Vol.7 Iss.6 2026 Communication & Education Review
https://doi.org/10.37420/j.cer.2026.094

Mechanism Deconstruction and Path Optimization of Dual-Teacher Co-Cultivation in Digital-Intelligent Media Industry Colleges in the Context of Industry-Education Integration

Yuanzhen Zhao*
Xiamen Institute of Technology, Xiamen, Fujian 361021, China
Corresponding author, E-mail: yuanzhenzhaow@outlook.com

Abstract
Dual-teacher co-cultivation is the critical leap by which faculty building in digital-intelligent media industry colleges moves from formal mutual appointment to substantive coordination. Situated in the policy context of industry-education integration and the industrial context in which generative artificial intelligence is reshaping the media industry, this paper speculatively deconstructs the operating mechanism of dual-teacher co-cultivation. It argues that real commercial projects constitute the minimal effective field of co-cultivation; that capability co-training, curriculum co-development, project co-supervision, and evaluation co-determination form its operating chain; and that benefit sharing and institutional safeguards determine its sustainability. Loose coordination forms, imbalanced incentive structures, drifting identity recognition, and stalled capability iteration are the main blockages to implementation. Accordingly, four optimization paths are proposed—institutional embedding, laddered certification, two-way rotation, and evaluation fusion—providing a theoretical reference for faculty building in digital-intelligent media industry colleges.

Keywords:
industry-education integration, dual-teacher co-cultivation, digital-intelligent media industry college, real projects, coordination mechanism

1 Introduction

The Outline of the Plan for Building China into a Leading Country in Education (2024–2035) lists deepening industry-education integration and strengthening modern industry colleges as key levers for the transformation of application-oriented universities. In terms of policy evolution, industry-education integration has moved beyond the initial stage of "signing agreements and hanging plaques" and is moving toward the institutional construction of school-enterprise relations (Xu, 2025). The downward shift of policy gravity means that the yardstick for evaluating an industry college is shifting from "whether it exists" to "whether it works"—from the formal coverage of organization to the effective operation of mechanisms. Meanwhile, generative artificial intelligence is reshaping the media industry across the board: AIGC is rewriting content-production workflows, virtual digital humans are entering livestreaming rooms, and recommendation algorithms determine traffic allocation. Facing this change, journalism and communication education must

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

respond systematically in its training objectives, curriculum system, and faculty structure (Li & Wang, 2026). The industry's technological logic has changed, and the faculty logic of education cannot remain unchanged. The faculty required by new formats such as livestream e-commerce, short-video creation, and AI content production is no longer individuals holding dual certificates, but teaching communities capable of educating people in coordination with frontline enterprise personnel. The reason is not complicated: for such posts, knowledge updates happen at the production site rather than in textbooks; if teachers are not present at the site, what they teach is outdated from the start. Enterprise personnel, though on the front line, are unfamiliar with the laws of teaching, and their experience cannot spontaneously transform into teachable courses. Each of the two teams has its shortcomings; coordination is thus a must rather than an option. The digital-intelligent media industry college is precisely the organizational form that carries this requirement, and the quality of its faculty building directly determines whether talent cultivation can keep pace with the industry's beat.

The problem is that the practical logic of dual-teacher building has long remained at the individual level. Qualification certification, enterprise secondment, and skill training mostly revolve around the individual teacher, and there is little genuine common labor between the two faculty teams of school and enterprise. Researchers have revealed from an economics perspective that in industry-education integration the input–return structures of schools and enterprises are asymmetric, and enterprises lack sustained incentives for deep participation in education (Zhang et al., 2026). Empirical research has likewise found that even where education platforms have been built, "lose coupling" between school and enterprise is widespread, and educational outcomes vary with the differentiation of participating roles (Jiang et al., 2026). In short, mutual appointment of faculty is not rare, but joint teaching is uncommon—appointment agreements are easy to sign, coordination mechanisms hard to land. This is exactly the question of what this paper calls dual-teacher co-cultivation: through what mechanism can two heterogeneous faculty teams turn "common presence" into "common education"?

