Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities Research
Print ISSN: 2959-992X
Online ISSN: 2959-9938
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/tsshr3243

ALGORITHMS AS AGENDA SETTERS: THE CASE OF WEIBO'S ZHISOU AI AND ITS ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS IN CHINA'S MEDIA ECOLOGY

YuTian Zhang[1*], YunHan Liu[2]
[1]*Arts in Communication, Johns Hopkins University, Washington D C 20003, USA.*
[2]*Department of Mathematics, Boston College, Boston MA02467, USA.*
[*]*Corresponding Author: YuTian Zhang*

Abstract: As artificial intelligence becomes embedded in digital platforms, algorithms increasingly perform editorial functions such as selecting, ranking, summarizing, and circulating information. This study examines Weibo's Zhisou AI as a case of algorithmic agenda-setting in China's platform media environment. Drawing on agenda-setting theory, media ecology, and framing theory, the paper analyzes two Zhisou-related Weibo hot search topics concerning Sam's Club China in July 2025: "#Sam's Club is becoming more and more like Walmart#" and "#Sam's Club responds to questions about declining product quality#." The study combines qualitative case analysis of Zhisou AI-generated explanations with public-facing platform indicators, including reading volume, discussion volume, interaction volume, ranking performance, media participation, and hot-search visibility records. A supplementary descriptive survey of 186 active social media users is also used to provide background insight into user perceptions of algorithmic influence and trust. The findings lead to three main conclusions. First, Zhisou AI does not simply summarize existing public discussion; it helps transform scattered consumer complaints into structured public issues by organizing causes, stakeholders, and emotional reactions. Second, algorithmic visibility operates through multiple signals rather than a single ranking metric. The "more like Walmart" case showed stronger peak ranking and broader cumulative diffusion, while the product-quality case generated stronger immediate engagement and longer hot-search duration. Third, AI-curated agenda-setting raises ethical concerns because the platform's summaries and visibility indicators may influence users' understanding of controversy while remaining only partially transparent. This study argues that AI-curated systems are becoming important actors in shaping issue visibility, public interpretation, and the distribution of online attention.
Keywords: Artificial intelligence; Agenda setting; Algorithmic governance; Weibo; Media ecology; Framing

1 INTRODUCTION

Digital media platforms no longer function only as channels for information distribution. They have become environments where information is selected, ranked, summarized, and made visible through algorithmic systems. In earlier media environments, journalists and editors played a central role in deciding which issues deserved public attention. In today's platform-based media ecology, this power is increasingly shared with, and sometimes transferred to, recommendation systems, search algorithms, and AI-generated summaries. Weibo's Zhisou AI provides a useful case for examining this shift. It offers functions such as intelligent search, topic explanation, AI-generated answers, and event summaries.

These functions are designed to help users understand trending topics quickly. At the same time, they also shape the way users encounter public issues. By selecting key information, organizing causes, summarizing public attitudes, and presenting event developments in a structured format, Zhisou AI does more than make information easier to access. It participates in the construction of public meaning.

This paper focuses on two Sam's Club China controversies that became visible through Weibo's Zhisou and hot search environment in July 2025. The first topic, '#Sam's Club is becoming more and more like Walmart#,' emerged after consumers criticized Sam's Club for introducing more mass-market products, including items associated with ordinary retail rather than premium membership shopping. The second topic, '#Sam's Club responds to questions about declining product quality#,' centered on broader doubts about product selection, quality control, imported product proportions, and the perceived weakening of membership value. These two cases are closely related, but they do not tell the same story. The first is more about brand positioning and the perceived massification of Sam's Club. The second is more about quality anxiety and consumer trust.

These cases are valuable because they show how AI-curated platform systems help transform consumer complaints into public issues. The controversies were not simply about individual products. Through Zhisou's summaries, hot search ranking, media participation, and visibility indicators, they became broader discussions about brand identity, consumer rights, lifestyle expectations, and platform-shaped public attention. In this sense, the Sam's Club cases allow this paper to ask a wider question: how does AI participate in agenda-setting when it becomes part of the infrastructure of social media visibility?

