Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN Print: 3104-4328
ISSN Online: 3104-4336
CD ISSN: 3104-4344
https://doi.org/10.63313/SSH.9160

Framing and User Responses: An Analysis of Comments on AI-Related Videos on Bilibili

Qingyue Ke. Ling Jiang
College of Publishing, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai 200093, China

How to cite this paper: Ke, Q., & Jiang, L. (2026). Framing and user responses: An analysis of comments on AI-related videos on Bilibili. Social Sciences and Humanities, 6(1), 67–78. ISSN Print: 3104-4328, ISSN Online: 3104-4336.
https://doi.org/10.63313/SSH.9160
Published: 2026-11-26

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Erytis Publishing Limited.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
CC BY 4.0

Abstract

This study examines how two videos about AI on Bilibili construct communication frameworks and how users respond in their comment sections. Drawing on Entman's framing theory, it analyzes 3,978 cleaned comments through sentiment analysis, LDA topic modeling, and qualitative examination of selected comments. The findings reveal that the videos construct distinct Communication Frameworks—Risk-Reflection and Technology-Empowerment—accompanied by differences in comment themes and emotional expressions. Users respond through four forms: affirmation, elaboration, challenge, and reconstruction. The study highlights comment sections as spaces for the interpretation and negotiation of generative AI-related meanings.

Keywords

Generative Artificial Intelligence; Communication Framework; Bilibili Comment Section; Meaning Negotiation

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

Generative artificial intelligence (AI), exemplified by ChatGPT and Sora, is rapidly evolving, with AI-powered creative tools increasingly entering mainstream content production. As ordinary users engage with AI-related content on digital platforms, public discussions have expanded beyond the technology itself to encompass content creation, career development, ethical risks, and human-machine relationships. Public perceptions of AI are shaped not only by direct user experiences but also by how media content frames and communicates AI-related issues.

As a representative digital community for youth-driven content creation and discussion in China, Bilibili has become an important platform for AI-related communication. AI-related videos on the platform exhibit distinct thematic orientations: some focus on technological applications and creative practices, while others explore technological risks and their implications for human agency,

employment, and values. These differences provide a basis for examining how AI-related issues are framed in media content and how users interpret and respond to them. Accordingly, this study selects two AI-themed Bilibili videos representing these contrasting orientations as case studies. Combining communication framework analysis with an examination of comment-section discourse, it investigates the frameworks constructed by the videos, as well as users' discursive concerns, emotional expressions, and response patterns.

1.2. Research Questions

Accordingly, this paper poses the following research questions:

RQ1: What communication frameworks do the two case videos respectively construct?

RQ2: What characteristics do the discussions in the comment sections of the two cases exhibit in terms of discourse focus and emotional expression?

RQ3: What kinds of responses do users in the comment sections offer regarding the AI topics presented in the videos? What forms do these responses take?

2. Theoretical Foundation and Analytical Framework

2.1. Theoretical Foundation: Framework Construction and Audience Decoding

Existing research on generative AI has largely focused on the individual psychological mechanisms underlying technology acceptance and risk perception (e.g., Davis, 1989; Li et al., 2025), with relatively limited attention paid to the dynamic construction of meaning on social media platforms as mediated contexts. As the human-AI relationship shifts toward collaboration and symbiosis (Peng, 2023, 2025), platforms are not merely channels for information flow, but also interactive arenas where users generate and negotiate meaning through participation (Tang, 2025). Therefore, this paper extends its research perspective from purely individual attitudes to the specific context of “media content–platform interaction,” thereby addressing the shortcomings of existing research in integrating the examination of issue frames with user responses.

In terms of specific theoretical tools, this study is grounded in Entman’s (1993) framing theory and Hall’s (2007) encoding/decoding model. Entman points out that the core of framing lies in “selection and salience,” meaning that communicators provide audiences with specific interpretive pathways by highlighting particular information. Accordingly, this paper examines how the two videos about AI construct distinct Communication Frameworks by presenting technological capabilities, social impacts, and human–AI relationships in different ways.At the same time, drawing on Hall’s encoding/decoding perspective, audiences do not passively receive media texts, but may adopt dominant, negotiated, or oppositional reading positions. Applying this lens to Bilibili’s comment sections helps explain how users draw on personal experiences to affirm, elaborate on, challenge, and

reconstruct the Communication Frameworks presented in the videos, engaging in ongoing meaning negotiation around AI.

