Emotional Framing in the Naming of Weibo Hot Search Topics

Chen Yu[1]*

[1] Heilongjiang University, China
* Correspondence: Heilongjiang University, China.

https://doi.org/10.53104/res.media.commun.2026.06003

Citation: Chen, Yu. "Emotional Framing in the Naming of Weibo Hot Search Topics." *Research in Media and Communication*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2026, pp. 30–44.

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract: Weibo hot search topic names often serve as the first point of contact between users and public events. These names do more than identify what happened. Through word choice, sentence structure, and the selection of details, they can guide users toward anger, sympathy, fear, blame, or moral judgment. This paper examines the naming logic of Weibo hot search topics and focuses on several common forms of emotional framing, including conflict-oriented naming, moralized naming, and sympathy-oriented naming. It also discusses how these forms affect early judgment, remove context, strengthen group emotion, and create lasting labels for the people involved. The paper argues that emotional expression is not always improper, but it becomes problematic when emotion replaces facts, hides uncertainty, or assigns responsibility too early. Hot search topic names should keep the main action, source, time, and level of certainty clear. Stronger editorial review and timely correction are also needed when the wording may mislead users or cause harm.

Keywords: Weibo hot search; topic naming; emotional framing

1. Introduction

Weibo hot search topics have become a common entry point for people to learn about public events. Many users notice the topic name before they read a news report, watch a video, or check the original source. A short phrase on the ranking list may decide whether they open the topic and how they understand it. For this reason, the naming of a hot search topic is not a simple act of shortening information. It is also a process of selecting facts, arranging emphasis, and setting the tone of discussion(Entman 52).

A hot search topic name usually contains only a few words. It cannot include the full background, the source of the information, or every change in the event. The person who creates the name must choose which detail to keep. This may be a conflict, an unusual action, a painful experience, a strong response, or an unexpected result. The selected detail often becomes the main label of the event. Other facts may receive less attention because they do not appear in the topic name.

Emotional wording is often used to make a topic more visible. Words that suggest anger, fear, sympathy, surprise, regret, or blame can quickly attract users. A neutral statement may only explain

what happened, while an emotional statement can create an immediate feeling. This feeling may appear before the user knows whether the information is complete or reliable. Topic names such as "a heartbreaking scene," "an angry response," or "a shocking act" do not only report an event. They also tell users how the event may be felt and judged.

Emotional framing does not always depend on clear emotional adjectives. It may also appear through the choice of verbs, sentence structure, or selected details. A topic name that stresses "refusal," "exposure," "confrontation," or "collapse" may create a sense of conflict or danger. A question may create suspense even when the answer is already known. A personal detail may turn a general issue into a story of suffering. These choices make the topic easier to notice, but they can also narrow the way users understand it.

The influence of a topic name can continue after users enter the topic page. People often read later information through the impression created by the title. A conflict-oriented name may lead them to search for the person at fault. A sympathy-oriented name may lead them to support one side without checking other accounts. A moralized name may turn an unclear dispute into a simple question of right and wrong. Comments and reposts then repeat the same emotional language, which gives the original framing greater force.

This issue is closely linked to the position of hot search topics in public communication. The ranking list brings together news reports, personal posts, entertainment events, social disputes, and public emergencies. These topics differ greatly in seriousness and reliability, but they are often presented in the same short form. When emotional naming is used in cases involving accidents, legal disputes, personal reputation, or incomplete evidence, the effects may go beyond attracting attention. It may influence public judgment, increase pressure on the people involved, and make later correction more difficult.

This paper examines emotional framing in the naming of Weibo hot search topics. It focuses on the naming logic behind short topic labels, the common forms of emotional expression, and the effects of these names on public understanding. It also discusses the limits of emotional wording and the need to keep factual information, uncertainty, and source context visible in topic naming.

2. The Naming Logic of Weibo Hot Search Topics

2.1 Information Compression

A Weibo hot search topic name must present an event in a very limited space. It usually cannot explain the full background or show every part of the event. The name needs to be short enough to fit the ranking list and clear enough to be understood at a glance. This basic limit makes information selection unavoidable.

An event may involve several people, a long period of time, different accounts, and unclear responsibility. The topic name can only keep a small part of this information. The chosen part is often the most unusual action, the strongest statement, or the most visible result. A long dispute may be reduced to one person's angry reply. A social issue may be presented through a single personal experience. An event that is still being investigated may be named through an early claim. The selected detail then becomes the main way users identify the event.

This form of compression is not the same as neutral shortening. Shortening only reduces the number of words, while compression also changes the order and weight of information. A detail placed in the topic name gains more importance. Facts left outside the name become less visible. Users may enter the topic with the belief that the selected detail is the central fact, even when it is only one part of a larger event.

The choice of subject also affects the meaning of a topic name. A name may focus on a person, an institution, an action, or a result. These choices create different impressions. A person-centred name may turn a public issue into an individual story. An action-centred name may make one moment appear more important than the events before and after it. A result-centred name may hide the process that

produced the result. The event itself has not changed, but its public image changes through the selected focus.

