Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

Psychological Warfare in the Digital Age: The Impact of Social Media Manipulation on International Relations and Public Opinion

Asia Rahman Khan Lodhi
Director, PID Islamabad. Email: asia.khan.lodhi@gmail.com

Asmat Ullah Khan
PhD Scholar, IR Department, NDU, Islamabad. asmatkhan092@gmail.com

Madiha Hussain
International Islamic University, Islamabad. madiha.hussain@iiu.edu.pk

Abstract
The revolution in the digital world has altered the mode of communication around the world not just in interpersonal interaction but also in strategic behavior of international politics. The psychological type of warfare, which was previously confined to propaganda advertisements on war time radio and undercover intelligence missions, is now becoming a widespread and ongoing aspect of online geopolitical rivalry. The social media has risen as a strategic tool whereby states and non-state actors control the narratives, enhance misinformation, and influence mass opinions across borders. In this qualitative research paper, the study explores the mechanisms, implications, and geopolitical effects of the social media manipulation as a method of psychological warfare in digital age. Case studies, interpretive qualitative analysis, and discourse analysis of documented influence operations form the basis of the study in order to explore the role of digital platforms as cognitive battlefields. The conclusions of the findings indicate that algorithmic amplification, data exploitation, coordinated inauthentic action, and emotional polarization reshape the international relationships by undermining the trust, disrupting the institutions of democracy, and redefining the projection of power. The argument of the study is that what psychological warfare entails in the twenty-first century is informational and not territorial in nature and requires new regulatory frameworks, cyber diplomacy policy and digital literacy programs. The article adds to recent concerns of the international relations, media studies, and security studies fields by locating the concept of social media manipulation in the context of the larger notions of power, propaganda, and hybrid warfare.
Keywords: Psychological warfare, social media manipulation, international relations, misinformation, qualitative research, digital propaganda, hybrid warfare

1. Introduction
The twenty first century has seen a radical shift in the channel of power exercise and struggle increasingly becoming informational and identity based as opposed to purely receiving material capabilities (Wendt, 1999; Nye, 2004). The digital information world has become the new frontier of the battlefield, as technologies are developed that influence the perceptions, attentions, and senses of people in forming their self sense-making (Postman, 1985; Pariser, 2011). Previously serving the functions of wartime propaganda and intelligence surveying, the

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

psychological warfare is now part of the daily activities of global digital communication networks and platform infrastructures (Hoffman, 2007; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Socially oriented media, e.g., Facebook, Twitter, and TikTok, have become the spheres, in which geopolitical discourse is created, fought, and used in real-time (Bakshy et al., 2015; Lazer et al., 2018).

In contrast to the conservative propaganda tools that used the centralized approaches to broadcasting, the introduction of digital platforms enables decentralized and participatory manipulation and enables the users to become the amplifiers of the instrumentalizing discourses (Postman, 1985; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). With concurrent messaging and attention engineering, individuals, state actors, intelligence agencies, and private organizations are capable of doing all of this at once (Walker and Ludwig, 2017; Lazer et al., 2018). The engagement optimization algorithms work against us by pushing content with high emotional appeal, polarizing views and sensational stories to the top and ensuring a good breeding ground to operate the psychological influence machinery (Tufekci, 2015; Bakshy et al., 2015).

Networked diffusion and low-cost automation has allowed psychological warfare in the digital age to be more massive in scale, fast, and deniable over its historical predecessor (Hoffman, 2007; Lazer et al., 2018). The activities that used to demand a lot of logistical coordination can now be performed by anonymous accounts, automated bots, and AI-enabled content generation and offer more plausible deniability and reach in the functioning of operations (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). The influence campaigns are able to access millions of people in a matter of minutes, choosing not to be confined by national borders and regulatory measures (Lazer et al., 2018; Walker and Ludwig, 2017). Consequently, long-distance political relations turn into the domain of the digital opinion movements instead of being directed primarily at the diplomatic negotiation and military deterrence (Wendt, 1999; Nye, 2004).

This paper is an analysis of the nature of social media manipulation as an example of a psychological warfare and the implications of the concept to international relations and opinion (Wendt, 1999; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). The paper explores the process of creating, amplifying and internalizing stories in digital ecosystems that are governed by algorithmic curation and identity processes using a qualitative interpretive methodology (Postman, 1985; Pariser, 2011; Tajfel and Turner 1979). The research question that will guide the study is as follows: How does social media manipulation play the role of psychological warfare, and what are its effects on the international relations and the formation of the opinion? (Wendt, 1999; Hoffman, 2007).