2.2. Definition of Core Concepts

- **Communication Framework：** Drawing on Entman's (1993) concepts of "selection and salience," this term refers to the way videos about AI construct meanings around AI-related issues by selectively organizing and emphasizing technological capabilities, social impacts, and human–AI relationships.
- **Risk-Reflection Framework：** This is an operational concept inductively derived from the case content, referring to the presentation of generative AI within the context of issues such as job displacement, the value of labor, and human subjectivity, emphasizing the potential social impacts and real-world risks associated with AI development.
- **Technology-Empowerment Framework：** This operational concept, inductively derived from the case content, refers to the presentation of generative AI as a creative tool, highlighting its practical value in enhancing productivity, lowering the barriers to creation, and expanding the scope of expression.

2.3. The Analytical Framework of This Study

Integrating the theoretical and conceptual foundations above, this study links video framing, comment-section user responses, and sentiment expression across three analytical levels: comparing the Risk-Reflection and Technology-Empowerment frameworks in video texts, examining topical focus and four response forms (affirmation, elaboration, challenge, reconstruction) in comments, and analyzing sentiment distributions alongside topic–sentiment co-occurrence. Rather than assuming causal effects of video frames on user attitudes, this framework captures discursive and associative patterns across the two cases.

3. Research Design and Methodology

3.1. Case Selection and Comparability Discussion

This study combines purposive sampling and maximum variation sampling to select cases based on three criteria: issue typicality, platform popularity and user engagement, and framework representativeness.

Accordingly, two Bilibili videos were selected: Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? by Yingshi Jufeng and the AI animated short film Zombie Cleanup Crew. The former addresses potential job displacement, human subjectivity, and existential meaning in the age of AI, constructing a Risk-Reflection Framework. The latter showcases the creative applications of AI-generated video, constructing a Technology-Empowerment Framework. Both videos attracted substantial discussion and represent distinct orientations in AI-related communication.

The cases differ in creators, video formats, dissemination scales, and potentially audience composition. Rather than treating these differences as variables to be eliminated, this study considers them contextual conditions that may shape the issue structures and discursive characteristics of the comment sections. The videos also differ in release dates: Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? was published on November 28, 2025, and Zombie Cleanup Crew on May 9, 2026. Given their different comment accumulation periods, this study does not compare total comment volumes or absolute reach. Instead, it adopts unified data collection and analytical procedures to examine differences in comment-section discourse and user response patterns across the two communication frameworks.

3.2. Data Collection and Preprocessing

In June 2026, Python scripts querying Bilibili's official API collected public comments (text, nickname, timestamp, likes, and reply hierarchy) from Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? (5,020 raw comments) and Zombie Cleanup Crew (5,368 raw comments). Cleaning removed empty and duplicate texts, comments with fewer than two Chinese/English characters or repetitive modal particles, and non-substantive or ad-keyword entries, leaving 3,978 valid comments for sentiment analysis (2,620 for Can AI Replace Me? and 1,358 for Zombie Cleanup Crew). After Chinese word segmentation, stop-word removal, and dropping empty token lists, 3,858 texts remained for LDA topic modeling and topic–sentiment cross-tabulation (2,578 for Can AI Replace Me? and 1,280 for Zombie Cleanup Crew).

Sample structure and retention also differ across cases: all 2,620 valid comments for Can AI Replace Me? are top-level, whereas Zombie Cleanup Crew includes 1,006 top-level and 352 nested comments (interpreted with parent threads for context), with overall retention rates of 52.19% and 25.30%. Because discarded items were not sub-categorized, this gap—likely reflecting content, hierarchy, and rule interactions—warrants caution in cross-case comparisons.

3.3. Analytical Pathway and Coding Design

This study adopts a mixed-methods design integrating framing analysis of video texts and content analysis of comment texts across four analytical dimensions: communication frameworks (issue selection and salience, AI positioning, human–AI relationships, and value construction), discourse topics, sentiment orientations (positive, negative, neutral, and mixed), and framing responses.