Verbs play a strong role in this process. Words such as "claims," "questions," "refuses," "admits," "exposes," and "responds" carry different levels of force. "Responds" suggests that a dispute already exists. "Exposes" suggests that hidden wrongdoing has been found. "Admits" may imply guilt even when the person has only confirmed a small fact. A single verb can give a topic a direction that a longer and more careful description might not support.

Time is often removed from hot search topic names. Users may not know whether an event happened that day, several months earlier, or over a long period. This can make old information appear new or make separate events appear closely connected. Changes in the event may also disappear. A topic name based on an early report can remain in use after later facts have altered the situation.

Sources are also difficult to show in a short name. A personal post, a media report, an official statement, and an anonymous claim may appear in a similar form on the ranking list. The topic name may not tell users where the information came from or how reliable it is. A claim can then look like a confirmed fact. When the source is missing, users may judge the content by the strength of the wording rather than by the quality of the evidence.

Uncertainty is another part of information that is easily removed. Events involving disputes, accidents, legal questions, or personal accusations often contain facts that have not yet been checked. Careful reporting may use words such as "alleged," "reported," or "under investigation." These words make a title longer and less direct, so they may be left out of a hot search name. The result is a cleaner phrase, but it may give more certainty than the available information allows.

A hot search name is often repeated in posts, comments, screenshots, and news titles. After repeated use, the compressed phrase may replace the full event in public discussion. Users no longer need to explain what happened. They only need to repeat the topic label. This makes discussion faster, but it also keeps attention on the detail chosen at the naming stage.

2.2 Attention and Traffic

Hot search topics appear together on a ranking list. Each topic competes with many other topics for a user's attention. Users often scan the list quickly and choose only a few items to open. A topic name must be understood in a short time, but it must also appear interesting enough to deserve a click. This setting gives emotional language a clear advantage.

Neutral wording may describe an event accurately without creating a strong response. Emotional wording adds tension, surprise, sympathy, anger, or fear (Berger and Milkman). A simple report that a person made a statement may receive limited attention. A name that describes the statement as an "angry response" or a "tearful reply" gives users an emotional reason to open the topic. The event is no longer presented only as information. It is presented as a feeling that users can share.

Conflict is useful for attracting attention because it creates a clear relationship between different sides. Words such as "argues," "criticises," "refuses," and "hits back" suggest action and opposition. They give the topic a simple story: someone has acted, another person has reacted, and a dispute is taking place. This structure is easy to follow and easy to discuss. It may be used even when the original event contains no direct confrontation.

Surprise also increases the appeal of a topic name. Words such as "unexpectedly," "suddenly," and "rarely seen" tell users that the event is outside ordinary experience. The user is encouraged to open the topic to find out what made it unusual. In some cases, the surprising element is real. In other cases, the wording creates a stronger sense of novelty than the event itself supports.

Stories of suffering and loss can attract attention through sympathy. A name may highlight age, family status, illness, financial difficulty, or personal pain. These details make an event easier to feel and may bring needed attention to people in difficulty. Yet they can also reduce a wider issue to a sad personal story. Users may remember the emotional

detail while missing the social conditions or institutional problems connected to it.

Controversy has similar value in the competition for clicks. A topic name that suggests disagreement invites users to enter the discussion and express a view. Questions such as "Is this reasonable?" or "Who should be responsible?" turn the topic into an open judgment. The user is not only invited to read but also to take part. This can increase comments and reposts, which may give the topic more visibility.

The need for attention can affect which facts are placed in the name. An ordinary but important fact may be removed, while a minor emotional detail is kept. A careful statement may be shortened into its strongest sentence. A long explanation may be represented by one dramatic reaction. The selected wording may still be connected to the event, but it does not always show the event in a fair proportion.

Traffic pressure can also encourage similar naming patterns. When certain words or structures attract clicks, they are more likely to be used again. Phrases built around exposure, response, anger, tears, reversal, or shock become familiar. Users quickly understand what kind of reaction the name is trying to create. The repeated pattern makes hot search topics easy to recognise, but it can make different events look emotionally similar.

This naming logic creates a conflict between clear information and emotional appeal. A name that keeps every condition and source may be accurate but difficult to read. A short and forceful name may gain attention but remove facts that limit its meaning. The problem does not come from all emotional expression. It appears when the need for clicks begins to decide which facts are kept, which facts are removed, and how strongly the event is presented.

3. Main Forms of Emotional Framing

3.1 Conflict-Oriented Naming

Conflict-oriented naming presents an event through dispute, opposition, accusation, or refusal. This type of topic name often places two people, groups, or views in a direct conflict. Common verbs include "questions," "criticises," "refuses," "accuses," "responds," and "hits back." These words make the relationship between the people involved appear tense, even when the original event contains only a difference of opinion.

Conflict gives a topic a clear structure. Users can quickly identify who acted, who responded, and which sides are involved. A complex event is changed into a simple story of action and reaction. This makes the topic easy to understand, but it may remove the background that explains why the disagreement happened. Long-term problems, unclear duties, and earlier communication may disappear from the topic name.

