**Open Access Library Journal**
2026, Volume 13, e15697
ISSN Online: 2333-9721
ISSN Print: 2333-9705

# Psychological Reconfigurations of Communication Mediated by Platforms and Algorithms: Cognition, Affectivity, and Sociality in the Digital Age

**David Kiantwadi Pata**

Laboratory of the Psychology of Communications (LaPsyCom), Faculty of Communication Sciences, University of Information and Communication Sciences (UNISIC), Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo
Email: communicometrie@gmail.com

**How to cite this paper:** Pata, D.K. (2026) Psychological Reconfigurations of Communication Mediated by Platforms and Algorithms: Cognition, Affectivity, and Sociality in the Digital Age. *Open Access Library Journal*, **13**: e15697.
https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1116108

**Received:** September 30, 2026
**Accepted:** October 31, 2026
**Published:** November 3, 2026

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

Open Access

## Abstract

The generalization of digital environments profoundly transforms the cognitive, emotional and social conditions of communication. Using the framework of communications psychology, this article analyzes how platforms, interfaces and algorithms reconfigure attention, emotion, decisions and social relationships. It shows that contemporary communication is part of hybrid human-technical systems, where digital environments act as active architectures guiding cognition, amplifying affects and structuring interactions. The article finally proposes an integrated analytical model and discusses its theoretical and methodological implications for Information and Communication Sciences.

## Subject Areas

Psychology

## Keywords

Digital Communication, Numerical Cognition, Affects, Algorithms, Psychology of Communications

## 1. Introduction

Digital communication has become a routine and structuring framework of contemporary social experience. Social networking platforms, information platforms, instant messaging applications, and algorithmic systems profoundly shape the ways individuals and groups perceive, express themselves, and inter-

act. While Information and Communication Sciences (ICS) have extensively documented these transformations from the perspectives of technical devices, usage patterns, and socio-economic dynamics, their deeper psychological effects—cognitive, affective, and relational—are often examined in a partial and fragmented manner.

Building on the research program of the Laboratory of Communication Psychology (LaPsyCom), this article proposes to analyze digital communication as a space of psychological reconfiguration in which cognition, affectivity, and sociality are reshaped through technical and algorithmic mediation. This perspective seeks to move beyond approaches focused solely on technological infrastructures or observable practices in order to restore the psychological depth of contemporary communicational transformations and to assess their theoretical and methodological implications for Information and Communication Sciences.

## 2. Research Problem: The Psychological Transformation of Digital Communication

The central research question of this article can be formulated as follows: *How do digital environments reconfigure the fundamental psychological processes of communication?*

Digital platforms no longer merely ensure the transmission of messages. They direct attention, prioritize information, modulate emotions, and structure forms of social interaction through technical and algorithmic architectures that intervene directly in individuals' communicational experiences. In this sense, they act as active mediators of cognitive, affective, and relational processes.

In light of these transformations, it becomes necessary to move beyond analyses focused exclusively on technical infrastructures, patterns of use, or socio-economic dynamics, particularly those developed in studies of the information society, technology use, mediatization, and the political economy of platforms [1]-[5]. Instead, this article advocates an integrated psychological perspective on digital communication, drawing on recent research on digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality [6]-[11].

Such an approach makes it possible to understand how mechanisms of perception, emotional engagement, decision-making, and socialization are reconfigured through algorithmic mediation, and to assess the theoretical and methodological implications of these transformations for Information and Communication Sciences.

## 3. Fundamental Psychological Processes of Communication

Numerous psychological processes are involved in communicational phenomena. However, not all of them hold the same theoretical status. Among these processes, three appear to be constitutive of the psychological and ontological nature of communication: cognition, affectivity, and sociality. These processes are now being reconfigured within digital environments.

### 3.1. Digital Cognition: Attention, Cognitive Overload, and Cognitive Delegation

Digital environments impose an attention economy characterized by information overabundance, continuous stimulation, and the multiplication of competing stimuli [12] [13]. In such contexts, individuals' attentional resources become highly fragmented, profoundly altering information-processing mechanisms and fostering forms of rapid, discontinuous, and often heuristic cognition [14].