1. Framing Analysis of Media Texts (RQ1)

Grounded in Entman's (1993) framing principle of "selection and salience," this study thoroughly examines how the two case videos select, emphasize, and construct meaning regarding AI-related issues. For the discussion-oriented video Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?, the analysis focuses on how it

highlights AI's substitution risks and reflections on human subjectivity. For the narrative-driven short film Zombie Cleanup Crew, the analysis centers on its presentation of AI's creative capabilities and visual narrative possibilities. Based on this, the Communication Frameworks constructed by both videos are inductively categorized and compared.

2. Content Analysis of Comment Texts (RQ2 and RQ3)

In the computational stage, LLM sentiment analysis classified all 3,978 valid comments into positive, negative, neutral, and mixed categories, while LDA topic modeling (implemented in Python via jieba and Gensim; random seed = 42, 10 iterations, k = 3～6 evaluated by perplexity and C_v coherence) extracted latent topics from the 3,858 segmented texts for topic–sentiment cross-tabulation. Manual spot-checks audited automated outputs; while minor biases appeared on irony, slang, and complex mixed emotions, full-sample statistics remained anchored in the automated classification.

4. Findings

4.1. Communication Frameworks in the Two Videos about AI (RQ1)

Drawing on Entman's (1993) framing perspective, which emphasizes the selection and salience of certain aspects of reality, this study examines the two cases in terms of issue selection, meaning construction, and value orientation. Although both videos focus on artificial intelligence (AI), they differ in their communicative emphases, constructing a Risk-Reflection Framework and a Technology-Empowerment Framework, respectively.

4.1.1. Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?: A Risk-Reflection Framework Centered on Questions of Human Subjectivity

Starting from Yingshi Jufeng's production of Galaxy Train for singer 57, the video highlights AI's efficiency leap—visual sequences once taking five people and 50 hours generated by AI in two minutes with sound—positioning AI as a potential competitor to creative labor amid team departures and suspended projects. Rather than competing on visual effects, the team uses drone lights to create a "galaxy" rooted in singer 57's post-surgery experience, emphasizing that "humans can be imperfect in this way." It thus shifts from job-displacement anxiety to human subjectivity, emotional connection, and lived experience.

4.1.2. Zombie Cleanup Crew: A Technology-Empowerment Framework Centered on Practical Applications of AI

Produced independently by Liu Ziyu using Xiaoyunque Seedance 2.0, Zombie Cleanup Crew is an AI-animated sci-fi short set in a post-apocalyptic wasteland where a cowboy robot forms an emotional bond with a mannequin while fighting zombies. Focusing on visual quality, scene building, and atom-punk aesthetics, it keeps storyboarding, prompting, pacing, and emotion under human direction while

assigning visual generation and technical execution to AI, illustrating practical creative collaboration.

4.1.3. A Comparison of the Two Communication Frameworks

Although both cases focus on generative AI, they differ markedly in issue selection and meaning construction (see Table 1). Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? adopts a Risk-Reflection Framework that problematizes how technological substitution affects human value and subjectivity, whereas Zombie Cleanup Crew constructs a Technology-Empowerment Framework that demonstrates how AI expands creative possibilities within audiovisual workflows. These contrasting frameworks establish distinct discursive contexts for user engagement, though commenters do not passively accept them; instead, they actively negotiate meaning through affirmation, elaboration, challenge, and reconstruction.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Communication Frameworks in the Two Case Videos

Comparison Dimension	Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?	Zombie Cleanup Crew
Content format	Issue-discussion type	Story-narrative type
AI presentation	Discusses the possible impacts of AI	Directly demonstrates AI generation capabilities
Core emphasis	Replacement risk, human subjectivity and value	Creative capacity, efficiency, cost and expressive possibilities
AI image	A technological force that challenges human capabilities	A technological tool that expands individual creative capacity
Human–AI relationship	Tension between AI and human value	Humans achieve creation with the aid of AI
Core question	"What does AI development mean for humans?"	"What can AI currently achieve?"
Communication framework	Risk-Reflection Framework	Technology-Empowerment Framework

4.2. Discursive Focus and Attitudinal Differences in Comment Sections under Different Communication Frameworks

4.2.1. Topic Analysis of Comment Section Discourse

This study uses Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to identify discourse topics in the comment sections of the two cases. Based on perplexity and topic coherence scores (C_v), the two datasets were compared across k = 3–6; both achieved their highest coherence at k = 3 (Zombie Cleanup Crew: 0.3813; Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?: 0.5360). Three topics were extracted for each case and manually named based on high-frequency keywords and representative texts. Topic distributions and top keywords are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. LDA Topic Extraction and Top Keywords in the Comment Sections of the Two Case Videos

