the Wuhan public security authorities, in accordance with the regulations on the prevention and control of infectious diseases and public security management, investigated and dealt with the dissemination of SARS-related information online. On January 3, 2020, the Wuhan Public Security Bureau issued a reprimand to Dr. Li, quickly quelling the incident. It was only after the novel coronavirus was confirmed and Dr. Li contracted the virus that the incident gained attention from netizens again.

During the gestation period, the number of netizens involved was small, and the channels of dissemination were limited. Although the topic was sensitive, the rapid development of the COVID-19 pandemic diverted public attention, so the incident did not cause significant waves. The government did not deliberately conceal or guide public opinion, remaining in a "silent" state.

3.2.2 Outbreak Period (February 6 to February 7, 2020)

Due to the government's silence, the information circulating online could not be confirmed, so most netizens adopted a wait-and-see attitude. However, as more specific information about the incident emerged, along with the involvement of opinion leaders, more netizens began to participate

in the discussion, expressing their views and demanding a response from the government. The public opinion entered the outbreak period, with netizens' comments forming a clustering effect, increasing the attention and impact of the online public opinion event. However, due to information asymmetry, many rumors emerged during the outbreak period. Therefore, the outbreak period is the most dangerous stage of an online public opinion event, and proper handling is crucial.

In the Li Wenliang incident, from February 6 to February 7, 2020, there were a total of 658,026 related pieces of information. Among the media platforms, Weibo had the most information, with 455,459 posts, accounting for 69.22% of the total.

On the evening of February 6, multiple media outlets reported that Dr. Li had passed away at 9:30 PM. At 11:28 PM, a professor from Peking University Third Hospital posted on Weibo that Dr. Li was still in critical condition. The uncertainty surrounding Dr. Li's death became the trigger for the incident, leading to a surge in online discussions and emotional outbursts from netizens. Netizens expressed dissatisfaction with the government's handling of Dr. Li's early warning and his reprimand, questioning the unfair treatment of Dr. Li as a "rumormonger" and demanding an explanation and apology from the government. Some netizens' reposts and likes were controlled, further fueling doubts about the restriction of free speech. According to statistics, negative information about the Li Wenliang incident accounted for 42.24%, indicating extremely negative emotions among netizens.

The surge in public opinion attracted the attention of mainstream media, with many outlets publishing editorials paying tribute to Dr. Li. To address public concerns, on the afternoon of February 7, the National Supervisory Commission established an investigation team to look into the issues related to Dr. Li Wenliang, aiming to quell online public opinion and netizens' comments. The following table lists the top 10 most reported news headlines during the outbreak period.

Table 1. Media Coverage During the Outbreak Period

Title	Number of Media Outlets
Editorial: Paying Tribute to Dr. Li Wenliang	90
National Supervisory Commission Sends Investigation Team to Wuhan	84
National Supervisory Commission Investigates Issues Related to Dr. Li	67
Wuhan Central Hospital: Dr. Li Wenliang Dies of COVID-19	50
Wuhan Health Commission: Dr. Li Wenliang Dies of COVID-19	36
Wuhan Central Hospital: Dr. Li Wenliang Dies After Contracting COVID-19	34
Wuhan Municipal Health Commission: Dr. Li Wenliang Passes Away Due to Deterioration of COVID-19 Condition	31
"Whistleblower" Dr. Li Wenliang Passes Away	22
Wuhan Central Hospital: Li Wenliang in Critical Condition, Undergoing Full Rescue Efforts	19
National Supervisory Commission Decides to Send Investigation Team to Wuhan, Hubei Province, to Conduct a Comprehensive Investigation into Issues Related to Dr. Li Wenliang as Reported by the Public.	19

3.2.3 Spread Period (February 8 to March 18, 2020)

After the government's effective response, the online public opinion event was somewhat controlled, but the incident was not fully resolved, leading to repeated fluctuations in public opinion. During the spread period, netizens' attention to the information remained stable, and the volume of information gradually decreased. Influenced by the authoritative voice of official media, netizens became more rational, and the group polarization phenomenon that emerged during the outbreak period gradually disappeared.

The spread period of this incident coincided with the national investigation into the Li Wenliang incident. Therefore, the government did not make any further statements during this period. However, on March 5, 2020, Dr. Li Wenliang was posthumously awarded the title of "Advanced Individual in

the Prevention and Control of the COVID-19 Epidemic in the National Health System," affirming his contributions. Due to the effective response during the outbreak period and the honorary title awarded to Dr. Li, netizens' emotions during this period were mostly positive.