Recommendation and ranking algorithms actively participate in the selection and prioritization of content by taking over part of the cognitive operations traditionally performed by individuals, such as information filtering, prioritization, external memory storage, and, in some cases, decision anticipation [2] [15]. This algorithmic mediation transforms the relationship to knowledge and information by directing cognitive pathways and reducing the visibility of certain interpretive alternatives.

Digital cognition is thus characterized, first, by fragmented and intermittent attention, subject to frequent interruptions and constant competition among content streams [16]. Second, it is accompanied by chronic cognitive overload resulting from excessive information and notifications that exceed the limited capacity of working memory [17] [18]. Finally, it manifests itself through an increasing delegation of cognitive functions to technical devices, including search engines, digital platforms, and algorithmic assistants, illustrating what Clark and Chalmers [19] and later Clark [20] describe as a form of extended cognition.

These transformations are not merely functional adjustments; they contribute to a lasting reconfiguration of the ways individuals think, learn, and make decisions in digital environments. They highlight the need for an integrated psychological approach to digital communication that takes into account the complex interactions between human cognition, technical devices, and algorithmic mediation.

### 3.2. Digital Affectivity: Emotional Amplification and Polarization

Digital platforms promote an intensification and increased visibility of affects by transforming emotions into public, quantifiable, and comparable signals. Interaction mechanisms—likes, reactions, comments, and shares—produce an emotional formatting of communication in which affects are not only experienced but also displayed, measured, and valorized [6]. This emotional quantification modifies social recognition dynamics and influences users' communicational behaviors.

Within these environments, emotionally charged content benefits from greater visibility because it captures attention more effectively and generates higher levels of engagement. Recent studies show that emotions—particularly anger, indignation, and enthusiasm—increase the likelihood of message diffusion and contribute to their virality [21]. Recommendation algorithms reinforce these dynamics by prioritizing content that elicits intense emotional reactions, thereby contributing to discourse polarization and the formation of affective echo chambers [22].

Digital affectivity is characterized by several structural features. First, it manifests itself through emotional amplification resulting from the constant staging of affects and their algorithmic valorization. Second, it is marked by immediate affective reactivity, fostered by the accelerated temporality of digital platforms, which reduces opportunities for emotional regulation and critical reflection [14]. Finally, it is accompanied by phenomena of emotional polarization and contagion, whereby emotions spread rapidly through social networks, reinforcing divisions and attitudinal homogenization within groups [23] [24].

These dynamics confirm that digital affectivity is not merely an extension of offline emotions but rather a specific reconfiguration of emotional processes shaped by technical architectures, visibility logics, and algorithmic mediation. Their analysis therefore requires an integrated psychological approach to digital communication that considers the interactions among emotions, technical systems, and social dynamics.

### 3.3. Digital Sociality: Mediated Interaction and Algorithmic Norms

Digital sociality is based on interactions mediated by technical interfaces and regulated by algorithmic architectures that structure the visibility, circulation, and prioritization of exchanges. Unlike face-to-face interactions, digital relationships are filtered through sociotechnical devices that intervene in mutual recognition processes, the distribution of attention, and the formation of collectives [2] [25].

Within these environments, social norms no longer result solely from implicit interactional conventions but are partially redefined and imposed by platform rules, including participation formats, moderation policies, reporting mechanisms, and visibility criteria. These algorithmized norms shape communicational behavior by defining what can be published, made visible, or sanctioned, thereby transforming the modalities of social regulation [26].

Moreover, power relations are increasingly reconfigured around visibility and moderation mechanisms. Influence depends not only on actors' social status or symbolic legitimacy but also on their ability to align with algorithmic logics of recommendation and amplification. Platforms thus become central actors in the structuring of the digital public sphere by modulating audience access and the circulation of discourse [27].