2. Conceptualizing Psychological Warfare in the Digital Era

2.1 Historical Foundations of Psychological Warfare

Long-known psychological warfare has been considered as a means of command in the military and political arenas, with the aim of manipulating the beliefs, feelings and actions (Hoffman, 2007; Postman, 1985). Freedom of media was used to undermine self-esteem and create good impressions towards the adversary by deploying the use of propaganda leaflets, radio messaging and cinema during the World War II (Postman, 1985). This is an important feature of the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, where broadcast propaganda and cultural diplomacy were vital in the

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

ideological competition between the two countries (Nye, 2004; Postman, 1985). Classical psychological warfare was striving to change feelings, thoughts, and actions of specific groups of people and usually did so by creating a state of confusion, terror, mistrust, or loyalty (Hoffman, 2007). Such were however centrally controlled and was generally state monopolized where the flow of information was mainly unidirectional, that is, between the broadcasters and the audience (Postman, 1985). This order has radically changed with the digital era where the information flows have become also multidirectional, participatory and algorithmically edited in a manner that shapes the attention and meaning (Pariser, 2011; Bakshy et al., 2015). Such a change will require a shift in the definition of psychological warfare, including introduction of digital mechanisms, platform architecture, and identity-based amplification (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Bennett and Livingston, 2018) in it.

2.2 From Soft Power to Sharp Power

The concept of soft power introduced by Joseph Nye focuses on the capacity of any state to do so by employing attraction instead of coercion and working in terms of culture, values, and diplomacy (Nye, 2004). But researchers believe that digital manipulation carries another hew and push which is commonly referred to as a sharp power whereby manipulative and clandestine information infiltration occurs and is alterative instead of appealing (Walker and Ludwig, 2017). In contrast to soft power, sharp power is based on trickery, secrecy, and taking advantage of openness instead of appealing to legitimacy (Walker and Ludwig, 2017; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Social media manipulation can be described as a good example of sharp power since it tends to hide the state role, and it focuses on the division of society and structures of trust (Walker and Ludwig, 2017; Lazer et al., 2018).

2.3 Hybrid Warfare and Information Operations

In modern security circles, it is said that the modern conflict is referred to as hybrid warfare that involves the combination of the old method of warfare and cyber warfare and information warfare (Hoffman, 2007). Psychological warfare is now also engaged in acting side by side with cyberattacks and economic coercion as part of coordinated strategic campaigns (which are now often designed to cause institutional erosion and identity polarization) (Hoffman, 2007; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). The so-called actions of the Internet Research Agency on the 2016 election in the United States provides a clear example of how the integration of digital campaigns might be used to capitalize on the social polarities and destroy the trust in democracy (U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 2019; Jamieson, 2018). Using such operations to perpetrate damage on the trust the population with democratic institutions was also in line with wider trends in the disinformation order (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 2019), even though there was a specific focus on supporting particular political candidates.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study combines three theoretical approaches: constructivism in international relations, the media ecology theory and the social identity theory (Wendt, 1999; Postman, 1985; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Constructivist theory maintains that international politics operates based on shared ideas, identities

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

and stories and not only on material power, and thus informational influence is consequentially strategic (Wendt, 1999). It is in this sphere that digital psychological warfare attacks the meaning, legitimacy and identity limits (Wendt, 1999; Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

According to media ecology theory, the communication technologies influence the perception of humans and social arrangement, which means that the platforms do not exist as the means of neutral conduction but rather as environments that organize thought and cognition (Postman, 1985; Pariser, 2011). In algorithmic design, social media platforms shape the information received by the users and the reality they perceive (Bakshy et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011). The social identity theory believes that people make themselves an in-group and out-group and this results in polarization and hostility in situations where there is a perceived threat or competition (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). By enhancing inhabited content into social media, social media is taking advantage of these identity forces in amplifying the divisive content which strengthens in-group solidarity and intensifies an out-group antagonism (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). All these models systematize digital psychological warfare as competition in the name of identity conducted by technological infrastructures (Wendt, 1999; Postman, 1985; Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

4. Research Methodology

The research design assumed in this study is a qualitative research design based on interpretivism research. Instead of measuring the frequency of misinformation, the aim is to learn how to pattern, mechanisms, discursive strategies, and constitution of meaning as part of the digital influence activities (Wendt, 1999; Habermas, 1989). The interpretivist schools of thought are especially well placed to investigate the use of narratives to make international relations concepts of political identity, legitimacy, and perception (Wendt, 1999). The study is based on the case study, discourse analysis, and reviewing secondary documents. Some examples of case studies include; the 2016 U.S. presidential election, the RussiaBukraine conflict, and the regional information conflicts in South Asia. The cases were chosen due to the fact that they represent different geopolitical settings in which the digital platforms helped to mediate narrative competition and strategic communication (Hoffman, 2007; Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023).