The word "response" is often used in hot search naming. It seems neutral, but it can create the sense that a public dispute is taking place. A person may only be giving an explanation or correcting a detail. When this action is named as a "response," users may assume that the person is under pressure or answering an accusation. If the name uses "hits back," the tone becomes even stronger. It suggests that the person is fighting against another side rather than offering information.

The same effect appears in names built around refusal. A topic name may say that a person "refused to apologise," "refused to accept," or "refused to respond." The word "refused" suggests a clear and active rejection. The actual situation may be less certain. The person may not have received the request, may still be checking the facts, or may have chosen not to comment at that time. These conditions are difficult to show in a short name. The refusal then becomes the main fact, and the person may be viewed as cold, unreasonable, or guilty.

Conflict-oriented naming may also create opposition where the parties are not directly arguing with each other. Two separate statements can be placed together as if one is answering the other. Different views made at different times can be turned into a public debate. The topic name may connect them through words such as "versus," "responds to," or "questions." This arrangement gives users a clear conflict to follow, but the

connection may come mainly from the way the topic is named.

Some names use direct quotations to increase tension. A short sentence taken from a longer statement may sound sharp when it is separated from its original setting. A careful explanation can contain one sentence that expresses dissatisfaction or doubt. If this sentence is used as the topic name, it may make the whole statement appear angry. The quotation may be accurate at the word level while giving a different impression from the full message.

Conflict naming often encourages users to choose a side. The topic is presented as a disagreement between clear positions, so comments may quickly become expressions of support or blame. Users may ask who is right before asking what happened. They may repeat the language used in the name, which keeps the discussion inside the same conflict structure.

This type of naming can be useful when a real and important conflict exists. Public disputes, policy debates, and differences in responsibility may need to be shown clearly. The problem appears when conflict is made stronger than the available facts. A minor disagreement may be turned into a serious confrontation. A request for information may be presented as an accusation. A normal explanation may become a public "battle."

Conflict framing also affects the treatment of later information. Once an event is known through a topic name that sets up two sides, new facts are often placed into the same structure. An explanation from either side may be read as self-defence. A correction may be viewed as retreat. Silence may be treated as guilt. The original naming makes it harder for users to see the event outside the idea of opposition.

3.2 Moralized Naming

Moralized naming presents an event through ideas of right and wrong, kindness and cruelty, honesty and deception, or responsibility and failure. The judgment may be stated directly through strong adjectives. It may also be hidden in the choice of verbs, labels, or selected details. Users are not only told what happened. They are given a moral position from which to view the event.

Some topic names use clear labels such as "heartless," "shameless," "irresponsible," or "warm-hearted." These words reduce the need for users to make their own judgment. The moral meaning is already included in the name. A person described as "heartless" is placed in a negative role before the details are known. A person described as "kind" or "brave" is placed in a positive role that may make later criticism difficult.

Moral judgment can also appear without direct adjectives. Verbs such as "abandons," "deceives," "ignores," "protects," and "saves" carry clear values. They suggest not only an action but also the character of the person who performed it. For example, "left" and "abandoned" may refer to a similar physical action, but "abandoned" suggests a failure of care and duty. "Did not reply" reports a lack of response, while "ignored" suggests that the person made a deliberate and uncaring choice.

Labels related to social roles can add another layer of moral meaning. A topic name may stress that the person involved is a parent, teacher, doctor, employee, customer, or public figure. These roles carry expected duties. When the role appears next to a disputed action, users may judge the event through those expectations. A mistake made by "a person" and the same mistake made by "a teacher" may produce different reactions, even when the facts are unchanged.

Family relations are often used in this way. A topic name may identify someone as a mother, father, daughter, husband, or wife rather than using a neutral description. The family role makes the event easier to understand in moral terms. Users may compare the person's conduct with common ideas about care, loyalty, sacrifice, or responsibility. The event can then move away from its legal or factual questions and become a test of personal character.

Moralized names often simplify unclear responsibility. Many public events involve several causes, weak communication, unclear rules, or mistakes made by more than one side. A short topic name may select one person as the moral centre of

the event. This person becomes the one who failed, harmed, protected, or helped. Structural or institutional causes receive less attention because they are harder to express through moral language.

The naming of an event as an act of "deception" is a clear example. Deception requires intention, but intention is often difficult to confirm from early information. A false statement may come from error, confusion, incomplete knowledge, or deliberate lying. When the topic name uses "deceives" or "lies," the issue appears settled. Users may then discuss punishment or blame rather than asking whether intent has been shown.

The same risk appears in names that describe an action as "deserved" or "unacceptable." These words close the space for uncertainty. They suggest that the event has a clear moral answer. Users who disagree may be treated as supporting wrongdoing rather than questioning the available facts. Discussion becomes a test of values instead of an examination of evidence.

Moral framing can spread quickly because it gives users a simple way to express identity. Supporting a topic may allow them to show that they care about fairness, kindness, safety, or responsibility. Condemning a person may become a public sign of moral concern. The comment section can fill with repeated statements of anger or support, even when few users have read the full information.