From this perspective, digital communication introduces several major transformations of sociality:

- the emergence of new forms of social recognition based on quantified indicators (likes, followers, shares);
- the establishment of algorithmized interactional norms that shape participation and speaking practices;
- the reconfiguration of influence dynamics, in which algorithmic visibility becomes a central lever of communicational power.

These developments demonstrate that digital sociality is not merely a transpo-

sition of offline social relations but a specific reconfiguration of mechanisms of recognition, regulation, and influence, inseparable from the technical and algorithmic architectures that mediate contemporary communication.

Finally, cognition enables the processing, interpretation, and organization of information; affectivity directs attention, motivation, and engagement; and sociality embeds exchanges within relational, normative, and interactional frameworks that make the co-construction of meaning possible. These three dimensions—digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality—must be understood as interdependent. Platforms influence the content to which individuals pay attention, the emotions they experience, and the interactions in which they engage. In turn, users' affective and social responses feed algorithmic systems that reorganize content visibility. Digital communication thus appears as a dynamic psycho-communicational configuration in which human and technical processes mutually shape one another.

## 4. Toward an Integrated Model of Digital Communication

### 4.1. Foundations of the Model

Building on the preceding analyses, this article proposes an integrated model of digital communication aimed at explaining how digital environments jointly reconfigure the cognitive, affective, and social processes of communication. The model is based on the idea that these dimensions are neither autonomous nor sequential, but are simultaneously mobilized and mutually dependent in any communication situation mediated by platforms and algorithms.

The first dimension concerns digital cognition, understood as the set of information-processing processes reconfigured through technical mediation. It includes the orientation and fragmentation of attention, the partial externalization of memory, and decision-making assisted by algorithmic recommendation and ranking systems. Cognition is no longer located solely within the individual but is distributed between humans and technical devices, in accordance with the logic of extended cognition [19] [20].

The second dimension refers to digital affectivity, characterized by emotions that are mediated, made visible, measurable, and amplified by platform architectures. Dynamics of engagement, virality, and emotional polarization are embedded in systems that privilege highly affective content, thereby altering the psychological conditions of persuasion, influence, and opinion formation [6] [21].

The third dimension concerns digital sociality, which is based on interactions mediated by interfaces and regulated by algorithmic norms. Social relations, recognition mechanisms, and influence dynamics are reconfigured through visibility, moderation, and recommendation systems that redistribute forms of communicational power within the digital public sphere [2] [26].

By articulating these three dimensions, the model makes it possible to analyze digital communication as a hybrid psychological system involving humans, technical devices, and algorithms in the co-production of meaning, emotions, and so-

cial relations. It therefore provides an integrative theoretical framework capable of overcoming fragmented approaches while capturing the psychological complexity of contemporary communicational practices and preparing the development of analytical tools adapted to digital and algorithmic environments.

### 4.2. Scope and Methodological Approach

The present contribution is essentially conceptual and theoretical in nature. It is based on a narrative and integrative synthesis of the literature devoted to the digital transformation of communication. The objective is not to conduct a systematic review or statistical meta-analysis, but rather to identify the main theoretical convergences capable of illuminating the psychological reconfigurations induced by digital platforms and algorithmic systems [28] [29].

The literature was selected from research in Information and Communication Sciences, cognitive psychology, emotion psychology, social psychology, platform studies, extended cognition theory, and recent work on algorithmic mediation. Particular attention was given to academic publications that have contributed to understanding the effects of digital environments on perception, attention, emotional engagement, social influence, and meaning-making processes [2] [3] [20] [30].

To structure the analysis, the selected studies were grouped around three psychological dimensions considered fundamental to contemporary digital communication. The first concerns digital cognition, encompassing research on attention, information processing, memory, decision-making, and cognitive delegation to digital devices [10] [14] [31]. The second concerns digital affectivity, bringing together studies on online emotions, affective engagement, emotional virality, and audience mobilization mechanisms [6] [7] [11]. The third concerns digital sociality, referring to research on social influence, digital norms, recognition, participation, and platform-mediated relational dynamics [8] [9] [32].