Peer-reviewed academic literature, government investigation into the topic, policy evaluations, objective journalism, and official government information are all possible sources of data. Specific emphasis was put on the published research including the report of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the problem of Russian interference (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019) and the academic studies of disinformation and democratic erosion (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). The most frequent patterns were regarded as narrative framing, emotional amplification, identity polarization, and algorithmic exploitation, identified through thematic coding (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Kramer et al., 2014; Bakshy et al., 2015).

Qualitative approach can be analyzed by in-depth study of situation, interpretation and discursive sense as opposed to superficial statistical measurement and this approach is congruent with constructivist conceptions of power as being socially constructed using ideas and discourses (Wendt, 1999;

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

Postman, 1985).

Table 1: ***Research Design Overview***

Component	Description	Purpose	Key Supporting Literature
Research Paradigm	Interpretivist qualitative design	Understand meaning and narrative construction	Wendt (1999); Habermas (1989)
Methods	Case study analysis; discourse analysis; document review	Identify discursive strategies and influence mechanisms	Bennett & Livingston (2018)
Case Selection	2016 U.S. Election; Russia–Ukraine War; South Asian digital rivalries	Comparative geopolitical contexts of digital manipulation	Hoffman (2007); Hoskins & O'Loughlin (2023)
Data Sources	Academic literature; Senate reports; journalism; policy documents	Triangulation and validation	U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee (2019); Lazer et al. (2018)
Analytical Technique	Thematic coding	Identify recurring mechanisms (framing, polarization, amplification)	Tajfel & Turner (1979); Bakshy et al. (2015)

5. Mechanisms of Social Media Manipulation

5.1 Algorithmic Amplification

The social media are based on interaction-based algorithms whose purpose is to increase engagement and retention. It has been confirmed that posts with emotional appeal and political bias are more likely to lead to more engagement and, consequently, they will become more visible through algorithms (Bakshy et al., 2015; Kramer et al., 2014). This organizational favoritism increases polarizing storytelling, which contributes to echo chambers and filter bubbles that Pareto enhance prior thoughts (Pariser, 2011; Nickerson, 1998). This causes platform architecture itself to work as a force multiplier of psychological activity, by focusing on emotionally evocative content instead of well-balanced information (Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

5.2 Data Exploitation and Microtargeting

The Cambridge Analytica scandal demonstrated that such data obtained by analyzing the profile of millions of users could be used to profile psychographically and predict their behavior (Isaak and Hanna, 2018). Because microtargeted political messages utilize cognitive biases and identity associations, tailored appeals are sent to particular demographics based on their identity. (Nickerson, 1998; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Such practices are morally wrong in that they affirm deliberative democratic values in transparency and informed consent (Habermas, 1989).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

5.3 Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior

Consensus is generated by bot networks and fake accounts using a simulated grassroots outreach. The 2016 U.S. election has investigated that trending topics and hashtag campaigns were manipulated with a coordinated inauthentic behavior (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019). These strategies manipulate the understanding of legitimacy and social conventions by creating an illusion of group support or opposition, affecting the opinion of people indirectly (Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

Table 2: ***Core Mechanisms of Digital Psychological Warfare***

Mechanism	Operational Tool	Psychological Effect	Political/Geopolitical Impact	Key Sources
Algorithmic Amplification	Engagement-ranking systems	Emotional polarization; echo chambers	Agenda manipulation; trust erosion	Bakshy et al. (2015); Pariser (2011)
Microtargeting	Psychographic profiling; targeted ads	Bias exploitation; identity reinforcement	Electoral influence; behavioral steering	Isaak & Hanna (2018); Tajfel & Turner (1979)
Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior	Bots; fake accounts; troll farms	Artificial consensus; legitimacy distortion	Social fragmentation; diplomatic tension	U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee (2019)
Synthetic Media	Deepfakes; AI-generated content	Epistemic uncertainty; distrust	Crisis escalation; misinformation normalization	Chesney & Citron (2019); Lazer et al. (2018)

6. Digital Psychological Warfare and Electoral Interference

The 2016 presidential election in the United States of America is among the most popular examples of digital psychological warfare. The presidential race between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton turned out to be a hotbed of the analysis of how the social media could be used to manipulate political discussions and undermine the trust of the institutions (Jamieson, 2018; U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019). The investigation came to the rebate that organized influence operations associated with Russian individuals attempted to affect the American opinion regarding this issue via precise amplification of meaning and identity-concentrated targeting (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019).

The Internet Research Agency was using its activities not to promote a single

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

candidate only. As the qualitative analyses indicate, the campaign intensified dividing messages based on the race, immigration, gun rights, and police brutality as a means to significantly weaken social cohesion instead of simply persuading voters (Jamieson, 2018; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Such a strategy is in line with the answers given by social identity theory, which highlights the presence of intergroup dissimilarity as a source of increased aggression and strengthening of an in-group identity (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

Discourse analysis proves that highly emotional language, memes and conflicting stories were used to polarize further. According to the emotional contagion study, this type of affect-laden communication enhances interaction and faster spreading (Kramer et al., 2014). These messages were also reinforced by engagement-motivated algorithmic systems, which served as structural facilitators of influence procedures (Bakshy et al., 2015).