This study is guided by three research questions: RQ1: How does Weibo's Zhisou AI participate in agenda-setting processes? RQ2: How do Zhisou-related hot search metrics and AI-generated summaries shape the visibility and framing of public issues? RQ3: What ethical concerns arise when AI-curated systems become part of public agenda formation?

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The growing use of artificial intelligence in media communication has drawn attention from communication studies, information science, and media ethics. Scholars increasingly argue that AI technologies should not be understood as simple technical tools. They are socio-technical systems that influence how information is produced, distributed, and interpreted.

Abed and Farrokhi identify several areas in which AI has transformed media communication, including automated journalism, targeted advertising, personalized recommendation, and immersive storytelling [1]. Their findings suggest that AI can improve efficiency and scalability in content production and dissemination. However, they also note that algorithmic systems often prioritize engagement indicators such as clicks, shares, comments, and watch time. This creates a tension between visibility and quality. Content that generates strong reactions may become more visible even when it is incomplete, sensational, or emotionally simplified.

Sovianti and Novrian also highlight the tension between efficiency and authenticity in AI-mediated communication [2]. While AI systems can process information quickly and personalize content delivery, users still value human judgment, empathy, and contextual understanding. This point is especially relevant to public controversies. When a social issue involves consumer disappointment, identity, trust, or public anger, a summary that is technically efficient may still miss important social nuance.

Research on AI and social media further shows that algorithmic personalization can increase user engagement but also narrow users' exposure to diverse perspectives [3,4]. AI-driven recommendation systems may reinforce filter bubbles and make certain viewpoints appear more dominant than they actually are. At the same time, automated moderation and AI-generated summaries raise concerns about transparency, bias, and accountability. Users may see the final ranking or summary, but they often do not know why certain information was selected or excluded.

UNESCO offers a useful ethical framework for understanding these problems [5]. It emphasizes that AI systems influence all stages of the communication process, from content production to distribution and consumption. The report argues that fairness, transparency, accountability, and human oversight are essential to ethical AI governance. Importantly, it rejects the idea that AI systems are value-neutral. Their outputs reflect the assumptions, priorities, and institutional goals built into their design.

Existing research has therefore established that AI is reshaping media communication. However, there is still a need for case-based studies that examine how a specific AI system operates in a real platform event. This paper addresses that gap by analyzing Weibo's Zhisou AI through two Sam's Club hot search cases. Rather than discussing AI and media in general terms, the study examines how one AI-curated platform feature helped frame, quantify, and circulate two concrete public controversies.

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study uses agenda-setting theory, media ecology, and framing theory to examine how Zhisou AI shapes public attention. Agenda-setting theory, first developed by McCombs and Shaw, argues that media may not tell people exactly what to think, but it strongly influences what people think about [6]. In traditional media environments, agenda-setting was mainly connected to newspapers, television, and professional news organizations. In platform environments, agenda-setting increasingly depends on algorithmic systems. Trending lists, search rankings, recommendation feeds, and AI summaries all help determine which issues become visible.

Lippmann's concept of the pseudo-environment is also useful here [7]. Lippmann argued that people respond not directly to reality itself but to mediated representations of reality. In the age of AI-curated platforms, these representations are partly produced by algorithms. Zhisou AI selects key points, summarizes causes, and organizes public reactions. These actions help build the picture of an event that users encounter before they form their own judgments.

Media ecology theory adds another layer to this analysis. McLuhan emphasized that media are not neutral containers of information [8]. They shape human perception, social relations, and ways of knowing [4]. From this perspective, Zhisou AI is not only a search tool or summary function. It is part of a media environment that structures how users experience public issues.