Case	Topic Number and Name	Top Keywords
Zombie Cleanup Crew (Technology-Empowerment Framework)	Topic 1: AI generation quality and work evaluation	generation, quality, video, short film, work, effect
	Topic 2: AI video generation techniques and creative process	generation, shot, storyboard, expression, tool, creation
	Topic 3: AI-enabled creative expression and	creativity, storyboard, production,

Case	Topic Number and Name	Top Keywords
	video creation	film, creation, AI
Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? (Risk-Reflection Framework)	Topic 1: Human subjectivity, emotion, and lived experience	human, emotion, experience, meaning, subject, replacement
	Topic 2: AI development and job replacement anxiety	learning, development, work, future, replacement, problem
	Topic 3: AI as a tool and the reconstruction of human value	tool, meaning, emotion, creation, value, subject

(1) AI Short Film Zombie Cleanup Crew: A Discussion of AI-Generated Capabilities and Creative Possibilities

For Sample 1 (Zombie Cleanup Crew), the topic coherence score was C_v = 0.3813, lower than that of the other case. Given the colloquial and unstructured nature of the comments, computational results were interpreted in conjunction with manual reading. As shown in Table 2, discussions primarily revolved around AI-generated effects, technical implementation, and creative practices. Overall, users focused on the practical capabilities of AI in video production, evaluating both its technical performance and its potential to facilitate creative expression. These discussions reflect the Technology-Empowerment Framework constructed by the video.

(2) Yingshi Jufeng's Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?: From Anxiety over Technological Replacement to a Discussion of Human Value

For Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?, the topic coherence score was C_v = 0.5360, indicating relatively better thematic coherence. As shown in Table 2, discussions extended beyond AI's technical capabilities to encompass human subjectivity, emotional experience, occupational uncertainty, and the relationship between humans and AI. Users' concerns about technological replacement were closely intertwined with reflections on human uniqueness and value. Rather than focusing solely on whether AI could replace humans, discussions also explored how individuals might redefine their value amid technological change. These themes correspond to the Risk-Reflection Framework constructed by the video.

Overall, the two cases exhibit distinct patterns of comment-section discourse. Discussions surrounding the Technology-Empowerment Framework primarily focus on AI's technical capabilities and creative applications, whereas those associated with the Risk-Reflection Framework extend to occupational concerns, human–AI relationships, and questions of human value. This correspondence suggests that the videos' Communication Frameworks provide an initial context for discussion, while users further interpret and extend AI-related issues through their own experiences.

4.2.2. Sentiment Analysis of Attitudinal Expression in Comment Sections

Using a four-category scheme (positive, negative, neutral, and mixed) audited via manual spot-checks on 3,978 cleaned comments, sentiment distributions differ markedly across the two frameworks (Table 3). Zombie Cleanup Crew is dominated by neutral and positive comments (90.3% combined), with minimal negative (6.5%) and mixed (3.2%) shares, reflecting straightforward appraisal of technical and

creative performance. By contrast, Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? has a comparable neutral share (42.6%) but much higher negative (14.1%) and mixed (15.2%) shares (29.3% combined vs. 9.7%), with the 15.2% mixed category capturing ambivalence between admiration for AI's efficiency and anxiety over occupational replacement.

Table 3. Comparison of Sentiment Distribution in the Comment Sections of the Two Case Videos

Case	Communication Framework Type	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Mixed	Total Comments (N)
Zombie Cleanup Crew	Technology-Empowerment Framework	578（42.6%）	88（6.5%）	648（47.7%）	44（3.2%）	1358
Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?	Risk-Reflection Framework	737（28.1%）	369（14.1%）	1117（42.6%）	397（15.2%）	2620

4.2.3. Topic–Sentiment Cross-Analysis

To examine the relationship between discourse topics and sentiment orientations, LDA topic assignments were matched with sentiment labels for each comment. The analysis covered 1,280 comments from Zombie Cleanup Crew and 2,578 from Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? that met the LDA modeling criteria. Each comment was assigned to its highest-probability topic, and the resulting topic–sentiment distributions are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. Topic–Sentiment Cross-Distribution for Zombie Cleanup Crew (Technology-Empowerment Framework) (N = 1,280)