3.2.4 Turning Point Period (March 19 to March 23, 2020)

After a period of spread, some online public opinion events gradually lose attention as time passes or the incident is resolved. However, some events may experience a secondary crisis due to the revelation of new facts or the emergence of new topics, leading to another surge in public opinion. The government's handling or response to the incident, as well as the public's reaction to the government's actions, can cause changes in the development of the online public opinion event, entering the turning point period.

On March 19, 2020, the National Supervisory Commission investigation team released a report on the issues related to Dr. Li, responding to his reprimand and sparking another surge in public opinion. The online public opinion event entered the turning point period. From March 19 to March 23, 2020, there were a total of 3,886 related pieces of information. Among the media platforms, WeChat had the most information, with 1,917 posts, accounting for 49.33%. Due to the government's effective response, netizens' attitudes toward the Li Wenliang incident improved significantly. Overall, neutral information accounted for the majority, with 2,681 posts, or 68.99%.

3.2.5 Dormancy Period (March 24 to April 18, 2020)

When a turning point occurs in the online public opinion, the incident is effectively resolved, and the online attention and topic heat begin to fade. The issues and contradictions reflected in the public opinion are, to some extent, resolved or temporarily put to rest. Netizens' views gradually become more rational. If a new online public opinion incident occurs at this time, it will stimulate netizens anew, and most netizens will actively join the discussion of the new event, causing the original online public opinion incident to enter a dormant period. However, some incidents may have a "period of extinction" due to the sensitivity of their issues, and when similar incidents occur again, they will be brought up as part of the "social collective memory." Therefore, during the dormant period of online public opinion, guidance on online public opinion should not be relaxed.

Due to the government's proper handling of the Li Wenliang incident, timely attention to the development of the event, and response to netizens' concerns, the negative emotions of netizens were somewhat alleviated. As time passed and no new information emerged, the online public opinion event entered the dormancy period. During this stage, discussions about the "Li Wenliang incident" decreased, and public opinion gradually subsided.

4. Analysis of Public Opinion Control Issues in the Li Wenliang Incident

Due to the sensitivity of the topic during the pandemic, the emergence of rumors, and the government's delayed response, the Li Wenliang incident ultimately occurred. Although the incident was successfully resolved, the government's actions and netizens' emotions revealed several shortcomings in public opinion control.

4.1 Gestation Period: Insufficient Monitoring and Judgment, Avoidance Behavior

The outbreak of information on online platforms is often faster than offline. Therefore, it is crucial for the government to strengthen the monitoring of online public opinion to improve its control capabilities. The monitoring of public opinion should be real-time, comprehensive, and accurate. The more timely and accurate the monitoring and judgment, the more likely the event can be stopped at the budding stage or directly enter the dormancy period. However, when facing sensitive online events, the government often adopts an avoidance attitude toward some values or content that is at odds with mainstream trends. However, these voices that the government deliberately ignores also represent the wishes or interests of netizens. Therefore, avoidance is not a long-term solution.

During the gestation period of the Li Wenliang incident, the government's monitoring and judgment capabilities were insufficient. Although the government did not deliberately conceal the incident, it remained in a "silent" state, failing to provide timely and effective public opinion guidance. The government's lack of attention and acumen was evident. Specifically, before the outbreak of public opinion, there were already signs online, such as multiple reports from self-media interviewing Dr. Li, which raised questions about the Wuhan government's handling of the situation. However, the Wuhan government avoided a positive response, and failed to report the situation in a timely manner, leading to the subsequent development of the incident.

4.2 Outbreak Period: Single Handling Approach

Behind every online public opinion event lies different demands from netizens. The internet provides an open platform for the public to exchange information, but each online public opinion event has different causes, developments, and types. However, the government often adopts the same type of response to each public opinion event. This approach cannot effectively dispel rumors or gain public recognition.

In the Li Wenliang incident, the government's handling approach was single and lacked flexibility. Specifically, in handling this online public opinion event, the government ignored the pressure of public opinion on all parties involved. If the government had promptly refuted the rumors about Dr. Li's death and guided public opinion to pay tribute to the epidemic workers, it would have gained more discourse initiative, aligning public opinion with reason and legality rather than the overwhelming criticism and blame during the outbreak period. Additionally, in response to the "national funeral" on social media, the government did not respond promptly but instead, take control and delete measures first. It was only on the morning of February 7, when group polarization occurs and public sentiment runs high, that the government issued an official response. Although this action effectively controlled public sentiment, it left the impression of government "inaction" in the minds of the public.

4.3 Turning Point Period: Adequate Response but Insufficient Interaction

On internet platforms, the government often lacks interaction, only responding after the hot point of an online public opinion event has occurred and caused a climax. The internet is characterized by interactivity, which is the essence of online public opinion event dissemination. This value can be utilized in managing the relationship between the government and netizens, as well as between the media and netizens.