Framing theory further explains how meaning is organized. Frames highlight certain aspects of reality while pushing others into the background. In the Sam's Club cases, the controversies could have been framed as ordinary product adjustment, market competition, consumer rights, brand crisis, class identity anxiety, or platform-driven outrage. Zhisou AI's summaries mattered because they helped stabilize certain frames, especially membership value collapse, product massification, and quality downgrade anxiety.

Together, these theories allow this paper to treat Zhisou AI as more than a technical feature. It is examined as an agenda-setting and framing actor within a broader media ecology.

4 METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a mixed-method research design that combines qualitative case study analysis, public-facing platform data analysis, and supplementary survey research. The goal is to examine how Zhisou AI participates in agenda-setting through both meaning construction and visibility construction. The two Sam's Club hot search cases are used as the central empirical material, while the survey provides additional evidence about how users perceive algorithmic influence.

4.1 Research Design

The study uses a case-oriented mixed-method approach. The qualitative component analyzes Zhisou AI-generated explanations, issue framing, stakeholder positioning, and emotional language in the two Sam's Club cases. The quantitative platform component examines public-facing indicators such as reading volume, discussion volume, interaction volume, original post volume, hot search ranking, ranking duration, media participation, and related visibility indicators. The survey component examines user perceptions of algorithmic influence, trust in AI-curated information, awareness of bias, and ethical concern. This design is suitable because algorithmic agenda-setting is not only a textual process and not only a numerical process. AI summaries organize the meaning of an event, while platform metrics make that event visible as socially significant. Combining these two layers makes it possible to study both how a topic is framed and how it is amplified.

4.2 Case Selection

This study follows a case study logic rather than a statistical sampling logic. As Yin argues, case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions rather than to populations [9]. Therefore, the two Sam's Club cases are not selected to represent all Weibo hot search topics. They are selected because they offer analytically rich examples of how Zhisou AI organizes public controversy through summaries, rankings, heat indicators, and media participation. In this sense, their value lies in analytic generalization: they help extend agenda-setting theory to the context of AI-curated platform visibility. The two cases were selected because they were both Zhisou-related hot search topics concerning Sam's Club China, but each represented a different aspect of the same broader consumer controversy.

The first case, '#Sam's Club is becoming more and more like Walmart#,' centered on consumer dissatisfaction with Sam's Club's product adjustments. Users questioned whether the brand was moving away from its selected membership retail model and becoming closer to ordinary mass retail. In this case, the controversy was not only about a specific product. It was about whether Sam's Club was losing the symbolic value that consumers associated with membership.

The second case, '#Sam's Club responds to questions about declining product quality#,' focused more directly on product quality and consumer trust. Zhisou's explanation connected the controversy to several concerns, including mass-market products, disputes over low-sugar Orion Pie, the declining proportion of imported products, and doubts about product selection standards. This case therefore offered a clearer example of how product-level complaints became a broader trust issue.

These cases were selected for three reasons. First, both involved Zhisou AI-generated explanations and public hot search records, making them suitable for examining AI-curated agenda-setting. Second, both generated measurable platform attention, including reading volume, interaction volume, ranking, and media participation. Third, the two cases were related but different enough to allow comparison between brand-positioning controversy and product-quality controversy.

4.3 Data Sources and Analysis Procedure

The platform data came from public-facing Weibo Zhisou event pages and hot search data records related to the two selected topics. The data included Zhisou AI-generated explanations, reading volume, discussion volume, interaction volume, original post volume, current and highest hot search ranking, time on the list, host media, media participation, and related visibility indicators.

For '#Sam's Club is becoming more and more like Walmart#,' the public platform record showed 13.265 million reads, 1,824 discussions, 6,561 interactions, and 475 original posts at one point of observation. The topic reached a current hot search ranking of No. 2, with a highest ranking of No. 2 and 1 hour and 17 minutes on the list. Another public-facing record for the same topic showed 41.071 million reads, 6,869 discussions, 31,000 interactions, and 1,104 original posts, suggesting broader cumulative diffusion beyond the immediate ranking moment.