Existing research mostly discusses faculty co-cultivation at the macro-institutional and meso-organizational levels, with limited attention to the mechanism level of how co-cultivation happens within concrete educational tasks. Macro research answers whether to integrate; meso research answers how to build the organization; yet the puzzles teachers encounter daily are microscopic: when the enterprise mentor arrives, how do we prepare lessons together? When a project enters the classroom, how do we grade together? If these questions remain unsolved, however adequate the institutional supply, co-cultivation can only hang in mid-air. This paper attempts to narrow the entry point to the minimal educational field of the real commercial project, and speculatively pursues three questions: where is the field of dual-teacher co-cultivation, how does the mechanism operate, and how can it keep operating. The speculative approach is chosen because the co-cultivation mechanism is above all a relational and processual existence; before sufficient large-sample evidence accumulates, clarifying the concepts and articulating the mechanism is precisely the premise on which empirical research can unfold. The value of the small entry point is that whether the mechanism holds must ultimately be tested in the coordination details of concrete tasks; and in the digital-intelligent media field, projects have short cycles, complete process data, and dense dual-teacher interaction, providing exactly a high-resolution observational object for mechanism analysis.

The theoretical intent of this paper becomes prominent accordingly. First, it restores dual-teacher co-cul-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

tivation from an institutional requirement to everyday practice, supplementing a micro-mechanism-level theoretical explanation for understanding school-enterprise collaborative education. Second, it provides a mechanism draft that comparable industry colleges can check against and revise, and a theoretical reference for education administrative departments optimizing support policies for industry-education integration.

2Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Foundations

The connotation of the dual-qualified teacher has undergone a process of continuous enrichment. From the early formal standard of stacking two certificates, to the dual-capability requirement valuing teaching ability and practical ability alike, and then to the industry-education dual capability proposed in recent research—that teachers must be able both to stand at the podium and to enter the production line, with the two abilities reacting chemically in the same person (Hu et al., 2025)—certification standards have gradually shifted from static qualifications to dynamic capabilities. However, the raising of capability standards has also amplified teachers' identity tension. Qualitative research shows that under the high-pressure advance of the Double High construction, some dual-qualified teachers fall into a crisis of self-identity: regarded at school as "those who go down to enterprises" and at enterprises as "the teachers," present on both sides yet marginal on both (Liu et al., 2025). This reminds us that dual-teacher co-cultivation is not only a matter of capability building but also a matter of settling identity and institution. If teachers cannot find a stable identity fulcrum between school and enterprise, co-cultivation can only rely on individual enthusiasm and can hardly become an institutional climate.

From this, this paper's definition of dual-teacher co-cultivation can be drawn. It is not a synonymous replacement for the cultivation of dual-qualified teachers: the latter takes the individual teacher as the unit of construction, whereas the former takes the relationship as the object of construction. Nor does it equal the physical mixing of faculty: mixing solves where people are; co-cultivation answers where the effort goes. Dual-teacher co-cultivation as used in this paper refers to the sustained coordination relationship formed by two heterogeneous subjects—on-campus teachers and enterprise mentors—around the same educational task; its essence lies in the co: co-preparing lessons, co-supervising teaching, co-evaluating, and co-bearing responsibility. The four co-s are indispensable. Co-preparation without co-supervision degrades the enterprise mentor into a content supplier; co-supervision without co-evaluation excludes the enterprise mentor from the education loop; working together without bearing responsibility together means the coordination may break up over a single project failure.

The industry college provides an organizational container for this settlement. Zhou (2021) points out that the modern industry college is essentially a hybrid organization between school and enterprise, whose vitality depends on whether institutional innovation can be accomplished between the two organizational logics. Research focused on application-oriented universities further lands the core capabilities of industry-education integration on three fulcrums—specialty, curriculum, and faculty—and regards the dual-teacher team as the key point of modern industry college construction (Yu et al., 2025). This paper follows this judgment: faculty co-cultivation is the final cashing-in of the industry college's institutional innovation at the human level; detached from the everyday coordination of dual teachers, the industry college's organizational innovation hangs suspended as an idling structure. Beyond the general attributes of industry colleges, the digital-intelli-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

gent media industry college has two particularities. First, the media industry it docks with iterates technologically at extreme speed, and the half-life of faculty capability is short, so the co-cultivation mechanism must have a continuously updating channel built in. Second, its production tools and teaching tools are highly isomorphic: livestreaming rooms and short-video workbenches can serve both operation and teaching, and the same set of equipment, the same accounts, and the same data mean that dual-teacher co-cultivation requires no separately built training scenarios—a convenience rare in other fields.