In the Li Wenliang incident, the turning point period was the most perfectly handled stage by the government. The National Supervisory Commission's investigation report on the issues related to Dr. Li significantly shifted netizens' attitudes. However, some questions remained unanswered, and some netizens adopted a wait-and-see attitude, concerned that the government's response was merely superficial without follow-up. This shows that the government's response to netizens' attitudes and opinions was adequate but lacked interaction. This approach only drew a "period" to the incident but did not effectively restore the government's image.

4.4 Spread and Dormancy Periods: Lack of Follow-up Measures

The spread and dormancy periods of online public opinion events are stages where public opinion gradually subsides. Especially during the dormancy period, in addition to summarizing the lessons learned from public opinion control, the government should also conduct follow-up work to improve its image. The phenomenon of the media and the government being forced by online public opinion is a direct reflection of social issues. In the eyes of netizens, the government's inaction led to the occurrence of this incident. Therefore, if similar incidents occur in the future, netizens' negative emotions will resurface, and the government's image will suffer greatly.

In the later stages of the Li Wenliang incident, although the government's response basically worked out perfectly, the incident and its actions were recognized by netizens, the Wuhan

government's inaction during the early stages of the incident had already significantly impacted its image in the minds of the public. The impression of the Wuhan government's procrastination and finger-wagging became deeply ingrained. Especially before the outbreak of the Li Wenliang incident, the Wuhan government's poor handling of the pandemic had already greatly affected its image and credibility. If this impression is not changed, it will significantly impact social harmony and stability, making it difficult to better control public opinion during the pandemic.

5. Suggestions for Public Opinion Control Mechanisms in Online Public Opinion Events

5.1 Stage-based Management According to the Lifecycle

Based on the analysis of the Li Wenliang incident, it is evident that the development of online public opinion events significantly impacts the government's response. Similarly, the stage-based management of unexpected events and online public opinion events, based on lifecycle theory, can provide reference for the government's stage-based response to online public opinion events[24]. During the gestation period, the government should prevent the occurrence of malignancy online public opinion events or control them within a specific discussion range. During the outbreak period, the government should respond promptly to control the further proliferation of the event. During the turning point period, the government should communicate timely, capture the direction of the event, and guide netizens' direction of public opinion. During the dormancy period, the government should summarize the entire process of handling the online public opinion event and take follow-up measures to maintain government image and prevent the event from reigniting.

5.2 Diversified Public Opinion Guidance

In terms of public opinion guidance, it is suggested that the government should not unilaterally guide public opinion. On one hand, it should respond to netizens' demands, highlighting Dr. Li's professional dedication and literacy, and criticizing the local government's reprimand without confirming the facts. On the other hand, the government should respond with more constructive solutions, taking this opportunity to propose legislation on public information disclosure.

5.3 Establishing a Comprehensive Public Health Information Disclosure Mechanism

A comprehensive public health information disclosure mechanism should be established, focusing on three aspects.

First, establish relevant procedures for the disclosure mechanism, following the process of "government - professional arbitration - information disclosure hotline," to ensure that the public can always rely on the government to reveal online public opinion events or public health events. Second, establish a sound legal system to ensure the safety of information disclosers and protect public interests. Third, conduct public education to guide the public in a correct understanding of "freedom of speech" and the correct use of civil power. When encountering questioning public health events or online public opinion events, the public should first turn to a trustworthy information disclosure system rather than a we-media platform that is more likely to generate rumors.

5.4 Improving Laws on Public Opinion Control

Currently, China's laws on public opinion control are not perfect. To prevent similar incidents from occurring again and spiraling out of control, it is necessary to perfect laws on public opinion control. Experts in public administration and law should be organized to establish and improve laws based on China's current national conditions, referring to other countries' relevant laws, to ensure that professionals like Dr. Li Wenliang, who are dedicated to the people, can rely on a more secure, safe, and scientific information disclosure mechanism, safeguarding public interests and promoting social solidarity.