For '#Sam's Club responds to questions about declining product quality#,' the public platform record showed 16.175 million reads, 2,248 discussions, 9,899 interactions, and 442 original posts. The topic was recorded at No. 27 on the hot search list at one point, with a highest ranking of No. 6 and 2 hours and 40 minutes on the list.

The qualitative analysis focused on Zhisou AI's language and structure. The study examined how Zhisou defined the controversies, explained their causes, represented stakeholders, and framed consumer emotions. The coding process focused on issue definition, causal explanation, emotional framing, and stakeholder positioning.

The quantitative platform analysis compared the two cases through raw indicators and derived engagement ratios, including reads per discussion, interactions per discussion, original-post share of discussion, interactions per original post, and reads per original post. These derived indicators help avoid overreliance on raw volume and make it possible to compare different forms of visibility and engagement. To supplement the platform case analysis, a structured online survey was conducted with 186 respondents. All participants were active social media users between the ages of 18 and

40. The survey measured perceived algorithmic influence, perceived agenda-setting, trust in AI-curated content, bias awareness, and ethical concern using a five-point Likert scale. Respondents were recruited through online convenience sampling, and the survey results are used only as supplementary descriptive evidence rather than as representative population data.

4.4 Methodological Limitations

Several limitations should be noted. First, the platform data came from public-facing Zhisou event pages rather than Weibo's internal database, so the study cannot directly observe the internal ranking algorithm. Second, hot search metrics change quickly, so the numerical indicators should be understood as event-specific platform records. Third, because the survey sample was non-random, the survey findings are exploratory rather than representative. Despite these limitations, the combination of Zhisou AI textual analysis, platform metrics, trend data, and survey responses allows this study to examine algorithmic agenda-setting from multiple angles.

5 RESULTS

The findings are organized into three parts. The first presents survey results on users' perceptions of algorithmic influence. The second analyzes platform metrics from the two Sam's Club hot search cases. The third examines the qualitative frames produced through Zhisou AI's explanations.

5.1 Survey Findings

The survey results show that respondents were highly aware of algorithmic influence in everyday media consumption. Among the 186 respondents, approximately 145 respondents, or 78%, agreed or strongly agreed that AI algorithms influence what topics they pay attention to on social media. Similarly, approximately 134 respondents, or 72%, agreed or strongly agreed that trending topics are shaped by algorithmic selection rather than only spontaneous public discussion. By contrast, only approximately 76 respondents, or 41%, expressed confidence in AI-recommended or AI-summarized information.

These descriptive findings reveal a clear awareness-trust gap. Users recognize that algorithms shape online visibility, but this recognition does not necessarily produce confidence in AI-curated content. In other words, algorithmic influence is visible to many users, yet its legitimacy remains uncertain. This pattern is important for understanding Zhisou AI because the system may be useful for organizing information, while also producing skepticism about transparency, bias, and platform accountability.

Because the survey was used as an exploratory supplement to the case study, the analysis focuses on descriptive patterns rather than inferential statistical testing. The results should therefore be interpreted as indicative of user perceptions rather than as representative evidence for all social media users, see Table 1.

Table 1 User Perceptions of AI-Curated Content

Indicator	Operational meaning	Agreement
Perceived algorithmic influence	AI algorithms influence which topics users notice	78%
Perceived algorithmic agenda-setting	Trending topics are shaped by platform selection rather than purely organic public interest	72%
Trust in AI-curated information	AI-recommended or AI-summarized information is reliable	41%

5.2 Platform Metrics of the Two Zhisou Hot Search Cases

The platform metrics show that the two Sam's Club topics gained visibility in different ways. The product-quality case generated higher immediate reading volume, discussion volume, and interaction volume. It reached 16.175 million reads, 2,248 discussions, and 9,899 interactions, while the "more like Walmart" case reached 13.265 million reads, 1,824 discussions, and 6,561 interactions. These figures suggest that quality-related concerns produced stronger immediate user engagement. However, visibility was not only reflected in engagement volume. The "more like Walmart" case reached No. 2 on the hot search list, while the product-quality case reached No. 6 at its highest point and was recorded at No. 27 at one stage. This indicates that the first case achieved stronger peak ranking visibility. By contrast, the product-quality case remained on the hot search list for 2 hours and 40 minutes, longer than the 1 hour and 17 minutes recorded for the "more like Walmart" case. Therefore, the two cases reveal different visibility patterns: one was more prominent at its peak, while the other sustained attention for a longer period, see Table 2.