Table 3: ***2016 U.S. Election as Digital Psychological Warfare Case***

Dimension	Observed Pattern	Strategic Objective	Evidence Source
Identity Polarization	Race, immigration, gun rights narratives	Intensify social divisions	Jamieson (2018)
Coordinated Troll Activity	Fake accounts; meme campaigns	Manipulate public discourse	U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee (2019)
Algorithmic Boost	High engagement emotional posts	Viral amplification	Bakshy et al. (2015)
Trust Erosion	Decline in institutional confidence	Destabilize democratic legitimacy	Pew Research Center (2018)

7. The Russia–Ukraine Conflict as an Information War

Russia-Ukraine conflict is a modern example of the digital psychological warfare operating in parallel to kinetic military actions. The war between Russia and Ukraine has taken place in real time on global digital media unlike previous wars where the media in relation to state dominion had managed the coverage of war events.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

President Volodymyr Zelenskyy used the Face-to-face communication technique of direct smartphones-recorded video messages to reach both the domestic and foreign press with messages. These were casual, natural-looking messages, which were in opposition to the formal nature of war leadership. Media scholars grim that this approach provided more credibility and emotional connection, strengthening international unity (Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023).

At the same time, accounts and media to which the Russian state is affiliated spread the stories according to which the invasion was an act of self-defense against Westernization. Competitive hashtags, viral videos, and digital memes went all around the world with each party trying to form the international opinion. The digital space therefore emerged as a field of story struggle, in which validity and morality were negotiated at all times.

Qualitatively speaking, discourse patterns uncovered that Ukrainian messaging placed a focus on sovereignty, democracy and resistance as its key themes. Russian propaganda appealed often to historical resentment and security issues. These narrative tools were aimed at persuading not only the domestic people but also abroad the opinion of the population about it, especially in Europe and the Global South.

The influence on foreign affairs was felt. The people of European nations were subject to the policy of public opinion that could determine the government policies towards sanctions, military assistance, and refugee politics. The digital world therefore acted as a intermediary between the events on the battlefield and the foreign policy. In this regard, psychological warfare had gone beyond propaganda; it actually influenced policymaking.

The situation was also problematic with attribution. Contradictory stories and doctored videos spread quickly and sometimes before fact-checking systems came in to play. The epistemic uncertainty that such pieces produce can be seen as an example of what researchers refer to as the liar dividend, in which the presence of the deepfakes is that it is feasible to dismiss valid evidence as fake (Chesney and Citron, 2019). This destabilization of epistemics is a major danger of digital psychological warfare.

8. South Asian Digital Rivalries and Narrative Escalation (with citations)

In South Asia, the example of social media manipulations into information battles between Pakistan and India shows how the use of identity-based narratives and emotionally charged frames can drive up regional tensions (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). International hashtag campaigns and viral disinformation often inflame nationalistic feeling at times of military or diplomatic crisis, with platform dynamics favoring content that is

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

high-engaging, polarizing, and thus high-liking (Bakshy et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011; Kramer et al., 2014).

In the wake of events like the 2019 Pulwama attack, social media platforms were swamped with emotionally appealing stories, edited videos and unconfirmed assertions, which far outpaced official diplomatic messages and mainstream fact checking processes (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). Patterns of dehumanization, invoking grievance in history and lynching retaliation are patterns common to qualitative analysis of digital discourse in such crises, which are consistent with intergroup threat framing and in-group/out-group mobilization (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Nickerson, 1989).

9. Mechanisms of Public Opinion Transformation

Psychological warfare is based on the manipulation of perception instead of the physical fact. The formation of public opinion in the digital era is done in algorithmically edited settings, in which exposure, even to false assertions, may produce familiarity effects that lead to a sense of increased credibility (Fazio et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011). This (politically) is relevant as the dynamics of international relations are socially constructed and legitimacy and the meaning of communities is perceived and this is what publics are likely to receive as feasible or even justifiable (Wendt, 1999).

This process is amplified by echo chambers. Personalization by an algorithm predicts what the users like to read before and exposes them to the content that confirms their beliefs instead of allowing them to cross-cut and rectify misinformation (Pariser, 2011; Nickerson, 1998). In this kind of conditions, there is no mechanism checking against misinformation, particularly when there is a movement of disinformation-based orders of communication through the disruption of wider media systems (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer and others, 2018).