For the theoretical lens, this paper introduces boundary-crossing learning theory. In their classic review of boundary-crossing research, Akkerman and Bakker (2011) propose that heterogeneous subjects interacting in boundary zones by means of boundary objects can generate new forms of learning and practice. The real commercial project happens to possess all the features of a boundary object: for the school it is a teaching carrier, for the enterprise an operating task; the two sides negotiate continuously around the same object, and the dual teachers' collaborative teaching is precisely a learning process occurring in this boundary zone. The explanatory power of this lens lies in rewriting the dual teachers' difference from an obstacle to coordination into a resource for coordination: precisely because enterprise mentors and on-campus teachers have different knowledge backgrounds, their negotiation around the same project has the value of mutual illumination. In addition, the intervention of generative AI confronts teacher education with a reconstructed hidden curriculum (Warr & Heath, 2025); empirical examination of the journalism education field likewise shows that whether generative AI can be effectively integrated into teaching depends on teachers' own technical understanding and application training (Khamadi et al., 2026), and the barriers in transition and their solutions are transnationally commensurable (Ngoc Linh & Chien Thang, 2026). Together these studies form the knowledge background for this paper's analysis of dual-teacher co-cultivation in the digital-intelligent media field.

Synthesizing the above discussion, this paper establishes an analytical framework of field, mechanism, and safeguard. The field is the real commercial project, answering where co-cultivation happens; the mechanism is the actual operating chain of co-cultivation, answering how the four links of capability, curriculum, project, and evaluation connect; the safeguard is the institutional arrangement that keeps the mechanism running, answering how incentives, management, and returns are configured. The three are not a juxtaposed platter but a nested relation: the field carries the mechanism, and the mechanism depends on the safeguard. The analytical efficacy of this framework lies in decomposing the vague overall evaluation of how well dual-teacher co-cultivation is doing into three sub-questions that can be separately pursued, separately diagnosed, and separately improved—so that blockage analysis does not degenerate into impressionistic criticism. The discussion below first dissects the blockages, then deconstructs the mechanism, and finally gives the paths.

3 Four Practical Blockages to Dual-Teacher Co-Cultivation

The first blockage is the looseness of coordination form. In a considerable number of industry colleges, dual-teacher cooperation stops at mutual appointment certificates and joint course delivery: enterprise mentors entering campus are mostly lecture-style embellishments, and on-campus teachers entering enterprises are mostly visit-style secondments; the two sides have never carried out a complete cycle of common labor around the same educational task. Examining the operation of education platforms, researchers found that under loose coupling the platform exists but its effectiveness is discounted (Jiang et al., 2026). The essence

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

of looseness is not an attitude problem but the absence of a common task. Without a common task there is no common rhythm, and without a common rhythm, so-called coordination is merely the accidental overlap of two timetables. At a deeper level, the loose form is stubborn because it is a low-cost equilibrium for both sides: the school fulfills the assessment indicator of cooperation agreements, and the enterprise cashes in the face project of social responsibility; neither has the motivation to break the equilibrium first, and both know well that the educational effectiveness under the equilibrium is limited. It must further be made clear that looseness is not simply a low degree of coordination; it also means the absence of coordination structures. Without a common lesson-preparation institution, the enterprise mentor's frontline experience cannot enter instructional design. Without a common review institution, the successes and failures in projects cannot sediment into knowledge shared by both sides. In other words, under the loose form, even if both dual teachers are individually excellent, their excellence occurs separately on two parallel lines.