Positive moral framing can also limit understanding. A person presented as a hero may receive support that leaves little room for questions about motive or accuracy. A moving act may be praised without attention to the conditions that made the act necessary. Personal kindness can take the place of discussion about weak rules or public duties. The emotional value of the story becomes stronger than its wider meaning.

Moral language is not always improper. Some actions clearly involve harm, neglect, or public responsibility. Topic names do not need to remove all judgment. Yet judgment should match the strength of the evidence. When facts are still changing, a moral label can fix the public image of a person before responsibility is clear.

3.3 Sympathy-Oriented Naming

Sympathy-oriented naming draws attention to pain, loss, weakness, illness, age, family difficulty, or personal hardship. It presents an event through the experience of a person who appears to need care or support. This form of naming can make distant issues feel close. It can also direct attention toward people whose problems might otherwise be ignored.

Personal details are central to sympathy framing. A topic name may include a person's age, health condition, family role, income, or living situation. These details help users form an emotional connection. A general labour dispute may be presented through an employee who supports a family. A public service problem may be shown through an older person who cannot complete a process. A medical issue may be named through the suffering of a child or parent.

Age is a common emotional signal. Words such as "elderly person," "young child," or "teenage student" create a sense of weakness and need for protection. The same event may receive different reactions depending on the age included in the name. Users may pay more attention because they believe the person had less power or ability to protect themselves.

Family identity also strengthens sympathy. A person may be described as a single parent, a child caring for relatives, or a family member facing loss. These descriptions make the event more personal. They place the individual inside a relationship of care and duty. Users may feel that the harm affects not only one person but also a whole family.

Topic names about illness or injury often use emotional details to show the seriousness of an event. References to tears, pain, long treatment, or physical weakness can increase concern. These details may be important, but they can also dominate the topic. Questions about medical facts, responsibility, or access to services may receive less attention than the visible suffering of the person involved.

Sympathy-oriented naming often depends on selected images or moments. A person crying,

waiting alone, holding a family member, or describing a difficult experience can become the central part of the topic name. This moment may be genuine, but it does not show the full event. The public may understand the person mainly through that emotional scene.

The use of words such as "helpless," "heartbreaking," "pitiful," or "in tears" gives the topic a clear emotional direction. These expressions tell users that sympathy is the expected response. They may also place the person in a fixed role as a victim. Once this image is formed, later information that shows greater complexity may be difficult to accept.

A victim image can remove personal agency. The person involved may have views, choices, or demands that go beyond suffering. Yet the topic name may focus only on pain. Users may speak for the person, defend the person, or turn the person into a symbol without paying attention to what they actually said. Public concern then becomes centred on an imagined victim rather than the full individual.

Sympathy framing may also hide wider causes. A difficult personal story can make a social problem visible, but it can also keep attention at the level of one case (Gross). Users may offer donations, comfort, or blame toward a single actor. Rules, working conditions, public services, and long-term causes may not enter the discussion. The event is treated as a sad exception rather than part of a larger problem.

The emotional focus can affect how responsibility is judged. When one person is presented as weak or suffering, the other side may be placed in a negative position even before its role is clear. The contrast between a visible victim and a less visible institution or individual can produce quick blame. The strength of sympathy may take the place of evidence.

Some people may also face unwanted exposure. Personal illness, family loss, financial difficulty, and private pain can become public labels through the topic name. Even when the attention is supportive, the person may lose control over how their experience is presented. Their identity may remain connected to the painful event after public interest has moved on.

Sympathy can bring real support and give public attention to ignored problems. Its value depends on how the person and the event are presented. A topic name that shows suffering without hiding facts can help users understand the human cost of an issue. A name that uses pain only to attract clicks may reduce a complex person to a short emotional image.

4. Effects on Public Understanding

4.1 Early Emotional Judgment

A hot search topic name is often the first part of an event that users see. Some users may only read the name on the ranking list. Others may open the topic but still use the name as the main guide for understanding the content. When the wording already carries anger, sympathy, fear, or blame, an emotional judgment can form before the user checks the facts.

The first impression matters because it gives the event a basic meaning. A name that stresses conflict may lead users to expect a dispute. A name that stresses suffering may lead them to look for a victim. A name that uses moral language may encourage them to decide who is right and who is wrong. Later information is often read inside this early frame (Scheufele).

Users do not always examine every post on a topic page. They may read a few popular posts, look at screenshots, or scan the most liked comments. If these materials repeat the wording of the topic name, the first impression becomes stronger. The name appears to be confirmed, even when the later posts do not provide new evidence.

Early emotional judgment can also affect which information users trust. Information that supports the first impression may feel clear and believable. Information that challenges it may appear weak, late, or defensive. For example, when a topic name suggests that a person acted without care, later explanations may be treated as excuses. When the name presents someone as a victim, facts that show

a more complex situation may be viewed as an attack on that person.