The results of qualitative interviews conducted by previous researchers show that people tend to perceive digital content through the framework of identity. Identity consistent messages tend to be distrusted and passed on which forms favorable circumstances to enable influence campaigns to implant manipulative scripts within the existing group identities and grievances (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Nickerson, 1998). This conforms to those of constructivists where identity and collective meanings organize political meaning and acting (Wendt, 1999).

Emotional contagion is equally very vital. The expression of emotions on social media has the potential to touch upon the emotional state of other individuals, and more specifically, fear, anger, and outrage are more viral, which means that emotionally colored content is more likely to go viral (Kramer et al., 2014; Bakshy et al., 2015). The latter is exploited by influence campaigns making use of emotionally charged language and imagery to drive the sharing behavior with a high rate of reaction and an overall change in mood (Kramer et al., 2014; Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

The overall impact is the normalization of the distorted narratives gradually. With time, repeated perception and emotionally reinforced sharing form a perception of reality, and as such, international issues (e.g., migration, alliances, interventions) are perceived through moralized and identity-based terminology, instead of empirical evidence (Fazio et al., 2015; Lazer et al., 2018; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). This compromises deliberation requirements to make

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

informed judgement and consent by the masses (Habermas, 1989).

10. Digital Psychological Warfare and Emerging Technologies

Artificial intelligence and machine learning also add further to influencing operations by making the persuasive text, images, and video to produce them on a scale, and provides a faster way to experiment with what works emotionally and behaviorally (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Generative systems add to data volume and amplify pace further increasing the structural weaknesses of attention-maximizing platforms (Bakshy et al., 2015; Postman, 1985).

The Deepfake technology is especially dangerous to the international stability. Faked videos of political figures may lead to the diplomatic crisis before the authenticity is verified, and the mere threat of deepfakes incites the rejection of the original videos (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Lazer et al., 2018). This liar dividend game undermines collective truth that is needed in making democratic and diplomatic decisions (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Habermas, 1989). With the advancement of AI-based personalization, there will be more microtargeting. Hyper-personalized persuasion techniques possibly achieved through psychological profiling may use cognitive biases and identity predispositions, and become even more challenging to detect (Isaak and Hanna, 2018; Nickerson, 1998; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Such processes make informational power strategic in the context of world politics, where the projection of influence may be made in a cognitive but not territorial form (Wendt, 1999; Walker and Ludwig, 2017).

Incorporation of AI into the sphere of influence activities is an indication of a new era of psychological warfare where the battlefield is becoming more cognitive and algorithmic than territorial and only adds to the logics of a hybrid-warfare, where informational and political disruption are merged (Hoffman, 2007; Chesney and Citron, 2019).

11. Identity Politics and Cognitive Framing in Digital Psychological Warfare

This is the main principle of using psychological warfare in the digital age, which consists of identity building and cognitive framing. Constructivist international relations theory also states that narrative power is a resource of strategy since the behavior of states is not exclusively controlled by material interests but by identities and social meanings (Wendt, 1999). Social media sites enhance such identity process by facilitating the quick dissemination of symbols, narratives, and emotionally-charged imagery in attention-seeking settings (Postman, 1985; Bakshy et al., 2015).

There is a notion that qualitative discourse analysis in parallel with geopolitical setting supports, often digital manipulation appeals to the discourses of civilizational rhetoric, religious symbolism, historical resentment, and nationalistic pride. The effect of such framing is not merely to create a policy impact--it re frames the lines of collective identity, which makes it psychologically challenging when politics is framed as life or death struggle (Wendt, 1999; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Such frames also use confirmation bias because they plant messages in pre-existing belief systems in the minds of the audiences (Nickerson, 1998; Pariser, 2011).

According to social identity theory, people have their self-esteem rooted in their

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

membership of a particular group. The digital psychological processes take advantage of the fact that they manipulate intergroup solidarity and outgroups hostility through hashtags, viral posts, and symbolic cues that can be understood as a signal of either ethical superiority or danger (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Kramer et al., 2014). Such identity markets may result in increased perceived conflict cost and escalated social de-escalation cost during moments of diplomatic tension (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Wendt, 1999).

12. Comparative Cross-Regional Patterns of Digital Influence

Despite the focus of high-profile ones like the 2016 election in the United States and the conflict in Russia against Ukraine, digital psychological warfare exists at a variety of political regimes around the world, demonstrating both similar mechanisms and regional variations (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Hoffman, 2007). Through comparative qualitative analysis, it can be found that platform architectures, as well as information disorders, generate recurring patterns in which the publics interpret the conflict, legitimacy, and power (Postman, 1985; Lazer et al., 2018).

The influence operations in the Western democracies often focus on electoral processes and media trust. Manipulation has attractive grounds of polarization around immigration, race, and inequality, and institutional corruption or fraud are usually featured in campaigns to decrease faith in democratic processes (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). They are enhanced by the dynamics of the echo-chamber and constant onslaught that builds credibility (Pariser, 2011; Fazio et al., 2015).