Table 2 Public Platform Metrics of the Two Sam's Club Zhisou Hot Search Cases

Indicator	More like Walmart case	Product-quality case
Reading volume	13.265 million	16.175 million
Discussion volume	1,824	2,248
Interaction volume	6,561	9,899

Original posts	475	442
Current hot search ranking	No. 2	No. 27
Highest hot search ranking	No. 2	No. 6
Time on hot search list	1 hour 17 minutes	2 hours 40 minutes
Host media	Southern Daily	Jingshi Live
Category	Social	Social
Participating media outlets	35-48	48

Source: Public-facing Weibo Zhisou event pages and hot search records for the two selected Sam's Club topics, collected by the authors in July 2025.

To further compare the two cases, this study calculated several derived engagement ratios. The reads-per-discussion values were similar: 7,273 for the "more like Walmart" case and 7,195 for the product-quality case. This means that both topics converted visibility into discussion at a similar level. The difference appears more clearly in interaction intensity. The product-quality case generated 4.40 interactions per discussion and 22.4 interactions per original post, compared with 3.60 and 13.8 in the "more like Walmart" case. This suggests that the product-quality case produced denser engagement around each discussion unit, see Table 3.

Table 3 Derived Engagement Ratios for the Two Hot Search Cases

Derived indicator	More like Walmart case	Product-quality case
Reads per discussion	7,273	7,195
Interactions per discussion	3.60	4.40
Original-post share of discussion	26.0%	19.7%
Interactions per original post	13.8	22.4
Reads per original post	27,926	36,595

Source: Calculated by the authors based on public-facing Weibo Zhisou metrics.

The "more like Walmart" case had a higher original-post share of discussion, at 26.0 percent, compared with 19.7 percent in the product-quality case. This suggests that it encouraged broader original commentary. By contrast, the product-quality case concentrated stronger interaction around fewer original posts. In agenda-setting terms, the first case reflected wider discursive participation, while the second reflected stronger engagement intensity.

The cumulative diffusion record of the "more like Walmart" case also shows that a topic can continue to expand after its initial hot search moment. Its reading volume increased from 13.265 million to 41.071 million, discussion volume from 1,824 to 6,869, interaction volume from 6,561 to 31,000, and original posts from 475 to 1,104. Among these indicators, interaction volume increased the fastest, by 4.72 times. This suggests that once the topic gained visibility, it continued to invite active participation rather than only passive reading, see Table 4.

Table 4 Cumulative Diffusion Record for the More Like Walmart Case

Indicator	Immediate record	Later overview	Increase factor
Reading volume	13.265 million	41.071 million	3.10x
Discussion volume	1,824	6,869	3.77x
Interaction volume	6,561	31,000	4.72x
Original posts	475	1,104	2.32x

Source: Public-facing Weibo Zhisou event pages and hot search records for the two selected Sam's Club topics, collected by the authors in July 2025.

Overall, these metrics show that algorithmic visibility cannot be understood through a single number. Ranking position, reading volume, discussion volume, interaction intensity, duration, and later diffusion all capture different aspects of how a topic becomes publicly salient. This is important for the study's central argument because Zhisou AI operates within a platform environment where public attention is shaped through multiple visibility signals rather than through traditional editorial selection alone.

5.3 Qualitative Case Findings

The quantitative differences between the two cases were also connected to different issue frames. Zhisou AI did not simply summarize the two controversies as isolated consumer complaints. Instead, it organized each case around a broader interpretive frame.