Topic No.	Topic Name	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Mixed	Topic Total
Topic 1	AI generation quality and work evaluation	178(43.3%)	25(6.1%)	196(47.7%)	12(2.9%)	411(100.0%)
Topic 2	AI video generation techniques and creative process	114(39.4%)	23(8.0%)	136(47.1%)	16(5.5%)	289(100.0%)
Topic 3	AI-enabled creative expression and video creation	261(45.0%)	40(6.9%)	263(45.3%)	16(2.8%)	580(100.0%)
Overall proportion	—	553(43.2%)	88(6.9%)	595(46.5%)	44(3.4%)	1280(100.0%)

Note: Based on LDA-eligible texts (N = 1,280), differing from the full cleaned comment sample in Table 3 (N = 1,358).

Table 5. Topic–Sentiment Cross-Distribution for Yingshi Jufeng's Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? (Risk-Reflection Framework) (N = 2,578)

Topic No.	Topic Name	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Mixed	Topic Total
Topic 1	Human subjectivity, emotion, and lived experience	329(34.7%)	114(12.0%)	365(38.5%)	141(14.9%)	949(100.0%)
Topic 2	AI development and job replacement anxiety	149(23.1%)	125(19.4%)	234(36.3%)	137(21.2%)	645(100.0%)

Topic No.	Topic Name	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Mixed	Topic Total
Topic 3	AI as a tool and the reconstruction of human value	252(25.6%)	128(13.0%)	485(49.3%)	119(12.1%)	984(100.0%)
Overall proportion	—	730(28.3%)	367(14.2%)	1084(42.0%)	397(15.4%)	2578(100.0%)

Note: Based on LDA-eligible texts (N = 2,578), differing from the full cleaned comment sample in Table 3 (N = 2,620).

Across both cases, negative and mixed sentiments remain low across all topics in Zombie Cleanup Crew, whereas in Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?, "AI development and job replacement anxiety" reaches a combined negative and mixed share of 40.6% (19.4% negative and 21.2% mixed), higher than the other two topics in that video. Discussions of technical and creative performance thus lean toward neutral or positive appraisal, while job displacement and human value evoke greater concern and ambivalence. These patterns reflect topic–sentiment co-occurrence across distinct framing contexts rather than a direct causal effect of video frames on user attitudes, setting up how users affirm, elaborate on, challenge, and reconstruct these frameworks.

4.3. Users' Responses to and Negotiation of Communication Frameworks in Comment Sections

Qualitative analysis identifies four user response forms—affirmation, elaboration, challenge, and reconstruction—illustrated through representative comments.

1. Framework Affirmation and Rational Extension: Resonance with the Video's Core Message

Some users affirmed the core arguments emphasized in the videos and further extended the relevant discussion on this basis. In the comment section of Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?, one user commented: "AI is 'a tool that is created,' while you are 'an active creator'... AI can complete tasks for you, but it cannot become 'you' on your behalf." This view continues the video's discussion of human subjectivity and further grounds human value in active creation and individual lived experience.

In the comment section of Zombie Cleanup Crew, a user stated: "What's most impressive is not the level of production technology, but the level of the director. The plot is smooth and full of drama, the soundtrack is comfortable, and there is not a single superfluous shot. This is the kind of AI film I'd be willing to pay to watch." While acknowledging AI's generative capabilities, the user extended the focus to directorial thinking and narrative ability, emphasizing human creative subjectivity.

2. Experiential Elaboration and Real-World Connection: From Macro Issues to Personal Circumstances

Some users connected the videos' broader themes to personal experiences and everyday concerns. One user commenting on Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? reflected on the limitations of AI in understanding human emotions:

"When you describe an emotion or the texture of something to it, when you tell it about the sound of wind or leaves, or the feeling of sunlight and raindrops on your skin, it can only pretend to understand, but it cannot truly reach into my heart..." This comment extends the discussion of AI capabilities to subjective experience and emotional understanding.

Another user approached the issue from the perspective of ordinary workers: "Even someone as successful as Tim feels fear; when it comes down to ordinary people or those at the bottom, if the sources of food, clothing, shelter, and transportation are all replaced by AI, it would be catastrophic." By foregrounding livelihood concerns, the comment connects technological replacement to the everyday pressures faced by ordinary people.