The second blockage is the imbalance of the incentive structure. In industry-education integration, what the school obtains is the long-line return of talent-cultivation quality, while what the enterprise pays out is immediate mentor working-hours and commercial resources; cost and return are doubly mismatched in time and in subject (Zhang et al., 2026). Absent a visible benefit-return mechanism, the enterprise mentor's deep participation can only rely on the entrepreneur's personal educational devotion, and devotion cannot be compiled into a class schedule. When the incentive imbalance transmits into the school, it appears as the difficulty of counting co-cultivation investment into workload and into the title evaluation and appointment system; on-campus teachers likewise lack institutional reasons to deepen co-cultivation. A hidden vicious circle thus forms: insufficient incentives make co-cultivation superficial; superficial co-cultivation cannot produce convincing results; and the absence of results in turn weakens the legitimacy of increasing institutional incentives for co-cultivation. The fulcrum for breaking the circle lies not in calling for attention but in rearranging returns: letting enterprises see the return of talent pre-selection within the school, and letting teachers see the return of career development within the school—only then can co-cultivation become self-reinforcing.

The third blockage is the drift of identity recognition. Dual-qualified teachers move between two organizational logics: assessment looks at teaching, appointment looks at research, and co-cultivation looks at industry—three yardsticks pointing in different directions, so teachers easily fall into the meaning predicament that nothing counts (Liu et al., 2025). The same holds on the enterprise mentor side: their promotion within the enterprise depends on operating performance, teaching output is not recognized by their employer, and the educator identity remains forever an amateur identity. The deep consequence of identity drift is that both sides of co-cultivation regard coordination as extra labor, and the willingness to coordinate is quietly consumed in the day-by-day depreciation of identity. It is worth noting that the identity problem is often misread as a treatment problem, as if raising lesson fees would solve it. Not so: the core of identity is recognition—recognizing that co-cultivation labor counts in both evaluation systems, school and enterprise—and such recognition cannot be purchased in the form of lesson fees; it can only be supplied in the form of institutions.

The fourth blockage is the stall of capability iteration. The particularity of the digital-intelligent media field is that platform rules, recommendation algorithms, and AIGC tools update on a monthly or even weekly basis, whereas faculty training in universities is mostly organized on a semester or yearly cycle; between the two lies a speed difference hard to bridge. The impact of generative AI on teachers' knowledge structure is

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

concealed (Warr & Heath, 2025): surface learning of tool operation is easy to complete, but deep understanding of algorithmic logic and content-production mechanisms requires sustained immersion in the industrial site. International experience in journalism education likewise shows that between teachers' knowing of and knowing how to use new technologies lies a chasm of systematic training (Khamadi et al., 2026), and the causes of the barriers and the directions of their solutions show striking similarity across different institutional environments (Ngoc Linh & Chien Thang, 2026). When on-campus teachers' industrial cognition lags several versions behind that of enterprise mentors, co-cultivation easily degenerates into one-way output by the enterprise with the school passively accompanying. And when technological iteration leaves enterprise mentors themselves learning while doing, co-cultivation faces the new situation that neither side has mature experience to teach. The dual teachers shift from teacher-student complementarity to co-learning—this is a challenge, but also an opportunity for the coordination relationship to move toward equality. The stall blockage reminds us that dual-teacher co-cultivation in the digital-intelligent media field cannot follow the linear logic of train first, then take the post; it must turn to the parallel logic of co-cultivating while updating.

4 Deconstructing the Mechanism of Dual-Teacher Co-Cultivation: Field, Chain, and Safeguards

To deconstruct the mechanism, one must first answer the question of field: where must dual-teacher co-cultivation occur to count as really occurring? This paper's judgment is that the real commercial project constitutes the minimal effective field of dual-teacher co-cultivation, for three reasons. First, real projects carry irrevocable operating consequences—investment is cost and mistakes are losses—and this constraint prevents both dual teachers from treating the work with the mindset of a teaching drill; coordination thereby acquires real tension. Second, real projects yield complete process data: traffic, conversion, fulfillment, and other indicators provide the dual teachers with a common object of negotiation, fitting the conditions for a boundary object to function (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Third, real projects have clear periodic boundaries—definite start and end, closed tasks—matching exactly the organizational logic of course units. It must also be pointed out that real projects exert equal pressure on both dual teachers: enterprise mentors must face the constraints of teaching laws, and on-campus teachers must face the test of market results; equality of pressure is the premise for coordination to unfold on equal terms. By comparison, simulated training may train operations but cannot produce this equal pressure, and thus can hardly generate a genuine co-cultivation relationship. It is called the minimal effective field because a unit smaller than a project cannot carry a complete coordination cycle, while a unit larger than a project dilutes the concentration of coordination; the project sits exactly at the scale at which the mechanism can be observed and designed. Choosing real projects as the field also means accepting an attendant constraint: project data are mostly commercial information, and mechanism research must learn to walk between confidentiality obligations and academic openness; anonymization should be the methodological self-awareness of such research.