This process does not require users to make a careful decision. It may happen through quick reading. Hot search lists are often viewed during short breaks or while users are moving between other content. Under these conditions, people may rely on familiar words and simple emotional signals. A short label offers an easy way to understand the event without spending much time on it.

The emotional direction of a name can also shape the questions that users ask. They may ask why a person was so cruel rather than whether the act happened as described. They may ask how the victim should be helped rather than whether the available account is complete. The wording does not directly stop users from checking the facts, but it makes some questions feel more natural than others.

The timing of the judgment can create further problems. Many hot search topics appear when an event is still unclear. Early reports may come from one party, a short video, or an incomplete statement. If the topic name gives these materials a strong emotional meaning, the public may reach a conclusion before more reliable information is available. Later corrections then enter a discussion that already has a clear emotional position.

A correction usually receives less attention than the original topic. It may use careful and neutral wording, while the earlier name was short and forceful. Users who remember the first name may not notice the update. Others may see it but continue to rely on the first impression because it has already become familiar.

4.2 Loss of Context

A hot search topic name cannot contain the full context of an event. The problem becomes more serious when emotional details take up most of the limited space. Causes, conditions, sources, and changes may be removed, while a striking action or statement remains. Users then judge the event through a small part of the available information.

Context includes what happened before the selected moment. A short video may show an argument but not the events that led to it. A quotation may record an angry sentence but leave out the earlier question or later explanation. A photograph may show visible suffering without explaining its cause. When the topic name is built around this single moment, the event may appear simpler than it is.

Time is another important part of context. Separate actions may happen days or months apart, but a short topic name can make them appear connected. An old statement may return to the hot search list after a new event. Users who do not notice the date may treat it as a current response. This can create a false sense of direct conflict or immediate cause.

The source of information may also disappear. A personal claim, an anonymous post, a media report, and a confirmed notice do not have the same level of reliability. Yet they may look similar when reduced to a short topic name. If the name does not show that the information is only an allegation, users may treat it as an established fact.

Emotional wording can hide uncertainty. Terms such as “may,” “reportedly,” and “according to one account” limit the strength of a statement. They show that the facts are not yet complete. These terms are often removed because they make a name longer and less forceful. The remaining phrase sounds clear, but its certainty may not match the evidence.

Context loss can also separate personal conduct from wider conditions. An event involving work pressure, weak rules, poor public services, or unclear duties may be named through one person’s mistake. Attention then stays on personal character. Users may blame or defend that person without discussing the conditions that shaped the event.

A similar problem occurs when a social issue is reduced to one emotional story. A painful case can help users understand the human effect of a problem. Yet the same case may also narrow the discussion. People may focus on donations, apology, or punishment while giving little attention to the rule, service, or institution connected to the event.

The selected detail may not be false. It may be a real part of the event. The loss appears in the relation between that detail and the whole case. A true

sentence can still mislead when it is separated from the facts needed to understand it. The shorter and more emotional the label is, the easier it becomes for one detail to stand in place of the full event.

4.3 Group Emotion and Rapid Spread

Emotional topic names give users a simple language for taking part in public discussion. A user does not need to explain the full event. They can repeat a word from the topic name, add a short judgment, or share the topic with an emotional reaction. This lowers the effort needed for commenting and reposting.

When many users repeat the same words, individual reactions begin to look like a shared public feeling (Papacharissi). Anger may appear to be the normal response to a topic. Sympathy may become the expected position. Ridicule may spread because users see that similar jokes receive approval. People who have not formed a clear opinion may follow the tone already visible on the page.

Highly liked comments have a strong role in this process. They often appear near the top of the discussion and give users an early sense of how others are reacting. If these comments use the emotional direction of the topic name, they strengthen the same frame. Later users may copy their language or adjust their views to match the dominant tone.

Reposting also changes the reach of emotional wording. A topic name can move beyond the original hot search page through screenshots, short posts, videos, and group chats. In these forms, the original source may disappear. The emotional label remains because it is short and easy to remember. Users who encounter the event through a repost may only see the name and a short comment.

Anger spreads easily when the name identifies a clear target (Fan et al.). Users can direct blame toward a person, company, school, hospital, or other group. Repeated accusations may become stronger than the original wording. A topic that begins with criticism can develop into calls for punishment, personal attacks, or searches for private information.

Sympathy can also grow through repetition. Users may share personal stories, offer help, or express support. These actions can have real value. Yet repeated sympathy may create pressure to accept one account without question. Requests for evidence may be treated as cold or harmful, even when the facts remain unclear.

Fear and alarm can spread when a topic name suggests danger. Users may pass on warnings before checking whether the event is common, current, or correctly described. The topic may create the sense that a risk is close and widespread. Corrections often move more slowly because they lack the same emotional force.

Ridicule uses a different tone but follows a similar pattern. A person's action, appearance, or statement may be reduced to a joke. The joke is repeated because it is easy to copy and brings social approval. The person involved can lose control over how the event is understood. Serious facts may receive little attention once the topic becomes a source of entertainment.

Group emotion can make the discussion look active while reducing factual examination. Large numbers of comments do not always mean that users have read more information. Many comments may repeat the same judgment in different words. The topic receives greater visibility, but the range of views may become narrower.