3. Technological Scrutiny and Challenge: Reassessing AI's Capabilities and Their Boundaries

Some users questioned the authenticity and practical implications of AI-related content. Regarding Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose?, one user remarked: "I don't know whether I should be moved, because I'm not sure if this script was generated by AI..." This comment questions the authenticity of the video's emotional appeal and reflects uncertainty about human–machine emotional expression.

In the comment section of Zombie Cleanup Crew, another user observed: "Without the materials from those top-tier teams, these AI-made things wouldn't exist... it still depends on human innovation, but with AI, cost constraints will limit those innovative projects." While acknowledging AI's creative potential, the user questioned whether its application might constrain the resources available for innovation.

4. Framework Reconstruction and Oppositional Reading: From Technological Replacement to Human Value

Some users moved beyond the videos' original problem framing and redefined the issues from broader social and human perspectives. One user compared AI with the Industrial Revolution: "The train is a contradictory thing—it carries both those returning home and those leaving home; AI is the same, embodying both technological progress and generational conflict." This analogy connects technological change with broader social transformations and individual experiences.

Other users emphasized the distinction between AI-generated content and lived experience: "AI may be able to generate the sea for people, but it cannot let people see the sea." Another asked: "With the same temperature and the same salinity, can AI mix tears?" These comments relocate human value in perception, experience, and emotion rather than content generation alone.

Another user challenged the premise of human competition with AI: "Isn't fearing that AI will replace you itself a way of objectifying your own concept? ... Human

beings are not born as tools, nor should they be." This response shifts the discussion from job competition to human subjectivity. In the comment section of Zombie Cleanup Crew, one user connected technological cost reduction to labor and profit distribution: "The future won't give employees raises just because costs have gone down; instead, it will cut employees' wages and the employees themselves..." This comment situates AI's economic implications within broader questions of labor relations and distribution.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study demonstrates that the two Bilibili videos about AI construct distinct Communication Frameworks, which correspond to different patterns of discussion and emotional expression in their comment sections. Can AI Replace Me? Then What Is My Purpose? builds a Risk-Reflection Framework centered on job displacement and human subjectivity, eliciting higher shares of negative and mixed sentiment alongside discussions of career anxiety and human value. Conversely, Zombie Cleanup Crew constructs a Technology-Empowerment Framework focused on audiovisual generation and creative practice, attracting predominantly neutral and positive evaluations around technical execution and lower creative barriers. Across both cases, commenters do not passively accept video meanings; instead, they actively engage through affirmation, elaboration, challenge, and reconstruction—though these patterns reflect discursive correspondence rather than direct causal effects of video frames on user attitudes.

By integrating framing analysis with Hall's encoding/decoding model in a platformed context, this study clarifies how digital audiences negotiate AI meanings. While affirmation broadly aligns with dominant reading and elaboration and challenge may reflect negotiated reading, reconstruction moves beyond straightforward oppositional reading by redefining issue boundaries from alternative social or existential perspectives. Communication Frameworks on interactive platforms thus operate not as closed scripts, but as open meaning structures continuously reshaped through user interaction. Practically, these insights invite creators and platforms to attend to how different AI framings shape public debate, while future research can extend this cross-sectional comparison across broader platforms and longitudinal windows.

References

[1] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

[2] Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51–58.

[3] Hall, S. (2007). Encoding and decoding in the television discourse. In CCCS selected working papers (pp. 402–414). Routledge.

[4] Li, L., Zhou, X., Yang, Y., et al. (2025). Resistance or acceptance: User trust and satisfaction with AI-generated text [In Chinese]. Xin Meiti yu Shehui [New Media and

Society], (5), 164–183, 494–495.

[5] Peng, L. (2023). Viewing intelligent communication and human–AI relations through ChatGPT: Panoramas and prospects [In Chinese]. Xinwen Daxue [Journalism Research], (4), 1–16, 119. https://doi.org/10.20050/j.cnki.xwdx.2023.04.005

[6] Peng, L. (2025). Platforms from a media perspective [In Chinese]. Xiandai Chuban [Modern Publishing], (4), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.2095-0330.2025.04.001

[7] Tang, X. (2025). "Communication as generation": Shifts in communication subjects, structures, and content on digital platforms [In Chinese]. Journal of Fujian Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), (6), 79–91, 171–172.