Within the field of the real project, dual-teacher co-cultivation presents itself as an operating chain of four interlocking links. The first is capability co-training. The premise of co-cultivation is that both dual teachers possess the capability base of being teachable and able to lead: on-campus teachers acquire industrial skills and enterprise mentors acquire teaching methods—the direction is two-way, echoing what industry-education

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

dual capability demands of both subjects simultaneously (Hu et al., 2025). The main channel of capability co-training is not off-job training but learning by doing at the project site, consistent with the judgment that teacher education in the generative-AI era emphasizes contextualized training (Warr & Heath, 2025). The second is curriculum co-development. When real projects enter the curriculum, the difficulty lies not in bringing them in but in converting them over. Enterprise mentors supply frontline knowledge; on-campus teachers, according to the learning situation, reorganize it into progressive teaching units, and after the project ends the two sides jointly write back into the course case library. Conversion is difficult because industrial knowledge and disciplinary knowledge follow different organizing principles: the former takes tasks as the main line, pursuing learn-and-use immediately; the latter takes concepts as the main line, stressing step-by-step progression. The substance of dual-teacher co-development is to find isomorphic mappings between the two organizing principles—translating the task chain into a capability chain, then folding the capability chain into the teaching calendar. This two-way project-curriculum conversion is precisely the landing of application-oriented universities' core industry-education-integration capability on the curriculum fulcrum (Yu et al., 2025); reconstructing courses with real tasks as the intermediary is also a feasible channel for integrating generative AI into professional teaching (Khamadi et al., 2026). The third is project co-supervision. A stable front stage–back stage division of labor is the basic form of co-supervision: enterprise mentors control pace and results at the operating front stage, on-campus teachers organize learning and conversion at the educational back stage, and the two sides exchange information through routine reviews. This division keeps students' progression within the dual teachers' common sight at all times, structurally avoiding loose coupling (Jiang et al., 2026). It should be stressed that front stage and back stage are not a primary-secondary distinction but a functional one: every operating move at the front stage is teaching material for the back stage, and every pedagogical ordering at the back stage in turn raises the self-awareness of front-stage moves. The dual teachers' relationship in the project is therefore not lead supervisor and assistant supervisor but two sides of the same supervision process. The fourth is evaluation co-determination. Placing operating indicators and educational indicators side by side and having the dual teachers jointly assess them by agreed weights turns the enterprise's moral participation in the educational process into institutional participation, and also gives students' capability growth a direct calibration from the market end. At a deeper level, evaluation power is the most sensitive power zone in school-enterprise gaming; that both sides are willing to cede and accept on evaluation is itself a sign that co-cultivation is entering deep water. The four links interlock: capability co-training supplies the people of co-cultivation, curriculum co-development supplies its content, project co-supervision supplies its process, and evaluation co-determination supplies its closed loop; remove any link and the chain breaks at once.