Digital manipulation in Eastern Europe is convergent with historical memory politics, in which conflicting memory accounts of the past are enhanced to warrant recent geopolitical alignments--as part of constructivist relations of identity and meaning-making (Wendt, 1999; Bennett & Livingston, 2018). In South Asia, influence operations have amplified nationalists debate in border conflicts, objecting with grievances in the past, and religious forms in mobilizing the masses and restricting diplomatic choice (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Nickerson, 1998; Pariser, 2011).

In Southeast Asia, there is a possible overlap between digital psychological warfare and ethnic politics or religious acrimony; misinformation can lead to physical violence, which can be instigated online, which is how narrative ecosystems can generate material results (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). Digital manipulation can also support the legitimacy of regimes under authoritarian regimes by reinforcing positive government propaganda and censoring opposition even though information control is consistent with political consolidation (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Postman, 1985).

13. The International Law and the Problem of Attribution

International law has a problem with the advent of digital psychological warfare due to conventional frameworks being made on the conflicts between identifiable state actors and geographic limits (Hoffman, 2007). The digital operations obscure these delineations by allowing subtle impacts across boundaries without any actual intrusion and relocating war to the informational realms where definitions and legality are disputed (Wendt, 1999; Walker and Ludwig, 2017).

Attribution is one of the major challenges. Influence briefs may be made anonymously or by proxy agents, whereas the ultimate accountability involves

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

technical research and intelligence release that may be reluctant to be offered publicly by the state (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019). In the absence of such attribution, any retaliation may lead to further escalation of the situation or diplomatic retaliation, increasing the dynamics of mistrust between the states (Wendt, 1999; Lazer et al., 2018).

Under international law, manipulation of the internal affairs of sovereign states is not to be interfered with, but it is disputed how to determine that a certain operation is manipulation and an illegal one at that as it may be associated with manipulating public opinion, not infrastructure (Hoffman, 2007; Walker and Ludwig, 2017). Even though blatant cyberattacks are undoubtedly attributable to the sovereignty, the misinformation coordination of the act is less established on the grounds of the ambiguity of its evidence and the impossibility of enforcement across multiple jurisdictions (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Lazer et al., 2018).

The process of norm development is sluggish, and the system is not particularly strict, which provides the space of influence campaigns in which denial and ambiguity decrease the risk of escalation in the perpetrators (Walker and Ludwig, 2017; Chesney and Citron, 2019). There is also an issue of accountability brought up by non-state actors, where the influence can be conducted by post-independent private firms and loosely affiliated networks, and determining the limits of its state-sponsorship becomes challenging (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). The digital space therefore provides vulnerabilities in governance with psychological warfare keeping pace over regulation (Lazer et al., 2018; Bennett and Livingston, 2018) (see Figure 2).

14. Cyber Diplomacy and Strategic Communication

To address the threat of manipulation, there is a tendency to use cyber diplomacy in the strategies of foreign policy by states, prioritizing the issues of cybersecurity standards, cyber infrastructure, and information integrity (Hoffman, 2007; Lazer et al., 2018). The ways in which governments incorporate official narratives and impact the international system are now considered central to modern day diplomacy with strategic communication serving as means to construct meaning that can shape international consequences that the constructivist understanding that the process of making meanings is central to international relations (Wendt, 1999; Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023).

There are risk aspects of digital diplomacy as well: due to the high speed of information exchange, the likelihood of misunderstanding and exacerbation grows, and viral posts may exacerbate tensions before the work of the official diplomat (Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023; Postman, 1985). Diplomacy, according to qualitative analysis, is turning into a narrative framing struggle where states frame conflicts in moralistically compelling ways that are in accordance with their strategic interests (Wendt, 1999; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Cooperation efforts (i.e., intelligence exchange on influence work) are an expression of the acknowledgment that they are transnational, yet competition hinders organization and disperses governing systems (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019; Walker and Ludwig, 2017).

15. Etisalat Reimplication of Social Media Manipulation Implication

The problem of digital psychological warfare involves ethical considerations since manipulative deception is incompatible with the principles of democracy

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

and reasoning (Habermas, 1989; Lazer et al., 2018). Deliberative democracy relies on the availability of correct knowledge and open communication; the manipulation disrupts this setting with the false stories and crafted focus (Habermas, 1989; Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

Platform governance exacerbates ethical conflicts moderation rulings may be interpreted as partisan choices, whereas non-moderation makes possible dangerous online misinformation, both of which may promote polarization (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). The exploitation of data only exacerbates the fears: microtargeting and psychographic profiling question autonomy and consent, which happened to Cambridge Analytica (Isaak and Hanna, 2018). The issue of ethical dilemma gets worse when democracies are involved in clandestine manipulation of other countries which can lead to undermining their own normative legitimacy (Habermas, 1989; Nye, 2004). Finally, online psychological warfare questions the honesty, freedom of choice, and responsibility in openness (Habermas, 1989; Lazer et al., 2018).