The comparative examination of these three bodies of literature seeks to identify the common psychological mechanisms that structure communication mediated by platforms and algorithms. This approach makes it possible to propose an integrated theoretical framework linking digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality in order to jointly analyze the psychological dimensions of communication in contemporary digital environments [3] [8] [10].

### 4.3. Operationalization of the Three Dimensions of the Model

Beyond its theoretical scope, the proposed model can be used as an empirical framework for analyzing the psychological reconfigurations of digital communication. Each of the model's three dimensions—digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality—can be operationalized through observable indicators, identifiable data sources, and units of analysis adapted to digital environments (See **Table 1**).

Digital cognition may be illustrated through the study of a personalized news

Table 1. Operational framework for the three dimensions of the model.

| Dimension | Central Question | Main Variables | Examples of Indicators | Data Sources | Units of Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Digital Cognition** | How do platforms influence information processing? | Attention, exposure, comprehension, memory, cognitive delegation | Attention span, click-through rate, information recall, frequency of algorithmic recommendation use | Digital traces, surveys, cognitive tests, browsing data | User, session, content |
| **Digital Affectivity** | How do platforms shape emotions and engagement? | Emotions, engagement, emotional valence, motivation, adherence | Emotional reaction rate, affective comments, shares, engagement score | Reactions, comments, questionnaires, sentiment analysis | Message, post, user |
| **Digital Sociality** | How do platforms structure interactions and social influence? | Participation, influence, trust, belonging, social norms | Number of interactions, relational density, influence index, participation level | Social networks, interaction graphs, relational surveys | Individual, group, community |

feed on a social media platform. The analysis may focus on the content actually viewed by users, their ability to retain exposed information, and their dependence on algorithmic recommendations to access content.

Digital affectivity can be observed through the diffusion of a message that generates strong emotional reactions. Relevant indicators may include the number of reactions, the emotional tone of comments, the level of engagement generated, and the propensity to share the content.

Digital sociality may be examined through interactions within an online community. Mechanisms of influence, social validation, cooperation, and polarization can be analyzed through interaction networks, participation rates, and indicators of relational centrality.

This operationalization provides a methodological foundation for the future development of communicometric indices such as a Digital Cognition Index (DCI), a Digital Affectivity Index (DAI), and a Digital Sociality Index (DSI). These instruments would make it possible to comparatively measure the psychological effects of digital platforms and assess contemporary transformations in algorithm-mediated communication.

### 4.4. Positioning the Model in Relation to Related Approaches

The proposed model builds upon several theoretical frameworks that have contributed to the analysis of the digital transformation of communication while distinguishing itself through its explicitly psychological grounding.

Mediatization theories primarily emphasize the ways in which media and communication infrastructures progressively reconfigure social practices and institutions [3] [33]. Affordance-based approaches focus on the possibilities for action enabled or constrained by technological devices and digital platforms [34] [35]. Sociomaterial approaches, in turn, highlight the co-production of social phenomena by human actors and technological artifacts within hybrid assemblages [36]

[37].

Without challenging the relevance of these perspectives, the present model shifts the analytical focus toward the psychological mechanisms through which these transformations are concretely experienced by individuals. Its originality lies in integrating digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality within a single explanatory framework, making it possible to analyze how platforms and algorithms simultaneously influence information-processing processes, emotional dynamics, and social interactions.

The model therefore appears as a psycho-communicational complement to mediatization, affordance-based, and sociomaterial approaches by placing at the forefront the psychological transformations underlying contemporary digital practices.

### 4.5. Limitations of the Model

Despite its heuristic value and integrative ambition, the proposed model presents several limitations that should be acknowledged.