The chain's operation depends on safeguard mechanisms. The first is benefit sharing: project operating proceeds are divided by rule between school and enterprise and among participating teachers and students, so that the enterprise obtains the dual returns of real gains and pre-selection observation of talent, the school obtains real projects and teaching resources, teachers obtain supervision performance and case outputs, and students obtain combat experience and industry recognition. The visualization of the four parties' returns partially corrects the structural problem of cost–benefit asymmetry (Zhang et al., 2026), so that co-cultivation need not be sustained by devotion alone. The design point of the benefit-sharing mechanism is to make division multiplication rather than division: the purpose of sharing is not to cut up existing returns but to amplify

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

all parties' common will to do the project well. Of course, revenue sharing can only solve the problem of willingness to come; teaching well must still return to the mechanism itself. The second is shared responsibility: school and enterprise each appoint a project leader and share responsibility for the project's success or failure, avoiding a no-one's-land in co-cultivation. The third is identity settlement: counting co-cultivation investment simultaneously into the school's workload recognition and the enterprise's performance appraisal confirms for the dual teachers a formal co-educator identity within their respective organizations, answering the worry of identity drift (Liu et al., 2025). The three safeguards correspond respectively to the incentive, coordination, and identity dimensions of the blockages; the level of safeguard supply ultimately determines the speed and lifespan of the mechanism chain.

5 Optimization Paths for Dual-Teacher Co-Cultivation

In response to the above blockages, this paper proposes four optimization paths. The first is institutional embedding: upgrading co-cultivation from project tacit understanding to organizational contract. Relying on the industry college council, written rules for project admission, dual-teacher staffing, and revenue sharing should be established, so that school-enterprise relations move toward institutional construction (Xu, 2025) and organizational innovation hedges the conflict of the two logics inside the hybrid organization (Zhou, 2021). For each real project, a dual-teacher co-cultivation task statement is issued simultaneously with project approval, writing the division of labor, powers and responsibilities, and returns up front. The crux of institutional embedding lies not in the number of texts but in turning co-cultivation from after-the-fact recognition into prior agreement: tacit understanding can accomplish one project; only contract can accomplish a string of projects. At the same time, institutional embedding should reserve interfaces for commercial-information protection: the confidentiality boundaries of the project, the scope of data use, and the way results are made public should all be agreed in the task statement, freeing both sides from worries. The second is the laddering of capability certification: starting from entry-level industry certification, design intermediate and advanced progression channels, and solidify the two-way rotation of teachers entering enterprises and mentors entering classrooms into a semester institution. On-campus teachers complete a certain length of immersive practice on the enterprise side each semester; enterprise mentors receive short training in teaching fundamentals and pass a trial-teaching recognition, thereby simultaneously relieving on-campus teachers' skill lag and enterprise mentors' teaching weakness. The significance of laddered certification lies beyond capability itself: it provides the dual teachers' co-cultivation labor with accumulable, displayable, and convertible professional capital. When co-cultivation results can be priced simultaneously in both systems—title evaluation and appointment at school and promotion at the enterprise—the institutional root of identity drift is truly touched. The third is evaluation fusion: develop a dual-element conversion table of operating and educational indicators, specify weight ranges for different project types, and introduce value-added evaluation of student growth, with evaluation results serving both academic assessment and enterprise talent selection. The difficulty of evaluation fusion lies in the different dimensions of the two indicator sets; the feasible approach is to set weights by type and priorities by stage, rather than pursuing a once-and-for-all unified formula. The fourth is testing effectiveness by employment quality: taking graduates' post quality and career development as the ultimate yardstick of co-cultivation effectiveness. Large-sample evidence has shown that industry-education integration significantly improves graduates' employment quality, most prominently in the post-quality dimen-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

sion (Xie & Fan, 2026); the co-cultivation reform of digital-intelligent media industry colleges should accept measurement by the same yardstick. The four paths also have an order logic among themselves: institutional embedding is the premise, certification and rotation are the levers, evaluation fusion is the hinge, and employment quality is the destination; any one advanced alone will be dragged back to the origin by the absence of the other three.

For government departments, this paper's implication is that if industry-education integration policy is to take effect at the faculty level, the focus of support should shift from qualification certification to mechanism building, and from subsidizing individuals to subsidizing coordination units; the policy tools of city-level industry-education consortia and industry-education-integrated enterprises can both be calibrated accordingly. For the industry, dual-teacher co-cultivation provides a low-cost channel for talent pre-training: enterprises complete talent observation while projects proceed, far more precise than concentrated recruitment after graduation. For application-oriented universities, real projects plus the four-co chain plus benefit sharing constitutes a minimal institutional package that can be migrated as a whole, at a migration cost far lower than rebuilding an independent practical-training system.