In the "more like Walmart" case, Zhisou AI framed the controversy around Sam's Club's changing membership identity. The issue was not presented only as a reaction to individual product changes. Instead, the AI summary connected the controversy to larger strategic pressures, including competition with Hema and Costco, Sam's Club's expansion in

China, and changing consumer expectations. It also presented different consumer positions, such as old members' dissatisfaction, price-sensitive consumers' practical support, and more neutral views from users who preferred flexible product choices.

In the product-quality case, Zhisou AI emphasized dissatisfaction with product quality and brand trust. The summary connected specific complaints to broader concerns about whether Sam's Club was still delivering the value promised by its membership model. In this framing, consumers were not only reacting to individual products. They were also questioning the credibility of the brand and the meaning of paying for membership.

Together, the two cases show that Zhisou AI's role is both informational and interpretive. It provides users with quick explanations, but it also organizes scattered reactions into recognizable public issues. The "more like Walmart" case became a discussion about membership value and brand positioning, while the product-quality case became a discussion about trust and consumer rights. This supports the argument that Zhisou AI participates in algorithmic agenda-setting by shaping not only which topics become visible, but also how these topics are understood.

6 DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that Zhisou AI functions as an active agenda-setting agent rather than a neutral intermediary. Its role is not limited to delivering information that already exists on the platform. It participates in deciding which information becomes visible, which emotional tones become dominant, and which interpretations are easier to circulate.

The Sam's Club cases show that agenda-setting power has become increasingly algorithmic. In traditional agenda-setting, issue salience was often produced by repeated coverage from news organizations. In the Zhisou environment, salience is produced through a combination of AI-generated summaries, hot search rankings, topic clustering, media participation, and user engagement. Product changes became a discussion about membership value. Product-quality complaints became a discussion about brand trust. In both cases, Zhisou AI helped move the controversies from scattered consumer reactions to more organized public issues.

The findings also show a shift from editorial gatekeeping to algorithmic gatekeeping [10]. Traditional media gatekeeping is carried out by identifiable editors, journalists, and institutions. Algorithmic gatekeeping is less visible. Users can see a hot search ranking or an AI-generated explanation, but they usually cannot see the full decision-making process behind it. This creates a challenge for accountability.

Lippmann's concept of the pseudo-environment helps explain why Zhisou AI matters [7]. Users do not encounter the full complexity of the Sam's Club controversies directly. They encounter a structured version of the issue: a topic title, a ranking, a summary, a list of causes, public reactions, and related media information. This structured version becomes the basis on which many users form opinions.

The study also challenges the idea of algorithmic neutrality. Algorithms may appear objective because they are based on data and computation. Yet their outputs are shaped by design choices, training data, platform goals, and engagement incentives. If a system is optimized to identify and circulate high-engagement content, emotionally intense topics are likely to receive more attention. The study identifies three ethical risks. The first is transparency. Users often do not know why a topic is recommended, why a summary is written in a particular way, or which sources are prioritized. The second is bias. Bias can appear not only as discrimination but also as a structural preference for content that is emotional, controversial, or easy to circulate. The third is information integrity. Complex events may be compressed into short and emotionally powerful narratives.

These risks do not mean that Zhisou AI is harmful by nature. AI summaries can help users understand complicated events more quickly. The problem is that efficiency alone is not enough. When AI systems help shape public attention, they also need clearer disclosure, better source transparency, and stronger accountability [11].

7 LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. First, the platform data were collected from public-facing Zhisou event pages rather than Weibo's internal database. Therefore, the analysis can examine visible platform outcomes, but it cannot directly observe Zhisou AI's internal ranking logic.

Second, the study focuses on two Sam's Club cases. These cases are useful because they are specific, comparable, and data-rich, but they cannot represent all forms of algorithmic agenda-setting on Weibo. Political controversies, public health issues, entertainment scandals, or crisis events may follow different patterns.