The first concerns its level of generalization. In seeking to account for the psychological reconfigurations of digital communication through the dimensions of digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality, the model emphasizes psychological mechanisms common to a wide variety of digital environments. Yet social networking platforms, messaging applications, information platforms, collaborative workspaces, and AI-based conversational systems often operate according to very different logics [2] [3]. Consequently, the observed effects may vary significantly across contexts.

The second limitation relates to the analytical simplification implied by distinguishing between digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality. In real-world situations, these dimensions constantly interact. Attentional mechanisms influence emotional reactions; emotions shape social interactions; and relational dynamics, in turn, modify cognitive processes. The boundaries between these dimensions remain highly porous and should therefore be understood as analytical categories rather than independent realities [8] [9].

A third limitation concerns the status attributed to algorithmic systems. The model considers platforms and algorithms as active mediators of communication. However, this formulation should not be interpreted as attributing intentionality to technical systems. The notions of "co-actor" and "algorithmic agent" are employed from a sociotechnical perspective to emphasize their capacity to shape information flows, emotions, and social interactions, without granting them autonomy comparable to that of human actors [10] [26].

Finally, the model remains primarily conceptual at this stage. Its relevance must be assessed through empirical research aimed at operationalizing the three proposed dimensions and measuring their interactions across different digital contexts. Recent developments in generative artificial intelligence, algorithmic personalization, and automated conversational systems further underscore the need

for continual reassessment of the theoretical framework in order to account for the rapid evolution of contemporary digital environments [38] [39].

These limitations do not invalidate the relevance of the model. On the contrary, they highlight its evolving nature and open new avenues for research aimed at refining, enriching, and empirically validating the analysis of the psychological reconfigurations of communication in the age of platforms and algorithms.

## 5. Implications for Contemporary Information and Communication Sciences

Analyzing digital communication through a model integrating cognition, affectivity, and sociality has significant implications for the theoretical and methodological development of Information and Communication Sciences in the context of contemporary algorithmic environments.

### 5.1. Theoretical Contributions

From a theoretical perspective, this framework contributes first to a clearer understanding of the psychological effects of digital technologies. By highlighting cognitive reconfigurations (attention, memory, decision-making), affective transformations (mediated emotions, engagement, polarization), and social dynamics (algorithmic norms, visibility, influence), it moves beyond analyses focused exclusively on technological devices or patterns of use. Digital communication is thus conceptualized as a structured psychological process embedded within active technical architectures.

Second, this approach promotes the integration of algorithms as co-actors in communication. Recommendation, ranking, and moderation systems are no longer viewed as neutral infrastructures but as entities that participate in the production of meaning, the modulation of emotions, and the structuring of social relations. This theoretical recognition contributes to a renewed understanding of communicational power in the platform era.

Finally, the proposed model strengthens interdisciplinary dialogue between Information and Communication Sciences, psychology, and digital studies. It provides a common conceptual framework capable of articulating insights from cognitive and affective sciences with critical analyses of platforms and algorithms, thereby enhancing theoretical coherence and scientific cumulativeness.

### 5.2. Methodological Contributions

From a methodological perspective, this approach opens the way for the development of specific indices of digital cognition and digital affectivity designed to empirically measure phenomena such as attentional fragmentation, cognitive overload, emotional engagement, and affective polarization. These indices constitute essential tools for operationalizing the psychological transformations induced by digital environments.

The framework also encourages a stronger integration of psychological analysis

with platform-generated data. The combined use of behavioral data, interaction indicators, and psychological measures makes it possible to analyze digital communication practices from both subjective and structural perspectives.

Finally, this approach supports a greater reliance on mixed and computational methods, combining surveys, interviews, discourse analysis, statistical techniques, and algorithmic analysis. Such methodological hybridization appears essential for capturing the complexity of digital communication ecosystems and for developing rigorous diagnostic tools adapted to contemporary challenges in Information and Communication Sciences.

### 5.3. Scope of Application of the Model

The proposed model primarily targets digital environments in which platforms and algorithms actively intervene in the organization of information, interactions, and communicational behaviors. Its scope of application focuses mainly on four categories of digital environments.