6 Conclusion

This paper has narrowed the dual-teacher co-cultivation of digital-intelligent media industry colleges into the field of the real commercial project for speculative dissection. It argues that the real commercial project is the minimal effective field of dual-teacher co-cultivation; that capability co-training, curriculum co-development, project co-supervision, and evaluation co-determination constitute its operating chain; and that benefit sharing and institutional embedding determine its sustainability. Looseness, imbalance, drift, and stall are the four blockages that must be faced squarely. The four blockages are not isolated but mutually causal: looseness makes incentives hard to attach, imbalance makes identity hard to settle, drift makes updating hard to sustain, and stall in turn intensifies the rational excuse for looseness. Path optimization must therefore proceed as a whole; single-point breakthroughs can hardly work. The value of speculation lies in clarifying concepts and mechanisms, and its limit lies there too. The mechanism propositions proposed here await testing through anonymized multi-case empirical research, provided that school-enterprise commercial information is strictly protected. How dual-teacher co-cultivation can maintain adaptability amid the high-speed iteration of AI technology is likewise a question follow-up research cannot avoid. But in any case, one thing is certain: the success or failure of dual-teacher co-cultivation lies not at the signing ceremony but in the everyday details of every joint lesson preparation, every joint review, and every joint grading. Mechanisms hide in the everyday; co-cultivation is accomplished in the details.

Funding

This work was supported by the 2026 Education and Teaching Research Project of the School of Liberal Arts Education and Art Media, Xiamen Institute of Technology (Grant No. BYJY25001).

References

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[1] 徐国庆 . 产教融合共同体：走向校企关系的制度化建构 [J]. 华东师范大学学报（教育科学版）, 2025, 43(11): 1-12.
[2] 李曜宇 , 王斌 . 生成式人工智能背景下新闻传播教育体系的创新发展 [J]. 全球传媒学刊 , 2026, 13(2): 68-84.
[3] 张浩 , 胡姝 , 梁铭轩 . 职业教育产教融合的经济学分析 [J]. 华东师范大学学报（教育科学版）, 2026, 44(4): 40-55.
[4] 蒋林浩 , 张锐哲 , 胡钦太 . 导师创业企业实习平台对工程类研究生培养的作用机制研究 [J]. 中国高教研究 , 2026, 42(4): 67-74.
[5] 胡剑锋 , 畅立丹 , 许倩婷 . 产教双能：职业教育 “ 双师型 ” 教师的时代内涵与发展路径 [J]. 教师教育研究 , 2025, 37(5): 114-121.
[6] 刘韧 , 韩玉铭 , 刘玉静 . “ 双高 ” 建设背景下高职院校 “ 双师型 ” 教师自我身份认同危机形成机理与化解策略 —— 基于扎根理论的质性研究 [J]. 教育发展研究 , 2025, 45(7): 66-75.
[7] 周继良 . 现代产业学院的组织属性与制度创新 [J]. 内蒙古社会科学 , 2021(3): 197-204.
[8] 余东升 , 刘晓宇 , 朱俊 , 等 . 应用型高校产教融合核心能力提升 —— 兼论现代产业学院建设的关键点 [J]. 高等工程教育研究 , 2025(3): 107-113.
[9] Akkerman S F, Bakker A. Boundary crossing and boundary objects[J]. Review of Educational Research, 2011, 81(2): 132-169.
[10] Warr M, Heath M K. Uncovering the hidden curriculum in generative AI: implications for teacher education[J]. Journal of Teacher Education, 2025, 76(3): 245-261.
[11] Khamadi I, Hossain M S, Nyaboro J, et al. Examining generative AI integration in journalism education[J]. Journalism, 2026. DOI: 10.1177/14648849261459719.
[12] Ngoc Linh T, Chien Thang D. Barriers and solutions in using AI to transform journalism education in Vietnam[J]. Journalism, 2026. DOI: 10.1177/14648849261467553.
[13] 谢昊伦 , 范栖银 . 高职院校产教融合对毕业生就业质量的影响效应研究 [J]. 中国高教研究 , 2026, 42(1): 93-101.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)