Users who question the dominant emotion may face pressure. A request for more facts can be read as support for the accused side. A different interpretation may be treated as a lack of sympathy. Some users may remain silent to avoid conflict. The visible discussion then appears more united than the actual views of users.

4.4 Fixed Labels and Personal Pressure

A hot search topic name can become a lasting label for the people involved. The name may connect a person with one action, statement, accusation, or emotional image. Even after the event leaves the ranking list, the phrase may remain in search results, screenshots, reposts, and later discussions.

The label often removes parts of the person's identity that do not fit the event. A person may be known only as the employee who refused, the parent who failed, the customer who became angry, or the public figure who was accused. The event becomes the main way others describe them. This can happen even when the original information was incomplete.

Emotional labels are difficult to change because they are easy to remember. A careful correction may contain several facts and conditions. The original name may contain only a person, an action, and a strong emotional word. Users are more likely to remember the shorter phrase. The correction may change the record, but it does not always change public memory.

Search functions can keep the label visible. When users search for the person's name, the hot search phrase or related posts may appear. New content may repeat the old wording because it is already familiar. The label can return whenever the person becomes involved in another event.

Personal pressure may begin while the topic is still active. Users may leave large numbers of comments on the person's account. They may contact the person's workplace, school, relatives, or friends. Some may search for private information or share details that have no clear link to the public issue. The emotional tone of the topic can make these actions appear justified.

People connected to the event may also be affected. Family members, colleagues, and organisations can receive messages or public criticism even when they had no role in what happened. A topic name that identifies a group rather than an individual may direct blame toward all members of that group.

Reputation damage can continue after the facts change. A person who is cleared of an accusation may still be linked to the earlier label. Users may remember that the person "was involved in" a scandal without remembering the later result. The difference between being accused and being responsible becomes unclear over time.

The pressure is not limited to negative labels. A person presented as a victim or hero may also lose control over their identity. Users may expect the person to continue acting in line with that image. A victim who later speaks in a way that users dislike may lose public sympathy. A person praised for one act may face strong criticism when later conduct does not match the earlier image.

Public attention can affect a person's ability to speak. Any explanation may be read through the existing label. Silence can be treated as guilt. A detailed statement can be called an excuse. An emotional statement can be described as manipulation. The person may have no form of response that is accepted by the dominant discussion.

The effects can reach work, study, family life, and mental well-being. A short topic name may remain online long after users have moved to another subject. For the person named in it, the event may continue through search results, messages, lost opportunities, and repeated public attention.

5. Boundaries and Regulation of Emotional Naming

5.1 Keeping Facts at the Centre

A hot search topic name needs to be short, but it should still show the main facts of the event. Users should be able to identify who or what is involved, what happened, and which part of the event has been confirmed. Emotional words should not take the place of this basic information.

Some topic names give more space to feelings than to facts. A name may describe an event as shocking, heartbreaking, or outrageous without clearly stating what happened. Such wording can attract attention, but users may enter the topic with a strong reaction and little factual knowledge. The emotional effect comes before the event itself.

A clearer name should include the main action. For example, a topic about a public statement should show who made the statement and what issue it concerned. A topic about an accident should show the place, time, or basic result when these details are known. A topic about a dispute should identify the

disputed matter instead of using only words such as "angry response" or "major conflict."

The selected fact should also reflect the real weight of the event. A minor detail should not be placed at the centre only because it sounds dramatic. An emotional reaction may be part of the event, but it may not be the most important part. If a long statement includes one angry sentence, the topic name should not make that sentence stand for the full statement unless it carries clear public meaning.

The topic name should avoid giving more certainty than the source allows. Words such as "may," "alleged," "reported," and "under investigation" are not empty additions. They show the current state of the information. Removing them can change an unconfirmed claim into a factual statement.

This point is especially important when a topic concerns personal conduct, legal responsibility, public safety, or professional duties. A name such as "person causes accident" states a clear causal relation. If the cause has not been confirmed, the wording may create blame before the investigation is complete. A more careful name can state that the person was involved or that the event is being examined.

Important conditions should remain visible when they change the meaning of an action. A person who did not respond within one hour is different from a person who refused to respond for several weeks. An organisation that ended a service under a written rule is different from one that stopped it without notice. If these conditions are removed, the action may appear more serious or less reasonable than it was.

Numbers also need context. A topic name may use a large figure to create shock, but the figure may refer to a total amount, an estimate, or a long period. Users should not be led to believe that the number has a different meaning. When a number is central to the topic, its unit and basic condition should be clear.

Quotations should be used with similar care. A direct quotation can make a topic easy to notice, but a short sentence may not reflect the speaker's full meaning. Words taken from a longer answer should not be presented as a complete position when the surrounding explanation changes their meaning. A quotation that depends on irony, humour, or a specific question may be especially easy to misunderstand.

Keeping facts at the centre does not require every topic name to sound flat. Some events have a clear emotional meaning. Public loss, serious harm, or an act of help may reasonably be described in human terms. The wording should still allow users to know what happened before it tells them how to feel.