The first category includes social networking platforms such as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, TikTok, LinkedIn, and YouTube. These platforms constitute privileged spaces for observing processes of digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality, since recommendation algorithms directly influence content visibility, emotional engagement, and users' relational dynamics [2] [10].

The second category concerns messaging and interpersonal communication applications, including WhatsApp, Messenger, Telegram, Signal, and WeChat. Within these environments, interactions occur within more restricted relational networks, yet mechanisms of social influence, emotional circulation, and meaning construction remain highly significant. Analysis therefore focuses more specifically on conversational dynamics, interpersonal trust, and processes of social coordination.

The third category encompasses information and search platforms, such as Google News, news aggregators, search engines, and online news platforms. These systems play a major role in access to knowledge, information prioritization, and the orientation of users' cognitive pathways. They therefore provide a particularly relevant context for studying digital cognition and the algorithmic mediation of information [3] [26].

Finally, the model can also be applied to other specific digital environments, including educational platforms (Moodle, Google Classroom), professional collaborative spaces (Microsoft Teams, Slack), e-commerce platforms, virtual communities, immersive environments, and conversational systems based on generative artificial intelligence. In these contexts, platforms intervene not only in the circulation of information but also in the structuring of interactions, the support of decision-making, and the production of meaning.

However, the model is not intended to treat all digital environments as homogeneous. The cognitive, affective, and social mechanisms it identifies may vary

according to technical architectures, communicational objectives, platform governance models, and usage contexts. It should therefore be understood as a general analytical framework that must be adapted to the specific characteristics of each digital environment under investigation.

## 6. Illustration: A User's Experience on Facebook during a Major Political Event

During an electoral period in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, analyzed in a research report produced by the Laboratory of Communication Psychology (LaPsyCom) (Pata, 2025), a university student consults his Facebook news feed in order to learn about the various candidates competing in the election.

### 6.1. Digital Cognition: Directed Attention and Cognitive Delegation

Upon opening the application, the student does not access all the information available about the election. Instead, the algorithm selects specific content based on his previous searches, interests, and past interactions.

The first posts displayed mainly concern candidates he has already viewed. His attention is therefore directed toward a limited set of information. Moreover, rather than actively seeking diverse sources, he relies on the platform's automatic recommendations. Part of the work of selecting and prioritizing information is thus delegated to the algorithm.

This situation illustrates attentional fragmentation, information overload, and cognitive delegation to digital systems.

### 6.2. Digital Affectivity: Emotional Amplification

Among the suggested content is a video denouncing a political scandal. The comments are numerous, and emotional reactions are abundant: anger, indignation, fear, and enthusiasm. These emotions attract the student's attention more effectively than nuanced analyses or technical documents.

Encouraged by visible reactions (likes, shares, and emojis), he experiences a strong emotional response and decides to share the post. The algorithm detects this engagement and further increases the visibility of similar content. This process illustrates emotional amplification, affective contagion, and the gradual polarization of opinions.

### 6.3. Digital Sociality: Influence and Algorithmic Norms

The student then examines the reactions of his friends and the groups to which he belongs. Most members of the group support the same political position. Contradictory viewpoints rarely appear in his news feed.

Gradually, he develops the impression that this opinion is widely shared. Algorithmic visibility mechanisms therefore reinforce group norms and influence the formation of his judgments.

This situation illustrates the formation of echo chambers, social recognition through likes and shares, and the redistribution of communicational influence through algorithms.

### 6.4. Integrated Reading of the Model

In this example, digital communication results from the continuous interaction among three processes (See Table 2).