Third, the survey sample was exploratory and non-random. The results offer useful insight into active social media users' perceptions, but they should not be generalized to all Chinese social media users. Finally, the trend data should be read as an approximate record of event movement rather than a complete backend time-series dataset. Future research would benefit from platform-level data access, computational content analysis, and cross-platform comparison.

8 CONCLUSION

This study examined Weibo's Zhisou AI through two Sam's Club China hot search cases: "#Sam's Club is becoming more and more like Walmart#" and "#Sam's Club responds to questions about declining product quality#." The analysis shows that Zhisou AI did not simply provide background information about these controversies. It helped define the issues, organize causes, summarize consumer reactions, and make the topics visible through platform metrics and rankings.

The two cases reveal different forms of algorithmic visibility. The "more like Walmart" case reached a stronger peak ranking and showed broader cumulative diffusion. The product-quality case generated stronger immediate engagement and stayed on the hot search list for a longer period. Together, they show that algorithmic agenda-setting cannot be understood through one metric alone. Ranking, duration, reading volume, interaction, media participation, and AI framing all matter.

The study makes three main arguments. First, AI-curated systems are becoming agenda-setting actors in platform media environments. They influence not only what users see but also how public issues are organized and interpreted. Second, algorithmic neutrality is limited. Zhisou AI's summaries and visibility indicators are shaped by platform design, engagement logic, and the social meanings attached to consumer controversies. Third, the ethical challenges of AI-driven media systems are not abstract. They appear in ordinary public events, including consumer disputes, brand crises, and hot search debates.

At the same time, this paper does not argue that AI tools should be rejected. Zhisou AI can help users process information more efficiently and follow complex topics more easily. The key issue is governance. If AI systems are increasingly involved in public agenda formation, they need clearer transparency standards, stronger accountability mechanisms, and more attention to information integrity.

Future research should compare Zhisou AI with other platform-based AI systems, examine different types of public issues, and study how users interpret AI-generated summaries over time. Future work should also ask how platforms can balance efficiency with fairness, personalization with diversity, and engagement with public responsibility.

In conclusion, the Sam's Club cases show that algorithmic agenda-setting has become part of everyday platform communication. Zhisou AI does not simply reflect public attention; it helps organize attention through summaries, rankings, engagement metrics, and topic structures. Rather than framing this mainly as an ideological issue, this study understands it as a question of platform visibility and algorithmic governance. The key question is how such systems can become more transparent, accountable, and responsible when they participate in the formation of public attention.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

[1] Abed N, Farrokhi N. The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Media Communications. AI and Tech in Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2025, 3(1): 159-167. DOI: 10.61838/kman.aitech.3.1.15.

[2] Sovianti R, Novrian N. Communication in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Its Impact on Human-Technology Interaction. Journal of Dialogos, 2024, 1(4): 10-18. DOI: 10.62872/hn108y85.

[3] Saheb T, Sidaoui M, Schmarzo B. Convergence of artificial intelligence with social media: A bibliometric & qualitative analysis. Telematics and Informatics Reports, 2024, 14: 100146. DOI: 10.1016/j.teler.2024.100146.

[4] Krajcovic P. Media ecosystems in the digital age: algorithmic environments and user perception. Media Studies Journal, 2024, 18(1): 33-49.

[5] UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. UNESCO, 2021. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455.

[6] McCombs M E, Shaw D L. The agenda-setting function of mass media. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 36(2): 176-187. DOI: 10.1086/267990.

[7] Lippmann W. Public opinion. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.

[8] McLuhan M. Understanding media: the extensions of man. McGraw-Hill, 1964.

[9] Yin R K. Case study research: design and methods. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014.

[10] Gillespie T. Custodians of the internet: platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media. Yale University Press, 2018.

[11] Weibo Corporation. Weibo publishes 2024 environmental, social and governance report. PR Newswire, 2025, 04. http://ir.weibo.com/news-releases/news-release-details/weibo-publishes-2024-environmental-social-and-governance-report.