16. Integrative Discussion

These results of the qualitative analysis of case studies and theoretical discussion sum up to one main point: digital psychological warfare is a structural change in the power to discrete propaganda to sustained competition to control the perception and meaning (Wendt, 1999; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Instead of substituting any form of power in the traditional forms, it superimposes and intertwines with it, including informational influence into bigger hybrid techniques (Hoffman, 2007; Walker and Ludwig, 2017).

The notion of material power is retained, but it is undergoing an increase in the mode of its legitimization via narrative power. The application of military actions, sanctions, and diplomatic efforts can be seen as digital narratives that form the way in which the community views them and knows what is deemed legitimate, urgent, and morally right by the community (Wendt, 1999; Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023). This supports the constructivist argument about the fact that, international outcomes are determined not simply on the basis of abilities, but on the basis of mutual meanings and identity discourse (Wendt, 1999).

The constructivist theory assists us to understand the real geopolitical implications of narrative contestation: when international politics is socially constructed by mutual understandings, it will become a strategic goal to manipulate the understandings (Wendt, 1999; Nye, 2004). Acute power structures also explain the effectiveness of covert informational penetration: they disfigure and unstable information spaces instead of enticing with a sense of attraction (Walker and Ludwig, 2017; Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

The theory of media ecology explains that the perception is structured through technological architecture. Social media is not a passive medium of information dissemination but engages its tools to supply information and organize attention and prioritize emotionally charged material by ranking and customizing through engagements (Postman, 1985; Bakshy et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011). This is enhanced by the mechanisms of emotional contagion, where the content with an emotional judgment propagates virally and affects the collective mood, enhancing polarizing narratives (Kramer et al., 2014).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

17. Policy Implications

Qualitative results indicate that the concept of digital psychological warfare does not happen in isolated cases, but it is a structural element of modern international politics that needs to be addressed by involving no less than domestic, regional, and international actions (Hoffman, 2007; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). Since influence operations rely on platform incentives and human cognition, the policy needs to implement measures to mitigate informational integrity, institutional legitimacy, and societal resilience in all three (Lazer et al., 2018; Habermas, 1989).

On the national level, governments should enhance institutional resilience at the expense of democratic freedoms. Regulatory measures are needed to increase political advertising transparency, disclose coordinated inauthentic actions, and hold websites accountable to report on the risks of the algorithm. This transparency minimizes the obscurity, which facilitates the manipulation under the radar and enables open responsibility (Lazer et al., 2018; U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019; Bennett and Livingston, 2018).

Second, there should be inclusion of digital literacy courses in the school curriculum and civic education. Media literacy programs must focus on more than fact-checking, but also on emotional influencing, algorithmic amplifying, and familiarity-based credibility influences, because repeated exposure may raise perceived truth (Fazio et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011). Since influence operations tend to capitalize on identity processes and cognitive bias, resiliency strategies must encompass knowledge of the confirmation bias and in-group/out-group framing (Nickerson, 1998; Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

Third, cooperation on an international level is mandatory. Since platforms are transnational, unilateral response is not appropriate: the networks and rules upon cyber conduct, election integrity, and digital sovereignty ought to be of primary importance to minimize the risks of cross-border interference and escalation (Hoffman, 2007; Walker and Ludwig, 2017). There can be confidence-building strategies that minimize the risk of misattribution, which contributes to the escalation of diplomatic crises, particularly in settings full of epistemic insecurity and doubt supported by deepfakes (Chesney and Citron, 2019; Lazer et al., 2018).

Fourth, reforms on platform governance should deal with the economic incentives, which favor engagement rather than information integrity. Accountability might be enhanced by independent content auditing, disclosure of content ranking and moderation, as well as collaborative research with scholarly establishments, which will help minimize the strength of polarizing content that is amplified (Bakshy et al., 2015; Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018).

Lastly, there is the civil society and independent journalism that is still of importance. The ability of the media to carry out investigative reporting and verification is a contributor to the strength of democracy and the weakening of local journalism makes people more vulnerable to misinformation and lack of trust (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018). The creation of credibility infrastructures assists deliberative democratic environments that are required to make informed consent (Habermas, 1989).

18. Future Research Directions

Although the qualitative study represents an integrative approach to the analysis

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

of the digital psychological warfare, some of the areas should receive more attention. To begin with, comparative studies on cross-cultural differences in susceptibility wrought by political systems and media cultures should be carried out because there are considerably different identity narratives, institutional trust, and information infrastructure across political settings (Wendt, 1999; Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Lazer et al., 2018).