Table 2. Manifestations of the operational framework of the three dimensions of the model.

| Dimension | Manifestation |
|---|---|
| Digital Cognition | Algorithmic selection of information, directed attention, cognitive delegation |
| Digital Affectivity | Anger, indignation, enthusiasm, emotional virality |
| Digital Sociality | Group influence, algorithmic visibility, digital norms |
| Overall Outcome | Construction of a political opinion within a hybrid human-algorithm environment |

The experience of this student demonstrates that contemporary digital communication is no longer merely an exchange between individuals. It constitutes a hybrid psychological system in which platforms and algorithms actively participate in the production of meaning, the modulation of emotions, and the structuring of social relations. Cognitive, affective, and social processes are thus co-constructed by human actors and the digital architectures that mediate their interactions.

This illustration highlights the relevance of conceiving digital communication as a hybrid human-algorithm psychological system, which constitutes the central thesis of this article.

## 7. Discussion and Perspectives

The psychological analysis of digital communication reveals a profound transformation in the conditions of contemporary communicational experience. Cognitive delegation to technical systems, the amplification and increased visibility of affects, and the algorithmic mediation of interactions reconfigure the ways individuals perceive, understand, and participate in symbolic exchange. These dynamics modify not only communicational practices but also the psychological structures that underlie them.

These transformations raise major issues regarding cognitive autonomy, communicational responsibility, and the critical capacities of individuals and collectives. The growing delegation of mental functions to algorithms calls into question the control of informational and decision-making pathways, while affective intensification and the polarization of discourse weaken the conditions necessary for a reflective public debate. By redistributing forms of visibility and power, algorithmic mediation also redefines the responsibilities of both human and technical actors in the production and circulation of meaning.

In this context, communication psychology offers a particularly relevant theoretical framework for analyzing these transformations by articulating cognition, affectivity, and sociality within a unified explanatory system. It not only helps explain the psychological effects of digital technologies but also supports the examination of their social and ethical implications by providing conceptual and analytical tools for thinking about regulation, responsibility, and the development of a more reflective and sustainable digital communication environment.

## 8. Conclusions

This article has demonstrated that digital communication can no longer be understood as a simple technical extension of traditional communicational practices. It constitutes a hybrid psychological system in which cognition, affectivity, and sociality are profoundly reconfigured through algorithmic mediation. Cognitive delegation, emotional amplification, and the algorithmic regulation of interactions transform the very conditions of communicational experience by reshaping relationships to attention, meaning, emotion, and otherness.

By proposing an integrated model of digital communication based on digital cognition, digital affectivity, and digital sociality, this article contributes to strengthening the theoretical coherence of Information and Communication Sciences in the face of contemporary transformations induced by platforms and algorithms. It also opens the way for the development of analytical and methodological tools capable of capturing the psychological, social, and ethical effects of digital environments, reaffirming the need for a psychologically grounded approach to understanding communication in the algorithmic age.

While the analysis of digital communication helps explain how algorithms reconfigure individuals' cognition, affectivity, and sociality, it also calls for an expansion of the analytical framework to the civilizational level. Digital environments do not merely transform communicational practices; they redefine worldviews, relationships to time, meaning, authority, and, more broadly, the symbolic and ontological horizons of contemporary societies. It is to the exploration of these civilizational, cosmological, and metaphysical transformations in the algorithmic age that the next article is devoted.

## Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

## References

[1] Castells, M. (2009) Communication Power. Oxford University Press.

[2] van Dijck, J., Poell, T. and de Waal, M. (2018) The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World. Oxford University Press.

[3] Couldry, N. and Hepp, A. (2017) The Mediated Construction of Reality. Polity Press.

[4] Miège, B. (2004) L'information-communication, Objet De Connaissance. De Boeck Supérieur. https://doi.org/10.3917/dbu.miege.2004.01

[5] Wolton, D. (2009) Informer n'est pas communiquer. CNRS Éditions.

[6] Papacharissi, Z. (2015) Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199999736.001.0001

[7] Beer, D. (2017) The Social Power of Algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, **20**, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2016.1216147

[8] Valkenburg, P.M., Meier, A. and Beyens, I. (2022) Social Media Use and Its Impact on Adolescent Mental Health: An Umbrella Review of the Evidence. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, **44**, 58-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.017

[9] Beyens, I., Keijsers, L. and Coyne, S.M. (2022) Social Media, Parenting, and Well-Being. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, **47**, Article 101350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101350

[10] Bucher, T. (2018) If...Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics. Oxford University Press.