References

- [1] General Office of the State Council. Opinions on Further Strengthening Government Information Disclosure, Responding to Social Concerns, and Enhancing Government Credibility [EB/OL]. http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2013-10/18/content_1219.htm
- [2] Xiang Chunling. New Concepts and Measures for Strengthening and Innovating Social Governance in the 19th National Congress [EB/OL]. <http://theory.people.com.cn/n1/2017/1211/c40764-29697335.html>
- [3] People's Daily Online. Boosting Confidence, Warming Hearts, and Uniting the People: How to Conduct Publicity and Public Opinion Guidance for Epidemic Prevention and Control [EB/OL]. <http://media.people.com.cn/GB/n1/2020/0204/c14677-31570935.html>
- [4] Liu Yi. Introduction to Online Public Opinion Research [M]. Tianjin People's Publishing House, 2007: 53.
- [5] Qiu Sijia, Zhang Chunju. Government Strategies and Actions in Online Public Opinion Incidents [N]. Study Times, 2011-05-30.
- [6] Chen Xu, Gao Hui, Fu Yan. Situation Analysis and Prediction of Web Public Sentiment [J]. 2008 International Symposium on Information Science and Engineering, 2008(2): 707-710.
- [7] Ampofo L, Anstead N, O'Loughlin B. Trust, Confidence, and Credibility: Citizen Responses on Twitter to Opinion Polls during the 2010 UK General Election [J]. Information Communication & Society, 2011, 14(6): 850-871.
- [8] Sun Tian. Analysis and Response to Online Public Opinion in Public Health Incidents [D]. Central China Normal University, 2019.
- [9] Song Hailong, Ju Naiqi, Zhang Bei, Pu Xiaojin. Formation, Evolution, and Control of Online Public Opinion in Emergencies [J]. Journal of Henan University of Engineering (Social Science Edition), 2010, 25(04): 12-16.
- [10] She Lian, Ye Jinzhu. The Spread of Online Emergencies and Their Risk Assessment [J]. Journal of Engineering Studies, 2011, 3(2): 157-163.
- [11] Hughes A L, Palen L. Twitter Adoption and Use in Mass Convergence and Emergency Events [J]. International Journal of Emergency Management, 2009, 6(3/4): 248-260.
- [12] Mendoza M, Poblete B. Twitter Under Crisis: Can We Trust What We RT? [J]. Proceedings of the First Workshop on Social Media Analytics, 2011: 71-79.
- [13] Verma S, Vieweg S, Corvey W J, et al. Natural Language Processing to the Rescue? Extracting "Situational Awareness" Tweets During Mass Emergency [J]. ICWSM, 2011.
- [14] Li Zide. On the Early Warning of Harmful Online Public Opinion from the Perspective of a Harmonious Society [J]. Journal of China University of Petroleum (Social Sciences Edition), 2008(04): 37-39.
- [15] Wu Shaozhong, Li Shuhua. Research on the Early Warning Mechanism of Online Public Opinion [J]. Journal of People's Public Security University of China (Natural Science Edition), 2008(03): 38-42.
- [16] Lan Yuexin, Zeng Runxi. Research on the Dissemination Patterns and Early Warning Stages of Online Public Opinion in Emergencies [J]. Journal of Intelligence, 2013, 32(05): 16-19.
- [17] Tao Jianjie. Improving the Joint Emergency Response Mechanism for Online Public Opinion [J]. Party and Government Forum, 2007(09): 28-30.
- [18] Lan Yuexin, Dong Xilin, Chen Chengxin. Research on the Evaluation of Local Governments' Ability to Respond to Online Public Opinion and Crisis Early Warning [J]. Modern Information, 2012, 32(05): 8-12.
- [19] Guo Letian. Control of False Information on the Internet and Guidance of Online Public Opinion [J]. Journalism Review, 2005(02): 23-26.
- [20] Wang Liping, Liu Dapeng. Policies and Countermeasures for Conducting Online Public Opinion Control [J]. Journal of Jilin Public Security Academy, 2006(01): 109-112.
- [21] Si Jin. On Establishing a Three-Dimensional Online Public Opinion Monitoring Mechanism Based on the Characteristics of Online Public Opinion Formation [J]. Information Network Security, 2008(08): 59-61.
- [22] Central Commission for Discipline Inspection and National Supervisory Commission. With the Approval of the Central Committee, the National Supervisory Commission Decides to Send an Investigation Team

to Wuhan, Hubei Province, to Conduct a Comprehensive Investigation into Issues Related to Dr. Li Wenliang as Reported by the Public [EB/OL].
http://www.ccdi.gov.cn/yaowen/202002/t20200207_211014.html

- [23] Crable R E, Vibbert S L. Managing Issues and Influencing Public Policy [J]. *Public Relations Review*, 1985(11): 3-16.
- [24] She Lian, Ye Jinzhu. The Spread of Online Emergencies and Their Risk Assessment [J]. *Journal of Engineering Studies*, 2011, 3(2): 157-163.
- [25] Bai Mingying, Xu Guang, Lü Shanghao. Research on Government Response Behavior Based on the Development Stages of Online Public Opinion [J]. *China Electronic Commerce: Technology and Innovation*, 2014(4): 6-6.