5.2 Reducing Premature Judgment

Hot search topic names should not decide responsibility before the facts are clear. Words that assign blame or define a person's moral character can turn an early report into a public judgment. Once such a label appears on the ranking list, it may shape comments and reposts before the person involved has had a chance to explain.

Some verbs contain a direct judgment. "Lied," "cheated," "abandoned," and "ignored" suggest intention. Intention is often harder to confirm than the action itself. A person may provide incorrect information without knowing it is false. Someone may fail to reply because of delay, confusion, or lack of access. A topic name should not describe these acts as deliberate unless there is enough evidence.

The same care is needed when identifying a victim. A person who reports harm may need protection and public attention, but the report may still be under review. Calling one side "the victim" can place the other side in the role of offender. More neutral wording can describe the claim without denying the person's experience.

Moral labels should be limited when they do not add factual value. Words such as "heartless," "selfish," "brave," and "kind" give users a ready-made judgment. They reduce a complex event to a personal quality. The discussion may then focus on whether the person is good or bad rather than on what happened and what responsibility applies.

Questions can also carry judgment. A topic name such as "How can anyone do this?" appears to ask a question, but it already defines the action as

unacceptable. "Who should be blamed?" assumes that blame is the main issue. Questions of this kind may look open while directing users toward a fixed response.

The placement of names and roles can have a similar effect. When a person's job, family role, or social identity is placed next to a disputed act, users may judge the act through expectations linked to that role. A topic that names someone as a teacher, doctor, parent, or employee may create stronger blame than a neutral description. The role should be included only when it helps explain the event.

Topic names should also avoid creating a simple opposition between two sides when the event involves several causes. A dispute may involve unclear rules, poor communication, earlier decisions, and actions by several people. Naming one side as the person who "caused" the problem may hide this complexity.

A cautious name does not mean that all parties must be treated as equally credible. Some events have strong evidence, and public responsibility may be clear. The level of judgment in the name should match the level of confirmation. A verified finding can be stated more directly than a personal post or an early claim.

The wording should leave room for later facts. If a topic name is too final, any update may appear to reverse the whole event. This can create a second wave of emotional reaction. Users may shift from attacking one person to attacking another without examining why the early information was incomplete.

Reducing premature judgment also protects public discussion. Users can still express views, but their views are less likely to begin from a label that has already decided the issue. A topic name should open the event for reading rather than close it through blame, praise, or moral certainty.

5.3 Protecting Context and Source Information

The topic page should make the source of the information easy to identify. Users need to know whether the topic comes from an official notice, a media report, a personal statement, a short video, or an anonymous post. These sources do not carry the same weight. When they are presented in the same form, users may treat an unverified claim as confirmed information.

The original source should appear near the top of the page. Users should not need to search through many reposts to find it. The publication time, account name, and type of source should be clear. If the source has edited or removed the original post, that change should also be shown when it affects the topic.

Personal statements need a clear label. A person describing their own experience provides important information, but the account may contain only one side of the event. The topic name and page should not present the statement as a complete finding. Phrases such as "according to the person involved" can keep the source visible without dismissing the claim.

Media reports should also be separated from direct evidence. A report may be based on interviews, documents, or other sources. Users should be able to see whether the report checked the information or only repeated a popular post. The name of a media organisation does not remove the need to show how the claim was supported.

Images and videos need context because they can create strong emotions very quickly. A short clip may not show what happened before or after the recorded moment. A photograph may come from another time or place. A screenshot may leave out earlier messages. The topic page should show the original length, date, and source when these details are available.

A striking sentence should not be removed from the setting in which it was spoken. The meaning of a statement may depend on the question, the speaker's tone, or the lines that followed it. A short quotation can sound harsh, careless, or surprising when it is separated from the full answer. The page should provide access to the complete statement rather than repeat only the selected sentence.

Time order should be clear when an event changes. Users need to know which information came first, which account responded later, and when new

evidence appeared. Without a timeline, an old statement may look like a reply to a new event. Two unrelated actions may appear to be part of the same conflict.

Updates should be linked to the original topic. A new notice should not appear as a separate topic without a clear connection to the earlier name. Users who saw the first topic may not know that the facts have changed. A visible update marker can help them recognise that the earlier information is incomplete.

The topic page should distinguish confirmed facts, disputed claims, and public reactions. These forms of content often appear together. A comment with many likes may be placed near a factual report. A personal guess may circulate beside an official statement. Clear labels can reduce the chance that popularity is mistaken for proof.

Source protection also involves avoiding false balance. When one claim has strong evidence and another has none, the page should not make them appear equal only because both sides have spoken. Keeping context does not mean removing judgment about evidence. It means showing users why one piece of information has more support than another.

Privacy is part of context protection. Personal information should not be added only to make the event more emotional. Details about family, health, address, workplace, or private communication may not be needed to understand the issue. Once these details enter the topic page, they can be copied and spread beyond their original setting.