Second, longitudinal qualitative studies would be able to examine the way that sustained exposure changes attitudes through time especially by repeated exposure effects and normalization processes, which makes misleading statements seem more credible (Fazio et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011). These studies would enhance learners regarding the slow process of mental framing as well as polarizing, which are just some of the gaps (Nickerson, 1998; Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

Third, the collaboration between political science, psychology, computer science, and communication studies is also required on the interdisciplinary domain since the psychological war proceeds on the grounds of platform architecture combined with human cognition (Postman, 1985; Kramer et al., 2014). Single frameworks should be applied to illustrate interaction between engagement ranking, identity process and strategic behavior (Bakshy et al., 2015; Wendt, 1999).

19. Conclusion

This study has analyzed psychological warfare in the digital age in terms of a qualitative approach that proves that manipulation of social media is structural change of international relations and formation of opinions among citizens (Wendt, 1999; Bennett and Livingston, 2018). In contrast to traditional propaganda being limited to times of war or imprisoned by the state apparatus, digital psychological warfare is non-centralized, permanent, and algorithmically circulated within platforms of attentionalist practices (Postman, 1985; Bakshy et al., 2015; Pariser, 2011).

The examples of the U.S. election in 2016, the conflict in Russia and Ukraine, and South Asian digital rivalries can serve as examples of how operations of influence can be conducted in different contexts and that narrative contestation provides factual outcomes related to geopolitics (U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, 2019; Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2023; Hoffman, 2007). Shared repeatedly recurring mechanisms are algorithmic amplification, identity-based framing, coordinated inauthentic behavior, emotional polarization, and data-driven microtargeting, despite the contextual difference (Bakshy et al., 2015; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Kramer et al., 2014; Isaak and Hanna, 2018).

The results emphasize that the international politics are constantly arranged at the cognitive and informational planes. Diplomatic alignments, electoral legitimacy, and support to policy choices are shaped by the narrative dominance, and the erosion of trust and common understanding of truth make in destabilization of shared understanding of the truth psychological warfare is used (Wendt, 1999; Lazer et al., 2018; Pew Research Center, 2018). Constructivism explains the significance of these effects: ideas and identities pattern how people in the world can interpret conflict and legitimacy in the public (Wendt, 1999). Media ecology also demonstrates that technologies influence perception and attention i.e. platform architectures are vigorously used to structure what becomes politically salient (Postman, 1985; Pariser, 2011).

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

According to the social identity theory, emotionally colored identity narratives have a greater impact and are disseminated, which strengthens polarization and the hostility of the out-group (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Kramer et al., 2014).

They have far-reaching ethical implications. The problem of manipulative politics and strategy undermines the process of democratic deliberation and independence, and legal and diplomatic order fail under the circumstances of deepfake-permitted uncertainty (Habermas, 1989; Chesney and Citron, 2019; Lazer et al., 2018). The system of platform governance still boils down to incentives to be engaged that encourage polarization, which forms structural weaknesses that can be exploited by committing sharp-power actions (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Walker and Ludwig, 2017).

References

1. Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science, 348*(6239), 1130–1132.
2. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication, 33*(2), 122–139.
3. Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review, 107*(6), 1753–1819.
4. Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(5), 993–1002.
5. Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. MIT Press.
6. Hoffman, F. G. (2007). Conflict in the 21st century: The rise of hybrid wars. Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.
7. Hoskins, A., & O'Loughlin, B. (2023). War and media in the 2020s: The Ukraine conflict and digital communication. *Media, War & Conflict, 16*(2), 123–139.
8. Isaak, J., & Hanna, M. J. (2018). User data privacy: Facebook, Cambridge Analytica, and privacy protection. *Computer, 51*(8), 56–59.
9. Jamieson, K. H. (2018). *Cyberwar: How Russian hackers and trolls helped elect a president*. Oxford University Press.
10. Kramer, A. D. I., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(24), 8788–8790.
11. Lazer, D. M. J., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A., Greenhill, K., Menczer, F., Metzger, M., Nyhan, B., Pennycook, G., Rothschild, D., Schudson, M., Sloman, S., Sunstein, C., Thorson, E., Watts, D., & Zittrain, J. (2018). The science of fake news. *Science, 359*(6380), 1094–1096.
12. Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology, 2*(2), 175–220.
13. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
14. Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
15. Pew Research Center. (2018). Public trust in government: 1958–2018.
16. Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death*. Viking.

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146
Vol. 4 No. 2 (February) (2026)

17. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
18. U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. (2019). *Report on Russian active measures campaigns and interference in the 2016 U.S. election.*
19. Walker, C., & Ludwig, J. (2017). *Sharp power: Rising authoritarian influence*. National Endowment for Democracy.
20. Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.