[11] Rathje, S., Van Bavel, J.J. and van der Linden, S. (2021) Out-Group Animosity Drives Engagement on Social Media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **118**, e2024292118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2024292118

[12] Simon, H.A. (1971) Designing Organizations for an Information-Rich World. In: Greenberger, M., *Computers, Communication, and the Public Interest*, Johns Hopkins Press, 37-72.

[13] Citton, Y. (2014) Pour une écologie de l'attention. Seuil.

[14] Kahneman, D. (2011) Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

[15] Pariser, E. (2011) The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You. Penguin Press.

[16] Rosen, L.D., Lim, A.F., Carrier, L.M. and Cheever, N.A. (2011) An Empirical Examination of the Educational Impact of Text Message-Induced Task Switching in the Classroom: Educational Implications and Strategies to Enhance Learning. *Revista de Psicología Educativa*, **17**, 163-177. https://doi.org/10.5093/ed2011v17n2a4

[17] Sweller, J. (1988) Cognitive Load during Problem Solving: Effects on Learning. *Cognitive Science*, **12**, 257-285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

[18] Mayer, R.E. (2009) Multimedia Learning. 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press.

[19] Clark, A. and Chalmers, D.J. (1998) The Extended Mind. *Analysis*, **58**, 7-19. https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/58.1.7

[20] Clark, A. (2008) Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension. Oxford University Press.

[21] Brady, W.J., Wills, J.A., Jost, J.T., Tucker, J.A. and Van Bavel, J.J. (2017) Emotion Shapes the Diffusion of Moralized Content in Social Networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **114**, 7313-7318. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618923114

[22] Sunstein, C.R. (2017) #Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400884711

[23] Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T. and Rapson, R.L. (1994) Emotional Contagion. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139174138

[24] Kramer, A.D.I., Guillory, J.E. and Hancock, J.T. (2014) Experimental Evidence of Massive-Scale Emotional Contagion through Social Networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **111**, 8788-8790. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1320040111

[25] Boyd, D. (2014) It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens. Yale Univer-

sity Press.

[26] Gillespie, T. (2018) Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media. Yale University Press.

[27] Couldry, N. and Mejias, U.A. (2019) The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism. Stanford University Press.

[28] Greenhalgh, T., Thorne, S. and Malterud, K. (2018) Time to Challenge the Spurious Hierarchy of Systematic over Narrative Reviews? *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, **48**, e12931. https://doi.org/10.1111/eci.12931

[29] Snyder, H. (2019) Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, **104**, 333-339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

[30] Floridi, L. (2014) The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere Is Reshaping Human Reality. Oxford University Press.

[31] Neisser, U. (1967) Cognitive Psychology. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

[32] Moscovici, S. (2000) Psychologie sociale des relations à autrui. Nathan/HER.

[33] Hepp, A. (2020) Deep Mediatization. Routledge.

[34] Boyd, D. (2011) Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications. In: Papacharissi, Z., *A Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*, Routledge, 39-58.

[35] Bucher, T. and Helmond, A. (2018) The Affordances of Social Media Platforms. In: Burgess, J., Marwick, A. and Poell, T., *The Sage Handbook of Social Media*, Sage Publications, 233-253. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473984066.n14

[36] Orlikowski, W.J. and Scott, S.V. (2008) Sociomateriality: Challenging the Separation of Technology, Work and Organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, **2**, 433-474. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211644

[37] Leonardi, P.M. (2013) Theoretical Foundations for the Study of Sociomateriality. *Information and Organization*, **23**, 59-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2013.02.002

[38] Floridi, L. (2023) The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities. Oxford University Press.

[39] Miao, F. and Holmes, W. (2023) Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693