5.4 Editorial Review and Timely Correction

Not every hot search topic requires the same level of review. Topics involving entertainment updates or public performances usually carry lower risks than topics involving accidents, crimes, legal disputes, health claims, personal accusations, or public safety. High-risk topics need closer checking before the name is placed on the ranking list.

Editors should examine both the facts and the emotional force of the wording (Gillespie). A name may be factually connected to the event but still create a misleading impression. The review should ask whether the chosen verb suggests intention, whether the adjective adds unsupported judgment, and whether a quotation reflects the full statement.

The source should be checked before the topic is named. A popular post is not enough on its own. Editors need to see where the information began, whether the account is direct or second-hand, and whether other reliable sources support it. Screenshots without clear origin should not be treated as firm evidence.

The timing of publication also matters. A topic may gain attention quickly, but early information is often incomplete. Placing a strong name on the ranking list before basic facts are checked can increase later harm. In some cases, a short delay for verification is more responsible than immediate publication.

Review standards should pay special attention to names of private individuals. Public attention can affect their work, family, and reputation. A person's full name, workplace, school, or family role should not be included unless it is needed for the public issue. The fact that personal information is already circulating does not mean that the hot search name should repeat it.

Editors should also check whether a topic name creates conflict through arrangement. Two statements made at different times may be placed together as if they are direct replies. A neutral explanation may be described as a "counterattack." A difference in wording may be turned into a public dispute. The review should compare the name with the original materials rather than judge it only as a short phrase.

When important facts change, the topic name should be corrected. A correction may involve replacing a misleading verb, adding a source label, removing an unsupported claim, or changing the whole name. The earlier wording should not remain active only because it has already attracted traffic.

The correction should be easy to see. A small note hidden at the bottom of the page is not enough when the earlier name appeared on the main ranking list. Users who saw the original topic need a reasonable chance to see the update. The corrected name,

update time, and reason for the change can be shown clearly.

The original wording should not simply disappear without explanation. A visible record can show that the topic was changed and which fact required the correction. This helps users understand why the earlier information was unreliable. It also allows later review of how naming decisions were made.

Correction speed matters, but accuracy still comes before speed. Replacing one uncertain name with another can create more confusion. Editors should check the new information before changing the topic. When the facts remain unclear, the name can be revised to show that uncertainty instead of making another final claim.

Repeated errors should lead to changes in editorial practice. If the same emotional words often produce misleading topics, they should receive closer review. If certain sources repeatedly provide incomplete claims, editors should treat them with more care. Review rules need to respond to actual problems rather than remain as general statements.

Users should also have a clear way to report misleading topic names. Reports about false wording, missing context, privacy harm, or outdated information should be reviewed by staff rather than handled only through automatic systems. The response should focus on the name and source, not only on whether the topic has broken a general platform rule.

6. Conclusion

The naming of Weibo hot search topics is not a neutral process. A short topic name selects certain facts and places them in a visible position. When the selected words contain conflict, sympathy, blame, fear, or moral judgment, they also set an emotional direction for the event. Many users form an early view from this short phrase before they read the source or learn the full background.

Emotional expression is not always a problem. Public events often involve pain, loss, anger, care, or unfair treatment. A completely emotionless name may fail to show the human meaning of an event. Clear emotional wording can help users notice serious harm and understand why an issue matters. Its use becomes questionable when the emotional force is stronger than the facts that support it.

The main risk appears when emotion replaces basic information. A dramatic verb may suggest intention that has not been confirmed. A moral label may decide who is right before responsibility is clear. A story of suffering may turn a complex issue into a simple victim narrative. A conflict-based name may place two sides in direct opposition even when their statements were made in different settings. These choices can shape public judgment without giving users enough information to examine the event.

A reasonable hot search topic name should keep the main action, source, time, and level of certainty visible. Claims should not be written as confirmed facts. Personal roles should not be added only to increase blame or sympathy. Emotional words should match the available evidence. When later information changes the meaning of the event, the topic name should also be corrected in a clear and visible way.

The boundary of emotional framing depends on what the wording asks users to do. A name can draw attention to the human meaning of an event while leaving room for reading and judgment. It crosses that boundary when it pushes users toward anger, sympathy, blame, or support before they know enough about what happened.

References

Berger, Jonah, and Katherine L. Milkman. "What Makes Online Content Viral?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2012, pp. 192–205. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353.

Entman, Robert M. "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 43, no. 4, 1993, pp. 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x.

Fan, Rui, et al. "Anger Is More Influential than Joy: Sentiment Correlation in Weibo." *PLOS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 10, 2014, article e110184. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110184.

Gillespie, Tarleton. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. Yale UP, 2018. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300235029.

Gross, Kimberly. "Framing Persuasive Appeals: Episodic and Thematic Framing, Emotional Response, and Policy Opinion." *Political Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2008, pp. 169–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00622.x.

Papacharissi, Zizi. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford UP, 2015.

Scheufele, Dietram A. "Framing as a Theory of Media Effects." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1999, pp. 103–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Brilliance Publishing Limited and/or the editor(s). Brilliance Publishing Limited and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.